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

Prayer

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

Pledge of Allegiance

Mrs. Neiper led County Council in the pledge of allegiance.

Courtesy of the Floor

Ken Nagy, Forks Township, PA - stated once again Gracedale was in the news and usually when that happened, it was about money. He further stated the County was going to be $6.9 million short in 2009 and Governor Edward Rendell had chosen to cut the budget $4.25% across the board, except for cuts in health and other services which were going to be somewhat less. He noted this could result in a tax increase of approximately 1.25% to subsidize Gracedale and it was irrational to expect taxpayers who were already burdened with their own health care costs to continue to pay taxes to subsidize free health care for a population of less than 1% of the County.

Mr. Nagy advised these were extraordinary times and extraordinary action should be taken, therefore, it was time for Gracedale to go. He further advised the County no longer needed to be in that business as there were private facilities around the County. He noted Gracedale should either be privatized or closed down with its current patients sent to private facility even if it required the County to pay the difference.

Mr. Nagy stated if Gracedale was costing the County a lot
of money, just imagine what a health department was going to cost. He further stated he believed the health department was an issue that should have been decided by the people.

Mr. Angle agreed County government was growing and it was headed for serious financial times.

Mr. Robert Pfenning, 2830 Linden Street, Bethlehem, PA - stated the Gambling Impact Committee met on October 13, 2008. He further stated the first order of business was a report by Mr. Ross Marcus, Director of Human Services, on the internal progress the County was making in preparing for gambling addiction. He noted one of the things Mr. Marcus mentioned was there was a minimum $1.5 million put into a problem gambling fund to be administered by the Bureau of Drug and Alcohol Programs of the Pennsylvania Department of Health. He further noted that money did not come to the County, but went to certified professionals treating gambling addiction and there were only 16 of those individuals in the Commonwealth, with two of them working in Northampton County.

Mr. Pfenning advised the Committee also briefly discussed its future and the rest of the meeting was spent speaking to the representatives from the Borough of Freemansburg who were very much concerned about getting a gambling authority formed and finding out exactly what the grant procedures were going to be.

In response to Mr. Angle’s question as to whether any study was conducted to determine what the cost would be to treat those individuals who were affected by gambling, Mr. Pfenning stated he was not aware of any such study.

Mr. Cusick asked if the Gambling Impact Committee planned to present County Council with a written and formalized report at some point in time.

Mr. Pfenning advised as the Committee reported to the County Executive, they did not intend to submit a report nor would they be making any recommendations. However, he noted they did post their minutes on the County website.

Mr. G. Michael McDavid, Regional Director, Penn State Cooperative Extension and Outreach, Penn State University - stated for a second year, they were partnering with County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania to work on their programs and if anyone had any questions or comments, they could
Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Angle made the following motion:

Be It Moved By the Northampton County Council that the minutes of the October 2, 2008 meeting shall be approved.

Mr. Dertinger seconded the motion.
The motion was adopted by voice acclamation.

Presentation of the Lehigh Valley Economic Development Corporation (LVEDC) - Phil Mitman

Mrs. McHale advised the LVEDC requested the opportunity to address County Council and to provide a report on their activities.

Mr. Mitman, Executive Director of LVEDC, provided a packet of information, which included a document entitled, “Presentation to County Council, Thursday, October 16, 2008”; some articles pertaining to what LVEDC had been doing; a booklet entitled “2008 Priority Projects for Northampton County”; a booklet entitled, “A Strategy for Economic Enhancement of the Route 33 and 512 Corridor, Northampton County, Pennsylvania, March 2003”; a booklet entitled, “Office of Minority and Women-owned Business” and some financial records (see Attachment #1).

Mr. Mitman stated at this point in time, LVEDC’s responsibility was to retain as many jobs as they could in Northampton County. He then reviewed some of the information contained in the packet.

Mr. Mitman advised a report done by IBM, which was commissioned by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 2005, reflected Pennsylvania ranked first among all States for the number of new cross-border investment projects and was number one for manufacturing projects in the United States. He further advised it also reported Pennsylvania ranked fifth in North America for job creation and could achieve even greater success by increasing the level of collaboration and sense of shared
purpose between State officials and regional economic development leaders.

Mr. Mitman stated an article in the Business Facilities magazine for July 2008, reported the competition for the top-ranked state in overall biotechnology strength was very close, with Pennsylvania edging out California and Massachusetts and ranked Pennsylvania fourth in Biotechnology Venture Capital Investments. He further stated LVEDC had been staying with this type of industry clusters because it was a very important part of what they did and where they were getting a lot of growth.

Mr. Mitman advised the Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry in the Lehigh Valley reported May 31, 2006, that jobs in the Lehigh Valley had increased six times the rate of Pennsylvania and responsible for more than 35% of all new jobs created.

Mr. Mitman advised one of LVEDC’s major responsibilities was to retained jobs and attract businesses. He further advised some of their target businesses were advanced material manufacturing, business and financial services, life sciences and health care and technology-intensive manufacturing.

Mr. Mitman stated last year and now in 2008, LVEDC and its partners have funded 24 projects at a value of more than $18 million and projected to create more than 1000 jobs. He further stated they received about 300 calls and contacts a year from companies who want to relocate, with about 50 of them being serious about the Lehigh Valley.

Mr. Mitman advised, so far, in Northampton County, they provided financing for 11 projects, with $13 million total project costs, $7 million total loan amounts and 267 jobs created or retained. He noted they were also working with 25 prospective businesses for Northampton County, with $52 million in total project costs, $26 million in loan amounts and 1030 jobs.

Mr. Mitman stated LVEDC was the coordinating agency for the Lehigh Valley to bring forward projects to Harrisburg for funding. He further stated for Northampton County, Bethlehem had three projects, Easton had four projects and there were four other projects on the Priority Project List.
Mr. Mitman advised in 2008, LVEDC with its partners completed six projects, at $74 million total project costs and approximately 800 jobs.

Mr. Mitman stated another project was the Lehigh Valley Land Recycling Initiative, which dealt with brownfields, and they received grants in the amount of $159,000. He further stated they were one of the winners of a 2008 Environmental Achievement Award for outstanding effort in preserving the Mid-Atlantic’s environment from the United States Environmental Protection Agency Mid-Atlantic Region.

Mr. Mitman advised they opened an office to assist in helping to start, but mostly sustaining, minority and women owned businesses.

Mr. Mitman stated their next year budget would be approximately $3 million.

Mr. Angle advised he wanted to visit the offices of LVEDC some time next week and look at their records.

When Mr. Mitman asked what he specifically wanted to look at because he was providing some financial information in the packet, Mr. Angle stated LVEDC was taking public hotel tax money and he would like to see all those records except personnel records.

In response to Mr. Angle’s request to see the prospect records, Mr. Mitman informed him that would not be possible.

Mr. Angle replied LVEDC took public money and under the Freedom of Information Right to Know Act, there were only a few select things that could not be made public, but everything else should be made available to him, the media and the public.

Mr. Mitman advised they could not share the prospects because if that were to become public, the company may change their mind.

Mr. Dowd stated if the prospects coming to the Lehigh Valley could not depend on confidentially, it would put the Lehigh Valley off a lot of companies’ radar screens for
relocation. He further stated when the deal did become public, all information related to the deal could be made public.

Mr. Angle advised he understood that with respect to private industry, but this organization took public money and as such, the law was very clear about what could or could not be disclosed.

Mr. Cusick asked if there were any businesses that were not coming to the Lehigh Valley due to the current credit situation.

Mr. Mitman stated that only became an issue when a business did not have the experience or collateral that was required to obtain a loan and that was why LVEDC was even more relevant because they offered 24 State and Federal financing programs.

Mr. Cusick commented one of the complaints County Council received was this was a very attractive area for warehouses. He then asked if warehouses were encouraged or was there anything to be done to discourage it.

Mr. Mitman advised LVEDC had never encouraged it, but they never told clients what they could do. He further advised warehousing came because land was less expensive and the access to highways was greater. However, now land was more expensive and the workforce was becoming more technology oriented.

Introduction of the Railroad Service Resolution

Mrs. McHale stated at the October 2, 2008 County Council meeting, Mr. Paul Marin, Chairman of the LVEDC Transportation Committee, made a presentation regarding re-instituting rail passenger service to the Lehigh Valley region and Northampton County was being asked to contribute $75,000 toward a study pertaining to this reinstatement.

Mrs. McHale advised while $75,000 was currently contained in the 2009 proposed budget for this purpose, she asked that a resolution be prepared which would transfer $75,000 from the 2008 County Council Contingency Account for expanding a study
being conducted by New Jersey Transit to include the Lehigh Valley. She further advised the funding would actually be transferred to the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (LVPC) who would administer and manage Northampton County’s participation in the study. She noted she did not believe anything would be gained by waiting two and a half months to make a determination as to whether or not Northampton County should be a willing participant in such an endeavor.

Mr. Dertinger introduced the following resolution:

WHEREAS, New Jersey Transit is studying the extension of commuter rail service to Phillipsburg, New Jersey; and

WHEREAS, this rail study could be expanded to include the possibility of extending rail service into the Lehigh Valley and Northampton County; and

WHEREAS, local funding is required to complete this study; and

WHEREAS, the Lehigh Valley Economic Development Corporation has committed to contribute $100,000 to fund this study; and

WHEREAS, commuter rail service could provide an additional travel choice during a time of historically all time high gasoline prices and rapidly increasing traffic congestion; and

WHEREAS, commuter rail service could benefit the local economy of Northampton County; and

WHEREAS, commuter rail stations could contribute the vitality of local downtown areas.

NOW BE IT, THEREFORE, RESOLVED that the Northampton County Council does hereby support the concept of conducting the rail service study for the Lehigh Valley.

Further, the Northampton County Council hereby allocates the sum of $75,000 from the 2008 Contingency Account 305000-76050 to the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission as the Northampton County share toward expanding the New Jersey Transit
commuter rail study to include Northampton County and the Lehigh Valley.

Mrs. McHale asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr. Angle stated it was ironic that the LVPC was being asked to administer Northampton County’s participation because Mr. Mike Kaiser, Executive Director of the LVPC, made it clear that it would be senseless to do any kind of a study at this point in time based on the fact that the Federal government had no money available now or in the near reasonable future. He further stated based on the economic situation the country was facing, he did not understand how anyone could believe the Federal government would come up with billions of dollars for a rail study.

Mr. Angle advised this was all about accommodating a very small, handful of people who went all around the Lehigh Valley giving a presentation, noting most of them moved here from New York and now they did not have rail service to travel back there either for work or recreation. He further advised if the County had $75,000 to throw away, it would do better to put it in a fund to supply money for heat so the senior citizens around this County would not have to go without heat this winter or to assist those people who were on the Sheriff’s Sale list to help them hang onto their homes.

Mr. Cusick stated the obstacles in front of the County to complete a rail service were enormous and the money would be better spent to improve the parking lot for the bus service from Hellertown.

Mrs. McHale asked if the opinion Mr. Kaiser provided was his personal opinion or that of the board.

Mr. Angle advised Mr. Kaiser was asked to give his opinion as the Executive Director of the LVPC.

Mrs. McHale remarked she just read a news article that rail service was on the Federal government’s radar within the next three years. She further remarked that could have changed due to the recent economic situation, but she did not believe Mr. Kaiser was speaking on behalf of the entire LVPC board. Therefore, she would like a formal opinion from the LVPC board.
Mr. Angle made a motion to table this matter until a formal opinion was received from the LVPC as to whether they felt it was feasible.

Mr. Dertinger stated both presidential candidates had indicated they were focusing on the need for alternative energy and transportation was becoming an issue. He further stated Mr. Marin’s point was that if a study was not done and a plan or program was not put into place, there would be no possible way for the County to apply for any monies or making any pitch as to why it wanted money. He further noted one of the issues taken with the bond issue was County Council wanted a list of what the future costs would be, therefore, in that spirit, it made a lot of sense at this time to make certain the County did have the costs, projects and possibilities in order before moving forward to receiving any monies.

Mrs. Neiper advised she believed the resolution was to get the County’s share of the cost of the study now and asked if this resolution failed, would the County Executive leave the $75,000 in the budget.

Mr. Dowd stated he felt it would be better for the County to obtain information that would allow it to be in a position where it could capitalize if, in fact, grant money was available. He further stated he believed rail transportation was important to the cities because development around railroad stations was significant.

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


The resolution failed by a vote of 4-2 as it lacked a majority vote of 5.

Mrs. McHale indicated the money would still be in the proposed budget.
AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE CONVEYANCE OF AN EASEMENT ON NORTHAMPTON COUNTY-OWNED REAL PROPERTY IN EAST ALLEN TOWNSHIP TO PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION

WHEREAS, Northampton County Home Rule Charter Article 602 (a)(6) provides that the Northampton County Council shall enact an ordinance for any act which “conveys or leases or authorizes the conveyance or lease of any real property of the County.”; and

WHEREAS, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation has requested an electric and communication lines easement, across County-owned land in East Allen Township; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the provisions of the
Northampton County Administrative Code, Article XIII Procurement and Disposition of County Property, Section 13.15 Purchase, Sale and Lease of Real Estate a. and b. the Northampton County Executive presented two (2) sealed appraisals on the subject property (copies of both are attached hereto and labeled as Exhibits “A” and “B” respectively).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY ORDAINED AND ENACTED, by the Northampton County Council that it does hereby agree to grant, in consideration of Two Thousand ($2,000) Dollars, an easement, on Northampton County-owned lands located in the Township of East Allen, County of Northampton, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (as further described in certain deed dated December 23, 1980 and recorded in the Office for Recording of Deeds in and for Northampton County in Deed Book 622, Page 1030, being further described as Tax Identifier Number K6-15-PKB 0508C), to the PPL Electrical Utilities Corporation according to the terms and conditions of the easement agreement (a copy of which is attached and labeled as Exhibit “C”).

Mr. Angle advised the PPL ordinance was discussed at the Personnel and Finance Committee meeting held October 15, 2008, and during that meeting representatives of Keystone Cement Company agreed to grant an easement to Northampton County over Keystone Cement Company land for the development of the County’s Nor-Bath Trail if Northampton County agreed to approve the PPL Easement ordinance.

Mr. Angle stated the Finance Committee adopted a motion that the Finance Committee would recommend to the Northampton County Council that they should approve the pending PPL easement over County owned land, with the understanding that in return the Keystone Cement Company would provide Northampton County with a legally binding document that gave Northampton County an easement over land owned by the Keystone Cement Company for the future further development of the Nor-Bath Trail, subject to the approval of the Pennsylvania Department Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) and the National Park Service, who oversaw the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Mr. Angle stated he was asking for this to be acted upon now as there was a time constraint involved because if Keystone Cement did not move ahead shortly, the power line would not be
in place in time for them to hook up the new portions of the plant which would create some major problems. He further stated he understood the argument about Keystone Cement employing some illegal workers, but in reality Keystone Cement was a large employer in the County, caused no problems that he was aware of and they wanted to expand their facility to employ more people and do more business so to hold them up did not make any sense and the offer of trading right-of-way for right-of-way to complete the Nor-Bath Trail was hard to turn down.

Mr. Angle advised he would like to introduce an amendment to the ordinance that it be passed contingent on Keystone Cement’s proposal to County Council of the right-of-way, whether it be a letter of commitment or some type of an agreement, so long as it met the legal qualification of County Council’s Solicitor.

Mr. Dertinger stated when the County approached Keystone Cement in the past with regard to an easement for the Nor-Bath Trail, they had said no. He further stated Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) laws prevailed over the property and if Keystone was giving the County an easement across that property it could cause a concern as far as MSHA was concerned. He noted when he toured the facility, it did not give him any indication they were going to increase the number of people working there so to him, this still was not an economic development project as much as this was still removing resources from the County. He further noted Keystone Cement was not looking at Northampton County as a good place to employ people, but as a place to obtain limestone that they can turn into cement.

Mr. Dertinger advised he was very much in favor of continuing the access for the Nor-Bath Trail, however, his concerns were still the same and there were still a number of legal questions that needed to be answered. He further advised the two most important ones were whether or not there was, in fact, an MSHA issue that had to be addressed on their part and whether or not DCNR and the Federal government whose money that this was originally purchased with had any say.

Mr. Dertinger stated he could see passing this on contingent of all those items, however and no disrespect to Mr. Martino, he did not think satisfying his concerns was the important thing here, but satisfaction from DCNR, from the
Federal government and from MSHA was really the deciding factor. He further stated to the effect of the value of this land, he noted this land had actually put the County in a position where it could connect the Nor-Bath Trail so to his mind, this property was immensely valuable.

Mr. Angle stated the amendment would have to include that DCNR gave its approval, noting Mr. Gordon Heller, Parks and Recreation, had already talked to them and they appeared to like the idea and would give its approval. He further stated Keystone Cement was going to have their attorneys furnish Mr. Martino their suggestion of an agreement of sale or letter of intent, which would clearly and legally define what they would be delivering.

Mr. Dertinger advised he would certainly support a motion to enter into that sort of negotiation, but not amend the ordinance.

Mr. Angle asked a representative from Keystone Cement if the County gave them a letter of intent that the County intended to give them a right-of-way if DCNR approved and if the documents provided by Keystone Cement were legally binding for the right-of-way they were offering, would it meet Keystone Cement’s threshold. The representative replied that it would.

Mr. Angle then made a motion to retable this ordinance at this point in time.

Mrs. McHale seconded the motion.

Mrs. McHale called for the vote.


The motion passed by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Angle then made a motion that the County enter into an agreement with Keystone Cement, contingent on DCNR giving their approval, to give them the easement they requested and they, in turn, would furnish the County legal documentation that met the qualifications as determined by County Council’s Solicitor that
it was legally binding for the transfer of an easement to the County for the land in the front which connected to the Nor-Bath Trail.

Mr. Cusick seconded the motion.

Mr. Dertinger stated he would like to add an amendment to that motion that MSHA also agreed to the proposition.

Mr. Angle made the motion that Northampton County shall enter into an agreement with the Keystone Cement Company, contingent on the approval of the Pennsylvania DCNR, that Northampton County would grant the Keystone Cement Company the easement they previously requested for power lines across Northampton County-owned property, and in return, the Keystone Cement Company would provide Northampton County legal documentation that was satisfactory to County Council’s Solicitor that would deliver to Northampton County, within a reasonable time frame, the right-of-way connecting the Nor-Bath Trail, and that right-of-way be free of any and all encumbrances by any government agency.

Mr. Cusick seconded the motion.

Mrs. McHale called for the vote.


The motion passed by a vote of 6-0.

911

When Mr. Dowd advised he received a complaint letter regarding the Northampton County 911 office from a resident of Easton and asked what was being done, Mr. Stoffa responded the matter was being looked into.

Northampton County Judges

Mr. Cusick stated some time ago, an additional judgeship was requested for Northampton County and was passed through the State legislature. He further stated the Administration was
asked at yesterday’s Personnel and Finance Committee meeting to provide a cost analysis with regard to that position.

Mr. Angle advised the cost of a judge was not that great because it was reimbursed by the State, as well as some of the staff costs.

Consideration of the Resignation of the County Council Solicitor

Mrs. McHale stated on October 7, 2008, Mr. Leonard N. Zito was confirmed by the Pennsylvania Senate to fill the vacancy on the Northampton County Court of Common Pleas. She further stated as a result of that confirmation, Mr. Zito resigned his position as Solicitor to County Council.

As there were no questions or comments, Mrs. McHale called for a vote on the resignation of Mr. Zito.

Mr. Zito’s resignation was accepted by voice acclamation.

Consideration of Resolution Designating Interim County Council Solicitor

Mrs. McHale introduced the following resolution:

R.66-2008 RESOLVED, By the Northampton County Council that Anthony J. Martino shall be confirmed as interim Solicitor to the Northampton County Council, at the annualized salary of $47,025, effective October 8, 2008.

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


The resolution was adopted by a vote of 6-0.

Consideration of the Administrative Code Contract Approval

Resolutions - Xerox Corporation
Mrs. McHale advised from time to time County Council was asked to approve contracts that exceed $100,000 because of the provisions of Administrative Code Section 13.16c. She then introduced the following resolution:

R. 67-2008 WHEREAS, Northampton County Administrative Code Article XIII Procurement and Disposition of County Property, Section 13.16 Contracts and Agreements c.(1) requires approval of County Council for “[...]any contract exceeding $100,000, which was awarded using the Competitive Negotiation, Negotiation After Competitive Sealed Bidding, and Non-Competitive Negotiation source selection methods. For contracts with renewal clauses, the entire potential payout if all renewal clauses are exercised under the terms of the contract must be considered when determining if Council approval is necessary.”

WHEREAS, on October 16, 2008, the Northampton County Council received a request from the County Executive for County Council to adopt a resolution endorsing a contract with Xerox Corporation for the leasing of a copier/printer and also a color copier/printer.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Northampton County Council does hereby concur with the recommendation of the County Executive, as set forth in the attached documentation, to award a contract to Xerox Corporation for the leasing of a copier/printer and also a color copier/printer.

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

Mrs. McHale called for the vote.


The resolution was adopted by a vote of 6-0.

Hay Study

Mr. Angle stated for those who were not present at the Personnel and Finance Committee meeting yesterday, there was a lengthy discussion with regard to how the Hay Study was
conducted, which raised a lot of concerns on behalf of the members of County Council present.

As a background, Mr. Angle advised County Council voted to spend $115,000 for representatives of the Hay Group to come in and conduct a study. However, what actually happened was they came in for two days and trained six County employees to do the study. He further advised that was very disturbing to him, noting after 17 years later, the Barstan Study still was a sore subject because of how it was conducted.

Mr. Angle stated County Council was told these six individuals only looked at positions, not the people in those positions. He further stated he would be in favor of throwing out the complete results of the Hay Study because he did not know how County Council could convince employees this was a fair study.

Mr. Angle advised he found it very interesting that Mr. Robert Mateff and Mr. William Hillanbrand, employees of County’s 911 Center and part of the team that conducted the study, were in favor of giving their boss, Mr. John Conklin, Director of Administration, a raise. Also, Ms. Connie Sutton-Falk, Director of Human Resources, was in favor of giving herself a raise. He further advised some employees who had been doing a good job for the County for many years were having their salaries frozen. Therefore, it was giving long term employees salary freezes, while giving short term employees raises.

Mr. Angle stated he could cite numerous examples to show this study was flawed, one of them being the fact that Ms. Jill Mancini, who was just recently hired as a full time Assistant Solicitor with a negotiated pay, was shown as being underpaid and so was Mr. Mateff, who was a member of the committee.

Mr. Angle advised he did not know about other members of County Council, but his phone had been ringing off the hook with regard to this study by County employees. He further advised he believed it had to be thrown out because it was not what County Council approved payment for and he was not so sure they should not sue the Hay Group.
Mr. Stoffa stated he was wrong about the study and indicated he would like to bring a representative from the Hay Group in to discuss the issue. He further stated this was the way these studies were conducted and the Hay Group was a well respected, international organization. He reiterated this study was based on the responsibilities of the position and not the person who filled the position.

Mrs. McHale advised she would like a representative from the Hay Group to come in after the Personnel Commission had met and reviewed the study.

When Mr. Dertinger stated he failed to see anything in the study pertaining to the Voters Registrar’s position, Mr. Stoffa informed him it would be in the new study because there was no one there when the study was done, but the job was evaluated.

Mr. Dertinger advised his concern was there was an Acting Voters Registrar and there was a huge election coming up so it was important there was continuity there because it would be disastrous for the two people who were carrying the office at this time to see that they had been excluded from this study and he hoped they had been spoken to regarding this matter.

**County Bank Accounts**

Mr. Angle stated the County had deposits in a very small number of banks, with one of the primary banks being Sovereign and the other was Fulton. He further stated Sovereign was being bought by another entity and there were some questions as to what their situation was at this time. He noted supposedly all monies from this County that were deposited in any bank were backed up by pledged United States Government securities to cover every one of those deposits, however, he would like documentation from the Federal Reserve confirming that fact.

Mr. Stoffa advised Mr. Vic Mazziotti, Director of Fiscal Affairs, was working on that.

**Human Services Committee Report**

Mrs. Neiper stated a Human Services Committee meeting was
scheduled for Monday, October 20, 2008, and the agenda included an update on the Health Bureau and review of the Mental Health Division of the Department of Human Services.

Personnel Committee Report

Mr. Cusick advised it was requested that a representative from the Hay Group be present at the Personnel Commission meeting to be held on October 31, 2008. He further advised they also asked for a cost estimate for the implementation of the study for the next few years.

Budget Hearing

Mrs. McHale stated the first Budget Hearing was scheduled to be held on October 21, 2008.

Council Solicitor's Report

Mr. Zito provided a copy of his Solicitor’s Report for this meeting (see Attachment #2).

Adjournment

Mr. Dertinger made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Angle seconded the motion.

The motion passed by acclamation.

Frank E. Flisser
Clerk to Council