A regular meeting of the Northampton County Council was held on the above date with the following present: 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. Absent was John Cusick, President.

Prayer

Mrs. Ferraro asked for a moment of silence for Ms. Inez Donley, Ms. Pricilla Payne Hurd and Ms. Marlene Linny Fowler whose passing would be a great loss for the humanity of Northampton County.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Approval of the Minutes

Mr. McClure made the following motion:

Be It Moved By the Northampton County Council that the minutes of the January 24, 2013 meeting shall be approved.

Mr. Kraft seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved by voice acclamation.

Courtesy of the Floor

Jack D’Alessandro, Bangor, PA – stated he met with the Zoning Officer from Upper Nazareth Township and he was informed that Northampton County had enough land that was zoned governmental near the 911 Center with water and sewer and road access that could support a Human Services building. He further stated he was informed that the necessary permits could be obtained in a timely manner and he would not take three years as previously mentioned.

Reverend Mario Martinez, Forks Township, PA – advised on December 6, 2012, County Controller Stephen Barron stated Mr. Mark Stewart, Eckert Seamans, who was hired by the County to represent the taxpayers during the sale of Gracedale actually provided two hours of service to private litigants against those very taxpayers with funds provided by the County.
Reverend Martinez stated the private litigants who benefitted from these tax dollars would like everyone to believe this matter had been resolved. He further stated it was impossible for this matter to have been resolved in the Courts because this information was not provided until December 6, 2012. He noted the fact was that taxpayer dollars were misused.

Reverend Martinez advised on January 24, 2013, Mr. John Stoffa, County Executive, indicated he would pay back the $700, which amounted to the two hours of misused tax dollar, as a gift. He further advised any vote relating to this matter as a gift should be rejected just on the principal that it came by way of a lie.

Reverend Martinez stated Mr. Stoffa lied to him, the Coalition of Alzheimer Families (COAF), County Council and the taxpayers. He further stated he did not want County Council to force the people to take another avenue on this matter and to represent the people.

Reverend Martinez advised the COAF was considering several options, but they did not want to use them so he was asking County Council to sanction Mr. Stoffa and then demand his resignation for lying about misusing tax dollars.

Deputy Sheriff Darin Stewart – stated he was President of the Sheriff’s Association and for the fifth year they were going to sponsor an Easter Egg Hunt tentatively on March 23, 2013 and hope that County Council would allocate some funding toward it.

In answer to Mr. McClure’s question as to how much was he looking for, Deputy Sheriff Stewart advised last year they received $700, but prices have gone up.

In response to Mrs. Ferraro’s question as to what he was looking for, Deputy Sheriff Stewart indicated if County Council could give $800 that would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Christopher Moakley, Personnel Analyst, Department of Human Resources – stated the major function of his job was to recruit qualified and certified people who were eligible for hire in Northampton County. He further stated he felt the requirement for residence for certain offices would be a bad idea because it should not matter where someone lived if they were qualified for the job, therefore, he hoped that County Council would not pass this ordinance.
County Executive’s Report

Mr. Stoffa advised on April 5, 2013, they were planning to dedicate the Archives Building and asked when would be the best time for the members of County Council. After some discussions, it was agreed that 4:00 p.m. would be the best time.

Mr. Stoffa stated they would have the answers to all the questions regarding the proposed Human Services Building to County Council by tomorrow.

Mr. Stoffa advised the County finished the year with a Fund Balance of $42,367,000.

Mr. Stoffa stated Northampton County had 23,960 veterans and approximately six of them visited the Veterans Affairs Office on a given day. He further stated many of them had to walk up the hill to get to the Wolf Building and many had special needs so he wanted everyone to keep that in mind when the vote for the Human Services Building came up. He added even if the Human Services Building was not approved, he would like to move that office out of the Wolf Building.

Introduction of the Northampton Keystone Opportunity Expansion Zone Ordinance

Mrs. Ferraro advised this ordinance was reviewed at the Economic Development Committee meeting held earlier in the evening. She further advised the public hearing, debate and possible vote will be held at the February 21, 2013 County Council meeting.

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

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING EXEMPTIONS, DEDUCTIONS, ABATEMENTS AND CREDITS FOR REAL PROPERTY, EARNED INCOME TAX, NET PROFITS, MERCANTILE AND BUSINESS PRIVILEGE TAXES WITHIN A SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHIC AREA IN THE COUNTY OF NORTHAMPTON, EASTON, PENNSYLVANIA, DESIGNATED AS A PROPOSED KEYSTONE OPPORTUNITY EXPANSION ZONE ("KOEZ"), IN ORDER TO FOSTER ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES, STIMULATE INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS AND PREVENT PHYSICAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DETERIORATION WITHIN AREAS OF THE CITY OF EASTON, THE EASTON AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE BOROUGH OF WILSON AND THE WILSON AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT, COUNTY OF NORTHAMPTON AND COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA UPON CERTAIN TERMS AND CONDITIONS
WHEREAS, the Northampton County Council, County of Northampton, Pennsylvania, recognizes the need to encourage investment in a defined geographical area of the City of Easton, the Easton Area School District, the Borough of Wilson, and the Wilson Area School District, County of Northampton and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, bounded as follows ("Proposed KOEZ") as set forth in Exhibits "A", "B", "C" and "D", copies of which are attached hereto and made a part hereof, that is experiencing distress characterized by one or more of the following: high unemployment, low investment of new capital, blighted conditions, underutilized, obsolete or abandoned industrial commercial and residential structures, deteriorated tax base, and

WHEREAS, the Keystone Opportunity Zone, Keystone Opportunity Expansion Zone and Keystone Opportunity Improvement Zone Act (Act of October 6, 1998, P.L. 705, No. 92), as amended, hereinafter referred to as the “Act,” authorizes political subdivisions to apply to the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED) for designation of an area within the respective political subdivision as a KOEZ granting exemptions, deductions, abatements or credits from all local taxes identified in the Act; and

WHEREAS, approval of benefits provided in the Act will result in improving the economic, physical and social conditions within the Proposed KOEZ by stimulating existing businesses employment, creating new employment and diminishing blight; and

WHEREAS, it is expected that increased private and public-sector investors will reverse the disinvestment and conditions of blight within the Proposed KOEZ by the time of its termination; and

WHEREAS, the Proposed KOEZ is not less than ten acres but not more than 350 acres in the aggregate; and

WHEREAS, the Proposed KOEZ is comprised of parcels which are (i) deteriorated, underutilized or unoccupied.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED AND ENACTED By the County Council of the County of Northampton that effective as of the effective date of this ordinance, contingent only upon DCED’s approval of the application for the proposed new KOEZ, the following provisions shall apply:

1. Real Property Tax on the Proposed KOEZ is 100% exempt in accordance with the provisions and limitations hereinafter set forth in accordance with the Act, such exemption to begin on January 1, 2014, and to terminate December 31, 2023 (a ten year period).
2. Earned Income and Net Profits Taxes; Business Privilege and Mercantile Taxes. The County of Northampton also waives business gross receipts tax for operations conducted by a qualified business; earned income received by a resident and/or net profits of a qualified business received by a resident or nonresident of the Proposed KOEZ attributable to business activity conducted with said zone and benefits to begin on January 1, 2014, and to terminate on December 31, 2023 (a ten year period).

3. The provisions of the Act not herein enumerated, shall, nevertheless, be incorporated as part of this Ordinance by reference.

4. This ordinance shall be effective upon execution, conditioned upon the approval of the application by DCED.

Consideration of the Resolution Waiving the Appraisal Requirement for the Bethlehem Township Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Center Lease

Mrs. Ferraro stated the District Attorney requested County Council approve a new DUI Center lease in Bethlehem Township and requested waiver of the requirement for the appraisals.

Mr. McClure introduced the following resolution:

R. 3-2013 WHEREAS, Northampton County Administrative Code Section 13.15 b. provides that, “The County shall not purchase, sell, or lease real estate without first obtaining sealed appraisals from two (2) professional real estate appraisers.”; and

WHEREAS, the County of Northampton has leased and currently leases a portion of 2740 Fifth Street, Bethlehem Township, Pennsylvania, as a DUI Center; and

WHEREAS, the District Attorney is requesting approval of a lease for this property; and

WHEREAS, the District Attorney has requested that County Council waive the Administrative Code Section 13.15 b. requirement for appraisals; and

WHEREAS, Administrative Code Section 13.15 b. 2. allows for the waiver of the aforementioned appraisal requirement if certain conditions are met.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Northampton County Council that it does hereby concur with the County Executive's request to waive the requirement for appraisals for 2740 Fifth Street, Bethlehem Township, Pennsylvania, due to the provisions of Northampton County Administrative Code Section 13.15 b.2., which reads, “The nature of the project requiring a purchase, sale or lease of real estate does not justify the cost of appraisals or is otherwise deemed unnecessary.”

Mr. Lauer advised in his discussion with District Attorney John Morganelli, he learned the lease was for a relatively small space at a nominal rental.

Mr. McClure stated the rent was $1,000 a month.

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


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

Introduction of the Bethlehem Township Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Center Lease Ordinance

Mrs. Ferraro advised as a follow up to the resolution, there would be an introduction of the Bethlehem Township DUI Center Lease ordinance with the public hearing, debate and possible vote being held at the February 21, 2013 County Council meeting.

Messrs. McClure and Kraft introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE NORTHAMPTON COUNTY COUNCIL
AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY OF NORTHAMPTON, EASTON, PENNSYLVANIA, TO LEASE A PORTION OF 2740 FIFTH STREET, LOCATED IN BETHLEHEM TOWNSHIP, PA

WHEREAS, Northampton County Administrative Code Article XIII, Section 13.15 Purchase, Sale and Lease of Real Estate Section c. (1) Purchase/Sale/Lease of Real Estate, provides, “The County Executive, or his designee, may negotiate a contract for the purchase, sale or lease (with the County as lessor or lessee) of real estate. Any such purchase/sale/lease shall be approved by County Council, and no such contract shall bind the County nor shall any conveyance be lawful, until County Council approves of the terms of the purchase/sale/lease.”; and
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 that conveyance or lease of any real property of the County".

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY ORDAINED AND ENACTED by Northampton County Council that it does hereby authorize the District Attorney of County of Northampton, Easton, Pennsylvania, to lease a portion of 2740 Fifth Street, located in Bethlehem, Township, Pennsylvania, for the initial rent of $1,000.00. The terms and conditions of the lease shall be in accordance with the lease agreement and related documentation, copies of which are attached hereto and made a part hereof as Attachment "A".


Mrs. Ferraro stated at the request of Mr. Kraft, an ordinance was drafted providing for a Northampton County residency requirement for the: (a) Sheriff, (b) Coroner, (c) Recorder of Deeds, (d) Register of Wills/Clerk of Courts – Orphans’ Court Division, (e) Clerk of Courts – Civil Division or (f) Clerk of Courts – Criminal Division. She further stated this requirement would not affect any current incumbents, but would affect future appointments to those positions. She noted the public hearing, debate and possible vote would be held at the February 21, 2013 County Council meeting.

Messrs. Kraft and Gilbert introduced the following ordinance:


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

SECTION I – RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT

A. An individual appointed to serve in the position of: (a) Sheriff, (b) Coroner, (c) Recorder of Deeds, (d) Register of Wills/Clerk of Courts – Orphans’ Court Division, (e) Clerk of Courts –
Civil Division or (f) Clerk of Courts – Criminal Division of the County of Northampton, Easton, Pennsylvania, shall be a citizen of the United States and shall reside continuously in the County of Northampton.

B. The terms and conditions of this ordinance shall be prospective in nature and shall not apply to individuals serving in the positions of: (a) Sheriff, (b) Coroner, (c) Recorder of Deeds, (d) Register of Wills/Clerk of Courts – Orphans’ Court Division, (e) Clerk of Courts – Civil Division or (f) Clerk of Courts – Criminal Division of the County of Northampton, Easton, Pennsylvania, on the effective date of this ordinance.

C. Individuals appointed to serve in the positions of: (a) Sheriff, (b) Coroner, (c) Recorder of Deeds, (d) Register of Wills/Clerk of Courts – Orphans’ Court Division, (e) Clerk of Courts – Civil Division or (f) Clerk of Courts – Criminal Division of the County of Northampton, Easton, Pennsylvania, on or after the effective date of this ordinance shall be subject to the residency requirement set forth in Section I. A.

SECTION II – EFFECTIVE DATE

A. This ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days after the date of enactment.

Consideration of the 2012 Northampton Codification Resolution

Mrs. Ferraro advised Northampton County Charter Section 606(c) required County Council to provide, by resolution, a codification of all ordinances, as amended, having the force and effect of law, and of the Charter, as amended. She further advised this was an annual housekeeping matter.

Mrs. Ferraro introduced the following resolution:

R. 4-2013 WHEREAS, Northampton County Charter Section 606(c) requires the Northampton County Council to provide, by resolution, a codification of all ordinances, as amended, having the force and effect of law, and of the Charter, as amended.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Northampton County Council that the attached codification, for the period ending December 31, 2012, shall be adopted this 7th day of February 2013.
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As there were no questions or comments, Mrs. Ferraro called for the vote.


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

Consideration of the Resolution Providing for Acceptance of the County Executive’s Gift

Mrs. Ferraro stated Northampton County Home Rule Charter Section 202 (10) provided that County Council shall have, among others, the following powers: “to accept on behalf of the County any gifts of real property and to provide for the acceptance by any agency on behalf of the County of other gifts;” She further stated the County Executive presented County Council with a $700 check and an accompanying e-mail explaining the “gift.”

Mrs. Ferraro introduced the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Northampton County Home Rule Charter Section 202 (10) provides that County Council shall have, among others, the following powers: “to accept on behalf of the County any gifts of real property and to provide for the acceptance by any agency on behalf of the County of other gifts;” and

WHEREAS, on January 31, 2013, the Northampton County Executive sent an e-mail to the Northampton County Council which reads:

"By way of a hardcopy of this email, I am forwarding a check to County Council for $700 as a personal gift from me to Northampton County. During last week’s Council meeting, I made that pledge. But at the same time, I must point out that the accusations leveled against me by the Controller, at least one member of Council and members of the Gracedale group are ridiculous. I did nothing wrong other than to abide by the mandate at the time to sell Gracedale and one that was approved by County Council Resolution.

This is a matter that has been submitted to the District Attorney. It was the subject of private litigation and an attempted surcharge which required me to hire and pay for a private attorney. It went through the Court of Common Pleas. It went to the Commonwealth Court. It even went to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. The charges were dismissed at every level. They are completely unfounded."
The proof of this is Controller Barron's memorandum to you dated December 5, 2012, in which an attorney at a law firm admitted that he did exactly what he was hired to do. After hinting at some type of criminal behavior, Mr. Barron decided to recommend no further action.

In hind sight, we can certainly question the wisdom of authorizing a private law firm to do all things to expedite Gracedale’s sale. But to suggest, for even a moment, that this Administration was ever interested in anything other than the best interest of the County is personally insulting.

I am donating this as a gift in hopes that I can use my remaining time in office to discuss more important issues. A centralized human services building awaits your decision. We need to focus on deteriorating bridges, capital improvements at Gracedale and repairs around the Courthouse.

If paying Northampton County $700 will help us focus on these issues, it is money well spent. If you, the Council, can in good conscience take this money for doing what was authorized by your own resolution, please do so. I understand that the Home Rule Charter, Section 202, (10) requires that any gift to the County must be accepted by you.”

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Northampton County Council that it does hereby present this resolution, together with the monetary donation of $700.00., to the Northampton County Department of Fiscal Affairs for acceptance on behalf of the County of Northampton.

Mr. Gilbert advised he was having trouble with this issue because he did not feel the County Executive should have to do this. He further advised the Administration, and in particular Mr. Stoffa, worked very hard and had great deal of pride in this County.

Mr. Gilbert stated he could not support this resolution because although he understood why the County Executive was doing it, he did feel he should have to do it nor was it his responsibility.

Mr. Werner advised in referencing the County Executive’s e-mail, County Council would be forwarding the check as a personal gift from Mr. Stoffa to the County and according to Section 202 of the Home Rule Charter, the check would be presented to the Department of Fiscal Affairs. He further advised County Council could accept donations from various charities, but this was a little different.
Mr. Dietrich stated in the past any time the County received a gift it was usually of land or monies from estates, but this was not the case. He further stated Mr. Stoffa had been accused of doing something wrong so was it to absolve himself from what he was accused of or was it to basically pay off someone so they would stop berating him.

Mr. Dietrich advised it was not a lot of money, but the fallout from this was extreme because if there was a wrongdoing, was the matter then going to be forgotten or if there was no wrongdoing, does the County Executive get “blackmailed” for additional money. He further advised he did not see this being presented as other gifts have been in the past nor did he see it being given for the improvement or enhancement of the County. Therefore, he could not support this resolution.

Mr. McClure stated he believed his colleagues were missing the point with regard to this matter, but he would not support this resolution as it was introduced because of the nature in which it was presented.

Mr. McClure advised at the last meeting when he was questioning the County Executive about the entire issue, his hope was that some kind of consensus could be reached so they would not be mired in the quicksand of the past and move forward into the future with this fight finally behind them. He further advised this issue had been well covered in the media and he had been absolutely clear of his stand on this entire issue and it was time for it to be over.

Mr. McClure stated he understood why the e-mail was written the way it was in the context of the overall debate over this issue, but there was no contrition. He further stated he wanted to make it clear that he did not think there was anything criminal about the misuse of taxpayer dollars, however, he did feel there was a misuse.

Mr. McClure advised the $700 could not be accepted in the context of a gift, but only as a reimbursement to the people of the County for the misuse of their money. He further advised this resolution should fail and the fight would probably continue.

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


The resolution failed by a vote of 0-8.
Economic Development Committee Report

Mrs. Ferraro stated the Economic Development Committee met earlier this evening and received an update from Mr. Thomas Dittmar, Environmental Services Coordinator, Department of Community and Economic Development, on the County’s recycling and waste disposal. She further stated the State wanted the County to have its recycling up to 35% and the County was at 18%, but Mr. Dittmar indicated it would get there.

Mrs. Ferraro advised a discussion was held regarding the Keystone Opportunity Expansion Zone, which ordinance was introduced tonight and would be discussed at the meeting being held on February 21, 2013.

Human Services Building

Mr. Dietrich stated they planned to have Mr. Ken Mohr, Mohr Management Resources, attend the next Human Services Committee meeting if members of County Council would like him present to address some of the issues with regard to the Human Services Building.

In answer to Mr. McClure’s question as to whether there would be discussion regarding where the County was in their negotiations with the potential suitors for the sale of the Wolf and Bechtel Buildings, Mr. Dietrich advised that topic would not be a topic discussed.

Mr. Dietrich stated the purpose behind the Human Services Building was to properly house and utilize the services that the County provided to its citizens and not as a means to alleviate itself of other properties.

Mr. McClure advised this matter was being presented for a vote after eleven months of planning and review, but a keystone of the fit out of the building was that the County was going to have $2.8 million from the sale of the Wolf and Bechtel Buildings. He further advised the County was going to sign a lease before it had the money to fit out the building and once the lease was signed, the County was going to lose leverage with the potential suitors because they would know the County had to get out. Therefore, he felt it would be appropriate for an Executive Session to be held at the next meeting to discuss what was going on with the sale of those buildings.

Mr. Dietrich advised they were not pushing for a vote simply because the committee worked on it for eleven months, noting he voted to table this issue to allow other County Council members time to further review it. He further advised they were pushing for the vote because this was something the County had dealt with for numerous years and it was time for action to be taken.
Mr. Dietrich stated when they looked at the finances, the investment necessary to upgrade these properties and get the lease down to the same level of commitment given to the Wolf and Bechtel Buildings on a year to year basis was not dependent upon the sale of those buildings. He then asked if Mr. McClure was looking to sell the Wolf and Bechtel Buildings, house the employees elsewhere and then look at a lease.

Mr. McClure advised there should at least be an understanding of what the potential suitors would pay before the lease was passed.

Mr. Dietrich stated he understood Mr. McClure’s concerns, but if the County did not take care of the services it provided for the people how could a current or future County Council argue with the Legislative Branch that set the budget to keep these services.

Mr. McClure advised he understood why Mr. Dietrich wanted to forget the $2.8 million from the sale of the Wolf and Bechtel Buildings was part of the package, but what he did not understand was why he wanted to put the County into a position where it would end up taking less money for those buildings because the lease was passed.

Mr. Werner stated Mr. D’Alessandro was correct when he indicated the property at Gracedale was zoned government services because he also talked to the Zoning Officer and what that meant was the County could do what it wanted to with it because it owned it and the only two things that had to be done were traffic and storm water studies. He further stated this concerned him because he was told the property at Gracedale was fully reviewed during the eleven months.

Mr. Werner advised the County had no letter of commitment from anyone with regard to the Wolf and Bechtel Buildings so the numbers that were provided during the presentation that were supposed to be used for the proposed building were not there.

Mr. Werner stated he would like to see line by line how they came up with the figures that were quoted that would have to be put into the Wolf and Bechtel Buildings. He further stated someone should have been researching what those buildings needed if the County was going to be stewards for Human Services.

Mr. Kraft advised Mr. Werner and Mr. D’Alessandro only talked to the Zoning Officer, not the Zoning board and having been on a board himself, he knew it would take the County forever to build something up at Gracedale because the area zoned government was around the site so it would have to be rezoned and they would have to get impermeable ground permits for the parking lot of 300 plus spaces. He further advised it was easy to say that since the County owned land at Gracedale, a building should go there, but the committee found that
Gracedale was not easy to get to, noting that most of the people who used Human Services were predominantly from Bethlehem and Easton.

In answer to Mr. McClure’s question as to whether he had toured the Wolf Building recently and if he was grievously injured, Mr. Werner replied he had toured it and he was not injured.

Mr. Werner stated he toured the three floors and found the building to be an architecturally beautiful building so he was leery about just tossing away an investment and asset the County has had for many years just like they try to do with Gracedale.

Mr. Gilbert advised even if the lease were to be signed, there was a benefit to the investor who would get those buildings. He further advised the Wolf Building was a nice building and depending on what the next owner would do with it, it could be a boost for the City of Easton. He noted it would also be nice for the people who used the County’s services to have a place that they could actually call their place.

Mr. Gilbert stated if the County decided to put a building at Gracedale, there would be complaints from the residents of Easton and Bethlehem. He further stated with the location of the proposed building it would be able to serve the whole County and was easy to get to so those services would be used more.

Mr. McClure advised he did not agree that the price of the building would not decrease because they would know the County would be anxious to get out. He further advised the County was going to lease a building paying a significant amount of rent, pay to fit it out with money that was supposed to come from the sale of the Wolf and Bechtel Buildings, but now may come from somewhere else in the budget with the best case scenario being to buy it outright in five years, but who knew what the County’s financial situation would be in five years.

Mr. McClure stated he was not against doing something about Human Services or building a building, but this was of no benefit to the County taxpayers. He further stated he did not see how moving to Bethlehem Township was going to make it easier for the people living in Bethlehem and Easton.

Mr. Kraft advised there were people from Easton who were driving to the Bechtel Building to receive their services and people from Bethlehem driving to the Wolf Building for their services.

Mr. Werner stated that he was not upset because he felt the information provided was inaccurate, but because it seemed they were writing Gracedale off as agriculture. He then asked if the committee
was aware that there was a 72,000 square foot office building with 300 parking spaces vacant approximately two blocks away from the proposed building.

Mr. Parsons agreed it was zoned properly, but going before the local Planning Commission and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission to get permission to build there was a whole other ball game.

Mrs. Thierry advised that she was on the Planning Commission in Bushkill Township and it took forever for anything to get accomplished.

Adjournment

Mr. McClure made a motion to adjourn.

Mrs. Ferraro seconded the motion.

The motion to adjourn passed unanimously by acclamation.