

StreamBox

>> **CART Captioner:** I cannot connect to the Zoom. I am trying but it is asking for an authorized email and pass word. If someone could email me a link to Nicole @archivecaptioning.com that would be helpful. Thank you.

>> It is 1:07 p.m. and we have six items on the agenda today. I see chief haggan, Derek -- this is going to be complicated. Mark Killion, Chris Cooley and John sander and Nick grimes and Adam from the administration. From the water authority I have Erik, Mike and Wendy Walter from City Council we're almost all represented. There's me, I'm Liz Miele but we also have Bonnie Katz and Adam Yoder, members of finance committee, Vince Pulizzi and Jon Mackey and Randy Allison sitting in and making sure we're all honest, which we're not, guys, I'm just going to warn you and I think I see peg from the city line. Now that we kind of called the role, is that good enough for you, Janice?

>> You got it. Captioner is on, I think.

>> Yeah, captioner, is back there I believe. Okay. The first item on the agenda today is a resolution approving a collective bargaining agreement between the city of Williamsport and the FOP lodge 29. Chief haggan? -- chief Hagan?

>> **Chief Hagan:** Hello. We talked about the contract and all of conditions in it. We have believed for a while that it's a good agreement. It is on the way to where we eventually want to be. It's somewhere in the future. Obviously it wasn't everything we wanted but it's a strong step in the right direction with regard to legacy and other costs. We bring this back before you, having gone back to the union again and with the result that has been reported to you. As it was before and asked to consider this resolution and contract for the next four years. Thank you and I'll take any questions.

>> Other members was finance committee, do you have any questions?

>> Liz I do, this is Bonnie. Chief, did we -- you know with the base salaries for 2021-2024 the increases are as follows. 1% increase for 21, 2% for 2022, 3% for 2023 and 3% for 2024. Was there any way to not have a 1% increase for 2021? I think we're all getting very frightened of what could happen for next year? This year is proving to be a challenge. Next year is going to be an even bigger challenge. I know you -- I know you you sponsored this with pat Harvey and so on and so forth but there any possibility due to the circumstances that we can see where we can go with having a zero increase for 2021?

>> Chief, just to be clear, it seems that the fire department will also get an increase in 2021, am I correct?

>> You are muted, chief.

>> **Chief:** Was that directed at me.

>> Chief Hagan, you are muted.

>> We didn't hear anything you said. Sorry, buddy.

>> Can you hear me now? Okay. The fire department's contract, as you know, is a five year. The first year has already passed. In that first year they had a zero. In the second year which was the year to come, it IV be a one, two, three, three just like our proposal here. It

will be identical. So yes, the fire department this next year it's my understanding and the fire chief can correct me if I'm wrong but I believe they are getting a 1% in 2021 here and that's what we're proposing in the first year of police contract as well.

>> Got it. And then sorry, Bonnie, I wanted to clarify that before the chief answered your question about the increase. What do you want to say --

>> I knew it was a 1% with the fire department but I thought it was for 2022. I don't have the contract with me so I can't remember.

>> During our negotiations, Mrs. Katz, we went back and forth on pay early on. And the result was to lower the amount early on in the contract but try to have a similar overall amount over the life. So the initial proposal during negotiations was zero for the first year and the union countered with the one. It stayed that way sense. My opinion on that issue in terms of changing it at this point would be if we went back to the union, I don't believe they would want to change it. I think they would want to go to arbitration on that. That's my opinion on that. We're at where we're going to be on all of these issues. And either accept what we have now or -- in terms of an agreement here or we're probably going to arbitration.

>> Thanks, chief. I think that's accurate. Mr. Yoder, any questions?

>> No real questions. We've gone through this previously. We're at where we're at unfortunately. I'm not sure I'll be supporting it but it's on the agenda, nonetheless. I suspect it will pass. It's unfortunate. I was hoping that we could work with the union to get a little bit more. I think with this budget session specifically, I think we're seeing that a number of these are likely unsustainable, but, you know, we're at where we're at. I trust chief with his comments. You know, we're probably right there. So I don't know that we have many other avenues to pursue, unfortunately. I don't really have any other questions. We're at where we're at.

>> Okay. Good. That would be my observation. The administration has negotiated frankly a good contract with a handful of good concessions from the union. We're making progress in the direction we want to make progress in. I know some of us are council are chafing at the economic burden imposed by some of our contractual obligations but it's important for all of us to understand that the unions have actually been working with us to make concessions given the budget year and maybe they are not as generous as the concessions that we would like to see and maybe these are not the perfect contracts, but, you know, every time we come back to the unable we hopefully have the opportunity to gain a little bit more ground and low your our costs moving forward, especially our long-term obligations like pensions and healthcare. And I think the -- you know, the police union negotiated in good faith, the chief and the administration did a good job negotiating it. And I believe --

personally I believe it's very much in our best interest to avoid arbitration at this point. So I'll be supporting the contract. But if I hear no other discussion, no further questions for the chief, I would take a motion. Whatever that the motion might be is fine, you know.

>> Liz you are supporting it. I don't feel comfortable forwarding with a positive recommendation. We can forward it with a recommend that would make them more

comfortable.

>> I would vote for a positive recommendation. I recommend you make the motion that strikes you as most appropriate whether it's negative or no is fine with me.

>> I make a motion to forward to the council with negative recommendation.

>> Do I hear a second.

>> Yes, second.

>> All in favor?

>> Aye.

>> Aye.

>> All opposed, nay. Chief thing that you very much for your presentation and we'll review this further on Thursday, obviously. Item number two is say resolution authorizing the police to hire one police officer, wheeler, I believe it was Jordan Wheeler but I don't quite remember the first name. Chief Hagan.

>> Thank, again, members of council and the administration. The resolution before you is to hire one police officer. Brandon Wheeler is a recent graduate of the police academy in Mansfield. He actually attended with our officers officer Schwab and Heath. He is a great candidate. He is a former intern here. He is a graduate of central mountain junior, senior high. He is a graduate of south hills school of technology with an associate's in criminal justice. He is an all around good young man. 23 years old. The son of Rodney and Tina Wheeler. A great candidate with the resignation of an officer recently in late September our number went down 47. We would be proposing that Brandon wheeler start his employment with the bureau on January 4. That's the same date that the assistant chief retires. Mark retires on that same day. Brandon would become 48 only for a moment, long enough for the chief to retire, and we'd be back to 47. His proposed badge number would be badge number 41 and he is a graduate of the academy already and he goes right on the street and begins counting towards manpower immediately along with other new officers back from the academy.

With that I'll take any questions.

>> That's exciting chief to have gotten someone who has been through the academy. Bonnie, Adam, questions?

>> Chief, we are -- Brandon is going to be taken care with [inaudible] retiring, right?

>> There's background noise, I couldn't hear your question.

>> I am sorry. I'm at the store and we had customers. Brandon is taking Seacrest is retiring in the middle of January and is this going to bring the complement up to 47 or 48 once he retires?

>> We're at 47 we're budgeted for 49 this year. We never filled the 49th because of COVID. We were at 48. We had a resignation in September that brought us to 47. On the same day on January 4, the assistant chief will retire and Brandon Wheeler if approved by council would start his employment. He would become the 48th except the chief is leaving on the same day. So then we're down to 47. In the budget we have 48. Given Coronavirus it was the Mayor's choice to lower the number from 49 is approved by council.

>> Questions?

>> Yeah, no. I've gone back and forth on this one. You know, with the discussion that we had last week with the overtime and the police, you know, this is obviously something we want to look at to minimize the over time. But the counter to the argument is, you know, with what we faced year over year and the comments I made about the unsustainability of the contracts and just the way we've been doing things, you know, I don't know that there really is a good way one way or the another to vote to be Frank.

That's no disrespect to our police department. Our police department does a really good job. Chief Hagan, you specifically, in thinking about the hires that were brought forward this year, I have full faith and confidence that all of hires you brought forward are good people. You go through a rigorous process and I love the fact that Mr. Wheeler has already been through academy. It's something we talked about through the years. It's all good to see and I've got full confidence that Mr. Wheeler is a good candidate. In thinking about going through the budget this year and thinking about how we have year over year tackled the budget as we have, the structural thing that it seems like we need to do to really fix it long term is to shift how do it so we're not deficit spending year over year. I think what that has to come down is how we shift the personnel strategy. That's not a reflection of any job or the quality that anybody.

Does I think our departments do a very, very good job, but, you know, hiring this police officer it's kind of going down the same path and it's really a no one situation one way or the other. Just some thoughts as I have toyed in -- and looked at, you know, which way to go with this. Again, I'm sure Mr. Wheeler is a great candidate. The chief has done nothing but bring forth good candidates but I've struggled with this one. I'm not sure I'll be supporting it or not. I appreciate your efforts and the efforts of the police department very much. It's more of a structural and fundamental thing that unfortunately is not -- fundamental thing that unfortunately is not -- you understand what I'm saying, chief. That's all I have, Liz.

>> Liz I'd like to jump in here.

>> Sure.

>> I think we're bringing the complement up to as the chief is saying it fluctuates and maybe 49 for a minute if that. If we look at this realistically the lesser people that we have, the more over time we're going to have and we're trying to cut back on that. To me it's beneficial to try to bring that complement and keep it at at least 47, try to bring it to 48. And that's what we budgeted for. Right now, like you said, it's only 47. It's a catch-22, Adam. I see where you are coming from and understand, but we have to be careful how far back you take that complement before you really start bringing up the overtime and we don't want to do that either. Plus we don't want to put our police officers into any kind of danger because we have such a small complement. That's my feelings on this.

>> I understand, Bonnie. I've gone through that back and forth in my mind. Nobody wants our police to get hurt. Nobody wants our citizens to get hurt. It seems to me that a lot of issues that our police respond to are socioeconomic related and, you know, short of having a strategy to tackle that issue, you know, we're just going to keep seeing a lot of the same that we're seeing. The solution seems to be some kind of away to address the socioand

economic problems that increase the need we have of police. We haven't done that for a number of years. You know, it's one of many problems that this group of elected leaders has inherited unfortunately so -- just some thoughts.

I appreciate the comments, Bonnie. I agree it's a catch-22, 100%.

>> You raise an interesting issue, Adam. The whole idea as many communities are currently considering the whole idea of partnering mental health workers with police officers, the kind of changing the way the police force is structured such that first responders are not necessarily armed units et cetera, et cetera, is a really powerful idea. When we're looking at individual hires, you know, I would caution you that as the chief said this officer is for about five hours going to be our 48th officer and he will then become number 47 because of a retirement. We will have over the years and over the decades plenty of attrition in the police department through retirement. I think that we need to make hires and come up to the full complement as much as possible under the current economic situation and we need to look at ways to restructure. If that's something that we want to do and I personally think it is something we should look at in the police department. We

need to look at ways in which we would kind of restructure our response time as a separate issue. But, you know, I see no reason. Chief, I don't know how many retirements we have coming up this year but I'm certain we're looking at at least one more hire currently. And actually I did want to ask chief, talk to me about our hiring list. I see that Mr. Wheeler is number 12 on the hiring list. So I am assuming we have four or five more before we need to make a new list?

>> Actually not. We have that many names on the list. However, we have already in anticipation of the attempt to fill these positions, we've gone to the bottom of list. And between the number 14, a young man named Nathaniel Kendall who the next person in line interested. Between him and the 19th person, last person, no one else is interested. Mr. Kendall who could be number 48 if approved by council would be it and we would need to give a new test very soon into the new year. And then that answers that question. I did have some general comments with your permission, ma'am, that I wanted to --

>> Please, chief.

>> to address some of the things Mr. Yoder said if you have a moment.

>> Absolutely, please. I would appreciate that.

>> Just some things to keep in mind as you are deciding what our budgets will be in the future. It's true they are talking about a different structure, the Mayor has talked about the idea of a community service person potentially in the future working for the city or with the city and responding to non-criminal type calls. That's one of his goals in the future to try to forward that idea in keeping with what you were discussing. However, from the enforcement standpoint and it's kind of a domino effect. We discussed how less officers means more overtime and more officers means less overtime but I must impress upon you the extraordinary effect of people working drug enforcement. When you have even if it's one or two assigned, enough the right people, you literally are arresting in a year 20, 30, 40 more even as part of a larger unit people who might not be arrested if they were not in the

unit. These are people involved in 24 hours a day in felony drug dealing who protect their investment with firearms either on their person all the time or in close proximity to them 24 hours a day. These are the people doing most, maybe not all, but most of the shootings and killing people in the city. These are the people you want off the street. The more of these people particularly city officers who know this city, the more of these people who are especially assigned in drug enforcement, the less people die here in the city that. Is an absolutely statistical fact. And the less police officers get shot at and all of those things. That's not saying someone can't get shot or hurt by a robbery Guy but historically people involved in felonious drug dealing are mostly those involved in violent crimes, particularly those involving firearms. Just in your deliberations on these budgetary issues and extraordinary constraints this year. I would ask with regards to drug enforcement in particular and the extraordinary effect on violent crime in the city, that you consider the money associated with allowing us to have one or two people assigned to do that work even as part of a larger unit as we discussed before. I was -- the other night -- unprepared for the presentation on overtime so I kind of had to react to that. But that one thing is very important. It has a -- it really -- over the years, these special units have come and gone and come and gone. Every time they go, we've seen an increase again in violent crime. We don't want to see that in the future. So, you know, we're hoping you take that into consideration. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments, chief. Once again, I want to caution everyone on the meeting and listening in that a lot of this discussion goes well beyond the idea of hiring one officer. We have, you know we -- all of it is worth saying it and frankly I feel as though all of it might deserve a little bit more of our full attention at some time that is not a budget time and deliberation on a single hiring this is a larger discussion about the nature of policing in Williamsport and one that needs to happen. Chief, I think your perspective is valid and Mr. Yoder brought up a discussion that is valid and we need to match the two. All that seed we're talking about Mr. Wheeler today. Brandon Wheeler looks like he is a good candidate, like he will be gay hire, like he will enable us to keep our overtime in check in the police department ideally and certainly gets more boots on street and helps to keep our citizens safer. Bonnie, Adam, do you have further things would you like to add at this time or shall we move ahead to a vote?

>> Nor do I, Liz [inaudible]

>> Can I get a motion?

>> I'll make a motion to move forward with the full body council with a positive recommendation.

>> I'll second it.

>> Okay,.

Good all in favor?

>> Aye.

>> Aye.

>> Aye.

>> Okay, great. Chief, thank you very much and will Mr. Wheeler be joining us on Thursday?

>> Yes, ma'am, he will be on the meeting.

>> Thank you. Moving on to the next item on our agenda here. Hang on just one moment. Sorry I'm toggling back and forth on the computer. Next item shall Mr. Winder if it's okay with I'm going to boost the storm water management agreement in front of you. Okay?

>> Sure, that's fine.

>> That way Mike and Wendy can get back to their own hot mess at the water authority. . Next we're going to address item number four, resolution regarding form water manage. Mayor Slaughter?

>> His to unmute, sorry. Good afternoon members of council and administration.

This is the storm water agreement before you that actually was started a number of years ago and it's been out there since then. By reengaged with Mike Miller and folks at the water authority. That's what you have before you here, the storm water agreement. We have Mike and Wendy here as well as Mr. Smith and Jon sander as well that can weigh in on this conversation.

>> Terrific. So let's hear a little bit about -- I guess first Mr. Miller, do you want to talk about the agreement and the notes you think it hits?

>> sure, sure. So we -- this agreement was prom mull gated by a board. They put together an officer of what they are willing to do to help the city take over storm water. It makes sense to have it at the authority. We're especially skilled in working in pipes and pumps and ground storm water and sewer infrastructure. So it should be a good fit for us. We did send over the agreement. I know your solicitor Mr. White looked at it and had changes. Those changes need be run back through the board which is no problem. I don't expect there to be any issues with the changes to the agreement that Mr. White suggested. For the sake of consistency in paragraph number 1 it says it will take effect immediately I'm suggesting we have it take effect March 1 and that allows consistency with paragraph 3 that says the say will work with us to develop a list of things we need to do.

For practical purposes we'll end up sitting down with Mr. Winder and saying what are you working on? How do we transfer over so there's a continued level of service provision and it gives us time to work through legal wrangles that may be necessary with easements to be transferred over. We're fine with the changes that your solicitor has suggested. I'll run those through my board to formalize that process and make the agreement effective March 1 would help us all to move that through.

>> Great.

>> I go agree. I think that gives the whole thing more time to play out which is desirable in this case. But if we actually effectuate the transfer it will be a huge step for the city. Would anyone else from the administration like to chime in on this agreement at this time?

>> I have something to say, Liz?

>> Bonnie?

>> [inaudible] this -- is [inaudible] here?

>> Yes, he is.

>> the one thing I want to question is because we're going to turn this over now. I've been on this storm water thing like you said for five or six years. What we have to be careful of

with the budget is the water authority has been paying us \$80,000 a year. Now once they take over the storm water we will no longer be getting that \$80,000. How are we going to work that out?

>> Bonnie we -- Joe -- sorry.

>> You are better situated to address that. I was waiting for no good reason go.
, please.

>> the \$80,000 is in the budget. I wasn't aware of the agreement. It's in the budget currently.

>> But Joe, haven't we also been setting aside \$200,000 for various storm water expenses annually?

>> Just started in 2020.

>> Okay.

>> So we've been -- we set aside \$200,000 for storm water expenses we no longer need to set aside.

>> I want to clarify that's where things are going even though we're going to have the \$200,000. We're going to benefit more by water authority taking over storm water 110%. I'm happy to see that. The only other question I have is the water authority is taking over our [inaudible] for a permit which means we have no responsibility for the permit at all. But I would like to make sure that there is something on committee that is going to oversee that.

>> Bonnie, let me talk a little bit about this overall. I have the entire agreement. This is Jon, by the way. One of items here on the actual transfer. I'm going to read it because it's pretty clear. Essentially the water authority is looking to take over storm water in the city of Williamsport because it states that we lack necessary funding which I would certainly agree with under the times. Staffing, I agree, and expert. Staffing and expertise, the water authority has a team engineers and technicians across the street able to take this on. In addition to that we'll be transferring. Wendy one day. What happens if this pipe and in breaks. How much does it cost the city? It's nothing? It's on the water authority to fix, correct, Wendy?

>> They are shaking their head, yes.

>> Let me go on to a couple other items here. Operational responsibility would go to the authority. And MS4 a joint effort between the city and authority. And myself and Wendy and Marshall will continue to work together on the MS4 permit. We currently have an MS4 permit and currently have a pollution reduction plan approved. We're in good shape there. In addition to MS4 there's minor caveats with land development. Any new projects that require storm water management have to get approved by me and also approved by the water authority, is that right, Wendy?

>> Yes.

>> Yes.

>> So it will continue to be -- actually more of a joint effort because not only will I be reviewing it but I'll be discussing it with you, creblgh correct?

>> Yes, that's the plan.

>> It's a great plan. It really is. It really is. So.

>> They've got a GIS based system is that not right. You showed me that when I started here.

The water and sewer side we're pretty filled out.

>> So they have that now. I've been feeding Erik and his folks plans for every project we've done in town so they can connect the dots on the GIS system and they have a map of storm water facilities and towns, correct, Eric?

>> We have mapped from the city that we received. We put them electronic. The city provided us maps years ago and they put a GIS platform and John has been, like he mentioned, providing us with plans and markups from construction that we're able to update those maps as projects are getting completed.

>> So I -- overall I'm thrilled it's happening. It looked forward to continuing to working with the water authority.

>> If I could say Jon is 100% correct. This agreement obligates us to work together especially on matters of joint interest with regard to the permit. To be honest with you it won't work well for us if we don't work well together for the administrative staff.

>> There's an entire page and a half of joint interests we'll be working together on so --.

>> That's all I had. I wanted to clarify to folks that might not have the document in front of them. That's all.

>> Okay.

>> I just wanted to clarify to make sure that we are involved with the permits even though the water authority is taking it over.

>> We have to work with DEP because it's up to them for who is responsible. I would see before March 1 we try to iron that out as well.

>> That's what I would like to clarify. Thank you, Wendy.

>> You are welcome.

>> Thanks, Wendy.

>> And good discussion, all. Yeah, I mean the agreement is -- Wendy to what extent is this the agreement we originally contemplated four or five years ago now?

>> It's pretty close actually.

There's a different one that is more of a tiered approach.

>> In the middle.

>> and we went back to the one we had been working with, yes.

>> Got it.

>> It seems thorough. How are we looking at conveying the city storm water assets? Will this agreement take care of it or do we need another agreement moving forward?

>> I think it's a question we need to shape to the attorneys. The attorney is saying this should take care of it. Something like titles, easements allow us to button that up, too.

>> Got it. And the one question I had was actually had come from a solicitor. Let me pull it up here. It wasn't a question from a solicitor but rather an observation. In paragraph 16 there's a provision that says the authority is not debts or obligations relative to the system that may exist. What is the goal of that language? Let me pull it up because he mentioned it

but I didn't double check it against the agreement here.

>> It's not [reading agreement] makes perfect sense to me but Mayor Slaughter has the administration contemplated the meaning of this, that is to say anything that comes out of the system having been ours up to this point is our obligation even though the authority is taking over operation. If I were the authority that's how I would want it and I think it is fair. We understand the meaning of that, right?

>> Yes. Our solicitor reviewed, Jon Sander reviewed it and we did agree yes it would be fair to the authority.

>> It's clearly stated that the system will be conveyed as is. Yeah.

>> Whatever that might be, Mike and Wendy.

[LAUGHTER]

>> You have a good guess.

>> Probably not worse than you are expecting.

[LAUGHTER]

>> Right.

>> I guess my last question about the agreement actually does relate, Bonnie to the \$80,000 and come from the authority. Does the \$80,000 come from the authority. My understanding is related to levy elements. Does this agreement actually affect that annual contribution from the authority?

>> I thought it was pump station related.

>> I'm not quite clear. My understanding from our finance department had been it was levy related. Pump stations are levy related. So --

>> I understood it to be pump station related. Where that fits on the storm water or levy is -- that's a enough tough one.

>> Why don't we try to sort that --

>> Let's put that in the March 1 bucket, too.

>> Pardon me.

>> You guys are aware of the administrative responsibility stays with the city in regards to the pump station. I just wanted to make sure everyone was aware of that.

>> It will stay with the city until the pump stations have been brought up to a certain standard of operation and then it goes to the authority, correct?

>> Correct. Yes yes.

>> That is what we understood the intent to be as the county is making a nice effort to restore and rerehabilitate the levies. The Mayor said let's let the county continue the work which is excellent and get them set up and transfer the operation to us.

>> I would agree with that. I think that's a wise way to proceed. But that said, I guess that does leave a question there in terms of pump station subsidy to the water authority to what extent that remains or goes. Obviously we would love to keep it if you would like to continue giving it to us. But that said, you said the other thing we needed to continue working on was a separate of duties document that I'm assuming would come through as an exhibit A of sorts.

>> There's a number three. The city gives us what we need to do take it over.

>> Exactly. So, but, yeah. When we vote on this agreement on Thursday, I'm assuming as long as your board accepts the changes, this agreement won't come back before us again? Thank would be my guess. It's up to your attorney to tell you. Once you pass it on with the effective date of March 1, I don't think it needs to come back to you.

>> Fantastic. That would be lovely. Bonnie and Adam, any other questions or observations?

>> No I don't have other questions.

I'm happy to see this moving forward finally after all this time. A lot of time and effort has been put into it and I am sure we'll figure out the bugs after a while. We realize this. We realize until it starts going into motion we'll find out where we need to upgrade or do whatever. I am for this. I've been for this from the getgo so thank you.

>> Sounds great.

>> Yeah, I would completely agree. The only thing I would ask I guess is it's related to paragraph 16. It would be Ben -- we don't have to know today but I'm sure the work is going on from the administration side. But it would be good to understand what the remaining obligations are as noted in that article just so we as the city can plan according to make sure they are tackled in a responsible and timely manner. Aside from that you addressed my questions as well.

This is very good. I'm excited to see it going through.

>> Yeah, I think Adam that probably our obligations are some what limited but we have a handful of debts related to storm water. That debt remains with us which is not a huge surprise.

>> I could chime in for a second?

>> Please, Randy.

>> On those two be decided items, that's nothing new to this agreement. They were in there from the beginning years ago. We were negotiating. There were things that couldn't be settled right away. It was agreed as a matter of trust between the two entities and the city and authority that we would work those out equitably later. We had a good relationship.

So we felt we could do that. And I think we're in that kind of relationship now. And that's why it's timely to -- essentially picking up where we left off a while ago and expect it to be down the road a bit but better late than never. The other thing is we will -- we don't have a resolution for this for the agenda so we'll have to have that forthwith but we can proceed with it Thursday night then.

>> Thanks, Randy. That actually was a question that occurred to me at some point reviewing this item and I had forgotten it today in the discussion. I'm glad we're getting a cover for it. But excellent. Do we need any help with that or who is putting that resolution together?

>> John and I will put together that resolution. That's fine.

>> Terrific. Anybody from council or the administration have a comment about this item? We've been joined by councilman Dave Banks as well. We've got a full complement here. Anybody with anything to say? All right then hearing no further comments, Bonnie or Adam I would take a recommendation.

>> I make a motion we pass this on to full body of council with a positive recommendation.

>> I second that.

>> All in favor?

>> Aye.

>> Aye.

>> Thanks, guys. Good discussion. And we'll then return to item number three on your agenda, Mr. Winder this say resolution of city of council of the city of Williams fort adopt RBT safety and security plan. Adam?

>> Good afternoon. Part of the F.D.A. requirement for federal funding is to adopt a safety and security plan. I do have with me today Chris Smith who is the safety and security officer. He worked through this plan diligently and is the one who wrote the full plan and we submitted it to the FTA and I believe at this point we got our approval. Now we need council to adopt this plan in regards to river valley transit. I'll turn my computer and you can see Chris Smith and he will answer any questions you may have in regards to this.

>> Terrific, thanks, Adam. Bonnie, Adam?

>> Yes, I have several questions.

>> Please.

>> On page five, you have the Williamsport to [inaudible] do we need to take the city of Lockhaven out there?

>> I'm guessing that is the plan but sense we're offering that until the 31st we'll make an amendment then.

>> This is going to into effect January 1, right.

>> Correct.

>> That will be taken out of there. Then, let's see you did answer my question of who the safety security officer would be. Thank you. That was one of my next questions and then -- then Williamsport on page 18. Williamsport transportation. River valley transportation committee are mostly meeting through the city of Williamsport and key first responders. Does that mean that you have a meeting with --

>> We have supervisor Steve Smith who meets in the safety meeting held monthly. That's what we consider that. The search response in my mind is city and police. [inaudible] Adam if you are talking, we can't hear you.

>> [inaudible]

>> Still can't hear you.

>> Can't hear you Adam.

>> Can you hear me now?

>> Yes.

>> Okay. Joseph Anonea with the Williamsport bureau of police he is the chairman of safety committee. I think there's six to firemen part of the safety committee. I'm start through streets and parks [inaudible] is part of the committee through streets and parks. There's supervisor at river valley transit and members of A turch. The safety committee is complied of roughly 20 employees in the city as well as human resources.

>> Going to that with human resources and also with you, Adam. You have a huge --

according to this you are responsible -- you are responsible for overseeing this whole program. You are also running the streets and parks. These are two -- I'm looking at all these responsibilities. And, you know, I am questioning when are we getting streets and parks because you have a lot on your plate here plus I'm looking at what is going on coming in next day. Speaking of HR are we using the city's HR person or how are we working that out? Is that on page -- 13. The human resource manager is responsible for ensuring that the committees important to safety is within each job description, understanding the safety rule and partnering with the manager of operations and incorporating safety into the annual performance review process.

It's a lot of work for the city's HR person.

>> Correct we definitely utilized Joelleen. We have Kate who assists with human resource issues at river valley transit.

>> Okay. So that takes care of that. And --

>> And to answer your question about the general manager of streets and parks, we are just about ready to start. We did a first round. We actually offered to an individual that was not unfortunately to accept it. We're ready to start a second round here in the future of interviews for the GM position.

>> I question only because, you know, we're going to start a new year and let's start it with a full complement of people that we have everybody doing the job they are supposed to be doing. And especially now within -- whatever 48 hours we're going to have a specific snowstorm and it's going to put an awful lot of responsibility on Adam --

>> I fully agree. We're hopeful if not beforehand than to have everybody and all the positions filled. I agree with you on that.

>> Thank you, Mayor.

>> Mine is more process oriented. I know that the date on this was adopted in September. Sounds like it was submitted to FTA at that point. Can you walk me through the process from adoption to council of what have you. It struck me at odds with this gap.

It's probably by design. Trying to understand that a little bit.

>> Correct. Because this is the first time they've ever requested such a document.

>> Okay.

>> Chris worked on it for six months. We forwarded it on to solicitor Nagy as well as FTA at that point. If there were any changes they wanted to see, the information was vague because of now new a document it was they were requesting. We did send it on to them so we could have it 100% before we brought it to council.

>> Gotcha, okay. The timeline from then approving it from when we sent it in was extended. Originally it was in in July. They extended it to December 31 678 we got ours -- December 31. We got ours in September. Chris worked diligently on this and put focus and effort into this document so.

We did want to give it to them and make sure the ducks were in a row as far as how the lay out was, the information was correct. They ended up coming back with an approval instead of you need to fix this which was great. Don't get me wrong. But we were hoping to have that sooner than we recently received it. We knew everything was good. We need to get it

approved but we found out that they were happy with it. I think the process of them reviewing it and giving us their --

>> Gochal.

That's not un-- gotcha. That's not uncommon at all. I figured it was the case. It stuck out to me. I wanted to understand that better. The only thing that stuck out to me not really for this but moving forward, since we updated the codified ordinances back in September, moving forward -- it's legally a department versus a bureau. I don't know if that formal language will flag anything in the future. As things get updated as everything is lined up legally and accordingly.

>> We put Williamsport bureau of transportation and river valley transit in there. It does still hold both dbas. We're working to try to clean that up, too much it covers us on the safety comshes side as well as -- insurance side as well.

>> That makes sense. We did that at the time you submitted it anyway.

It's not a criticism. It's a thought that popped into my head, you know what I mean.

Whenever we do legal updates it's an example of the ramifications we need be cog nant of. That's all -- cognizant of.

>> Absolutely.

>> Chris wants to say something, sorry.

>> What you have in front of you is just the safety plan.

That's clearly what it is. From the FTA they made us do a safety plan for the transit agency. I'm in the process of now of working with the TSA to complete a security plan. They want two separate plans set up. When he was saying safety and security, this is purely safety. I'm working with the TSA and doing the security plan for RVP.

>> Gotcha.

>> I wanted to be clear so it's not confusing.

>> No, understood. I appreciate that tidbit as well. That's good to know.

>> Does anyone else have observations to make about this item? Hearing nothing, I would just say that I'm glad that this process went well. Adam Yoder you are right. It seems slightly confusing that the whole thing would get submitted and approved before it came to us. You know, government agencies have their curious ins and outs and --

>> Very much so.

>> and we're following the letter of law as prescribed by our state and federal overseers here, whatever that might be and however obscure it might seem to us at times. If I hear no further comments on this item, I would take a motion --

>> Yeah, I'm make a motion to forward to the full body council with a positive recommendation.

>> Second.

>> Okay. Thank you all in favor?

>> Aye,.

>> Aye,.

>> Aye.

>> Okay. Excellent. And then the -- we have two further items on the agenda one of them is

any related items but item number five is a discussion on the Mayor's budget cut proposal. At our last City Council meeting Thursday we requested the administration to find an additional \$434,000 to cut from the budget in order to bring us to a -- well, excuse me either \$344,000 to cut -- 434,000 to cut or a means of augmenting our income in the 2021 budget such that we could reduce the increase to .5mils this year. The administration proposed a 2.25mil tax increase. They reduced the increase and we asked the administration to fund the remaining .5mil so we could reduce the increase to a total increase of .5mils. The Mayor has proposed a mechanism for finding that \$434,000 as a cut to the budget and we're here to discuss that in finance. We can continue to discuss it in front of full body in council Thursday but the idea of this discussion was to give the administration some

idea of how City Council is leaning or the finance committee is leaning on the proposed budget cut so that they'll have time provide further information for us as necessary and or look for alternatives if general sense that this is not something the City Council would find acceptable as a cut. Mayor Slaughter would you like to discuss what they are proposals.

>>

>> There's \$850,000 in the city hall account. As you mentioned we were tasked with trying to find \$434,000 of additional savings around half a million. What we're proposing is \$450,000 out of the city hall account. That leaves \$400,000 in there. Generally speak Joe Pawlak said we like to keep around a year's worth in there which is around \$300,000. We would still have \$400,000 in there. We felt as though the easiest way for this would be to transfer the \$450,000, utilize this account for \$450,000 which gives us a million of savings. It buys us some time on the borrowing. What this does here is reducing that account but leaves a good chunk in there. As we get into the early parts of 2021, we can really look at the borrowing. What that amount not to exceed or how council and administration so choses to do it and what that amount would be instead of trying to, in my opinion here, scramble and trying to figure out the borrowing

relatively quickly. We have this money available and so we can go ahead and utilize it and then -- coming up with a plan for what we might need. Working with Joe Pawlak we decided this is the cleanest route to take. It takes \$300,000 in rent that we essentially pay ourselves for 2021. We take that \$300,000 and then another \$150,000 out of it and that leaves at us \$400,000.

>> Thank you for that explanation. A handful of questions here moving forward. Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Pawlak, exactly what this looks like. Borrowing was related to bowman field and the pool. We cut the \$70,000 going to bowman this year, correct? Last meeting is a blur. Did we actually cut that \$70,000?

>> We did not.

>> So the \$70,000 for bowman remains in the budget which allows for scoreboard.

>> Yes, and it provides the plan that was submitted with the application to fund the matching funds.

>> I'm trying to understand what the administration is visualizing as at process. That \$850,000 as we're all aware is enough begin money to begin funding handicapped

improvements to city hall or a move to city hall as another facility as determined by the ad-hoc committee moving forward.

If we utilize that for general budget expenditures this year, then we effectively have no funds in our bank account to begin that process. I guess Mr. Pawlk, my first question is talk to me about the debt ceiling for a city of our size. I know we have a maximum amount of debt we can talk on. You know, where we are in regards to -- I know we're not close to it at this point.

>> I want to say it's a certain times your annual operating revenues, but I would have to go back through the -- I would have to look at that.

>> Could you figure that out for me by Thursday by any chance?

>> sure. When council suggested borrowing, when I suggested borrowing in the Thursday meeting and I'll take responsibility for that and I'm not proud of it because I won't like borrowing, we talked about it potentially for the further man in we're putting into bowman field because interest rates are so historically low. As well as improvements to the pool. That amount to me was coming into something maybe \$450,000 something like that at the absolute max. If part of what we're contemplating by pulling this money out of city hall fund is borrowing for improvements to city hall which makes a fair amount of sense don't get me wrong. Then I think we need to understand exactly what the scope of that proposed borrowing is before I would be willing to commit to pulling this money out of city hall fund. Because I think I need to understand what it's going to do to our -- to how close we are to our debt ceiling. Our debt right now, Joe is what? About \$12 million?

>> the general fund breakdown or in total?

>> In total. The city's -- I'm not speaking of RBT the city's total debt load or that RBT's debt should factor into that somehow. That's a secondary question I have.

>> I'll have to see where we're at on the bond right now.

>> Got it. Anyway, I'm trying to understand if -- is it then the proposal of the administration to take out a rather large chunk of debt this year? Is that what I'm hearing? What we're proposing is this would give us some time to. What this does is it still gives us if we want to proceed any -- we still have 400,000 which is a large chunk to get us started.

>> You told me we want to leave \$300,000 in there because it's the annual operating budget.

>> We have that in there. That's in there to be used. And if --

>> Or or annual operating budget.

>> We can come up as we form a plan with the city hall ad-hoc committee.

>> There's still \$300,000 in the residual funds from the last bond issue.

>> Okay. Related to borrowing.

>> That we haven't accessed yet.

>> That is showing up in the capital budget. \$350,000?

>> Yes.

>> That would have been given us a total of \$800,000 to begin making improvements to city hall if we didn't cut this funding from the city call account. Joe, Pawlak, talk to me a little bit about act 13 funds. We have some year over year money backed up in act 13?

>> There has and we started a discussion on that during one of work sessions or readings.
>> I'm just wondering about given the amount of work we have to do to bring city hall up to standards or 20 move. It makes me exceptionally uncomfortable talking about cutting money out of an account like that. If the administration wants that as the out if there might be money in another account that is not for something we need so pressingly we need here shortly.

>> There are residual funds from the last budget meeting \$125,000.

>> There's the 125,000 right.

>> As long as we bring in.

>> This account is public infrastructure correct?

>> Yes, public infrastructure, public safety, IT, GIS. So it seem as though city hall work could fall under that category. I thought you said we had prior year funds.

>> There's 450 in streets. That has been -- that could help us with the money removed this year. 200 or so for the levy.

>> Yes.

>> 50 which we talked about for Grafias --

>> We know we want to hang on to that money. Giving a sense of monies in savings accounts, if you will, earmarked funds that might be flexible as well.

>> I sort of dominated the floor there. Bonny, Adam, other members of council on this, any questions anyone else wants to get out?

>> Liz, real quick, I want to make sure I'm understanding, I guess the procedure of what is the actual starting balance in the city hall account?

>> \$850,000.

>> Okay. Joe Pawlak, correct me if that's incorrect?

>> It's proxy \$850,000.

>> If I understand this correctly, we're talking about eliminating the \$350,000 in the general fund, first?

>> \$300,000.

>> Around \$300,000 yes.

>> Sorry \$300,000 and we take an additional \$150,000 out of account, correct? We're at \$450,000 and we have \$700 left in the account, correct? \$850,000 minus \$150,000.

>> It's \$850,000 less \$290,000 in anticipated expenditures less the \$150,000.

>> It's lrn \$400,000 remaining in there. I appreciate the effort on this one. I would prefer to see this as a secondary measure personally 23 used at all. You know, given the -- I think we're close to a decision with the ad-hoc. I think regardless of a decision it's facing us now. Personal we would be wise to save this money and use it for the intended use. That's just my personal opinion. I would very much rather see the results of some of the work that I think we had asked the administration to look at, you know, the RVT items, the potential revenue changes from that perspective. Some of the questions surrounding the IT department, recreation, that kind of thing. It seems to me that I think that would be -- that's at least my preference first when we can get the answers. I don't personally think this is necessarily the best idea. None the less though, I appreciate the effort looking into this.

So that's just my two cents. I don't know if there's -- if there's been any progress made on the items as well. You have a couple more today so it's okay if there's not. That's where my head is at.

>> That's a valid point, Adam. Anyone else with comments on this issue.

>> Liz, I do. I agree with what Adam is saying.

What is frightening is we're going to take down to \$400,000 at this point for the city hall account. And what is frightening with that is what we're going to come up with the ad-hoc, how much is it going to cost us to move out of city hall? There's so many variables and we're touching an account that is limited to begin with. Now to pull that money out of there is kind of scary from the standpoint of what we would lose in the city hall account but on the other hand talking about lowering tax rate for our taxpayers. To me I'm looking at other areas we worked on in the last two meetings of really nickel and diming everybody to death at this point to try to bring that tax rate down and then for the Mayor to look at the city hall account and pull \$450,000 out there was I think is -- I think is -- it's bother there some. It really is bothersome because Liz and Randy and you realize and we all realize what a limited income that is that leaves us with not that much in the account. So that's all I have to say right now. I have a store full of customers right now.

>> Liz, could I chime in? It's Randy?

>> Yes, please, Randy.

>> I just wanted to clarify, Joe, you said the the 450 in streets, the act 13 money could be used for the building?

>> I -- the categories for act 13 funding -- act 13 spending are very -- I guess they are -- they have room to work with.

>> There's flexibility there then. I guess I'm just --

>> I guess the category that I -- that I could potentially see it in would be public infrastructure. I think it would be clearly count. It's a building to be used by the public.

>> Trying to balance everything out here. So then suppose we did say. We have a landry list we need done for various reasons. Some need accessibility et cetera.

Obviously we're not going to do everything at once.

It's a multi-year project so address each one of these. So, you know, we would not necessarily have to generally I'm not in favor of taking away from streets. However, if we were, I think this would be the year because we've done so much. There's been so much Lee paving and renewing of streets and utilities and all that over the past four or five years actually. And there's going to be more. So I'm just weighing everything out. That would be a possibility. In fairness to the administration, we asked them to come up with a quarter million cut. And, you know, there may be another one. I'm not saying there isn't. There's a lot of moving parts here but if they can be kind of lined up in a certain manner, a certain way that makes this logical and makes sense that is not just a knee jerk on our part as council to address the tax increase and try to cut that down at the same time try to have the strategy that takes into account everything that we have to do, I think if there's a possibility there, we don't have a lot of time. We just have a couple days to weigh all of these things out and then we've got to pass a budget of some sort. If

we go into the year without a budget, the city shuts down. We're expressed here. That doesn't mean we can't think our way through this. That's all I have to say, thanks.

>> Thank you, Randy, for that. I would agree. I think -- I think -- what we've handed to the administration over the last couple of weeks of budget discussions is a number of open ended questions and the Mayor and Mr. Pawlak, you are 100% right that some of these things take more than two weeks to answer. The question of borrowing and how much it's appropriate to borrow rests in part on the interest rates we can get, the longevity, whether or not we can fix them all sorts of things and so, you know, that's one major issue. The one major challenge that we really issued to the administration in the last meeting was the idea of looking at our RVTs relationship with the city. If we are segregating ourselves as intensely as we seem to be looking to do then it seems to -- I think I know at least the members of City Council that we need to look at ways in which the city has been subsidizing RBT over the years, everything from trash collection to street repair to the -- you know the vast amount of land and improvements they have within the city. And I know that that process. We need begin looking at it hard as quickly as we can because I think that's been a potentially neglected way for the city and RVT to manage effectively. To try to sum this together and there's a lot to sum together and I feel as though I'm throwing scatter shot ideas out there, from my perspective I'd like to have the perspective as to what the city -- what the relationship of RVT's debt to the city is. That is whether or not RVT's debt counts as the approach to our debt ceiling.

>> Yes.

>> It does count as city debt, correct?

>> It's a department of city.

>> Right, exactly. So it would seem to me between us and the city we must have something around \$22 million in debt. I would like to understand what our ceiling is then and what the consequences are for approaching it. We can check and correct me if I'm wrong but I thought that I heard in the past that your cap is 2.5 times your average revenue over the last three years. I think there's some revenue that is not included in that, like, you know, interest revenue and whatnot, but I think it would -- you know, it would be 2.5 times what our average revenue was.

>> We're looking at something like \$50 million as a company.

>> \$50, \$55 if that's right. That's based on memory but -- let's try to get that confirmed but -- it's a bit of a moving target. I just want to know. I know that there are say credit rate impacts getting close to that number and the amount of debt we carry point blank. I'm trying to wrap my head -- trying to wrap my head around what those impacts interest. The secondary thing I might have been hearing from council president Allison is it may be some of us on council may be more comfortable with looking at a relocation of the \$125,000 that we left in current year act 13 funding as well as commitment by the administration to reallocate another what would that be about 309,000 in prior year ability 13 funds to city hall in exchange for removing \$450,000 from the city hall operating fund. Meaning we need to spend quickly rather than waiting on borrowing to go through. And retains for us some amount of liquidity related to Bowman field. Though we do have the funding for

bowman and we have not removed that so there shouldn't be an issue there either. So that -- if anyone else wants to comment that was what I was hearing.

We want to hammer home we need to look at the relation with RVT and we would like continued updates as that moves forward and in terms of removing money from the city hall fund we would feel best if that money was allocated from elsewhere from act 13 for the present time. Anyone else with feedback.

>> Councilwoman it's Derek. --

>> Yes, Derek.

>> So we've started that process. With Penn Dot and FTA and what that looks like. And as we're working to improve the financial elements related to, you know, the city and RVT and that relationship. So I would definitely keep abreast as we move forward there. That's actually going very well. There were a number of items that needed to be untangled or addressed that we work. So Penn DOT and FT A asked for a number of documents and we're working with them on the best Patted for. As we get information from Penn DOT and FTA I'll keep council informed and what that looks like here moving forward. I'm in agreement with you on that that we need address that and we need to make sure it's clean and clear. We're working through those elements and hopefully in the near future here, we'll have a very neat and easy to understand on all fronts.

>> That's a good start. But let's -- I think for years the city -- obviously the city's financial relationship with RVT has not been clearly spelled out. As we spell it out we need to look for ways because from my perspective the city has been sub Sid diseasing RBT's operation on a number of fronts.

We need to look for ways to make that a financial reality for the city here in 2021. Other members of council, do you have any comments on your comfort level with this? This is an easier arena to have this discussion in perhaps than Thursday night. Now that we've initiated it if anybody wants to say when they are comfortable with or uncomfortable with in the long run it might be helpful.

>> Liz, if I may --

>> Yes, please.

>> I appreciate the Mayor and Mr. Pawlak doing the work they've done and brought it to council. At this point I'm reticent or jump on board -- spending out of savings. To fix up city hall. I would agree with the sent.

Passed around. It may be a decent stop gap measure this year but I would be much more comfortable if we found the cuts elsewhere we're going to go face the same efforts next year. We have specific budget constraints this year but we will have increased costs next year that we have every year with pensions and healthcare so, you know, we need a -- tighten our belt so to speak. Thank you.

>> Thanks, Dave. Yeah, I think you've heard all of us make that statement. We know that we need to spend money on either city hall or a move in 2021 and early 2021. So I think what we've heard from all members of council is that removing that funding from the city hall operating budget without replacing it from funding elsewhere makes us uncomfortable because it makes it very hard to make the necessary plans for improvements or relocation.

So I think we what I'm hearing is is further information on debt, further information on debt --on pardon me -- further information on debt and a plan to realize that \$450,000 that we would like to move out of city hall operating fund from other sources within the city's budget so that we're not moving it to the pool. That said if I hear no further comments I'll close the discussion for the time being and I would ask that if anyone from the administration needs further guidance on that they reach out to either Mr.

Allison or I and we can try to get a sense of temperature of council. And having that closed that the final item is number six, any related items. Does anyone else have anything to introduce for the good of the order at this time? Hearing no other discussion items, I would take a motion to adjourn.

>> So moved.

>> Second.

>> All in favor?

>> Aye.

>> Aye.

>> Aye.

>> Thanks so much, guys. Good discussion. Thanks, administration for bringing your A game today and council for bringing your A game. I'll see everybody on Thursday. Okay.

>> Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Liz.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you. [meeting adjourned at 2:39 p.m.]

Chat

Writer: Hi, I am having trouble connecting to zoom

Writer: i have the meeting id and password but it wants me to use an email and password