A regular meeting of the Northampton County Council was held on the above date with the following present: Ann McHale, President; Wayne Grube, Vice President; Ron Angle; John Cusick; Charles M. Dertinger; J. Michael Dowd; Margaret Ferraro; Lamont G. McClure, Jr.; Diane Neiper; Leonard N. Zito, Solicitor to Council, and Frank E. Flisser, Clerk to Council.

Prayer

Mr. Dowd led County Council in prayer to open the meeting.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Dertinger led County Council in the pledge of allegiance.

Approval of the Minutes

Mr. McClure made the following motion:

Be It Moved By the Northampton County Council that the minutes of the July 10, 2008 and the July 17, 2008 meetings shall be approved.

Mrs. McHale seconded the motion.

The motion was adopted by voice acclamation, with Mrs. Neiper abstaining on the vote for the July 10, 2008 meeting and Mr. Dowd abstaining on the vote for the July 17, 2008 meeting.

Courtesy of the Floor

Mrs. McHale advised no one had signed in for Courtesy of the Floor, but asked if there was anyone who wished to address County Council. There were no respondents.
Public Hearing on the Ordinance Providing for an Amendment to Northampton County Administrative Code, Article XV Authorities, Boards and Commissions, Section 15.02 Retirement Board

Mrs. McHale stated this ordinance was introduced by herself and Mr. McClure at the meeting held July 17, 2008.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING NORTHAMPTON COUNTY
ADMINISTRATIVE CODE ARTICLE XV, AUTHORITIES, BOARDS
AND COMMISSIONS, SECTION 15.02 RETIREMENT BOARD, AND
FURTHER DELINEATING THE APPOINTMENT PROCESS FOR
MEMBERSHIP ON THE NORTHAMPTON COUNTY RETIREMENT BOARD

WHEREAS, Northampton County Home Rule Charter Section 202 Powers (7) provides that the County Council shall have the power “to adopt, amend, and repeal the Administrative Code;” and

WHEREAS, Northampton County Home Rule Charter Section 602. Ordinances (a)Acts Required (1) provides that the County Council shall “adopt an ordinance for any act which adopts or amends the Administrative Code, establishes or abolishes an agency, or assigns powers or duties among agencies.”

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED AND ENACTED, By the Northampton County Council that Northampton County Administrative Code, Article XV, Section 15.02 Retirement Board shall be amended as indicated hereafter (sections marked with bold underline have been added and sections marked with strikeout have been deleted):

ARTICLE XV
AUTHORITIES, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS
Section 15.01 Establishment
15.02 Retirement Board

Section 15.01 Establishment

a. The following boards and commissions are established by the Charter:
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(1) Personnel Appeals Board,
(2) Revenue Appeals Board,
(3) Election Commission; and
(4) Personnel Commission.

b. In accordance with Section 1304 of the Charter, the following authorities, boards, and commissions shall continue to exist unless specifically abolished by ordinance:

(1) Joint Planning Commission of Lehigh and Northampton Counties;
(2) Lehigh and Northampton Airport Authority;
(3) Lehigh and Northampton Transportation Authority;
(4) Northampton County Children’s Bureau Advisory Committee; (designated as the Advisory Board to the Division of Children and Youth)
(5) Northampton County Conservation District;
(6) Northampton County Coordinating Committee of the Lehigh Valley Transportation Study;
(7) Northampton County Drug and Alcohol Commission;
(8) Northampton County Hospital Authority;
(9) Northampton County Housing Authority;
(10) Northampton County Industrial Development Authority;
(11) Northampton County Mental Health/Mental Retardation Advisory Board;
(12) Northampton County Overall Economic Development Committee;
(13) Northampton County Park Board;
(14) Northampton County Re-development Authority;
(15) Northampton County Solid Waste Authority;
(16) Northampton County Prison Advisory Board; and
(17) Northampton County Area Agency on Aging Advisory Board.

All other authorities, boards and commissions are hereby abolished except as otherwise provided by ordinance or this Code.

Section 15.02 Retirement Board

a. Establishment. There is hereby established the Northampton County Retirement Board.

b. Function. The Northampton County Retirement board shall administer the retirement system of the County in accordance with applicable law.

c. Membership. The Retirement Board shall be comprised of seven (7) members. The members shall be the County Executive, the Director of Administration, the Director of
Fiscal Affairs, two (2) members of County Council (one of whom shall be President of Council), and two (2) participating members in the retirement system, one of whom shall be chosen from a list of three (3) nominees for appointment which shall be provided to the County Executive by the Northampton County Employee’s Retirement Association. The two (2) participating members shall be selected by the County Executive subject to confirmation by the Northampton County Council. All members of the Retirement Board shall have voting privileges relative to matters which are considered by the Retirement Board.

Effective Date: This ordinance shall become effective thirty days after the date of enactment.

Mrs. McHale asked if there were any questions or comments from the public. There were no respondents.

Mrs. McHale asked if there were any questions or comments from the members of County Council.

In response to Mr. Angle’s question, Mr. John Stoffa, County Executive, stated he felt this was a good idea.

As there were no further questions or comments, Mrs. McHale called for the vote.


The resolution was adopted by a vote of 9-0.
Public Hearing on the Ordinance Providing for Campaign Finance Regulations in the County of Northampton

Mrs. McHale advised this ordinance was introduced by Messrs. Cusick and Dowd at the meeting held July 17, 2008.

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REGULATIONS IN THE COUNTY OF NORTHAMPTON

IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED AND ENACTED, By the Northampton County Council as follows:

Section I DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this ordinance, the following definitions shall apply:

A. CANDIDATE:
   (1) An individual who files nomination papers or petitions for County elective office.
   (2) An individual who publicly announces his or her candidacy for County elective office.

B. COUNTY ELECTIVE OFFICE:
   1. the nine (9) members of the Northampton County Council;
   2. the Northampton County Executive;
   3. the Northampton County Controller; and
   4. the Northampton County District Attorney.

C. CONTRIBUTION: Money, gifts, forgiveness of debts, loans, or things having a monetary value incurred or received by a candidate or his/her agent for use in advocating or influencing the election of the candidate.

D. COVERED ELECTION: Every primary, general or special election for County elective office.

E. PERSON: An individual, partnership corporation, sole proprietorship, or other form of business organization permitted
under the laws of the Commonwealth to make political contributions.

F. POLITICAL COMMITTEE: Any committee, club, association, political party, or other group of persons, including the candidate political committee, as required by SECTION III. Candidate Political Committee Accounts, for the purpose of influencing the outcome of a covered election.

SECTION II. CONTRIBUTION LIMITATIONS.

A. Except as provided in subsection C., no individual shall make total contributions per covered election, including contributions made to or through one or more political committees, of more than two thousand dollars ($2,000) to a candidate for a County elective office.

B. Except as provided in subsection C., no political committee shall make total contributions per covered election of more than five thousand dollars ($5,000) to a candidate for a County elective office.

C. The limitations imposed by this Ordinance shall not apply to contributions from a candidate's personal resources to the candidate's political committee. However, if such contributions total $100,000 or more (regardless of the time period over which such contributions are made), then the contribution limits set forth in this Section for all other candidates for that County elective office shall double.

D. The limitations imposed by this subsection shall not apply to volunteer labor.

E. No candidate for County elective office, and no political committee, shall accept any contribution which exceeds the contribution limits set forth in this ordinance.

SECTION III. CANDIDATE POLITICAL COMMITTEE ACCOUNTS.

A candidate for County elective office shall have no more than one political committee and one checking account for the
County office being sought, into which all contributions for such office shall be made, and out of which all expenditures for that office shall be made. If the candidate for office maintains other political or non-political accounts for which contributions are solicited, such funds collected in these accounts shall not be used for the purpose of influencing the outcome of a covered election.

SECTION IV. COMPETITIVE BIDDING AND DISCLOSURE.

A. Any person who makes a contribution of $1,000, or more, during an election cycle may not be awarded a contract relating to County affairs, without going through a competitive bidding process.

B. Any candidate seeking an elective office in the County must submit a disclosure form for every contributor who makes a contribution of five-hundred dollars ($500.00) or more:

1. Does business with or has a contract with the County, its Authorities, Boards or Commissions and the nature of said business or contract for the past five (5) years;

2. Is employed by the County, its Authorities, Boards or Commissions or was employed by the same in the past five (5) years;

3. Has an appointment to any Authority Board or any other Board or Commission of the County or has held one in the past five (5) years;

SECTION V. PUBLIC RECORD OF REPORTS.

All candidates and political committees shall submit campaign finance reports to the Northampton County Election Commission in a timely manner. The Northampton County Department of Fiscal Affairs, Information Services Division shall be responsible for maintaining an up-to-date and public database that is searchable based on the following categories: candidate name, contributor name, contribution level, and, where applicable, employer.
SECTION VI. REQUIRED NOTICE OF CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.

The Northampton County Election Commission shall annually arrange for the publication of a notice setting forth the contribution limits set forth in this Chapter, together with a plain English explanation of the provisions of this Ordinance and the penalties and remedies for violations. Such notice shall also appear at all times on the County's official website.

SECTION VII. PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.

A. Any person residing in the County of Northampton, including the County Solicitor and the Northampton County Council Solicitor may bring an action for injunctive relief in any Court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin any violations of, or to compel compliance with, the provisions of this Ordinance. The Court may award to a prevailing plaintiff in any such action his or her costs of litigation.

B. The provisions of this Ordinance shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Northampton County Election Commission.

SECTION VIII. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Ordinance shall be determined to be unlawful, invalid, void, or unenforceable, then that provision shall be considered severable from the remaining provisions of this Ordinance, which shall be in full force and effect.

SECTION IX. Effective Date; Implementation

A. This Ordinance shall take effect on January 1, 2009.

B. By November 1, 2008 the Northampton County Executive shall provide the Northampton County Council with a report on the County’s preparedness of the implementation of this ordinance.

Mrs. McHale asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to address this ordinance. There were no respondents.
Mrs. McHale asked if there were any questions or comments from the members of County Council.

Mr. Cusick explained one of the aspects of this ordinance would set a limit of $2,000 per person per election and $5,000 for a political action committee.

Mrs. McHale made a motion to have this ordinance reviewed by the Finance Committee before voting on it.

Mr. Angle seconded the motion.

Mr. Dertinger asked why it would go before the Finance Committee and not some other committee because the Finance Committee dealt mostly with the finances of the County.

Mrs. McHale stated it could be sent to the Legal, Judicial and Operations Committee.

Mr. Angle noted he did not have a problem with that because he wondered if the County had the right to enact this ordinance and would like to know more about the legality of it.

Mr. Dertinger advised he also had a number of concerns with it and felt it may be a little over the top.

Mr. Grube stated he ran five campaigns with integrity and he felt if everyone did it in a proper manner, this ordinance was not necessary.

Mr. McClure advised the Philadelphia scheme was the scheme that was challenged and the Commonwealth Court upheld it, therefore, he wondered why Mr. Cusick chose Pittsburgh and not Philadelphia.

Mr. Cusick replied that the Pittsburgh ordinance was more applicable to what he wanted to accomplish for Northampton County.

Mrs. McHale made a motion to have this issue referred to the Legal, Judicial and Operations Committee for review.

Mr. Dertinger seconded the motion.
Mrs. McHale called for the vote.


The motion was adopted by a vote of 8-1.

Discussion of the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania (CCAP) Property and Casualty Insurance Contract

Mrs. McHale stated the CCAP property and casualty insurance contract was considered at the July 17, 2008 County Council meeting. She further stated after a detailed discussion at that meeting, Mr. Grube made a motion that the County Council Solicitor, President of County Council, the County Executive and the County Solicitor shall meet to discuss and attempt to arrive at a resolution to the issues pertaining to this contract. She noted this motion was adopted unanimously by all those present.

Mrs. McHale advised at the request of Mr. Cusick, this matter was being presented for discussion and indicated she would like to turn the floor over to County Council’s Solicitor.

Mr. Zito stated at 4:30 p.m., this afternoon, a meeting was conducted with Council President McHale and the County Executive, together with the respective County Solicitor, Mr. Karl Longenbach, and the County Council Solicitor to discuss the subject of Pennsylvania Counties Risk Pool (PCoRP) providing insurance for the County. He further stated a resolution would be proposed in the form of a motion by Mrs. McHale which would resolve the issue.

Mr. Zito advised Council President McHale determined the insurance contract in question was not a five year contract and accordingly, the one year contract could be cancelled according to its terms with 120 days previous notice prior to its expiration, which, in this case, was June 1, 2009.

Mr. Zito stated Council President McHale’s motion would be that County Council take no action to ratify this contract because there was a question as to whether or not the contract
was in accordance with Section 13.16 (c) (1) of the Administrative Code.

Mr. Zito advised Council President McHale and the Administration, through Mr. Stoffa, have agreed to keep the insurance presently in effect for at least the one year period, which would provide the Administration with the opportunity to immediately put out a Request for Proposal to solicit vendors under the competitive negotiation process set forth in Article XIII of the Administrative Code. He further advised once competitive vendors returned their interest in negotiating with the County, a proposal would be developed by each of the respective vendors which would be reviewed by Mrs. McHale in her particular expertise as not only County Council President, but as an insurance executive. Thereafter, under the competitive negotiation process, the vendors who expressed an interest would be requested to solicit proposals which would contain criteria that had to prove it would insure the County for all aspects and provide coverage that was required for the size of Northampton County. He noted following that, there would be public notice given of the proposals that were received and County Council would be asked to ultimately pass upon the contract for the successful proposer under Section 13.16 (c) (1).

Mr. Zito stated effectively this would resolve the issue, indicating the County would continue to be insured by PCoRP for the year ending June 1, 2009 and County Council and the Administration would have an opportunity to obtain an insurance contract which was both suitable and acceptable to County Council.

In response to Mr. Zito’s question, Mr. Angle advised he would make a motion to approve the proposal set forth by Mr. Zito on behalf of Mrs. McHale.

Mr. Dowd seconded the motion.

In answer to Mr. Dertinger’s question, Mrs. McHale stated the entire process should take approximately six months.

In response to Mr. Cusick’s question as to why it took so long for the contract to come from the Purchasing Manager to County Council for approval, Mr. Vic Mazziotti, Director of Fiscal Affairs, advised he did not know as he was not involved in the process.
Mr. McClure stated this was such an important issue and he would like to have something in writing before voting on it, therefore, he asked if the vote could be delayed until the next meeting when a resolution could be presented.

Mrs. McHale, with the consent of Mr. Angle, advised the motion was being withdrawn.

Mr. Dowd stated years ago, County Council had requested the Administration to provide a listing of all significant contracts and their expiration dates.

Mr. McClure commented perhaps the Administrative Code should be amended to insure that County Council would be presented a list on a regular basis to prevent these types of situations from occurring.

Courthouse Project

Mr. Dertinger advised at the request of County Council, the Controller’s office provided a breakdown on the cost of the Courthouse project. He further advised the President Judge requested $43 million for this project and as the audit showed, that was all that was needed. However, it did not show a lot of the items that he personally asked for to try and make sense of the costs. He noted there were approximately $800,000 worth of extras for unforeseen circumstances, which was the largest cost overrun issue that the County dealt with, but this audit did not uncover that. He further noted there were approximately $93,000 worth of extras requested which were above and beyond what the original contract called for. Again, these were the questions that were asked time and time again by members of County Council, but were never answered.

Mr. Dertinger stated he would like to thank Mr. Larry Rutt, the Project Manager for this project, for getting back to him within a day to give him these numbers. He further stated time and again, County Council was told how the Butz Company dragged their feet on this project and how shoddy their workmanship was, but it turned out, they came in under budget. He noted he was concerned that a number of the issues that were addressed in
this audit, and specifically in some of the responses that came from the Administration, were just not true.

Mr. Dertinger advised when he first came onto County Council, he sponsored a resolution to pay the Butz Company for what they had done to that point. He further advised he had a conservation and relationship with Butz straight through to find out what was going on with this project because County Council never got an answer from the Administration. He noted Butz was then taken off the project and another company was hired to do what Butz should have been doing. He further noted it was stated in the response and unfortunately erroneously reported that there was no progress chart for this project. Additionally, the Director of Public Works indicated there was no Critical Path Method (CPM) when they had actually hired a separate consultant to deal with just that.

Mr. Dertinger stated the project was handled reasonably well and to see a $43 million project really and truly only go over its price by $500,000 was remarkable in that the County had a window project go over more than 33% of its price. He further stated he asked the Controller to continue to find out where the County stood on these extras and why the project was not closed out.

Mr. Dertinger advised for two years, County Council heard complaints that all these people were either ripping the County off or doing shoddy work and it turned out that neither were true. He further advised he was deeply concerned because there was going to be a significant amount of money set aside in the form of bonds for new construction and here is a project that was 85-95% completed in the first year, but still not completed after two and half years. He noted he did this kind of work for a living and he had never seen a project drag on like this one.

Mr. Dertinger stated the good news was the amount of interest that accrued on the money as it was dragged out so even though the project took longer than expected, the County received more interest than expected which covered a lot of the extra costs.

Mr. Cusick asked Mr. Dertinger if this contract would have been better off being bid through a general contractor and should the County have hired or created a position of capital projects manager.
Mr. Dertinger replied in a private circumstance, there were usually a general contractor and a construction manager for a project of this size. He further replied bidding separately allowed a lot more flexibility in dealing with the contractors and better control over the costs. He noted when a general contractor was involved it could turn into a big finger pointing operation if something went wrong so it generally did not work out to go with a general contractor to oversee all of these items.

In response to Mr. Angle’s question as to whether these circumstances were correct, Mr. Stoffa replied they were not. In answer to Mr. Angle’s question as to what the Administration disagreed with, Mr. Steve DeSalva, Director of Public Works, advised he recognized the value of Butz’s handling of the job because in a lot of ways, they did do a good job managing the project, but in some basic ways, they did not.

Mr. DeSalva stated when he came on the job, he did ask they run a CMP, which they did once. However, it should have been done periodically and compared to the previous one to see where the work activities changed, but he did not want to harp on that because there were a number of things that affected the overall schedule and cost of the job.

Mr. DeSalva advised there were three main issues remaining, at this point, with regard to the new addition which were problems with condensation, the roof issue with regard to whether the snow catcher was working correctly and problems with elevator #8.

Mr. Angle asked Mr. DeSalva to rate the project on a scale of 0-10, with 10 being outstanding. Mr. DeSalva stated he could not provide a straightforward answer to that question.

Mr. Dertinger advised Mr. DeSalva indicated the significant cost overruns could have been addressed by the CMP properly being used, however, the problem was there were no significant cost overruns. He further advised the contractor could not be blamed for doing more work when extras were added to the job nor could the construction manager be blamed if the schedule had to be expanded because things needed to be done differently or added.
Additionally, Mr. Dertinger noted since Mr. DeSalva came into the project at a late date, it was not fair to him to ask him how well the project was done or not.

Mr. Angle asked Mr. Dertinger how he would rate the project. Mr. Dertinger stated he would rate the first 85% of this project, a nine, but he would not even give the close out a rating of one.

In answer to Mr. Angle’s question, Mr. Dertinger advised he felt letting Butz go was a huge mistake because that was the person who could have been held responsible. He further advised the problems with the roof and condensation were due to design faults. He noted he could not speak to the problem with the elevator.

In response to Mr. Angle’s question as to what could be done about the design faults, Mr. Dertinger stated the designer could be held accountable, but they gave the County what it was looking for, therefore, it was arguable because the designs were accepted.

Mr. Grube advised he spoke to Mr. Stoffa about the audit because he believed it was a political way to put down a building which had been given accolades from different individuals. He further advised what upset him was there was not one positive comment about the Courthouse.

Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority

In answer to Mr. Angle’s question, Mr. Dowd stated he requested the resolution pertaining to the Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority grant application be removed at this time because he felt more research had to be done.

Mr. Angle advised it was his understanding Lehigh County was not agreeable to putting in their $50,000. He further advised he would not support such a resolution because he felt Northampton County should not be paying for a study to determine how to better run the airport when there were plenty of employees with offices at the airport that should be determining that.

Gracedale
Mr. Grube stated he understood there was a consultant at Gracedale and now he read the County was going to hire a consultant to look over the future of Gracedale.

Mr. Stoffa advised there was someone filling in two of the top three positions to help run the place. He acknowledged they were reviewing the operation at Gracedale, however, it did not mean there were going to be any significant changes.

Mr. Grube asked if this was leading up to the leasing or selling of Gracedale.

Mr. Stoffa stated he had no intention of doing that and there have not been any discussions with regard to that issue.

In response to Mr. McClure’s question, Mr. Stoffa advised they were advertising in an effort to fill the vacant positions.

Review of the Regional Crime Center Proposal

Mrs. McHale stated the Northampton County District Attorney provided County Council with a draft resolution which would provide for Northampton County’s participation in a Regional Crime Center for the Lehigh Valley, in conjunction with Lehigh County. She further stated a representative from the District Attorney’s Office was present to offer some comments, however, this matter would be referred to a committee where a formal presentation would be made.

WHEREAS, the Lehigh County Board of Commissioners approved a professional services agreement with Computer Aid, Inc. via Ordinance 2006 – No. 209 which endorsed the request of Lehigh County’s Administration to co-fund the feasibility study of a Regional Crime Center for the Lehigh Valley; and

WHEREAS, the concept of a Regional Crime Center was initially embraced by James Martin, Lehigh County District Attorney, and John M. Morganelli, Northampton County District Attorney and was modeled to some degree after New York City's "Real Time Crime Center"; and
WHEREAS, the results of the study conducted during early 2007 show a definite need and indicated strong support from municipal police departments across both counties; and

WHEREAS, the primary function of the Regional Crime Center is to fill a major void in the Lehigh Valley by tracking and analyzing criminal activity on a valley-wide basis and providing guidance to individual police departments; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Crime Center would have access to "real time" reports from all municipalities and trained investigators to put that information to practical use; and

WHEREAS, it should be understood that a potential limitation of the project is that each county has considerable populations covered by the Pennsylvania State Police and its data has not been historically shared with local police operations; and

WHEREAS, the feasibility study conducted by Computer Aid provided a rough estimate of the following needs for a Regional Crime Center: modest space needs of approximately 1,500 square feet; the equivalent of five to eight full time staff; $4 million of start-up costs which is primarily equipment; and $1 million of annual operating costs; and

WHEREAS, the findings of the feasibility study were shared with James Martin, Lehigh County District Attorney; John Morganelli, Northampton County District Attorney; Donald T. Cunningham, Jr., Lehigh County Executive; John Stoffa, Northampton County Executive; Ed Pawlowski, Allentown Mayor; John Callahan, Bethlehem Mayor and Salvatore J. Panto, Jr., Easton Mayor; and

WHEREAS, the group enthusiastically supports the study and endorsed proceeding to the step of securing legislative support from the Lehigh County Board of Commissioners and Northampton County Council while pursuing grants and outside sources of funds to cover the start-up costs.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE NORTHAMPTON COUNTY COUNCIL, THAT:
1. The Northampton County Council affirms its support for a Regional Crime Center for the Lehigh Valley, which would be the first of its kind in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

2. The Northampton County Council supports efforts by Northampton County's Administration to secure grants and/or other financial aid to address the start-up costs of a Regional Crime Center.

3. The Northampton County Council supports budgeting up to $500,000 in the 2009 Northampton County Budget toward the estimated $1 million of annual operating expenses required to fund a Regional Crime Center.

4. Any resolution or part of a resolution conflicting with the provisions of this resolution is hereby repealed insofar as the same affects this resolution.

5. The County Executive shall distribute copies of this resolution to the proper officers and other personnel of Northampton County whose further action is required to achieve the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. Michael Thompson, Assistant District Attorney, advised a request was sent to County Council to consider supporting a Regional Crime Center. He further advised this center would be model after New York City’s “Real Time Crime Center” and allow the sharing of information from different law enforcement departments at a faster pace to offer assistance in determining what action they should take. He noted it was like a clearing house with a link to Lehigh County where most jurisdictions could enter their crime reports in a central repository.

In answer to Mr. Angle’s question, Mr. Thompson stated there was a request for County Council to budget up to $500,000 toward the estimated $1 million annual operating expenses. However, there were discussions to seek grants from other government agencies to offset the costs.

In response to Mrs. McHale’s question, Mr. Thompson advised the Drug Task Force funds they received had to be used for certain things, however, they could look into using them for this center.
In answer to Mrs. Ferraro’s question, Mr. Thompson stated this center would help with the cities of Allentown, Bethlehem and Easton, but felt it could also benefit some of the smaller outlying law enforcement agencies and there was a possibility of increasing its service in the future. He further stated at this time there were no plans to assess any of the municipalities.

In response to Mr. Angle’s question, Mr. Stoffa advised he would not be recommending a $500,000 line item in the budget for this unless it came from the gaming revenues. He further advised he felt it was a wonderful program, but one weakness was the State Police were not involved in it.

Mr. Angle stated sharing information was very important, but it should be on a state or national level instead of just involving two counties.

In answer to Mr. Dertinger’s question, Mr. Thompson advised normally when a crime happens, a report would be filed with the respective police department and the information would be entered into the National Crime Information System. He further advised if an officer observed the crime and could identify the individual or a vehicle, he could enter an All Points Bulletin which would go through the County’s 911 Center. However, if it could be entered into a system of the type they were proposing, it could give law enforcement a head start.

Mr. Cusick asked if a copy of the study could be forwarded to County Council so it could be reviewed.

Mrs. McHale stated this matter would be forwarded to both the Finance and Intergovernmental Committees.

Introduction of an Ordinance Providing for Amendments to the 2008 Budget

Mrs. McHale advised County Council was recently provided with the second amendment to the 2008 Northampton County budget. She noted the public hearing, debate, and possible vote would be held at the August 21, 2008 County Council meeting.

Messrs. Grube and Angle introduced the following ordinance:
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2008 NORTHAMPTON COUNTY
BUDGET: DEPARTMENT OF FISCAL AFFAIRS: REVENUE;
ADMINISTRATION: HOUSING AUTHORITY, EMERG COMM & 911 -
ACT 56; DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT: EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANT; CORRECTIONS;
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES: CHILDREN, YOUTH AND
FAMILIES, GRACEDALE; CAPITAL PROJECTS: COURTHOUSE,
PRISON EXPANSION, GRACEDALE RENOVATIONS, COUNTY PARK
PRESERVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

| 2008 |
| BUDGET AMENDMENT |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>INCREASE</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>ACCOUNT TITLE</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>(DECREASE)</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Affairs - Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31300</td>
<td>44010</td>
<td>Interest on Investment</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Affairs - Balancing Of Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31300</td>
<td>46010</td>
<td>Budgetary Fund Balance</td>
<td>12,722,090</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>16,168,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83,635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>362,621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56450</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retirement (General Fund)</td>
<td>(2,022,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration - Housing Authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30700</td>
<td>42510</td>
<td>Housing Authority Reimbursement</td>
<td>770,000</td>
<td>40,049</td>
<td>810,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salaries Full Time</td>
<td>516,900</td>
<td>27,316</td>
<td>544,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56050</td>
<td></td>
<td>FICA</td>
<td>39,600</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>41,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Healthcare &amp; Dental</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56300</td>
<td></td>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56550</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision &amp; Prescription</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workers Compensation</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39102</td>
<td>42387</td>
<td>Wireless 911 Fee</td>
<td>86,700</td>
<td>879,919</td>
<td>966,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62999</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pooled Program Operating Cost</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>879,919</td>
<td>884,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63999</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pooled Admin Supplies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83,635</td>
<td>83,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31100</td>
<td>41120</td>
<td>Emergency Shelter Grant</td>
<td>62,300</td>
<td>154,338</td>
<td>216,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71085</td>
<td>ESG 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154,338</td>
<td>154,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71900</td>
<td>50200</td>
<td>Salaries Union - Full Time</td>
<td>8,049,800</td>
<td>2,142,709</td>
<td>10,192,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56050</td>
<td>FICA County</td>
<td>944,266</td>
<td>163,917</td>
<td>1,108,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56600</td>
<td>Workers’ Compensation</td>
<td>368,254</td>
<td>77,995</td>
<td>446,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71900</td>
<td>42600</td>
<td>Prison Commissary Sale</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64999</td>
<td>Pooled Service &amp; Other Oper Supply</td>
<td>1,550,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51000</td>
<td>41210</td>
<td>Title IV E</td>
<td>3,695,900</td>
<td>300,500</td>
<td>3,996,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41550</td>
<td>Medical Assistance</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>31,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42580</td>
<td>Parental Payments</td>
<td>405,900</td>
<td>105,200</td>
<td>511,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42650</td>
<td>Supplemental Security (SSI)</td>
<td>27,800</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>42,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52100</td>
<td>69999</td>
<td>Pooled Subcontracted Services</td>
<td>2,770,250</td>
<td>429,000</td>
<td>3,199,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64100</td>
<td>75150</td>
<td>Building Renovations</td>
<td>6,692,362</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>8,192,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75350</td>
<td>Improv Other Than Building</td>
<td>338,818</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>838,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Project - Courthouse</td>
<td>42000</td>
<td>44010</td>
<td>Interest On Investment</td>
<td>7,402</td>
<td>4,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82100</td>
<td>Courthouse</td>
<td>1,815,480</td>
<td>4,568</td>
<td>1,820,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Project - Prison Expansion</th>
<th>42001</th>
<th>44010</th>
<th>Interest On Investment</th>
<th>3,671</th>
<th>4,336</th>
<th>8,007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86270</td>
<td>Prison Annex</td>
<td>944,750</td>
<td>4,336</td>
<td>949,086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Project - Gracedale Renovations</th>
<th>42002</th>
<th>44010</th>
<th>Interest On Investment</th>
<th>1,627</th>
<th>1,515</th>
<th>3,142</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85310</td>
<td>Main Steam Line</td>
<td>147,576</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>149,091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Project - County Park Preservation</th>
<th>42003</th>
<th>44010</th>
<th>Interest On Investment</th>
<th>11,538</th>
<th>13,775</th>
<th>25,313</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87700</td>
<td>Weaversville</td>
<td>2,686,506</td>
<td>13,775</td>
<td>2,700,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Project - Economic Development</th>
<th>42005</th>
<th>44010</th>
<th>Interest On Investment</th>
<th>19,392</th>
<th>20,322</th>
<th>39,714</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72696</td>
<td>Northampton County Municipalities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,322</td>
<td>20,322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Summary - Budget Amendment | County of Northampton Budget | 363,284,445 | 4,194,078 | 367,478,523 |

Effective Date:

In accordance with Northampton County Home Rule Charter 705 (e) this ordinance shall become effective upon the date of enactment.

Consideration of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)2008 Annual Action Plan Resolution
Mrs. McHale advised the Administration requested County Council adopt a resolution approving the FY 2008 CDBG Annual Action Plan for the County of Northampton.

Mrs. Ferraro introduced the following resolution

R. 50-2008  A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE FY 2008 ANNUAL

WHEREAS, the County of Northampton has prepared an Annual Action Plan for the County covering the period October 1, 2008 to September 30, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Annual Action Plan is to identify housing and community development needs and to develop specific goals and objectives to address those needs over a one-year period, and is a requirement of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development which the County must meet in order for the County to receive federal housing and community development funds; and

WHEREAS, the County of Northampton has prepared an Annual Action Plan for Fiscal Year 2008 which includes the funding application for the Community Development Block Grant Program, said application having been duly reviewed and considered, together with supporting documentation which took in to account blight in the community, needs of low and moderated income families, environmental factors, fiscal considerations, and the maintenance of local effort in Community Development activities.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the County of Northampton:

1. THAT the FY 2008 Annual Action Plan for FY 2008 Community Development Block Grant funding is hereby in all respects approved. The County Executive is hereby directed to file a copy of said application with the minutes of this meeting.

2. THAT it is cognizant of the conditions that are imposed in the undertaking and carrying out of Community Development activities with federal financial assistance.

3. THAT the County Executive of the County of Northampton is authorized to execute and file the application for financial
assistance for such amount as the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development is willing to make available to carry out the Community Development Program and act as an authorized representative of the County of Northampton.

4. THAT the County Executive of the County of Northampton is hereby authorized to provide such assurances and/or certifications as required by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and also any additional or revised data which may be requested during the review of said applications.

As there were no questions or comments, Mrs. McHale called for the vote.


The resolution was adopted by a vote of 9-0.

Bi-County Health Bureau

In answer to Mr. Angle’s question, Mr. Stoffa stated they were trying to resolve the issue of the joint appointment that would be acceptable to both Counties. He further stated he felt it should be someone affiliated with St. Luke’s Hospital.

Pennsylvania Council of Governments

Mrs. McHale advised the Pennsylvania Council of Governments met recently and elected Mr. Angle as their new president and she wanted to offer congratulations to him.

CCAP Awards

Mrs. Neiper stated Mr. Flisser was honored for being Outstanding Chief Clerk for 2008 at the CCAP Awards Ceremony this past week.

4-H Fair
Mr. Dertinger advised the 4-H Fair was held this past weekend and Mr. Cusick did a great judging job and he got to hand out the Best in Show Ribbons. He further advised the children did a remarkable job and encouraged everyone to attend the event in the future.

Farmland Preservation Liaison Report

Mr. Angle stated the Farmland Preservation Board announced they have passed the 10,000 acre mark for preserved farmland and they were going to be holding an event at the River Farm to which each member of County Council would be receiving an invitation.

Council Solicitor's Report

Mr. Zito provided a copy of his Solicitor’s Report for this meeting (see Attachment #1).

Adjournment

Mr. McClure made a motion to adjourn.

Mrs. McHale seconded the motion.

The motion passed by acclamation.