A regular meeting of the Northampton County Council was held on the above date with the following present: Ron Angle, President; John Cusick, Vice President; Thomas H. Dietrich; J. Michael Dowd; Bruce A. Gilbert; Lamont G. McClure, Jr.; Ann McHale; Barbara A. Thierry; Philip D. Lauer, Solicitor to Council and Frank E. Flisser, Clerk to Council. Absent was Margaret Ferraro.

Pledge of Allegiance

A member of the audience and a Veteran led County Council in the pledge of allegiance.

Prayer

Associate Pastor Carl McCullough, Greater Shiloh Church, led County Council in prayer to open the meeting.

Approval of the Minutes

Mrs. McHale made the following motion:

Be It Moved By the Northampton County Council that the minutes of the February 4, 2010 meeting shall be approved.

Mr. Dowd seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved by voice acclamation.

Courtesy of the Floor

Mr. Ken Nagy, Forks Township, PA - stated from 2000 until today, Gracedale had cost the taxpayers $4 million and some of
the employees were seeking a 21% increase, which was not only outrageous in these economic times, but it would be a springboard for the other unions. He further stated the Federal Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services ranked Gracedale as being below average so basically the County was paying a Cadillac price for a Yugo.

Mr. Nagy advised 50 Counties in the Commonwealth used to have nursing homes, however, now there were only 34. He further advised Gracedale was an old building that was going to require constant and expensive maintenance. He noted the future held higher labor costs, fewer grant dollars from the Federal and State governments, fewer patients, more building maintenance, which all added up to more money for the taxpayer to pay.

Mr. Nagy stated it could be said the County had a moral obligation to care for those who could not take care of themselves, which was true to a point, however, he felt it was somewhat immoral to ask people to pay for their own healthcare while paying higher taxes to support people so they could receive free healthcare.

In conclusion, Mr. Nagy advised he felt economically and morally, the County had an obligation to its taxpayers to get out of the nursing home business.

Mr. Angle stated at the Finance Committee meeting held yesterday, Mr. Ross Marcus, Director of Human Services, indicated the efficiency at Gracedale was improving every day.

Mr. Nagy advised things could be improving some, but that operation had been inefficient for the last five years and could serve as the poster child for inefficiencies in the County.

Mr. McClure stated he thought it was the County’s moral obligation to maintain Gracedale at the high standards the current residents were receiving. He further stated he wanted to share with the public, a letter which was received with regard to Gracedale.

"DEAR MR GRANDA:

MY HUSBAND, CLAIR RUTT, PASSED AWAY JANUARY 22, 2010 AT GRACEDALE AFTER JUST LESS THAN SIX YEARS AS A RESIDENT. I JUST
WANTED YOU TO KNOW THAT I WAS A PRIVATE PAYER FOR ALL THOSE YEARS AND I DO NOT BEGRUDGE ONE CENT THAT I SPENT FOR HIS CARE. HE WAS LOVED BY THE STAFF ON SOUTHEAST II, AS WAS I, WAS GIVEN THE BEST OF CARE, AND WAS TREATED WITH RESPECT AND DIGNITY. HE WAS HAPPY THERE IN HIS OWN WORLD. THE FUNERAL DIRECTOR, JOHN MORELLO, TOLD ME WHEN MAKING HIS FINAL ARRANGEMENTS THAT HIS BODY WAS IN EXCELLENT CONDITION WHICH HE SAYS IS NOT ALWAYS THE CASE WHEN RECEIVING THEM FROM OTHER NURSING HOMES. I THOUGHT THAT WAS A GREAT TESTAMENT TO GRACEDALE'S CARE AND SHOULD BE PASSED ON TO YOU.

I KNOW THERE ARE RUMORS ABOUT SELLING GRACEDALE AND I SINCERELY HOPE THAT NEVER COMES TO FRUITION. IT WOULD BE A SHAME AND A GREAT LOSS TO OUR COMMUNITY. I KNOW I MADE THE RIGHT DECISION WHEN I PLACED MY HUSBAND IN GRACEDALE. I HOPE IT CONTINUES TO BE A NURSING HOME FOR ALL THOSE OTHER PEOPLE WHO WILL NEED THE CARE THAT MY HUSBAND NEEDED.

MAY GOD BLESS YOU.”

Mr. McClure advised he could not state the County’s moral obligation better than that. He further advised even though he did not agree with all of Mr. Cusick’s concerns, he did agree that the last two budgetary cycles would be unsustainable over the long term and the burden would be on the taxpayer if it continued.

Mr. McClure stated that Gracedale was now ready to receive all the people it could possibly receive. He further stated there was a residence requirement for Gracedale, which few of the other surrounding counties had for their facilities. Therefore, by dropping this requirement, Gracedale could have the potential to fill all of its beds and not only break even, but possibly make a profit.

Mr. McClure suggested that the residence requirement be dropped with a resolution drafted that indicated Northampton County residents would always be given first priority on the list.
Mr. Angle advised that Mr. Doug Hill, Executive Director of CCAP, was present to speak to County Council about what was going on at CCAP.

Mr. Hill introduced Ms. Brinda Carroll Penyak, Deputy Director, and Ms. Kristen Goshorn, Government Relations Manager. He stated they were a non-profit, non-partisan association based in Harrisburg and provided legislative regulatory representation, as well as training, insurance programs, technology services, research and other programs to all the Counties in the Commonwealth. He further stated their most important function was to provide a voice for the Counties at Harrisburg and Washington.

Mr. Hill advised the biggest issue right now was the Commonwealth’s budget, both surviving the current fiscal year and the one that was just put before the General Assembly, noting they have been involved in these issues. He further advised he was present tonight to take a look at what was going on in Northampton County to get a handle on the real issues and how they were playing out locally. Therefore, he asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Cusick asked if Mr. Hill could highlight some of the items in the State budget that have changed from previous years to the one the Governor recently presented.

Mr. Hill stated many of the County line items showed nominal increases, but actually were cut in previous years so they had to go back, in some program areas, to 2002 and to provide comparative numbers. He further stated they were trying to portray where program funding levels should be compared to where they were in the proposed budget and compared to where they should be with the changing service level demands they have seen.

Mr. Hill advised the biggest areas for them in any Commonwealth budget were in Human Services and their focus this year was primarily in Children and Youth, Mental Health and
Mental Retardation and Drug and Alcohol. He further advised they were also interested in the Human Services Development Fund, which was non-categorical funding so it was not tied to any specific program and the agencies could allocate the money to where they needed it. He noted this funding had also taken a tremendous cut when compared with previous years.

Mr. Hill stated they actively tracked more than 90 line items, such as emergency management services, elections, environmental programs, County planning and tourism. He further stated in every case they were seeing cuts compared to prior budgets.

Mr. Cusick advised the Lehigh Valley Convention and Visitors Bureau had taken a major hit and asked what had some of the other Counties done and/or what had CCAP done to lobby the State legislatures to restore some of that funding.

Mr. Hill stated most of the Counties were in the initial phases of reacting to the budget because part of the hit was in the initial appropriation, the rest came from the freeze the Governor announced in January. He further stated he did not think any County had coordinated a response yet, but they were putting together a strong lobbying effort to try and restore the funding.

In response to Mr. Angle’s comment that there appeared to be hard times in Harrisburg in supporting and financing the endeavors that they should be, Mr. Hill advised that was why they continually asked for the County’s help in coordinating these efforts because even though the Commonwealth cuts back funding, the County does not cut back its services.

Mr. Dowd stated with respect to the Human Services department, he felt the State often lost sight of the enormous economic impact that the Human Services sector had on the County’s economy and region.

County Executive’s Report

With regard to the residency requirement at Gracedale, Mr. John Stoffa, County Executive, advised Mr. Marcus did a survey
of eleven nursing homes and found nine of them did not have a residence requirement. He further advised he informed Mr. Marcus to disregard the residency requirement for now to see if they could make Gracedale work. He noted there were 725 beds and they had approximately 650 patients so there was room for 75 more patients. He further noted he was informed they could do that without hiring additional staff.

Mr. Stoffa stated the roof on the Prison had been completed and the punch list was just about completed. He further stated he reported last time there was a problem with the food vendor, which they have worked out, and he planned to ask County Council to adopt a resolution regarding the matter at the next meeting.

Mr. Stoffa advised the kitchen equipment in the Prison was being installed and there was some work on the bathrooms being done. He further advised the count at the Prison was 813, which was not good, but manageable.

Mr. Stoffa stated they had proposals going out this week to repair the parking deck and the walkway. He further stated they were installing a lift on the walkway to assist people in getting to the entrance.

In answer to Mr. Angle’s question as to an update on Bethlehem Township, Mr. Stoffa advised they were waiting for Judge Michael Franciosa’s opinion.

Confirmation of Appointments

Mrs. McHale introduced the following resolution:

R. 11-2010  RESOLVED, by the Northampton County Council that the following individuals shall be confirmed in their appointments/re-appointment as indicated hereafter:

AREA AGENCY ON AGING  ADVISORY COUNCIL

Appointment: Brenda Templeton 1912 Fairview Avenue

Term to Expire: 6/30/11
Mrs. McHale stated the appointees were unanimously approved by the Personnel Committee yesterday.

As there were no questions or comments, Mr. Angle called for the vote.


The resolution was adopted by a vote of 8-0.

Public Hearing on the Ordinance Granting an Avigation Easement on County Owned Land to the Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority

Mr. Angle advised the following ordinance was introduced by Mr. Dowd and Mrs. Ann McHale at the meeting held February 4, 2010:
AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING AN EASEMENT ON AND OVER COUNTY OWNED PROPERTY TO THE LEHIGH-NORTHAMPTON AIRPORT AUTHORITY FOR THE AUTHORITIES USE OF A DASR RADAR SYSTEM

WHEREAS, the Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority (Authority) is the owner and operator of the Lehigh Valley International Airport situated in Hanover Township, Lehigh County, and is in close proximity to property owned by Northampton County which property is located in Allen Township, Northampton County, and described as Tax Parcel No. M5-2-3A PKB; and

WHEREAS, the Airport Authority has provided land to the United States acting by and through the Department of Transportation - Federal Aviation Administration, which has constructed on the site for the use and benefit of the public a new Digital Airport Surveillance Radar System (DASR); and

WHEREAS, the County wishes to grant an easement on and over certain land and airspace to the Authority for the operation and use of the DASR system; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY ORDAINED AND ENACTED by the Northampton County Council that it does hereby authorize an easement on and over a certain tract of ground located in Allen Township, Northampton County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, identified as Tax Nap No. N5-2-3A-PKB to the Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority; subject to the terms and conditions of the Avigation Easement which is attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit "A".

Public Hearing

Mr. Angle asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to comment on this ordinance. There were no respondents.

Mr. Dietrich advised since there were going to be some restrictions as to what the County could construct within that zone, there could be additional expenses incurred and wondered if the County would be reimbursed for these expenses.
Mr. Lauer stated he did not have an opportunity to review that issue at length.

Mr. Karl Longenbach, Northampton County Solicitor, advised the restrictions indicated there could not be anything constructed higher than 500 feet above sea level nor could anything made of metal that may interfere with the system be placed there.

Mr. Dowd stated he believed it would be a while before the County constructed anything in that area and when they did, he did not see this as having a big impact.

Mr. Dietrich advised the easement was going to be long term and he felt they were making a short term decision.

Mr. Angle asked Mr. Lauer to review the matter and return with an opinion. He then indicated he was going to put the vote aside for now.

Consideration of Administrative Code Article XIII Contract Approval Resolution – 911 System, TuWay Communications

Mr. Angle stated this matter was reviewed at the Finance Committee meeting yesterday. He then introduced the following resolution:

R. 12-2010  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.”; and

WHEREAS, on January 28, 2010 the Northampton County Council received a request from the County Executive for County Council to adopt a resolution endorsing a contract, in the amount of
$1,897,285.53 with TuWay Communications, for a 911 and administrative telephone system, digital voice logging recorder and console furniture upgrade and installation.

**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 TuWay Communications for a 911 and administrative telephone system, digital voice logging recorder and console furniture upgrade and installation.

As there were no questions or comments, Mr. Angle called for the vote.


The resolution was adopted by a vote of 8-0.

Consideration of the Resolution Supporting the Concept of the Construction of an Interchange at the Intersection of Route 33 and Tatamy Road

Mr. Angle advised this resolution supported the concept of constructing an interchange at the intersection of Route 33 and Tatamy Road.

Mr. Dowd introduced the following resolution:

R. 13-2010 **WHEREAS**, plans have been developed for the construction of a diamond shaped interchange at the intersection of PA Route 33 and Tatamy Road, located in Palmer Township, County of Northampton, Pennsylvania; and

**WHEREAS**, Charles Chrin has offered to donate the land necessary for the construction of the interchange; and

**WHEREAS**, the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and the United States Department of Transportation are carefully reviewing the engineering requirements for such an interchange; and
WHEREAS, the project has gained broad based support from the Northampton County municipalities most immediately affected by the construction of the interchange; and

WHEREAS, Palmer Township is prepared to create a new zoning designation to support the construction of the interchange and the development of the surrounding properties; and

WHEREAS, the Northampton County Council and the County of Northampton have demonstrated a firm commitment to expanding economic development opportunities and to creating jobs within the County of Northampton.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS RESOLVED By the Northampton County Council that: (1) the Northampton County Council supports the concept of constructing the interchange; (2) the Northampton County Council supports granting the approvals necessary for the construction of the interchange and (3) the Northampton County Council supports an examination of all available appropriate funding sources to pay the costs associated with the interchange, including but not limited to the funding programs authorized by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

Mr. Cusick stated his only concern was there seemed to be a growth in very large warehouses in that area that created a lot of truck traffic and he hoped whatever went in there was not more of the same.

Mr. Dowd advised he believed the zoning was going to reflect what type of development would be done at that site.

As there were no further questions or comments, Mr. Angle called for the vote.


The resolution was adopted by a vote of 8-0.
Consideration of the Emergency Shelter Grant Program Resolution

Mr. Angle stated this matter was discussed at the Economic Development Committee meeting.

Mr. Dowd advised he felt the nice thing about this was that all the matches have been secured, therefore, the County had no obligation.

Mr. Dowd introduced the following resolution:

R. 14-2010 WHEREAS, the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987, as amended, authorized the Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) Program; and

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania through the Department of Community and Economic Development (PA DCED) has received ESG program funds and is making these funds available to units of local governments for eligible emergency shelter activities.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Northampton County Department of Community and Economic Development (NC DCED) is authorized and directed to execute and ESG Program Application on behalf of the County of Northampton in an amount not to exceed $121,501 to the PA DCED for the renovation of emergency shelter services and facilities for the homeless.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Northampton County Council that the proposed Renovation activities are hereby eligible and approved.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the County of Northampton will assume the responsibility for securing the required matching amount of project funds.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the County of Northampton will reimburse the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the State's share of any expenditures found by the PA DCED to be ineligible.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the NC DCED is authorized to
provide such assurances, certificates, and supplemental data or revised data that DCED may request in connection with the application.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Clerk to County Council is directed to execute a certification, and this resolution shall serve as certification, attesting to the adoption of this resolution. Further, a copy of this resolution shall be forwarded to the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development.

As there were no questions or comments, Mr. Angle called for the vote.


The resolution was adopted by a vote of 8-0.

Consideration of the Resolution Pertaining to the Outside Legal Counsel Contract

Mr. Angle stated this matter was discussed at the Finance Committee meeting. He further stated a concern about holding the line on spending was expressed to Mr. Stoffa and he agreed to place a cap of $60,000 for the year 2010 and not to go beyond that before coming to County Council for approval.

Mr. Angle introduced the following resolution:

R. 15-2010  WHEREAS, Northampton County Administrative Code Section 11.03 Outside Legal Counsel, provides in Section 11.03 a., “The Solicitor, with the approval of the County Executive and County Council, may retain outside legal counsel where necessary.” and in Section 11.03 b., “For the purposes of this section, outside legal counsel shall mean the use of any legal counsel, attorney, or firm of attorneys, other than the County Solicitor and Assistant County Solicitors, which may be used to defend and/or represent the County of Northampton, a County employee, or a County elected official in litigation;
and/or assist the Solicitor’s Office with matters involving the County of Northampton.”; and

WHEREAS, Northampton County Administrative Code Section 16.04 Outside Legal Counsel, provides in Section 16.04 a., “The requirements set forth in Administrative Code Section 11.03, Outside Legal Counsel, shall apply to all departments, services, bureaus, offices, divisions, or other administrative unit under the direction and supervision of the County Executive.” and in Section 16.04 b., “For the purposes of Section 11.03, the term approval of County Council shall mean either the adoption of a separate and specific resolution, or ordinance, regarding any retention of outside legal counsel.”; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive issued Executive Order No. 10-09 in which he ordered and decreed that a contract should be awarded to Flamm Walton PC in the amount of $60,000.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Northampton County Council authorizes the County Executive to award a contract to Flamm Walton PC for outside legal counsel to advise and assist the County with labor and labor related matters. It shall be clearly understood that: (1) authorization is being given only for a one (1) year contract; (2) the total compensation paid to Flamm Walton PC shall not exceed a total of $60,000 for the period of the one year contract and (3) that there shall not be any contract extensions, without the approval by resolution or ordinance of County Council.

As there were no questions or comments, Mr. Angle called for the vote.


The resolution was adopted by a vote of 8-0.

Public Hearing on the Ordinance Granting an Avigation Easement on County Owned Land to the Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority (continued)
As Mr. Lauer was prepared to discuss this matter, Mr. Angle re-presented the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING AN EASEMENT ON AND OVER COUNTY OWNED PROPERTY TO THE LEHIGH-NORTHAMPTON AIRPORT AUTHORITY FOR THE AUTHORITIES USE OF A DASR RADAR SYSTEM

WHEREAS, the Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority (Authority) is the owner and operator of the Lehigh Valley International Airport situated in Hanover Township, Lehigh County, and is in close proximity to property owned by Northampton County which property is located in Allen Township, Northampton County, and described as Tax Parcel No. M5-2-3A PKB; and

WHEREAS, the Airport Authority has provided land to the United States acting by and through the Department of Transportation - Federal Aviation Administration, which has constructed on the site for the use and benefit of the public a new Digital Airport Surveillance Radar System (DASR); and

WHEREAS, the County wishes to grant an easement on and over certain land and airspace to the Authority for the operation and use of the DASR system; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY ORDAINED AND ENACTED by the Northampton County Council that it does hereby authorize an easement on and over a certain tract of ground located in Allen Township, Northampton County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, identified as Tax Nap No. N5-2-3A-PKB to the Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority; subject to the terms and conditions of the Avigation Easement which is attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit “A”.

Mr. Lauer advised essentially what County Council was being asked to do was to convey an easement for the use by the Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority for its use, but the concern that was raised dealt with what the County could or could not do in that area. He further advised the County was agreeing to keep anything off of that property that exceeded certain heights and the authority would be allowed to remove to ground level any natural growth which would exceed the required heights at their
Mr. Lauer stated the County was agreeing not to construct or permit to be constructed any obstruction that extended above those heights as noted. He further stated the County was also agreeing not to use or permit the property to be used in a way that would either create electrical interference with radio communications between the airport and the aircraft or anything that would make it difficult to distinguish the airport lights.

Mr. Lauer advised, in addition, the County was agreeing to not construct any item that could act as a reflector, such as metal buildings, chain link fences, poles, etc. within the area.

Mr. John Conklin, Director of Administration, stated that any type of planning down the road for this park would be discussed with the authority and people in the County’s Parks Department as far as proper placement and construction.

Mr. Angle advised he believed Mr. Dietrich’s concern was if the County planned to construct something and the authority indicated it had to meet other standards that might entail additional costs, then why should the County have to be responsible for those costs. He further advised what he wanted to see in this document was a clause that indicated if there were any additional costs to the County over and above what they would normally have to spend, that cost would be borne by the airport to rectify that problem.

Mr. Dowd stated this only referred to a very small section of the park.

Mrs. McHale questioned why the County would even consider building something there when there was an easement.

Mr. McClure advised he shared his colleagues’ concern about the potential disability of the County to develop this park in a way they felt was in the best interest of its citizens, however, he felt the issue of air traffic safety outweighed it.

Mr. Dowd stated this system already existed and he did not think anyone wanted to construct something that would impede its operation.
Mr. Lauer advised the only item he was concerned about was the clause about liability and felt the County should get some sort of documentation that indicated the airport authority would maintain some level of appropriate insurance.

Mrs. McHale stated they would have to provide a certificate of insurance indicating that particular piece of property was insured.

As there were no further questions or comments, Mr. Angle called for the vote.


The ordinance was adopted by a vote of 6-2.

Consideration of the Resolution Opposing Proposed Route C by PPL Corporation’s Susquehanna-Roseland Transmission Line Project

Mr. Angle advised PPL had previously indicated they wanted to run a new transmission line across the northern end of the County, which met with a lot of opposition. He further advised PPL thought it over and they moved to their second choice, but that was now facing opposition. He further noted PPL was allowing people to provide their input and since the deadline was March 5, 2010, he was presenting this resolution tonight.

Mr. Flisser stated there were originally three routes proposed and in July 2008, County Council took the position opposing Route C, which took it through the northern tier of Northampton County. He further stated PPL then chose Route B, which received regulatory approval in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, but now the National Park Service was opposing this route because of the environmental impact it would have on the Delaware State Forest.

Mr. Flisser advised it was his understanding the Park Service had the ability to move it to a different section of the park or entirely out of it. He further advised if they moved it
entirely out of the park, PPL could decide to go back to the route the County opposed initially so this resolution would reaffirm County Council’s position against Route C.

Mr. Angle introduced the following resolution:

\textbf{R. 16-2010 \ WHEREAS}, at the meeting held July 17, 2008, the Northampton County Council adopted Resolution No. 48-2008, in which stated its opposition to Alternate C of the PPL Corporation’s Susquehanna-Roseland transmission line project. Resolution No. 48-2008 reads as follows:

\textbf{WHEREAS}, the PPL Corporation is considering upgrades to its electrical systems, and has identified the following three alternative routes that could be used for this project:

\$\$\$\$ Route A begins at the PPL Electric Utilities switching station near Berwick and travels northeast through Luzerne and Lackawanna counties on a path of an existing 230-kV power line. The line then travels west through Lackawanna and Wayne counties primarily on the path of existing power lines before heading east-southeast through Pike County; and

\$\$\$\$ Route B begins at the PPL Electric Utilities switching station near Berwick and travels through Luzerne, Lackawanna and Wayne counties on the same power line rights of way as Route A. Route B separates from Route A at a point northeast of Lake Wallenpaupack and travels south through the Delaware State Forest on the path of an existing 230-kV power line; and

\$\$\$\$ Route C begins at the PPL Electric Utilities switching station near Berwick and travels south primarily on an existing future-use right of way through Luzerne and Schuylkill counties. The line then travels east primarily on future-use or existing transmission power line routes in Schuylkill and Lehigh counties. The line then moves east-northeast through Northampton County on the path of an existing power line; and

\textbf{WHEREAS}, Routes A and B, the two northern routes, pass through
more remote areas of Pennsylvania and New Jersey while Route C would pass through the more populated areas, in particular the townships of Lehigh, Moore, Bushkill, Plainfield, Washington and Lower Mt. Bethel in Northampton County; and

WHEREAS, Route C, the Lehigh-Valley-Warren County Route would require more property acquisition and/or building on undeveloped rights-of-way than either Routes A or B. Further, only 55 percent of Route C would be built on existing rights of way, compared with 60 and 95 percent for the other routes; and

WHEREAS, many concerned residents of Northampton County have publically expressed concerns for the planned Route C, most notably that: (1) the high voltage power line would generate strong electromagnetic fields which could adversely affect the health of those who live in the vicinity of the power line and (2) the construction of Route C, and the related loss of trees would adversely affect the environment in the area near the base of the Blue Mountains, the Appalachian Trail and the headwaters of three creeks.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Northampton County Council that, due to the reasons set forth above, it does hereby express its formal opposition to the proposed Route C. Further the Northampton County Council, after reviewing the publically presented information pertaining to Route C, believes, that another option would better serve the goal of PPL to improve electric service, in a way that is less intrusive on the lives of Northampton County residents, less harmful to the environment, and less adverse to the quality of life in Northampton County.; and

WHEREAS, PPL Utilities chose, and the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission approved, Route B; and

WHEREAS, the National Park Service recently began an environmental impact statement on the Susquehanna-Roseland transmission line project, and is conducting public hearings, and accepting public comment on the project; and

WHEREAS, other alternatives are being considered by the National Park Service and may include relocation of the project
WHEREAS, the public comment on this phase of the project ends on March 5, 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED By the Northampton County Council that it does hereby reaffirm its stated opposition to Proposed Route C due to the reasons herein set forth.

As there were no questions or comments, Mr. Angle called for the vote.


The resolution was adopted by a vote of 8-0.

Lehigh Northampton Transportation Authority (LANTA) Liaison Report

Mrs. McHale stated representatives from LANTA were holding a public hearing tonight in the City of Easton on the proposed terminal and parking garage. She further stated she believed once people could see what the proposed project was, it would be approved.

Lehigh Valley Economic Development Corporation (LVEDC) Liaison Report

Mr. Angle advised he attended his first LVEDC meeting and if for some reason he was unable to attend a meeting, he would like to appoint Mr. McClure as his alternate.

Mr. Angle then asked if there were any objections. There were no respondents.
Clerk to Council Report

Mr. Flisser stated the meeting was being web cast tonight and he received a message from his son who indicated the live feed was working really well.

Solicitor’s Report

Mr. Lauer advised Mr. McClure had presented him with four questions and he had replied to three of them and was currently working on the last one.

Adjournment

Mr. Dowd made a motion to adjourn.

Mrs. Thierry seconded the motion.

The motion passed by acclamation.

Frank E. Flisser
Clerk to Council