Easton, Pennsylvania                                         March 20, 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. McClure made the following motion:

Be It Moved By the Northampton County Council that the minutes of the March 6, 2014 meeting shall be approved.

Mr. Parsons seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved by voice acclamation.

 Courtesy of the Floor

As no one signed up for Courtesy of the Floor, Mrs. Ferraro asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to offer comments.

There were no respondents.
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Confirmation of Appointments

Mrs. Ferraro stated the Personnel Committee met on March 19, 2014, to review the County Executive's appointments/re-appointments to the Gaming Revenue and Economic Redevelopment Authority, the Gracedale Advisory Board, the Lehigh Valley Workforce Investment Board and the Open Space Advisory Board.

Mr. Kraft introduced the following resolution:

R. 23-2014 RESOLVED, by the Northampton County Council that the following individuals shall be confirmed in their appointments/re-appointments as indicated hereafter:

GAMING REVENUE AND ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Re-Appointment: Term to Expire: 12/31/18

Municipality Representative
Bethlehem Township
Thomas J. Nolan
Commissioner
3910 Kipton Court
Bethlehem, PA 18020

GRACEDALE ADVISORY BOARD

Re-appointments: Terms to Expire: 03/15/16
Ruth Ann Terres
1580 Chaucer Lane
Bethlehem, PA 18017
Reverend David H. DeRemer
2165 Girard Avenue
Bethlehem, PA 18015
Paul Brunswick
3554 Southwood Drive
Easton, PA 18042

Term to Expire: 04/19/16
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LEHIGH VALLEY WORKFORCE
INVESTMENT BOARD

Appointment: Term to Expire: N/A

Council – Optional Member
Youth Workforce Development
Thea M. Phalon
546 Church Road
Bath, PA 18014

OPEN SPACE ADVISORY BOARD

Re-appointments: Terms to Expire: 3/18/16
Pamela Denise Kistler
49 Applewood Drive West
Easton, PA 18045-5835

Isidore C. Mineo
70 Ballek Road
Riegelsville, PA 18077

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, "yes" and Benol, "yes".

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

County Executive’s Report

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

Mrs. Ferraro stated prior to conducting the public hearing on the Wolf Building storage lease ordinance, it was necessary to consider the County Executive’s request, through the County Solicitor, to waive the Administrative Code requirement for conducting two professional appraisals on the property to be leased.

Consideration of the Resolution Waiving the Appraisal Requirement

Mrs. Ferraro introduced the following resolution:

R. 24-2014  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 Executive is requesting approval of a lease for approximately 5,883 square feet consisting of storage space being the warehouse building located in the rear parking lot of the Governor Wolf Building, 45 North 2nd Street, Easton, Pennsylvania; and

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

WHEREAS, Administrative Code Sections 13.15 b. 2. allows for the waiver of the aforementioned appraisal requirement if, "The nature of the project requiring a purchase, sale or lease of real estate does not justify the cost of appraisals or is otherwise unnecessary."; and

WHEREAS, Administrative Code Sections 13.15 b. 3. allows for the waiver of the aforementioned appraisal requirement if, "The property at issue has been appraised within 2 years prior to the proposed sale, lease, or purchase of the real estate, and the appraisals were approved by County Council."
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 approximately 5,883 square feet consisting of storage space being the warehouse building located in the rear parking lot of the Governor Wolf Building, 45 North 2nd Street, Easton, Pennsylvania, due to the provisions of Northampton County Administrative Code Sections 13.15 b. 2. and 3.

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

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

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

Public Hearing on the Ordinance Titled, "AN ORDINANCE OF THE NORTHAMPTON COUNTY COUNCIL AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE OF THE COUNTY OF NORTHAMPTON, EASTON, PENNSYLVANIA, TO LEASE A PORTION OF REAL PROPERTY COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE WOLF BUILDING LOCATED AT 45 NORTH 2ND STREET, CITY OF EASTON, NORTHAMPTON COUNTY"

Mrs. Ferraro advised the following ordinance was introduced by Messrs. Kraft and McClure at the meeting held March 6, 2014:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE NORTHAMPTON COUNTY COUNCIL AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE OF THE COUNTY OF NORTHAMPTON, EASTON, PENNSYLVANIA, TO LEASE A PORTION OF REAL PROPERTY COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE WOLF BUILDING LOCATED AT 45 NORTH 2ND STREET, CITY OF EASTON, NORTHAMPTON COUNTY

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 "purchases, conveys or leases or authorizes that conveyance or lease of any real property of the County."; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY ORDAINED AND ENACTED by Northampton County Council that it does hereby authorize the County Executive of the County of Northampton, Easton, Pennsylvania, to lease approximately 5,883 square feet consisting of storage space being the warehouse building located in the rear parking lot of the Governor Wolf Building, 45 North 2nd Street, Easton, Pennsylvania. 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".

Effective Date: This ordinance shall become effective thirty days after the date of enactment.

Public Hearing

There were no questions or comments from the public.

As there were no questions or comments from the members of County Council, Mrs. Ferraro called for the vote.

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

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

Consideration of the Resolution Pertaining to Sahl Communications, Inc.

Mrs. Ferraro stated a resolution regarding Sahl Communications was introduced by Mr. McClure at the meeting held March 6, 2014. She further stated after a period of debate, the resolution was tabled to the March 20, 2014 meeting on a motion made by Mr. Benol, seconded by Mr. Geissinger and adopted by a
vote of 5-4, therefore, in order to consider it, a motion to remove it from the table had to be made.

Remove from the Table

Mr. Benol made a motion to remove this resolution from the table.

Mr. Parsons seconded the motion.

Mrs. Ferraro called for the vote to remove the resolution from the table.

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

The motion was passed by a vote of 9-0.

Consideration of the Sahl Resolution

Mr. McClure introduced the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Northampton County Executive issued Executive Order No. 14-16 which hired the firm of Sahl Communications, Inc., at a cost not to exceed $84,000.00, to provide communications consulting services for Northampton County; and

WHEREAS, it appears the contract entered into with Sahl Communications, Inc. violates the Administrative Code of the County of Northampton. Specifically, the sections of the Administrative Code that were not complied with were 13.09 (a) and 13.09 (g).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that it is the stated opinion of the Northampton County Council that the award of the contract to Sahl Communications, Inc. should be repealed.

Mr. McClure advised based on information he had, a payment of $7,000 had already been made to Sahl Communications so a resolution calling on the County Executive to rescind this contract and restart the process was probably moot at this time, which was why he drafted the next resolution.
Mr. McClure stated Mr. Lauer’s opinion was the Executive Order that was used violated the Administrative Code and the amended Executive Order was also insufficient so that made the process that was undertaken in the original awarding of the contract unlawful. He further stated he felt if this matter went to Court, the process would be found unlawful because he believed Sahl Communications provided a professional service and felt a Court would find it so.

Mr. McClure provided a document referring to Sahl Communications in which it indicated Ms. Kim Plyler was the President and Chief Executive Officer and was a proven relations, marketing and media communications professional with 25 years in news media, strategic marketing/communications, interim management and public affairs (see Attachment #1).

Mr. McClure advised clearly Sahl Communications and Ms. Plyler believed that she was a professional and they offered professional services. He further advised Ms. Plyler was also a member of several public relations associations.

Mr. McClure stated that Ms. Plyler stated one of these associations was The Public Relations Association that had an accreditation process. He further stated the Accredited in Public Relations (APR) accreditation process indicated, “The APR mark also bears forth witness to my proficiency in the strategic planning and executive of public relations campaigns. Does Accreditation prove that APRs are the best practitioners around? No, but for me, APR is a mark of distinction for public relations professionals who demonstrate their commitment to the profession and to its ethical practice, and who are recognized for broad knowledge, strategic perspective and sound professional judgment.”.

Mr. McClure advised accreditation was one of the things that Mr. Victor Scocillio, Northampton County Solicitor, had grabbed onto when discussing Judge Leonard Zito’s opinion at the last meeting. He further advised he did not know if Ms. Plyler was accredited, but this was one of the organizations she belonged to.

Mr. McClure stated Ms. Plyler also belonged to The National Association of Government Communicators (NAGC) and their mission was dedicated to providing opportunities for professional advancement, enhancing effective communications with
constituents and advancing the profession. He further stated another organization she belonged to deemed this was a profession and they provided professional services.

Mr. McClure advised Ms. Plyler belonged to the International Association of Business Communicators (IABC) and they were working on a certification program or may already have one now. He further advised she was a professional and she and Sahl Communications provided professional services so the contract should have been bid competitively.

Mrs. Ferraro stated a committee would be reviewing the Home Rule Charter and the Administrative Code because there were a lot of parts of both that were opened to interpretation.

In answer to Mr. Phillips’ question as to what Mr. Lauer’s stance was on this matter, Mr. Lauer advised his position remained the same with the exception to the discussion that was held with regard to Section 13.07 (b), which provision indicated the procurement of any County property for more than $25,000 shall be by competitive sealed bid, competitive negotiations or cooperative purchasing unless the County Executive, with the approval of County Council, showed those methods were not practical.

Mr. Lauer stated he believed given the language used in this section as opposed to certain other sections, it was intended to imply County property and this was not a contract relating to County property. He further stated with respect to the other provisions of the Administrative Code, if one determined this contract related to the procurement of a professional service then Section 13.09 (a) required the competitive negotiation for Request for Proposal (RFP) be used. He noted if it was not a professional service than any of the other methods could be used.

Mr. Lauer advised the method the County Executive used was non-competitive negotiations, under Section 13.10, and the only problem he had with the use of that method was if that method were to be used, the County Executive had to determine that it was not practical or prudent to use another method and prior to the award of the contract, he had to issue an Executive Order stating the specific reasons for using this method.
Mr. Lauer stated last time he indicated if it was determined that it was not a professional service and the non-competitive method was used, the County Executive would be required to issue an Executive Order stating the specific reasons for using that method. He further stated the objection he had last time to the Executive Order was that although it stated reasons for awarding it to this entity, it did not specifically state the reasons for using non-competitive negotiation as opposed to something else.

In response to Mr. Phillips' comment that he was not taking a position on whether it was a professional service, Mr. Lauer advised he was not because in the last litigation, it was crystal clear that according to the way the Court decided in each case one had to make a determination as to whether that particular service was a professional service. He further advised certain criteria was used in the Gracedale transport case that may or may not apply here as Judge Zito listed some things that could make it a professional service.

Mr. Lauer stated professional service was defined in the Administrative Code as services involving specialized knowledge, skill and expertise provided by persons with advanced training in a field that required an extended course of specialized instruction and study. He further stated that definition was something people could differ on and it was apparent the County Executive believed it was not a professional service, but if County Council believed it was then there was difference of opinion and a decision would have to be made.

Mr. Lauer advised he felt County Council may want to consider amending Article XIII of the Administrative Code because it did not make a lot of sense to go to Court periodically to have a judge determine if something was a professional service or not.

Mr. Benol stated in Section 13.10, it indicated a contract may be awarded for a required or designated supply, services or time to a sole supplier using non-competitive negotiation so he wondered if that referred to professional or non-professional services.

Mr. Lauer advised he did not believe it pertained to professional services, but Section 13.09 was clear that all professional services shall be selected using competitive
negotiations.

Ms. Kathryn Anderson, Purchasing Manager, Procurement Division, stated her division struggled with the Administrative Code all the time because there were a lot of irregularities and things that were left open to interpretation so they would not be opposed to it being revised.

Ms. Anderson advised Mr. Brown did contact the Procurement Division when this process was started and they looked at competitive solutions, cooperative solutions, emergency solutions and non-competitive solutions. She further advised the competitive solution required a bid for the lowest cost and a RFP that included cost with other factors.

Ms. Anderson stated the interpretation of the lawsuit opinion by the County Solicitor’s Office was that professional services must be done by the RFP process, but it did not negate the opportunity for non-competitive negotiation and/or cooperative solicitations. She further stated the County did a lot of sole source types of contracts for consultants so they did not feel anything that was done was inappropriate.

In answer to Mr. McClure’s question as to whether she agreed that if it was a professional service, it had to be competitively bid; Ms. Anderson advised the County Solicitor’s interpretation was if it was going to be a competitive solution.

Mr. McClure stated that interpretation was ultimately found by Judge Zito to be lacking so he asked if it was her position that a professional service under Section 13.09 did not have to be competitively bid.

Ms. Anderson advised the County Solicitor’s Office gave them that interpretation after the lawsuit under the previous Administration.

In response to Mr. McClure’s question as to whether she would agree that an Executive Order had to be issued before awarding a contract to a sole source provider stating the compelling reasons and if not, it would be a defective process, Ms. Anderson agreed.

In answer to Mr. Benol’s question as to whether this contract was out of the norm, Ms. Anderson replied it was not.
Mr. McClure stated reviewing the Administrative Code would not solve anything because it was subject to interpretation by all the bodies involved so there would always be disagreements. He further stated that was what the Courts were for because the judges could get to these issues quickly and he long advocated there be more judicial interpretation of the Administrative Code and Home Rule Charter to provide more guidance. He noted there was no long review or legislative fix that would prevent future disputes unless the power dynamic that was originally conceived of in the Home Rule Charter was changed.

Mr. Geissinger advised he agreed with some points of Mr. McClure’s argument, but disagreed with the definition of professional because his profession required no State license, particular certifications or association affiliation to be accredited and no set standards of accreditation for him to be paid for what he did. He further advised he believed Judge Zito issued his opinion to make the Administrative Code clearer so he did not think they had to redefine the word professional.

Mr. Vaughn stated he believed County Council had the ability to amend the Administrative Code to make it more tailored to what they were looking to get out of it. He further stated he did not think there had to be a power play between the bodies or to advocate for legal action if there was a particular part of the Home Rule Charter or Administrative Code that County Council would like to revise.

Mr. Kraft advised he did not believe spending $84,000 on a communication consultant to make the County Executive look better was a prudent expense of the taxpayers’ dollars.

Mrs. Ferraro stated that was not part of the vote on this resolution and it would be up to the County Executive to answer to the voters for his decision for entering into this contract or any other contract. She further stated she agreed with Mr. McClure in that they would never perfect anything to the point of eliminating litigation; however, it did not hurt to look at the Administrative Code to possibly make some improvements.

Mr. Kraft advised Mrs. Ferraro was behind upholding the professional services portion of the Administrative Code when it came to the Nazareth Ambulance medical transport issue. He further advised this was a professional service by Ms. Plyler’s website and own admission and by Mr. Geissinger’s admission that
it was a professional service. He noted they were not here to try and find a way out of the meaning of the Administrative Code, which they all swore to uphold.

Mrs. Ferraro stated she just happened to live in Nazareth and Gracedale just happened to be in Nazareth, but she would have voted the same way she did for any other medical transport company.

Mr. McClure advised when the County Council Solicitor indicated the process that was used specifically with respect to the Executive Orders was improper, it was his job to address this issue. He further advised County Council had the opportunity with this resolution to make it clear that they wanted to avoid a lawsuit and come to some kind of reasonable accommodation. He noted it was County Council’s obligation to make sure the Administrative Code was upheld and if they allowed someone else to abdicate that responsibility, they have failed and lost the ability to influence what ultimately happens.

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

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

The resolution failed by a vote of 4-5.

Consideration of the Resolution Authorizing the County Council Solicitor to Take Legal Action — Sahl Communications Contract

Mrs. Ferraro stated at the request of Mr. McClure, a resolution was prepared authorizing the County Council Solicitor to take legal action with regard to the Sahl contract.

Mr. McClure introduced the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Northampton County Executive issued Executive Order No. 14-16 which hired the firm of Sahl Communications, Inc., at a cost not to exceed $84,000.00, to provide communications consulting services for Northampton County; and
WHEREAS, it appears the contract entered into with
Sahl Communications, Inc. violates the Administrative Code of
the County of Northampton. Specifically, the sections of the
Administrative Code that were not complied with were 13.09 (a)
and 13.09 (g).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that it is the stated
opinion of the Northampton County Council that the award of the
contract to Sahl Communications, Inc. should be repealed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Northampton
County Council does hereby authorize the Solicitor to County
Council to take legal action to enforce the provisions of
Administrative Code Article XIII.

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

The vote:  McClure, “yes”; Geissinger, “no”; Kraft, “yes”;  
Benol, “no” and Ferraro, “no”.

The resolution failed by a vote of 4-5.

Consideration of the Appointment of Director of Public Works

Mrs. Ferraro advised the Personnel Committee met yesterday
to consider the County Executive’s appointment to the position
of Director of the Public Works Department.

Mr. Kraft introduced the following resolution:

R. 25-2014  RESOLVED, by the Northampton County Council
that Richard A. Young shall be confirmed in his appointment as
Director of the Department of Public Works, salary range Group
VI, $87,838 to $124,975, effective March 20, 2014. The salary
shall be at Step 3-C, $95,921 of the salary range.

Mr. Richard Young stated when he became the Director of
Public Works for the City of Allentown, there were many
challenges and he looked forward to addressing the challenges
facing the County.
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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, "yes" and Benol, "yes".

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

Consideration of the Human Services 2014 Pay Scale Resolution

Mrs. Ferraro advised at the Personnel Committee meeting yesterday, the revised Human Services pay scale was considered.

Mr. Kraft introduced the following resolution:

R. 26-2014 WHEREAS, the Northampton County Council adopted resolution #9-2014 which adopted pay scales for certain Human Services Civil Service (Non-Union) Administrative Staff and PSSU (Union) employees; and

WHEREAS, on March 11, 2014, the Department of Human Resources indicated that due to changes in State maximum allowable salaries, it became necessary to revise the pay scales for certain 2014 Human Services Civil Service (Non-Union) Administrative Staff and PSSU Employees (Union).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Northampton County Council that the 2014 pay scales for certain Human Services Civil Service (Non-Union) Administrative Staff and PSSU (Union) shall be revised to read as indicated on the attached document (refer to Exhibit "A"). The revisions shall be retroactive to January 1, 2014.

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

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

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 9-0.
Consideration of the Administrative Code Article XIII Contract Approval Resolution: Xerox State and Local Solutions, Inc.

Mrs. Ferraro stated the Finance Committee met yesterday and the Administrative Code Article XIII contract approval request for Xerox was considered.

Mr. Geissinger introduced the following resolution:

R. 27-2014 WHEREAS, Northampton County Administrative Code Article XIII Procurement and Disposition of County Property, Section 13.16 Contracts and Agreements c. (1) requires approval of County Council for "...any contract exceeding $100,000, which was awarded using the Competitive Negotiation, Negotiation After Competitive Sealed Bidding, and Non-Competitive Negotiation source selection methods. For contracts with renewal clauses, the entire potential payout if all renewal clauses are exercised under the terms of the contract must be considered when determining if Council approval is necessary"; and

WHEREAS, on March 7, 2014, the Northampton County Council received a request from the County Executive for County Council to adopt a resolution approving a contract, with Xerox State and Local Solutions, Inc., totaling $106,709.35 for computer equipment for implementation of NetApp Daily Backup SAN.

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 Xerox State and Local Solutions, Inc., totaling $106,709.35, for computer equipment for implementation of NetApp Daily Backup SAN.

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

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

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 9-0.
Consideration of the 2014 Contingency Account Transfer Resolution

Mrs. Ferraro advised at the March 6, 2014 County Council meeting, the Deputy Sheriff's Association made a request for $800.00 in County Council Contingency account funding for the County's Annual Easter Egg Hunt.

Mrs. Ferraro introduced the following resolution:

R. 28-2014 RESOLVED, By the Northampton County Council that the sum of $800.00 shall be transferred from the 2014 County Council Contingency Account No. 05000-76050 for the 2014 Northampton County Easter Egg Hunt.

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

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

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

Consideration of the County Council April Meeting Schedule Resolution

Mrs. Ferraro stated it was recently discovered that the originally scheduled third Thursday meeting in April conflicted with the Easter holiday scheduled Courthouse closing on Friday, April 18, 2014. She further stated a resolution was drafted changing the scheduled April 17, 2014 meeting to April 24, 2014. She noted the Personnel and Finance Committees meeting scheduled to be held on April 16, 2014 would be held on April 23, 2014 and the Human Services Committee meeting scheduled to be held on April 17, 2014, had been cancelled.

Mrs. Ferraro introduced the following resolution:

R. 29-2014 WHEREAS, the Northampton County established the 2014 County Council meeting schedule via adoption of resolution 118-2013 on December 12, 2014.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the County Council meeting scheduled for Thursday, April 17, 2014, commencing at 6:30 p.m. is canceled and rescheduled for Thursday, April 24, 2014, commencing at 6:30 p.m., prevailing time, in the third floor meeting room, room #3116, Northampton County Courthouse, 669 Washington Street, Easton, Pennsylvania.

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

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

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

Capital Projects and Operations Committee Report

Mr. Phillips advised at the Capital Projects and Operation Committee meeting, they received a report from the County Executive regarding the system he was establishing with Xerox to track the capital projects.

Mr. Phillips stated the County had been negligent in developing maintenance plans for its buildings so they requested that at the June meeting, a comprehensive maintenance management plan be presented regarding the Human Services Building.

Courts and Corrections Committee Report

Mr. Benol advised the Courts and Corrections Committee will be meeting on April 23, 2014 after the Personnel and Finance Committees meeting.

Information Service Governance Committee Liaison Report

Mr. Phillips stated he attended the Information Service Governance Committee meeting where he presented the concerns Messrs. Vaughn and Kraft had pertaining to redesigning the website. He further stated Mr. Al Jordan, Xerox Director of Information Services, advised they were working on a number of
projects so he asked if a priority list could be established.

Adjournment

Mr. Benol made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Geissinger seconded the motion.

The motion to adjourn passed unanimously by acclamation.

Frank E. Flisser
Clerk to Council