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. Angle 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 April 17, 2008 meeting shall be approved.

Mr. Dertinger seconded the motion.

The motion was adopted by voice acclamation.

Courtesy of the Floor

Mr. Fritz Wiede, Easton, PA - advised he read an article today that Northampton County approved a contract for health insurance for the Prison with Prime Care for $305,000 a year. He noted in 2003, the County paid $70,000 in premiums and in 2006, the County paid $400,000. Therefore, he wondered just how the County was doing business.

Mr. Angle stated more people were being sentenced to jail who had major health problems and the County becomes responsible for them. He noted this was not just a County issue, but a nationwide problem.

Mr. Wiede advised he understood what Mr. Angle was saying, but he believed County Council was pandering to the Prison. He further advised the decision was made to put an addition on the Prison and now that was not good enough and the County was looking for another
Mr. Angle stated the people were going to have to decide if they wanted the people who committed lower level crimes going to jail or treated with programs and if it was jail, then the Prison would have to keep expanding.

Mr. Wiede advised when former County Executive Glenn Reibman was voted out of office, he felt County Executive John Stoffa would put an end to the spending and suggested this matter be investigated to make sure the County was receiving the best price.

Mr. Angle stated health insurance, on the whole, had increased greatly.

Mrs. McHale advised the increase in medical costs in the Prison were due to the increase of inmates. She further advised the health care contract was put out for bid and the County took the lowest one.

**Presentation of the Cupola Award**

Mrs. McHale stated the Northampton County Cupola Restoration Project won an award from the Eastern Pennsylvania Chapter of the American Institute of Architects in December 2007. She then called upon Mr. George Moore to make the presentation.

Mr. Moore provided County Council with a copy of their submission and award. He thanked the County for allowing him to be involved with such an interesting project.

**Public Hearing on the ArtsQuest/Lehigh Valley Public Telecommunications Corporation Hotel Tax Ordinance**

Mrs. McHale advised this ordinance was introduced by herself and Mr. Dowd at the meeting held April 17, 2008:

AN ORDINANCE OF NORTHAMPTON COUNTY COUNCIL PURSUANT TO THE HOTEL ROOM RENTAL TAX ACT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Hotel Room Rental Tax Act P.L. 307 of 2000, 16 P.S. Section 13211, et seq., now 16 P.S. 1770, et seq. the County of Northampton, a Third Class County, enacted Ordinance No. 359 of 2000, effective October 8, 2000 and Ordinance No. 440 of 2005, effective October 2, 2005; and,

WHEREAS, Act 12 of 2005, enacted by the Pennsylvania General Assembly and approved by the Governor effective sixty (60) days from July 5, 2005 authorizes by Section 1770.8 (16 P.S. 1770.8) the County of Northampton to impose a Hotel Room Rental Tax by Ordinance at the rate of four (4%) percent and provides for the distribution of such tax monies; and,

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 359 of 2000 established the Hotel Room Rental Tax and thereafter Ordinance No. 440 of 2005 effective October 2, 2005 increased the Hotel Room Rental Tax Act from 3.5% to 4% and restructured the distribution of the tax collected for Northampton County purposes to its current level as follows:

(a) 68.75% to the Northampton County Regional Tourist Promotion Agency (Lehigh Valley Convention and Visitor Bureau, Inc. "LVCVB").

(b) 18.75% to be retained by Northampton County for further development of tourism facilities; community development initiatives, which will enhance regional tourism; and
(c) 12.5% for future development of facilities and for marketing purposes within Northampton County to enhance regional tourism.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 1770.8 of the Hotel Room Rental Tax Act pertaining to counties of the Third Class, Northampton County has retained 12.5% of the funds collected in Northampton County for the further development of facilities and for marketing purposes within Northampton County to enhance regional tourism; and,

WHEREAS, Northampton County Council has determined that ArtsQuest and Lehigh Valley Public Telecommunications Corporation are not-for-profit corporations whose activities enhance regional tourism and are therefore qualified to receive revenues generated by the Hotel Room Rental Tax Act.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ENACTED AND ORDAINED by Northampton County Council, that:

1. The foregoing "whereas" provisions are incorporated as though set forth in their entirety.

2. All the definitions and provisions of the Hotel Room Rental Tax Act of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (16 P.S. 1770, et seq.) as amended are incorporated in their entirety.


4. Northampton County Council hereby designates its 12.5% of revenues received under Ordinance No. 440 of 2005 to be distributed on an annual basis to ArtsQuest and Lehigh Valley Public Telecommunications Corporation as follows:

   a. Fifty percent (50%) shall be allocated to ArtsQuest, until a total of one million dollars ($1,000,000) is reached. Thereafter the funding shall cease.

   b. Fifty percent (50%) shall be allocated to Lehigh Valley Public Telecommunications Corporation, until a total of one million dollars ($1,000,000) is
reached. Thereafter the funding shall cease.

c. It shall be expressly understood that the allocation of funding outlined in paragraphs 4.a. and 4.b. shall be subject to an annual review by County Council during the annual Northampton County budget review process.

d. The Northampton County Council hereby requires as a condition of the aforementioned grant funding that ArtsQuest and Lehigh Valley Public Telecommunications Corporation shall each provide the Northampton County Council and the County Executive with a written annual report which shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the revenues received from the Northampton County hotel tax, the manner in which those revenues were used, and a status report on the respective projects.

5. This Ordinance shall be administrated by the Northampton County Executive subject to the powers of the Northampton County Council under Section 1.2-202 of the Northampton County Home Rule Charter (348 Pa. Code 1.2-202(1)) to adopt and repeal Ordinances as well as under its other powers and duties.

6. The Controller of Northampton County shall annually audit the funds distributed to assure that they are committed and expended for the enhancement of regional tourism by the beneficiaries ArtsQuest and Lehigh Valley Public Telecommunications Corporation for the benefit of Northampton County.

7. Any Ordinance or any part of any other ordinance conflicting with the provisions of this Ordinance is hereby repealed.

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

As there were no questions or comments from the members of County Council, Mrs. McHale called for the vote.

The ordinance was adopted by a vote of 7-2.

In answer to Mr. Angle's question, Mr. Dertinger stated he voted against the ordinance because he felt the County was putting too many eggs in one basket and even though he considered it a wonderful project, he felt the County was over funding it.

Executive Session Subject: Borough of Wind Gap V. County of Northampton and Northampton County General Purpose Authority, Docket No. 48CV-2007-1609

Mrs. McHale advised at the request of the County Council Solicitor, an Executive Session was scheduled. She then asked Mr. Zito to explain.

Mr. Zito stated the purpose of the Executive Session was to allow the Special Litigation Solicitor for the Borough of Wind Gap to present a possible settlement position for this litigation to County Council and the County Executive.

Mr. Dowd made a motion to move to Executive Session.

Mr. Angle seconded the motion.

The motion was passed by voice acclamation.

Mrs. McHale reconvened the meeting and asked Mr. Zito to report on the Executive Session.

Mr. Zito advised County Council adjourned for Executive Session at 6:47 p.m. and returned at 7:27 p.m.. He further advised during the Executive Session, the Wind Gap Special Litigation Solicitor presented a potential settlement position for consideration.

Personnel Policy Changes

Mrs. McHale stated the Home Rule Charter indicated, and County Council's Solicitor confirmed, the County Executive was the person to recommend a change in policy. She noted it further indicated the County Executive was to prepare the change, have it reviewed by the
Personnel Commission and then present it to County Council for approval. Therefore, as this procedure was not followed, she did not know if the changes currently presented were legal. She further stated another potential problem was the fact there was currently only one individual on the Personnel Commission and the Home Rule Charter indicated there should be three.

Mr. Zito advised the Home Rule Charter sets the policy for the Administration to interact with County Council to make the changes. He then asked if Mrs. McHale would like him to explore the effectiveness of the changes made.

Mrs. McHale acknowledged she would and also to look into the retirees' medical benefit change that was presented as she believed it was the Retirement Board and not the County Executive who could make any changes.

Mr. Dertinger advised members of County Council received a copy of the Employee Policy Manual and were asked to sign a receipt form. As he did not plan to sign this form, he wondered if he would be in danger of being fired and asked Mr. Zito to also look into that matter.

**Voting Machines**

Mr. Cusick stated since the County had purchased new voting machines this year, he asked if Mr. John Conklin, Director of Administration, could provide a brief presentation as to how the process went, if there were enough machines and if he was satisfied with them.

Mr. Conklin stated he spoke to a number of poll workers and he summed it up by saying there was an Election Judge from North Catasauqua who had been doing elections for many years and he felt it was one of the best elections he had been involved in and the machines were absolutely fantastic. He further stated a few workers did indicate some areas experienced long lines and suggested adding machines for the next election.

Mr. Angle stated he also heard the machines were great, but people felt there could have been more of them, noting some people left because the line was so long.

Mr. Conklin commented the registration process and familiarizing individuals with the machines contributed to people
Mrs. Ferraro advised she had good feedback regarding the machines, however, also thought there should be more machines to cut down on the lines. She further advised the only complaint she heard was from the candidates with regard to the layout of the ballot.

Mr. Conklin indicated he also heard that and indicated the registrar designed the ballot.

Mr. Dertinger stated one of the reasons for the long lines was not the County's responsibility because it had to do with the municipalities not setting their districts. He further stated the ballot for the general election should look a lot more like the traditional ballot.

In response to Mrs. Ferraro's question with regard to the miscount, Mr. Conklin advised the Department of State did not pull the correct information and it was not the County's fault.

Consideration of the Weaversville Community Conservation Partnerships Program 2008 Grant Application

Mrs. McHale stated from time to time County Council was asked to adopt resolutions approving the County's application for grant funds. She further stated the Parks Department had requested County Council adopt a resolution approving the Weaversville Community Conservation Partnerships Program 2008 Grant Application.

Messrs. Grube and Dertinger introduced the following resolution:

R. 28-2008 WHEREAS, County of Northampton ("applicant") desires to undertake the following project, "Weaversville County Park Phase 1b"; and

WHEREAS, the applicant desires to apply to the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources ("Department") for a grant for the purpose of carrying out this project; and

WHEREAS, the application package includes a document entitled "Terms and Conditions of Grant" and a document entitled "Signature Page for Grant Application and Grant Agreement"; and
WHEREAS, the applicant understands that the contents of the document entitled "Terms and Conditions of Grant," including appendices referred to therein, will become the terms and conditions of a Grant Agreement between the applicant and the Department if the applicant is awarded a grant; and

WHEREAS, the applicant understands that by signing the "Signature Page for Grant Application and Grant Agreement" and submitting it to the Department as part of the grant application, the applicant agrees to the terms and conditions of the grant and will be bound by the Grant Agreement if the Department awards a grant;

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS RESOLVED THAT:

1. The "Signature Page for Grant Application and Grant Agreement" may be signed on behalf of the applicant by the official who, at the time of signing, has the title of Northampton County Executive.

2. If this official signed the "Signature Page for Grant application and Grant Agreement" prior to the passage of this Resolution, this grant of authority applies retroactively to the date of signing.

3. If the applicant is awarded a grant, the "Signature Page for Grant Application and Grant Agreement," signed by the above official, will become the applicant/grantee's executed signature page for the Grant Agreement, and the applicant/grantee will be bound by the Grant Agreement.

4. Any amendment to the Grant Agreement may be signed on behalf of the grantee by the official who, at the time of signing of the amendment, has the title specified in paragraph I and the grantee will be bound by the amendment.

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

The vote: Grube, "yes"; Dertinger, "yes"; McClure, "yes"; McHale, "yes"; Neiper, "yes"; Angle, "yes"; Cusick, "yes"; Dowd, "yes"
Consideration of the Government Center Courthouse Expansion Project Resolution

Mrs. McHale advised at the request of Mr. Cusick, a resolution was prepared which requested the County Controller's office perform an audit of the Courthouse Expansion project.

Mr. Cusick stated over the last three years, there have been questions and issues with regard to the final cost of this project and about a year ago, County Council was informed there was just a punch list of items that had to be completed. He further stated in the October budget address, the County Executive informed County Council this project was done in 2007 and yet last month, there was a budget amendment for $100,000.

Mr. Cusick advised at a Finance Committee meeting, he asked Mr. Steve DeSalva, Director of Public Works, if he knew the purpose of this additional $100,000 and was not given a definitive answer. He further advised after he voted for the amendment, he really wanted to know where the money was going. Therefore, he talked to the Controller's office and they indicated they could conduct an audit and so he asked that the following resolution be presented for consideration:

WHEREAS, the 2001 Bond Issue ordinance, Ordinance No. 371-2001, enacted on July 19, 2001, included $43,000,000 for the Government Center Courthouse Expansion Project (hereafter referred to as Project); and

WHEREAS, the 2008 Northampton County Budget, 2001 Bond Issue Projects indicates that $45,606,700 has been expended on the Project (refer to exhibit "A"). Further, the 2008 budget, account 4200-82100 CH Courthouse Expansion (refer to Exhibit "B"), contains an allocation of $2,046,302 for completion of various aspects of the Project. If all 2008 budgeted funds are expended, the Project total cost would be $47,653,002.

WHEREAS, from time to time over the past three years questions and issues have been raised concerning the cost of the project, the work that had to be done to complete the Project, potential cost overruns and the need to appropriate additional funding to complete the project; and

WHEREAS, obtaining a detailed analysis the Project is a wise and prudent endeavor, particularly as the County contemplates additional and new capital construction projects; and

WHEREAS, Northampton County Home Rule Charter Section 202 (8) empowers the County Council to require periodic and special reports from elected officials and their subordinates.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Northampton County Council that it hereby requests that the Northampton County Controller's Office audit the Government Center Courthouse Expansion Project and issue a written report to the Northampton County Council which would include an analysis and explanation of the reasons for all of the funds expended over the original cost estimate of $43,000,000, (2) an explanation of the work that has yet to be completed, and (3) an analysis of whether or not the allocation of
additional funding, other than what is budgeted, will be necessary to complete the project.

Mr. Dertinger stated he overall supported the idea, however, he felt for some portions of this, the Controller’s office was the wrong entity, but fell under the purview of Mr. DeSalva, specifically with regard to the work that had yet to be completed.

Mr. Dertinger made a motion to withdraw numbers two and three from the last paragraph of the resolution.

Mr. McClure commented he would second the motion, but first asked Mr. Cusick if he was willing to voluntarily withdraw these two items.

Mr. Cusick advised that would be acceptable.

Mr. Angle then asked how Mr. Dertinger would like to proceed to obtain those answers.

Mr. Dertinger stated it could either be put on the agenda for the next County Council meeting or the appropriate committee meeting.

Mr. McClure advised, as Chair of the Judicial, Legal and Operations Committee, he would be willing to have a meeting to explore these issues.

Mr. Angle stated he believed when the project was begun the Courts indicated if they were given $43 million, they would not ask for any more funds. Therefore, he felt the Courts should be involved in any discussions.

Mrs. McHale advised Mr. Angle was correct, but believed the increase in price was due to the project taking so long to complete.

Mr. Grube stated the original cost and the final cost of any project was always different for various reasons.

As there were there were no further questions or comments, Mrs. McHale called for the vote on the following amended resolution:

WHEREAS, the 2001 Bond Issue ordinance, Ordinance No. 371-2001, enacted on July 19, 2001, included $43,000,000 for the Government Center Courthouse Expansion Project (hereafter referred to as Project); and

WHEREAS, the 2008 Northampton County Budget, 2001 Bond Issue Projects indicates that $45,606,700 has been expended on the Project (refer to exhibit “A”). Further, the 2008 budget, account 4200-82100 CH Courthouse Expansion (refer to Exhibit “B”), contains an allocation of $2,046,302 for completion of various aspects of the Project. If all 2008 budgeted funds are expended, the Project total cost would be $47,653,002.

WHEREAS, from time to time over the past three years questions and issues have been raised concerning the cost of the project, the work that had to be done to complete the Project, potential cost overruns and the need to appropriate additional funding to complete the project; and

WHEREAS, obtaining a detailed analysis the Project is a wise and prudent endeavor, particularly as the County contemplates additional and new capital construction projects; and

WHEREAS, Northampton County Home Rule Charter Section 202 (8) empowers the County Council to require periodic and special reports from elected officials and their subordinates.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Northampton County Council that it hereby requests that the Northampton County Controller’s Office audit the Government Center Courthouse Expansion Project and issue a written report to the Northampton County Council which would include an analysis and explanation of the reasons for all of the funds expended over the original cost estimate of $43,000,000.


The resolution was adopted by a vote of 7-2.

Consideration of the Archives Building Project Resolution

Mrs. McHale advised at the request of Mrs. Neiper, a resolution was prepared which reaffirmed the support of County Council to construct a stand-alone Archives Building at the County-owned property located at 654 & 670 Wolf Avenue, Easton.

Mrs. Neiper and Mr. Cusick introduced the following resolution:

R. 30-2008 WHEREAS, on May 17, 2007, the Northampton County Council adopted Ordinance No. 465-2007, which formally authorized the acquisition of 654 & 670 Wolf Avenue; and

WHEREAS, the clear intention of, and stated purpose for acquiring the property was to construct a new stand alone Archives and Records Management facility that was as close as possible to the Northampton County Courthouse and to increase the County’s available parking capacity.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Northampton County Council does hereby reaffirm its support for constructing a stand alone Archives and Records Management facility at the County-owned property located at 654 & 670 Wolf Avenue, Easton, Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Neiper stated in 1982, the original, awarding winning Archives Building was built on Union Street and then was demolished in 2003 for the new Prison expansion.

Mrs. Neiper advised a committee was formed to determine where the new Archives and Records Management facility would be built. She further advised it was suggested that it be built as close to the Courthouse as possible and they came up with four recommendations.

Mrs. Neiper stated in May of 2007, County Council approved the purchase of 654 & 670 Wolf Avenue for a new Archives, Election Office and additional parking spaces. She further stated this was approved by the County Executive and Request for Quotes were sent out, noting 16 responses were received. She noted in January of this year, four were chosen and Request for Proposals were to be sent out, however, to her knowledge, they never were.

Mrs. Neiper advised Schoor DePalma came in to do a parking garage study and they came up with the idea of putting Archives in
the lower left hand corner of the parking garage. She noted one problem with that was, it was part of Phase II and who knows what will happen between the building of Phase I and Phase II.

Mrs. Neiper stated the County needed to move forward with the Archives, as planned and approved, in its original place. She further stated the parking lot that was next to it could provide expansion down the road, which could not happen if it was put in the bottom of the parking garage.

Mr. McClure advised he understood Mrs. Neiper’s frustration with the Administration regarding this issue, but unfortunately he would not be able to support this resolution. He further advised one of the reasons was the County’s current archives format did not cost the taxpayers any money and believed the money received from the State may be a revenue positive for the County. Secondly, this came too close to directing the Administration to take a specific administrative action, which he did not feel was appropriate for County Council to do.

Mrs. Neiper stated the current cost for archiving was $6,500 a month and agreed the State did provide some reimbursement. She further stated she was not trying to tell the Administration what to do, but a committee was formed who researched the project and came up with what they thought was the best solution to the problem which was agreed to by the County Executive.

Mr. Angle asked Mr. Conklin if there was ever going to be a time when the Administration would submit to County Council some proposals on things that were long over due to be done.

Mr. Conklin acknowledged there were a lot of building projects on the table, however, they have hit some roadblocks. He stated the municipalities hold all the cards as they have the final say on zoning and planning issues. He noted he was an engineer and there were a lot of processes that the County had to go through with each of these municipalities.

Mr. Dertinger advised he had to disagree with Messrs. McClure and Angle because if County Council did not step up and start providing some guidance, the County was going nowhere. He further advised the Gracedale window project alone was a perfect example. He commented he was not particularly concerned as to where the County’s documents were stored, however, he was concerned the County had an Administration that could not build a birdhouse, let alone finish a Courthouse, build an Archives facility, a parking deck or finish the Gracedale Window Project.

Mr. Cusick stated he wanted to cosponsor this resolution for one simple reason and that was the County already spent $1.5 million for that piece of property with the intention that those three components would be part of it. He further stated the Archives was a strong selling point for him and had he known that Mr. Stoffa did not want to put it there, he would not have voted to spend that kind of money for that piece of property because it would not have been worth it. Additionally, to now find the Archives was being held hostage to a $30 million parking deck was not fair to the people who voted for that purchase.

Mr. Angle asked Mrs. McHale to set up a meeting, perhaps weekly, with the County Executive, Mr. McClure as Chair of the Legal, Judicial and Operations Committee and himself, as Chair of the Finance Committee to discuss the projects that needed to be done.

Mr. McClure did not disagree with the idea, but felt there should be a public component to this process because that was the only
thing that got anyone moving.

Mr. Dowd advised he was also concerned as to whether this was County Council’s responsibility, however, it was time to make things happen. He further advised the Archives Building had been talked about since the previous building had been demolished.

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


The resolution was adopted by a vote of 5-4.

Mr. Angle made a motion that a Committee shall be formed consisting of the President Judge of the Court of Common Pleas (or his designee), the President of County Council, the Chairperson of the County Council Finance Committee, the Chairperson of the County Council Legal, Judicial and Operations Committee, the County Executive, the Director of Public Works and the Director of Administration, and shall meet biweekly to review and consider capital projects/building needs of the County.

Mr. Dowd seconded the motion.

Mrs. McHale called for the vote on the motion.


The motion passed by a vote of 6-3.

Budget Amendment

Mr. Vic Mazziotti, Director of Fiscal Affairs, stated he wanted to clarify the budget amendment that Mr. Cusick referred to had to do with additional interest that was earned in the bond process.

Quarterly Comprehensive Financial Report

Mr. McClure advised on page 40 of the Quarterly Comprehensive Financial Report it reflected an unreserved, undesignated fund balance of $98,808,064 and asked if that was an error.

Mr. Mazziotti stated that figure was correct, but it was inflated from the prior ending balance because they received State reimbursements. However, he noted that figure would drop downward during the year.

Bond Issue
Mr. Grube advised he read an article in the paper which indicated in 2001, County Council was given the challenge of approving a $110 million bond to build a Courthouse, to spur economic development and give financial assistance to municipalities, which was called an aggressive type of way to do things. He further advised the article indicated one of the biggest projects was Commerce Boulevard which was to spur economic development on brownfields on the defunct Bethlehem Steel. He noted for the past seven or eight years, a certain individual repeatedly called this a road to nowhere and tonight he would like to rename it the road to jobs.

Human Services Committee

Mrs. Neiper stated a Human Services Committee meeting was held on April 28, 2008, and the topic this month was Drug and Alcohol. She further stated at the last Mental Health/Mental Retardation meeting she attended, Mr. Ross Marcus, Director of Human Services, informed them that Drug and Alcohol was going to be removed from the Mental Health/Mental Retardation/Drug & Alcohol Division. She noted after the Human Services Committee meeting, she asked Mr. Marcus if he could just do that without approval from anywhere and he answered in the affirmative.

Mrs. Neiper advised she then asked Mr. Flisser to look into the matter and learned in 1999, the proposal to add Drug and Alcohol to the Mental Health/Mental Retardation Division was brought to County Council, discussed at a Human Services Committee meeting, and then an ordinance was passed. She further advised in 1999, a letter was sent to the Pennsylvania Director of Drug and Alcohol Bureau to make sure everything was acceptable on the State level.

Mrs. Neiper stated the Home Rule Charter indicated the County Executive had the power to organize and reorganize the structure of the agencies under his direction and supervision and to assign and reassign their functions, powers and duties by submitting to County Council a written proposal on the matter.

Therefore, Mrs. Neiper stated there was a process to be followed and once again, this was just another example of things not being done correctly.

In conclusion, Mrs. Neiper advised the Area Agency on Aging was moving to the Wolf Building in the old Elections office.

Mr. McClure stated he was an advocate of preserving the Executive’s power, but he was also an advocate of preserving the power of County Council and it seemed to him this Administration was consistently ignoring the Home Rule Charter and Administrative Code.

Mr. Dertinger advised this was no different from several of the other issues brought forth, including the Elections office. He further advised even after Mr. Zito had issued two different answers to two separate questions, the Administration was still trying to find a crack in the law to wedge in their ability to do something other than what was expressed by Mr. Zito or what had been done in the past.

Prison Liaison Report

Mrs. McHale stated a Summer Scholar Internship had been established at the Prison in conjunction with Lafayette College. She noted it was a department funded by the United Way of the Lehigh Valley and it developed a re-entry program for the female inmates at the Prison.

Mr. Cusick asked if the Prison Board discussed the request that came from the Judges regarding the Prison issue.

Mrs. McHale advised she was meeting with President Judge Robert A. Freedberg and Mr. Stoffa next week. She noted they were
aware of the issue and asked to be informed, however, because it involved a real estate transaction, she was not at liberty to provide further information at this time.

Slate Belt Council of Governments

Mr. Angle stated last Saturday, the Slate Belt Council of Governments held a mock emergency drill and the individuals who attended were very complimentary on the County’s involvement and felt the County had made vast improvements in the last six months.

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.

Mr. Dowd seconded the motion.

The motion passed by acclamation.

Frank E. Flisser