Easton, Pennsylvania                                      February 5, 2015

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; Linda M. Zembo, Acting 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

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 22, 2015 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 were any questions or comments from the public.

There were no respondents.
County Executive’s Report

Mr. John A. Brown, County Executive, advised they were doing a soft close on the financials for 2014 to enable them to present some numbers to County Council. He further advised he had been meeting with the department heads to summarize 2014 and discuss plans for 2015.

Recognition of Gracedale

Mrs. Ferraro stated on February 3, 2015, the Northampton County Administration announced that after a week-long inspection and audit by the Department of Health, Gracedale Nursing Home had no deficiencies and received a zero deficiencies survey result. She further stated this was the first time in the history of Gracedale that the Long Term Care Facility Survey received unprecedented results.

Mrs. Ferraro advised the members of County Council would like to extend their congratulations and appreciation to the employees and Administration at Gracedale.

Mr. Scott Parsons made a motion to transfer up to $1500 from County Council’s Contingency Fund to Gracedale to honor the employees.

Mr. Werner seconded the motion.

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


The motion passed by a vote of 9-0.

Mr. Millard Freeman, Nursing Home Administrator, introduced Ms. Ann Terres, Chairperson of the Gracedale Advisory Board; Ms. Sue Edwards, Assistant Nursing Home Administrator; Ms. Beth Berkite, Assistant Director of Nursing; Mr. Hector Rivera, President of American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Local 1435 and Ms. Paulette Feld, President of Steelworkers Local 579.
Mr. Rivera stated he wanted to thank County Council for recognizing the employees. He stated he worked at Gracedale for more than 25 years and had always known the employees provided excellent care, but it took teamwork from all the departments to meet all the aspects of the residents’ needs.

Ms. Terres advised she wanted to thank the constituents because they voted to keep Gracedale and the members of County Council for working with them. She further advised she believed the employees have proven their goodwill and quality measures.

Mr. Freeman stated the Department of Health increased Gracedale’s star rating so they could have a Veterans Affairs contract this year and some of the other insurance providers would also be able to contract with them.

Mr. McClure advised it was right and appropriate to recognize the fine work that was done leading up to this last inspection. He further advised it was good there were no deficiencies, but the County’s moral obligation to keep Gracedale should not be judged by its deficiencies or lack thereof or used as an excuse to begin to neglect it.

Mr. McClure stated that Gracedale was kept in the hands of the County was essentially a miracle. He further stated the achievement of lack of deficiencies was a minor miracle in that these employees gave $3 million back in wages and benefits in order to make sure Gracedale would be on a sound financial footing.

Mr. McClure advised these people still do not have a contract and as far as he knew, the Administration was not negotiating with them in good faith. He further advised they have not had a raise in years and now their medical care was drastically changed so in that context having no deficiencies was an amazing thing and they should not be forgotten.

Mr. Werner stated employees at Gracedale have been consistent with their passions and their actions have spoken louder than anything. He further stated they have gone from years of hypocrisy to hope.

Mr. Werner advised in the past there had been highly illustrated negligence in the hope of getting rid of Gracedale, but now that was not going to happen because it was known Gracedale could be the contributing asset it once was when it
used to provide the County $10 million contributions to the General Fund.

Mr. Werner stated they overcame the Department of Health having 700 residents with ongoing programs and their families in a facility that existed since the 1700's. He further stated it was a huge accomplishment that Gracedale had come from the throws of being sold for a mere $35 million to where it was today.

Mrs. Ferraro advised obtaining 22,000 signatures on a petition was incredible and truly a miracle. She further advised the employees at Gracedale were proving every day this could be done, but nothing could have happened without those signatures.

Mr. Brown stated he wanted to correct something Mr. McClure stated and that was the Administration had been negotiating with the unions in good faith and were moving into arbitration hearings over the next few months.

Mr. Brown advised he did not want to address the financials at this time because he believed they had to be separated from the quality of care, commitment and compassion of the employees. He further advised in coming into office, his commitment and mandate was to operate Gracedale as effectively as it could and some of these results were part of that process.

Mr. Brown stated the financials were not what they should be because the facility continually lost money since 2009. He further stated the challenges they faced with the facility were not necessarily the result of anything anyone had done, but the dynamics of the business model the County was stuck with.

Mr. Brown advised the Administration at Gracedale did an excellent job in increasing the census to maximize the revenue the facility could generate, but the expense side continued to grow.

Mr. Brown stated he just wanted to raise a caution in the enthusiasm because on the financial side, there was still a lot of work to be done, but overall it was a great day for Gracedale.
Mr. McClure advised generally when someone was correcting a record, the record needed to be corrected. He further advised he was aware that the Correction Officers and the Court appointed employees have chosen to go to interest arbitration because they had certain limitations in the actions they could take in collective bargaining that some of the other units did not have.

When Mr. McClure commented he believed there were no negotiations going on with the AFSCME union at Gracedale, Mr. Brown stated that was not true. He further stated contracts have been left open, but they were working to bring them all to a conclusion in a timely manner in a way that was appropriate for the facility, employees and taxpayers.

Mr. Phillips advised he wanted to thank Mr. Brown for taking a personal interest in Gracedale, as well as everyone involved, but he was concerned about the amount of capital improvement funds that had to be spent. He further advised a lot of time was devoted to the operating expenses, but capital improvements expenses should be included.

Mr. Brown stated he concurred all the aspects should be looked at and the capital improvements part was something that had been problematic. He further stated there were more than $10 million of capital improvements requests that have been made for various projects. He noted they had to be worked in on a regular basis because the quality of care could not be totally separated from the infrastructure itself.

Mrs. Ferraro advised that was a debt the County was willing to tolerate.

Mr. Werner stated he was very grateful for all the work that had been done at Gracedale. He further stated Gracedale was never established to be a money making proposition, but to take care of people.

Mr. Werner advised Warren County had commented that they should be doing with their nursing home what Northampton County was doing, which should be a very positive incentive for everyone. He further advised the heart of Gracedale was to take care of people in the community that have paid their dues and spent their lives here. He understood the financials had to be discussed, but no one should ever lose sight that Gracedale was not originally built to raise money for the County.
Mr. Brown stated the commitment from the Administration was to put together the best financial picture it could that represented what was actually taken place there. He further stated there were changes taking place that should have a positive impact on the financial situation and they were working diligently to continually improve the operation of the facility.

Mrs. Ferraro advised she was the Executive Director of a school district foundation to raise money to improve things so she wondered if a foundation or an endowment fund could be established for Gracedale.

Mr. Vaughn stated he was very proud of the progress being made with Gracedale because the people of the County loved it. He further stated he had always been a supporter of Gracedale and the Administration had been doing things to modernize it.

Mr. Geissinger advised the people of the County gave a charge to County Council and that was to work along with the Administration to provide the best care for the residents, the best work environment for the employees and to make it run as efficiently as possible without losing sight that it was not a for profit operation. He noted he appreciated everything everyone did to bring Gracedale to the place it was now and making every effort to keep improving it.

Public Hearing on the Ordinance Providing for an Amendment to Administrative Code Article XIII Procurement and Disposition of County Property, Section 13.16 Contracts and Agreements C. (1)

Mrs. Ferraro stated the following ordinance was introduced by Messrs. Phillips and Parsons at the meeting held January 22, 2015:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE NORTHAMPTON COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, ARTICLE XIII PROCUREMENT AND DISPOSITION OF COUNTY PROPERTY, SECTION 13.16 CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS C. (1)

WHEREAS, Section 602 Ordinances (a) (1) of the Home Rule Charter empowers Northampton County Council to adopt Ordinances for the purpose of amending the Administrative Code.
NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED AND ENACTED by the Northampton County Council that Northampton County Administrative Code, Article XIII Procurement and Disposition of County Property, Section 13.16 C. (1) Contracts and Agreements shall be amended as indicated hereafter (sections marked with strikeout are being deleted and sections that are marked with bold and underline have been added):

ARTICLE XIII

PROCUREMENT AND DISPOSITION OF COUNTY PROPERTY

13.16 Contracts and Agreements

Section 13.16 Contracts and Agreements

a. Written contracts are required for all purchases of goods and services exceeding $25,000. All contracts and agreements shall be prepared and executed as directed by the County Executive by way of the Executive Order. All contract formats shall be approved by the County Solicitor prior to use.

b. All executed contracts and agreements shall be filed in the Procurement Division within fourteen (14) days after execution, and shall immediately be available for inspection by any member of County Council.

c. At least twenty (20) days before the County Executive obligates the County to the proposed terms of any prospective contract, the County Executive shall provide written notification of the proposed terms of the prospective contract to County Council if the contract consideration exceeds $100,000, regardless of whether the contract term spans more
than one fiscal year or exceeds twelve months. Such written notice shall specify the procedure used to choose the individual or entity providing the services, including a copy of the Invitations to Bid/Request for Proposals, if applicable; the name of the successful bidder; the nature of the project and the scope of work; the projected total monetary amount of the contract; the hourly or other unit costs charged under the contract; a statement of the need for such services, and a disclosure of prior relationships between the vendor and the County or County Personnel. In addition, prior to making the award, approval of County Council is required in the following instances:

(1) Any contract exceeding $25,000 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.

(2) Any contract where costs are to be funded with monies outside of the County's General Fund, such as those funded through bonded indebtedness.
d. No contracts shall be entered into by the County Executive, or any other independently elected official, without:

(1) giving written notification to the Office of the County Council, as provided in Section 13.16 c; and

(2) receiving the approval of the agreement by County Council resolution, if the contract involves the retention of professionals pursuant to the authority of the Council under Section 202 of the Home Rule Charter to incur indebtedness, levy taxes, assessments, and service charges; adopt and amend an Administrative Code; adopt a Personnel Code; establish salaries and wage levels; and acquire property.

e. No work shall be authorized to begin nor payment made under a contract prior to the completion of the written notice process, set forth in Administrative Code Section 13.16 c, until sufficient appropriate funds have been encumbered, and where required, the approval process completed, unless exigent reasons or an emergency situation requires the immediate execution of a proposed contract, but the term of such contract shall not exceed thirty (30) days. Such reasons shall be documented and filed with the Council within 24 hours of the execution of the proposed contract.

f. Every professional service contract shall specifically state that a copy of any final report or study delivered
pursuant to a contract shall be provided directly by the vendor to the County Council; and the vendor shall agree to present the final report or study should the County Council so desire. Exempt from the aforementioned requirements are:

(1) Contracts that involve the investigation of a crime and the apprehension or prosecution of persons suspected of, or charged with, the commission of a crime if the District Attorney determines that the information might prove to be prejudicial or detrimental to such action.

(2) Contracts involving services in the defense of persons suspected of, or charged with, the commission of a crime if the Public Defender determines that the information might prove prejudicial or detrimental to such action.

g. Required Conditions for All Contracts

(1) Every contract shall specifically state that it is contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds from which payment can be made.

(2) Every contract shall contain an express written provision which clearly provides that in the event of non-appropriation of funds, at any time during the term of the contract, which would prevent the County from making payment under the terms and conditions of the contract, the County may terminate the contract, without the assessment of any
termination charges or financial penalties against the County, by providing written notice of intent to terminate to the contracting party.

(3) The County of Northampton shall not make contractual arrangements with a vendor who is delinquent on any taxes due the County until the taxes are paid in full. Delinquent shall herein be defined as the point when the taxes owed become the responsibility of the Tax Claim Bureau to collect.

(4) Every contract shall state that if the vendor becomes delinquent on taxes owed the County during the term of the agreement, vendor shall be in breach of the agreement and the County shall withhold vendor payments in lieu of taxes until taxes are paid in full.

(5) The County Executive, or his designee, shall issue written notice to the Council within sixty (60) days of the end of the fiscal year if a vendor or lessee is found to be delinquent on any taxes due the County. As directed pursuant to contract language authorized by this Section, the County shall withhold payments until the taxes are paid in full.

(6) The County of Northampton shall not make contractual arrangements with a vendor who is also a lessee of the County until the rent due the County is paid in full as
provided for in the terms of the lease agreement.

(7) No renewal of any existing contract, upon the expiration or termination of the original term, shall be entered into if such renewal fails to conform to provisions of the Administrative Code herein set forth.

(8) The provisions of Administrative Code Sections 13.07 through 13.13 and 13.16 shall not be evaded by entry into piece-meal contracts, which should in the exercise of reasonable discretion and prudence be conducted as one transaction, that exceed the dollar amount or term of contract set forth in Administrative Code Sections 13.07 and 13.16.

(9) All County construction projects over $25,000 shall be awarded by competitive bid to the lowest responsible bidder unless rejected in accordance with other provisions of Article XIII of the Northampton County Administrative Code.

(10) If the County Executive, or his agent, on behalf of the County of Northampton bids a construction project with a Project Labor Agreement Requirement, then in that event, the County Executive, or his agent, shall simultaneously bid the same construction project without a Project Labor Agreement. No Project Labor Agreement shall be utilized in any County construction project unless approved by Northampton County Council prior to execution of the contract by Resolution.
(11) A Project Labor Agreement is hereby defined as a contract which requires that the project be awarded exclusively to:

(a) recognize unions as representatives of their employees on that job;
(b) exclusively use the union hiring hall to obtain workers;
(c) pay union wages and benefits; and
(d) obey the union restrictive work rules, job classifications, and arbitration procedure.

(12) Every contract shall specifically state that the vendor agrees not to hire County personnel who have or shall exercise discretion in the awarding, administration or continuance of that vendor's contract. The prohibition shall be in force for up to and including one year following the termination of the employee from County service. A vendor's failure to abide by this shall constitute a breach of contract, and the agreement shall so state.

(13) Each contract must contain the following conditions:

(a) Undue Influence: The Provider agrees not to hire any County personnel who has exercised discretion in the awarding, administrating or continuance of this contract for up
to and including one year following the termination of the employee from County service. Failure to abide by this provision shall constitute a breach of this contract.

(b) Conflict of Interest: The Provider agrees to notify in writing the County as soon as the Provider learns that:

(1) A current employee of the County has commenced, or is intending to commence, employment with the Provider while continuing to maintain County employment, or while continuing to maintain County employment. Any written notice required to be given under this section shall specify the County employee's (associate's) name, the nature of the County employee's (associate's) employment, or the subject of the County employee's (associate's) contract with the Provider and the date on which the County employee's (associate's) employment or contract with the Provider commenced.

(c) Breach of Contract:

(1) The Provider agrees that any breach of performance, of any covenant, representation, or warranty, indemnity, or condition, or attached appendices, shall constitute default of this contract.

(2) When a breach of contract has occurred, the County, in the exercise of its discretion, may allow the
Provider a specific period of time to correct its breach of the contract. Such period of time shall not exceed thirty (30) days.

(3) If Provider does not correct its violation of the contract as specified, the County may terminate the contract in whole or in part if such partial termination is in the best interest of the County.

Public Hearing

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

There were no respondents.

Mrs. Ferraro asked if there were any questions or comments from the members of County Council.

In response to Mr. Geissinger's question as to what impact this ordinance would have on the process, Ms. Kathryn Anderson, Purchasing Manager, advised for whatever process they used, they asked the end user to provide a recommendation to the Procurement Office that would include the funding source, the benefit to the County and why they required the services. She further advised the Procurement Office would draft the Executive Order indicating the information provided to them, which was then sent to Mr. Brown for approval, and prepare the contracts.

Ms. Anderson stated if it was something that required County Council’s approval, they prepared the notification sheet and all the necessary documentations. She further stated they all the documents were then sent to their Solicitor and after his review, they were forwarded to the Administration and County Council.

Ms. Anderson advised she contacted her counterpart at Lehigh County and all invitations to bid and Request for Proposals for non-professional services did not require the
approval of the County Executive and/or Commissioners. She further stated the Procurement Office obtained the bids or Request for Proposals and provided them to the department/division and upon receipt of a recommendation, a contract was issued as long as the Procurement Office agreed with the recommendation. She noted Lehigh County’s law department prepared the language of the contract not the Procurement Office.

Ms. Anderson stated professional services contracts were not required to be issued through the Procurement Office, but were obtained by the individual end users. She further stated if the expenditure was in excess of $10,000, an approval must be obtained by the Commissioners and justification must be provided for the recommendation. However, if the expenditure was less than $10,000, the end user only had to notify the Commissioners of their intent.

Ms. Anderson advised her office was required to have anything that was to be considered by County Council the Friday before a meeting, but depending on the timing, it could be six to seven weeks before it was put on the agenda.

Mr. Geissinger stated that was his concern and he appreciated her clarifying the differences between Lehigh and Northampton County.

Ms. Anderson advised in 2014, there were 77 Executive Orders issued through the Procurement Office. She further advised for the sole source method, there were 18 Executive Orders issued and if the threshold was reduced to $25,000, 13 of them would have also required County Council’s approval. She noted the majority of the sole source contracts were for Gracedale, 911 and the Sheriff’s Department.

With regard to Request for Proposals, Ms. Anderson stated 9 Executive Orders were issued for competitive negotiations and 7 of them obtained County Council approval, however, with the change, all of the would need the approval. She further stated 15 Executive Orders were issued for competitive bids and 3 of those required approval because of the funding source. She added for cooperative purchases, 10 Executive Orders were issued, but County Council was only required to be notified.
In answer to Mr. Hayden’s question what was the additional number of competitive negotiations, negotiations under competitive sealed bid, non-competitive negotiations between $100,000 and $25,000, Ms. Anderson advised there were have been 13 more.

In response to Mr. Benol’s question as to what would be her recommendation, Ms. Anderson stated she did not think the process was every taken advantage of so she did not see a reason to change it.

In answer to Mr. Parsons’ question as to whether she had a recommendation to speed the process up regardless of the threshold, Ms. Anderson advised County Council used to address contracts at both of their monthly meetings. She further advised they could eliminate Executive Orders and do them through a workflow process.

In response to Mrs. Ferraro’s question as to what happened if County Council did not approve a contract, Ms. Anderson stated Mr. Brown could sign it.

Mrs. Ferraro advised she was torn because she hoped this was not a way for County Council to micromanage the process.

Mr. Phillips stated he considered approving the budget and the tax rate the most important jobs he did, but he also took very seriously the job of monitoring the financial spend throughout the year. He further stated he did not feel comfortable with the limit at $100,000 so if this would delay the process, it was a consequence he could live with.

Mr. Vaughn advised he agreed with Mr. Phillips regarding the oversight of these contracts, but he was concerned since the members of County Council were only part time how many extra contracts should be brought before them.

Mr. Phillips stated his proposal would not affect contracts under a collective government contract, bulk items or emergency spending.

Mr. Geissinger advised he did not totally disagree with Mr. Phillips, but he was concerned that it was micromanaging. He further advised County Council had a responsibility to provide an efficient and stable working government for the people of the County and he could not support anything that would slow down
its efficiency and he believed a balance had been struck with the $100,000.

Mr. McClure stated there were statements made regarding the separation of power issue, but County Council was the governing body of the County and this threshold was solely at their discretion. He further stated he previously asked the members of County Council to step up their game and this would provide them another tool to get more control over the agenda, spending and policy decisions.

Mr. Benol advised he did not have an issue with the proposal, but the prudent thing to do would be to come up with a plan as to how the process was going to work before voting on it. He further advised Ms. Anderson commented that she saw no issues with the amount or process that was currently in place.

Mr. Phillips stated Ms. Anderson could explain the mechanics of the process, but she could not say what the appropriate level of oversight for County Council was on spending taxpayer money.

Mr. Benol advised he never said he was against lowering the amount, but if County Council were going to do this there should be a plan in place as to how any potential slowdowns would be handled.

In answer to Mr. McClure’s question as to whether any of the contracts were for emergencies, Ms. Anderson replied no, but they were justifiable.

Mr. Vaughn stated Mr. Benol made a valid point with regard to having a plan in place.

Mr. Parsons advised at Finance Committee meetings, the contracts were usually passed with very little discussion so he did not see why they could not just be put on the agenda for a regular County Council meeting and discussed then.

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

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

Consideration of the Codification Resolution for the Period Ending December 31, 2014

Mrs. Ferraro stated the Northampton County Home Rule Charter Section 606 (c) required County Council, by resolution, adopt a codification of all ordinances, as amended, having the force and effect of law, and of the Charter, as amended. She further stated the Codification was an annual housekeeping matter that arranged the ordinances in an index format.

Mrs. Ferraro introduced the following resolution:

R. 9-2015 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, 2014, shall be adopted this 5th day of February 2015.

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.

Pipeline

Mr. Werner advised he wanted to know if his fellow County Council members would be agreeable to presenting a resolution stating they were not happy with the pipeline coming through the County.

Mr. McClure stated he should draft a resolution and bring it forward for consideration even though he did not think it would stop the pipeline from coming through. He further stated
in New Jersey the municipalities received a fee for the areas the pipeline passed through, but Pennsylvania law prohibited municipalities from receiving that fee.

Mr. McClure advised County Council could call on the State legislators to change the law and make it more consistent with New Jersey's law. He further advised they could start encouraging the local municipalities to negotiate directly with the company putting in the pipeline to see if they would voluntarily pay some sort of impact fee, which would not be against the law.

Mr. Werner stated there were 350 miles of gas pipelines in the United States and the allowable decibel level was 55. He further stated they talked about the gas passing at 40 feet per second through the lines, which was not governed so there was no control over it.

Mr. Werner advised there were some community awareness activities taking place so he wanted to bring it to County Council's attention and indicated he would be bringing forth a resolution.

PrimeCare Medical Audit

In response to Mr. Vaughn's question as to whether there had been a recent audit of PrimeCare Medical, who was the healthcare provider for the Prison, Mr. Stephen Barron, Controller, stated their contract had not been audited. He further stated they made a recommendation when they did the Inmate Revenue Account that a fee was charged to the inmates so they were not overwhelming the system and had a legitimate need to be seen. He noted there were a very limited number of companies providing this service.

Mr. Barron advised they would not have access to all of PrimeCare Medical's records because there were some Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act issues involved based on services provided.

In answer to Mr. McClure's question as to whether they would be able to see the costs, Mr. Barron replied they would be.
In response to Mr. Kraft’s question as to the reason for the audit, Mr. Vaughn stated it was a large contract and he felt it was important to ask for an audit.

Mr. Brown advised PrimeCare Medical had been at the Prison for 14 years and he had not been able to find any audits. He further advised he had planned to recommend the Controller’s Office look at the contract.

Mr. Barron recommended Mr. Vaughn look at the year-end audits to see if that contract was pulled by the external auditors because there may be some notes in that audit.

Mr. McClure suggested, and County Council agreed, a resolution be prepared for the next meeting authorizing an audit of PrimeCare Medical.

Economic Development Committee Meeting

Mrs. Ferraro stated at the Economic Development Committee meeting, Ms. Diane Donaher, Director of the Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED), introduced the new members of her staff and provided an overview of the department’s reorganization. She further stated that Ms. Becky Bradley from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission gave a presentation regarding the return the environment provided to the Lehigh Valley.

Mr. Parsons advised he felt DCED was moving in the right direction and their mission looked great because during his time on County Council, DCEC was presented in a negative light so he was anxious to see how they moved forward.

Finance Chairman

Mr. Geissinger stated as Chairman of the Finance Committee, he would set up a meeting with Mr. Brown and the Procurement Office to discuss the ramifications of the decision County Council made tonight and to insure it moved forward efficiently as possible.
Adjournment

Mr. Kraft made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Parsons seconded the motion.

The motion to adjourn passed unanimously by acclamation.

Linda M. Zembo
Acting Clerk to Council