

StreamBox

Please stand by for realtime captions.

>>> Welcome, everyone, to the Williamsport city council meeting of Thursday, December 17th, 2020. It's a little past 6:30 p.m. We're meeting remotely tonight as we have been. I want to announce there was an executive session held before the meeting to discuss personnel and public safety. If we move to item one approval of city council minutes December 3rd, 2020. Is there a motion from council?

>> So moved.

>> Motion in the second. Any discussion from Council members, questions? Directions? Hearing or seeing none, Ms. Frank, on the motion, please.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes.

>> Motion passes 7-0. Thank you.

Ms. Frank. Move to item 2, limited courtesy, we've had no request tonight. Before we move into the other parts of the agenda, I just wanted to -- is Mr. Winder on?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Winder, would you just briefly address for the public and council about the event and the response of our streets Department?

>> Sure. We received 24.6 inches of snow overnight. It started at roughly 1:00 p.m. yesterday. It came down very lightly. The streets Department went out about 9:00 a.m. yesterday morning and put a coat of salt down on the roads as a pretreatment. We did have 18 employees, which filled every truck that we had. They started their day yesterday morning at 7:00 a.m. and at about 4:30 today I felt like we pushed them to the max hour-wise. During the event of the storm, we had multiple trucks that got stuck multiple times. The storm hit a point where it actually snowed 2 to 3 inches an hour overnight. It was very intense to keep up with. I myself got in a plow truck at roughly 8:00 p.m. last night to try to start helping them catch up, not that they were really behind, but just try to keep up with the storm. At roughly 10:30 last night, I ended up getting into a piece of equipment and spent five to six hours just pulling trucks out that got stuck. At one point,

we actually had to shut down Hepburn street hill due to a dump truck that slid sideways and slid and got lodged into a bank there. It was determined that it was in our best interest not to try to recover it at that moment. It was too much of a risky situation to try to pull that truck out of there during the snow storm. Thankfully, we had -- nobody got hurt at any point when the trucks got stuck.

None of the equipment was damaged when it got stuck. It is a very wet and heavy snow. I know they said it was supposed to be very light and fluffy.

They were completely false. The other obvious circumstantial we ran -- obstacle we ran into, once it was daylight people wanted to unbury their car, things of that nature. The roadways became congested for people to clean out their parking area. I would say by far, the public works Department worked very diligently and efficiently to try to clear the roadways. It is going to a couple-day process until we get it all taken care of just due to the amount of snow that we received. We did make all main routes a priority, and secondary routes were naturally following that. Alleys will be the last thing we're able to do. It did shut down the transit agency for the entire day. We did shut down last night at 7:00 p.m. A lot of decisions were made by the Administration to try to keep the public and the employees as safe as possible.

>> Thank you Mr. Winder. We all appreciate the job that our street Department did. It was an unprecedented amount of snow, and we got hit hard and I think you've respond admirably, and the whole crew. I think all council is appreciative of the effort that was put forward and that the citizens can be patient. Everybody's in the same situation digging their vehicles out and trying to get back to normal, but there is no normal when you get dumped with that much -- that amount of snow in one snowfall so thanks again.

>> Thank you.

>> Let's move on to item 9 then.

We'll move to the stormwater resolution. Ms. Frank, would you read that in short form, please?

>> Resolution for the transfer of operations and transition agreement for stormwater control system.

>> Thank you. Thank you, Ms.

Frank. Is there a motion from council tonight, motion in the secretary.

>> So moved.

>> Second.

>> Thank you. The motion is seconded. Mayor Slaughter and Mr. Miller from the Williamsport municipal water and sewer board.

>> Yes. Good evening, council President Allison, council vice president Miele and council and Administration. What you have before you is a stormwater agreement that is probably 6 or 7 years in the making, and we're glad to see that it's traction again and we have representatives from Administration and the authority that would be happy to answer some questions.

>> Thank you, Mayor Slaughter.

Mr. Miller, do you have any opening comments, and then I'll move to our finance

committee who reviewed this?

>> The agreement -- the agreement moves it over effective March 1st. We've been working co-op ritting very well with the Mayor's office and with city council to make it a -- an agreement that's a great service to the citizens of Williamsport, so we're looking forward to helping to continue the good service provision.

>> Thank you, Mr. Miller. Ms.

Miele, finance committee.

>> Yes, this was reviewed by the finance committee, and I think we largely discussed the fact that this has been a long time coming and we are very pleased that we finally made it through all the --you know, just the sort of sundry policy details around the issues and we'll be able to get it done by March 1st. As you'll see, the March 1st asked deadline is a bit of a change from the start of the agenda. That would allow us time to sort out a specific list of duties between the water authority and our staff, as well as to sort out specific transfer details for the stormwater assets as one might call them, that are not in fact, necessarily assets to us right now. And the only other thing to note is obviously any debt that city has incurred for stormwater prior to the transfer and/or any other obligations or issues arising out of things that happened prior to the transfer will be the responsibility of the city, not of the water authority. That seems only fair and we can all hope that of course that will, you know, obviously the debt is already bundled into all of the debt that the city has at this point, and I don't think that we anticipate any particular issues between now and then or anything to pop up, so this is an exciting step. As we've discussed in the past, and as it specifically states in the agreement, this allows the water authority, which the water and sewer authority, excuse me, which has not only the expertise, but also the equipment necessary to deal with our storm sewer system to take over our stormwater system, and among other things, the water authority, as everyone knows, levies a fee. You pay a fee for your water service, you pay a fee for your sanitary and stormwater can function the same way. Were the city to move to upgrade our stormwater system in a way that is undoubtedly necessary, the city would have to levy a tax to do that and taxes are only charged to taxpayers, whereas fees are charged to everyone. This is a -- making this a vastly more equitable means of handling stormwater negotiations and the costs associated with that. The finance committee forwarded this to the full body of council with positive recommendation and I'll defer to others.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes, this has been as everybody said a long time coming. One of the discussions I think we're going to have to have is for the public to become aware of the changes that are going to come on their bills, which I know you will take care of. But I also really want to thank Wendy and for all the hard work this woman has put in over these years. Mike -- Michael, you were there -- we were on the committee together, and now you are also working on this now, so I mean you have transitioned from the committee to what is the process of this, and I know we as the city are very happy with the way this has been going at this point, and it's going to be a long road to go at this point, because of all the work that has to be put into this, but it's beneficial for everybody involved, and thank you both very much for

everything you've put into it.

>> Thank you, Bonnie. Other comments? From Council members or --

>> Could I add one more, just --

>> Yes.

.

>> As a matter of housekeeping.

There were a couple subtle changes. For housekeeping I will run that through my board in January, and I don't see any issues with those comments.

>> Just one thought I had was most of the city is on a combined stormwater sewer system, and when there is a break in the stormwater pipes or the pipes that carry that, people are charged for that rep pay for it in the fees as it is.

It adds a cost of -- just comes to mind one that was on Campbell Street that was so expensive to repair. And there is a good chance because of the age of the system, there is other ticking time bombs just like that one.

This is a way to -- to move out that cost, I think. The users are going to get charged for the upgrade and repair of the system whether it's over a period of time that's planned or it's just failure of the system, it's better to have a plan to replace and repair as we go than just reacting an emergency. So, it's not quite totally an added cost.

It's something we're paying for as we go. It just separates it out where you can quantify the cost of up keeping that system, so I think it's going to be very economical for the regular residential fee payers to although to come assess it like that. Any other comments or questions -- okay. Ms. Frank, on the motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 7-0. Thank you, Ms. Frank. We'll move to item 10., which is a demo and lot consolidation LYCOMING County.

>> Good evening, city council.

What I bring to you tonight is a demo application request and lot consolidation request by Lycoming college. What they are requesting to do is they have -- there is four parcels On West Fourth Street, which the house numbers, 14, 316, 328, 324. They currently own the properties. They are requesting to demo those for a future land development plan and

again that's why the lot consolidation is brought before you, as well.

What they are requesting to do again is do the demo of those three houses, and then they will take a total of ace parcels which you have in front of you and combine them as one parcel.

That would be a little over 1 acres. This plan was reviewed by the County and also was reviewed by the planning commission. The County's comments, the plans that you actually have before you are corrected copies of the comments from the County. So you do have the corrected copies and the updated copies. And again, I do have a representative here and what they are requesting to do is demo those three houses, added total of eight separate parcel into one parcel for a future land development that will be required to come before council.

>> Thank you, Mr. Knarr. Is there a motion in the second from council on this?

>> Moved.

>> Second.

>> There is a motion in the second. Discussion now from council, or questions?

>> Just one quick question, Mr.

Allison, if I might? Mr. Knarr, did you say there was a timeline specific to this development?

>> I don't specifically have a timeline. I'm already in conversations with both the architect and the engineering firm that is doing the land development plan so we are in motion with that. It is my understanding that something won't happen until probably some time after the first of the year, early spring.

>> Okay. That's fine. I just wanted to make certain it wasn't one of those things where we were taking the structures down and not anticipating anything until next year -- or sorry, two or three years down the road, because that would be kind of a bummer, okay.

>> This is something they're definitely moving forward with a rapid pace. What it will be is a music -- music building.

>> Yep, that's fantastic. I think that will be a huge asset down there. Okay. Thanks very much.

>> Any other questions or comments? Hearing and seeing none, Ms. Frank on the motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

Yes. Motion passes 7-0. Okay. We can move back up to item number 5. Would you read that in short form, please Ms. Frank?

>> The ordinance amending article 327, cable TV systems of the codified ordinances of the city setting the franchise fee of 5% in the final reading.

>> Is there a motion in the second?

>> So moved.

>> So moved.

>> Second.

>> Motion in the second. This is the second reading. We've had discussion on it. Are there any more comments or questions from council tonight? Again, hearing and seeing none, Ms. Frank, on this motion, please.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, motion passes 7-0. Thank you, Ms. Frank. Item 6, a resolution for the collective bargaining agreement. Would you read that in short form, please, Ms. Frank?

Resolution of a collective bargaining agreement, between the City of Williamsport and FLP lodge 29.

>> Is there a motion in the second from council?

>> So moved.

>> Second.

>> We have a motion in the second. This was reviewed -- or chiefchief hag an. We'll turn to you first.

>> Yes. This is the collective bargaining agreement that we have discussed at length.

Negotiated by the Mayor, myself, the assistant chief, Chapel.

Many sessions back and forth. We were able to come to an agreement, and it has been reviewed by the solicitor. We believe it's a good agreement.

We've had discussion with council on multiple occasions about it, and we are, again, presenting it to you here tonight. We believe there were many concessions. The union itself has voted to accept this and voted unanimously despite the concessions that they made. So, we feel good about it, and we ask that you take this under consideration, and I'm

available for any questions. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Chief Hagan. This was reviewed in the finance commit me?

-- committee?

>> Yes, it was. Thanks, Randy.

First thing's first, the finance forwarded this item with a negative recommendation, and that was based on two votes, one dissenting. I was the one dissenting. The -- we obviously had mixed feelings as we'll might refer from the recommendation. I believe that other two members of the committee felt we would have liked to see further concessions and I can let them speak to that if they'd like. From my part, while I understand that this isn't a perfect contract from the city's perspective, frankly, I think that police department, department, union did collaborate with the city in a tough year and we got a good contract, perhaps not as good as we would have loved to see it, but as good as we could have hoped for, so I well will be supporting this, this evening, and I could that it is a strong contract and I commend the chief and the union for working well together and the Administration. But of course, we will hope to see other concessions and further concessions in the next iteration of this contract, as well. As I said I'll defer to other members of the committee. Thanky, Randy.

>> You're welcome, Ms. Miele.

Other members of finance? Mr.

Yoder?

>> Sure. Yeah, as one of the two votes for a negative recommendation, yeah, you know, certainly appreciate the efforts of the police union and the Administration in going after this contract. Certainly is a solid start but certainly would have like to have seen more. I think there are things we could have hopefully got on the healthcare side. You know, they unfortunately did not match what we have in a couple of our other union contracts. The salaries unfortunately, are not equitable as some of our other salaries in the public safety and first responder contracts, as well, and unfortunately, you know, frankly it's just, you know, given the challenges we face this year, this certainly could have been an avenue I think would have helped us amid a lot of the deliberations we're having. This not only has ripple effects in 2021, but this is a four year contract. Certainly we'll appreciate the efforts and thank them for good-faith efforts. It's just unfortunately difficult for me to support this at this time, and nonetheless appreciate the collaboration and the discussion on that.

Thank you.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Being the other dissent vote, I think our discussions all year were how are we going to protect the city and the city's taxpayers and how are we going to continue as a city and I applaud what the chief has done with this contract, with the union, I really do. I know how difficult this can be, but under the circumstances, I think everybody has got to understand that we have to protect the whole city, not just one unit of the city, and it's been very difficult, very, very difficult, because I know how hard our police officers work. I know how hard our chief works to try and do the best they can, but under the circumstances because of where we stand financially with the city, I find this one very, very difficult. So, and those

are my reasons. It all boils down to the dollar. It really does.

Not to the way the decisions have been made, and not to where the negotiations. We do look forward to in four years, trying to cut it even more, and hopefully it's going to be worked on in the next four years. So, I still am going to have to say no to this.

>> Other members of council Snell.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Thank you, councilman. To mirror what councilman Yoder, applaud the Mayor's efforts to negotiate with the union the way they did, however given all the circumstances, given everything that's happened through this year, you know, a lot of people have become unemployed or affected financially because of the COVID-19 pandemic. I just cannot find a reason -- I want to support this agreement. I support our police officers and support everything that they do, however it comes down to finance for me. We -- I don't see where we have the money. If -- if the situation was different, by all means I would agree wholeheartedly. I just don't see how I can support this though as part of a bigger hole that would lead to further tax burden given our tax year. I thought it was a great starting point. If one or two more concessions had been made or matched by some other units, I'd be in full support of this, but so for those of matters, I will also be voting no but thank you again, chief, and everybody that was part of this.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> I think it's really important at this point to take into account how far the union's come. In this contract goes to arbitration we have a lot more to lose than we could possibly gain, in terms of what's been negotiated down to, at this point, so I'm a yes on this because I think it's actually the physically prudent stance to make sure we keep the gains that we've made, and that's all I have to say.

>> Thank you, Mr. Banks.

>> Other comments? I'll just say that I think Mr. Banks hit the -- what this comes down to, at this point what's in the contract, at this point, has been negotiated, so now we're faced with the decision we either pass the contract, or we don't. And if we don't pass the contract, the fact of it is it goes to arbitration. And with the outlook for arbitration that's backed up by a professional. We would stand to lose because of the concessions that the police union has made.

They've taken a step in the direction we wanted them to, maybe we would have liked -- they've taken a few steps. They've moved in different areas. We would have liked another step or two, but to risk arbitration, I think is too big of a risk under the current circumstances, and that's what it comes down to.

Yes, this is going to cost money if we go to arbitration because it's costing money, and then having it cost us more money, I don't see the logic in that and that's why I'm going to support it tonight. But I do appreciate that -- the effort that chief Hag and Joe Ellen Chapel, HR, and the Administration did in negotiating these things. We got movement in areas like healthcare and pension and those things that I think are important. Those are going to pay benefits year-over-year moving forward. So that's why I'm going to support it. Are there any other comments? I don't see or hear any, so Ms.

Frank, on the motion, please.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> No.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> No.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> No.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison.

>> Yes motion passes 4-3. Thank you, Ms. Frank. We will move to item 7. Would you read that in short form, please, Ms. Frank?

>> Resolution, authorizing the Williamsport bureau of please to hire one police officer, Brandon Wheeler.

>> Thank you, Ms. Frank. Is there a motion in the second from council?

>> Should moved.

>> Second.

>> Motion in the second. Chief Hagan?

>>> You're muted, chief.

>> Can hear me now?

>> Yes, sir. Thank you members and we bring you applicant from our civil service list Mr. Brandon Wheeler present with us on this Zoom meeting. Brandon, we know him, and we've known him for a while. He was an intern here while he was in college.

Fantastic young man. He has recently completed the police academy at Mansfield, so if hired, on our proposed date of January 4th, 2021, he would be able to go right to the street. Mr. Wheeler is 23 years old, and he's from Millhall, Pennsylvania. He's the son of Rodney and Tina Wheeler. He's a 2015 graduate of Central Mountain high school, and also a graduate of South Hill business of technology, where he has an associate's degree in criminal justice. He is, again, a recent graduate of the Mansfield academy, and he has passed our background investigation with flying colors and has been recommended to me by the agent who did that background investigation. I have approved and so has the Mayor, of his hire. Mr. Wheeler would be, if hired today, the 48th, however his proposed date of hire is the same day our assistant chief, Mr. Sechrest retires, so he would be number 47. We -- in his proposed badge number, by the way, is badge number 31. We really, really recommend hiring Mr. Wheeler. It's rare that you get a young man, a police candidate of this quality. I think it would be, despite our financial concerns, a mistake to pass him up, and I know this was brought before finance and there was certainly some hesitation there given the financial constraints of the pending budget and so forth, but I

think if we're going to stay at 47, you can't do any better than Brandon Wheeler, and so with that, I'd like to present Mr.

Wheeler to council and I can take any questions. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Thank you, Chief Hagan. Welcome tonight, Brandon.

We're very happy to have you with us tonight. I'm going to temporarily refer to the finance committee that was reviewed there, and let Ms. Miele have the floor.

>> Yes, Randy, this was reviewed in finance and forwarded with the full body of council with a positive recommendation. We are -- while we had some discussion about, you know, police funding et cetera, et cetera, and looking to the future, I think the overwhelming sentiment was that we want to bring our police department off to a full compliment. Mr. Wheeler will mark the -- will mark something very close to the end of our current hiring list, which means we'll -- we will need some time to create a new one, and -- and I'm just trying to remember what else she said about him. Any way, he's an excellent candidate. It's particularly exciting when he comes to us and is ready to go out on the street as soon as he arrives because there are -- our previous two hires are just about to enter the police force now, so we have a -- kind of a freshman class here going on, I guess chief. Any way forwarded with a positive recommendation, and I'll defer to other members of council.

>> Thank you. Other members of finance? Mr. Katz?

>> Yes. I -- under the circumstances, chief, we've discussed finances, finances, finances until it comes out of our ears. We do realize we have to keep compliment up to -- Brandon is going to make this -- why can't I remember, 47 or 48 come January 2nd?

>> He would be 47 because mark Sechrest retires the same day.

>> Right. So we still haven't brought it up to what the compliment is budgeted for.

Brandon, I do want to welcome you and putting yourself forward here, and again thank you. And thank you, chief.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yeah, I'll mimic councilwoman Katz's sentiments. We've, the past number of weeks, talked about the fiscal situation we're in. We've asked a lot of our police department as a part of that. I have, as an individual.

I've certainly recognized that, and while I absolutely disagree with the mechanisms that the police are working on, or what the contractors have voted against it T I also do recognize that we need to have adequate people there, and I'll happily support this, but I will challenge you, chief, I'm anxious to see how the police force does with a number of 47, and if we do need to go to 48, my challenge to you is going to be, we need to figure out how to live within the 48, because I'm afraid the problems that we're running into this year, they might be recurring for sure over the next couple of years. So, I know we ask a lot out of you. I certainly have in this budget. I know you're up to the task. I'm hoping that you can come up with some things here working with in that.

>> Actually later, the Mayor, during the discussion on the budget, is going to introduce an idea brought about by an earlier challenge me, challenge from me, sir, and that idea would have us staying at 47 and enabling other things to occur because of that. So also in our effort to be transparent and to give you all of the information you need, we would like to

extend an invitation for you to do a ride along with the bureau at any time you would like, sir. That -- and that goes out to all Council members. We know councilman Mackey has been a regular stay on all of our patrol shifts, but we would encourage all of you who would like certainly after the vaccine is available and we're able to be around each other a little more to come out with us and see what we do. Hopefully that would help give you a better understanding. Because it's not all Xs and Os and dollars and cents. Thank you.

>> Understood. I had full intention to do that before this all happened. I unfortunately didn't get to. I very much look forward to doing that and will absolutely do that when the time is right. And so I very much appreciate that, chief.

>> Could we temporarily deputyize councilman Mackey to do some things? Just kidding. Other comments from Council members? Mr. Wheeler, we're certainly happy to have you coming onboard. We have a police force that's getting younger and transitioning, and we're excited about that because you're joining a force of the future that is -- we really believe you're going to do some really good things in the city. So, are there any comments you'd like to make? You're muted. There you go.

>> You can hear me?

>> Yes.

>> I'd just like to say thanks for the consideration and everything, and I look forward to hopefully becoming a part of this Department. I've worked with them before as chief Hagan said. They work as a great team and I can't wait to be part of that team and I hope to be able to help everyone out and try to keep everyone safe.

>> Thank you. Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you, Mr. Wheeler.

Appreciate those sentiments. Mr.

Frank on the motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks? Check.

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes motion passes 7-0. Mr.

Wheeler, welcome aboard. And congratulations, and we wish you the best. And if we were in city hall, we would mention that above the city seal, it says serve and protect, and that's

what our police force does and we know you're going to uphold values with great performance and ability.

>> Thank you, Mr. Allison, and city council.

>> You're quite welcome.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Randy, he'll be fantastic and when we get back to some normal meetings, if we can get to meet the families, and all the people that have been hired and throughout that we have not yet met in person and to welcome them. It's -- this has been such a hard year.

>> Right. And even though we're seeing you on a screen, it's not like the same thing in person.

And I --you know, I think it would behoove us. And I'd also like to see the dogs.

>> That's a great idea, Ms.

Katz. I think chief Hagan can arrange that.

>> Absolutely. We can bring the dogs to you, if you like.

>> That would be fantastic.

>> Okay. Well, thank you very much. And that was a good discussion. Let's move on item 8, Ms. Frank N short form, please?

>> Are resolution of the city council of the City of Williamsport to adopt an RVT safety and security plan.

>> Thank you, Ms. Frank. Is there a motion from council Snell.

>> So moved.

>> Second.

>> Welcome Mr. Winder.

>> Good evening. This a resolution to adopt the safety plan, a requirement by the FTA that we have one. River valley transit has a safety and security officer which is Chris Smith. I believe he is on here.

Chris worked extremely hard to write this safety plan. He did submit it to the FTA for their review since it's so new, and I believe we submitted it back in September. It was recently approved, which was not exactly how we thought it was going to work out. We thought they would come back with some corrections or other things they would like to see in it, so we sent it in early on for them to review it.

It's technically not due until the end of December. Chris did such an excellent job it was approved and now we just need to bring this resolution in front of city council for their approval to adopt it on the behalf of River Valley Transit, and Chris Smith is on this call if anybody would have any questions in regards to it. He is the best person to answer them since he did write it.

>> Thank you Mr. Winder. This was reviewed in finance, Ms.

Miele.

>> Randy, my apologies. Yes, it was. Sorry, it took me a second to get to that mute button. Any way. Yes, this was reviewed in finance and forwarded to the full body of counsel with a positive recommendation. I had follow up discussions about it.

They largely centered a little bit on the sort of unusual procedure of getting council's

approval to adopt after we'd gotten PennDOT's approval to adopt, but that was the requested procedure in this case, and this is a relatively new format for us, so we're excited that they -- that they approved it so rapidly and with flying colors. That's everything. Thanks, Randy.

>> Thank you, Ms. Miele. Other comments or questions from 's committee members? Or anybody on council Snell hearing and council? Hearing and seeing none, a motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey? Mr. Mackey?

You're muted Jon.

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, the motion passes 7-0.

Thank you, Ms. Frank. We will move up to item 3. We're back to the ordinance adopting various budgets for the City of Williamsport. So, this is the -- we had this tabled, so is there a motion to remove this from the table?

>> So moved.

>> Second.

>> Motion in the second. Mr.

Frank on the motion to remove from the table, please.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 7-0. It's removed from the table and it's back up for discussion. I'm

going to open it up to just Mayor Slaughter tonight. We've done -- council has done a lot of work on this budget heretofore, and we asked the Administration to come back with a half mill of cuts so I'm going to turn it over to the Mayor.

>> Thank you, council President Allison. Yes. As council asked Administration to come back with half a mill cuts, and again we appreciate the work that city council and Administration have done, given this budget this year, the constricted that we are all under. And so once --you know, once I brought it back and we started to review, there were \$850,000 wells in the city hall account, so if utilize that account and replenish -- because we had a somewhat lengthy discussion during the finance committee on Tuesday, given some of the items going on with city hall, and the decisions we'll be making here in the future at some point, whether they stay or go to another building, whatever that decision might be. So there were some talk about wanting to keep the city hall account, you know, with some funds in there, which we can utilize Act 13, as well. That would allow the City Hall account to stay at the balance where it is.

Furthermore, and what was just alluded to earlier with council Yoder and chief hagin, we had a compliment of 47 when we hire --

or as Mr. Wheeler's hire was just approved by city council kill, assistant chief Sechrest will retire simultaneously essentially, so we've decided to propose that we stay at 47 officers and for the --you know, for this budget season, we believe that we could live within our means with 47 and so we'll propose that, as well. So this gets us \$2.5 million savings, maybe a little bit more. So that's where we think this evening it would be the cleanest and easiest moving forward, and we can revisit some of this in the near future with officer 48 or some other items as we move forward. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Mayor Slaughter.

Obviously, this has to take the form of several motions and votes to accomplish that. Are there comments or questions about -- Mr. Yoder?

>> Yeah, just a couple questions just to make sure that I'm understanding the -- the thought process, the flows of money, and what have you. So if I'm understanding this, not including the 47 level of staffing in the police department, not including in this, so we currently have \$850,000 in the city hall operating fund under the proposal for Mayor Slaughter, if I'm doing my math correctly, we would eliminate the \$350,000 currently allocated to it be contributed to on the fund. We would keep the expenditures in there because that's what operates at city hall, utilities, et cetera, which are \$290,000 in change. Sounds like we want to -- they're proposing to take about \$25,000 as a transfer out of that, leaves us with a balance of \$534,500 roughly, and if I understand it, we were going to leverage \$325,000 of Act 13 money, so we would have available \$859,000 of available capital roughly for city hall repairs between two different funds, correct?

>> Those numbers sound correct.

I'll defer to Joe Pawlak, but I believe that is correct.

>> Correct. Correct.

>> Okay. Understanding this, and as somebody who asked for an idea from the Administration, I think I can live with this. By my math, I think this is \$50,000 left of available

funding for city hall. I think in this year, I think that's something that I can live with, at least. That reduces this \$350,000. If I recall, there were some general fund changes. Were they a part -- or as a result of the maintaining a level of the 47 level compliment in the police department? They were not.

>> They were not. No. We actually discussed that after I had Joe Pawlak put together those numbers specifically around the city hall account.

>> Okay.

>> So that would be -- sorry, go ahead.

>> No, no, go ahead. I'm sorry.

>> So that would be in addition to what laid outright there.

>> Okay. So between having roughly \$360,000 available for city hall, which is actually about a \$10,000 increase, between the changes that you and the eliminating city hall, we're saving -- or minimizing the general fund by \$487,000 in change, roughly? So about half a mill, that's how you're getting to half a mill; is that correct?

>> That's correct.

>> Okay. I think I can support that. I think, given the current year, as this is an idea that's been kicked down way, way too long. I think we can all agree on that, but I think if we can hold that 860 there, I think that's adequate to get us started, depending on what we do. I think I can support that.

So Mayor Slaughter, thank you for coming up with that.

>> You're welcome. And can I just -- are you did, councilman?

I can just back in real quick?

>> Yep, absolutely.

>> All right. And also -- that also buys us a little bit of time as we discuss the city hall options. I know council, throughout review about borrowing -- it gives us some time to weigh all of the various city all options, Bowman Field, et cetera, to really look at the borrowing and not to exceed amount, what all we're going to include in that. So I appreciate that Councilman. This is not by any means what we plan to do, year-over-year, obviously. 2020 clearly was a little bit different. So, you know, it -- and also, it leaves it in that city hall account, but then again it's not like once we make a decision we're going to stroke a check for \$800,000 on day one.

It does give us a little bit of time to figure out kind of what the borrowing looks like, what we're going to do and make some decisions in the future. So thank you.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> This is a question for Joe Pawlak. Joe, under -- since we're using Act 13 money for city hall, why has this never been approached with -- before when we've been struggling so much with trying to do repairs and everything else at City Hall? We more or less were told we could not do that.

>> Each year we allocate the funds in a budget. These were residual funds that we're proposing to move out of a prior project into the current. So, it was something that this is the time that we -- that the Mayor, the Administration, thought this is something we should move on to not deplete the balance that we have current for city hall and there.

>> Even though it was initially coming from act 13?

>> It is under this proposal.

>> I mean, this is what -- am I understanding this right or wrong, that money that's being utilized for city hall is coming out of Act 13? But I was -- but we were told we couldn't do that before.

>> I'm not sure who said that.

>> Over the years when we've -- when we've struggled so hard for HVAC systems and roof leaking and things like that, trying to come up with the funds to repair why couldn't we have gone through Act 13 at that point, especially when we were getting a lot of Act 13 I'm just questioning because I want to in my head clarify this.

>> In the previous years the funding sources have mainly been towards streets, levy improvements, setting aside money for those project

-- projects. I guess the Administration feels we can waiver on some of those other items and reallocate it toward this use.

>> It's not the Administration.

Act 13 sets guidelines of what you can use the money for, and that's why I'm -- I'm very happy that it's coming up this way.

I'm just questioning why we couldn't have done this before?

>> I believe that other projects have taken priority those times.

>> At those times.

>> The projects at city hall, some of them were trying to patch a roof and doing it piecemeal because we couldn't come up with any money, that's why I'm questioning this. I just -- I don't want to -- I don't want to come back a year or two from now saying, oh, we weren't supposed to touch that money. I want to make sure this is perfectly legal to do this. That's why I'm asking this question.

>> And I think that the belief is that this is falling under public infrastructure, and that's what we're proposing to move it from -- or to.

>> Yes, councilwoman. From everything that we've read, this qualifies. I can't speak obviously for prior Administrations, but when we reviewed this, and everything that we've read and been told, that Act 13 would qualify.

>> I think you can all understand, you know, -- understand, you know, the frustration you're hearing we can use this now when we struggled for how many years with trying to maintain the projects in city hall and trying to come up with the funds for things. I think that's the thing that's why I'm -- I'm happy.

Don't get me wrong. I'm pleased this is being used that we can do it. I'm just sad we had to wait so long to be able to do this.

>> I think one of the things, Ms. Katz, is that we -- we talked a lot about the HVAC system, but we never -- it never got to the planning stage so the funding for it never got addressed because it never progressed -- most of it never progressed past that, and I think that's one of the reasons why possibly it was never considered before, but we did use it for public facilities, but a portion of it went to street paving and things like that, so that -- that's one of the things that I attribute it to. There was a lot of talk about the things we needed, but we

never got to the point where, okay, this is what we going to do and this is when we're going to do it. So we never talked too much about the finances.

>> But we kept on putting money aside for the repairs at city hall. Every year we kept on putting aside, and not utilizing and being so careful, and where we were going with raising taxes, not raising taxes. So, I just want to clarify this is going to be fine.

>> I understand. That's -- I think -- I guess -- I mean I believe they've done their due diligence to verify that this is an actuality.

>> Okay. I just want to clarify.

Very happy where you've come from.

>> Good point, Bonnie. So --

>> Hey, Randy, if I can put something out there?

>> Yes.

>> Okay. Go ahead.

>> I just wanted to say, Bonnie, I think -- I think this pretty clearly falls under the public infrastructure descriptor, so I'm not super concerned about being able to use it. I think as we've covered in years past, as we all know we have so many needs as moonis palate, and streets are absolutely one of them. We're in a better place with streets with the utility work than we were expecting to be and this money was basically a reappropriated surplus from years past, money hopefully we'll be able to spend on streets in perhaps 2021, or 2022, or 2023. This is somewhat of an extraordinary measure and not something I would support doing in an average year because I do believe City of Williamsport hall, we should be able to fund out of our own budget, but if we amplify, or we decrease the streets project predicated on how much we receive iAct 13 funding, that's one thing. We're trying to lessen the burden on taxpayers and if we have is you know plush -- surplus years in October 13, we can do that. I think that's slightly desirableabsolutely desirable this year.

I with that said I would be happy to begin the somardous process to make this an on-paper reality, if everyone else feels comfortable with that, or who wants to start before we start the discussion, I'm happy to sit back and listen to the discussion for a little longer.

>> I'm fine with that. Is everyone else?

>> I'm fine with it, and I'm happy to second those motions, Liz.

>> Terrific. Thanks, Adam.

>> Okay. So the first thing I'd like to propose, kind of a large one -- and excuse me, do we have Austin or norm on this meeting tonight?

>> Norm.

>> Hey, norm, how you doing.

>> I would like to go ahead and rollen decreasing all of the office rent items in the general fund budget to zero as one motion. That is the legitimate mend amendment, correct?

>> You really should put it as one separate motions for each individual line item.

>> For each general fund line item?

>> Yes.

>> Okay.

>> The reason for in case -- only because there might be split votes, that's why.

>> Norm, would it be allowable for me to ask Council members if anyone has a split vote on this item? And then move forward with a single motion?

>> Yeah, then you could do it as a single.

>> Okay, guys I don't mind lining it out but it's going to take about an extra half an hour to do that. Does anyone have an objection to me rolling all of these items up?

>> I don't.

>> And making them one motion?

>> I don't, Liz.

>> Nope.

>> Nope.

>> Okay.

>> No.

>> If you do speak now or forever hold your peace. All right. Okay. All right. Then I will make a motion that we reduce every item in the general fund relating to office rent from whatever it currently stands at to zero. Mr. Yoder?

>> I will second that.

>> Okay, thank you.

>> There is a motion in the second to make a reduction to office rent and reduce it to zero. And discussion on that?

Hearing none, Ms. Frank on that motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, motion to reduce passes 7-0. Thank you, Ms. Frank. Thank you, Ms. Miele.

>> Great, thanks, guys. All right. Next item, I would make a motion that we -- excuse me -- increase -- Mr. Pawlak, you can give me some guidance on how I phrase this? On page 10, zero 50646910 transfer to city hall operating.

>> Yeah, this is --

>> This is creating a line, Mr. Pawlak, I assume?

>> There is a line I assume at zero.

>> There is a line.

>> It's adding a new line.

>> Okay. So I would make a motion to create a line on page 10, 050646910 transfer from city hall operating, and that we would take that line item, increasing it from zero to \$25,000.

>> Correct.

>> I'll second.

>> Is everybody following that?

>> Guys, this is happening a little bit out of sequence, and I apologize. We're doing a handful of things. We're reducing the \$300,000 contribution that we would have been making out of every Department in the city to rent to zero, but we're also putting a contribution in for \$25,000 from the general fund. Mr.

Pawlak, explain to me again that \$25,000 is coming from where in the general fund? Or it's coming from the bottom line? We've been moving this around a lot.

>> That will add to the bottom line and then be replenished with a future reduction in city hall.

>> Okay. There you go, guys. So it's not a direct transfer from one Department to -- to this line. It's a transfer from the bottom line but we'll be adding money to the bottom line elsewhere as we just added \$300,000 to the bottom line from the office rent. Okay?

>> Is there a second on this motion then?

>> Yeah, I seconded it, Randy.

>> Oh, okay. Motion in the second. Any other discussion from Council members? I hear and see none. Ms. Frank on the motion, please?

>> Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 7-0. Thank you, Ms. Frank, and thank you, Ms. Miele.

>> Okay. Next up to put this in a slightly more understandable order, on page 50, under our Act 13 budget, there are no line numbers in this budget, however I would add a line called budget surplus only and take that line from zero to \$300,000. This money is the money from from the \$450,000 prior year surplus we had related to streets being transferred as a reappropriated surplus into year's Act 13 budget so we can transfer it out to city hall.

>> I'll second that.

>> Okay there is a motion in the second. Any questions from Council members on this particular move? Okay. I hear and see none. Ms. Frank, on the motion, please?

>> Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Hold on.

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks.

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, motion passes 7-0. Talk,

-- thank you, Ms. Frank, and thank you, Ms. Miele.

>> I might be about to get bogged out in some of this here, but on page 50, I would then like to under Act 13, I would then like to create a line for city hall improvements. This would obviously fall under the expenditures whereas the \$300,000 line we just created would fall under income to Act 13. So this line will be city hall improvements and will be -- will be -- or obviously originally funded at zero and we're going to increase that to \$325,000.

>> I will second that.

>> We have a motion in the second.

So now we have 625 for city hall.

>> Uh-huh.

>> Questions or comments from Council members?

>> Actually, the one thing that I wanted to clarify, Mr. Pawlak, we do not need to show any transfer of this money into the city hall operating budget, correct?

>> It's going to --

>> It's going to sit there?

>> It will sit in October 13, and to complete this series you'll want to go to the budget hey and make the changes there.

>> Yep. Yes, I will --

>> On page 57.

>> Yep. Yeah, exactly. I'll take care of that one second when we vote on this. So just to be clear, then with all members of council, this \$325,000 then will sit October 13, in the way that act13, has been sitting in the last few years until we make a decision on expenditures related to city hall, on moving and/or upgrading city hall and that money would be taken directly from the act 13 Money, okay?

>> Yes, that makes sense.

Questions or comments? I hear or see none. Ms. Frank on this motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes. Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Ketoacids?

-- Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Mile me?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, motion passes 7-0. Thank you, Ms. Frank. Thank you, Ms.

Miele.

>> Okay. Then Mr. Pawlak's suggest to make this as competency -- hencible as lines on page 57, we're going to modify 800146200, internal rental income.

>> UU.

>> We're going to take that from \$300,000 to zero.

>> Okay. Mr. Yoder, anybody want to second that?

>> Second.

>> I didn't call it that as an order.

>> Hey, Bonnie, you're not on mute.

>> Okay.

>> There is a motion in the second. Discussion from council?

Does everybody have a sense of where we're flowing here? No other questions? Ms. Frank on the motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz? Janice, I think we can wait on Ms. Katz for this one.

>> Yes.

>> Was that a yes?

>> That was a yes.

>> Mr. Banks.

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes and Ms. Miele.

>> Next item on page 57, this is -- Mr. Pawlak, is this accurate, 800 -- story, income versus expense. 780027 7877 transfer to general fund. We're going to increase the -- Mr. Pawlak, are we creating this line, or are we --

>> Yes.

>> Yes, we are. Okay. So we'll create this line and fund it with \$25,000, guys.

>> Okay. For a total transfer into the general fund for a total drop to the bottom line of \$325,000 from these particular items.

>> Uh-huh.

>> Second.

>> There is a motion in the second. Discussion or comment from Council members?

>> Are we're

>> We're getting there.

>> Slowly but surely.

>> Ms. Frank on the motion, please.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, motion passes 7-0. Thank you, Ms. Frank and Ms. Miele.

Okay.

>> Okay. Then the next related motion to create that \$425,000 drop in the bottom line that we need to get to put us to \$500,000 tax increase from \$500,000 will be first off, excuse me, a decrease in the general fund on page 28, that's line 28076052. The line is flood levy certification. We're going to decrease that line from \$100,000 to zero. Just so that everyone understands where we're going here, we are then going to also derive that money from Act 13. We're going to put the levy money into act 13. Mr. Banks, in our last council meeting, had reduced an expenditure related to stormwater from \$175,000 to \$50,000 leaving \$125,000 unappropriated amount in October 13, so between the \$25,000, transferred to city hall, improvements and the \$100,000 we will transfer with the next motion, to levy improvements, we will have utilized that \$100,000 in current year Act13 funding, and expected to recreate that funding act 13.

>> Thank you. A motion in the second?

>> Thank you Ms. Miele and thank you, Mr. Yoder. Any question on that explanation and WhatsAppinghere? Okay. Hearing and seeing none, Ms. Frank on the motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>>. Yes. Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks.

>> Yes Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, motion passes 7-0. Talk, Ms. Frank, and Ms. Miele.

>> Okay. Can I finish off that motion then, Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> I'm going to take us back to page 60, the act 13 budget and under the line levy improvements, I'm going to increase that line from zero to \$100,000.

>> Zero to \$100,000. Is there a motion?

>> Second.

>> And there is a second.

Questions from council on that move? Hearing and seeing none, Ms. Frank on the motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, the motion passes 7-0.

Thank you, Ms. Frank and Ms. Miele.

>> Okay. Shall I keep going?

Anybody else want to make any sort of motions here, or shall I keep -- keep kind of moving

forward with the Administration suggestion for a moment?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yeah, I did want to ask chief -- since we took care of I think the majority of the key ones there, I did want to ask chief Hagan and the Mayor about specifics on staying at 47. Can you guys speak to that? And Liz, I'm sorry, I don't know what you were going to continue with is related to that. If it is, my apologies.

>> One of the items is, but it's a little ways down the list.

It's as good a time as any to have this discussion, so let's go.

>> Certainly.

>> Mr. Mayor, would you like me to go ahead?

>> Certainly. Start it off and I can jump in.

>> Okay. Given the constraints this year, the special situation that we're in, given the pandemic, also taking into account that the hiring of our 48th officer, if we did that next year, would involve someone who would need to go to the academy beginning in March and his presence would not be felt until November probably, late October or November. We would not see in terms of preventing over time much help from a 48th officer next year, given those realities. However, the removal of that position from the budget would free up \$52,000 in salary, \$12,500 in health insurance, and \$505 in FICA for a total of \$65,000 plus. That amount, if eliminated from our budget, would free up, with council's approval, \$30,000 to be returned, 15 in overtime and 15 in comp time and would enable us to assign those two very important officers to the Lehigh County. Keep in mind we have two new officers who just returned from the academy. You just hired a third one. So we have three more people than we did a few months ago to count as manpower. We also have the ability to return another from a special assignment, if necessary, so those are four more people. Certainly three, if not four. Leaving these two over there is extremely important to us. The reduction of violent crime and drug crime. We believe the elimination of this position this year from 48 to 47, given the realities, would be the best thing to do under the circumstances, and it would also, after the \$30,000 is returned, 15 in each, you would still have \$35,000 or so in savings left. So we think it's a great idea, and we welcome any questions on that.

>> I just -- chief Hagan, appreciate that. And it makes perfect sense the way you explained it with the academy and the time that officer would not really perfect anything saving on over time or anything like that. And I -- this is an unusual year and budget, and I think that's a top gap, and that'll solve the problems for next year, so I think we're still going to have work to do because this issue will come up in next year's budget with these officers. So we need to have -- we talked about looking outside of the box, or maybe talking with the County and club rating -- collaborating with them on an ongoing basis that can be repeated year after year.

And this gives us -- I'd like to take the opportunity to take this coming year to do that. I'd like to see that.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> I would echo those sentiments. I appreciate the idea, and I think it's a solid idea. I just

wanted to clarify.

So we're going to save -- we're going to save \$65,000 and it sounds like you're proposing to save 30 for the NEU, and then put \$35,000 towards the bottom line. What would the \$30,000, you're proposing to keep, go towards?

>> I believe in the last budget session -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- I believe Mr. Banks made a motion and it was passed to reduce police over time by 15, and I think comp time by 15, as well, for a total of 30. The question was asked of me then what is the estimate if those two were returned. Members of council believed we couldn't afford to support the task forces. This particular task force we believe is important enough to give up a position on the police department to continue support, if necessary, and that's what it's come to here. We would ask, if that was the case, if it was 15 in each, that amount to be returned to the -- to each of those line items so that we could continue to have enough over time in the budget. This over time and comp time we're asking to put back is what we pay out is manpower being on patrol because those guys are over there. We don't believe it will be as much next year given the new people that we have, and the fact that if we brought them back they would all be on the same shift probably.

But it still would be significant. We're asking that it be returned and we're willing to do this in order to keep those operations going.

>> Thank you, chief.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Just to clarify, we took 20 from over time, and 15 from comp time. It wasn't 15 and 15.

>> My mistake. Then it would be 35 returned and 30 to the bottom line, sir.

>> Mr. Slaughter?

>> And also, you know, I think chief Killian alluded to it, as well last week's meeting, we will continue to pause on this over time, and at any moment, are able to bring those to -- any special assignments for that matter back. So if we do see a spike in overtime or comp time we have the ability to bring back any special assignments which we would do that. We do keep a policy on over time. It is our goal to reduce it. Clearly you can't determine how many fires you have are going to reduce that.

It's always our going to reduce that. As it pertains though to this specific case we have the ability to bring back and assignments. Our proposal is not to eat up that over time, so [Indiscernible].

>> Mr. Banks?

>> You mentioned with the academy, the 48th officer wouldn't start until November.

Then why is it we factored -- and maybe we haven't -- but why we factored an entire year's salary for that individual? I think it's 52.54?

>> Yes, sir. The full amount is budgeted, and then we plan to use half of it to pay for the academy during the time they're in the academy. While they're a cadet, they make one half of the first year officer's salary for those months in the Academy -- academy, and the other salary is used for the academy and the minute they graduate and appear here for full duty, their salary is increased to the full first year amount.

>> So just to make sure we get these amendments right, 52 \$524,000 from salaries, and

\$500 from FICA, correct?

>> According to Mr. Pawlak, those are the numbers.

>> Is this Joe, Pawlak, can you verify is that accurate?

>> That's correct.

>> Okay. Then I guess I'll go ahead and get started.

>> Mr. Banks? Dave, can I jump in for a sec? The one idea that wanted to suggest and this might be something we want to below blow out of the water right away is potentially reducing more or less half of the cost of that position with the idea we would reopen the question -- so reducing about \$35,000 worth of the cost of that position with the idea we could reopen discussions about a 48th officer, after mid-summer, say some time in August, in case it happened to be forefewous time to hire, I think it would give us a little bit more flexibility than dropping that money to on the bottom line.

>> You're saying in the case there is some sort of -- something God forbid something happens to one of our officers or something like that we need to fulfill that.

>> If something bad happens to one of our officers -- if we would lose an employee for some reason, we could hire another, but I don't know, if a new hire becomes available, if we would like to move forward with a 48th hire in the 2022 budget and we'd like to move forward with that 48th hire prior to the beginning of 2022, something like that. It may also be that that is absolutely not something that we want to contemplate and it -- of course we will authorize the hire so it wouldn't matter. And I'm not saying that's necessarily the way we want to go, but I just wanted to put that out there as a possibility in case that appealed to anyone.

We are looking to restore \$35,000 to the police over time budget. We could do that with about half of the total salary and benefits numbers from the entry-level police salary line.

>> I think that's a fair suggestion. If you want to put it forward.

>> I'm happy to. I was actually just looking to hear. Does anybody have any objections to that or any thoughts about why that's a horrible idea? I'll admit I haven't had a lot of time to think about it so it was kind of a proposal as something else we might consider.

>> Fair point, Liz. I'd prefer to see it go to the bottom line personally. I think every a little bit's going to help.

That's just opinion as one of seven.

>> Just wanted to put it out there.

>> I would prefer it gets dropped to bottom line. If we committed to this course we'll just say 48 for 2021.

>> And I'll agree with them, also it should go to the bottom line.

>> Sounds good then, Dave, up to the do you want to move on those motions?

>> Yes. So, on page 49, 24405110, reduce that by \$52,524.

>> I'll second.

>> There is a motion in the second. We've had quite a bit of discussion thereany more? Hearing none, Ms. Frank on the motion, please.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 7-0. Thank you, Ms. Frank. Thank you, Mr. Banks.

>> We'll keep rolling if that's all right with you.

>> Yes, sir.

>> All right. I would like to make an amendment to line 244052090. That's a health insurance, and to reduce that by \$12,500.

>> I'll second.

>> There is a motion in the second. Any discussion on that?

Hearing and seeing none, Ms.

Frank on that motion, please.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, motion passes 7-0.

>> To finish the introductions out I'd like to propose an amendment to line 244052010, it's the FICA and I'd like to reduce it by \$500.

>> Second.

>> The motion in the second. I don't see any discussion. Ms.

Frank, on the motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> I'm sorry, Ms. Mile me?

Miele?

>> Just one question. Mr. Pawlak, it looks like we're lined up to FICA elsewhere for \$1,000, so can we make a motion to increase that by \$500 for a total instead?

>> No, we need to -- we'd have to increase it \$1,500.

>> We --

>> To make the full change.

>> Oh okay. I thought we were decreasing by \$500, at this point.

>> I'm sorry. You're correct.

You're correct.

>> Okay. Mr. Banks could I possibly ask to you amend your motion to increasing FICA by \$500 to \$70,500?

>> Yes. And I'd like to end amend the motion to --

>> Increase.

>> -- increase by FICA by, you said \$1,500?

>> \$500 to \$70,500.

>> I understand. Yes, \$70,500, so increase it by \$500.

>> Sounds good.

>> Motion to amend. Is there --

>> Second.

>> Okay.

>> Second to amend. Ms. Frank on the motion to amend, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, motion to amend passes 7-0, so let's have the vote on the motion then.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, the amended motion passes 7-0. Thank you, Ms.

Frank, and thank you Mr. Banks -- or Ms. Miele -- or Mr. Banks.

Mr. Banks, more, please.

>> I will keep going on this, just to finish this out. So I would like to increase -- propose an amendment to increase line item 244052040, police over time, by \$20,000 to a total of \$180,000.

>> Second.

>> There is a motion in the Increase police over time by \$20,000. Hearing and seeing none, Ms. Frank on the motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>>

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Carrs?

Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Mile me?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes motion passes 7, 0. Thank you, Mr. Banks, Ms. Miele.

>> I'd like to make an amendment to line 244051040, that's the comp time, to increase it by \$15,000 to a total of \$180,000.

>> Second.

>> There is a motion in the second. Increase comp time by \$15,000 to 185. Is there -- Mr. Banks?

>> Just before we're off this, I just want to thank you, chief, and the Mayor for bringing this forward. It was a good compromise, so thank you.

>> Yes, and thank you-all for your support. Thank you.

>> Thank you, sir.

>> President Allison, I would just like to second that thought. Dave beat me to it.

This is what compromise looks like and I really appreciate this idea. I believe actually, I was

the one that made the motion to cut that over time and comp time. I'm not going to let Dave take the wrap for that, so I am glad to see us putting it back in though because this work by these two officers is very important. And I'm glad to see that we're not going to be losing -- losing these officers in this unit.

>> It well said, Mr. Mackey. And making a budget like they say, any kind of legislation is like making sausage. You don't want to see the process, but you're happy with the results and everybody likes it, so there's no -- there's no wrong answers here. We're making sausage, and hopefully we come up with something everybody's going to enjoy. Okay. Any other comments on this? Hearing and seeing none, Ms. Frank, we'll have the vote, please.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> You're muted, Bonnie.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> I'm sorry. I couldn't get it unmuted. Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes, Janice. Thanks.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> know each other well enough. Yes, motion passes 7-0.

Thank you, Ms. Frank, and thank you, Mr. Banks. Job well done, sir. And Administration.

Okay. What do we have left?

>> Just a handful of things in terms of small changes bite Administration to clean up -- by the Administration just to clean up some stuff. Is it okay if I start moving forward with this?

>> Yes, if you're ready to.

>> I'd like to make pay motion on page 35, line 23207100, contract services, I'd like to decrease that line from \$40,000 to \$30,000. That's more or less a make good on some other slightly inaccurate numbers that we'll be changing moving forward.

>> Okay. That was line 232079102.

>> Yes, 79100.

>> Second that.

>> There is a motion in the second. Discussion on that, council? Hearing and seeing none, a motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks? Had.

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Mile me?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 7-0. Thank you, Ms. Frank, and Ms. Miele.

Next up.

>> Okay. Next up, on page 49 of the general fund. This is in the police department under non-uniformed salaries, 51080, and please folks my vision is not that great so if I get the numbers wrong somebody jump me and correct me. Going to increase that line from \$86,614 to \$97,784. Mr. -- okay never mind. Yep. To \$97,784.

>> Okay.

>> I'll second that.

>> there a motion in the second? Is there a discussion on that? Hearing and seeing none, can I get a motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder.

>> Mr. Mackey.

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Pel Allison?

>> Yes, motion passes 7-3. Thank you, Ms. Frank, thank you, Ms.

Miele.

>> Okay. Next motion. Oh, we took care of FICA already. Thank you, Dave. Okay. On page 26 in the general fund, under trash removal, we realized some savings on the trash contract.

The line 22707960, decrease that line to \$40,000.

>> Second that.

>> Motion in the second.

Decrease trash removal from 45 to 40. Is there a discussion from anyone?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Bonnie, did you -- you were muted? There -- she's a yes. Okay. Motion passes, 7-0.

Thank you, Ms. Frank. And thank you, Ms. Miele.

>> Okay. The final item I believe unless anyone knows of something that I don't is a motion related to page 34 in the general fund. This is once again a contract services line item, line 231076060. I'd like to decrease that line from \$10,000 to zero.

>> To zero. There is a motion in the second. Questions from council? Mr. Banks?

>> Just one here. What was this intended to be used for?

>> This was for our by annual OPEV valuation, but that won't occur until -- it's going to -- will rein company ber the funds from 2021, so it's just a valuation that happens periodically. We'll encumber the funds from 2021 and just won't have anything else for any contracted services.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you, Mr. Pawlak. No other questions or comments. On the motion, please, Ms. Frank.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> I apologize for my mute not working half the time here, but yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes motion passes 7-0. Thank you, Ms. Frank, and thank you, Ms. Miele. That was --

>> Just cleaning up, Randy.

>> -- a valiant effort. Yes, I appreciate that. So Mr. Pawlak, where does that leave us right now? In relation to our goal?

>> The bottom line leaving taxes as they stand, is \$1,028,748.

And to reduce \$1 million of taxes is \$872,540.

>> Which would leave us then, I don't Joe, with about \$125,000 in the bottom line?

>> No, because there has been an additional change that wasn't on my proposal. It's 156.

>> Yeah, 156. Got it. All right.

The news just gets better and better kind of.

>> So that's where we're at, council. Did everybody get what he just said? Had so we have a decision to make. So let's have a discussion on where we want to end up. Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Thank you, Mr. Allison. So real quick, given all -- and Mr.

Pawlak, I know I'm probably putting you on the spot to see how quick your quick math is, I apologize. But given all the changes we've made, where does that put our -- what the proposed millage increase would be?

>> We were at 1572, so that would be at 1622, if I'm correct. For a half mill in tax increase.

>> I'm sorry. I probably didn't present my question clearly enough. With these changes, what would our total millage increase be then with this new pro posted budget in this format?

>> It would be a one-half mill tax increase..

>> Questions or comments? Mr.

Yoder Yoder? We've got a half mill tax increase, which is about \$150,000?

>> Roughly.

>> 434.

>> Okay. I for one would like to see us go further. I'm just going to throw that out there. There were a handful of things in there that we, in addition to what the Mayor brought forward, which again thank you. I appreciate that effort. There were a handful of things I think the Administration was looking into. I know it's only been a week. We've been having these discussions for a couple of weeks. I didn't know if there was any progress on any of those items, you know. We've talked about contracting out a couple of potential services that support city hall, you know, there was talk of the recreation Department. There was talk of a number of other things. I know it's been a short time, but we don't have a lot time so I didn't know there was any additional insight into those items that could be helpful for those efforts?

>> We have -- we've looked into a few and really what we got back was the savings -- if you contract out, the savings are normal, if any. What we're trying to get, what I spoke to a few people about would be the hourly how many hours, if it's contracted out. We have an employee obviously full-time every day. If we contract out, is it twice a week, three days a week, what do you get for that money. So we've looked into this. It's not looking as though the savings would really be that great. Councilman Banks and I spoke about engineering the other day, and that was one of the areas, same with I.T., Chris Cooley and I discussed that. We have a very good conversation.

They typically charge about twice what the salary would be and will you're not sure what the hours you would get, so it would take a little bit more digging into. I know it was a week. We tried the last few weeks, as you've said, we started to call around and ask but it's still some more work to be done, but I definitely know we can do to have these

conversations going forward. My personal. Right now is another area we looked at a think I spoke with council President Allison about this, is when we're looking at the consultants, having an in-house grant writer possibly cutting what we have for consultant bringing us a grant writer part-time, which would give us more than we would normally get and using the other piece of that for consulting, so that's an idea I'm throwing out to get council's input, as well. That's a possibility. So there is a number of items we could look at even here in the beginning of the new year that could realize us some possible additional savings, too. And bring some folks in-house that we would get more hours from potentially than otherwise. So, there is still a lot of -- there is still a lot of variables out there that would allow us to realize some savings and we're continuing to look into those.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor, those variables, if we were pushed how soon do you think we'd be able to get some clarity on what those savings might be?

>> Hopefully sooner rather than later. PennDOT and FTA have said that before. That's going to improve our systems greatly, and that'll probably allow us to realize some savings. So again those items we don't know yet.

There is also some other items that we are -- we don't know yet. So hopefully -- I don't want to speculate too much, but I would say hopefully soon after the new year. Some of them are out of our control. The PennDOT and FTA and others, but we'll hopefully get those very, very soon here, and have those mechanisms in place.

>> Thank you, Mayor. The only reason I had asked is, you know, hypothetical, should the budget not pass tonight, we would have to go back to the table and make sure that we could rework a budget before January 1st, and if we couldn't, then my understanding is, and anybody feel free to jump in and correct me, at that point in time, the city would quote/unquote shut down. Until that time, January 1st, the city would continue to operate as normal with the current budget, right? It -- it would be nice to see those additional savings, and that's why I had asked, like how soon we might be able to see those savings. Because the last thing anybody would really want is to see the city go into quote/unquote a shutdown.

>> That is correct. And other -- the other option, as well, Councilman, is to hypothetical again if we -- if you-all pass the budget, once that comes -- once they all come in, we can reopen, so say we don't get them over the holidays with next week in the holiday season, if we don't have those prior to January 1st, if the budget were to pass tonight, and then we get all of those items in, as an as we get them, obviously the Administration will bring those to city council. We have the option of reopening and looking at, once we have all of those accurate numbers, and coming back and adjusting or amending any of these line items as council sees fit.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> I'd just like to, at this juncture, just remind all of us that if we're thinking about voting against the budget without even attempting to amend it down to the level that we're comfortable with, that would be highly irresponsible of us. It is our job to -- this is on our

desk now so it's our job to get to a place we're comfortable with. If there are amendments we need to make, we need to make them now. I just want to make sure we're clear on that.

>> And just as soon as I have the information from other agencies, I will get that to city council's desk instantly, I can sure you assure you that.

>> Thank you, Mayor.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes, I --you know, Councilman Banks, I don't think it would be irresponsible when we're trying to figure out how we can amend some things. There are things still questionable as far as what the budget goes. This is a budget that we've been working on as council for at least three weeks, and it's been a daily process of how are we going to make sure we are not going to strap our taxpayers at this point. We brought it down to a half a Mill and that in itself is still money I hear some people is going to be hard for them to deal with. But this year in so many precarious positions not working, not bringing in an income, it's very difficult for some of our taxpayers. You're questioning a lot of things.

Now, as far as what we can outsource, Mayor, I hope you look at this diligently from the standpoint of some of the offices, departments. You brought up the engineer. An engineer is vitally important to our city. This is -- that's one -- one employee that we know the problems we incurred when we didn't have one that was qualified. Especially with everything that's going on with the levy, gravous run, and so many different areas. That's a position you cannot outsource.

This is someone who has to work within the city Administration.

There are other areas that maybe we can look at and that would be I.T. for some --you know, we more or less have done a lot without I.T. in city hall this year because our I.T. person was over at RVT. So therefore maybe that can be outsourced. The rec Department. That's another area that we can look at, as far as what we can do in other areas with that. When we say you're not only looking at salaries, you're looking at the legacy and when I say legacy, your health insurance and all the other expenses that go along with thosaries. Let's not be foolish in what we want to pull away from the city government and let's be smart about it. You said let's bring in a grant writer for maybe 20 hours a week. I'm looking at chief Killian and chief hag an We have skip Mimi, at this point, who is qualified to do things like that. I think that would be foolish to bring somebody in with -- for that purpose. As far as lobbyists goes, lobbyists are entirely different than grant writers. They're the ones sitting in the offices of the legislators trying to beg for the money the cities need. It's an entirely different element that you're looking at, so let's run our city smarty and smoother and let's not just sit here and, at the last minute trying to make these cuts and trying to come up with different ways to run things. Let's do this starting January 1st, as far as how we're going to run our city lean and mean next year, because, you know, we're talking problems we're having with this budget. Trust me, you know, as well as I do next year is going to be worse without some of the income that's not going to be coming in. We've got to have somebody out there fighting for us to try and bring money into the city to help cover some of the expenses, and you know as well as I do what might happen with RVT, so therefore

you have -- we have to be so careful for next year. And this year, you know, a half a mill can be very hurtful to some of our citizens. So let's think about this. Okay? And you're right. It can be amended come January if we voted yes to this. We still can amend it and I do understand that factor. But I still have to put our taxpayers first.

>> Can I just piggyback on what you just mentioned, councilwoman Katz? We are down to half a mill, and I think I heard you say we should be careful about what we changed and need to do our due diligence in researching that because we don't want to go cutting just because we're trying to get to a certain point. And -- and I agree with that. I think the things that we're asking the Mayor to look at within a couple of weeks, to me are things that really are going to take a reason -- a reasonable amount of time beyond that to really do the kinds of things you were referencing, Bonnie, you know, what function does this Department play, what function does that Department play, and then balancing that against if you go to a consultant -- or go to contracting, what's that cost going to be, because every -- there is a lot of moving parts there. We get somebody that's familiar with how city government runs, or how do we work all that -- I think it's going to take more time than a few weeks to really hit the nail on the head there, and then the other thing that know in relation is now we're at a half a mill now. Where exactly do we want to get the consensus is to get? Is it quarter of a mill? Is it a third of a mill? Is it zero? We have to have a hard target other wise we'll have a hard time identifying what we need to get there. So those are my concerns and thoughts right now as we go forward. I'm sorry, Mayor Slaughter?

>> I -- are you finished, council President?

>> Yes.

>> Okay. I just wanted to be clear as it pertains to John sander, our engineer. I by no means want to outsource the engineer. This was brought up at one of the council sessions when we were talking about the various departments and had happened to be -- Councilman Banks and I spoke about it briefly, but not by any means of -- from Mai's point of view to get rid of Jon sander. We hired him on earlier this year and he's done an absolutely tremendous job with all of the projects and I 1,000% want him to stay and I would never propose getting rid of him or outsourcing that position. I think what he is doing is fantastic. So I want to clear up that point and make sure that wasn't misunderstood. And secondly, I absolutely will do my due diligence as councilwoman Katz mentioned. We will make sure that everything that we look into and that the Administration has been asked to look into. I'm not suggesting by any means what Jon sander is doing is not appreciated. He is very much, so, and I would actually go to bat for him any other way if council considered outsourcing engineering, I would actually strongly disagree with that, so just wanted to clear that up. Thanks.

>> I'm happy to hear that, Mayor.

>> Mr. Winder?

>> If I can just voice my. Real quick. John sander's phenomenal.

I have been through as management two other engineers.

Jon sanders, by far, knocks it out of the park. I would not give up Jon sander for anything.

I'd give up my salary before I'd let you guys cut his. The other one that I heard come up before was human resources, and I guess the point I'm going to make is that I was here when we outsourced human resources before. It was a nightmare for the employees. I called Joelen when she was technically off. We talked for about an hour. We resolved the issue. The employees work around-the-clock.

You need somebody that will be.

I know Joe Ellen has gone to the fire Department, first, second third shift, it doesn't matter. She's always made herself available. And I think it's the key point to make is this administration, it doesn't matter what time it is, I could call chief Hagin, I could call Killian, through snow storm and different events we've all come to work very hard together. To outsource certain things I think is my personal opinion wrong for the employees and the city itself. You need these people that are devoted to the city, not to five other companies. If you want to make some cuts I'll offer \$55,000 in the streets Department's equipment line item. You can cut that. It will definitely hinder the process with the equipment we were going to buy there. We've made it this far. We'll make it even longer.

If you want the Administration to look through, I'll go through and pick apart my budget line by line if that's what you really want. I'm here to help you do whatever. I don't to see certain departments get outsourced so if the street Department has to be affected in some fashion to make that happen, I'm glad to do it.

Thank you.

>> President Allison?

>> Yes.

>> Would you mind if I said something for a second?

>> Absolutely. Go ahead.

>> Personally, I'm with -- I'm with everyone on council that I would prefer to see this year be a zero tax increase year. None of us -- none of us on council, none of us in the Administration want to see us raise taxes, especially in a difficult budget year. However, I would suggest that we have, over the course of my time on council, over the last 12 years, but a number of years past when we had an opportunity to give ourselves -- this isn't an opportunity to give ourselves flexibility in the bottom line.

This is a matter of necessity, and we do not want to cut our budget so closely that God forbid something unforeseen would happen, we wouldn't have money to transfer into a line of expenditures and that is what I think we would be doing to try to increase the tax to consider and keep the taxes exactly the same as last year. I cannot stress the extent to what that would be an exceptionally wise idea on our part. We have succeeded in reducing the tax increase by 1.75 mill. That's a huge accomplishment. We have -- we have outlined further opportunities for potential savings moving forward with the Administration, and we have committed to waiting with the Administration to realize those savings. If we realize those savings, that money falls to the bottom line. It doesn't matter whether or not we've taken on this budget. It's going to be there for us. So, we -- to me, I think we need to move forward with the -- with the idea that with the next item that we look at, we will -- we will -- we will include a tax increase of a half a mill. It is a hard ask.

It is not an ask that I am proud to make. It is not an ask that I want to make, but I feel it is the best option for the services the city provides to the citizens, for the City of Williamsport, and for keeping -- for making certain that poor Mr. Pawlak doesn't die of a heart attack by the end of 2021 as we ask the finance Department to perform miracles with money that's not there. We need to keep the budget as lean and tight as humanly possible, Ms. Katz, I agree. But quite frankly this first year in the budget process, that process looks like working on the budget beginning in January. That process looks like focusing on the budget cuts not just in November and December, but throughout the entire year, focusing on places we can economize. This is somewhat of a lost year for us. The pandemic has scattered a number of issues that were far beyond the city's control have scattered our ability to focus on budgetary issues this year and made it even more difficult this year but we need to make it a priority every year moving forward until we have a plan for the city's budget. And we know where we're going and we know how we want to spend our money, because really the reason for the city's financial situation is in part the constantly rising demands of personnel costs and healthcare, and in part the fact we have in the course of my tenure on council, never seeded in making a plan for the administration we will find ourselves in ten years from now and that is what is necessary to provide the city with a sound financial footing. Why don't we commit to doing that after we pass this year's budget and commit to a more solid financial future in 2022.

Thanks, Mr.

Allison.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> I would like to say I agree with Liz. Every -- every year that we do the budget, we're given this budget in November and we're off scrambling, and I think what we would all like to see is we would like to see a five year plan laid out. So, come November, we're not all sitting here scratching our heads trying to figure out how we're going to save money and cut wherever we can. This is something again that I think we really don't want to see the Administration do starting January. There were so many different areas, maybe we have to start looking at different areas, and I do have to agree with Joe Pawlak, and Liz Miele, we cannot cut things down to the bone where we are strapped and things cannot run smoothly.

There is such a point of being foolish in what we do with our government, and -- but on the other hand we have to be careful because we are using other people's money to finance what's going on in our city, and we do have to be careful how we do this. We have to look out for the benefit of others. So I'm asking you Mayor and the Administration to please start putting a plan together for five years that we can start working on things. Please start in January to start working on how we can do things, run smoother and cleaner and more financially stable. I don't know how we can do that, but I think if we all put our heads together, maybe we can all come up with something different instead of scrambling the last minute. Trying to do this the eve of Christmas is very hard mentally and physically for all of us, and we've been doing this for how many weeks, at this point, and I don't want to see us going through another year of this. I really don't. It is kind of -- it's hard, but it's also

ludicrous to be putting us physically and mentally through this. Every Department, every Council member, we're all going through this and I think we're all getting tired.

>> Thank you.

>> I think I've said my peace.

>> I'll agree with that, Ms.

Katz, and could I just agree with that, and I'll go to Mayor Slaughter. And I'm going to sound like a broken record, but -- and I'm sure everybody feels the same way on this, but whatever plan we come up isn't just for running a tight ship.

It's for how are we going to go grow our revenue outside of real estate tax, and I think that's a big of the equation. Mayor slaughter?

>> I wanted to follow up, I agree with all of that and council President Allison and I had a very early meeting this year with DCD to have the talks of a five year strategic plan.

Was that January or February? I don't know. It was prior to the pandemic. And we had every intentions of that this year, and of course the state and federal budgets, you know, were out of whack just like everyone else across the country. So we've already -- we've begun the engagement with DCD, and their strategic planning process, and we're hopeful that in 2021 here we'll be able to continue that and get definitely a plan in place, so I agree with you.

We've already started it and hopefully that'll come to fruition very soon.

>> Thank you, Mayor Slaughter.

Chief haggan? You're muted, chief Hagan.

>> Very briefly, with regard to I.T., the bureau of police, and really the Department of public safety, but especially the police with the confidential information that we handle has special needs with regard to I.T. that go far beyond the normal sort of I.T. stuff that regular government units need.

It is an intimate relationship that we have with our I.T.

person, and that extends beyond the current I.T. back to the prior guy, as well. There are direct conversations with spillman and other companies.

There is planning, and there are specific needs, emergency and otherwise that come up, that make it -- I think that go beyond would be realistic to a contract worker, so I would ask that you keep that in mind. With regard to the grant writer, I want to thank Councilwoman Katz for the compliments on the grant writing. And it is true.

Especially our fire chief is an extraordinary talent when it comes to grant writing. The simple fact of the matter is we are responsible for running bureaus and departments, and so we are part-timers at best, amateurs at this, and so the idea of being it is a leap of faith, but you pay 20 or 50 or whatever for a part-time or full-time, 20, \$50,000 part-time, full-time grant writer, but you see possibly six or seven figures in revenue because of that, because they can dedicate more time to it. I know this is what the Mayor meant even without asking him.

The idea is that you would have a huge return on that small investment. I think the County has seen a return like that with the same sort of investment over the past several years, and I think -- I think we could, as well, but it would be a leap of faith. There would be a trial period. It's just that the chiefs, myself and mark and others, only have so much time to do

that and we have to do a lot of other things and to have somebody who could do that all the time could be -- in some time of financial constraint might just be the answer in an effort to find new revenue that we just aren't being able to find right now.

>> Chief Killian?

>> Yeah, just to again, reemphasize Chief Hagan's point.

Yeah, we have been successful in some past years with the grant processes, and quite frankly writing the grants are the easy part. Managing the grants oftentimes are the difficult part and we spend a -- an inordinate amount of time managing grants from a financial standpoint with Mr. Pawlak and such to exactly what Chief Hagan said. We have Departments to run also, and as I enjoy grant writing, it becomes a huge time commitment, specifically with a lot of the stipulations on the federal grants and such and quite frankly, it is almost a full-time job to keep up with the -- with the constant updates and new requirements and so forth from the grant standpoint.

So I would agree with Chief Hagan wholeheartedly, and you know obviously from the Administration standpoint, the intention there would be to realize those savings -- or to realize those savings in actual hire and make that money back from a grant funding standpoint, and again my expertise per se and I wouldn't even call it expertise, but my forethey is fire Department writing, Chief Hagan's is police department grant writing. Our expertise is not in many of the other avenues of, you know, city government, so just some food for thought regarding that. But the time commitment is tremendous, and trying to balance that, and run a Department, as well and everything that comes along with that can be quite challenging.

>> Thank you chief Killian.

Other -- Mr. Banks?

>> If I could just support what the chief was saying -- what Chief Hagan was saying about I. T. That conversation started I think with you and I, President Allison. Over the past couple weeks I've had some more time talking with Mr. Coolie about all of the avenues that he's involved within the city and I would say if he's not -- it's not just I.T. It's just technology in general. Outsource for somebody to handle help desk tickets would cover such a small amount by what's actually done by our information technology director, that Department. So it's a good value for what we have.

>> Thank you, Mr. Banks. Other comments? Mr. Mackey?

>> I know it's getting late and I don't know what there is else to say, but I will fifth the notion we need to start this process earlier, because what I'm hearing is that maybe there are other areas that we can -- could save. We just don't have the time to figure it out, right? It's December 17th. And to figure these things out in the next 14 days would be unrealistic, so that leaves us with this decision. To approve this budget or to delay it what another week and have it come back and look exactly the same or maybe delay it and have it come back and look the same, and at that point, now we're voting on the budget that is before us right now or we would be voting essentially to shut the city down and I've heard a lot about what is go in the best interest of the citizens of Williamsport and I'll council what Councilwoman mealy said, I don't think any of us want to raise taxes. We're all taxpayers

here.

I don't want my taxes to go up, but this is, for me, we have two options here, pass this budget, or I guess that the city down, and I don't know who's the best to answer this question, but what does that look like exactly? I've heard that a couple times, stat shutting down, the city government shutting down. What exactly does that like? And that's an actual question, I would like answered.

I think it's important for the citizens of Williamsport to hear what that means.

>> This is norm Lubi new.

-- lubin.

>> After January 31st, there is no authorization to spend any money. The one case that went to the common law's court on that are the court was very emfattis on it, the authorization to spend money doesn't exist. The reason it got to the court was the Mayor and council asked the police department to work without being paid until they get a budget passed. The police department said no so they had to lay off the entire police department.

>> And I'm assuming the same would go for the fire Department?

>> Same for any Department.

On anything. If we had a snow Department on January 31st, the authority couldn't spend any money.

>> Again, I think what I'm trying to say is, I'm supporting this budget. A half a mill is not idea am, but when you consider the alternative I just --you know, that to me seems very irresponsible. That's all I have to say. Other comments or questions?

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> It's okay if Mr. Lubin wanted to say something further.

>> The only thing I can point out is under the third class city code, there is a provision for reopening the budget in January, and basically, it has to be done by February 15th, and there is some notice requirements to get to the paper, ten days of public inspection, things like that.

But it can be done.

>> Okay.

>> But it has to be done in the month of January though.

>> Okay. So I would like to ask Mr. Grimes, you're the one who actually sends the tax bills out. How does that affect your timeline?

>> We have to certify with the County, actually next week, the tax rate, however for real estate tax rates if you would change the millage rate by February 15th, that's about president latest. Our bills usually around that time are when they're all produced to be mailed, so if the millage rate would change February 13th, if we could get it adjusted on the tax hills, we would just have to see what we would need to change with that certification process with the County. I imagine we can just tell them here is our new tax rate, but I'm not 100% positive.

>> Okay. That gives us some -- that -- this is useful information, I'd say, that we just heard. From our solicitor and treasurer. Did you have something else to say, Mr. Lubin?

>> It's just section 11810 in case anybody wants to check it out, or look for the more details that are in the provision.

>> Okay.

>> And just for reference sake, like I said we're talking about getting it lowered, but we don't have a hard target. Some people make as a consensus, if we wanted to get it down to a quarter of a mill, we'd have to find \$217,000 more cuts. Or some combination there of. Mr. Pulizzi, you can go first.

>> Thank you, Mr. Allison. You know, I will just be completely Frank with everybody and with all of our residents, that's what ski I sec /* /* -- what I ask of people, to be honest. I came in to tonight fully of the mind-set that I was going to vote against this budget. Firmly because a burden placed on our, I didn't feel was necessarily this year. However seeing how well our Administration and our council worked just recently in the past few very short weeks to be able to find the cuts made, to bring down the budget from what it was to what it currently is, a lot of us have seen ideas how we can bring increased revenue into the city without having to increase the tax burden on the residents.

All things considered, I am going to vote to support this budget. You might even say that I'm inspired at how well our city is working together, at least from where I'm sitting.

Mayor, we all know you were elected into a pretty tough spot and it's been a pretty tough year. We are a mag ority of a freshmancouncil. A lot of past Council members might not have ever gone through. So with all of that, and I will cut it short because we're after, 89 -- 9:00, I'm going to vote yes vote yes to budget because I believe how well we're working together and I believe in what we'll be able to accomplish this coming year, however Mayor and everyone else, Department heads, please know that the upcoming budget presentations for years to come, I expect that after we've all gone through this, going into the next budget proposals yup if I'll be so -- I don't know if I'll be so understanding of a budget like this in front of me.

With everyone as new and as green as we are we can really do some incredible things for the future of our city. So all of you, thank you very much.

>> Thank you. Mr. Yoder?

>> I'll echo the sentiments of Mr. Pulizzi. I was hoping we could get to zero. I think we've still got a little bit of more time if we can reopen this in January. It gives the Administration some more time to look into this things that were brought up in our deliberations and our discussions, some idea counsel threw to the Administration. I'm willing to vote for the budget to give the Administration some more time to identify those things in hopes we get it to zero. I've got a couple other ideas but they can hang in there until January.

That's no problem. I'll echo what Mr. Pulizzi said, as well.

This has been an interesting process. Tonight we've done a lot of work together specifically, that's great. I think the seven of us specifically have done a lot of heavy lifting in this, and I appreciate the collaboration between everybody we've had a lot of ideas shared and that's inspiring and fruitful. I very much hope we are not here next year. There is a lot that can be done to avoid that. And that starts in January, like everybody said. I will be here to help that effort but it's got to be led by the Administration.

I'm looking to the Administration to lead that effort so that we are not sitting here again next year and repeating the same craziness.

Long-term it's not responsible I'll look forward to helping you, Mayor Slaughter. I look forward to reopening this in January so we can get it to zero. Thanks.

>> I don't see any other Council members. Very heartfelt thoughts expressed by everyone. I think we all appreciate that, appreciate each other. I'll second that -- those thoughts, that there was a lot to deal with and I'm very proud of my Council members and fellow colleagues. It's been a great year working together. We're not quite done, but we're almost there. So kudos there and thanks to the administration. So that takes us back to the budget as it stands now. Our first matter will be to vote on the ordinance, at this point, that we've already opened up and brought off the table. So if we're already to vote on the cuts we've made and the changes, and apparently we are. Ms.

Frank, on the motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison.

>> Yes.

>> Motion to adopted operating budget passes, 7-0. Thank you, Ms. Frank.

>> Randy, this is such a hallmark moment. I just went all of us to stop and appreciate the love in the room right now, the virtual room any way. Okay.

Sorry.

>> A combination of good feelings and exhaustion.

>> I don't know if you could you call it love -- if you call it love, Liz. It's been tiring.

>> I'm over myself. I just had to put that out there.

>> It was good to feel unanimous about that, so thank you.

>> Very good.

>> It was done with trepidation and promises.

>> More than promises. A hear a commitment to doing things differently, but organized intentionally I think is what I hear voiced tonight. We don't want things to just happen. We're going to be intentional.

So that brings us to item four, adopting. Would you read that in short form, form, form, please.

>> An ordinance of the City of Williamsport, County of Lycoming, City of Pennsylvania, fixing the tax rate for all 2020 and final reading.

>> Thank you, Ms. Frank and we need to bring this off the table. So is there a motion in the second?

>> So moved.

>> Second.

>> Ms. Frank, on the motion to bring this off the table?

>> Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> There yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison.

>> Yes, motion passes 7-0. It's back on the table for its final reading and vote. So, could you go over those numbers then, Mr. Pawlak for a half mill increase?

>> We're currently at 1722. I think we're looking to bring it down to 1622 or 1 mill decrease.

>> 1 mill decrease.

>> Yes.

>> Which would amount to \$872,540.

>> Decreasing the millage?

>> Increasing the millage from last year, decreasing the millage from the proposed millage in the propose the ordinance, if we're being totally clear, right?

>> We're decrease at a mill to leave us with a mill -- a half mill increase from last year.

>> That is correct. And that's with the option we find out we have a timeline in the beginning of 2021 to open the budget and make further changes should we desire to do so and find the means to do so.

>> Randy, if -- can I say something? And this is for norm.

Didn't you tell me we have until February -- whatever is it? -- February 15th, or 18?

>> 15th.

>> 15th. To pull this all together. It has to be passed by -- or adopted by February 15th at the latest.

>> Okay. Just wanted to clarify that.

>> Mr. Slaughter?

>> Quick question for norm as it relates to process. If we leave it open here, is that -- who

initiates that?

>> The institute obvious stat is lilength like -- silent like all Pennsylvania statutes. It doesn't matter who because obviously it's council's action, so it would be a meeting where it would say first motion to -- a motion to reopen the budget what I was going to do is copy that statute and send it to everybody.

>> Thank you, norm. We appreciate that.

>> Just from a timing stand point, that would be required by ordinance. I don't have the calendar in front of me, but we meet on the 7th, meet the 21st of meet probably some time in February.

>> February 4th.

>> You're looking really at the 21st of January, and the 4th, forof February for the meetings.

>> Okay that's helpful. Other comments or questions?

>> And I?

>> In did we amend the millage?

>> No, we just took it --

>> Took it off the table. Okay.

Thank you.

>> So are you making the motion and.

>> Joe, remind me again what the updated millage rate would be for only a half a mill tax increase.

>> It would be 16.22.

>> All right. I'll make a motion to amend the millage to 16.22.

>> Is there a motion in the second.

>> Second.

>> Discussion on that millage? I think we had all the discussion we can have about it. Ms. Frank on the motion, please.

>> It Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>>? Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 7-0. Thank you Ms. Frank and thank you Mr.

Yoder for doing that. And the second whoever that was. I missed it. In any case, Mr.

Banks. We will move on to item 11. Expect for filing, bureau of codes report, October 2020, and the Williamsport municipal water authority from 1028/20, and Williamsport municipal

sewer authority, 10/28/20 in the minutes. Is there a motion in the second?

>> So moved.

>> Second.

>> Moved and second the. Any questions on the minutes?

Hearing and seeing none, a vote on the mooving, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes, motion passes. Thank you, Ms. Frank. We'll move to announcements. I need to amend the announcements. Council will be having one more meeting. One more special meeting this year.

Date to be determined, but between Christmas and new years, that week, to deal with some city insurance issues that have to be done by the end of the year. So the next regularly scheduled city council meeting that's already in the cue is January 7th, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.

remotely, however we will have a meeting before that at the end of the year. Comments from Council members tonight? Mr.

Banks?

>> Don't want to drag this out, but Chief Hagan, did you give a date on chief Sechrest's requirement? I thought it was early in January, right?

>> Yes, 30 years to the day, January 4th.

>> Yeah, so I thought it was before our next official council meeting. I just want to make sure that, you know, I'd hope we get a chance to acknowledge the assistant chief.

>> Yes.

>> For his service. I don't know if we could -- I don't know if he wants to come to a council meeting after 30 years of service, after his requirement, but requirement, if we could pass it on to him, in some sort of official capacity.

>> Thank you, sir. I will -- and I am sure he will greatly appreciate that. Thank you very much.

>> Other comments from council?

>> Council comments from the Administration?

>> I'll say thank you to city council for your hard work. I'll share in the sentiments it will be

much better in the very near future, and secondly, just to echo Adam winter said earlier, as y'all know this was a record breaking snowfall, and our public safety and public work folks are out there working diligently. Everybody wants their roads cleared as soon as possible and our public fox works are working extremely hard so just bear with us a little bit longer here, and we'll get the streets cleared just as soon as we can. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Mayor Slaughter.

We have one comment from the public tonight that I'm going to read. It's from misty Deon. Center for independent living, 24 east third street, Williamsport. President Allison and members of city council, the citizens of Williamsport with disabilities urge council not to approve the Mayor's proposed \$40,000 -- \$450,000 from the city hall maintenance upgrade fund as it is desperately freed for a number of things, but specifically for access. Access is far overdue. 30 years overdue, to be exact. On another note, the city's poor display of their inability to remove snow efficiently causes further access issues for the citizens, especially the Disability community who are unable to travel to their employment, stores, and healthcare, which is even more concerning during the pandemic that disproportionately affects them at much higher rates. City hall for all, misty Deon. And that brings us to a close. I'll entertain a motion for adjournment.

>> So moved.

>> Second.

>> Second.

>> All in favor?

>> Aye.

>> City council members could you hang on for a second?

Chat