

### **Wednesday, July 16, 2014**

The second regular meeting of July of the Pike County Commissioners was called to order by Commissioner Osterberg at 9:00 a.m. at the Pike County Administration Building, followed by the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag.

**PRESENT:** Commissioners Caridi (via telephone until the Press & Public Comments/Questions section at the end of the meeting), Osterberg and Wagner; Chief Clerk Orben; Solicitor Farley.

#### ***Public Comments/Questions concerning today's agenda.***

##### ***Item #1 under new business was moved to this point in the meeting.***

Mike Dennen of PNC Bank explained that the County is refinancing the \$5,149,882 at a fixed rate of 1.5% for the remaining tenor of the debt. This will save the County \$174,197 over the next two years. Joe Pierce of Eckert Seamans, the County's Bond Counsel, introduced Ordinance #25 which is ready for adoption by the Commissioners. This was advertised in the News Eagle and Pike County Dispatch. The County is qualified as a local government unit under the Local Government Unit Debt Act, which authorizes how the County can issue debt and borrow money. The amount of the note is \$5,149,882 which is a precise amount, unlike bond issues which are sold in \$5,000 denominations. The bank loan can be right down to pennies of the amount that is needed to do the refunding project and have the minimal amount of excess funds. This will include the 2004 notes, 2004 A bonds which will be paid off in October 1, 2014. The ordinance authorizes TD Wealth Management as successor the paying agent to put out the legal notices to the bond holders to see that those bonds are available for redemption on that date and no interest will accrue on those obligations after October 1, 2014. Mr. Pierce said that the Ordinance needs to be approved by DCED, after which the closing should be scheduled for August 21. After the closing the note will be delivered to PNC Bank, who will wire the money to TD Wealth Management, who will see that it is properly positioned, and who will buy US Treasury Obligations for that short period of time as opposed to just sitting there. On October 1<sup>st</sup> the old bonds will be redeemed and the County will be left with the 2014 note to PNC Bank. The previous interest rates were 5.50, 5.65 and 5.75%.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Osterberg, to adopt Ordinance No. 25, Authorizing and Directing Issuance of a General Obligation Note, Series of 2014, in the Principal Amount of \$5,149,882.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi and Osterberg voted 'aye'. Commissioner Wagner abstained. Motion carried.

##### ***Motion: by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to recess the Commissioners' Meeting to hold a Retirement Board Meeting.***

***Vote: Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.***

##### ***A RETIREMENT BOARD MEETING WAS HELD.***

##### ***Motion: by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to reconvene the Commissioners' Meeting.***

***Vote: Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.***

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to approve the July 16, 2014 Agenda.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to approve the July 2, 2014 Commissioners' Meeting Minutes.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to approve the July 10, 2014 Conference Minutes.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to approve payment from **GENERAL FUND (County Bills)**, in the amount of \$189,680.39, subject to further review.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to approve payment from **ACT 44 FUND (Bridges-Prof. Serv.)**, in the amount of \$2,221.75.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to approve payment from **PC EMPLOYEES' HEALTH INS. FUND**, in the amount of \$62,953.16.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

#### **PERSONNEL:**

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to hire **LISA LONGO** as a Site Manager I for the Area Agency on Aging, for less than 1000 hours per year, effective July 15, 2014, with no benefits. This is a replacement position.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

##### ***Motion: by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to recess the Commissioners' Meeting to hold a Salary Board Meeting.***

***Vote: Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.***

##### ***A SALARY BOARD MEETING WAS HELD.***

##### ***Motion: by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to reconvene the Commissioners' Meeting.***

***Vote: Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.***

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to open bids received for the sale of a 1996 Jeep Cherokee, VIN #1J4FJ6850TL234023, with 172,498 miles, for a minimum bid of \$500, AS IS.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

Solicitor Farley opened the only bid which was received from Antonio Biafora in the amount of \$801.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to accept Mr. Biafora's bid for the 1996 Jeep Cherokee, VIN #1J4FJ6850TL234023, with 172,498 miles, AS IS, in the amount of \$801.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to advertise for bids for the HVAC replacement project and for bids for the roof replacement project at the Administration Building.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to execute the Purchase of Service Agreements FY 2014-15 between the following Providers and the County of Pike, on behalf of Children & Youth Services: Interprettek Pennsylvania and Edison Court, Inc.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to execute the Agreement for Janitorial Services between Jane Phraner and the County of Pike, on behalf of the Area Agency on Aging for the Blooming Grove Senior Center.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to authorize the Vice Chairman to execute the Annual Software Support Renewal Agreement between Real Vision Software, Inc. and the County of Pike, on behalf of the Prothonotary's Office.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to execute the Contract for Consulting Services and Statement of Work between BTM Software Solutions and the County of Pike, on behalf of the District Attorney's Office.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Caridi and seconded by Commissioner Wagner, to execute the HAVA Certification of County Maintenance of Effort for the reporting period January 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014, on behalf of the Elections Office.

**VOTE:** Commissioners Caridi, Osterberg and Wagner voted 'aye'. Motion carried.

## **MISCELLANEOUS:**

Timothy Knapp, Operations/Training/Facility Director, gave an overview of the Training Facility activities of the first half of 2014. There were 21 classes equaling 192 hours of training with an average of 32 students per class; 17 company level drives equaling 80 hours of training with an average of 14 students per drill; 353 hours of classroom use by other Pike County agencies, such as Aging, Children & Youth, Source Water and the PA Department of Health. The highlights of the first half of the year were hosting the first ever Northeast Terrorism Task Force meeting; Governor Corbett toured the facility; and the Training Facility became state accredited by the Department of Health as a Continuing Education Sponsor for EMS providers to stay in-county for training. During the next six months, the Bucks Basic Academy Class will be held for 160 to 180 hours, a Recruiting & Retention Planning Event will be held on August 21, 2014 with fire departments and municipality officials.

## **PRESS & PUBLIC COMMENTS/QUESTIONS (Commissioner Caridi ended the call at this time).**

Commissioner Osterberg announced that the Commissioners Meeting originally scheduled for August 6<sup>th</sup> has been cancelled and has been rescheduled for July 30<sup>th</sup>.

Peter Rushton, resident of Milford, asked if the County has an annual budget for building maintenance. Commissioner Wagner responded that it is part of the budget as one of the line items for departments. Mr. Rushton asked how much is in the annual budget for building maintenance. The Commissioners did not know the answer off the top of their heads, but would look at the budget and give him an answer after the meeting. Mr. Rushton inquired as to why, if there is an annual budgeted amount for building maintenance, the two buildings down here are not being cared for. He said the Courthouse definitely needs work, as he walks by he sees it needs a lot of work, and the building next to it, the historic building needs a lot of work. He asked if this was not what the money was budgeted for. Commissioner Wagner said he is absolutely right, those buildings were not taken care of. Commissioner Wagner said once they start working on the Annex there is money going to be expended to fix the Courthouse, the present Courthouse, inside and outside. The Courthouse will be put back in good shape. The other building, the Kenworthy building, is still up in the air, what is going to happen to that, which will be decided by Milford Borough. Commissioner Osterberg understands Mr. Rushton's concern about the condition of the buildings and informed him that, just recently, this building has been bid on to be painted, the Miller Oil building on George Street is getting refurbished on the outside and we just got a bid for gutters on the old jail and also a bid to paint Debbie Fischer's office. This is separate from the Courthouse. Commissioner Osterberg understands exactly what Mr. Rushton is saying and he takes no ownership of it, but the bids are out there.

Ms. Nichols, also a resident of Milford, said that all these different things are being put out for bids, but there does not seem like there were any bids for the Courthouse. Commissioner Osterberg said that they have not put the Courthouse out for bid yet. He explained that these are not going out for formal bids. Local painters are being called because they are under the threshold. Three to four written quotes are being received for the painting. These are not bids that are over the threshold of \$19,500. Commissioner Osterberg said that they are just trying to do some maintenance on the buildings, like the gutters on the old jail with a tree growing out the back of it. She said that the plans that were presented for the Courthouse sounded like it was a done deal when it was presented at the Planning Board meeting, which she attended, and here, she said, you share the plans, it wasn't like there was still room for variation or difference in prices, that's why she is saying it doesn't sound like it is....so you put a plan before the Borough Council and they were asked to expedite things, that's what it said in the paper, based on what? Based on what, if that wasn't the plan, that's what she wants to know. Commissioner Osterberg replied that they only went to the Borough Council informally to show them what the project is looking like. Nothing has gone out to bid, and as far as expediting it through the Borough, Commissioner Osterberg said there is a little confusion around the word expedite. The Borough has a sequence of order, the first thing you are supposed to do is get a sewerage permit, after that you get your zoning, and you work down, and one of the last things you need is on the list is ARB, because there is no reason to get an ARB permit if you don't have a sewerage permit because you can't build a building or do what you want to do. Commissioner Osterberg explained that what they asked the Borough, which is not unusual, because the library has done this and many of the other organizations that have built buildings, is

if they can do the zoning, the ARB, and do it all together, but that if something happens in the middle of doing zoning, we could start all over again. We can't tell them we already got that because we changed the design of the building. Let's say we go for zoning and we change the size of the building on the plot and right now we are saying it's going to be 7 foot off the line, the line is 5 foot, we go through the whole zoning, get a zoning application, then go back to ARB and ARB says we need to move the building over 3 feet and now we are within the 5 feet, we have to go back to zoning. That's our peril, that's our problem. There was nothing being done that was going to expedite, it was just moving together, that's all it was, simultaneously. Commissioner Osterberg said that as far as bidding anything out, there is nothing bid out, we don't even have bid packages. Ms. Nichols said that your anticipation on this going through is quite a ways into the future. Commissioner Osterberg replied that the Commissioners are going to the Borough Council on...Solicitor Farley said the 28<sup>th</sup> is ARB and the 30<sup>th</sup> is Planning. Ms. Nichols again asked if anything else was needed. Commissioner Osterberg said that the bid package is not needed to be in place because we don't bid the project until we get approval on the project. We can't go out and ask people to bid on a building that there are no approvals for yet. Ms. Nichols asked if there is a budget for this or a planned price that you are starting with? Commissioner Osterberg answered that we have a budget of \$10 million, which includes everything, for renovation of the existing Courthouse and the construction of the new one. Ms. Nichols asked if any inspections were done on those buildings to check for asbestos or mold/mildew, things that would affect the cost if they're found. Commissioner Osterberg said that some of the buildings have been looked at, but he is not sure if the Courthouse has been itself. He wasn't sure, but that's what we have the engineer form and he's sure that before he does all that, he's going to have to go through all that, but he is not sure that they are renovating everything out of the courthouse they are going to be knocking the walls down. We are not doing any of that. The inside of that existing Courthouse is pretty much staying the way you see it because when the Pennsylvania Museum Commission was here, they were very concerned about what was being done inside that building, and there is nothing changing inside that building. There may be a movement around the entryway, but he would have to look at the plans, but not much, there are no walls coming down, they are not changing everything inside there. Ms. Nichols again said that they don't know what is behind the walls. Commissioner Osterberg said again that they are not taking the walls down. Ms. Nichols again asked even if they find things that are not good, like mold. Commissioner Osterberg said he didn't know if there was mold in the building. There could be mold in this building too, he does not know that.

Someone asked if the County has gone to the formal planning process with the town for the use, not short term for a building, but long term on how the two will interact over the course of the next 25 or 50 years if growth changes. Commissioner Osterberg answered that years ago that was done, when he was a Council Member, about how the County would grow within the Borough. He doesn't know if there was one down now because this whole plan has been worked on for quite a long time. That's why they keep going back to the Borough, because it's the Borough Council is who we keep on bringing these plans to show them, which is why we had informal, six times now, 2 each to the ARB, the Planning Commission and the Borough Council. Nothing formal, just laying out, this is what we're doing so that they can understand it so that they can ask us questions, and that's the process. The gentlemen asked if there was a written document from the other plan. Commissioner Osterberg didn't understand what the other plan was. The gentleman said this wasn't the first process. Commissioner Caridi said years and years ago there was always discussion on how the County would expand. As far as this current plan right now, that's why we have been going back and forth to the Borough. Since it is growing so much, the gentleman continued, doesn't it make sense to bring in an outside company that does a study, not necessarily a building but not an architect of the building but just how the town will co exist if we grow again, what happens if the Administration Building has to be enlarged. What happens if you get more criminal cases in the Courthouse, not necessarily....Commissioner Wagner said that's something the Borough may want to explore, but we have done as pace needs study as to what we need with regards to the functioning departments that will be going into the annex. We did a space study which is probably going to provide our space needs for hopefully the next 15 to 20 years. The gentleman asked if that included everything that the town has. Commissioner Wagner said that if the Borough would want to get involved in something like that they could. Commissioner Osterberg stated that he thinks the Borough has done that because it is in the Comprehensive Plan. About 5 years ago there was a Comprehensive Plan done with Milford Township and Milford Borough and that encompassed all that. That is really the Borough's role to deal with their Comprehensive Plan. This is the County seat and we need to expand the Courthouse. The Comprehensive Plan needs to be updated every 10 years which all municipalities have to have pursuant to state statute. The gentleman said it was his understanding that the County can buy any building in the Borough at any time, not change it but buy it, so you could say we need the Tom Quick for office space. Solicitor Farley responded that this County has never used eminent domain on any of its properties. The gentleman said you are evidently buying and growing based on the County's needs and you go to the Council for buildings and stuff in terms of the whole plan of how the two needs to coexist it would make sense to him to sit down. Commissioner Osterberg said we have been there two times to the Borough Council. They are the elected officials of the Borough. We have been there. We have shown them everything. There is nothing that we are not telling them, but they have the right to then, maybe you need to ask them if that's what they want to do. We've shown that to them and they can comment however they want to comment on this. That's why we are going there.

A woman stated that you made comments about bids to the Miller Oil building where at one point there was talk about moving the Kenworthy building to that corner. What's going to be done to that building? Commissioner Osterberg clarified that it was never going to be on that corner. It is the next lots over. The old gas station that you're talking about is going to be removed so that we can expand the parking lot. The Miller Oil building, Commissioner Osterberg explained that all these buildings have names that go back 100 years, is actually the little white house on George Street. Chucky's Arco or whatever anybody wants to call it, or the dry cleaner, is the little gas station that sits there. That is being removed, not the white house. The woman asked about all the cars that are parked there and if they are all use. Commissioner Osterberg said yes. The woman asked in what capacity? Commissioner Osterberg said they are used by Children & Youth, Probation, County use. It is either use County cars or allow employees to use their cars and pay them mileage, so we have a fleet of cars, but most of those cars belong to Children & Youth, they need them, yes they do, and in the back are all the buses which are the senior buses.

Amy Eisenberg said she was at and spoke at the last Commissioners meeting. She said as much as she can appreciate, perhaps she can't, the space study that has been done for the Courthouse needs, she is wondering if an impact study on the Milford community and the County at large, residential and commercial properties, has been done, because that is a major concern. Commissioner Wagner said the County has not done that, but that is something the Borough Council can consider, but as a County Commissioner, we are dealing with the Borough. She said as a County Commissioner, don't you feel a certain liability to your

constituents and responsibility to answer to them and their property values, now that there is growing opposition to the Courthouse and as far as I'm concern I haven't seen change in pace or a change of perhaps tweaking the plan or opening up to public forum. Commissioner Osterberg said that she has not seen the plan yet, the outside design is not done yet. As far as property values, Commissioner Osterberg said that he and Commissioner Wagner live in this town. He said do you think if he really thought this would have an impact on the value of his house by this building, he didn't think there was an impact by this building built when he lived here in 1984 and he doesn't think there was an impact on Commissioner Wagner's house in 1984. So if someone wants to do an economic impact to see what that building is going to do to the values of the houses in this town, he guesses someone can do it. He doesn't see where either building affects the value of his house as it sits right now. She, as a County taxpayer, is not willing to accept that he is not willing to accept the opposition and the impact on her property value. She said she was the only one in this room two weeks ago and as you can see we filled the room, we filled the Borough Council meeting last week, and I don't understand why you're not listening to what you're constituents are saying. I am listening, Commissioner Caridi said, I am not agreeing. Commissioner Wagner said we are never going to see eye to eye on this. We have a project and we think we have considered the alternatives, you probably don't think we have, but we are not going to see eye to eye and we have been going around on this for months and months. The final arbiter on this is the Milford Borough Council. By law we have to go to the ARB first which we are going to go to on the 28<sup>th</sup>, and then the ARB will make a recommendation to the Borough Council and the Borough Council will make a decision and they obviously are the ones more so than us represent just the residents of Milford. So, continued Commissioner Wagner, you can make your position known to the ARB, you can make your position known to the Milford Borough Council and they will make a decision and if they make a decision we don't like, we are going to have to deal with it. We are going to have to deal with it, and I'm not saying we are going to sue them. Someone said that once. We may have to change things, but they are the final arbiter, and I am tired of discussing the whole thing with different alternatives back and forth because we are never going to see eye to eye on this, that's for sure. Ms. Eisenberg said it is not a matter of you and I seeing eye to eye, there are many of me, and I'm not even a resident of Milford. Commissioner Wagner said go to the ARB then, go to the ARB, that's where we are going next. Ms. Eisenberg said she wants to stand here today on record as saying that you don't represent my interests. Commissioner Wagner said that's fine, we will put it in the record. Commissioner Osterberg said that he can't expect that he is going to represent everybody, but I also represent, as Karl said here many times, there are 57,000 people in this County. We represent all of them. I really do not see the impact that this is going to have on this community. As much as I keep telling you this building didn't either. Neither did the PennStar building, neither did the Newton Hospital. As you are saying to us that we are not listening, I am listening to you and very clearly, but I am not agreeing. There is a difference there, because there are other people that have a totally different viewpoint than what this group has. I can tell you, I see them. I was out all weekend throughout this County. There is a whole different viewpoint out there. So, while I am listening to you, I have to listen to them and we feel that we have made the right decision. We are going to go to the Borough. Come to the Borough meeting, come and listen to what we are going to do. If it gets pushed down, I don't know where we are going, I know I said last time we would go to court. Who knows if we are going to go to court. I don't know what we are going to do at that point, but we need to realize that this Court facility needs to be added on to that building. To take that building and do anything else with it but use it as a courthouse is not, there is not a lot of responsibility there, I'm sorry, so that has to be our courthouse and it needs to be an addition on it because there is a major security issue. You were here last week listening to the Sheriff. He is telling you what is going on over there and when something happens, and I'm not saying it will, but if something does happen, something tragic, who is going to be sitting here saying oh my gosh why didn't you do something about it. If you would just give us time to show you the plan, I think you are going to see that this could be a building that we can all come to realize is a part of Milford. Something in this town is going to change. As I have said, and I am going to repeat myself, do we honestly believe that every single home on Broad and Harford Street is going to be here for the next 20 years. Do we really believe that? I don't think that that's reality and that was never the ARB's intention in 1999 when I sat there.

Commissioner Wagner said the Borough Council should be the entity you want to go to. We have to answer to every taxpayer in this County. The Borough Council doesn't. The Borough Council only has to act for the people that live and have business in the Borough. That's where you should be directing your attention too, and hopefully you will, and again, if they're not satisfied with our plan, we will find out and then we are going to have to deal with it, but they are the ones who are going to decide, and they only represent people like you in the Borough, so they don't have to listen to somebody else, like we do in Lehman Township, Palmyra, Lackawaxen, Blooming Grove and Porter.

Someone said, do you remember two weeks ago that I specifically had asked Matt if the ARB turns you down and the Borough Council turns you down, what are you going to do next, are you going to go the Courts? Karl said no not necessarily. The gentleman said that Matt answered yes. Matt responded that you're right, I'm not going to deny it, it's in the minutes, it's fine, but as all of us in this room and anyplace you know, can misspeak at times. I can rethink my thoughts, but we are going to have to do something, whether we go to court whatever we need to do, somehow this has got to be answered. Somehow this has to be done, and maybe it is going to court. As much as I hear it, there is another group that says if we win they are going to take us to court, so I hope this doesn't end up in court, but I think you need to let us give you the plan and let you see how this building is going to appear, and then take it to the Borough Council and you go to the Borough Council and you go to the ARB and let them, like Karl says, they're the ones who are going to make the final decision, not us. We are only getting proposals here. Commissioner Wagner said the options we have are obviously we go to court, but I think we also could rethink the whole issue through as to what we are going to do. A lot of people want us to move the County seat to Blooming Grove, that's floating around all over, I hear that all the time, there's an option there. There are a lot of options.

Someone asked Commissioner Wagner if the people that are in the other areas that you speak of like Lehmann or places like that, they don't have the same vested interest in Milford that the business owners have. Commissioner Wagner stated no, that's why I say the Milford Borough Council, that's where you go to. They don't have to listen to those people, but we do. We are elected by everybody, not just the Milford Borough voters, we have to answer to everybody. We have you saying one thing and we have people all over the County saying other things to me, that's why I think that's how the system is set up, the Borough Council is the one who makes the decision.

Another person said, she just said they are not hearing. I am from Dingman Township. I have a very vested interest in Milford Borough. I am born and raised in Pike County, and we need this courthouse. If anybody has ever had a juvenile go through this

system, we need a new courthouse, so it's necessary. Someone responded that nobody is denying that. Commissioner Osterberg said I understand that. We have been writing this continually. We all agree we need a courthouse, the thing is we have determined that that is the most cost effective location to put a Courthouse because it needs to attach to the existing Courthouse. If you haven't seen this we have put out all these documents. We have looked to go to the back and we can go on here all night long, but I have to tell you that I personally don't agree with the eroding of the residential zone. That's up to the Borough again.

Kathy Rossanelli introduced herself and asked if the different campuses had been entertained instead of having this monster building. Commissioner Osterberg said they are talking about redundancy of services and trying to make it one secure facility so Probation, the Courts and the Sheriff can be in one place instead of marching people around the town. That is a real safety issue there. Again, Commissioner Osterberg said, he wished they would wait until the plans are absolutely put out there before they call it a monster. He said he asked last month if this was a monster and he was told no. This building is just as big, sits almost at the same spot as this new addition will. This is a pretty big building, but do you even notice it? Some answered yes. Commissioner Osterberg asked if they thought it harmed the Borough? In a way, someone responded. Commissioner Osterberg said the County seat has to be in the Borough so what else, what other choices do we have? Someone said it's the design too. Commissioner Osterberg said again then wait till the design is out, we are not done yet. Someone asked Isn't there any way possible that you all can get together and we can attend a meeting where the Commissioners, the ARB, and the Trust all sit together and comment before you make final decisions. Commissioner Osterberg said it's the ARB meeting, that's where it will happen. The individual asked if everybody will meet together. Commissioner Osterberg said we can meet at the ARB meeting and present the whole thing. The ARB meeting is the 28<sup>th</sup> and you have to ask if the Borough Council wants to attend the ARB meeting. The ARB meeting is on the 28<sup>th</sup> and they normally don't because the ARB is only a recommending Board to the Borough Council and the Borough Council meets on the first Monday of the month. The individual said she would like to hear both sides, and from what she understands the design of the building is what is going to affect Milford. Commissioner Wagner said that's why he would go to the ARB and bring that point up. The individual said they don't want it to look like a state prison and she doesn't want to live in an environment of internment where we hold prisoners for four to five months. Commissioner Osterberg assured that that is not happening. She said they speak about an influx of thieves, and Commissioner Osterberg responded that yes, they are up in the Correctional Facility. OK that was one month, she said she used to work in the Prothonotary, so you're talking about an influx of thieves and drug people and that, so you only have six judges, you think these court cases are going to go one, two, three, they are going to be in there months, they are going to be in there months, so that means you're going to have holding cells for these people. Commissioner Osterberg said there is some real confusion here. Solicitor Farley explained by saying that there are only two judges, Judge Kameen and Judge Chelak. The woman asked, you don't have six judges. No, said Solicitor Farley, there are two and the magistrates, but they don't handle those cases. Judge Kameen does most of the criminal work, one judge. She asked if that takes a day, a month? Solicitor Farley said he would explain it to her so that she would know and then go from there. He said all the prisoners are kept up at the jail on 739. The only concern is the AOPC which runs the Court system for the State, and a lot they are trying to do by video conferencing, we are finally in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, but there are certain times the prisoners have to be in front of Judge Kameen. The problem right now is we have that little jail there where the Sheriff's office is. And fights break out, she said. Solicitor Farley continued that we have major problems, I don't want to get into specifics, but you're right. The prisoners will be taken down from the jail and they will be kept at the Sheriff's office just for a maximum the day while their time is up for court. They will not be in Milford overnight, they will not be in Milford for more than 5 or 6 hours, and they will be brought back to the jail facility. She asked why they need such a huge building. The huge building, Solicitor Farley explained the intent is to house the Sheriff's Office, the holding cells, that you are concerned about, but just for the day, and the DA's office, the Court systems there, the Court Administration staff, everything is going to be incorporated into that building and part of the reason it looks bigger than you say is AOPC again requires security purposes. We can't have the Judges using the bathrooms that the prisoners use. We can't have the Judges using where the public are. The intent anymore because of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century problems we have, they want to keep the Judges secure from everyone for safety purposes, so there are some redundancy in bathrooms and areas, but that is because that is the security we need to protect the Judges. I am not asking you to agree or disagree. I am just explaining why it's being done this way, that there are certain requirements we have to meet, but in fairness, we only have two judges, no prisoners will be here overnight, the intent is just for security purposes because right now what we are having is the guards are walking some prisoners from the jail to the courthouse, it looks terrible and god forbid somebody gets hurt and whether you like it or not, this County is really dealing with some major heroin problems. The woman said she was not against it. Solicitor Farley said he wasn't asking for or against, he was just telling her why. She said she was against the size and the design. Solicitor Farley told the woman that he would give her every opportunity at the hearing for her to raise her issues. He said his job is to present the County's side, but he will also make sure that she gets to present her side. He said that this is not a position where it's hide and go seek or hide the facts. We are going to lay everything out. I'm not asking everybody to agree with us. This is what we need to do, these are the reasons why the Commissioners have reached their conclusions. I agree with that lady, although she will not agree with the conclusions, but I will tell you in good faith, there has been a lot of effort and time to look at all the issues, including going backwards, everything, and economically for the whole County, and I agree with you, economically it has been determined this is the best project. I understand some people don't like it, Farley continued. I respect your decision, you can lay it out, but the way it works is we can't do private meetings, we can't go into back rooms to meet with the Trust members. We have an obligation to have every meeting in the public, every meeting for everyone who wants to participate to participate, and nothing is hidden, so the best way to do that is to do the proper procedures. We are going to go to ARB, we are going to have everything laid out on the 28<sup>th</sup>. We are then going to Planning and we'll lay it all out. The woman asked if the public is allowed to attend. Solicitor Farley told her that the Commissioners want them to attend. He said if he didn't say it enough, it's the 28<sup>th</sup> and the 30<sup>th</sup>, please all come. All come and present your sides, and we will make decisions. Solicitor Farley asked the woman if he answered the questions and she said somewhat, she understands what is involved.

Someone by the name Michelle asked what was meant when Commissioner Osterberg said this has to be our courthouse. What do you mean by saying that has to be our courthouse. Commissioner Osterberg explained that to not use the existing courthouse as a courthouse is...he said if we build this thing, two courtrooms, in another location, for all the security reasons, what is the County to do with that building? Michelle said you could term that we are not using it for different, but why do you use the term it has to be our courthouse. Commissioner Osterberg said it does not have to be, but economically it has to be because we would have to build even bigger if we want to keep all of it in one building and we think that's very important for security that

everything be in one building. That building is already built, so we are looking to build an addition on the side of it and continue to use it as it was built. Michelle said so it doesn't have to be our courthouse. Commissioner Wagner said not legally no. Commissioner Osterberg said it needs to be in the Borough. So, Michelle said, it could be safer and built in another location, it is possible, it doesn't have to be there. Commissioner Osterberg again said it's all economics. Michelle said it is an old building and a historic building and maybe that needs to be retired and preserved. It has served a great purpose, but maybe it could be repurposed to be preserved. Commissioner Osterberg repeated that the Pennsylvania Museum Commission is very concerned about what is done inside that building. It is a huge courtroom upstairs, so if they are concerned about what is done in there. It's a courthouse. It has served us since 1872 and it's continued to be our courthouse, now we just need to put some more room with it, but to say we should retire that and go to another location and build a building that is all of that plus the addition, we are talking about some serious money now. We are trying to do this economically and not spend, and I don't even know what that amount of money would be, but it would be huge. It would be a lot more than \$9 million to build that building and another.

Sean Strub said he thought he heard that the Commissioners are getting bids to paid Debbie Fischer's building? Commissioner Osterberg said yes, correct. Sean Strub asked, so is the consideration of demolishing that.....Commissioner Osterberg said let's correct that for a moment. We never.....Commissioner Wagner interrupted and said we never suggested that, the Commission suggested we take that building down instead of maybe the two little ones next to it. Commissioner Osterberg said not our suggestion. Sean Strub said he didn't bring it with him, but there is correspondence from the County to the Historic Museum Commission saying that you are considering that. Commissioner Osterberg explained by saying when they came here we walked them around the Borough, they stood in front of Debbie's building and they said to us you should take that building down also. He said that's in the ARB and he didn't see a reason to knock it down. They put that in there, so we answered them, she was talking about something with parking if I remember right, there was something about parking, but that was never our intention. We may have answered her because they brought it up, but that building is not coming down. Sean Strub said he was happy to hear that and would be happy to share this correspondence with anyone who wants it. Commissioner Osterberg said they had to answer her concerns. Commissioner Wagner stated the reason they said that is because that building is not in the residential zone. They were saying in back of the alley, that's where the residences start and they said why don't you just don't do anything over there, but take this one down because it's not in the residential zone. Sean Strub said that Matt's point about the concern about going in the back of the courthouse because it goes into the residential zone, even though it would be totally surrounded by properties that are already not in residential use, that disturbs him yet tearing down two houses in the residential zone, two craftsman houses that are used for county offices to turn into a parking lot, you don't consider that an infringement into the residential zone? Commissioner Osterberg said I do, but when the County bought that back in 1991, they should have taken them down them because that was their plan. Their plan was that those buildings were coming down for parking. No it doesn't because I think there are going to be times where that, that's not a three story brick building though, or a two story brick building sitting next to somebody's residence. No it doesn't. I think a parking lot in a residential zone it can be done tastefully and I think it will be fine. Those buildings back there to have offices in them are, they are two bedroom and three bedroom homes, I mean we are trying County offices efficiently out of houses. We can move them into a facility like this and have more parking. Years ago that was a big concern in the Borough, about how much parking we have and about how much parking the County was using on a daily basis, well that can alleviate some of it. The back of that is going to be the sewerage for this addition, so there is not going to be much property there for parking, and there is not going to be any back yard left. Sean Strub said that Karl and Matt reject the idea that this addition will have an impact on the property values and businesses, I'm just curious as to how many people here are property owners and business owners in Milford who believe that it will. Bring it up to the ARB meeting, Commissioner Wagner said. Sean Strub said the issue with the assumptions and the plan, first of all, I filed a right to know request that specifically asked for information on your space planning needs and the assumptions that you are using for that and I was told nothing existed. Subsequently you have referenced the Kimble study. Let's just stop one moment said Commissioner Osterberg, Mr. Kiger, who is not here, had a right to know request for the Kimbles back in February. Sean Strub said he is talking to last year, before that, subsequently you have identified the Kimbles study and you rejected that study and had McGoey Hauser do a study, but no one has seen that study. And even more specifically,.....Chief Clerk Orben and Solicitor Farley said we don't have them. Sean Strub said if we paid for them but we don't have access to them, the issue will come back again and again, but even after the actual documents and the actual study that this plan is based on that the public can't see because you are calling it McGoey's work product and we don't have a right to see it, can you at least identify what the population projections are, what the case load projections are, that you are basing the size of this facility on, because I suggested repeatedly that it may be larger than we need, but I also follow that by saying I don't know because I don't know the assumptions that underline the size that has been proposed. I think that's the issue. The people would like more information, rather than say take your word for it. If McGoey, Hauser did a study, why can't we see it? Why can't we see it in comparison, how much this had previously and how much space it would have now. What is the population and projection reason. Since this project started, we go from being the fastest growing state to now we are losing population. These are the ambiguities that concern a lot of people and that the Commissioners, if they provided that information it would give more assurance around the process. Sean Strub continued by saying that Commissioner Wagner said we will never see eye to eye, to him that is saying my mind is closed, I am not listening, that's what I hear. Commissioner Wagner asked what did Strub think he was doing for the past 9 months. All he is saying is that you don't agree with us on this, we don't agree with you, you can't say we haven't considered other alternatives, we have, but why should we keep going back and forth when the Borough Council is the one to make the final decision. He said, answer me this, the Borough Council is the final arbiter, they represent you and the people in this Borough, we represent the whole County. Why can't you let them make a decision, they are going to have to legally make a decision. Mr. Strub replied that what is going to happen is that it is going to come to the Borough Council and you're going to say we spent so much money, the time is urgent, we are going to have a security issue and you can't go back and change it. You've already spent with McGoey Hauser on just the Malhame Building, not the construction, just the engineering and architectural services and all the things you do with McGoey Hauser on no bid contracts, you've spent \$113,000 just for the Malhame Building. Commissioner Osterberg and Solicitor Farley said there are no such things as no bid contracts, these are professional services. The Malhame Building was put out for bid. You just said a no bid contracts. That's not fair. The Borough of Milford has professional services, an engineer, Schoenagel, now they have McGoey Hauser & Edsall, so everybody has professional services. To say that it is no bid, it is a little confusing. Sean Strub clarified that municipalities have the right to hire professional services just to designate, they hire a solicitor, they hire engineers. Solicitor Farley said they have a right to determine their professionals based on experience. Sean Strub said that what was intended for was for routine things that come up all the time, your legal counsel, your engineering issues that come up, which is understood, but whether that is

intended to develop major capital projects. On the Courthouse alone, just on the Courthouse expansion, not including the Malhame building or all sorts of other things, you've now spent over \$280,000 with McGoey, Hauser, \$280,000, and that's just in the last two and a half years. I don't know what there was before that. Sean Strub continued that the Commissioners hired them to go and get the architect and do the appraisals, and this is a way of, to me, evading the spirit of the bidding process for municipalities in Pennsylvania. Back to the point, is that your argument with the Borough Council is going to be it's too late, you just raised the prospect of the security thing. This is a kind of veiled threat. Commissioner Osterberg said there is no veiled threat. I take this extremely serious. I get tired of people telling me I have a veiled threat. There is no threat here. We believe that what we are doing is the correct thing. You don't agree with us, but we are listening to you, but we don't agree. Can we agree to disagree? But to say that we are coming up with a veiled threat to you or anybody else in this room is really unfair. It is extremely unfair. It is unfair to people in that Borough Council, everybody, to think that we did that. I don't do that. I'm not telling you this County seat is moving. I am not telling you anything like that. I am telling you that we think, as Elected Officials that represent 57,000 people, we are elected to make decisions. Sometimes those decisions are really hard and you know what folks, this is a really hard one, and I would ask any of you to sit up here and try to make this decision to spend another \$1.5 million to save a \$290,000 house. This is business. I hate to put it that way, but I'm not looking to reduce the value of your home, I don't think anybody's business in this town. I have worked in this town for 35 years. It built all these buildings. I made a living here. Nothing changed when all of a sudden something got built, but don't tell us that we are making veiled threats to you. We're not. So let's just stick to the subject.

Commissioner Wagner said you know how the system is set up here. Nationwide you have Boards that make decisions because the people and the groups that come in front of them can't agree on things. That's the reason you have a Borough Council and that's the reason the law says they will make the decision. We may not like it, but we'll have to deal with it. You may not like it, and you'll have to deal with it, or you can appeal it, but that's where we are going and that's how the system works. So let us go there. It's going to be two weeks from now, and you can go in there and say whatever you want, because you have to appeal it then. We don't make the decision, they do. So you have to influence them and you might and they may tell us forget it, we don't like it and we don't want it. Sean Strub said and then you'll sue. He said you say you won't and Matt says that you will. That's one of our options, said Commissioner Wagner. So, asked Sean Strub, are you saying that you will not sue the Borough?

Commissioner Wagner said we have two other Commissioners besides him. Solicitor Farley said no, we are not suing the Borough. Commissioner Osterberg stated that he told them earlier that he misspoke. Is anybody in here that doesn't misspeak sometimes, raise your hands. That's right, we all do. Sean Strub again asked are you saying that you will not sue the Borough. Commissioner Osterberg said he is not saying one way or the other. Solicitor Farley said the only thing they would do if we don't like the decision, is you would go to the Court, give them the transcript, and say Judge, we don't think the Borough made the right decision. That's all we do. There is no suit to the Borough, and the Borough can take any position they want to. Anybody is entitled to that. Let's compare the County to a basic developer. The developer goes to the ARB, goes to the Planning Commission, it presents their projects they spend money too, and then they either tweak it, make changes, etc., and no developer can make a threat just because I sent money you have to approve the way they sent it. Same for us, we are just equal to the developer, and here's the project. Developers have the right if they think the Borough makes an improper decision to go to the Judge to review it. It is not suing the Borough, it is not suing them personally, it's saying we think a mistake was made. Everybody is entitled to that. That is how the system is set up. Sean Strub continued that the analogy to a developer is actually kind of apt in this circumstance. Solicitor Farley said he thinks it is too. Sean Strub said the County is functioning much more like a Wal-Mart coming in rather than elected representatives. Commissioners Osterberg and Wagner said to tell the Borough that. Sean Strub still continued that with such an important building, it could have such an important impact on the community, why couldn't you have appointed a blue ribbon commission of the various people, why couldn't you have the Preservation Trust involved in this from the beginning, why can't you have the public meetings that we have asked for since last August when I met with you, have a meeting where people from the community can come and present their ideas, they can have the experts there and question them. You've declined all these things, so there is an issue around the process. We may disagree about the result, we certainly disagree about the result now, we may disagree about the result overall, but if there had been a different process, the process you've gone through has been divisive in this community particularly when you use phrases like these elites, and this one percent. Commissioner Osterberg said we never used those terms. Never. That was people in the audience. I have never used that term. You find the minutes that say that I did that. This is the problem here, we are putting words in people's mouths. If you would read the minutes you would see that that does not occur. Commissioner Osterberg continued that just by you doing that and accusing us of doing something that we did not do, there is the divisiveness or whatever word you used, that divides us. I never said that. I respect everybody in this room, and I hope you respect me. Sean Strub asked so neither of you ever said referred to the one percent? No, that was people in the audience, replied Commissioner Osterberg. Go on Channel 13 and listen to the woman who said it. Solicitor Farley said that the Trust gentleman, Brennan, used that term. He started his speech in front of the ARB about the elite and how they contributed to the.....Solicitor Farley said he never touched that and he will not touch that, because he represents as Solicitor, everyone in the County.

Sean Strub pointed out specifically the PennDot building on Bennett Avenue. That would necessitate moving the main Courtroom over to that building, but it would also be much more efficient overall use of space, enable the County to be able to sell the Kenworthy building. There are at least two different parties in town who have expressed an interest in it, sell the buildings on High Street, return those properties to the tax roll, save the cost of demolition which right now you have budgeted at \$120,000, save the cost of finding temporary space while the proposed expansion is under construction. So, according to Sean Strub, the savings would be somewhere close to \$1 million in savings and new revenue, which would be more than enough to save the Kenworthy house and build an additional courtroom. In addition to that other things would be less costly including things like sewage disposal and other things because you have such a large site over there, it's over three acres. Security would be even better over there because you could close it off at Bennett Avenue. You have chosen to determine that the security level need is the very, very highest security level for any Court of Common Pleas in Pennsylvania, the State organization that Matt referenced identifies three different levels of security for Courts of Common Pleas in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and you have determined that we need the very, very highest one. I don't know if that is true or not, but I would be curious to know what other counties in our area have or how that compares. But if that security level is so incredibly high that we need, does it make sense to put this right up against the alleys and the main street with all the pedestrian traffic that we have in the center of town, or wouldn't it make more sense to put it on Bennett Avenue. We have lots of County offices that can go in the Courthouse, the

Auditor's office, whatever, all these offices that are in these little offices, put those offices in the existing Courthouse. The Courtroom itself, perhaps it could become a Community space, perhaps as some creative incredible idea that would contribute enormously to the County if it was used in a different way. I am curious to hear your thoughts on that.

Commissioner Wagner said your thought is brand new. If you want to present that to the Borough, fine, I am not going to wait until we can get use out of that building. Right now we have a contract with the State to buy that building. We have had that contract for six years now. First of all, there are a lot of contingencies in that contract, not the least being environmental concerns, and the State has to run a lot of tests and do a lot of things, and you know how the state is lethargic and it is going to take them forever to do this stuff. Then when we do close on that building, they are going to lease it back until they build the building up in Blooming Grove. It will take the state three to four years to build a building. That's how long it always takes them. So what we are going to do is we are going to put everything on hold. With security problems, Judge Kameen is sitting in a small room and could be shot, we are going to wait five or six more years now so we can use that place down there? I am not willing to wait. Sean Strub said he doesn't think its going to be five or six more years. Commissioner Wagner said if he thinks he's wrong on these facts, then you check them out. Sean Strub said the PennDot spokesperson said they thought it would be ready by late next year or early 2016 in the News Eagle article where Mr. Caridi was quoted as saying.....Commissioner Wagner said we've had six years, I have worked on this contract myself six years ago and we are not even close to closing on it yet, and once we close then they have to build on the other piece. So the main reason you're against that, Strub continued, is because of time? Commissioner Wagner, said no not the main reason. I haven't even looked at the other ones, but right there stops me from even considering something else because we have to get something done for security reasons. We can't wait that long. Sean Strub said he would respectfully suggest if you had a different process that was more inclusive of more stakeholders from the beginning that we would be an approval process for whatever the result was from that rather than the process that is getting increasingly divisive and more and more people are getting....

A woman asked if it goes before the ARB and the Borough Council and they don't approve it, you can take it before a judge that can reverse that? One of the judge' who would be in this space? Solicitor Farley explained that the way it works, not matter which side loses, for lack of a better term, they have the right to appeal to Judge Chelak or Kameen to say that based on the transcripts, we believe the Borough, it would basically be the Borough, because the Borough made the wrong decision. The judge can review the transcript and he can make based on that, send it back and say we need more evidence, or he could just say I disagree, the Borough did what they were allowed to do. So, the woman asked, if he disagrees, then it goes ahead. Solicitor Farley said it depends what he reaches, I guess ultimately if he overturns it and says the Borough is completely wrong and here's why, yes. Do I know where that would go, I don't know. Someone asked which Judge and isn't that a conflict. Solicitor Farley responded that In fairness, I don't know if the Judge would make that decision. They may decide to recuse themselves and have an outside judge make the decision.

Someone mentioned that it sounded like the proposal of Bennett Avenue was something new. She asked if this has any promise at all? Commissioner Osterberg said he answered earlier about having two separate courtrooms that does not satisfy the security. He said now we have redundant services in two buildings. This all comes down to dollars and cents, because if you, again, turn this courtroom into some kind of community building, can we be realistic. I sit on the Community House Board. We have difficult times finding money to keep that building going. Now we are going to have a building over here that's huge. I already told you that the Pennsylvania Museum Commission is very concerned about what happens inside the building not only outside, so when you say we are going to put offices in there and chop up the building. If we are going to build two courthouses down at the PennDot building, where are the dollars and cents for that? Have you ever been in the PennDot building? It's a big garage built in 1933. You look at the front of it and it looks like an office, and you go in the back and they are pulling in trucks the size of this room. It is not an office building. It's an old garage that was built by Pinchot back in 1933. It's a great looking building, but I'm not sure that that building is, we can ask our engineer. I am not telling you I am dismissing anything, but that discussion just started to use the PennDot building, and do we really want the Courthouse to be out of the center of town. The audience answered yes, absolutely. Commissioner Osterberg said he didn't think so, but that is up to the Borough Council.

A gentleman stated that the needs that would need to be taken care of would easily be taken care of on Bennett Avenue and then in the future if there were more expansion needed you could easily handle it there. What would we do in this case if we added on to the current Courthouse and we end up having to knock another block down. I don't think that's right, and to lose all of these historic buildings that are within the historic district just to put this monstrosity up there doesn't make any sense. Commissioner Osterberg said with regard to the word monstrosity, you have to give us a chance to show you the design.

Kathy Rossanelli said she keeps hearing the word security thrown around and one of the things having this huge building and having that many people in the one building, if we have a crisis, now we have a huge crisis there instead of having this divided up. I don't see where this is secure. She thinks this group is asking you to, Karl is saying to us to go to the ARB and have them make this decision, you're on one side, we are on the other side, we are asking you to re-explore some of the sites with us.

A woman said she has a problem with the Commissioners' way of thinking, their values, that they refer to the Kenworthy building as only being worth \$290,000. That building is priceless because it contributes to the ambiance and the integrity and what is Milford. If you go one building at a time and say that building is only worth \$390,000 let's put up a million dollar building because that's worth more, you're destroying Milford. Does that not mean anything to you? Commissioner Osterberg said I don't know if you know me or whatever, I take that stuff personally. I have lived in this town almost my entire life. I live across the street. Do I like that building? I think that building is wonderful, I do, and I think her house is also, but I am also a realist that realizes that not every building in this town is going to be here for 100 years. The woman became very loud and said why not, fight for it, somebody should have fought for the building that Rite Aid replaced. Commissioner Osterberg said if you know the history of the Rite Aid building you're going to find out that the hotel that was there burned down in 1960. The woman said then they should have put a duplicate up there.

Someone asked about the fireworks and the Dunkin Donuts. Commissioner Osterberg said you are asking me Borough questions. I am not the Borough president anymore. You have to go to the Borough for that. That is zoning issues for the Borough.

Another person asked why we would need a level 3 security court system, when we are Milford, Pike County. A level 3 in her mind would be Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, etc. Commissioner Osterberg said that we have that crime. You may not think so but we do. She continued that we don't have the population. Commissioner Osterberg said we have 57,000 people and you have that crime. I am telling you that you have that crime.

A gentleman said that was all the more reason why the Commissioners should consider the Bennett Avenue location. If it takes another year, what's the difference. Commissioner Wagner said it is not another year, it will be 4 or 5 years. If we all have this need why wouldn't we all be able to get on it and get it done sooner. I just think you are being myopic here. You are fixated on this one site when Bennett Avenue could possibly be a better solution now and in the future, and the thing that Sean mentioned previously is that we could link it to the Malhame building as well. Again, Commissioner Wagner told them to present that to the Borough Council. They may think it's a great idea. The gentleman said you guys have made up your minds and that's what we find disturbing. Commissioner Wagner again said we have explored other alternatives, and he doesn't think this is a good alternative. The gentleman said why don't we look into it, concretely, look into it, what would the cost be.

Sean Strub said we need an objective analysis and a committee, you have a representative, the Trust has a representative, the Borough has a representative, the Court system, but an independent, objective committee with some experts on it to look at these alternatives and come back, rather than us listening to you say we looked at that, it's too expensive, it won't work, you just say this and they are essentially your opinions, they are not backed up with real data or analysis with outside expertise other than the expertise you hire, direct and manage.

Someone who is new to the area asked if there were any prisoners in the jail overnight. Commissioner Wagner answered that they come down to court during the day then they leave. She asked what about where the Sheriff is, that's a jail isn't it? Solicitor Farley answered that no it is not a jail, it is just a holding cell. She restated that no prisoners are here in the evening. Commissioner Osterberg said no they are in Blooming Grove. She said she is new to the area and does not know anything about politics, but her personal opinion is that she feels that the gentleman on the right was shut down, that she was looking at body language, and I feel that he is listening, but it's my own personal opinion. Commissioner Wagner replied how is that shut down, I just feel that the system is set up so they have to go to the Borough Council, we have waited as far as I'm concerned long enough, we've had our discussions, and I don't care what you say, we haven't been non-transparent, we have looked at alternatives, we know going back is \$1.5 million. We got that in writing from different entities what it's going to cost, and again, you know the Borough may not care about that. They may say look, spend it, but we represent everybody in the County. Again, I know you probably poo poo that all the time, but the thing is what about the people in Lehman and Palmyra, do they want us to spend another \$1.5 million. Someone said if it takes another year, isn't that worth it to have something for the next 20 years.

Sean Strub again commented that the biggest factor driving cost is the size, and when we can't see the assumptions on which size facility is based, then it is very difficult to respond to that. Solicitor Farley said I'm sorry, Mr. Strub, but the problem is this is a work product. Last I checked, I don't have an actual document in hand, just the work product of the engineer. When I have the document to give you, you will be the first to get it. Sean Strub said he just told you it needs to be.....Solicitor Farley responded that that is where you and I disagree sometimes, you take cheap shots. Arguments ensued.

Solicitor Farley explained that the engineer went through and met with everyone in the County, every department head, every agency starting with the needs study that was originally created and kept notes and documents and reached conclusions on what needs to be met. We then based on that talking from my understanding still cut back based on what the department heads. Commissioner Osterberg said there is that document. Solicitor Farley said he does not have an actual written document to hand out. It is their work product. Someone said we pay for that work product. Commissioner Osterberg said there is an analysis. We brought it to the Borough Council, I am looking through my papers. I am not hiding anything. Someone said they were just there last week and the Borough Council said they didn't have anything, Commissioner Osterberg said there is a document that shows the amount of space, I brought this to the Council, I know they have it, it's on the back of one of these sheets, and I'm sorry I don't have it. It's probably on my desk. It shows what the calculation was for 2008 when they did the space needs study, and then we analyzed that and said let's scale this back because for one thing it was like a \$63 million project, way over the top, and we said we don't need that any longer, and then we interviewed people and we came up with spaces to show how much space they have now and how much space they are going to gain. We've needed a Courthouse in this community, this didn't just happen yesterday, we've needed this for many years. I'm going to speak for a little while and then I have a reporter, I am trying to give everyone one shot here or we are going to be here all day. We also have other meetings.

Beth Brejle of the Pocono Record, said that Judge Kameen had written a State of the Court that had some indicators of the growth in cases, but in that report, I believe he mentions his desire to eventually add a third judge. Is that something that is still being looked at down the road. Solicitor Farley said that he agrees with Mr. Strub and from what he sees as a lawyer and he thinks the Commissioners agree, from his perspective, we are definitely not increasing population. The crime volume has decreased a little bit, but it is still significant. You can't handle it with one courtroom. Ms. Brejle said the wait to get to court is so long right now, certainly for civil, you could wait for a year to get heard on a civil case, and yet there are no plans to add another judge at this time. Commissioner Wagner said there are no plans now, but in the future who knows. Solicitor Farley said you're talking a large cost to the tax payers and don't forget for every judge, it's not just the judge, it's his staff, tipstuffs, court personnel. It would get really expensive for the County.

Someone asked Commissioner Osterberg when he met with the Borough Council because she was at the meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> and we were told that they have seen nothing. Commissioner Osterberg said that what he thinks they said is that there is no formal application. We were there and some of you were there at that meeting. I don't have the dates in front of me, but was it May? Solicitor Farley said at that meeting the Borough Council was handed about 15 to 20 documents outlining what the cost was to go in the back because that was examined thoroughly. The cost was just excessive, it really was \$1.5 million more. We gave that all to the Borough and laid it out for them informally why this was the plan that the Commissioners have decided on the cost and it wasn't just our opinion, we showed the appraisals, the different costs. I spent a lot of time with Verizon finding out about moving

those lines, and what the cost would be and it was astronomical just to move the lines. I never knew this until I did the research, there is one line I think from the cable company or Verizon and all they kept saying is it would be a fortune to move. We put a lot of time into that to consider that option and they gave us in writing the cost, it wasn't just verbally, and we presented all that to the Borough.

A woman said that it was mentioned that the building might cost about \$9 million and there is quite a lot of footage involved and to provide security for two judges, it has been clarified a little bit, that there is no plan to increase the hiring of the judges, it doesn't sound like the caseload can increase as well, so part of the question I have is it sounds like there may be other purposes going on for the use of this building, because for \$9 million for two judges, it sounds like quite a lot. It has also been emphasized that the government is trying to be cost conscience and not hire professionals. Well there's an issue too because it sounds like, and what often winds up the case is the money goes to a contractor to construct whatever the building is but what we really need are jobs and there is a reason why there is a heroin epidemic and other problems that are tied to the economic decline we have been having. We really need jobs. There is also a national trend that has been going on that the New York Times and Washington Post have done an excellent job chronicling the past year of the expansion of our prison industry. We have contractors coming in and constructing big facilities and if you need a bigger prison or you are expanding a prison it goes without saying you are going to have to expand the Court system as well. I think a lot of people understand that we need to modernize our system to a certain extent, but constructing a new building may not be the panacea and the concern too is we don't want to see contractors benefit when we need community services and we definitely need jobs here..... We want to have a driving democracy and that includes a healthy economic system.

Commissioner Osterberg responded I think we are working on jobs. I think that is another whole discussion with the economic development and with businesses. You are absolutely right. We do need jobs here and that probably does attribute to some of the heroin addiction. Heroin addiction is not just here, it's all over the country. We all read about it every day, but we are working on jobs. Just so you understand, this is not just about two Judges, this is about Probation, and this is about the Sheriff's Department. When the Probation Office moves from upstairs, wherever they're going, that loosens up more space for Children & Youth. Some of you may not have been up there, but take a walk up there, and then you have to ask to go into somebody's office, because some of them are secure. You are going to find people working in cubicles. There is definitely a space need not only for what we are saying here, but it also loosens this up, because it is very tight. So the building over there isn't just about two Judges. It's about the Sheriff's Department. It's about Probation. Because we are trying to keep all of those people in one location. The people that see Probation are the same people that went to Court and now they are out of jail or visa versa or they are getting ready to go to jail. So it's not just about two Judges. I understand your question about needing jobs in the community, and that is another whole discussion. It's related to everything. It's related to what Timmy was just talking about volunteerism in the County because 57% of us leave the County every day to go to work someplace else, and that effects our volunteerism because people don't have time when they come back at 6 o'clock at night to volunteer for the fire companies, and they're hurting. Every fire company is at maybe almost a critical state, and that's why he's doing what he's doing.

The woman said if you're volunteering and if you're getting adequately paid, you can afford to volunteer. If you are unemployed and you're trying to make your bills.....

Tim Knapp said that references were made regarding impact studies and asked if anyone has done an impact study to see what would happen if they moved the County seat to someplace else in the County, what would happen to the town of Milford, businesswise? I am just asking..... Arguments ensued.

Kathy Rossanelli wanted to know when we all meet with you at ARB are you coming in defense of the decision that you have now or are you going to be exploring the other options.

Solicitor Farley said, at that point from a legal standpoint, the job is for the engineers and myself with the Commissioners being present to present the plan that we would like approved. So it is not a compromise time.

Kathy Rossanelli confirmed that they would not be coming with any other options. Solicitor Farley said no, at that point it would be here's our plan, here's what we're laying out, we'd like you to approve it. There will be engineers and other professionals to lay out why we think it's the right plan in front of them, but it will not be a time for input for changes. That doesn't mean there won't be a time for everyone in this room to stand up and say why you disagree with the plan or what changes you'd like, but my job, as Solicitor at that point will be to just present the job and proposal as presented and asked for approval. She asked at what point would the Commissioners be looking to possibly compromise? How do we get this going to work it out. Commissioner Osterberg again stated that he really wants everyone to see the design. Someone said it seems like the ship has sailed, that you guys made a decision and it is unfair. Commissioner Osterberg stated that there were 27 newspaper articles, and since 2011 when he wasn't here the discussions started about the Courthouse and the bonding, so the ship has been sailing, but how many articles have been in the paper, how many times have we been on TV. All I can tell you about the PennDot thing, and I'm just going to say this, let me talk to Mike Lamoreaux. I really am concerned about having two courthouses though and I'm really concerned about the dollars and cents, because back to what we said earlier, we represent 57,000 other people. I don't know the number, but there is going to be a large dollar amount to building two courtrooms down there. Build two courtrooms, I don't know what we would do with this. We don't fix the security issue by having redundant services, Sheriff cells over here, which this doesn't have at all. There is no place over here for them to hold prisoners. Over there they would have a place to hold prisoners, so now we have to put cells over here. It comes down to a huge dollar amount. I live here, I keep telling you that, but I also have to realize that there is going to be people in the other part of this County that are going to say how much more millions of dollars are you going to spend to preserve that house. Yes the house is worth something, I agree, but we can't preserve everything.

It isn't just the house, someone replied, it's the whole area that is being impacted by this. Commissioner Osterberg asked if anyone has been to Bedford County or Hollidaysburg. These are really lovely communities with Courthouses in the center of them that are much larger than ours and they are really very vibrant communities. My daughter lives out there and looked to buy

a house, the most expensive community to move into is Hollidaysburg and their Courthouse makes ours look like my house, it's so large. I think we just have to give this a little time. Let me talk to the engineer. I think it is a very farfetched idea with a bridge going across the Vandermark and all this type of stuff, but we can go on this all day long. Right now we are working in this direction. It's your responsibility, and I tell you to do this, to go to the Borough Council, and I am not sicking you on them, I am just telling you that's where you should go. When I sat there people would tell people the same thing, go to the Borough Council and talk to them, and I know you've been there, and go to the ARB and talk to them and we are going to go to the ARB and talk to the ARB and the Borough Council about ours. We'll see what Mike thinks about this, but I'm telling you it's going to come back to dollars and cents.

Commissioner Wagner said don't say we've been intransigent, take the Kenworthy building for example, the first thing we did was we explored maybe selling it to somebody. We are still going to go out for bid to see if someone wants to buy it to move it. We said first of all let's go out for bid, maybe somebody has a lot in town they can move it. We will even give them \$40-50,000 to help them move it. That was one thing. The other thing is we went to the Preservation Trust and we said we'll even give you a lot up here, we'll lease it to you for 99 years which is tantamount to selling it, or we'll just deed it to you and you can put it right next to the Columns which is very historic. We said you can do that. Nope, they didn't want to do that either. Then we considered, we still had the option to maybe we'll move it up there, who knows, but there is an example, we threw three or four things out and all four just got nixed period. You took the position that that building is going to stay there and it can't go anywhere else in the Borough even if it's only a block and a half up the street, even if it's next to the Columns which is a very historic building, that's no good either. So who is being intransigent? So if you can answer that one, answer it.

Someone responded that people have looked into moving that building and the actual cost of moving the building. It's ridiculous. It makes no sense at all. Commissioner Wagner said maybe they can buy it, who knows. Someone else said, just to keep the record straight, the Trust said they would do that deal even though it is very costly, but if the County would pay for the cost of moving it and in fact moved it there, that's what the Trust letter to you said. Commissioner Wagner said well it depends on what the ARB and the Borough Council say again. That may be something that, who knows what's going to happen but again we have to go there and we have to start this thing moving and we'll see what happens.

Sean Strub, again commented ,Matt, you suggested that you were going to have Mike Lamoreaux look at the PennDot building which is great, but why not take this a little different, why don't we appoint a little committee with Mike Lamoreaux, the Trust can appoint someone, and get some other experts involved so it isn't just somebody coming back that your paying saying what you already may have decided, that this would be a way to actually have a dialog and look at it with some objectivity and experts. I sent pictures of it to several architects and think it could be an amazing use of that building with that fantastic blue stone foundation, there is plenty of space there, there may be environmental issues. Commissioner Wagner said that's a big key. Don't say maybe, there are environmental issues and the problem is the work PennDot may have to do to clean that site up they may not even want to do it. They got oil tanks under there, they got gas tanks under there. The property environmentally is a hazard there. I don't even know if we can ever use it for anything we want to. Sean Strub said lots of properties deal with environmental issues and they can be complicated, but they can be dealt with and especially in terms of the State, this is the County, the Borough, you can get an expedited process with the state. We can get Senator Baker involved and say let's move this along fast, we have an urgent need for this facility in Pike County. The timing could be dealt with and may very well be done less expensively.

A woman commented to just create a community around it. That's all you need to do. This is an opportunity for you to just say you know what, let's do this, let's create a community around that, because everyone here wants that. Don't think for one second when you talk about criminals that people here don't get scared. Don't think that for one minute that every time we read about a drug bust and every time we read about another house break in and every time we read about somebody, it scares the shit out of us, excuse me, but it does. It scares us. The people who are here right now love this community. If you can create, and I know you can, if you can create a small little community around this one thing, what you are doing is you are bringing people together and that's what this County needs. It doesn't need another library experience. You right now, and Karl, don't be so quick to say no. We voted for you. You need to care enough about this community. Commissioner Wagner said we have to get Rich involved in this conversation obviously. The woman continued but you and Matt, I know you like this community so much, bring it together a little, just one time, bring this together for Sean and for everybody here. Argument ensued. I misspoke. Bring this opportunity together for everyone that is here, for every person who has something invested, emotionally and spiritually, and financially in this community, because otherwise, it is time for this County to really work together.

Another woman said she heard on the radio that the Democratic Committee asked the Commissioners and all the groups to come together in a public forum, not to just have individual groups, but a public forum. Another thing that they said Wayne County has had the biggest decline in population and Pike County has had a tremendous decline in population but that the majority of the population are older people. There aren't as many young families. She met a police officer who said they had 75 foreclosures that day and a lot more to come. The population is decreasing where younger families are concerned. More of us are older. I think that might be a good reason to have an evening meeting too instead of the meetings only twice a month at 9 a.m. because people can't come because they are working.

Commissioner Wagner said they have to get Rich involved as soon as he comes back. Someone then said it is going to be there legacy. Commissioner Osterberg said it depends on how you look at whose legacy it is. You don't agree with what I think is the correct way to go, so either that's my legacy or this is my legacy. Someone said his legacy will be that he fought for this town. Not everyone has to agree with everything, but we all need to know that you're fighting on our behalf too.

**ADJOURNMENT: THE PIKE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 6, 2014 HAS BEEN CANCELLED AND HAS BEEN RESCHEDULED FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 30, 2014, AT 9:00 A.M., AT THE PIKE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING.**