A regular meeting of the Northampton County Council was held on the above date with the following present: John Cusick, President; Margaret L. Ferraro, Vice President; Thomas H. Dietrich; Bruce A. Gilbert; Kenneth M. Kraft; Lamont G. McClure, Jr.; Scott Parsons; Barbara A. Thierry; Robert F. Werner; Frank E. Flisser, Clerk to Council, and Philip D. Lauer, Solicitor to Council.

Prayer

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

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Cusick stated County Council was honored to host Cub Scout Pack 21, Webelos Den 2, from Forks Township. He further stated on behalf of County Council, he wanted to wish them well especially in their quest for their citizenship pins and asked them to lead 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 September 20, 2012 meeting shall be approved.

Mrs. Thierry seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved by voice acclamation, with Mr. Cusick abstaining.

Courtesy of the Floor

Mr. Daniel Chiavaroli, 231 South Whitfield Street, Nazareth, PA - advised he was the President and Executive Director of the Nazareth Ambulance Corps (Nazareth) and he was present with some of the staff and their Director, Ms. Jen McCloskey. He further advised it had been mentioned that there would be an approximate $50,000 savings because of the use of Certified Nursing Assistants, but that was a requirement in the
Gracedale bid process and would be an equal amount across the board.

In answer to Mr. McClure’s question as to why that was important for County Council to know, Mr. Chiavaroli stated because it was mentioned that there was an $80,000 difference between themselves and LifeStar Response (LifeStar) so it would make the difference a lot less.

Mr. Chiavaroli advised they currently received the schedule via a fax, however, he did feel an electronic scheduling process would be better and they were prepared to put one in place.

Mr. Chiavaroli stated they were hiring Certified Nursing Assistants to meet the terms of the contract. He further stated they were also moving to a new location that they specifically picked because of its closeness to Gracedale, noting it was .9 miles away and two minutes in travel time, noting their current location was two miles and four minutes in travel time. He further noted that LifeStar’s location was 11 miles with an average travel time of 22 minutes 25 seconds. He added the Request for Proposal requested 15-20 minutes.

Mr. Chiavaroli advised it was also indicated that Nazareth would still handle the emergency calls. He further advised LifeStar indicated they were going to station three vehicles at Gracedale so he seriously doubted they would allow Nazareth to take those calls.

Mr. Chiavaroli stated their backups in case of an emergency were Bushkill Township, Bethlehem Township and Bath Borough. He further stated that Suburban had called to say they would back them up and that they had 19 ambulances and 7 wheelchair vehicles. Additionally, Easton also called them to say they would be a backup for them. He noted he did not know who LifeStar’s backup was or if they were even in the area.

Mr. Chiavaroli advised they had an all paid professional staff and the only volunteers were their board and medical director. He further advised they had provided their pay scales and benefits, which included medical, dental, retirement and vacation.

Mr. Chiavaroli stated they were not lowballing this bid, but were basing it on their six years of experience with
Gracedale. He further stated they planned to review their expenses over the first year to see what effect any change in population or the opening of the short term facility would have on the number of trips coming out of Gracedale. He noted any savings they uncovered would be passed onto Gracedale.

Mr. Chiavaroli advised that LifeStar indicated they would put Gracedale’s name on three of their ambulances, but Nazareth would put it on all of their vehicles.

Mr. Chiavaroli stated it was also indicated that the contract would not be awarded on price alone so he asked County Council to consider all the factors in this decision. He further stated Nazareth was recently recognized with the St. Luke’s Hero Award.

In response to Mr. Gilbert’s request to explain the $50,000 savings that was mentioned, Mr. Chiavaroli advised at one of the two County Council meetings that were held, it was mentioned by having LifeStar provide Certified Nursing Assistants, Gracedale would not have to take their nursing assistants off the floor, which they estimated would be a $50,000 savings per year for Gracedale. He further advised it was part of the bid process for the vendor to provide the nursing assistants and they were willing to do that.

In answer to Mr. Gilbert’s question as to how soon that would take effect, Mr. Chiavaroli stated that Ms. McCloskey had talked to some of the staff of Gracedale to join them on a part time basis.

In response to Mr. McClure’s question as to what services they were currently providing to Gracedale, Mr. Chiavaroli advised wheelchair and emergency services.

In answer to Mr. McClure’s question as to whether there have ever been any incidents where they were unable to meet the needs of Gracedale, Mr. Chiavaroli replied there were not.

Mr. Chris McLain, Attorney for LifeStar – stated the Request for Proposal required that the provider comply fully with all laws governing licensing. He further stated Nazareth did not have authority from the Public Utility Commission (PUC) to engage in wheelchair and stretcher paratransit authority provisions, noting their application in 2005 was denied.
Therefore, they did not have the licensing to provide the service to the County now and they certainly did not have the authority required under the authority of the bidding documents to be awarded this contract.

Mr. Chiavaroli advised their solicitor informed them that since it was a governmental contract to provide medical transportation, they did not need a PUC license. He further advised if they were providing transportation from a home to other than a doctor office and they were charging on a one trip basis, then they would need a PUC license. He noted they investigated this when the last contract came up and they did not have it and were awarded the contract.

Mr. McLain stated the exemption for medical transportation was very specific, noting a doctor’s visit was not considered medical transportation. He further stated from this type of facility there was no exemption for a governmental contract, it was for the type of service provided and this did not meet that exemption.

In response to Mr. Werner’s question as to whether LifeStar had a contract with Cedar Brook, Ms. Michelle Siedel, General Manager for LifeStar, advised they never had a contract with Cedar Brook.

County Executive Report

Mr. John Stoffa, County Executive, stated the 2013 Proposed Budget was issued yesterday and released to the press today. He further stated it was also located on the County’s website for the public to view.

Mr. Stoffa advised as of today, there were 71 men located at the West Easton Treatment Center and it was working out well.

Mr. Stoffa stated October 1, 2012 was the official closing date for the bond. He further stated if they had waited for the callable date of September 29, 2012, the cost of the Swaption would have been $2 million more. He noted the interest rate on the tax exempt piece was 3.196% and on the taxable piece, it was 2.69%.

Mr. Stoffa advised they were currently working on the County’s parking ordinance and it will be presented to County Council shortly.
Mr. Stoffa stated the Citizens Academy had been very successful and recently completed its fourth session with very high attendance and positive feedback.

Mr. Stoffa advised Gracedale held a ribbon cutting ceremony to officially open their short term care rehabilitation unit on October 1, 2012. He further advised the program had been very successful to date with a high census.

Mr. Stoffa stated the retirement fund was continuing to make a remarkable recovery from $160 million a few years ago to $280 million as of September 21, 2012. He further stated the County also continued to fund its future medical retirees cost with a fund that had grown to $17,354,647. He noted Northampton County was the first County to assume that responsibility and one of six or seven continuing to do so out of the 18 that should be doing it in Pennsylvania.

In answer to Mr. Cusick’s question as to what the situation was with the archives building, Mr. Stoffa advised they were still on target to have it finished by the end of the year. He further advised all the contracts have been signed. He noted the initial estimate was not accurate and it was going to require approximately $200,000 more to complete.

Mr. Steve DeSalva, Director of Public Works, stated the engineer had missed some costs that should have been taken into consideration, noting most of them were for heating, ventilation and air conditioning. He further stated the County got good contractors, who had worked with the County before, and healthy bids, noting the bid spread was close, but the estimate was off.

Mr. Herman VanFleet, Project Architect, Borton-Lawson, advised the archives building was a renovated building built in 1990 so the mechanical and electrical systems had seen their usefulness. He further advised they started out with a conservative budget, which was above the bids, but the County wanted to reduce it.

Mr. VanFleet stated the initial estimate was based on verbal discussions not on plans or specifications. He further stated as they proceeded, they discovered the roof had to be
pulled off instead of built over, the State came back with a very specialized sprinkler system, which was a lot more than anticipated, and humidity controls had to be added to the heating, ventilation and air conditioning.

In response to Mr. Kraft’s question as to what qualified him to design an archives building, Mr. VanFleet advised he had 30 years of experience in building and renovating warehouses.

In answer to Mr. Kraft’s question as to why he did not know an archives building required special humidity control on heating, ventilation and air conditioning units and fire suppression, Mr. VanFleet stated the systems as they were could have served the building, but they would have to have been replaced in a few years.

Mr. Kraft advised as a qualified architect, it was his responsibility to look at the building and determine what had to be done and provide an accurate number.

Mr. VanFleet stated the original estimate was $700,000 and the bids came in around $511,000. He further stated they were asked to move forward with a very low ball estimate of $350,000.

In response to Mr. Kraft’s question as to who asked them to move forward with that estimate, Mr. VanFleet advised they presented both.

When Mr. Kraft again asked who told them to move forward with that estimate, which came to County Council for approval, Mr. VanFleet stated both were presented and the lower one was decided upon.

In answer to Mr. Kraft’s question as to whom the estimates were presented, Mr. VanFleet advised they were given back to the County.

Mr. Kraft stated County Council was responsible for spending the taxpayers money and as a qualified architect, someone other than the County should be responsible for the $200,000.

In response to Mr. McClure’s comment that they originally submitted a bid for approximately $700,000, Mr. VanFleet replied it was a preliminary estimate.
In answer to Mr. McClure’s comment that was ultimately what it turned out to be, Mr. Van Fleet advised the final bid was $511,000.

In response to Mr. McClure’s question as to how a second proposal came about and did they realize that it was never going to cover the costs, Mr. VanFleet advised the second lower bid was very preliminary in nature and through the design phase, they discovered the actual cost was going to be more.

Mr. Van Fleet stated they had a signed contract given to them in June and they requested, in their bid, to have four months of design period so they could get more cost estimates, but were given one month. He further stated they tried their very best to get it done in that time period and it went out to bid on August 1st.

Mr. DeSalva advised a mistake was made and the estimate was wrong, but the County should be confident the design was what it should be for an archives building.

In answer to Mr. McClure’s comment that the architect made the mistake, Mr. DeSalva agreed, but stated it was a mistake in the estimate not in the details of the specifications.

Mr. McClure advised the issue was the veracity of bids that were presented to County Council tied to projects that they approved. He further advised the fact was they came in with a higher bid and someone asked them to lower it so he wanted to know who requested that.

Mr. DeSalva stated the general theme was the County did not want to pay for more than it needed.

Mr. VanFleet advised there was a feasibility study done in 2011 and two approaches were provided, noting one was for approximately $680,000 and the second was for approximately $300,000.

In response to Mr. Werner’s statement that the figure they arrived at in November 2011 was based on a guess, Mr. VanFleet agreed.
Mr. Werner then asked why a more detailed estimate of the costs was not provided, Mr. VanFleet stated they started working on the final design around the end of June, but there was no final cost estimate made until the bids came back.

Mr. DeSalva advised their office had to have a detailed breakdown to come up with a number. He further advised the bids should have gone out with some estimated quantities, but they went out as lump sums.

Mr. Werner stated this has happened in the past and he did not think it should happen again, noting the County had to be more diligent. He further stated he would like to get more information on these costs because as things stood, he could not justify spending $285,631 more.

In answer to Mrs. Thierry’s question as to how many bidders were there, Mr. DeSalva advised there were four bids.

Ms. Kathryn Anderson, Purchasing Manager, stated Borton-Lawson provided two cost estimates and after reviewing them, they chose the second option to go forth with as the plans. She further stated that was then worked into the budget and brought to County Council for approval. She noted based on that, they prepared documents for the bidding.

In response to Mr. Kraft’s question as to what was a lump sum bid, Mr. DeSalva advised that was when they did not delineate the individual items of work that made up the total project.

Mr. McClure stated the estimate that was provided to County Council for approval was a guess so he wanted to know at what point during the process was the bidder approached and asked to modify their bid.

Mr. VanFleet advised it was not a bid, it was a cost estimate. He further advised they gave two preliminary cost estimates and they were given as options.

Ms. Anderson stated the County picked the second option to prepare the budget.
Mr. McClure made a motion that County Council refer the archives building bid process to the Controller for review and a report.

Mr. Dietrich seconded the motion.

Mr. Gilbert advised he believed the situation could have been better handled if a breakdown as to what the cost was, what was missed and what it would cost now was presented to County Council.

In answer to Mr. Werner’s question as to whether they would be willing to review this matter and be a part of correcting the problem, Mr. VanFleet stated they were here to serve the County.

Mr. Parsons advised the estimate was given to County Council, which was approved, and then the bid went out and now they were looking for $165,000 more so maybe they should have voted on the bids. He further advised in his experience bids always came in higher than the estimates and this project would probably have been approved regardless of the amount.

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


The motion passed by a vote of 8-1.

In response to Mr. Stoffa’s question as to whether they should proceed with the archives building, Mr. Cusick stated his opinion was not to stop it, but he wanted to make sure the process that took place was not repeated.

Mr. Stoffa advised Borton-Lawson made a mistake by underestimating the cost.

In answer to Mr. Kraft’s question as to whether they refunded any of their engineering costs, Mr. Stoffa stated they would not get one cent more until the project was complete.

Consideration of the Administrative Code Article XIII Contract Approval Request – Medical Transport Services
Mr. Cusick advised the resolution approving the medical transport services contract was introduced at the meeting held September 20, 2012. He further advised after discussion and public input, consideration of the resolution was tabled. He noted if the resolution was to be considered, it must first be removed from the table.

Mrs. Ferraro made a motion to remove the resolution from the table.

Mrs. Thierry seconded the motion.

As there were no questions or comments, Mr. Cusick called for the vote on the motion.


The motion passed by a vote of 7-2.

Mr. Cusick re-introduced the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Northampton County Administrative Code Article XIII Procurement and Disposition of County Property, Section 13.16 Contracts and Agreements c. (1) requires approval of 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 September 14, 2012, the Northampton County Council received a request from the County Executive for County Council to adopt a resolution approving a contract for a total of $315,600 for the first year, with the potential for three years being $946,800, with LifeStar Response for medical transport services (non-emergency) for Gracedale residents.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Northampton County Council does hereby concur with the recommendation of the County Executive to award a contract to LifeStar Response for medical transport services (non-emergency) for Gracedale residents.
Mr. Millard D. Freeman, Gracedale Administrator, handed out some documents entitled, “Summary of Transportation Finalist Interview”; “Concerns Raided by Nazareth Ambulance”; “Emergency Ambulance Runs – 2011” and an e-mail entitled, “LifeStar” (see Attachment #1).

Mr. Freeman stated this was a Request for Proposal process so it took in more than just the cost. He further stated they changed the whole scope of service this time around because right now Gracedale sent its nurses out with the ambulance company and then had to backfill those positions. He noted all the companies that bid had to provide their own staff for the ambulance.

Mr. Freeman advised there was a price difference of approximately $32,000 per year between LifeStar and Nazareth. He further advised the three lowest bidders came back and were questioned, noting the answers were provided in Attachment #1. He noted one of the questions dealt with a Public Utility Commission (PUC) license and it was determined that Nazareth’s attorney believed they did not need the license and LifeStar had one.

Mr. Freeman stated they were also asked what other services they would provide if they were the prevailing bidder and LifeStar indicated they could have three vehicles at Gracedale, they would put Gracedale’s name on these vehicles to assist in marketing and had electronic scheduling.

Mr. Freeman advised the Request for Proposal process was followed per the County code and consistent to all responders. He further advised when they made their decision, they looked at Gracedale’s budget in keeping with ways to make it self-sufficient.

Mr. Freeman stated as far as response time, Gracedale had always dialed 9-1-1 in case of an emergency and had no plans to change that so response time was not really an issue.

In response to Mr. Cusick’s question as to how this would affect the residents, Mr. Freeman advised the impact on the residents would be minimal as both companies had good reputations.
Mr. Freeman stated the President of the Emergency Management Services Council advised them that both bids were good and they could equally serve Gracedale.

Mr. McClure advised Premier Healthcare Resources (Premier) managed Pleasant Valley, who provided references for LifeStar, so he wanted to know if they also served any other nursing homes that Premier managed.

A representative from LifeStar indicated they only serviced Pleasant Valley and have been there for approximately two and half years.

In answer to Mr. McClure’s question as to who also serviced Gracedale, Mr. Freeman stated they only controlled the service when a resident was sent out and had no control over who was used when a patient was returned from a hospital.

In response to Mrs. Thierry’s question as to what was the average number of trips made per day, Mr. Freeman advised it was approximately eight.

A representative for Nazareth indicated they had 8-10 ambulance trips and 20-30 wheelchair trips.

In answer to Mr. Gilbert’s question as to the importance of having a PUC license, Mr. Freeman stated he looked into the matter, but did not have a final legal opinion. He further stated according to the attorney for Nazareth, it was used for non-medical transports and when they provided transportation to a special event, they used a backup provider.

Mr. Karl Longenbach, Northampton County Solicitor, advised this particular issue was not raised as a specific item to be considered and was not one that could be readily answered without research.

Mr. Gilbert advised he felt this was an issue that should be cleared up and a determination should be made as to what impact having a non-local agency providing basically the same service would have on the community so he made a motion to table this resolution.

Mrs. Thierry seconded the motion.
Mr. Freeman stated they looked at the local and non-local issue and they determined that LifeStar also had a number of people who lived or had relatives living in Northampton County so he did not believe that was part of the argument.

Mr. Gilbert advised Nazareth also had more local backups than LifeStar.

Mr. Freeman stated LifeStar would have three ambulances parked at Gracedale and when one was called out, another one would replace it. He further stated they would only be handling non-emergency transports.

In response to Mr. Cusick’s question as to whether LifeStar having a PUC license played a part in their decision making, Mr. Freeman advised it did not.

Mr. Ross Marcus, Director of Human Services, stated he just wanted to point out that the current contract expired on October 31, 2012.

In answer to Mr. McClure’s question as to whether Nazareth would continue working with Gracedale without a contract if a decision could not be reached, Ms. McCloskey indicated they would work under the old contract.

As there were no further questions or comments, Mr. Cusick called for the vote on the motion.


The motion to table failed by a vote of 5-4.

Mr. Parsons advised after looking into the matter, he determined there were no Medicare reimbursements involved and this was a fair process and everyone was treated equally. He further advised this was a tough decision, but it resulted in a $30,000 per year savings.

Mrs. Ferraro stated sometimes the lowest bidder was not the most practical, noting there was a human side to this. She further stated all the members of Nazareth were Northampton
County taxpayers and sometimes the County had a morale responsibility to take care of its own.

Mr. Dietrich advised in 2005, Nazareth was awarded the Gracedale contract and another ambulance company sued because they did not have a PUC license and it was determined that it was not needed for medical transports. During another bidding process in 2006, the contract was again awarded to Nazareth so apparently this issue had been reviewed by the Courts.

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


The resolution failed by a vote of 3-6.

Mr. Dietrich introduced the following resolution:

R. 84-2012  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, the County Executive’s Administration issued a RFP for medical transport services (non-emergency) for Gracedale residents and valid responses were received from (1) Cetronia Ambulance Corps, Inc., (2) EMStar, (3) Interstate Nursing Services DBA Whitehall Medical Transport Service, (4) LifeStar Response and (5) Nazareth Ambulance Corps.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Northampton County Council does hereby recommend to award a contract to Nazareth Ambulance Corps for medical transport services (non-emergency) for Gracedale residents.
As there were no questions or comments, Mr. Cusick called for the vote.


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

Introduction of the Ordinance Providing for an Amendment to the Articles of Incorporation of the Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority (Airport Authority)

Mr. Cusick stated on August 28, 2012, the Airport Authority adopted a resolution to amend its Articles of Incorporation so as to clarify term duration of its members so it was consistent with the Municipalities Authorities Act. He further stated the Airport Authority has asked both Northampton and Lehigh Counties to adopt the same amendment and if both counties adopt the amendment, it would file the amendment with the Pennsylvania Secretary of State.

Mr. Cusick advised the public hearing, debate and possible vote was scheduled for the October 18, 2012 Council meeting.

Mr. Kraft and Mrs. Thierry introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION OF THE LEHIGH-NORTHAMPTON AIRPORT AUTHORITY

WHEREAS, the Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority (“Authority”) is a municipal authority organized under the Municipality Authorities Act of 1945, as amended; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to resolutions duly adopted by the Counties of Lehigh and Northampton (the “Counties”), the Authority’s original Articles of Incorporation were filed with the Pennsylvania Department of State on June 12, 1968, such Articles of Incorporation being amended on December 27, 1973, September 20, 1985, October 4, 1994, February 16, 2001 and June 1, 2010; and
WHEREAS, recent appointments of members of the Board of Governors were inconsistent with the Municipality Authorities Act of 1945, as amended, and accordingly, a question has arisen regarding the term duration of appointments of members of the Board of Governors of the Authority; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of 53 Pa.C.S.A. §5605(a), an authority may amend its articles to, among other things, revise the terms of office of members; and

WHEREAS, on August 28, 2012 the Board of Governors of the Authority adopted resolution No. 4782 (a copy of which is attached hereto and labeled as Exhibit “A”), which provides for an amendment to the Authority’s Articles of Incorporation to clarify the term duration of members of the Board of Governors so that it is consistent with the Municipalities Authorities Act of 1945 as amended.

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

(1) The Articles of Incorporation of the Authority are hereby amended by adding a new Section 10 to read in full as follows:

“10. With respect to the term duration of the members of the Board of Governors of the Authority, each member’s term shall commence on the effective date of his/her appointment by the respective counties and shall expire in the first Monday in January or at the time of replacement or reappointment by the respective counties, whichever occurs later.”

(2) The Northampton County Council concurs with the recommendation of the Board of Governors of the Authority, as set forth in resolution No. 4782, to provide for an amendment to the Authority’s Articles of Incorporation to clarify the term duration of members of the Board of Governors so that it is consistent with the Municipalities Authorities Act of 1945, as amended.

(3) The appropriate personnel of the County of Northampton are hereby authorized and empowered to take all necessary further action and execute all necessary additional documents as they may deem appropriate to carry out the purpose of this Ordinance.
(4) Any Ordinance or parts of any Ordinance conflicting with the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby repealed insofar as the same affect this Ordinance.

(5) Effective Date: This Ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days after the date of enactment.

Consideration of the Resolution Opposing the Sale of Braden Airpark

Mr. Cusick stated at his request, a resolution was prepared which opposed the sale of Braden Airpark by the Airport Authority. He further stated this airport was located in Forks Township and provided general aviation services to a lot of local pilots.

Mr. Cusick introduced the following resolution:

R. 85-2012  WHEREAS, the Lehigh-Northampton Airport Authority (Authority) owns and operates Braden Airpark, a facility that is located in Forks Township, Northampton County, and serves general aviation demands in Forks Township and surrounding communities; and

WHEREAS, the Authority has hired the Rockefeller Group to assess the sale and development potential of Braden Airpark; and

WHEREAS, Forks Township has struggled, at times, to meet the demands of rapid residential growth together with the demands of retail and industrial development; and

WHEREAS, the sale and development of Braden Airpark: (1) would be a loss for general aviation pilots and would force them to find hangar space elsewhere, (2) would undoubtedly increase small plane demands at the Lehigh Valley International Airport and (3) could create unwanted demands on the already strained residential, commercial and industrial infrastructure resources in Forks Township and surrounding communities.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED By the Northampton County Council that it opposes the sale and development of Braden Airpark for the reasons herein set forth. Further, a copy of this resolution shall be sent to the Lehigh-Northampton
Airport Authority and to the Forks Township Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Dietrich advised he would support this resolution because if the smaller airports were shut down, they would be forced to go to the Lehigh Valley International Airport, which would slow down its traffic.

Mr. Werner stated this was a mainstay in the community, provided activities for the children in the area and he did not think selling it would make a huge difference.

Mr. McClure advised the Airport Authority needed the money and they felt this was their only option.

Mr. Cusick stated he felt there was land in other areas that would be more suitable for development.

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


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

Medical Transport Contract

Mr. Parsons advised that the savings of $30,000 a year that would have been realized if the contract was given to LifeStar should not be held against Gracedale.

Mr. McClure stated he felt the whole process would need to be rebid.

Gracedale Liaison Report

Mr. Werner advised that the press missed an opportunity to cover the ribbon cutting ceremony that took place at Gracedale. He further advised Gracedale was in the paper for almost two years when things were not good and this year, when good things were occurring, it was forgotten.
Informational Meetings

Mr. Parsons stated that he held two informational meetings for his constituents in his region and he wanted to thank Ms. Maria Bentzoni from Farmland Preservation, Ms. Alicia Karner and Ms. Lori Sywensky from the Department of Community and Economic Development, Ms. Angle Gillette, from Emergency Management Services, Mr. Stoffa and Mr. Thomas Harp, Director of Administration, for attending.

Conservation District Liaison Report

Mrs. Ferraro advised the Conservation District would be sponsoring their Act 48 Teachers Workshop on October 18, 2012.

Council Clerk’s Report

Mr. Flisser stated the first Budget Hearing would be held at 4:00 p.m., on October 9, 2012, in the meeting room.

Council Solicitor’s Report

Mr. Lauer advised that he and Mr. Flisser were working on some potential changes to the Home Rule Charter.

Mr. McClure asked Mr. Lauer to look at the PUC issue and whether the contract would have to be rebid.

Adjournment

Mr. McClure made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Kraft seconded the motion.

The motion passed by acclamation.

Frank E. Flisser
Clerk to Council