

StreamBox

>> Real e.

>> The meeting is live, Mr. Alison.

>> Welcome to the Williamsport budget work session number one.

It is Monday evening, November 30th, 2020.

It is roughly five minutes after 7:00.

This is our annual budget review.

We have items for tonight, departments and funds and then we're going to finish the rest on Wednesday evening at 7:00.

And then Thursday evening at 6:30, we will have our regular council session, which is going to be brief.

But it is also going to include finishing out the first round of the budget and maybe making changes, whatever that night.

That is usually the process that we work through over the years.

So we will get right into to tonight.

Item one under our budget review is the utility fund, river valley transit file.

So welcome Mr. (name?)

>> Good evening.

How is everybody.

>> RANDY ALLISON: We're all good.

How are you doing.

>> I'm doing fabulous.

I want to start this off so everybody is on the same page we have operated within this budget for the last six months because the fiscal budget goes from July 1st to June 30th.

So council technically adopted this budget April 16th, 2020 when it was approved by the state and -- it was approved by resolution 9019 with the local share.

So what I'm going to present, we have already used 23% of the budget.

Operating expenses charged to report period salaries and wages operations \$2,038,693.

Other operating expenses \$186,423.

Salaries and wages other \$2,006,332.

Other operating expense -- absences \$173,377.

Fringe benefit cost \$2,383,328.

Services \$406,920.

Fuel \$406,920.

I'm sorry 372, 174.

Other materials and supplies \$344,366.

Tires and tubes 56,654.

Utilities \$163,277.

Casualty and liability cost \$140,697.

Miscellaneous expenses 269.

650.

10,174.

Para transit fringe benefits \$3,391.
Purchased transportation para transit 136,344.
Total operating expenses charged to report period 8,690,801.
>> Keep going.
>> Applied reconciling items.
Planning expense 104,203.
PHTW.
>> M.
>> 21,588.
Total operating expenses, 8,817,000 -- 588 I'm sorry.
Nonsubsidy federal noneligible revenue \$565,004.
Organization paid fares 150,456.
Fair box revenue nonfixed routes passenger fares 21,704.
Other federal eligible revenue advertising and charter 100,000.
Total nonsubsidy eligible revenue 837,184.
Nonsubsidy noneligible revenue.
Other federal -- federal noneligible revenue 1,710,009 -- or 653.
Total nonsubsidy revenue 2,547,837.
Operating deficit 6,268,751.
Federal operating grant cares \$1,135,811.
Planning revenue \$64,187.
Act 44 grant imagine charged state share \$4,642,549.
Act 44 operating grant amount charged local share 426 -- \$426,204.
Operating assistance 6,000,200 -- 268,751.
>> RANDY ALLISON: That's the balance budget.
Any questions from council tonight on the budget?
Yeah, Randy if I could ask a question.
>> RANDY ALLISON: Sure.
>> The difference between the budget and the total budget lines on this chart.
For instance the budget and total budget lines show at the bottom of the chart show the same operating assistance of 6,000,247.
And then the operating balance surplus is the total coming in from county, I see.
But explain to me by and large the numbers in the -- the numbers in the far right column seem to be less than the county operating amount.
Correct?
>> For the total budget or the Clinton county.
>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Total budget.
The budget seems to include the Clinton county numbers.
Whereas the total budget does not.
Correct?
>> Do you want me to answer.
>> Yeah.
>> The Clinton county is a demonstration grant.

It has all of our expenses.

When you submit it to the state for the coa, the demonstration grant has to come out of that.

That is what is at the bottom.

The total expenses are 322.

We have to include a piece for the fair box revenue.

That is the difference.

So that has got to come out of your -- your expenses to start with.

Clinton county comes out and that is your state operating budget that gets submitted.

After this year, we won't have the Clinton county demonstration grant.

It is over this year.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

Are we moving forward with Clinton county in any capacity.

Sorry about that.

Or is that the -- is the Clinton county grant over and that is the end of [Indiscernible]

>> Penn dot is evaluating the numbers.

It does not look promising.

The numbers are not high enough to off set the costs to have the Clinton county piece keep running.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

Understood.

And then this budget obviously looks totally different than the budget that we saw last year for RBT.

Help me to understand.

I know we received some items earlier today that I haven't had a ton of time to review.

But -- and Adam, you will be at the next budget session as well.

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

So we can ask further questions on this if we need to.

>> Yes.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Only because it looks different than I'm used to it looking in the budget packet.

I'm trying to reconcile what I was expecting to get from this.

Randy, I can yield any other questions.

And Nicole.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Mr. Yoder.

>> ADAM YODER: Yeah.

Quick question.

I notice the cares grant.

That is something that wasn't there last year.

1.1 and change million dollars.

What would have happened if we hadn't had that money.

It appears to me that we would be in the hole \$1.1 million and then some.

What would have happened in that scenario?

That is money that we can't rely on I'm going to assume if not next year the years after.

>> We have a \$2.5 million federal operating grant that is for budget year 2021 that we haven't even applied for yet.

We have three years to apply for it.

The feds told us to use the cares money first.

But if cares wouldn't have been here, that would -- that line item 1.1 would have been 2.5.

>> ADAM YODER: Okay.

>> And we actually have 7.2 of the cares money that we can use over the next three years.

>> Correct.

>> ADAM YODER: Okay.

>> Adam, can I follow up on that real quick.

>> ADAM YODER: Please do.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Just trying to understand if that number were 2.5, where would that have gone?

What services would be provided that we're not providing with this 1.1.

Sorry.

Help me understand.

Or the 2.5 that would have kicked in in fiscal year 2021-2022.

>> Ask me that again.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: You said --

>> The difference of the 1.1 versus the 2.5.

What would we use the difference for.

>> The 1.1 right now includes -- it is lower than the 2.5 would have been normally because normally we didn't include under nonfederal noneligible revenue there are revenues in there that per the state and the auditors we have to include that we hadn't included in past years on the report.

So our 2.5 was used up and that money was used for other things.

So what would happen is we would use our federal first, our 2.5 million and then the 4.62 of our expenses didn't meet what our revenues were.

Part of the 4.6 would have been deferred state money that you can use the next year.

Make sense.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Somewhat.

It is just the whole being halfway through the budget year.

[Indiscernible] and so we will be moving forward with cares money rather than other federal allocations it looks like for the next two to three years.

Is that correct.

>> We have the 7.2 that we can use over the next three years.

We have the 2.5 that the feds are saying don't apply for until we have exhausted the 7.2.

We have three years to apply for that.

We haven't gotten our allocation for FY21-22 from the feds yet.

We will get that in the spring.

And then we have three years to apply.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Got it.

Okay.

All right.

Then Adam, sorry to steal the court from you.

I was trying to understand that a little better.

I think I got it.

>> ADAM YODER: No worries.

Dave had his hand up.

I have a couple more questions but I'll let Dave go if he wants to go.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Bonnie as well.

Trying to work everyone in.

I think Bonnie may have --

>> The only thing that I would like to ask you stated that Clinton county won't be part of this -- this is the last year for Clinton county.

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> BONNIE KATZ: I thought we were going for regionalization.

And with regionalization we were able to get more funding for RVT.

And if you're taking away from this, would that create a problem with some of the funding that you might get?

>> No.

Because what Penn dot is requesting that we do is basically pull Clinton county out, reevaluate everything, come up with new roots when I spoke to deputy secretary granger, I explained to her that what our goal with river valley transit was to connect to all other transit agencies, help people to get to where they want to go, whether it be state college, southward, connect to rabbit transit and get people to Lancaster area Harrisburg.

She thought it was an excellent idea but she felt we needed to do it to -- due to the funding restraints and COVID-19 dropping the numbers drastically in the Clinton county piece.

We basically needed to not waste money on it at this time.

Let things settle down.

Reevaluate.

Come up with new roots and try to do another full study of the Clinton county piece.

At this time, we're averaging about eight riders a day.

Which is not good.

Lock haven was a key element in this.

Not knowing when they are going to reopen, it does create some issues with Penn dot saying that they will fund the operations in that area.

Without knowing the numbers will come back.

>> BONNIE KATZ: So it is a possibility that it will come back on the boards eventually, if everything is back to what is let's put in quotes normal.

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> BONNIE KATZ: All right.

I can understand.

Eight passengers does not pay for the gas.

>> No.

It averages about -- what did we figure out?

\$150 a day per bus.

To run that piece.

>> BONNIE KATZ: It is not cost effective right now.

>> No.

The numbers are just not there.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okay.

>> The biggest -- I'm going to call it the biggest ticket item up there was the super Wal-Mart mill hall.

But, you know, if you're going from Williamsport to that super Wal-Mart, you're jumping on three different buses to get there.

And it is just not feasible at this time.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okie-dokie.

Thank you.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Dave.

>> DAVID BANKS: Yeah I'm wondering why it is not included in the total budget, budget item line.

>> Is that the one that you didn't move over.

>> It is 20,000.

>> Is that the one --

>> The packet that you got today, I'm assuming you got today, has that corrected.

It didn't pull --

>> Yeah.

>> That's why the total expenses are 8,816,588 versus what is on the screen.

>> It didn't carry over from when we originally did it.

I apologize.

>> DAVID BANKS: All right.

Thank you.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Adam.

>> ADAM YODER: Yeah a general comment.

We got a different one that has more detail today.

I didn't get a chance to look at it.

I think moving forward the more information the better will be helpful to answer a lot of our questions and what have you.

I'm not sure why that one wasn't included in here.

But some feedback for the future, something like that or what we got last year would be good.

Over the next few years we have 7 point million whatever cares money.

Outside of expanding all of the other transit agencies, what are the plans on how we're going to use that money?

What are -- Adam, what are you looking at as far as a strategy to leverage that money.

Talk to me a little bit about that.

Please.

>> ADAM YODER: The current plan is basically hold on to as much as we can not knowing what

the future holds for funding.

>> Okay.

So we definitely keep things operating, keep our bus routes running, stay on time, stay on schedule.

Our numbers are climbing right now.

We're at about 70% from what we were previous -- prior to COVID.

So the numbers did tank for a while.

They are climbing back up.

People are riding the bus again.

Our current goal is just to keep everything functioning.

We did put that 7.2 million completely in operating.

We did not look at any capital projects with it.

Knowing that, you know, there's so many unknowns in the future.

I know Penn dot is concerned about what their funding will look like in the 21-22 fiscal year.

They made us aware of that.

So our goal currently is to stockpile money basically.

Just to be sure that if, you know, for some reason we should have a year where the funding source drops drastically, we can carry through.

>> ADAM YODER: Okay.

And mayor, this might be a question more for you than Adam.

Either one of you.

Have you guys had any discussions or is there any plans on regionalizing this into an authority?

If this thing is going to continue to grow, it seems to me that would probably be the best route to go for all ratepayers in county, in the city, out of county.

>> Sorry.

Go ahead.

>> No.

You're good.

Go ahead.

>> I was going to say we've had -- we've initiated these conversations with Penn dot.

Penn dot has been heavily involved as Adam mentioned earlier.

And so they're along with us reviewing all of the routes, all of the numbers and working with us, you know, on the best path forward.

Yeah.

Penn dot is heavily involved in those conversations and we're having those regularly.

Yes.

Absolutely.

We're exploring that possibility and in conjunction with Penn dot looking to see what that would look like for us and what it would look like for the region.

>> ADAM YODER: Do you have any kind of timelines associated with that or very exploratory.

>> Yeah.

I don't think there is a time frame right now.

>> ADAM YODER: Okay.

>> Obviously the numbers were skewed this year due to COVID.

So from our standpoint and from Penn dot's, as they obviously have to approve these type of things.

So I think they wanted a little more obviously see what the numbers would look like.

Once we, quote/unquote, return to normal and regionalization or additional fixed routes might look like.

>> Can I jump in real quick.

>> Yeah.

Go ahead.

>> So just to jump on that, I've held conversations with like rich Farr, for example from rapid transit.

He wants to get together.

He has a ten county system south of us.

He currently does para transit into the five counties below.

He is anxious to work with us and help us navigate through those five counties below with his contacts.

I've talked to other transit agencies, their CEOs, directors, et cetera.

We're definitely expanding our horizons and working with all of these other agencies to look at regionalization and -- I don't want to speak for mayor slaughter but here our goal is to become a ten county authority or a ten county regionalization of some sort.

Like I said, touch every other transit agency out there.

>> At the same time just to piggy back a little bit, we want to make sure that we don't count our ducks before they hatch.

>> Exactly.

>> That's why every step of the way here we're keeping pen dot involved, making sure that we don't get the cart in front of the horse and ourselves.

Just to make sure that everything is lined up.

Primarily to make sure that it is lined up for the way that pen dot wants to see it and it is lined up for us as well this isn't in the budget session.

It will be later.

But something that we should really figure out on our departmental earning section is indirect cost for the Williamsport transportation.

We have \$75,000 in here of revenue that we're getting from RVT into the city budget.

I think -- I feel very confident saying that city -- city departments are spending a lot more time over at RVT supporting RVT.

That number should probably be six figures at least.

Between HR, finance, IT, even the mayor's office.

I know mayor slaughter, you're over there.

Just an observation.

That is something that we should really look at over the next number of years as long as that -- as long as the city proper is supporting RVT.

>> The only question that I have, Adam, didn't we start last year doing some exchanges with rapid transit?

Aren't there some short runs that we're using?

I can remember seeing the vehicles up here.

>> Rapid transit does it themselves through the MA trips.

If an individual down in thatir has to go to UPMC or a doctor up this way, they have all rights to bring that person up here.

We receive nothing from that.

>> BONNIE KATZ: I thought we were trying to get into an exchange program with them last year if I remember at budget time.

>> Yeah.

There was some conversation of that between the previous administration and Mr. Farr and things kind of fell through.

We are definitely going to hold that conversation again and see what we can do to all work together.

>> BONNIE KATZ: It would be financially beneficial to us, I think, to make sure that we are using -- utilizing as much as we possibly can with other transit systems since we're all trying to regionalization.

Say that fast.

>> Absolutely.

Absolutely.

Can I just jump back to council man Yoder real quick, his last statement.

So yes.

I agree with everything that you're saying.

We are tracking like streets and parks does different things for RVT.

We're tracking those ours as well as RVT hours for the city.

The HVAC Jordan fill man this year has carried the load for the heating and air-conditioning at city hall.

Fire head getters, Bowman field, streets and parks.

So we have gone on the track of trying to track hours for all individuals that are crossing over and we're going to be working on billing, et cetera, for those items.

I mean, even including myself, I have to track my hours for streets and parks.

It's across the board on this end.

I'm sure mayor Slaughter is keeping track of his hours so we can figure this all out.

>> Yeah.

That's good.

I mean, I'm pretty sure if I -- if I recall, we have to do that legally and what have you.

So that is -- that is good to know that that is happening.

But especially I think with our city employees that are supporting RVT and not the other way around, there's more revenue to be had there.

I don't think we're only spending \$75,000 of our time in supporting RVT.

I would be pretty highly inclined to think it is a lot more.

>> I'm not disagreeing with that at all.

Just letting you be aware that it is happening on the streets and parks side.

>> ADAM YODER: Yeah.

Speaking of tracking time, we never got a copy the time study from July.
July/August.

>> I don't know.

>> Nicole is going to check on that.

>> What we started doing, the whole time study we did it on our time slips instead of just doing sporadic snapshots with the time studies.

When we dealt with the state and the auditors, we changed our time slips.

So now, for example, if I'm working on something that is not RVT related from 8:00 in the morning until 10:00, toy track it.

Those two hours went to this.

These two hours went to whatever agency, city RVT or whatever.

So we've been doing it on a per pay basis.

>> ADAM YODER: We were supposed to get that back in August.

We never got it.

>> We can summarize it.

That is not hard to do.

Because we use it to invoice.

>> We will get you something.

>> Well, I think the other thing that we're concerned about is not only are we utilizing city employees with RVT, we don't want city hall -- once city hall is up and running again, we don't want city hall to be short shifted at the point.

You know, eventually it will get back to normal where, you know, we're going to need all hands on deck on city hall and not spending so much time at RVT.

I understand that RVT is in a transitional period.

Let's not forget that we do have city hall to be concerned about.

And that they're on the straight and narrow also.

>> Any question or comment.

>> Can I collar one thing.

Not time study.

I think it was Adam that said it.

About our federal moneys, the 7.2 million.

>> Uh-huh.

>> We have access to it.

But it is not -- we don't get all of that money up front.

We draw that money down as we need it.

We can't draw down the whole 7.2 million.

When you draw it down, you have to spend it within a certain amount of days.

If we have at the end of the year we would use our federal moneys.

If there is any kind of surplus, it would be the state moneys.

>> Okay.

>> Thanks for that clarification.

>> I just had one question on -- if we would transition to an authority, there's also an issue about decoupling with the city as far as pensions and all of that kind of thing.

So --

>> That's why we are in regular contact with PENN-DOT.

Because there's a lot of variables that would have to be untangled.

>> Yeah.

>> If we -- you know, if we were to move to an authority.

Because it's been -- RVT has been so intertwined.

Well, it is with the city obviously.

So to undo that.

>> Yeah.

>> So to speak undo that, make it an authority, we just have to make sure -- that's one of the things I'm saying -- that's why we have to have all of our ducks in a row.

>> Yeah.

>> Before we would do that which is why PENN-DOT has been and will continue to be heavily involved throughout this process.

>> Right.

We need to -- and I think council would like to be updated on some of that -- those --

>> Oh, yeah.

Yeah.

Obviously there is no decisions.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Yeah.

>> As we -- as that gains traction of course council will be kept in the loop.

>> Okay.

Other questions, comments, anything?

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Randy, can I ask one more thing.

>> RANDY ALLISON: You sure can.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Help me understand.

I understand the concept of PENN-DOT's involvement.

To what extent are we expecting to be intertwined with PENN-DOT moving forward and for how long?

That is to say to what extent are we continuing to have autonomy and what are we looking to PENN-DOT for decision making.

>> I'm sorry.

Liz.

I missed the last piece of that.

Of what you --

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Well, PENN-DOT keeps coming up.

They really haven't been involved with RVT previously.

To what extent are we continuing an affiliation with PENN-DOT.

I mean, I know -- I understand that RVT is constantly with PENN-DOT.

I unthe connection here.

>> Right.

>> I understand that the state is a major source of our funding, yadayada.

PENN-DOT is acting like an oversight [Indiscernible] role in RVT like it hasn't in the past.

How long do we expect that to continue.

And to what extent is RVT -- is PENN-DOT going to [Indiscernible] versus the city.

>> As far as how long their involvement will be, you know, that's hard to tell.

You know, obviously right now with Clinton county, we've touched -- we've been in contact with them about that.

Same thing as far as other transit agencies and the possibility of transitioning to an authority. Untangling as I just mentioned.

Some of what the finances and the projects within the city that RVT has been a part of and just making sure that all of the grants -- you know, if we transition authority, that the city is not on the hook for any of the grants that they would need to pay back or anything along those lines. I don't know how long PENN-DOT would need to be involved except to make sure that it is transitioned correctly and everything is aligned to their -- the way they want to see it.

So, you know, I don't know.

Can jump in.

My discussions with PENN-DOT it is more so they just want to make sure that it's correct from the beginning and we're not going to them after the fact saying we did this.

Is this okay.

Or that, hey, we're looking at an authority.

They know that and what do those steps look like.

Where we stand currently and moving forward.

>> All of the funds from RVT go into one pot with city money.

That was absolutely not allowed.

PENN-DOT came along said this shouldn't be happening.

It is not the way it should be done.

Federal account has to be in one account.

State money in another account and local match in a third account.

You can't have everything compiled together.

There are different things that over the years whether it changed or whatever that for whatever reason did not change like it was supposed to.

So we're just -- you know, relying on PENN-DOT to make sure that everybody here is in line with what we're supposed to be doing.

We're doing all of the proper reporting.

We're doing all of the proper documentation.

We know that we're using everything the correct way.

The way we should be.

So the city does not get in any trouble or RVT, myself or any employees here.

It is also being that they are the ones that distribute most of the money to us.

It is a lot like the liquid fuels.

Technically PENN-DOT has more control over the liquid fuels than city council does.

Because if we -- if you guys say that, yes, we can use that money for this and I go spend it, PENN-DOT can come back to the city and say, nope, you weren't allowed to spend it that way.

The city now has to give that money back to us.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: And I think those accounting were done done -- Adam, was it

September that we fixed that.

>> Yeah.

It was September.

We found out that it was being done incorrectly and within about a week we had it fixed.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Again, that came from PENN-DOT there.

Are certain piece that's PENN-DOT is initiating.

That they have to be involved in.

Then there's other times where we have reached out to them just to make sure that it was correct.

That was one of the issues that they reached out to us and said your funds are all commingled.

You need to get these separate accounts, which we did.

What.

>>> what are some of the takes have been corrected?

Why have they been corrected?

I think that would be very valuable for my learning.

>> And what is the budgetary impact, I think Adam.

>> ADAM YODER: What is the budgetary impact on that.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: The budgetary impact from what.

>> ADAM YODER: It sounds like there has been stuff adjusted based on learnings that PENN-DOT has offered us.

If we have done anything wrong in the past, if there's going to be a budgetary impact because of that, we need to know now for sure.

And I -- I mean, in my opinion, that -- those are stuff that probably should have been included in the budget.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Some of those budgetary impacts may not be known at the moment.

But they may be known in the future.

>> ADAM YODER: Understood.

But we could know they are potentially out there.

The budget was two pages.

That's -- that's the challenge.

And it -- Adam, to your point, it could very well be in the document that was sent.

The more information, I think especially with transit, the better.

There are so many things that intricacies involved with that.

>> If I could jump in.

What I spoke to Mr. Alison about, this budget is no longer after this going to be in the city budget.

This budget should be completely adopted as an ordinance just like the CDBG budget.

And it should be done in April when it is submitted to the state so council can approve it then.

Then the state approves it.

Then it is our operating budget.

Because it is very complicated to intermingle six months of what we're expecting to spend into a city's budget and six months of next year's budget that we don't really know what our allocation is going to be.

So in April, you're going to see a whole new budget.

So at that point it is not really going to exist in the city budget.

We were trying to do that prior to the city budget.

But due to everything else, it just couldn't happen.

And I apologize.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: As soon as -- we do know any budgetary impact council will know that immediately.

As soon as -- we're not aware at this point of any budgetary impacts.

However, if some come down the road, you know, you will know -- as soon as I know, you all will know.

Whether it is an e-mail or phone call, whatever, I'll forward it right along.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Can I return briefly to the question of an authority.

>> Yes.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: So it seems as though our kind of great every involvement with PENN-DOT is partly related to the idea that we want to form an authority here in the future potentially.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Yeah.

That is part of it.

Yeah.

>> It is the cleanest way to be.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

Then when we talk about an authority, we have talked about a couple of different things in the past.

We talked about separating out drivers, mechanics, et cetera.

Everything under an authority we have also talked about the idea of management authority.

Manages among other things employed by the city.

Do we have a direction that we're looking at at this point there?

Are both of those possibilities still under consideration?

The first would involve less disentangling and health care.

>> Correct.

I think we're landing more towards an operating authority.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: All right.

>> Versus the management authority.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

>> With the operating authority, that would -- it would untangle things and it would make it so that the mayor and council would be the ones appointing the board to oversee the authority.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Got it.

But all of the -- all of the drivers and mechanics would [Indiscernible]

>> They would remove from the city's health care and pension plan so that there would be the city would have a significant savings on both sides of that.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Why would that be the case?

>> I would have to get you more explanation.

That's what I'm being told by the auditors as well as the attorneys Jill Nagy.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: It seems if we remove a hundred people from the pension plan our our

health care plan it has the potential to cost more.

>> Not necessarily.

You're still in the health care poll which is multiple municipalities come together to get that lower rate.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

I would be interested to hear more about that at some point.

>> I do have -- I would be happy to share once we get it.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: All right.

Sounds good.

Thanks.

Thanks Randy and everybody.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Thank you.

Any other questions?

Before we leave this subject?

Thank you, Nicole, for being here tonight to help.

And lots of good discussion tonight.

We will move on to income estimates.

That would be Mr. Pawlak.

>> Going into the income estimates for the 2021 budget.

Under taxes real estate current \$15,605,929.

That represents a milage of 17.9.

And a collection rate based on the assessment information rate sent over by the county found in the miscellaneous tab.

Real estate prior 900,000.

Wage tax 2,150,000.

Local services tax 1,050,000.

Mechanical devices 31,500.

Business privilege and mercantile tax.

You will see a reduction in this at 1,746,000.

Coming up with our estimate -- our proposed budget number, being that we were shut down for approximately three months, one quarter of the year, due to the pandemic, we decided to budget at 75% of the collections in 2020.

Under real estate transfer tax, 300,000.

Interest and penalties, 285,000.

Discounts allowed, 270,000.

And tax and revenue training proceeds \$2 million for total taxes of 23,798,429.

For license and permits, the TV, cable franchise fee, 220,000.

Other license and permits.

95,000.

Building permits, 250,000.

And street excavation permits of 100,000 for total licenses and permits of 665,000.

under fines and forfeits, traffic fines states 15,000.

Traffic fines and restitutions 44,000.

Traffic fines local, 1,500.

And magistrate fees.

Do you want me to continue on or --

>> Are there questions from anyone on page 8?

>> I do.

>> Okay.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Okay.

Bonnie.

You're first.

>> BONNIE KATZ: With the TV cable franchise, did we not discuss sometime during this year that the franchises we have to renegotiate our contract?

>> That is correct.

I have not been involved in that process.

My budgeted consistent with the prior years, assuming we would at least stay where we're at today.

I will refer to other members of the administration if they have --

>> I can jump in.

It is Chris.

We are in the process of renegotiating that.

We're working withing (name?) township in that.

There have been a number of changes based on an order from the FCC that limits what free services we can ask for from Comcast.

So it is -- it is really a very boilerplate franchise agreement at this point.

And that fee is what we collect is based on what we set the rate at that they charge their ratepayers.

So right now we are at 3%.

Legally we're allowed to go up to 5%.

And that is something that we certainly can consider.

But that would be up to city council.

>> At this stage of the game I think 5% would increase the income.

The other thing is our TV equipment is so old.

Would it be possible to renegotiate getting newer equipment with them, that they would supply the equipment.

>> You mean for like the peg channel.

>> Right.

>> Yes.

Yes.

We will be asking for a grant as part of the process.

>> At this stage of the game we don't know how long we're going to be using youtube.

If we do go back to live.

And wherever we go, we still could utilize the TV equipment.

>> Absolutely.

And -- yes.

The initial agreement they sent did not have the peg grant in it and I asked them to add that back into it.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Thank you, Chris.

I think that important.

I think you of all people know how outdated our equipment is.

>> Absolutely.

Yep.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Thank you.

>> Sure.

>> Yeah.

To piggy back off of that, when do we expect to have that renegotiated resolved and come before council?

>> I would say in Jon or early February.

>> ADAM YODER: Okay.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Can a ask a quick question relate today that as well.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Yes.

Go ahead.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Currently leer at 5%.

We can increase the charge up to 5%.

>> We can do that.

But just remember that you're -- you're basically taxing the subscribers at that point.

Comcast is not paying us that 3%.

It is passed directly on to the subscriber as the franchise fee at 3%.

And if it increased to 4%, it would be passed on directly -- just like a sales tax.

It would be passed on to them.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Right.

Understood.

But likewise, the potential then revenue increase would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 150,000.

>> 146, 666.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

Is that accurate, Chris, or is there some --

>> No.

That would be accurate.

Yep.

>> Based on today's collections.

>> Yes.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

That is merely something that we would request from Comcast, that is not --

>> That is actually something that we can do at any point outside of the franchise negotiations.

I believe we have to give them 90 days notice..

>> Do we have to do that immediately then, to negotiate the contract.

>> Negotiate the contract or increase the franchise fee.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Increase from 3% to, say, 4 or 5%.

>> Certainly.

I think we probably just need a resolution of council.

And -- to request that.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okay.

>> ADAM YODER: Yeah.

That might be something that we want to consider.

I don't like -- there's a lot about the revenue side and the tax increase specifically that I don't like a lot.

And I'm sure a number of us don't.

But I think if -- and I don't even like maybe even bumping that up, I think if somebody has to decide keeping their home or keeping their TV, that is an easy decision.

I think that is justifiable.

>> I will speculate in that over the next few years, even if we do increase that amount, I suspect that what we're receiving is going to decrease.

That -- that franchise fee is only paid on -- it is a list of 25 or 26 items.

But all of those items basically relate to basic TV, cable equipment, those types of things.

There is -- we cannot collect any franchise fee on Internet or phone service that they carry on their same cable system.

I mean, that -- and that is something that has been talked about numerous times both at the state and federal level.

And that's basically set by the FCC and has been for the years.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Would we be able to ask how many people are using Comcast?

Isn't the money that is used -- what we're getting is based on the usage.

>> Correct.

>> BONNIE KATZ: And to know how many people are actually using Comcast.

I mean, there's -- so many people use direct, they use dish, whatever.

>> We absolutely can ask for it, yep.

And I can request those numbers from them.

>> BONNIE KATZ: I would like to see those numbers to see where we stand.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Liz.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Yeah.

I had a couple of small questions about revenue.

So the increase in interest and penalties, what is that related to?

>> This year it was down because we extended the -- so compared to 2020, it is up \$40,000.

That increase is related to the extended collection dates.

So face and discount were extended out.

So it gave people more time to collect the funds to pay them within the face and discount period.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Got it.

So we think our interest and penalties will be up over -- it makes sense.

I'm just trying -- I guess I'm trying to -- we're not figuring on income that --

>> Will be on a higher tax rate for 2021 at this point.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: True.

And then the building permit.

Down 100,000 from our estimate last year but up 75,000 from what we actually took in last year. Is there a reason to think that we're going to see more building this year just related to no stoppage of work?

>> Something similar to the mercantile and privilege business.

We had to shut down for a period of time or it was only essential construction or things of that nature.

So I believe back in the day we have always said the standard for a normal year or a base year at 250.

So I planned on that in 2021.

Our standard base year without any major projects going on.

So, you know, having a year to today.

And another year -- bigger construction project go through.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

Thanks.

That is everything that I had, Randy.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Thank you, Liz and everybody.

>> I have one quick one.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Go ahead.

>> JON MACKEY: The mechanical device line item.

We have about 315,000 devices we're taxing for lack of a better term?

>> And emissions is included in that.

It is \$100 for any establishment that charges an emission.

That is charged once a year not per emission.

That number has gone up in the last couple of years I think in relation to the game machines, the skill machines.

But they're collected by the treasurer's office.

I think I see Nick on here.

I might have some additional information.

>> Yeah.

I guess I was just curious what the breakdown was of that \$31,500.

How much of that is actual machines this how much is charging admission to something?

Do we have numbers on that.

>> Some of that we have to be careful.

Some of that tax information is confidential.

That budget item was 15,000 or less a few years ago.

We had a new arcade come to town that has a lot of machines, skilled machines influxed into the area.

That is a lot of the increase.

I can give you a general backdown for city purposes but we can't share that widely.

>> JON MACKEY: I get it.

I was just curious.

>> We don't track it extremely.

But because it is \$100 no matter what it is, we don't make them identify what that machine is, when they apply for the permit.

>> JON MACKEY: Okay.

Thank you.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Anything else, Jon?

>> JON MACKEY: No.

I'm good.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Okay.

All right.

I think we can go to page 9.

>> Okay.

On page 9 under interest, general interest is proposed at 30,000.

Tax investment income is 1,700 for total interest \$31,700.

Under departmental earnings and direct cost for bureau transportation, \$75,000.

Recreation program income 20,000.

Pool admissions, \$30,000.

Concessions, 1,000.

Rescue operation fees, 10,000.

Towing fees, 16,000.

Rental inspections, 40,000.

Special events, 30,000.

Miscellaneous workers comp, 10,000.

Miscellaneous codes, 1,000.

Miscellaneous controller, 100.

Miscellaneous finance and other, 95,000.

Miscellaneous fire, 5,000.

Miscellaneous police, 25,000.

Miscellaneous streets and parks, 12,000.

Miscellaneous treasurer, 9,000.

Surplus property sales, 4,000.

Bencon health insurance surplus, 15,000.

For a total of \$809,100.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Questions, council?

Mr. Yoder.

>> ADAM YODER: Yeah.

A couple questions on a couple line items.

Just start from the top.

So interest received, I was talking with treasurer grimes here earlier in the year.

And he had referenced about potential income revenue if we ever RFP banking services.

Is that something -- I know he brought that far.

I donned remember.

My apologies.

I encourage us to take a look at that.

There seems to be a potential revenue stream that we're not taking advantage of there.

>> I can talk about that if you would like.

I don't know if we have ever RFPed it.

It is very complex so there is a lot of pieces to it.

Certainly when we had cash on hand and interest rates were climbing, climbing, climbing, there was a lot of opportunity and a lot of people that wanted business.

But as we look at that, which could even be a greater positive impact for the city, you know, to the right vendor, but we have to consider our debt obligation.

You know, the other service that's we get from the banking institution.

Right now a lot of our banking is down through MUT bank.

They don't just handle the deposits.

They provide a lot of other services.

It would be a hard change if we moved things because all of our checks have to be changed, all of the automatic withdrawals, all of that needs to be change.

Especially when interest rates are higher, there is opportunity to move money around and to make more money.

In fact there is even companies that specifically do that for you, that go out and take bids for cash on hand, whether it is short term, you know, six months CD or it is, you know, a savings account, money market, whatever it is.

I think like Holman county uses three plus one and they see a couple money for doing that.

>> ADAM YODER: I know the administration for a number of contracts which I agree with generally has RFPed a lot of stuff.

I think when we're there, when this is up for renewal, I would -- I think it is something that we need to look at for sure.

Obviously like Nick said, the economic environment plays into that.

This is the kind of stuff that we could get value out of RFP and we should definitely look at doing it.

The indirect cost bureau of transportation, I mentioned this earlier under RVT's budget.

It seems to me at least this year we spent a lot more time than \$75,000.

I mean, by my math, if you take all of the budgets that we have, community economic development, RVT and the general fund, RVT accounts for about 32% of it.

With just core offices, finance, HR, mayor's office, you know.

I mean, if they're spending theoretically 32% of their time there, based on 32% of the -- the personnel budget, that should be about 400 some thousand dollars.

So -- and that is why I asked again about the time study.

That's why that time study is extremely important.

I think we need to know who is spending what time where.

So that we can accurately figure this out as well as the ripple effects of any time that we're relying on RVT to the general fund budget.

So I think getting that time study sooner than later, especially this year, is -- I mean in 2020, if not maybe next week before the second reading of this would be very, very beneficial.

That is something that we should definitely explore in my mind.

Bowman field naming rights.

I saw the announcement from the cross cutters this year.

My guess is that we're probably haven't started it or aren't necessarily there yet.

But I did want to ask the mayor, where do we actually stand with that agreement?

What are our plans there?

Since the MLB is officially going to be affiliated with the cross cutters.

>> That word just came out today.

That's what we were waiting on.

A number of people were interested but obviously they weren't interested if there wasn't going to be a team.

Since that just came out today, we're ready to get that ball rolling.

So the ones that were interested said that, you know, we don't want to make a monetary commitment until we know if there is going to be baseball in 2021 and beyond.

Now that we know there will be baseball, we can start doing negotiations.

>> ADAM YODER: Gotcha I know the announcement just came out today.

But do you have any kind of timeline on negotiations, when they're going to happen, when we can have them wrapped up?

Did you get -- were you ever able to potentially gauge any interest of monetary value if there would be an MLB affiliation?

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Yeah.

There's a lot of people that are interested.

I wouldn't say a lot.

But there are a number of organizations that are interested.

They did not commit to a monetary amount when I was talking to them.

But I would hope this would be wrapped up -- it shouldn't take too long.

We will reach out to them.

I think early 2021 it should be wrapped up and in front of council for consideration.

>> ADAM YODER: Cool.

I'm not -- I'm not fully aware of the naming rights market for stadiums.

Probably like most us aren't.

But given that MLB is there, given the major league classic that is there, that \$35,000 seems like something that might be a bargain for somebody.

I would think.

But, again, we have to see where the market is at and what have you for that.

But I'm hopeful that that might be something that increases.

>> There is some benefit to the organization that gets the naming rights.

They do introduce the field.

However, any signage that they have that would be visible through the camera views or whatever is typically covered up with the little league major league classic logo.

So we have to make sure that people are aware of that and take that into their cost considerations when they're putting it out there.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Yeah.

It is only available for the cross cutters.

>> ADAM YODER: Every time that I've watched on ESPN the Major League Baseball classic it says Williamsport PA or whatever name ball field.

So it is on TV.

>> Correct.

That's why I'm saying they do introduce the field as -- however, any of the signage that is on the field is typically covered up and replaced with other logos.

>> They take all of the advertising down, don't they.

>> They cover it up.

>> BONNIE KATZ: They take the advertising away.

>> They cover it up.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Mayor, wasn't it \$40,000 for the naming rights?

Joe?

>> I think it started at 30 and went up to \$35,000.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: I think \$35,000 is the highest that it got up to.

>> If I remember correctly.

I would have to pull the agreement to be sure of that.

>> BONNIE KATZ: \$40,000 seemed to be in my mind.

I'm happy we will have something with it.

At least it is \$40,000 in our coffers at this point.

Are you done, Adam.

>> ADAM YODER: Uh-huh.

>> BONNIE KATZ: We have here under codes with earnings.

And with the codes earnings, those are permits for signs outside, signage on top of -- for buildings and things like that, if I'm looking at what that is.

Is that right.

>> Under the miscellaneous codes.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Yes.

Uh-huh.

>> No.

That is actually -- there are miscellaneous fees that they charge that are infrequent in nature. But the majority of that comes from -- the payment on means.

You know in the codes department they have the clean and seal item.

That is with individuals going out and mowing grass and doing improvements.

So any time that that work is done, the cost of the vendor that we send out to do that work, we apply for liens on -- liens on that property.

It is typically repayment of liens.

>> BONNIE KATZ: What about the controller?

I know it is a minimal amount.

Just curiosity.

>> That one is the nonsufficient fund fee for check that's are -- that come back from the banks. So if I wrote a check to the city and it bounced, that is the fee that we have to pay or that I would have to pay to the city for that bounced check.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okay.

I was just curious.

Curiosity.

>> Small number.

But we're on track for that 250.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Thank you, Joe.

>> RANDY ALLISON: The Benecon surplus, is that an estimate based on what we sent our experiences or is that a place holder right now.

>> Throughout the year Bencon will give us an update.

I believe I pulled the last update for that and attributed the general fund portion.

Typically the general fund portion based on payments made for 75% of the expected return from the surplus.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Okay.

Thank you.

other questions or comments?

Okay.

Hearing none, page 10.

>> Under grants state the beverage license state 16,000.

The public utility tax 18,000.

1,250,000.

For total state grants of \$1,284,000.

For grants other payments in lieu of taxes 355,000.

Administration for the tax collection office, 31,500.

SRO grant local match, from the Williamsport school district, \$57,700.

And the county liquid fuels allocation of \$24,043.

For a total other grants of \$468,243.

And then under other contributions, there was the first line there, the cares federal act -- excuse me, the cares act federal grant funds.

I sent out a message to everyone this morning that was removing that.

And the corresponding expense of the police department.

And then under release assign fund balance streets, \$175,000.

For a total general fund income budget of 27,376,972.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Question, council.

Mrs. Katz.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Two things.

Explain the beverage license tax.

I always forget what that is.

>> Isn't that the fee -- that goes to retail liquor and malt beverage license fees?

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okay.

>> So businesses that sell liquor or malt beverages, I believe that is a fee.

>> I before that is our portion of the fees collected for the institutions in the city.

>> BONNIE KATZ: That seems awful Lilo.

>> I don't know how often.

I would have to do research on it.

Pull up some prior payments.

But that amount is consistent from year to year.

I don't know if it is a multi-year license.

I would have to look how they do that.

>> BONNIE KATZ: We see that in every budget.

Ways curious.

In lieu of other taxes are we still not negotiating one entity.

>> We are.

And that has the amount I believe that was previously submitted.

So I don't know where the current negotiations stand.

>> That should be in front of council most likely at the next council meeting.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okay.

And the county liquid fuels allocation, 24,000 seems awfully low for that also.

>> I don't know if Adam is still around.

I think he is up next.

That has been a standard amount since I've been in here.

I don't know if that has to do with the fact that we receive a direct entitlement of fuels.

I don't know the basis behind the amount.

We can look at it.

>> It is just a direct amount, Jeff.

>> BONNIE KATZ: It is the same amount every year, Adam.

>> It has been for the last few years.

Whether or not it will decrease due to COVID, I'm not 100% sure.

But it is average that statement amount for the last four years.

>> It has been longer than that.

And I think it is trying to divvy up what the county receives and also, you know, any projects that they may have that are eligible.

Trying to spread it across the county.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okay.

Thank you.

>> RANDY ALLISON: The in lieu of taxes, we've had this conversation amongst ourselves before.

And I recently had one with council man Pulizzi who brought this up as well.

I think we need to have a concerted effort to approach entities to give something.

We do have the heaviest burden of nonprofits because we're the county seat.

And we are the biggest city in the county.

And we appreciate all the services that they produce.

There is no doubt about that.

But at the same time we provide a lot of services as well.

That -- for all of these organizations that the citizens of Williamsport have to pay for and it just seems like there might be more room there for people at least to be made aware of what --

what is being done by some and to promote that sense of participating in that effort.

We're not out to break the bank or hurt anybody's organization or anything like that.

But I think it is time for us to publicize it more and at least ask who can help.

Just a thought.

Okay.

Any more questions on that page?

Mr. Yoder.

>> ADAM YODER: Yeah.

Related to the cares act federal funds.

I know that for the police radios that were in the budget which I don't think are in there anymore.

Not being super familiar with what else cares act money could be used for, could you educate me at least a little bit, mayor slaughter, on what other cares act funding might be out there.

Potentially we have gone after.

Is there anything else that we could potentially secure?

Probably won't help us this year.

But could help us in the future.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Do you --

>> Just to explain that -- that one.

This is an application that was put into the county.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: We don't -- we don't know where -- go ahead.

I'm sorry, Joe.

>> There was miscommunication when the police department submitted their budget.

I put this in as an off set to it.

They were putting it in as a discussion item in case we didn't get the county cares funding.

I think chief Hagan and Killion are working to secure county funds for this or other projects.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Yeah.

And we don't know yet where that stands.

That is still in limbo.

Which is one of the reasons we took that out of the budget for now.

We didn't want to make it appear as though we received it.

Because we have not received that yet.

The radios are contingent on if not the cares money then some type of funding stream.

Absolutely we're not going to do \$500,000 out of the general fund clearly.

As far as other cares funding we have -- I've advocated and I have signed on to letters advocating for direct funding to municipalities.

Because across the country we're all in the same boat.

Clearly we don't know if there is going to be another, you know, round of funding or relief.

Hopefully over the next couple of weeks we will know that.

I have spoken to senator Toomey and senator Casey directly and signed on other letters from congressional leaders asking for funding.

Hopefully we get additional funding.

That would clearly help us if we do.

But we don't know where that stands.

And so we will have to see over the next few weeks here if congress does act on another round.

Or if they don't.

If they don't, then, you know we will have to see once the dust settles where we are, a lot of these -- as Joe alluded to earlier, you know, we're trying to, you know, not knowing exactly what 2021 is going to look like, some of these numbers.

So additional funding would help clearly.

I've advocated, you know, extensively for that.

>> Which -- which one of our consultants has been advocating for it?

We have 200 contracts.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: For the cares money.

>> Cares money, COVID money, any of it yeah.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: We have on been on that.

But I've been directly involved in that.

And so I reached out to the federal legislation.

State legislation.

And so we will see.

Legislature.

So.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: And delta.

I've been working with delta as billion.

Penn strategy was involved with chief Haeg on.

I think you're aware of that.

Working on some of the possible money.

We've all been involved.

>> Gotcha.

Sow don't have any list of anything that might be out there as far as specific funding streams, grants, what have you?

It is really just high level it sounds like.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: As far as?

>> ADAM YODER: Any kind of stimulus money that is floating around there.

There's been a lot out there.

It seems like other municipalities are getting it.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: I don't know what you're referencing specifically.

But we've been, you know, going after what we can go after.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Did we get anything at all from cares?

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Yeah.

We had that -- the CDBG.

Well, RVT received the 7 million.

And the CDBG we got 9, I believe.

Somewhere in that vicinity.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Are you on there.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Let be clear.

900,000.

>> The cares money I believe for the -- for CDBG that the city received I think was around 600, in the 600 --

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Didn't we get an additional.

>> An additional 200 something der it was around 8 or 9.

>> We didn't get a lot to help.

>> Which is why all of the municipalities are asking for direct funding.

We need -- I mean, we all need it.

And Williamsport isn't in as bad of shape as other municipalities but we're all in need of direct funding across the whole country which is why you see everyone advocating for that.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Any other questions?

Okay.

I think that ends the portion.

Thank you, Mr. Pavlak.

We will move to general government.

Mayor slaughter.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER:

Sure.

So mayor's office.

Salaries 2,020,000.

Fining a2020, 3800, 2021, 8400.

Life insurance 675.

2020, 2021, 800.

Workers comp, 50.

2020.

And 55 in 2021.

Pensions 43,768 for 2020.

51,494 for 2021.

Health insurance \$35,900 for 2020.

\$37,000 for 2021.

\$179,015 for 2020.

And for 2021, 207,532.

Purchase of services communications 2020, the actual was 1,110.

2021, proposed 1350.

Hearing and litigation, 50,000.

2020, 30,000.

2021, 17,003.

Sub total purchase of services 103,400.

2021, 49,150.

SPCA or other expenditures.

28,000 in 2020.

2021, same at \$28,000.

Historical society 2020, 1,000.

2021, 1,000.

Business and grants development, 50,000, 2020.

2021, 0.

Contingency in 2020, 20,000.

And in 2021, zero.

Citizens Corp. council in 2020, 1,000.

In 2021, zero.

Newbury commission partnership 2,000 in 2020.

Victorian Christmas 2020, 1,000.

In 2021, zero.

29,150 for 2020, 29,000 for 2021.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Questions from council.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Yeah.

A random question that this brought to mind, if you don't mind.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Yes.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: I'm being reminded that we haven't seen a transfer this year that I can recollect.

Have we had one?

Anybody?

>> No we have.

Not.

What I put in there is proposed transfers.

So I want to get closer to the end of the year and find out where we are and put items that we know.

I think we have discussed some of them for the hearings and litigation when we brought on the economic specialist and things of that nature.

Anything that you see in the proposed transfers are only proposed at this time and I can get together an ordinance at the end of the year when we see where we're at.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: I don't think concurrent with any -- but the 40,000 that we transferred out of grants and business development I'm assuming 20,000 went to hearings and litigation.

>> No.

The 40,000 went down I think we were at 75 in the consulting, in the planning fees.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Yeah.

>> This brought it up to 120.

If I'm thinking of that correctly to get us through the year for the month to month agreements that were.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: 50,000 is something that we had put in last year.

The business and grants development.

>> That was last year if I remember correctly in the finance office.

It was going to be a position that was split with RVT.

I think during the budget process it got moved up to the mayor's office to allow him to determine.

I think that some of the work that they're doing may not be in the development stages.

But having the consultants that we have and their work with the grants that we have outstanding justified that transfer at this point.

And they were currently evaluating the consultant proposals that have been received.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Uh-huh.

>> And should be looking forward to bringing that probably in January.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

Excellent.

That's everything.

Thanks, Joe.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Thank you.

Mr. Yoder?

>> ADAM YODER: Yeah.

I just had a couple questions on the communications line item.

What is that?

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Oh, that's -- go ahead.

Sorry.

>> Mobile devices.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Yeah.

Cell phones.

Yeah.

>> ADAM YODER: Okay.

So it's -- so you have a city provided cell phone, I'm assuming.

Okay.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Correct.

>> ADAM YODER: Dues and subscriptions, what is that for.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: That was just if we have any magazines or any type of -- that we want to subscribe to.

You can as far as I'm concerned zero that out.

There is nothing that I'm subscribed to.

So --

>> ADAM YODER: Okay.

Yeah.

And I'm just generally thinking -- go ahead.

I'm sorry.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: I was going to say there were some magazines that I received -- or the mayor's office received.

But I don't think -- I have not renewed any of those.

I don't think there is anything there that is still -- I think all of the previous ones that were coming in are --

>> Let me confirm on that one.

>> Okay.

>> I think that previously -- we're trying to be more clear with the line items in the mayor's office budget.

And I think that could be something with the chamber.

Let me confirm that.

I believe that is what that fee is.

But I would have to -- previously that was in the supplies line item on the next page, I believe.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: Right.

So there were some things coming in, you know, magazines and things that I was getting.

Or that -- let me rephrase that.

The mayor's office was getting.

That I'm not interested in.

And if the chamber fee does have to come out of that, then, you know, that would -- that would I assume be appropriate for the mayor's office.

For our yearly chamber.

If the chamber -- if the chamber dues would be more appropriate somewhere else, that would be fine.

And zero that out.

I don't plan on subscribing to anything.

>> We will have an answer for you on Wednesday night.

I can get that for you.

I want to check and see.

I don't know if I moved it down into my dues and subscriptions which also includes the Pennsylvania municipal league annual dues.

But I'll have an answer to that on Wednesday.

>> ADAM YODER: Okay.

No I mean just -- this is the first part of the general fund budget from an expenditure standpoint that we're discussing here.

I know there's been a lot of communication from counsel's perspective as far as, you know, we've got a \$1.9 million property tax increase in the mayor's budget.

I think there is something that is substantial interest in minimizing.

To do that we've got to cut stuff out the budget.

So I mean just going through this, you know, we can sit here and go through this line item by line item and make a case of, you know, moving stuff around or cutting stuff seems to me those are two areas that could potentially go away in the situation that we're trying to minimize a tax increase.

The other two that I had at least noted to start off that effort is the SPCA and the county historical organizations.

They are two organizations that provide a great to our community.

If you look at the SPCA they relieve a government burden.

They don't play sales tax, property taxes, any of that kind of stuff.

It would be great to continue -- I think this is a grant that has been in there year over year from the mayor's office.

I don't think it is tied to community development funding.

I think that is a separate item.

At least in the community budget it appears to be.

This is something in my mind unfortunately we look at getting rid of to minimize the tax burden.

I'm not saying we get rid of it 100% every year moving forward, but, you know, in a tough year like this, I think that is potentially something.

Something with the historical society, same sort of deal.

Every little bit helps.

Something for all of us to consider, including you, mayor, slaughter, there is nothing in the contingency line item and I know we didn't really spend anything this year.

But that is fortunate.

But it is there for a reap.

If we're going to shift money around, we may have -- you may want to consider having a little bit in there so we can have a net decrease out of your office.

But have a little bit of the contingency built in we just don't know what potentially could happen.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: As you can see there is a huge net decrease as of now.

But yeah the others that you mentioned, that is -- you know,.

>> ADAM YODER: Yeah.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: So -- yeah.

We're down, what, I don't know 30, 100.

I don't know.

>> Just a quick update on the contingency line item.

Typically that's been an item if there was a contingency put in by the administration, it has been moved up to the mayor's -- I'm sorry to the counsel's contingency line item.

There is currently a contingency line item in the budget that has historically been done.

The 20,000 in contingency in 2020 was something new in 2020 or something that had stuck in 2020 but hadn't stuck in prior years.

It's not something that has always been in there.

And I think the intent on that was the public safety department's desire to get more officers out there was to set money aside so the mayor could evaluate it over the entire first half of the year and have funds to move in if that was a direction that he saw fit.

>> ADAM YODER: Okay.

>> One minor thing.

Chris, could you let Liz back in.

She has been kicked out again.

>> Sorry.

>> I'm sorry.

I would like to touch on communications.

We have communications with practically every department.

Under the circumstances, what we're trying to stream line our budget all the way around, would it not behoove us to do an RFP for cell phones and also what we're doing with our -- our telephone service.

How many people in city hall are given cell phones to work with that we're -- the cost of that.

Where are the cell phones coming from?

>> If I may, I can address the cell phone.

It is Chris.

Our contractor cell phones is off of a state contract with Verizon.

So we are getting state pricing which is very nice pricing forgetting unlimited data that is public

safety, which prioritized.

We don't ever pay for the actual device itself.

Those are provided for free or occasionally we may 99 cents.

There are certainly other providers out there that we can explore.

Hiss tore like Verizon has been -- has had the best coverage specifically in Williamsport.

So that is why we have stuck with Verizon.

>> BONNIE KATZ: I know there certain places in the city where we don't have good cell service.

So that is important.

>> And Verizon is -- was historically probably the best.

We have at RVT we actually use T Mobile.

But the problem with T Mobile is there are issues right in the downtown area.

So it is -- an ever-evolving thing.

We can certainly look at other options.

But we are getting pretty good pricing for the actual service that we have.

Services that you can't really get on the open market because they're governmental services.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Again, under the circumstances, like I said, because we're trying to cut as much as we possibly can and get the best service for the best buck, I think we're questioning a lot more at this point that this is happening.

>> Absolutely.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Thank you, Chris.

>> Sure.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Any other questions from council on page 19?

Okay.

Let's move to 20.

Just a little bit there to finish up on this one.

>> DEREK SLAUGHTER: General.

Supplies and materials, general office supplies 2020, \$3,500.

2021, \$700.

COVID-19 supplies, 2020, zero.

And then in 2021, zero.

Support equipment, 1500.

And 2020.

And in 2021, 250.

5,000, 2020.

And 2021, 950.

Total department expense 286,632, 2021.

The general office supplies could probably even go down a little bit.

I know it is not that much as it is but we really don't do much with that.

Same with support equipment.

We kept a little bit in there but that is another two areas that if council so chooses, you know, it is like paper and pens and things.

So -- that's why we decreased it so drastically.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Thank you, mayor.

Questions from council?

Not a whole lot there.

But -- okay.

No more questions on that.

Thank you, mayor Slaughter.

Let's move to department streets and parks.

And Mr. (name?)

>> Public works office of the director.

Personnel services.

Salaries 176,594.

Fica, 13,600.

Life insurance, 950.

Workers comp, 5,800.

Pensions, 77,241.

Health insurance, \$74,000.

Sub total personnel services, 348,185.

Purchase of services, training and travel, 2,000.

Office rental, 4,600.

Contracted services, 15,000.

Sub total purchase of services, 21,600.

Supplies and materials, general office supplies, 3,000.

Support equipment, 2,500.

Telephones, 4,000.

Sub total supplies and materials 9,500.

Total department expense, 379,285.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Questions on that page from anyone.

Mr. Yoder.

>> ADAM YODER: Yeah.

A couple -- a couple questions on this one.

Under the salaries tab, it looks like we're around 24,000 -- we're spending 24,000 less this year.

Why is that?

I'm struggling to remember what that is off the top of my head, Adam.

>> That's a good question.

>> That's the decrease since Adam has moved to his new position, we're not funding a full-time general manager.

So the actual estimate is coming in under because that position has been vacant since mid year.

>> ADAM YODER: Gotcha.

We should have about another 10,000 or so.

If I remember his old salary was in the mid-60s.

>> But there was a starting rate for the engineer and a bump after the evaluation.

I believe.

>> ADAM YODER: That came out of the -- gotcha.

Okay.

>> The engineers and the salaries of the -- yeah, the department.

>> ADAM YODER: Okay.

>> There's three positions.

>> ADAM YODER: And then what's the -- what is the 10K increase year over year from 2020 to 2021?

Under the -- under the salaries line item?

What is that?

Is it new people?

No it is the -- it's the engineer at the rate that he was hired at.

It is bringing the rate up into the current.

>> ADAM YODER: Gotcha.

>> Does that make sense.

>> ADAM YODER: That makes sense.

I get what you're saying.

That makes sense.

A couple just general -- as I've been going through and thinking of ways to stream down the budget to eliminate the tax increase.

Something that I had noticed that something for the mayor to consider and the rest of council, you will see the purchase of services and then the supplies and materials sections throughout the budget are going to -- they have all come in under budget.

Now, obviously I understand this was an odd year.

But from what I understand and what I can see at least, from talking to constituents, it doesn't seem like we've really had a fall-off in services.

And if we can come in considerably under budget, if we're looking for ways to save money, it seems like if we budget based on what we have spent, we can minimize our budgeted expenditure for next year and therefore off set the tax increase.

So with this page specifically, with purchase of services, with supplies and materials, if we budget for what we actually spent this year we would save \$7,900.

If we budget -- that Sunday purchase of services.

If we budget for what we actually spent in supplies and materials, we would save \$1,500.

You go through that throughout the entire budget, that adds up to a little over \$400,000.

Now, obviously there could be things that I don't know that we don't know as far as, you know, there could be something that they -- that didn't happen because of COVID.

But off the top of my head, it seems like that is a way for us to minimize the proposed tax increase.

Adam, under purchase of services and supplies and materials, is that an accurate assumption to think that this is something that could be controlled if managed correctly year over year if it was like this year.

>> Absolutely.

>> ADAM YODER: So through go.

So that's all I've got under -- on this page.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: If I could make an observation.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Yes.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Not that that is not a way to shave money off each department this year, Adam.

My one comment on that, I think we do and maybe Joe is the better person to address this.

We do overbudget slightly in some of these areas year over year.

That's why every year we see a small return.

That is to say, you know, when all of the expenditures shake out sometime in the first -- after the end of the first quarter, we see more money in our bottom line than we were expecting to and so -- and every year we keep shaving a little, shaving a little bit here.

There is a little less money in the bottom line when everything shakes out.

If we do that, yeah, probably this year it would be sufficient to shave off a substantial chunk of change from the budget.

But if we have any reason why we would need to spend more money than that, then we don't have that flexibility in the budget.

It is not that we are encouraging people to spend the amount of money in those small budgeted lines.

It is just that we do want to have a little bit of flexibility so that we're not -- if we -- if we -- I believe this year's budget drops our bottom line to \$178,000.

179 effectively.

If we shave \$400,000 in basically small change off of all of the various sundry departments in the city and for some reason those increase, we don't have a lot of bounce room.

>> ADAM YODER:

No I completely understand.

And if I remember the past couple of years, you know, you've brought that point up a lot.

And that -- in turn it is really deficit spending.

And even by eliminating the tax increase or minimizing it, we're still deficit spending unfortunately.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

>> ADAM YODER: You know, at some point we have to live within -- learn to live within our means.

It is unfortunate that we're not there in this budget.

You know, I think a lot of last year in talking to the electorate at least with my campaign, there was a lot of appetite for that in the city.

And I mean results showed that.

I mean mayor catch slaughter, you had the same messaging out there and a pretty mandate to win the mayor's office.

And unfortunately it doesn't look like we have done that this year.

And I don't know -- I have a lot of my own ideas of how we can do that.

I think could you bees has a lot of ideas how we can do that as well.

But I don't see a lot of that in here, at least from the mayor's perspective.

As we go through this, I would love to learn about how the mayor would like to potentially live within our means.

If it is in here, I'm not seeing it.

As we go through this, I would love to understand mayor slaughter what you're seeing and what

you have learned in your first year as far as living within our means.

Because there's a gap between what I think the people were looking for last year and what we're seeing this year.

Maybe we do here -- I have a lot of ideas how to slice the tax increase.

Mayor slaughter, if you're interested in, we can go through this and have a discussion from counsel's perspective what we see here.

Maybe you take this back and -- and look to come up with a second round of, you know, maybe there are other ways that we can save here and there and what have you.

That might be -- that might be fruitful.

That might be beneficial for all of us and working together to trim down the tax increase.

So just some perspective.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Go ahead, Liz.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Well, one thing in terms of strictly budgetary impacts, it is probably -- Joe understanding that way better than I do.

But from a sheer planning and look at the budget perspective, what we need to bear in mind all the time, whatever soapbox anybody got up on last year is that for better, for worse, the city has X number of employees.

Those X number of employees by and large cost more money every year.

That is not a commentary on the employees.

That is a general fact of life, whether you work for the city or elsewhere.

Most people get raises time to time.

Most people's health care plans increase in cost time to time.

Most people's pension plans might increase in cost, as ours did dramatically this year due to overarming decision making on pensions.

None of that is saying that the city doesn't need to trim our budget as hard as we can and look to minimize in every corner that we possibly can.

What is necessary for us to realize is that there is frankly only so much that we can do as a city to try expenditures.

And we need to be as creative as possible.

And Adam, believe me, I'm looking forward to hearing about your ideas and talking to you about the ones that I have.

But for us to -- there -- there's a difference between deciding because we are -- because we are in truly dire straits this yearly lated to the pandemic and the after effects on the 2021 budget deciding to cut certain expenditures this year and between simply deciding to trim all of the tiny little bits of extra padding that we put into our budget out because trimming the padding makes the budget more accurate in the long run and may or may not be a bad thing.

Cutting that from the bottom line effectively leaves us with no cushion.

I would suggest if we're interested in trimming the budget, which would be a wise idea, it would take some time and a meeting.

But that we take all of that money and drop it to the bottom line.

And then it all becomes a transfer.

If there is more money needed somewhere.

Which also adds a headache.

We add the money in the budget ask take it out of place that's we don't think is necessary and then evaluate that next year.

That seems to me like a smarter way to look at that particular kind of spending.

I guess -- and I'm not -- I'm not trying to lecture here in any way, shape or form.

But it's -- this has always -- ever since I got on council, it's been every year a grind of knowing that there's -- that there's never enough money to do the things that we think should be our priorities.

And knowing that we need to trim and cut and be as conscious as we can.

And while every year we seem to discover a way to economize.

And I think that is fantastic.

I don't -- I also don't think that there will be any measure that saves us in the long run that is within the city's power.

You know.

Any way in which this pressure comes off next year.

Any way that we discover a magic pill that makes this easy.

It is -- it is simply a matter of trying to trim where we can and trying to be respectful of the city's tax payer's but also the employees and know that everyone is doing their best to economize on the part of the city.

I said way too much.

So I will yield the floor to somebody else.

Thanks.

>> If I can jump in I agree with a lot of Ms. Miele's comments.

If we're comparing to the 2021 proposed, you know, earlier this year, we did try to encourage departments to cut their spending by certain amounts based on what we thought, based on, you know, some some period of shutdown.

I would caution taking too much out.

Once you take it out, you're going to have to add it back in and costs are going to go up and --

>> If I could chime in real quick.

Sorry.

Basically because with the streets and parks department we maintain every building.

We maintain every piece of property.

Every roadway, every traffic signal.

We have our hands in everything with every department.

You can trim these minimal items but realistically when mayor slaughter requested all department heads to give what they truly believe their departments needed, we had to sell him on those items.

And the biggest issue is for years and years the can just got kicked down the road.

I mean streets and parks is running 23-year-old trucks plowing snow that break down every day.

You have fire headquarters needs a whole new HVAC system.

You have issues at city hall.

We just replaced a playground because it was outdated, destroyed, whatever.

We have a swimming pool that costs thousands and thousands of a year in wasteful water because it has cracks in it.

The kick has gotten kicked down the road so far that now unfortunately the person that came into the seat now as mayor has to decide whether he is going to try to fix the issues, which may cost taxpayers a little more now but less later or do you kick the can down the road even further.

And unfortunately that comes back to council as well.

I've been doing this for four years.

We fixed a lot of issues.

We brought a lot more things in-house.

We cut every possible angle we can.

We tried to cut back on overtime and different things, the runs, snow storms, et cetera.

This area got taken out of the budget because it was a way to save money.

Not going to guarantee it is going to.

But there is that possibility.

As we go through the streets and parks budget, you're going to see -- I need another tractor this year, I need another truck this year.

The question becomes do we buy new equipment, try to keep things going or dump money into old equipment hoping that we can plow the snow, keep the traffic signals working.

Things are just going to keep, you know, totally declining.

And the question becomes whether or not we're going to have the money to fix it.

I mean if you want to cut support equipment or whatever out of there, you want to cut some streets out, that is counsel's choice by all means.

But logically were stuck in a position where we have to decide whether we keep people moving down the roads, we keep the roads safe, we keep the signals working, we keep this stuff working.

Or do we just keep cutting to the point that we can't even do our jobs or, you know, successfully do it efficiently.

That's my spiel.

I'm sorry.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Thanks.

I think it is a good discussion.

It is philosophical but also practical.

And, you know, it is good to have a free and open discussion about it.

And we have talked about this before.

And the main factor in driving city budget is personnel.

It is 80%.

And it is a repeating cost.

That is the cost where you save money.

Where you reduce that repeating and growing cost.

Where some of these other things are one-time savings.

Not to say that it is -- it's also something that should be diligently looked at.

But it is to really address the city's ongoing financial issues, you're talking salary and personnel.

Either that or dramatically increasing revenue in different ways.

Not to say that that can't be done and actually we probably need more of a strategic planning

way to do that and dedicated way to do that.

Not just hoping that it will happen or concentrating on the things that are already in the queue.

But planning ahead for how we bring that development in.

An increase in revenue of any sorts.

Obviously that was not going to happen this year.

With how business was affected by the virus.

But absolutely going forward I'm sure that's the direction that we're going to take because it is a matter of survival.

Any other questions on page 23?

Okay.

Let's move to 24.

25.

The police -- parks department rather.

>> Parks department.

Personnel services.

Salaries.

293,926.

Overtime 15,000.

Friday.

Aca, 23,600.

Life insurance, 1,450.

Workers comp, 13,700.

Pensions, 154,482.

Health insurance, 135,000.

Sub total personnel services 637,158.

Purchase of services, heat, 1,000.

Tree removal, 1,500.

Equipment rental, 500.

Brandon park electric bills, 3,000.

Ways garden electric bills, \$425.

Bowman field electric bills, 10,000.

Memorial park electric bills, 550.

Young's woods electric bills, 600.

Water and sewer, 1,500.

Way's garden commission, 1,000.

Festival of lights, 2,400.

Sub total purchase of services \$22,475.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Thank you.

Mr. Banks.

>> DAVID BANKS: I had a question about the increase in Bowman field items.

>> The electric bill.

>> Yeah.

>> Due to cross cutters not playing any games at Bowman field this year, we did see an increase

in what the city was paying for lights there for the facility.

Exterior lights, et cetera for nighttime.

Typically during the cross cutter season, they pay all of the electric bills.

Because there was no season and the unknowns of next year, we increased it just to make sure that we're covered.

>> DAVID BANKS: Okay.

Thank you.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Any other questions?

Mr. (name?), the festival of lights, this year are we going to have as many lights up this year?

>> Yes.

All of the lights will be the same.

The only thing we will not have is it the ceremony.

>> RANDY ALLISON: The ceremony, correct.

>> The lights go on on December 4th.

>> RANDY ALLISON:

Okay.

I know a lot of people are interested in that.

We need a little -- a little encouragement and a little joy and happiness after the year we've all been through.

And people appreciate that in the park.

Other questions from council on this particular page?

Hearing none, let's go to page 25.

Parks department continued.

new trees and shrubs, 1,000.

Bran ton park tree maintenance, 900.

Equipment, 60,000.

Sub total 90,200.

Equipment repairs, vehicle repairs, 6,000.

Repairs to other equipment, 9,000.

Sub total equipment repairs, 15,000.

Other expenditures, Bowman field improvements 70,000.

Sub total other expenditures 70,000.

Total department expenses, 834,833.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Questions or comments from council?

Mrs. Katz.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Let's discuss the Bowman field improvements for 70,000.

Joe, what kind of funding is for this?

>> You will see that later on this evening when we get into the capital projects budget.

That was part of the commitment that we were making to fund the matching funds for the rackbe grant over eye multi year period.

>> BONNIE KATZ: This isn't the score board then, is it.

>> It is.

>> BONNIE KATZ: It is the score board.

>> Correct.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Nothing has really been done with that, has it?

>> No.

But we need to have the funds on hand.

I don't know the status of the engineer working with Larson design.

But that should be about to the point to be let.

If I'm not mistaken.

>> You're correct.

>> BONNIE KATZ: The other area is new trees, flowers and shrubs.

That doesn't cover a whole heck of a lot for the city.

>> It does not.

But we use a tree vitalize grant as well as other donations.

We did plant 60 trees recently.

Little league boulevard, Campbell street area.

That was all planted and we have 40 more that we're doing in the spring because the tree vitalize grant was extended into 2021 due to COVID-19.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Explain to me the Brandon park tree maintenance.

Wouldn't that come out of the Brandon park commissions?

Don't they have funding left in that?

>> That is all in a CD.

I believe it's still in the CD.

So they don't necessarily have funding allocated for tree maintenance.

I know there is some money left for beautification of the entrance.

But I believe that's it.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okay.

So what you're saying really is that account is getting depleted then.

>> Yes.

>> BONNIE KATZ: And that was a donation from a private citizen, wasn't it.

>> Yes ma'am.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Maybe somebody out there can make a donation to parks.

>> That's what we're hoping.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okay.

Thank you.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Does the shade creek mission have funds available?

>> That is all through the hazardous tree program.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Uh-huh.

>> Which involves street trees.

That funding is used to purchase street trees, helps with the equipment for the forester.

We purchased chain saws.

We purchased a stump grinder.

We have done different things to offset the general fund when it comes to the hazardous tree program.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Okay.

Thank you.

other questions on page 25.

Hearing and seeing none, let's move to 26 and 27.

>> Streets department traffic control.

Personnel services, salaries, 886,634.

Overtime 60,000.

Fica, 72,400.

Life insurance, 5,250.

Workers comp, 41,750.

Pensions, 463,446.

Health insurance -- or 444,000.

Sub total personnel services \$1,973,480.

Purchase of services, water and sewer.

1,600.

Light and power, 13,000.

Street lighting, 62,000.

Heat, 7,800.

Beltway lighting, 6,500.

Trash removal, 45,000.

Contract services, 40,000.

Recycle program, 20,000.

Sub total purchase of services \$195,900.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Questions?

>> What brings for the increase in overtime.

It has gone up \$8,000 from last year.

>> It is the -- we just added 3% for the contracted -- or the negotiated contract salary increase.

>> Okay.

So you're expecting the same amount of overtime hours?

>> Hopefully not.

But due to the streets department being the front line to say what snowfalls, trees down, flooding, et cetera, they tend to work almost the most overtime.

And it demands the most amount of people whether it comes to a snowstorm or a flood event.

>> And believe me I know.

And what are the contract services that we get through public works.

>> Contract services through public works is for construction management.

We do pay for MS4 coordinator through the water authority.

We've held that number due to the possibility of storm water management fees coming out.

You know, things to move forward with that.

Do drawings of something for him for a project that he is working on.

>> DAVID BANKS: Thank you.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Mrs. Katz.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Adam, why was there such a decrease in street weaning for 2020?

Why the difference.

>> Because we have put up so many led lights.

>> BONNIE KATZ: And that's that much savings.

>> Yes.

We try to put up like 40 to 60 led street lights a year.

And we cover the cost of those with liquid fuels which you will see, you know, later tonight with that.

When you go from high pressure sodium bulb to an led bulb, the amount of pressure that the high appreciate sodium bulb needs to heat up the element and create the light to be bright is so significant versus an led flat panel cobra headlight that goes up.

We should -- moving forward, we should keep seeing a decrease.

>> BONNIE KATZ: That is terrific.

That should prove to all of us to make sure that we switch them all out in our houses also.

>> I would not go with anything but led.

>> Why have we budgeted the same amount as previous if we're expecting a decrease?

>> Only because unfortunately I don't know what is going to happen with this.

You know, whether we're going to be able to keep seeing a decrease or what's going to happen.

I mean, you guys have to approve my budget to keep doing what I'm doing.

>> BONNIE KATZ: What you're saying is you need the money that is in that line item to continue switching out the lightbulbs.

>> Right.

You could decrease that somewhat without a doubt.

Energy costs could go up a little bit.

You know, I wouldn't cut it drastically.

But we could definitely cut some money out.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Thank you.

>> Yep.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Any other questions?

Okay.

Let's move to page 27.

Gas and oil 42,000.

Uniforms.

COVID-19 supplies I've got nothing.

Storm materials 7,000.

Sub total supplies and materials \$75,300.

Other expenditures, paint, traffic, 18,000.

Traffic controls, 15,000.

Hand tools, 300.

Vehicle repairs, 6500.

Traffic signal repairs, 8,000.

Facility maintenance, 30,000.

Bowman field maintenance, 25,000.

Repairs to radios, 7500.

Street resurfacing reconstruction, 125,000.

Brick street resurfacing, reconstruction 50,000.

Street resurfacing, city liquid fuels, \$24,043.

Equipment, 80,000.

Sub total other expenditures, \$390,143.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Thank you.

Questions?

>> JON MACKEY: Yeah.

Randy, I just have something.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Yeah, Jon.

>> JON MACKEY: I'm curious.

I'll take a look at paint for traffic.

We had budgeted 15,000.

We've only spent \$1,154.

Do we think that we're going to get close to that \$15,000 number by the end of the year?

>> Yes with.

I'm just waiting for the invoice for the line painting that happened in the fall.

>> JON MACKEY: Okay.

>> That's why -- I don't have it in there yet as an expense because I know we went over a little bit on the footage because of adding additional line that's were requested by taxpayers on streets.

>> Mr. Mackey, remember the numbers that you're seeing are back through September.

There could be bill that's have been and ad posted since then.

Just as an overall comment for the entire budget.

>> JON MACKEY: Okay.

And then the \$3,000 increase for 2021, is that just due to the fact that we know we're going to have a certain number of line that's we have to paint, et cetera.

>> Yes.

For all intersections we're required every year to freshen the paint, we will say.

By PENN-DOT.

So when we do it, we just do all of the lines with the city.

We do get on the west branch cogs contract so that we get the best possible pricing because multi municipalities come together and bid that out.

>> JON MACKEY: Okay.

And then of course -- I mean, I brought this up before I got -- before I got sworn in.

I'll bring it up again this year.

And I'll probably keep bringing it up until it is gone.

But what is your opinion on the brick street resurfacing \$50,000?

>> I really thought that was going to be your first question.

[LAUGHTER]

So I ran some numbers.

Honestly, between vehicle repairs, plow repairs, money that we paid to citizens that call in and make complaints that they got damage to their vehicles on brick streets, we're right around \$225,000 a year is what it costs us in damages.

>> JON MACKEY: Okay.

And I've had plenty of conversations with plenty of people.

>> I think we need to redo the ordinance and get riddle avenue brick streets.

>> JON MACKEY: I'm in full agreement with that.

>> If you go to Wayne avenue, we spent almost \$50,000 there.

Earlier this year having the bricks repaired.

I could do it all over again next year because they're destroyed already.

When you have concrete with, you know, an inch and a half of sand on top of the concrete, the brick because that is the required way to lay the bricks, water and sand just do not do well together.

And then when you get winter coming that is going to freeze and everything else, it is repetitive motion.

In my opinion, it is a waste of taxpayers money.

You could pave the street and have it last 10, 15 years.

We will never catch up on the brick.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Liz, are you breathing heavy right now.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Thank you.

>> JON MACKEY: Again, I will point out that we're talking about -- and my estimate might not be exactly correct but we're talking about .8 miles of street here.

And you said we could pay \$200,000 on .8 miles of street.

That just -- I understand that there -- you know, there's history and then there is history for history sake.

I just can't see it.

>> RANDY ALLISON: I have a question.

If we -- it is one thing to take the 50,000 out.

If we -- but if we're talking about getting rid of brick streets, then we're talking about paving.

So that would be a cost we would have to budget for, correct.

>> Well, you could prioritize those streets as ones we pave that year.

>> Okay.

>> If they're in CDBG areas, then you could naturally use community block grant funds to pave the streets which every year we struggle to find streets that need done in those areas that fit the criteria for that funding.

The other thing is we could budget liquid fuels to do a little more paving and a little less of other things.

There are ways to -- I'm not saying do it all in a year.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Right.

>> If we take areas that we feel that the bricks don't make a lot of sense being in because maybe they're not the historic areas, you know, Wayne avenue is a prime example where the school is.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Right.

>> We're running buses and everything else on a brick street and we're repetitively throwing money away.

I mean no disrespect to anyone who likes brick streets.

But you have that kind of weight running on a brick street, it is not designed for that.

Memorial park area, you have that tiny brick area that you get a lot of truck traffic.

Where fourth street comes out with Oliver.

Not an area that is necessarily the best place for brick.

I understand the brick was there and we're trying to save it, et cetera.

But you're just spending a lot of money.

If you go to 5th avenue where you have a lot of older homes, history, et cetera maybe that's where we focus on saving a brick street.

In my opinion, I'm not -- I'm just a guy that is saying whatever -- I don't know.

it is just a lot of money to waste every year, \$50,000.

And we're not getting ahead on the brick streets at all.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Right.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Just to make one small point, we're not getting ahead of any streets right now, are we.

>> Thanks to GI, we are.

>> So if you can get UGI to do a bun not of work in the brick street areas.

>> That would be fabulous.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: All right.

>> Maybe we think about, you know, stamping the brick into concrete so that you have the look of the brick but maybe not necessarily the brick.

Concrete would hold up a lot longer.

Just a thought.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Than brick.

Really?

>> Yes.

Yep.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Just out of curiosity.

Do you mean at the point -- you mean concrete holding up a lot longer than brick in the middle of a brick street, not just the place where it merges with other substances, right.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Look at the cross rocks in the city.

That is stamped in business.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: And it is not holding up very well.

That's my concern.

>> That is probably not the best example.

The larger area you do T the more it will hold up.

The issue with the crosswalks college, et cetera, maybe it could be the quality of concrete that they used.

But if you -- at Bowman field we did the stamped brick in front of Bowman field.

It is holding up very well.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Are people driving on it.

>> Yeah.

They get truck deliveries backing up on it all the time.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

I guess what I'm confused about is I don't see us doing a lot of work on most of our brick streets.

And I still see the bricks in place.

I'm thinking about the ones that I travel on primarily.

Like over on 5th street.

Not 5th street.

You know what I mean.

Court and 5th up near Rite Aid where everything sort of intersects up there.

>> Dubois.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Yeah.

>> Very [Indiscernible] traveled area.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Yes.

>> Rural avenue is a mess because it is heavily traveled.

And the bricks are in place but they sink down in because the bricks -- give them the cushion that they need other than sand, it would be great.

But --

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: But that's the current best practice?

>> Yes.

Unfortunately.

>> PENN-DOT standards.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: All right.

Interesting.

Okay.

All right.

I'm done breathing heavy, Randy.

>> I'm sorry.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: I'm not offended.

I'm just asking questions.

Thank you for your honesty.

I appreciate it.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Good discussion.

Anything else on this page from council?

Okay.

Mr. Banks.

>> DAVID BANKS: Where are we resurfacing next year?

Do you have a schedule for that?

>> I can send that out to members of council.

I know jon just put together the bid documents.

He was just waiting for the budget sessions to be over to make sure that we held the number that he was putting out.

I could forward that to everyone tonight and give you the streets that we're looking at.

Naturally if we reduce the number that we are looking to use, then we would have to reduce some streets.

>> JON MACKEY: Okay.

I'm definitely looking --

>> DAVID BANKS: I'm definitely looking at that number.

It would be nice to know what that would have on taxpayer travel, their pocket books.

>> When I send it I will identify CDBG because that would be totally separate from the general fund.

Or liquid fuels.

State liquid fuels or county liquid fuels.

>> DAVID BANKS: All right.

Thank you.

>> RANDY ALLISON: One other -- to reference back to UDI.

Are they going to be doing a lot of streets again next summer?

Because I know at some point that will be wiping down.

>> Yes.

I believe they're looking at another three years.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Okay.

>> The rough number currently between city and UGI would put it close to a \$2 million street reconstruction project again.

Plus the water authority.

They're doing some work throughout the city again this year too.

Or 2021.

I'm sorry.

>> Okay.

Thank you.

>> RANDY ALLISON: We can move on to page 28.

>> Department public works flood control.

Personnel services salaries 103,220.

Overtime, 24,000.

Fica, 9,700.

Life insurance, 550.

Workers comp, 5,300.

Pensions, 5,000 -- or 51,494.

Health insurance, 39,000.

Sub total personal -- personnel services, 233,264.

Purchase of services, water and sewer, \$125.

Light and power, 37,000.

Heat, 16,000.

Sub total purchase of services \$53,125.

Supplies and materials, gas and oil vehicles, 5,000.

Uniforms, 900.

Flood control materials, 20,000.

Departmental equipment, 10,000.

Vehicle repairs, 3,000.

Other equipment repairs, 10,000.

Sub total supplies and materials \$48,900.

Flood levee certification, 100,000.

MS4 Chesapeake Bay PRP, 200,000.

Total -- sub total other expenditures 300,000.

Total department expense \$635,289.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Thank you.

Mrs. Katz.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Number one, Adam, on overtime.

How come we had overtime this year.

We had hardly any rain.

>> We did have two events, two heavy rain events where the water came up over the ten-foot mark, which automatically puts us into operating pump stations.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okay.

And my next question is for Joe P.

Flood levee certification and FS4 Chesapeake Bay.

This is money that we have set aside for this, these projects, right?

>> This is additional funding for future projects.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okay.

This has nothing to do with any of the grants or anything.

>> No.

I think we have in our assigned fund balance around 150 from prior year lines that have been underspent.

This year I'm only showing that in 2020, we're proposing to spend 20.

So that would be the maximum that we would set aside for future projects on the levee.

And we're budgeting then 100 to continually build that balance.

The same that we're doing with the MS4 and Chesapeake Bay PRP.

Matching funding for grants I guess I'll say.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okay.

That was going to be my next question, for matches.

I know there is so much going on right now with what we're going to do with the one part of the levee.

>> My understanding is the engineer has a project that needs to be done.

And one of the -- and I don't have the right terms.

But flood walls up there.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Memorial.

>> Yeah.

There was something that he wanted to get done this year.

It didn't happen.

He will have to put a package out for it.

Let a bid.

And then from there we can utilize some of that money.

I forget what his estimate was for that project.

>> BONNIE KATZ: It is one of the more expensive.

It is one of the things that we wanted to do last on the list but it had to be --

>> No.

Bonnie.

>> BONNIE KATZ: That's not the one that I'm thinking about.

>> This came about from the Army corps came through and do their inspection recently.

There is rip raft that is missing along the levee.

South of the 4th street bridge there is a slight curve.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okay.

>> It is starting to wash away the edge of the levee, which makes us concerned that it could become unstable at some point if we don't resolve it.

It is roughly 50 to \$60,000 to have it repaired.

>> BONNIE KATZ: So this is a new one on the project then?

>> Yes.

>> BONNIE KATZ: This didn't come to public works yet.

So I had no clue on this one.

>> No.

It was -- it is really an emergency repair.

But like Joe said, we're having trouble getting it all transitioned that quickly.

Jon was working with the Army corps.

They were going to see if they could possibly fund it.

That fell through.

So now we were just working through how we could fund it.

>> BONNIE KATZ: Okie-dokie.

This is where the lobbyists should be working.

>> And we have these funds here that we can use for that purpose.

>> BONNIE KATZ:

I know you have to people out there working to get the funding that is possible out there.

And every time we turn around, its going to be a huge expense the more you look at the levee and the certification, MS4, it is costing us so much money.

We could keep going after funding.

And it is still not going to cover all of the expenses.

>> RANDY ALLISON: I think long-term, this is a maintenance issue that is going to keep coming up.

And, again, that speaks to future planning towards possible levee authority or something like that.

Mr. Yoder.

>> ADAM YODER: Yeah.

In regards to the MS4 Chesapeake Bay stuff, if the water authority was to take over the requirements for the city of that, is this something that goes away?

From the general fund?

>> It would take a couple of years to get to the point that they would take that as well.

They would naturally want to start receiving revenue on the storm water authority side before

they would fully take it all over.

Yes, in a few years, it would go away.

>> ADAM YODER: Okay.

>> BONNIE KATZ: They didn't want to take any responsibility with the levee project until it was completed really.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Other questions about this page?

Thank you.

>> I think I got one more.

The fuels.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Oh, okay.

Yes.

I went too far.

>> Projected revenues, liquid fuels state 837,321.
167,000.

Total projected revenue \$1,010,321.

Projected expenditures salt and cinders, 85,000.

Street materials, 80,000.

Street resurface construction, \$302,821.

Beltway lighting maintenance, 1,000.

Storm sewers and drains, 20,000.

Equipment purchases, 155,000.

Hand tools, 1500.

Light and power street, 260,000.

Traffic light and power, 30,000.

Repairs to vehicles, 75,000.

Total projected expenditures \$1,010,321.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Thank you.

Questions?

Okay.

Don't hear or see any.

Okay.

Thank you Mr. Winter.

>> Thank you.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Now we will move on to other miscellaneous budgets.

I believe that is Mr. pawlak.

>> Yes.

Starting on page 55.

On page 55, projected revenues, 2021 proposed transfer from debt service, 850,000.

That is residual funds for city hall and the levee projects.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Uh-huh.

>> DCNR, 145,000.

First community foundation of Pennsylvania, 150,000.

Let me -- let me just put the projects with the lines as I go through.

So I'm going to go back up to the department of conservation and naturally sources.
The 175,000 is a Los Park grant which an application was sent out earlier this year.
The 150,000 are grant funds for the band show.
The next line transfer from Bowman field is 150,000 matching grant funds for the score board.
Transfer general fund, 210,000.
That is again matching funds for the rackbe grant there.
Is funding that has been assigned in the fund balance from 2019.
There will be funds assigned in the 2020 fund balance.
And the funds that were proposed for 2021 will -- can rise that \$210,000.
The remaining RACP funds for the score board project.
Cross cutters match for the score board project.
LY coming county.
Future years, 2021-2022, 40,000 for the score board.
The EDA disaster relief grant for 1,174,000.
For the levee design project for the design for the levee restoration for a total projected revenue of 2,933,000.
Just summarizing the projects described above the Bowman field for the score board, 94,000.
City hall improvements 350,000 from bond funds.
Los Park improvements, 145,000.
That will be matched with community development and their budget.
Brandon park band shell, 170.
This and then the levee improvements, expenditures of 1,467,000.
That is the revenue in the previous page of 1,000,464 with the remaining coming from bond funds, the 500,000.
Just to show the remaining funds from the bond for future levee match, 207,000 for total expenditures of 200 -- excuse me.
2,933,000.
>> RANDY ALLISON: Thank you Mr. Pawlak.
Questions?
>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Just a coupling for me, Randy, if that's okay.
>> RANDY ALLISON: Yes.
>> ELIZABETH MIELE: All right.
So Joe, talk to me a bit about what the plans are for the 350,000 that we didn't spend this year but are looking to spend this next year on city hall.
I just don't remember.
>> That all hinges I believe on the direction that we -- yes, there's been no use.
It would have to be something capital in nature.
Capital in nature with a life that matches the bond life.
It would have to be long-term improvement.
>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Long-term improvement.
Got it.
Understood.
And we talked about levee.

The band shell we are projecting this year.

Most of these we believe will actually come to fruition.

>> Yeah.

It is my understanding that the engineers working with foundation currently on that.

And working on getting that off the ground.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

Fantastic.

That's everything.

Thanks.

>> RANDY ALLISON: The los park improvements, what are they outlined anywhere?

Has that come before public works, Bonnie?

>> The lose park grant, the resolution to submit the grant was Stephanie had brought that forward in April.

It's resolution 9016.

The amount that we got -- that we have received is slightly under.

The amount that was requested.

So we're going to need to get a project put together out for design and then go from there as to how we move forward with the project that was proposed.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Okay.

>> I have to go back to the resolution to find out specifically what specific improvements were in there.

>> Joe, I think -- or Randy, I know that there was a pavilion planned as part of the parks improvement.

I think there might have been one extra sidewalk for handicap access and increase in lighting.

>> Now that those are being brought up, I think that resurfacing potentially of the basketball court.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Yeah.

That was the last thing.

Yep.

That seems to me that was the total project.

>> We're going to have to come up with estimates and find out what we can complete with or what additional funding we can secure.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Uh-huh.

>> To put a project together.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Yeah.

>> Get it off of design.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: I think we have 290 in total for that.

145 from DCR and 145 matching.

>> It would have been matching.

I don't recall what the community development match was set at in their budget.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

Got it.

>> Let me see if I can see.

That was in last year's project.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Yeah.

>> So I can get that number as to what they propose.

But they may have some flexibility as they close out things.

But I don't want to speak for funds that they may or may not have.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Yeah.

>> Lose park was budgeted at 250 in 2020.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

>> With that, I can't recall the estimates that were put together when the grant was submitted.

I want to look back at that.

But I can pull that and send it out to everyone.

If you would like.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Okay.

Thank you, Mr. pawlak.

Any other questions, comments on this page?

okay.

Let's move on to act 13.

>> Act 13 under proposed revenue we're proposing for the 2021 budget 375,000 with a total revenue of 375,000.

Breaking that into expenditures we're proposing 130,000 forestry resurfacing and rehabilitation.

200,000 as we have been doing for the past number of years for the general obligation bonds.

And not iting the investment o or the building of funds for mitigation in the amount of 45,000 for total projected expenditures of 375,000.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Questions.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Mr. Alison, can I have the floor.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Yeah.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Thanks.

Hey, Joe.

I see we're expecting a significant drop in funding from -- from this past year.

I'm assuming that is related to drops off in gas and normal activity.

>> That is the expectation that is going to occur.

That number in some years will come in over what we expected.

This year it came in pretty much right on our budgeted number.

So I always like to keep it a little bit lower to give us some flexibility if do drop off.

It is not a number that I hear or have insight to.

So we try to budget.

And then if more money comes in, we can determine how we want to allocate that.

Whether there is a project that comes up during the year or adding to one of the proposed expenditures.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Great.

Okay.

Thank you.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Any other questions?

Okay.

We'll move on to --

>> Page 59 the debt service fund budget for 2021 proposed.

A transfers from the general fund \$713,700.

Transfer from other funds, \$127,500.

And as just discussed transfer from act 13, 100,000.

That is half of the other half is for RVT.

Then under projected expenditures, transfer to capital projects, 850, which was the city hall improvements subpoena levee improvements previously discussed.

And then we have payment of long-term debt of \$515,700.

And interest expense on long-term debt, \$365,500 and interest expense on short term debt \$60,000.

For a total projected expenditures of 1,791,200.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Questions on this.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: I've got one.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Yes.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: What is the dramatic increase there our short term interest expense.

>> That is the CNN note.

That's something that we have to carry forward for the east third street project.

That will just go through -- I think that note expires.

And at the end of -- or the draw-down period ends at the end of 2020.

I think it was a two-year draw down.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Uh-huh.

>> From there we will have to determine whether we turn that out and continue -- continue to use those funds or pay it off with the grant funds received.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Got it.

So basically we have -- we currently have drawn down the entire \$2 million?

>> Yes.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Okay.

And we're waiting for potential reimbursements.

>> Yes.

The grant reimbursements will go towards the loan.

We will have to determine if we want to use those and pay it off or hold it open for I believe last year it was discussed levee or (word?) run.

Other bigger projects that we, you know, need matching funds for grants that may be secured or whatever.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Can I ask that the administration update the finance committee as they begin, when those reimbursements arrive or that is to say as the thought process evolves there, I think it would be helpful to know what our plan is for that money.

Okay?

Thanks, Joe.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Other questions on this section?

Okay.

Seeing none, let's move on.

City hall operating fund.

>> For the 2021 city hall operating budget, the projected revenue for rental income interior 250,000.

Rental income exterior 2,100.

For proposed expenditures, life insurance, 275,000.

Supplies and materials, 11,500.

Telephones, 43,000.

Water and sewer, 2,700.

Heat, 18,500.

Electricity, 34,500.

Repairs to other equipment, 5,000.

Facility maintenance, 75,000.

Contracted services, 45,000.

Contingency, 35,000.

Furniture and carpet, 10,000.

Machinery and equipment, 10,000 for a total of \$290,475.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Questions on the operating fund?

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Just one for me, Randy.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Sorry.

The contracted services refers to a custodial service that we contract with, correct.

>> That is part of that.

Also as Adam had indicated earlier, the individual employed by RVT that does the HVAC work, when he would come in to city hall to perform maintenance or improvements or modifications to our HVAC system, we would use this account to reimburse his services.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Oak.

Okay.

I just wanted to ask if -- how our contract for custodian services is working out.

Has it been a positive move for the city to go to contracting that out rather than having an in-house custodian?

>> Yeah.

I believe there is less cost.

Obviously you don't have the legacy cost for hiring a full-time person.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Right.

>> The medical benefits and things of that nature.

It has always been a low pay position.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Uh-huh.

>> When you put everything that together, I think the cost of contracting it versus having someone in house, I think that we need to establish potentially how much work that needs to be done.

Obviously when you contract out, they're there for a short period each day.

It is not to say that they can't get the work done efficiently.

It is just a matter of making sure that we get everything done, especially in today's day where

cleanliness and sanitation is a priority.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Absolutely.

Okay.

Thank you.

That was everything.

Thanks, Joe.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Are there any other questions?

Hearing none, we will move to unemployment compensation.

>> Under the 2021 unemployment compensation budget, projected revenues for 2021, \$10,000.

Transfer from utility fund, 5,000.

For total revenues of 15,000.

And then under projected expenditures, unemployment claims paid, 15,000.

For a total projected expenditure of \$15,000.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Thank you.

Questions on this?

Hearing none, let's move to pool repairs capital fund.

>> Okay.

This one is going to take us a while to get through.

So for the 2021 pool repairs capital fund budget, transfer from general fund \$2,000.

And then the available surplus of \$108,914.

For total projected revenues of \$110,914.

With no projected expenditures.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Okay.

I hope that holds true.

Questions on this?

Okay.

Hearing none then -- are we good, council?

Okay.

We're done with the first night of budget review.

Move to announcements.

Budget work session number two will be held this Wednesday, December 2nd at 7:00 p.m.

Remotely.

Upcoming meetings, Tuesday, December 1st, we have 11:30 a.m. public safety.

1:00 p.m. finance committee.

2:30 p.m. public works.

I'm not sure -- I think only finance is meeting.

>> And add hock is on the 8th.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Yeah.

>> The committee is the 8th.

Friday, December 4th, 11:00 a.m. etc.

I guess that is tentatively.

And then our next regularly scheduled city council meeting will be this Thursday, the 3rd, at 6:30 p.m.

Remotely.

Any comments from council members?

Good job on the first night.

Comments from the administration?

None from the administration.

Are there any comments from the public?

>> I didn't -- I didn't think we did that for these sessions since they're work sessions.

>> RANDY ALLISON: All right.

You're right.

Okay.

>> Shaking his head also.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Yeah.

Okay.

Then I'll entertain a motion for adjournment.

>> So moved.

>> Second.

>> Second.

>> All in favor.

>> Aye.

>> Aye.

>> RANDY ALLISON: Great.

Thank you, everyone.

Have a good evening.

The rest of it.

>> ELIZABETH MIELE: Good night, everyone.