Easton, Pennsylvania

August 21, 2014

A regular meeting of the Northampton County Council was held on the above date with the following present: Margaret L. Ferraro, President; Glenn A. Geissinger, Vice-President; Mathew M. Benol; Kenneth M. Kraft; Lamont G. McClure, Jr.; Scott Parsons; Hayden Phillips; Seth Vaughn; Robert F. Werner; Frank E. Flisser, Clerk to Council, and Philip D. Lauer, Solicitor to Council.

Prayer

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

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Vaughn led County Council in the pledge of allegiance.

Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Phillips made the following motion:

Be It Moved By the Northampton County Council that the minutes of the August 7, 2014 meeting shall be approved.

Mr. Vaughn seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved by voice acclamation.

Courtesy of the Floor

Mr. Jack Dalessandro, 705 Front Street, Bangor, PA - stated he wanted to commend County Council on selecting Nazareth Ambulance rather than LifeStar because according to the newspapers, they were going to leave the area at the end of the year.

Mr. Dalessandro advised in spite of former County Executive John Stoffa, former Councilman Ron Angle and Mr. Bernie O’Hare’s constant lies, Gracedale was doing extremely well.
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Confirmation of Appointments

Mrs. Ferraro stated the Personnel Committee met yesterday to consider the County Executive’s re-appointments/appointments to the Area Agency on Aging Advisory Board, Gracedale Advisory Board, Lehigh and Northampton Transportation Authority and Retirement Board.

Mr. Kraft introduced the following resolution:

R. 81-2014 RESOLVED, by the Northampton County Council that the following individuals shall be confirmed in their appointments/re-appointments as indicated hereafter:

AREA AGENCY ON AGING ADVISORY BOARD

Re-appointments: Term to Expire: 07/01/16
Eileen B. Segal
2701 Liberty Street
Easton PA 18045

Appointments:
Joanne L. Hoodmaker
7545 Miller Drive
Bath PA 18014

Gretchen Parseghian
20 South Main Street
Nazareth PA 18064

Pauline M. Hunter
233 Rock Street
Easton PA 18042

GRACEDALE ADVISORY BOARD

Re-appointment: Term to Expire: 3/15/16
Robert F. Werner
705 Paxinosa Avenue
Easton PA 18042
As there were no questions or comments, Mrs. Ferraro called for the vote.

The vote: Kraft, "yes"; Ferraro, "yes"; Geissinger, "yes"; McClure, "yes"; Parsons, "yes"; Phillips, "yes"; Vaughn, "yes"; Werner, "abstain" and Benol, "yes".

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 8-0, with Mr. Werner abstaining.

County Executive's Report

Mr. John A. Brown, County Executive, advised he did not have anything to report.

Public Hearing on the Residency Requirement Ordinance

Mrs. Ferraro advised the following ordinance was introduced by Messrs. Parsons and Werner at the meeting held August 7, 2014:


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, (f) Clerk of Courts - Criminal Division, (g) Director of Administration, (h) Director of Fiscal Affairs, (i) Director of Court Services, (j) Director of Human Services, (k) Director of Public Works, (l) Public Defender, (m) County Solicitor, (n) Director of Corrections, (o) Director of Human Resources, and (p) Director of Community and Economic Development, 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 an individual serving 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, (f) Clerk of Courts - Criminal Division, (g) Director of Administration, (h) Director of Fiscal Affairs, (i) Director of Court Services, (j) Director of Human Services, (k) Director of Public Works, (l) Public Defender, (m) County Solicitor, (n) Director of Corrections, (o) Director of Human Resources, and (p) Director of Community and Economic Development, of the County of Northampton, Easton, Pennsylvania, on the effective date of this ordinance.
C. 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, (f) Clerk of Courts – Criminal Division, (g) Director of Administration, (h) Director of Fiscal Affairs, (i) Director of Court Services, (j) Director of Human Services, (k) Director of Public Works, (l) Public Defender, (m) County Solicitor, (n) Director of Corrections, (o) Director of Human Resources, and (p) Director of Community and Economic Development, of the County of Northampton, Easton, Pennsylvania, on or after the effective date of this ordinance, shall have one year to comply with 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.

Public Hearing

Mrs. Ferraro asked if there were any comments or questions from the public.

There were no respondents.

Mrs. Ferraro asked if any member of County Council had any questions or comments.

Mr. McClure stated last year Mr. Kraft introduced an ordinance similar to this one, which he supported, and he intended to support this ordinance because it was his general philosophy that the people who govern you ought to be your neighbors.

Mr. Vaughn advised he thought the intentions of this ordinance were good, but the actual ramifications were over bureaucratic nonsense. He further advised he would challenge anyone who sponsored this or on County Council to find any empirical data that indicated higher quality individuals were going to be recruited because they lived in Northampton County. He added he would not support this ordinance because he thought it would create more of a problem for the County Executive.
Mr. Phillips stated this ordinance needlessly limited the pool of talent available to the County Executive to make an appointment. He further stated a good example would be the current Sheriff, who did not live in the County or even the State, but was extremely qualified so he did not plan to support this ordinance.

Mr. McClure reiterated he felt the people who were exercising power in your life ought to be your neighbors because they were going to be most responsive to your needs and it was your tax money paying them.

With respect to the Sheriff, Mr. McClure advised no one was questioning his qualifications, but the concern was he was neither a County resident nor a resident of the State. He further advised the office of Sheriff was found in the Pennsylvania Constitution and the County Code of 65 other Counties required an elected Sheriff that lived in their County for at least one year preceding their election.

Mr. McClure stated the issue of whether a Sheriff or any other cabinet level public official being from another State was never put before the voters and his interpretation of the enabling language of the Home Rule Charter (Charter) was it absolutely must be so he would prefer a Sheriff from Northampton County.

Mr. Parsons advised the laws in the Pennsylvania Constitution and in Counties where there were Commissioners, most of these positions were elected so they did not have the choice of going outside the County. He further advised our Charter chose to have them appointed because they probably never thought they would come from outside the County.

Mr. Parsons stated he realized in the past years, people have been appointed from other Counties and when Mr. Kraft presented his ordinance, he did not support it because it did not offer an opportunity to move into the County like this ordinance. He further stated this ordinance would not apply to individuals already in these positions, but to future appointments and if someone really wanted the position, they would move.
Mr. Geissinger advised the members of County Council, the County Executive and the judiciary members were required to reside in the County because they were elected so he did not think there was an oversight when the Charter was created and the cabinet positions were not given a residency requirement because it would allow for the best individuals to be hired. He further advised given the expertise and extensive quality of the individuals who have filled these positions, he saw no reason to impose a residency requirement now or in the future so he would be voting against it.

Mr. Benol stated when this issue was originally brought up, he agreed with it then and he agreed with it now. He further stated he talked to Mr. Parsons about it and the opportunity for any prospective appointee to move into the County was key and would not affect the current members of the cabinet.

Mrs. Ferraro advised these individuals served at the will of the County Executive so at any time during a County Executive’s tenure, they could lose their job. She further advised having this requirement would certainly limit the talent pool because not many people would move when there was no job security. She noted there was an excellent system in place and drew the best talent.

Mr. McClure stated even though these people were not elected, they governed the lives of the taxpayers every day and they should be their neighbors.

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


The ordinance was adopted by a vote of 5-4.
County Executive E-Mails

Mr. Kraft advised a few weeks ago, he requested to receive the e-mails between the County Executive and Ms. Kim Plyer of Sahl Communications and was told this request was being treated as a Right to Know request and would take 30 days. He further advised he still had received no response so he felt he was being stonewalled.

Mr. McClure stated he would also like to know why the e-mails have not been produced because they were not subject to Right to Know because it was being requested by a member of the governing body.

Mrs. Ferraro commented that was a legal opinion issue and then asked Mr. Benol if he had received the e-mails he requested.

Mr. Benol advised he also received the 30 day response so he asked Mr. Lauer if he could comment on whether members of County Council were subject to the Right to Know laws.

Mr. Lauer stated he did not have an answer at this time, but he would look into the matter, noting the Right to Know law indicated a person had the right to take an additional 30 days if they could not respond in the allotted time period.

Mr. Kraft advised his request was made on behalf of the governing body of the County and was not a Right to Know request.

Mr. McClure stated in the section of the Charter that created County Council and designated it as the governing body it indicated one of its powers was to require periodic and special reports from elected officials and their subordinates so that took them out of Right to Know regulations. He further stated they also had the power to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents and other investigative hearings.

Mr. McClure advised he would suggest that any agency that wished to stonewall any member of County Council that was looking for information, no matter what the basis, ought to be very concerned that subpoenas could be issued to receive the
information. Therefore, any request from a member of County Council should be available within a reasonable amount of time and if it could not, an explanation should be forthcoming so appropriate action could be taken.

Mrs. Ferraro stated she thought the connotation of stonewall was not the best description, but she would appreciate the County Executive providing an explanation at the next meeting.

Mr. Lauer advised the County Council's ability to require periodic and special reports necessarily pertained to someone producing e-mails, but it might if it was something County Council requested as a body. He further advised County Council did have a right to conduct investigative hearings and extend the subpoena power to other officials or agencies, but that section also provided they would have to indicate the specific inquiry and investigative purpose for which the subpoena power was being extended. In conclusion, he noted there was a mechanism in the Charter that could be used by County Council.

In answer to Mr. Geissinger's comment that County Council would had to have made the request, Mr. Lauer stated he did not see where the Charter authorized each and every County Council member to simply request and automatically be provided whatever they wanted, but it was clear, they did have rather broad powers to obtain things.

In response to Mr. Geissinger's question as to what would be considered a normal time period granted to someone for normal discovery in a trial case, Mr. Lauer advised it depended on what it was, but it could be 20-30 days.

Mr. McClure stated he agreed with Mr. Lauer's statement that the Charter did not empower individual County Council members to act, but he felt it would be better to be responsive to an individual member or groups of members of County Council than to force the issue to have subpoenas issued.

Mr. Parsons advised he had listened for the past few weeks to conversations regarding this debacle pertaining to Sahl Communications contract where the request for e-mails originated and there had been talk about transparency by this government and it was not occurring.
Mr. Parsons stated a lot of time was being spent arguing over a public relations firm that had been hired. He further stated the County Executive had done a lot of things he did not like, but it was time to move on and concentrate on governing the County and concentrating on getting things done.

Mr. Parsons advised if something illegal was done than it was for the Courts to decide, noting he did not agree with the hiring of the public relations firm and felt it should be gone.

Mr. Parsons stated there was a system in place and if there was a problem with the system, then it should be changed. He further stated there was a person who was appointed that could handle public relations so the County did not need an outside firm and that was the whole crux of the matter.

Mr. Werner stated the public relations firm was not necessary because the job description of the Director of Administration indicated he would handle public relations and the resume of the current Director of Administration indicted he had public relations experience.

Presentation and Review of the Controller’s Audit on the Community Education Centers, Inc.: a. Stephen J. Barron, County Controller; b. Community Education Centers, Inc.

Stephen J. Barron, County Controller

Mr. Barron advised back in February/March, County Council unanimously passed a resolution to have him look at the Community Education Centers, Inc. (CEC) Programs that were conducted at the Prison. He then provided a document entitled, "CEC/NCP Review" that gave a brief summary of his findings (see Attachment #1). He further advised the front page reflected some of the highlights of the request from County Council.

Mr. Barron stated there were three components to the CEC Program, which were the Futures Program, Sister to Sister and programs that were run at the West Easton Treatment Facility. He further stated upon his inquiry, he found there were no statistics kept on recidivism or completion of the programs at the West Easton Treatment Facility.
Mr. Barron advised it was reported by the previous Administration the recidivism rate was approximately 69%. He further advised it did not factor into his studies of the programs so he just looked at the CEC Programs at the Prison and those statistics.

Mr. Barron stated there have been some recent studies done that have been shared with County Council throughout the process and there were no assumptions made about the overall rate because he wanted to look specifically at the program and the money being spent.

Mr. Barron advised the Futures Program, which was the men’s program, there were 848 individuals identified as being potentially in the program meaning they may or may not have entered into the program or dropped out before the end of the program and of that number, 429 graduated. He further advised CEC was doing a much better job identifying the correct individuals with the correct length of stay that could be helped or potentially helped by the program. He noted in the Sister to Sister Program, there were 100 individuals identified and 49 graduated.

Mr. Barron stated based on CEC’s numbers, the reoffend rate was 40.7%. He further stated there was an aftercare component once they left the prison, noting of the 429 individuals, there were only 101 aftercare discharges.

Mr. Barron advised of the 101 aftercare discharges in the Futures Program only 50 successfully completed the program. He further advised in the Sister to Sister Program, there were 35 aftercare discharges and 18 successful completions.

Mr. Barron stated according to CEC’s data, there were 283 inmates that completed the CEC Program with no re-offenses. He further stated he ran the names of those inmates through the Pennsylvania Department of Justice Portal. He noted he found 49 reoffenders and two of them were in the County’s Prison at the time of the audit.

Mr. Barron advised based on his numbers, 51% of the individuals who entered both programs reoffended with 27 of them in Northampton County and more than half of the 49 were currently in a County or State correctional facilities.
Mr. Barron stated incidents at the Prison were lower among CEC participants. He further stated 11% of the money paid to CEC went to their overhead and 89% went into the programs.

Mr. Barron advised CEC was accredited and met the standards to provide the programming they did at correctional facilities. He further advised the County's lack of an aftercare plan caused struggles for CEC.

Mr. Barron stated aftercare was when an individual graduated from the program and re-entered into the community, they had to be part of additional programing to aid in that transition. He further stated after leaving prison, some people had a job and family to take care of so it was not easy to find the time and place to go to for the aftercare. He noted according to CEC, 80% of the individuals who did not receive some sort of aftercare within ten days reoffended.

Mr. Barron suggested using State grants available for specials courts if CEC was no longer an option. He added if the County was going to continue with CEC in some capacity, the County had to look at aftercare and make sure if it was going to invest this money, it would be done in a way that would enhance the possibility of success.

Mrs. Ferraro advised when she attended the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania Conference, she learned there was an aftercare program being piloted in several Counties that tied into Medicaid so she would suggest getting involved in that as soon as possible.

Mr. Barron stated the Medicare/Medicaid component was huge because it leveraged Federal dollars for treatment. He further stated if the CEC program were to be continued, he felt that someone should be dedicated to the program so individuals could be tracked more efficiently.

Mr. Barron advised his research on reoffenders did not include individuals who lived out of State or being held in an out-of-State correctional facility.

Mr. Barron stated Bucks County had a program that cost approximately $112,000 that got great results and he would be willing to share that information with County Council.
Mr. Barron advised CEC and the Prison were very cooperative during the audit and provided all the information requested.

Community Education Centers, Inc.

Mr. Steve Tomlin, Vice President of the Eastern Region of CEC, stated he was present with Dr. Ralph Fretz, Corporate Director of Research and Assessment.

Mr. Tomlin advised he wanted to thank the current and previous Administration of the Prison for their involvement and for providing a safe and secure setting where they could actually deliver their programs. He further advised he wanted to recognize those individuals who have participated in the programs and taken that information and changed their lives and became productive members of the community.

Mr. Tomlin stated they started as a 28-day treatment provider in New Jersey when they were approached by Essex County to deal with the prison population. He further stated they were a leading provider of re-entry services and in-prison treatment in 17 States and the Commonwealth of Bermuda.

Mr. Tomlin advised they had a daily capacity to service 20,000 individuals and 8,900 residential re-entry beds in various communities around the country. He further advised they had an in-prison capacity of 6,500 individuals nationwide and they currently employed 4,000 individuals.

Mr. Tomlin stated their client base was extremely diverse and encompassed a host of government entities at the Federal, State, County and local levels. He further stated they were committed to providing security and treatment to a population, noting they hired a mix of correctional and treatment individuals, as well as alumni individuals. He noted they had experience at operating and the ability to develop treatment alternatives, divergent programs, substance abuse programs and they ran re-entry, work release and prison facilities.

Mr. Tomlin advised they have been involved in the development, activation and ongoing service delivery in both the Prison and the West Easton Treatment Facility. He further advised he believed as this program had matured, it moved beyond numbers and spoke to many other intangibles within the prison
and the community and the public perception of treatment of inmates in general.

Mr. Tomlin stated the true cost benefit analysis must go just behind recidivism and take into account the intangibles.

He further stated once the Administration had a chance to look at the whole picture, he believed a discussion should ensue on how to best serve the County's needs and he indicated they would welcome the opportunity to participate in that discussion.

Dr. Fretz advised the audit Mr. Barron conducted was very helpful and transparent; however, it was not a recidivism study because in order to do that, there had to be a controlled group to compare against.

In answer to Mr. McClure's question as to what would constitute a control group, Dr. Fretz stated it would have included people with matching demographics who did not receive treatment versus those who did receive treatment.

Dr. Fretz advised substance abuse offenders were in the higher risk category for reoffending and half of the individuals in Mr. Barron's study reoffended by using drugs.

Dr. Fretz stated they tried to work with continuum of care, which started in the prison and then aftercare because that was where the rubber hit the road. He further stated 70% of the inmates in the Northampton County Prison had substance abuse issues and that took people with specialized training to handle.

Dr. Fretz advised whether the County continued with his firm or went with another one, there was always going to be a vast majority of individuals in the prison that required treatment. He further advised the most successful individuals were those who received treatment in the prison and then continued with aftercare.

Dr. Fretz stated leaving a person to sit in a cell without any treatment was very problematic because when that person was released, he was more likely to reoffend.
In response to Mr. McClure's question as to whether he was saying Mr. Barron's audit was deficient because there was not a control group, Dr. Fretz advised Mr. Barron did what he was told to do, but that was deficient because he was not asked to do a recidivism study.

Mr. McClure stated last year, Mr. Mike Contois, CEC's Data System Manager, was here during the presentation and debate about whether this program was going to be continued or not and he defined recidivism as any individual that had been a graduate of the Male TC Program, had been released from custody and then returned to the prison system.

Mr. McClure advised Mr. Contois also stated as of July 31, 2013, 136 out of 378 graduates returned and out of that number, 37 returned with new charges, mostly for drug offenses; 39 returned with criminal parole violations and 60 returned with technical parole violations.

Mr. McClure stated Mr. Stoffa asked what the County's normal recidivism rate was and Mr. Contois replied for the general population who did not receive treatment, it was 68-69%. He further stated the majority of the recidivism occurred within 18 months, but noted the first graduation took place in 2009 and of the overall recidivism rate of 35.9%, 26.1% were for parole violations and 9.8% for new charges.

In answer to Mr. McClure's question as to whether Mr. Contois had a controlled group to compare his numbers to, Dr. Fretz replied not that he was aware of.

Mr. McClure advised Mr. Contois further went on to say in an effort to determine the percentage of non-violent and violent offenses, he broke down all the crime categories they used for recidivism into these groups and determined 87.5% were for non-violent offenses and 12.5% were for violent offenses.

Mr. McClure stated at that time, CEC had a lot of numbers and percentages and what he was hearing from CEC tonight was those numbers were not numbers that County Council should have been using to base important public policy decisions on where millions of County taxpayer dollars were being committed.
Dr. Fretz advised that may be what he was hearing, but that was not what he was saying. He further advised Mr. Contois’ report was based on 18 months and Mr. Barron’s was based on 3 years so there was a vast difference between a 18 month period of time and a 3 year period of time post release.

Dr. Frentz stated Mr. Contois did not indicate he was making any comparisons, but he was just reporting figures that were provided to him.

Mr. McClure advised this discussion had been going on for years and the comparison always was the County’s recidivism rate for the individuals who went through the program was 35% with an overall prison rate of 68-69%. He further advised this was the information County Council had been receiving for years and it appeared to him now the County was committing millions of dollars to a program that appeared not to work because he learned more about how to evaluate it.

Mr. Benol asked if Mr. Arnold Matos, Director of Corrections, or Mr. Todd Buskirk, Warden, wanted to address the CEC program.

Mr. Matos stated he had to take a hard look at the numbers Mr. Barron provided and the numbers CEC had been reporting to see if any changes had to be made.

In response to Mr. Benol’s question as to how recidivism was going to be defined, Mr. Matos advised he felt it should be based on the return to prison rate of Northampton County.

In answer to Mr. Vaughn’s question as to what was the prison population prior to CEC’s inception, Mr. Matos stated in 2008, they peaked at approximately 912 inmates and today, there was 679.

In response to Mr. Vaughn’s question as to whether he felt there was a correlation, Mr. Matos advised there was a holistic approach going on in the County. He further advised he could not state that CEC specifically was the reason for the decrease, but it was the effort of a lot of entities.
Mr. Brown stated he felt the audit was valuable and all major contracts in the County should be evaluated from time to time to make sure it was getting a return on the dollar for the investment it was making. He further stated he did not believe anyone in the courts, prison or community who would state there was not an advantage to providing some sort of support while the inmates were going through the prison system.

Mr. Brown advised he would review the audit report and take into consideration the comments made tonight with the entities involved and based on their evaluation, a determination would be made to how it could be improved. He further advised aftercare was mentioned as an important component to this process so he planned to study how that should be incorporated with or without CEC.

Mr. Brown stated it was important to recognize that care within the prison system was valuable and important and that prospective should be kept in mind as this issue moves forward.

Mr. Benol advised he wondered if this contract could be looked at again and maybe revised based on the information provided because he would like to see parameters put in that would have to be achieved so it could be determined if the program was a success.

Mr. Brown stated he agreed there should be parameters in place and he believed CEC would be opened to discussing the matter. He further stated having performance based matrix was very important, as well as monthly reporting, so there could be some kind of tracking on a regular basis.

Mr. Geissinger advised under Item 15 in a document presented to County Council on December 5, 2013, it stated CEC was the current provider of these services for the County, meaning the services referenced in the contract, and over the last three years, recidivism rate for graduates of Future Foundation Program run by CEC was effectively reduced from 69% to 30.3%.

Mr. Geissinger stated his concern was that number was created out of some statistic so he would like to know how that number was arrived at and then look at Mr. Barron’s audit to determine if within the same time frame, he came up with the same number to make sure it was a fair comparison.
Mr. Geissinger advised when dealing with human beings programs had to be created to provide opportunities to those who had special challenges.

Mr. Brown stated he agreed it was important to get the correct numbers so the County could determine how to decrease the recidivism numbers and allow those individuals to become more productive.

Mr. McClure advised he would like to have a discussion with Bucks County regarding their program because they were only spending $112,000 a year wherein Northampton County was spending $750,000.

Mr. Brown stated he agreed because there could be new programs and now funding was becoming available through the State for aftercare support. He further stated he was interested in the best service for the inmates and the community and how they could leverage taxpayer dollars for the highest return.

Mr. Parsons advised he was happy that everyone agreed that a program had to be kept in place. He further advised last year, this program was recommended to County Council by the professionals and it was putting a dollar amount on somebody’s life to help them get better so the issue was what was that dollar amount and was it worth it.

Mr. Werner stated the modules were for men and women, which was unique to this program. He further stated the program in Bucks County was not a therapeutic program so that was why the numbers were lower and did not include men and women modules so he did not want everyone to get distracted by the numbers and to make sure the program fits our needs for the men and women in this County.

Consideration of Personnel Requests for the Department of Human Services

Mrs. Ferraro advised the Personnel Committee met yesterday to consider the Department of Human Services Area Agency on Aging personnel requests.

Mr. Kraft introduced the following resolution:
R. 82-2014  RESOLVED, by County Council of Northampton County that the one (1) existing part-time (.40 FTE) position of Aging Care Manager II, pay grade PS-35, annual salary $15,786, currently existing in the Area Agency on Aging Division of the Department of Human Services, shall be eliminated effective the 22nd day of August 2014.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED that the one (1) new full-time position of Aging Care Manager II, pay grade PS-35, salary range $39,466 to $63,440, shall be created in the Area Agency on Aging Division of the Department of Human Services, effective the 22nd day of August 2014.

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

The vote: Kraft, "yes"; Vaughn, "yes"; Werner, "yes"; Benol, "yes"; Ferraro, "yes"; Geissinger, "yes"; McClure, "yes"; Parsons, "yes" and Phillips, "yes".

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 9-0.

Consideration of Personnel Requests for the Department of Community and Economic Development

Mrs. Ferraro stated at the Personnel Committee, the Department of Community and Economic Development personnel requests were considered.

Mr. Kraft introduced the following resolution:

R. 83-2014  RESOLVED, by the Northampton County Council that the position of Community Development Administrator, pay grade CS-27, salary $63,129, in the Department of Community and Economic Development, shall be reclassified to the position of Deputy Director of Community and Economic Development, pay grade CS-31, salary $66,504, effective the 22nd day of August 2014.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED by the Northampton County Council that the position of Community Development Block Grant Program Coordinator, pay grade CS-21, salary $41,968, in the Department of Community and Economic Development, shall be reclassified to the position of Community and Economic Development Specialist,
pay grade CS-23, salary $44,036, effective the 22\textsuperscript{nd} of August 2014.

\textbf{IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED} by the Northampton County Council that the part time (.50 FTE) position of Economic Development Analyst, pay grade CS-23, annual cost $22,018, in the Department of Community and Economic Development, shall be eliminated, effective the 22\textsuperscript{nd} day of August 2014.

\textbf{IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED} by the Northampton County Council that one full time (1.00 FTE) position of Community and Economic Development Specialist, pay grade CS-23, salary range $44,036 to $62,685, shall be created in the Department of Community and Economic Development, effective the 22\textsuperscript{nd} day of August 2014.

\textbf{FURTHER, IT IS RESOLVED} by the Northampton County Council that the title changes for the below-listed positions in the Department of Community and Economic Development shall be changed effective the 22\textsuperscript{nd} day of August 2014:

The position title of Economic Development Administrator, pay grade CS-27, shall be changed to Community and Economic Development Administrator, pay grade CS-27.

The position title of Economic Development Analyst, pay grade CS-23, shall be changed to Community and Economic Development Finance Specialist, pay grade CS-23.

The position title of Economic Development Analyst, pay grade CS-23, shall be changed to Community and Economic Development Specialist, pay grade CS-23.

The position title of Environmental Conservation Coordinator, pay grade CS-21, shall be changed to Environmental Services Coordinator, pay grade CS-21.

In answer to Mr. McClure’s question as to where the money was for these changes, Ms. Diane Donaher, Director of the Community and Economic Development, advised these were reclassifications and only two positions were upgraded and that funding would come from positions that were not filled.
In response to Mr. McClure's question as to the reason for the name changes, Ms. Donaher stated this was currently two divisions so they were streamlining the department so they could work on its efforts together.

In answer to Mr. Parsons' question as to whether these positions had to do with the idea of combining Farmland Preservation and the Conservation District with her department, Ms. Donaher replied it did not.

In response to Mr. Phillips' comment that this was an increase of one full time employee and it increased the salary of two, Ms. Donaher advised that was correct because the Community Development Block Grant Coordinator did the work of a specialist. She further advised the Community Development Administrator had the knowledge and skill of a Deputy Director.

In answer to Mr. McClure's question as to whether there was a desk audit and if so, could it be provided to County Council, Ms. Donaher stated there was and she would provide it.

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

The vote: Kraft, "yes"; Werner, "yes"; Benol, "yes"; Ferraro, "yes"; Geissinger, "yes"; McClure, "no"; Parsons, "yes"; Phillips, "no" and Vaughn, "yes".

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

Consideration of the Amendment to Resolution No. 49-2014 - Nevin Park Open Space Project

Mrs. Ferraro advised County Council adopted Resolution No. 49-2014 at the meeting held June 5, 2014, which approved the Nevin Park Open Space Project in the City of Easton. She further advised subsequently the Open Space Coordinator, Mr. Bryan Cope, requested an amendment to this resolution, indicating after the closing documents were received and reviewed, the estimated costs from in-kind services from the City of Easton came back less than initially estimated. Therefore, he requested an amendment to reflect this factor.

Mrs. Ferraro introduced the following resolution:
R. 84-2014  RESOLVED, By the Northampton County Council that resolution No. 49-2014 shall be amended as indicated hereafter (sections marked with strikeout have been deleted and sections marked with bold underline have been added.

"WHEREAS, the County of Northampton implemented the Northampton County Open Space Initiative by enacting the Northampton County Open Space Ordinance #423-2004 on November 5, 2004; and

WHEREAS, the Northampton County Open Space Advisory Board has recommended approval of the City of Easton Nevin Park Fountain Revitalization Project, located in the City of Easton; and

WHEREAS, the Northampton County funding will be used as follows:

Property Owner: City of Easton
Site Location: Nevin Park
Park Development Description: New decorative fountain
Appraised Value: No acquisition involved
Phase II Municipal Allocation: $450,064.65
County Grant Request: $35,000.00 (23.91%) (27.6%)

Other Grants: $25,090.00 $55,405.28 (City of Easton) (51.23%) (43.69%)
$36,400.00 (College Hill Neighborhood Assoc.) (24.86%) (28.71%)

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED By the Northampton County Council:

(1) The Northampton County Council hereby approves the City of Easton Nevin Park Fountain Revitalization Project located in the City of Easton. Further, the Northampton County Executive, through the office of the Program Administrator of the Northampton County 21st Century Open Space Initiative, or
his/her designee, is directed to take any and all steps necessary to administer and complete Northampton County's obligations in this project.

(2) The Northampton County Council further directs the Northampton County Executive to appropriate $35,000.00 as the Northampton County contribution to the City of Easton Nevin Park Fountain Revitalization Project."

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

The vote: Ferraro, "yes"; Geissinger, "yes"; Kraft, "yes"; McClure, "yes"; Parsons, "yes"; Phillips, "yes"; Vaughn, "yes"; Werner, "yes" and Benol, "yes".

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 9-0.

Gracedale Advisory Board Liaison Report

Mr. Werner stated the census was at 677, noting that was the highest it had ever been and due to staffing and census control, the cost per patient was below budget. He further stated Gracedale had now received four stars out of five so it was doing very well.

Leigh and Northampton Transportation Authority (LANTA) Liaison Report

Mr. Geissinger advised he attended the LANTA Board meeting and he was very impressed by its consideration of retirement costs, noting they were looking at solutions which he hoped to be able to discuss after their next meeting.
Adjournment

Mr. Kraft made a motion to adjourn.

Mrs. Ferraro seconded the motion.

The motion to adjourn passed unanimously by acclamation.

- ________________
  Frank E. Flisser
  Clerk to Council