

Council President Adam Yoder brought the Williamsport City Council meeting to order on Thursday, February 3, 2022, 2022 at 7:00 PM .per remote.

Council members present:

Adam Yoder, President
Bonnie Katz, Vice President
Liz Miele, Councilwoman,
Randy Allison, Councilman,
Vince Pulizzi, Councilman, absent
Jon Mackey, Councilman,
Eric Beiter, Councilman

Absent:

Vince Pulizzi

Also, Present:

Derek Slaughter, Mayor,
Mr. Joe Gerardi
Mr. Joe Pawlak
August Memmi
Sam Aungst, Fire Chief,
Keith Lucas, Asst. Fire Chief
Adam Winder
Justin Snyder, Police Chief
Solicitor Norman Lubin
Janice Frank, City Clerk
Adam Winder, RVT
Scott Livermore, S&P
Sean, S&P

Approval of the Williamsport City Council minutes for 01/ 20/22 were approved upon a motion **Mr. Beiter and a second from Mr. Mackey All were in favor. The vote was 6 to 0. Mr. Pulizzi was absent.**

Suspending the rules vote to have meeting remote

Mr. Yoder The reason we are doing this you'll see as we get down later in the agenda, and if you watched two weeks ago you know when COVID started we made a couple actions we thought enabled us to hold remote meetings. And recently found out that that action was not continuously codified. And so we are working to address that tonight. If they are codified we need to suspend the rules for tonight. For those watching this evening, are there other questions or from the members in seeing and hearing none, on the motion please.

Mr. Allison made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Mackey

The motion to suspend the rules was granted with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0. All were in favor.

Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes and Mr. Yoder voted yes. Mr. Pulizzi was absent.

Roll Call

Mr. Allison was present, Mr. Mackey was present, Mr. Pulizzi was absent, Mr. Beiter was present, Ms. Miele was present, Mrs. Katz was present and Mr. Yoder was present.

Limited Courtesy of the Floor

There was none.

Bill# 1791-22

Ordinance Transfer Ordinance #6 (first reading)

The City Clerk read the ordinance in first reading.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second.

Mr. Allison made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Beiter.

Mr. Pawlak Good evening, this is transfer ordinance number 6 for 2021. Basically this transfer will get the 2021 account balances lined up with the budget – or get the budget lined up with expenditures for 2021 calendar year. Going through the transfers looking for who needed money and different lines, and where to get the money we were able to find most of the required money for each department within their own budget overall for the transfer in front of you. With that being said, it was reviewed on Tuesday by the Finance Committee.

Ms. Miele Yes, and it comes from the council with a full body of recommendation.

One of the focuses of this transfer ordinance was the additional debt service we had to account for in the 21 budget didn't anticipate in the beginning of 21. And Mr. Pawlak on the interdepartmental movements move into interdepartmental, he also located money throughout a variety of budgets to cover that additional net service.

And that's what makes this a complex item. But as we said, it's housekeeping for 2021 at this point. And so we sent it to the full body of council for a positive recommendation.

Mr. Allison Good work by Mr. Pawlak.

Mr. Yoder I'll second that, certainly, Miss Katz.

Mrs. Katz: I was going to say the same thing, tremendous job, Joe, the incredible the way you outlined everything and found the money, thank you so much. I would like to thank the departments able to save some money in some lines to add money to other lines too.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the ordinance.

The ordinance was carried in first reading with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0. All were in favor.

Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes and Mr. Yoder voted yes. Mr. Pulizzi was absent.

Bill #1792-21

An Ordinance Amending Part I of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Williamsport (first reading)

The City Clerk read the ordinance.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second to adopt the ordinance in first reading.

Mr. Beiter made the motion and it was seconded by Mrs. Katz.

Mr. Yoder stated Mr. Mackey and I are on the agenda this with. And I can kick this off. And Jon if you would like to follow with the discussion on limited courtesy on the floor, you are welcome to, if you want me to handle that, I'm happy to do that as well. What this is a ordinance updating a couple areas of the rule of procedure city council one is to rote and hold meetings deliberately and remotely. The way our ordinance is read now is we have to be in person to vote. We are okay today because we suspended the rules. But moving forward if we are in the middle of the an emergency or inclement member or a safety concern or members who want to participate but unable to participate in person due to emergency circumstances or what have you, this is enables us to do that. And updates this accordingly. I think over the past two years we have experienced the value and seen the value of holding meetings remotely. This is procedurally updating that. And Jon, if you want to speak to the second piece in here about limited courtesy of the floor I'll yield to you to talk about that. But I'm happy don't want to.

Mr. Mackey: That's fine, President Yoder. This is a topic I believe I brought up in a reorganizational meeting in January. And I think ultimately this will make things easier for a citizens of Will to come to a City Council meeting and speak to us before we vote on stuff. So thank you Adam for moving on this quickly. I think this makes the whole process less cumbersome for our Williamsport.

Mr. Yoder So a quick technical description. Limited courtesy of the floor is the public speak to go to the council before we deliberate on items specific to the agenda so we get direct feedback before deliberations and discussion on the agenda. Currently the way it's set up the requests have to be in about 30-ish hours before our council meeting. With the when the window of our when our final agenda posted per the rules to when that deadline is. It's a bit awkward. And may be a bit of a barrier to engaging the public. And it keeps this in place because it worked in the past but it creates a second mechanism to have requests spontaneously before the meeting starts to track it. So we expand mechanism how we get the public so ion up sign up for the courtesy of the floor. That's basically what it is. And Jon thank you if the idea and vocalizing it and encouraging us to look ate and take this approach. Very much appreciated. this was reviewed in finance. So I'll turn it over to Miss Miele.

Ms. Miele: Yep, I'm sure Mr. Yoder can speak to the discussion there as I can and other members of the committee. So stop me folks if I get something wrong. I think all of us thought that both of these amendments were a wise idea. There was some discussion with the Second Amendment regarding public participation about perhaps when we as a part of the sign-up process for limited courtesy of the floor asking the public to state which agenda item they'll be addressing as a double blind a means to make sure everyone was planning to address an item on the agenda and not open grievances or events or anything not germane to the content of the meeting. And as as far as item number 1 goes, I am particularly I made a handful of discusses for some content amendments just it seems to be Adam, one related to one related to handful of mechanisms we have listed for making a meeting remote are basically a movement by the President or like I actually can't even remember what the other one was currently, Adam. But I suggested we added like a telephonic vote of a majority member of council for the potential circumstance where the President was for some reason not reachable. And wouldn't be at the meeting and wasn't reachable and we had to make it remotod for a occasion like this evening for inclement weather. And the other suggestion is what Adam discussed at the beginning of the discussion which is an amendment that had allow individual members to vote telephonically as necessary even if the meeting were in person. The rationale being not individual members could not attend on a whim. But if we needed a quorum and weren't able to achieve one in person for some reason. Or if we had a member on vacation, say, who was particularly passionate an item on the agenda, I suppose that might be another reason. But anyway. And then I think we had some questions. And Adam, I don't know if you had time to figure this out or not. Whether we need to modify telephonically to include digitally or toll phonically by definition includes that in PA s law. And also whether excruciating circumstances was the best legal terminology for these circumstances or whether something else like extraordinary. So I don't know if you had time to put thought into that, Adam? Or like me, you hadn't had time to flesh out those thoughts since then.

Mr. Yoder I'll be fully honest with you. I have not had time to flush that out, no. And this is on Mr. Lubin's radar and he's with us this evening. So we can probably get a couple questions answered quickly from a technical perspective. But adding language for some other things that are very much appropriate and I think are good ideas, I have not had the chance to sit down with Norm to work those out. So my apologies. But Norm would you be able to address I think a couple verbiage questions at least related to what Miss Miele was asking?

Ms. Miele: Telephonically and then excruciating were the two words we weren't sure.

Mr. Lubin, Telephonically, you can also add in digitally to be on the safe side. But there's also -- I thought there was another provision in the rules for city council. Regarding the specifically required in-person voting. And if I can check on to that. I thought there was another provision in there, another rule. And if necessary, I can prepare an amendment for the next meeting for second reading.

Ms. Miele We think further down in the ordinance that we also have a requirement specifically that council members be in person to vote?

Mr. Lubin I believe there may be.

Ms. Miele: Adam do you have to full text of the ordinance in front of you?

Mr. Yoder: I do not, I have the text from the American legal publishing, which should be up-to-date. I did not catch that.

Ms. Miele said let's look into that.

Mr. Allison: I think when I looked in the book, I found where it did say -- so yeah.

Ms. Miele: Yeah, it certainly did say that at one point. Adam if you didn't where he remove this at this portion of the segment and we didn't remove it at the beginning of the pandemic, it's still there somewhere.

Mr. Yoder It is. We didn't remove anything based on what we did. So we need to. I only remember one [overlapping speakers] good catch, Norm.

Mr. Lubin I'll review the verbiage with you maybe tomorrow and then I can send a proposed amendments for second reading. Obviously this should be passed as is for first reading.

Ms. Miele, okay. So as of right now, what we -- the recommendation would be we pass this as is and you and Adam will work on revisions to address those terms that may or may not be legally on point with our intention and also perhaps the idea of giving a majority of council or all of council voting -- voting telephonically the right to move a

meeting to remote in the absence of a council President. And a revision that allows for individual meetings to attend remotely or individual members to attend remotely. And then cutting wherever the provision wherever we find the provision that specifically requires we vote in person. Or changes that to voting in person or by remote means? Got it. Okay. : Got it. Okay. That sounds good to me as long as we have all that text obviously in plenty of time for second read. Thank you. And but that I think then is the full report from finance, Adam. I'll yield to other members of finance if they have further recollections I'm missing.

Mr. Allison Only, you know, it's a minor thing but the second clause is 111.02.

Mrs. Katz Curious, all the years I was on council and even before I was on council, we were told a limited courtesy before had to be in 30 hours beforehand and that was the law. Was that just a ordinance set up by the city? Or where did that come from? Just curious.

So we always took it for granted we had to do it that way.

Mr. Yoder I think this version was put in before the most recent amendments to the censure law. Prior to that there was no requirement by statute of having public input before the vote.

This was put it in I think before the most recent round of amendments.

It came from city council. And I know if it came from the league of cities or it came from another city how to handle this issue but it wasn't part of the original statute.

Mrs. Katz I was curious because there was so many times people want to speak before council and if they weren't on the agenda they weren't permitted and they would have to wait until after council which is after the vote.

So this makes it more convenient for things on the agenda. Maybe more work for Janice, but she can handle this.

Mr. Yoder: And Bonnie just to piggy back on to Norm. The issue is specifically our local law, our local law outline that is process. So we are simply expanding access to do that. But that requirement still would be in place. The only difference is you can get on to limited courtesy of the floor up to the beginning of the meeting.

Once the meeting starts, you would not be able to get unlimited courtesy to the floor.

Mrs. Katz And people should understand she can speak afterwards.

Mr. Yoder: That does not change, correct.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the ordinance.

The ordinance was carried in first reading with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0. All were in favor.

Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes and Mr. Yoder voted yes. Mr. Pulizzi was absent.

Resolution # 9249

Resolution to Approve A Sales Order/Agreement with Rohrer School & Commercial Bus Sales

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

Mr. Beiter made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Mackey.

Mr. Winder stated This resolution is to authorize the purchase of a 2019 pro master low floor ADA transit vehicle.

The purchase will be from rural school and commercial sales in the amount of \$87,437.

We will be using 2019-2020 CCA funding in the amount of \$72,581. And our local match CCA funds of \$14,854. This vehicle will replace three other vehicles that were taken out of -- that were taken out of service over the last couple years due to meeting their useful life and no longer being expectable. This is a 10-passenger vehicle. It's two -- it can accommodate two wheelchairs and eight regular seats. It's a demo model and that's how we are receiving it at the price we are. If we were to wait to try to purchase a brand new one we would not see it until 2024. This vehicle would immediately go in service and accommodated some smaller routes like the downtown connector. The live Salk view.

Valley View connector. Areas using a 35-foot bus is a little tight. And areas we know we would definitely be picking up multiple wheelchairs. The highlights of this one is that typical vehicle like this would have a lift for the wheelchairs. This has like a normal bus where the ramp folds out.

So it's easier to access. This was reviewed in the transit oversight committee and passed forward with a positive recommendation.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you. This was reviewed in Transit Oversight Authority, . And was forwarded with a positive recommendation. Mr. Winder hit a lot of the highlights. And I'll defer to other members of the committee to make sure I don't miss anything. But we had a bit of a discussion around the route specifically and the ADA component of that. We had some questions surrounding the financial mechanisms we were using to pay for this. We are in alignment with a appropriate uses and there was some discussion with the other businesses no longer in service if I remember, where off loading them and will receives a monetary value out of them. That goes back into the operating fund for River Valley transit. From a cash flow perspective we had some discussion about where that was going as well.

Again, this was forwarded with a positive recommendation. I think that was the brunt of the discussion. I'll yield the floor to other members of the committee to make sure I didn't miss anything.

Mr. Beiter: One thing I would like to ask is simply looking at the bus itself. Is there going to be an additional cost to have this lettered and graphicked and branded for the River Valley transit in the next month when we receive it. The branding will be minor. This will roll into our rolling stock, which vector media will have an opportunity to do all the advertising on. So it will basically get a River Valley logo and number. If I were to guess, we are only talking a few hundred dollars to get our logo on it and numbers.

Mr. Winder The rest would be as I said another revenue stream for the advertising portion.

Mr. Beiter Okay. How many miles does this vehicle have on it since it's demo? And what's the useful life of this kind of vehicle.

Mr. Winder This had a little over 5,000 miles on it. Useful life is 10 years, 500,000 miles -- 12 years, I'm sorry, 500,000 miles.

Mr. Winder: Thank you, any other questions or comments from members of council?

Mr. Allison: Thank you. Mr. Winder, what kind of fuel does this run on?

Mr. Winder It's a 6 cylinder gas engine, it's turbo driven. To get a CNG that would be 2024, CNG is better to go but this is regular gasoline.

Mr. Allison It looked like it. I didn't see any tank visible anywhere. So it probably wouldn't -- would increase the size of it a little bit. But --

Mr. Winder Yes, currently we only have two vehicles that are similar to this. Like I said, we have the lift style for the wheelchair. So a person actually has to go on the lift and get it picked up in the air and move to the vehicle. And both of those are getting close to a useful life. So this would definitely be a great asset to us at this time.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the resolution.

The resolution was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0. All were in favor.

Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes and Mr. Yoder voted yes. Mr. Pulizzi was absent.

Resolution #9250

Resolution Awarding the Construction Services for 2021 Street Paving Project to Big Rock Paving, Inc.

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

Mr. Allison made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Beiter

Mr. Sander. This is the award of the city paving contract for this coming year. We had 6 bidders on the project. The lowest bidder is Big Rock paving. And the base low amount of \$856,691. You read the other bidders on Tuesday during finance. Most discussion in finance revolved around budgets. I guess we can hop to that for a second. In regards to budget, we were budgeting \$805,000 for paving for this year. so we are at 856, we are obviously \$55,000 over, so that was the most of the discussion revolved around that. And it was discussed in finance and given no recommendation. So any questions?

Mr. Yoder: Thank you, this was reviewed in finance. I'll turn that over to Miss Miele for the finance highlights.

Ms. Miele: thanks, Adam. I think the meat of the discussion we did have a hand offal questions about which particular streets were included. And I think Big Rock was by a far margin the lowest bidder on certain items on the paving contract. And we discussed that for a moment. And Jon is right. The vast majority of the discussion came when I asked how much we budgeted in 2021 for paving because I was only using half my brain I asked for the budget of 2022. But this is the 21 contract. And we budgeted 804 or 805,000 for paving. And even the lowest bidder on our paving contract comes in over that amount. This is forwarded with no recommendation. Obviously not because the Finance Committee doesn't believe in paving treat streets because the Finance Committee wanted the administration, that's to say the Mayor and the finance department to verify which path they intended to choose, whether we are going to remove a handful of street Mrs. The paving contract to meet the \$805,000 budget we set for ourselves in 2021. Or whether we preferred to use surplus funds and surplus money in our liquid fuels account to cover the difference.

And we received notification I think Wednesday on possible in in the day on Wednesday we were supposed to use liquid surplus. I think liquid fuels we had a \$900,000 surplus as of 2021. Although I think we allocated some of that in the 2022 budget. I'm not certain. But anyway, we should have bear minimum around \$700,000 of surplus in liquid fuels currently. And there's no restriction on the amount of surplus you can use on any time for streets according to Mr. Winder at the Tuesday meeting. So the \$100 we need to make up the difference is not big thing.

And liquid fuel can be used for a you remember in of things with road construction and sidewalks and vehicle purchases and to a certain extent, payroll but on a limited basis. But streets falls exactly within the wheel house and intent of liquid fuels funding. It was forwarded from the full body of council with no recommendation purely because we wanted the administration to clarify what their intent was. The only other piece of information that I would end with is that in the past when these items come to us or when we have seen street contract go forked by they are constructed in such a way that we have sort of primary streets as the primaries by and then we have certain treats considered as alternates to And I think that enables to easily remove streets if for some reason the paving numbers come in dramatically higher than anticipated and we don't have the funding to pave adds many streets as we thought and felt that might be a wise course of action to take Mr. Sander with the 2022 RFP. That gives us a bit more flexible in terms of ease of removing items. And I'm assuming by 2022, we will have come to a better understanding of exactly what, you know, the wage increases and all the inflation mean for the, you know, the City's paving cost. Where there's everything is really in flux this year.

That was everything, Mr. Yoder.

Mr. Yoder Thanks, Miss Miele. Are there any additional comments from other members of the Finance Committee or other members of council on this item?

Mrs. Beiter : Jon, looking at the streets on the schedule. A majority of them are half width. What is described half width here?

Mr. Sander What I do here -- and this is tie into the budget now that I think about it. We might be under. Because I include water authority's streets on our list as well. Because they get them to us early enough. So we may not even need to full from liquid fuels. Anyway, long story short. Anyway, certain streets are in fact half width. Certain streets were also determined to be a water authority's half or UGI's half. That's based on our the codes ordinance if they make so many cuts on the street, they are required to pave that half of the street.

If they are paving that half, and I'll look at the other half if that's bad, we'll pick up the other half. So we don't have so many freshly paved roads on one side and the older roads on the other side. So that's the rationale with the half width on some of these. And some were --

Mrs. Katz: We don't want to do the half width because it doesn't last as long. It's a problem. And I'm looking at so many of these that have half widths. I thought if we were doing things with the water authority or any other entity that's goes underground the whole street would be done curve to curve and half width that gets moisture in it eventually and doesn't last as long. Is there someone there from streets and parks? Scott, are you there?

Mr. Livermore Usually when they do half width construction if they do half width they'll seal that center joint to prevent moisture from getting into the joint. They are required.

Mrs. Katz: But it still doesn't last as long with curb to curb.

Mr. Livermore can argue that because I paved lot of hall ways you only do a half width and it's only a cold joint we tie into.

Mrs. Katz: This is what we are told for years for so long this is going to be a problem. And that's why I'm questioning this. I'm questioning the validity if it's the water authority and ours if we were on the same treatment I thought we were work together to do the whole thing at one time.

I gave the water authority my list somewhere end of summer early fall somewhere in there.

So and they -- they are well-aware of what streets I'm doing ahead of time.

Mrs. Katz: Being well-aware and working together are two separate things. I thought we were having a better working relationship we would work together on this and be done at one time. I won't willy nilly pick a street. Because if the wear surface is in horrible condition I'll pick that road over any other. That's how we prioritize our roads to pave.

Mrs. Katz: I don't think you are understanding. If the water authority started on a road that was already bad we were as a city would work with them on the whole to accomplish. What we would do is use their paving contractor and charge back to us or whatever, either/or. To make sure the road was done at one time.

Mr. Livermore We are doing that. For instance, Hawthorne, I can remember that one distinctly. It had a half width done recently. I'm just picking the other half. Why it was not timed perfectly. I'm not entirely sure. But we are working with the water authority and also UGI. In fact, I sent the list to streets to be paved to the water authority and UGI at the end of the summer, before I compiled the project and put it out to bid.

Mrs. Katz Okay, thank you, Jon.

Mr. Sander And I wanted to add this second -- there's two pages to this city paving list. The second half is almost exclusively water authority -- yes, second page is all water authority. So --

Mrs. Katz Are you talking Cliff Side.

Mr. Sander William, Hollywood, Maxwell, Isabella. So they are only required legally, to pave the half of the road they are digging into. So next year, I might do that. The other piece. But I try to prioritize roads based on their condition. So thank you for the incite though.

Mr. Allison: I think Bonnie, a number of the half widths on the other side are streets that were already paved. Half paved. And for some reason, a year ago or two years ago, only one side was done. So we'll be completing the rest of that road. Hollywood Circle I think one-half side has been paved I believe.

And so hopefully the water authority is doing the other side. Would that be correct?

Mr. Sander That is true. Last year, UGI paid for Hollywood Circle's half and the this year that's the water authority.

Mr. Allison: Typically their main run on either side of the street. So I did know that UGI was there. So they are actually, I mean, Hawthorne's there's been a lot of complaints on Hawthorne because the one side was paved. But if you are going down Hawthorne, the South side, it's not paved and that's the side they are doing to do. Ideally, yes, we would be able to coordinate it all at once. But if we are doing whole streets with our money, and then the utility is going to come in, we don't always know I think when the projects are by exactly where their facilities are until they mark it out and get the project started.

So it would take a lot of pre-planning but I suppose we --

Mrs. Katz: At one point we were working on that Randy, with David come wine and Joe Gerardi. So it's not a inconvenience to the citizens living on those streets you are tearing them up at different times.

Mr. Allison: It's true. But I know the gas company had a very aggressive plan over the past several years. To get a lot done. And I'm not sure sure we could have kept up with that pace to --

No, we couldn't have, it was too cumbersome, I know what you are saying. I'm just looking at this sheet now.

Mr. Allison: They paved lot of mileage. And I don't think we would have a the money to keep up with them. And then do other whole streets that were bad in the city. So it's kind of, you know, 6 of one if and half a dozen of the other. But in the end, we had a lot of city streets paved, which is a good thing. However in the future there's not going to be too much more from UGI. Of course, I know the people there. And they have most -- almost all the main work done within the City. That's not going to be a regular summer thing anymore.

Mrs. Katz: Can I go off track for 2 seconds and this would be with Joe Pawlak. I don't remember right now and I don't have my budget book with me. Did we take the brick streets out it have budget this year?

Mr. Sander Yes, that's why I don't have anything on there for brick work, that's correct.

Mrs. Katz: And believe it or not in the last few days I've gotten calls on people really upset about what is going on with the bricks on their street. So something will have to be addressed eventually. Because they cannot live with with the way the bricks are falling apart at this point. And since it's not in the budget, I don't know where to go for that, I really don't. We always did put some money in for the bricks but I think we are going to have to come to some realization of what is better for the cars traveling on the brick street there. Because Rural avenue has always been a problem.

Mr. Yoder: Bonnie, can I piggy back on that? And Liz you might have a comment here as well. So by all means jump in here after I'm done. But regarding the brick streets with budget, we have taken that out. Both for the reasons of cost savings on the budget because we had a couple of rough -- I don't want to say -- we had a rough year and then we had a bear bones year over our last two budget cycles. But in addition to that, I think we had some discussion about do we really want to maintain brick streets in the city? And we have differing opinions on council. But I would make the argument -- and Miss Miele is going to disagree with me. And the I respect that. But I think by taking that out two years, I think that we are saying -- and I don't want to speak for everyone else -- but I don't know if we want to maintain brick streets anymore. The way to fix that is to get rid of brick streets.

So my ask would be when we go through budget this year, I mean, I suspect we would want to see a plan and have that reflected in the budget from the administration on what they believe needs to happen. And I think that's the way we address this long term. That's just my personal thoughts again. I understand we are differing opinions throughout the group of 7 here on council but that's my personal perspective on that.

Mrs. Katz: This I will say. I don't think we have the man power to really maintain these brick streets. And you can't expect our citizens that are living on these brick streets to deal with all the damage that are coming to their vehicles. Also the safety of those roads to also -- and it must be horrible our streets and parks to maintain and plow those brick street also. So there's a lot of different reasons we got to I think really address this situation eventually here.

Mr. Yoder: Bonnie, I agree. And like I said, I'm at least looking -- I mean, I think over the past couple years we started to speak to this. I'm looking for the administration to really dig into that. Based on the past couple of years. Liz, I see you have your hand up as well. As I figured you would. I'll yield the floor to you.

Ms. Miele Sure, and we know I'm passionate about maintaining brick street and they add interest to a Councilman. But I would second the point what you and Bonnie are making is what is clearly not an option is not maintaining brick street Streets and also not doing anything to change -- do you see I'm saying? We can't simultaneously ignore the problem and refuse to fund the solution. Right?

So I think that we are going to have to make some decision there. I would encourage us -- when we look at brick

streets to bear in mind the quality of life they can add to a Councilman, at least in a limited number. And I would say that \$50,000 a year which is what we were putting into brick streets previously is really not sufficient to even remotely address the number of brick streets that we have in the city. Which is pretty pal tri. But brick streets these are streets that are 150 years old -- excuse me, I got company here -- that are 150 years old and they are still going. So we probably invested less money in them over their lifetime than we will invest in our other streets.

But if the decision is to get rid of them, I would encourage keeping one or two show piece one. But we need one, the matter of not funding it and not addressing it won't work for anything long. I agree, Adam, if nothing else we need the administration to put together a plan to allocate attention and time and money to the brick street issue.

Mr. Mackey: I have a standing desk, I might have to find a chair, I might pass out. I can't believe we've we are having this conversation. It's like there's a Councilman having this discussion for two years. So let's not just talk about yeah they lasted for 150 years but what of damages have these things doing to the done to resident's cars and city equipment. What kind of cost have we incurred because of that. I believe I did the math. I think we believe 0.8 miles of brick streets in this city. And this may not be popular with some people who live on these brick streets but @ at the end of the day we need to pave over these things and be done with it. Because these are not -- yeah, Roar avenue is a nice street. I live close to there. I walk in that neighborhood all the time. And it's just going to be just as enjoyable there for me if there's brick streets there or not. At the end of the street, I couldn't agree with you more, Councilman Yoder. And I think this is something that needs to be done. And that's that.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you, Mr. Mackey. Are there other comments or questions from members of council? I have a couple but I want to defer to everyone else first. Mr. Allison.

Mr. Allison: I have one for Mr. Livermore when you take out a brick street and then pave, is that -- are there extra costs associated with that?

I know you direct that had to Mr. Livermore but I was trying to jump in here.

Mr. Mackey Yes, there's extra cost because you now have to put base in. then your topcoat for sure. More than likely, you are going to need some sub-base underneath that as well. So it will be a total reconstruction of the road. But brick streets were not designed and we'll use Wayne avenue as a prime example you have all that bus traffic. Over the years we have hundreds of thousands of dollars on that road to do brick repair. It doesn't last. You are lucky if you get a year out of it. It's just you are using the same old bricks over and over again. You have to have concrete, then a sand base to do it properly. The weather we get pushes the sand out and uses the where I can up. You lose bricks.

Mr. Sander to Mr. Mackey's point, hundreds of thousands of dollars is really the cost and damage to vehicles across the city , police cars, fire truck, I'm not advocating for or against, I'm just saying they are very expensive and in my personal opinion we throw money away to fix them.

\$50,000 a year was never enough to do brick street repair.

Mr. Allison: Wayne avenue is the one I always think of because it's been in terrible shape for a long time.

I only ask that because -- if we were to eliminate them, I'm not sure if we would do them all at one time.

One thing, there's a ordinance that protects those brick street tats moment.

: Yes there is So we have a revise that ordinance or research that ordinance, which Norm can probably speak of.

Mrs. Katz: I guess I opened up a can of worms here, didn't it?

Ms. Miele: I think what we are telling the administration is we recognize we have a problem. We are looking to you to come up with a solution one way or the other. And work through that. Whether updating an ordinance, whether paving over the bricks. Whether it's restoring the bricks, we clearly have an issue brought up by Mrs. Katz, we had a good spirited discussion on both sides of the issue but I think we all agree this needs to be addressed and we are looking for the administration to take the lead on that. >> I would agree with that statement. The only thing I will say to council and Jon you can correct me if I'm wrong t biggest challenge is I would never pave over the bricks because it won't stick and it will peel back up every winter. You won't have a definitive cost to reconstruct a street. Until you really dive in.

So I mean, I would probably say we'll have to go a year without repaving streets and focus on brick. And try to come up with an estimated square yard cost to do total reconstruction of the brick area.

And keep our fingers crossed kro we don't go way over budget. Because I believe reconstruction size if we have \$800,000 to do street resurfacing, we could chew that up quick on Rural avenue alone.

Mr. Yoder: Under. I think all factors the administration needs to take boo account when they think of a solution.

Mr. Beiter : I understand, my question to Adam raised Mr. Winder raised was about the ordinance protecting the brick streets. Is that anything we need to be more concerned about because it have historical value? I know three years ago the city vacated Du Bois vote and gave up that property which was a brick street. I know that was something we talked about or was talked about the the time and had been done. So I don't know if that interfered with the ordinance.

The other thing I would just throw caution out to is the allure of that particular neighborhood.

I understand the equipment cost and everything that Jon is raising. But we should be mindful of the resident who is live in that area and why thigh do. It could be like newberry where they no longer have street trees and that altered the look of the neighborhood. And we should be concerned what they think as well.

Ms. Miele: Thank you, I think that's 100% accurate. We have a number of residents who have identity on the street they live on in a number of ways. I hope this discussion will spur some of these residents to speak out of their feelings. These are the brick streets. Are they adding to their home environment or detracting and then in turn will help council make a decision.

Mr. Beiter: Agreed.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you all very much. I have a couple of questions myself. And I kind of want to pull it back to the original spirit of the debate regarding the financial end of this. Jon, Mr. Livermore can you refresh my memory, what's the available starting on the budget for next year for liquid fuels.

Mr. Pawlak I can't answer the balance for liquid fuel, I'm not sure what the budget is. I think Adam winter had that.

Mr. Winder I'll take this one because I had to close out 202 is. In order to get Mr.Llivermore name on it. We were starting off fresh with no possible scenarios of trying to figure out where money was spent. Mr. Livermore will start this year with 1.\$7 million.

Mr. Yoder: What do we expect him to have at the beginning of next year?

Depending if everything goes correctly, water authority takes over storm water, he's probably -- I'll ballpark our liquid

fuel les allocation in 2023 would be the same as 2022.

We are going to be probably right around 1.5 next year. 1.3 to 1.5.

: Okay. So you're not expecting this to make much of a dent one way or the other on our ending year or starting year balance next year. I know I don't remember the specifics of what we previously budgeted that maybe didn't come out or what have you or that we have budget added for this year that we are pulling out of liquid fuels but I do remember there's some stuff happening out there that will probably impact that. So you are fully aware of that and if we need to dip into this, that we are to be in a very good position beginning 2023.

Mr. Pawlak correct. We have about \$300,000 hanging out there with expenses that I have that we have not received like for example the truck that we purchased early last year the 10-ton dump truck that's 147,000-ish. The score board I believe -- not the score board, the design work on Forest Street, Jon we are using liquid fuel money for that and we are getting reimbursement so we'll receive some money back once that reimbursement comes through. I don't think there's anything else hanging out there that we use liquid fuels for, other than possibly 50,000-ish. Jon needs for this paving project.

Mr. Yoder: The reason I asked is I thought we had a decent amount of money budgeted for the 2022 budget out of there to the tune of like 700,000 or \$800,000. And look, I don't know what the future revenue is going to be either. So I just want to make sure we are taking that into account.

If we are not taking that into account we might be looking at 100,000 or \$200,000 starting budget in future years and that would very much impact what we can do this time next year.

So I wanted to make sure we are taking that into account. I think that's very, very important. If you are saying you are, then fine.

Mr. Winder stated Liquid fuels budget high on everything. And I'll use salt and cinder, for example. We guess estimate every year under the contract how much salt and cinder we'll use. So far by the end of this season, we are required to give 60% of our allocation. At the end of the season, we are basically filling our bins to meet the 60% of the allocation. So we are budgeting an extra 40% of the cost of salt and cinders. And we're not getting anywhere near it because the issue is, you can go -- you can meet your allocated amount. But you can't go over it because then the company could naturally charge you excessively more money than you are slated in contract.

But you can only receive 60:00 p.m. With you budget high and thankfully we have come in low because the winters are excruciating. And our aggregates we budget extremely high. And nothing says we have to take it all or 50% or anything of that nature. We try and budget high. We allocate roughly \$40,000 to storm water. March 15th of last year, the water authority was supposed to take that over. We carried it through this entire last year. We hope they will start their process in the spring and be maintaining their part so we are not sinking money into that as well. So we are -- we budget for it but there's a good chance we are not going to use it for those items so it will stay in the bank, so to say.

Mr. Yoder: Okay. The other basis of my question -- the other question I had it's more administrative and what have you. And it's it came to mind following our discussion in transit oversight. I could be wrong here, this could be the wrong sense, but I have the sense that Mr. Wender you were involved in making the decision on spending this money. While your experience is certainly appropriate. And I know that you've been working with Mr. Livermore to get him up to speed. And that's very much appreciated. You are the leader of River Valley transit. And we made strides over the past two years to make sure we are separating our ties and as a rule ncialt between River Valley transit and the rest of the city. And from the conversation and from the documentation like the email for example I know Jon reference that had and Winder, I'm getting the sense you are involved in helping make some of these decisions that I'm not sure given your role at River Valley Transit you should involve in. And again, this is coming from a lot of the discussion we had in transit oversight. Two weeks ago talked about identifying where those connections were X putting a plan in place to sever them. To make sure that we are maintaining compliance. And we had good discussion about that again on Tuesday. I want to make sure that we are not in that boat. Because unfortunately that's -- that's the reason we are in the boat we are now. And I want to make sure we are not continuing that practice.

Mr. Winder We are not. The only reason I'm answering your questions is because I prepared the budget. And Scott Livermore came in after the budget was submitted to council. And the cut off for liquid fuels for 2022 is the report had to be closed out January 31st. So it made more sense rather than trying to give him a month and a half liquid fuel switching his name over and having him do the close out not knowing why I made the decision I made because liquid fuels is audited separate from the City. the decision was made from the Mayor and myself I would stay on liquid fuels until I got that close out done. I would have dop gotten it done faster if we had bank statements sent to the bank faster. But everything was becaused on December 31st. So that was the slight overlap. That's why I I answered liquid fuels because I don't know what I did with the close out and I prepared the budget.

Moving forward it's Scott's. He'll tell you all the time, I say don't talk to me about streets and parks and I'm happy and I don't come out in every snowstorm and all that. There's a cut off here we'll say.

Mr. Yoder: That's good. And it's not a easy question to ask. And I appreciate that. And Mr. Liver more is certainly new. We knew there was going to be a transition. And just because we want to sever ties it does not mean as colleagues we talked about this when we hired Mr. Livermore. You cannot offer advise one way or the other and collaborate like colleagues do. But I think that's different when we get into decision making what have you.

So I wanted to make sure we were not doing that. And I mean, and this is redundant. But I think redundancy is needed. And any time we are talking about this, that should not be happening. It sounds like it's not. And that is great. But to repeat. That should not be happening and it can happen. So thank you for that, I appreciate that, Mr. Wender.

Mr. Winder Thank you, I agree. And Mr. Livermore hit the ground running and he has done tremendous things for the city already. And he brings a lot of experience and insight. And the chiefs are sitting next to me shaking their head yes because they experience it at the firehouse. I don't get involved in that stuff. And Scott does reach out and ask different questions as far as learning liquid fuels, et cetera. I do assist him with that. But Scott Livermore is he had an interesting two months to start. But he's done a phenomenal job.

Mr. Yoder: That's good to know and I appreciate that very much. Those were my questions. I'll make one last round. Any other questions or comments from members of council?

The resolution was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0. All were in favor.

Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes and Mr. Yoder voted yes. Mr. Pulizzi was absent.

Certificates of Appropriateness – HARB

Item 1. 815 West 4th St - Sign Replacement – YWCA

Item 2. 857 West 3rd St – Wall Mounted Signs – Crazy Tomato

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

Mr. Allison made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Beiter.

The certificates of appropriateness were carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0. All were in favor.

Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes and Mr. Yoder voted yes. Mr. Pulizzi was absent.

Accept for filing::

Public Safety Minutes 01/18/22

Finance Minutes 11/16/21

Public Works 11/30/21

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

Mrs. Katz made a motion and it was seconded by Mr. Mackey.

The minutes were accepted for filing with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0. All were in favor.

Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes and Mr. Yoder voted yes. Mr. Pulizzi was absent.

Discussion on Fire Equipment

Chief Aungst stated earlier this afternoon you should have received an email with a report regarding various components of our operations. That are going to be needed to be repaired or replaced very soon.

Included in that are the apparatus we currently have. Currently, the four pieces of apparatus that we are, we are spending about \$63,000 a year on repairs for that apparatus and that includes a 2016 engine that has been quite a hassle. So chief Killian, moved forward with the idea of purchasing two new engines and an aerial.

That amounted to back on December 14th he asked for 3.2 million. And with that, the truck committee had counsel with a plan based on what his idea was or his plan for operating with two pieces of apparatus -- sorry, two engines and an aerial. We see it differently, specifically the tar truck. However, the funding on those apparatus on the 3.2 million is we are looking at the arba funding primarily because of the number of components that we deal with that like I said, needed repaired or replaced. If we did an annual lease and need payment, that would hinder or budget or operations. So that's why we were asking and seeking that 3.2 million. Has everybody read the report I sent out?

Mr. Yoder: I can't speak for everyone else, Chief, I had not had a chance to do that. I had a limited window between getting home and starting the meeting. So I have not. Mr. Beiter, I see you have your hand up. Chief. Is there more you would like to bring forward to start the discussion before I turn it over to

Mr. Beiter Thank you, thank you Chief for bringing this forward and having this discussion.

The reason why this was brought up on Monday night when you began your discussion a major difference in the resolution signed voted on in December and decided on Monday was payment. And in December it was decided payment was due 60 days prior to delivery of the fire about rat toc of 3.\$2 million, which gave us 18 months to figure out how to pay for that. And on Monday we were told that payment of 3.2 million was due in 60 days of signing that contract. And that put it in a predicament and raised eyebrows how we are going to do this.

And now we are discussing finance options that you are researching, diligently, thank you for doing so.

But it changes the conversation and how we are going to go about this now.

Chief Aungst agreed. The original plan I believe I didn't get a chance to talk to Chief Killian regarding the finance portion but originally he was looking at going with a different manufacturer. And with that different manufacturer, I believe, again, I can't speak for Chief Killian by the funding was open. They didn't have the prepaid discount that the Pierce manufacturing has. This prepaid plan it gives us more bang for our dollar. they have a program that -- I'm sorry a formula as I explained on Monday night, they provided a formula that they are able to calculate out how much they saved and the interest or how much they would gain in interest by paying 60 day after the contract.

And in addition to that, I know in that resolution it also said I believe 12-16 months or 12-18 months. That also has changed. Since the 16th, he made -- he was offered the agreement with Pierce, which is is much more financially sound and reasonable program. So that's why we were -- we were looking -- not looking, but we were -- we agreed to the prepaid discount. Which includes that 60 days. It's that's all part of it.

Mr. Beiter: Within that contract, you're saying that yourself and the administration agreed to the 60-day payment structure?

Chief Correct. Correct. To my knowledge, yes. And I believe --

Mr. Beiter: Is there a way -- are you able to send that contract to members of council? So we can review that, please?

Chief Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Yoder Yeah, I would like to see that. Look, we authorize a executing a contract really to lock in pricing. But that was based on particular payment terms. And I'm a bit concerned about not having this discussion before executing it with different payment terms. I mean, I don't want to say it is what it is but it's been done unfortunately. But Miss Miele, can you speak to -- this was brought up in finance, can you speak to the discussion that happened in finance? I think Mr. Beiter covered a little bit of it. But I was not there. And with finance, can you speak to some of the discussion that was had?

Ms. Miele: Yeah, I can address what we discussed in finance, however, I was -- I had to leave early from the session on Monday. So I missed some discussion that probably would have served me to have a better understanding in finance related to us chosen a different vendor and scwnly establishing a different timeline.

For reasons of savings. What I requested that hasn't -- that didn't appear in the material we received today was a breakdown of the savings we achieved through using ARPA funding for different percentages of the total. I don't know that we have money for the 3. but if if we have 1 million or 2 million, how does that help and with the spending wise with the bureau of fire. My understanding then, Chief, is you would like us to fund all 3.2 million for the apparatus acquisition out of ARPA funding so the general fund to the contribution of the fire department can be used to the additional repairs necessary to the facility?

Chief Yes, ma'am. And just so you know also through working on trying to get municipal leasing two companies asked if you are the 2019-2020 financial audits, which I understand they haven't been completed yet.

Ms. Miele: Yep, you are right.

. So help me understand. Are we purchasing the apparatus through a different company than we originally intended to purchase it through in December? Or financing differently than we intended to finance in department?

Chief Yes, on the 16th it was agreed to without the contract.

Ms. Miele Okay, but so the apparatus is still coming from the original manufacturer? Or we are purchasing a different one?

Chief No, it's a different manufacturer.

Ms. Miele: Got it. And that manufacturer asked for payment within 60 days?

Chief Correct. It was a program we thought would save the City additional money.

Mr. Yoder asked Chief Aungst. Can you clarify something for me. We switched manufacturers of the apparatus but is it through the same company?

Chief No, it's through a different company. Initially Chief Killian wanted to go with Sea Grave which is another manufacture other of apparatus, and we switched to Pierce and we had Pierce pretty much until we bought the KME in 2016.

Mr. Yoder: . Correct me if I'm wrong, but seems like a part of the change of the payment terms is because we switched manufacturers and companies that we are working with, is that correct?

Chief Yes, sir.

Ms. Miele Wait, here, Adam. Can I break in? If we switched manufacturers and companies that we are working with them then we are not obviously not committed to that end of 2021 deadline for apparatus purchase. Correct? Because we had made that end of 2021 deadline to get a discount from a manufacturer or not a discount but 2021 pricing. But at this point, I'm confused what's the 60 day rush if we haven't actually -- I mean, council hasn't authorized the contract yet with this new vendor, correct?

Excuse me, deputy Chief Lucas.

Mr. Yoder: Hang on, Norm, can you clarify that? I'm of that opinion also. We had a ruse luges to enter a contract with a different vendor with different payment terms. If we've gone to a different vendor, we didn't authorize that. Rm no, can you speak to that, please?

Mr. Lubin The only thing we have seen is this is a different contract. This is a different vendor. It's a different price. Different obviously the equipment would be different. It's a different company. You didn't -- council hasn't authorized this one at all.

Chief Aungst Mr. President, there was no vendor on the resolution.

Mr. Yoder Correct. You're right. But there were payment terms on the resolution reflective of a contract with the first vendor. Now it seems the payment terms changed because of the different vendor. And regardless of the technicality of that being on there, I think in spirit we should not be in that contract. And again, look, this is a worthy discussion. I'm not -- I don't want to negate that.

But first and foremost, we need to make sure we get process right. And I think we are falling short. That's my concern.

Mrs. Katz What's the look at the contract?

Mr. Yoder: I -- I struggle to understand how we signed that contract regardless of what solicitor looked at it. I don't -- I don't -- I mean, I don't understand how we did that. I mean, I don't believe council authorized this additional -- this different contract. I mean, that's -- the contract may be okay. But we didn't authorize it.

Chief stated Deputy Chief Lucas, members of council, President. I actually couldn't believe the members of council voted for something you didn't have a vendor selected yet. So I'm confused in this whole thing too. We were recently took over and we were handed this. We saw the opportunity to save the citizens on the Williamsport on their taxes the best bang for the buck expfnlgt we looked a the resolution and said okay there was no vendor picked so we are going with the best vendor, the best bang for a buck. Not knowing there was a 60 day requirement afterwards.

And we didn't know any of that stuff beforehand what went on at finance with the payment options.

We are just trying to do our best. And this is the best bang for the buck for the citizens of Williamsport.

Mr. Yoder: I certainly understand that. And in crunch time, whether it's right or wrong we authorized that like that to do the same thing. So you know, I'm not going to sit here and say that council is perfect. And that in the crunch time of things we certainly do that. And have done that in the past. And did that in this case. But none the less, --

Mr. Yoder It answers the root of the question why the payment terms changed, number one. And then number two, regardless of if it's right or wrong, if we want these apparatuses, we need to authorize that contract.

Chief Correct. Also Mr. President, on the Monday that Chief Keith and I were sworn in, I received a phone call from a - - sorry, one of the council persons and they seem to allude they -- the 60 day -- I'm sorry, I apologize, it had to be signed coming up before February 1st. They felt it had to be -- they knew it had to be signed by then. So that's why I kind of assumed, and I'll take responsibility for that, that was absolutely my assumption, that --

Mr. Yoder: Chief, that was me that I talked tow about that. When we voted on this we voted on the money and we were told the contract had to be signed in a certain period of time. And I know the Mayor can attest to this also, to save \$200,000, well, it seems with this contract that's the same amount of money that we are being told that would be saved also.

So, you know, I think that's where the confusion is also coming in. when I talked to you, there was no reference to a change in vendors. Where is Pierce located, anyway?

>> Wisconsin.

Mrs. Katz: They are in Wisconsin where's the other company located?

Chief answered Wisconsin.

Mrs. Katz: They are both in Wisconsin. Mayor, I don't think Adam saw your hand.

Mayor It's a question for Norm, I guess. Since it was authorized up to 3.2 but there was no contract in December. Or this one. So I'm assuming we bring this contract in and sounds as though listening to Norm this would be null and void. We bring the contract to council, even though they authorized up to 3.2 million, however clearly the contract, is that correct, Norm?

Mr. Lubin yeah, because council has to approve a contract, period. And if Boston reviewed -- Austin, I'll give them a

call tomorrow or Monday and we'll get it straightened out when I talk to Adam tomorrow.

Mr. Yoder: And just to clarify, I'm looking at the resolution now. If I'm looking the right one. There actually was a vendor number contract on there. So again, none the less we did this in crunch time. But I think in with the resolution we identified a vendor based on that. So we can -- Norm, we can work through that tomorrow. That's fine. But -- yeah, none the less, okay.

Chief Yeah. We proibl -- the cleanest would be to have it come before council in two weeks.

Mr. Yoder: Correct. None the less. Back on to the discussion of rescue plan funding.

So Liz, you had asked of the Chief yungst a financial analysis of what makes sense, whether 25%, 50%, 100% funded out of ARPA, correct?

Ms. Miele: Yeah, I think the chief said the total rates we were getting this is not the annual percentage but the overall expense if we looked at if we funded the 3.2 entirely as a loan. With something like 17 to 24% of the purchase price over the life of the loan. And so I think the discussion is -- I had not understood once again in finance the fire department asks was the full 3.2 million from ARPA. I can see potential reasons for doing that. However I think we are probably wisest the approach I would likely take would be to finance some portion of that expenditure and then utilize ARPA for another portion. And I'm open to discussion on that. But it would be certainly be helpful to understand the impact on the general fund of financing 2 million and 1.2 in ARPA versus financing 1.5 million. You understand what I'm saying, Chief. That financial data might best enable us to make a decision, especially if it were coupled with some slightly -- obviously we wouldn't expect you to be picture perfect accurate and no one can be with the way materials cost and are moving around. But some estimate with the additional cost of the cost of the department that you are hoping to fund in the general budget in the coming years and how that impacts the general budget in coming years, do you see what I'm saying? Like I said, if you tell us fire quarters needs \$250,000 investment over five years and it ends up 240, we won't scream and shout, we really won't if it's 240. But that would help us in the decision making process with ARPA funds more, understanding the financial picture we are pointing the city into depending on what we choose to do financially. And that's part of a larger discussion how we are committing as much of the ARPA funding we feel that we can commit at this point. But we discussed how really that process needs to move faster.

And I think the potential timeline we are looking at for the fire department agreement is going to help us on that path a little bit. But I would say the sooner Chief that you can get us some concrete numbers, there was another discussion of us attempting to put together some baseline budget for ARPA funding allocation across these five categories and the budget tear number in the fire department in the coming years would help with the numbers for public safety. Do you agree with that, other members of council?

Mr. Yoder: Miss Miele, I agree with you. Mr. Allison, ill defer to you quick. You have your hand up. Floor is yours, sir.

Mr. Allison: Chief, I'm referencing what you sent out earlier the email we got. And you enumerated in there some other expenses that the fire department is going to have to incur. I believe that's the way I interpret it anyway. The utility special ops truck. And the one that concerned me the most was the PPE. The personal protective equipment and gear. How a lot of what our firemen with using right now is at its 10-year life and some has purr passed that. And we have the expense of those attached to each one of those items. So I think some of the information we are looking for is in that email. As far as general fund expenses.

Ms. Miele: Randy, I agree. The other thing we can have a discussion about since the PPE seems like a pressing issue whether that should be funded at least partially with ARPA funds as well. Yeah. But I think getting it condensed into something that's more of a spreadsheet and less of a narrative might be helpful in digesting it.

Mr. Mackey Thank you, if memory serves me correct, when he did first start talking about this issue, I feel like Chief Killian had a couple different options for outright purchase and finance. And I'm also looking at this email, the PPE, obviously that's important. Do we have a overall total cost on how much this PPE would cost if we completely --

Chief> I believe Chief came up with these figures. He's the one who handles our personal protective equipment. And I believe that came out to about close to \$150,000.

Mr. Mackey Right. I mean, for me, I mean, buying these trucks outright does not seem possible. I'm not speaking for myself here. It would seem to make more sense to finance some of these trucks and maybe just buy this PPE outright with ARPA funds. If we are only talking about \$150,000. I don't know, I'm not a mathematician. That's Liz's neck of the woods. And the councilman who does all the quick math is not here tonight. But any rate. That's my two cents. But yeah, I would definitely like to see all those numbers. And but no, but PPE, obviously, extremely important. And we don't to mess around with that stuff.

Chief I can send you what I have so far. I did receive something from the vendor. It was a basically a sample quote for us. Based on \$3 million. I can forward you that with the contract.

Mr. Yoder: That would be fine. And Chief, I would forward you the presentation that Councilman Mackey was referencing last year. I sent it to all council and I copied you Mayor Slaughter and the city chief. And I think that speaks to what both Councilwoman Miele and Councilman Mackey what a couple scenarios look like with the fire trucks for sure. I'll echo what Liz was getting at. I think cleaning up the contract number one in two weeks. And I think in addition to that, having that information associated with that contract so we can make a decision will be helpful. And I think that you should be able to tackle that before our next council meeting. Liz, I think that's what you were getting at and asking, am I off base there?

Ms. Miele: That's what I was getting at, you are not at all off base. Sorry, I think that's would be -- yeah. That would be excellent. I think I guess what I am trying to understand is the timeline that we are currently on then in the case of this item. Are we on that 60-day timeline to approve that and answer the financing issue? Or are we not yet on that 60 day timeline.

Chief It's within the 60-baydays however once they go over that 60 days they whittle and add additional costs to it.

Ms. Miele: Got it. So what I'm hearing, and Mr. Yoder is it would be wise for us to attempt to both understand the financial implications for this and the larger pool or ARPA money as well as the contractual obligations by next meeting. So I would ask for that financial breakdown on a relatively tight timeline.

Chief I'll get that to you as soon as I can. absolutely. And again, just so you know, just to reminder, 2/3 financial institutions we reached out to have asked for these 2019-2020 financial audits. And my understanding --

Ms. Miele: Chief Aungst to be clear, those financial audits will not be available in that 60 day window if that's what you are asking me.

Chief That's what I'm trying to get across. Chief Lucas and I came into this. We were not really involved with the truck committee or what Chief Killian's plans were. So when we came into this, we were like we read as much of what we could on what the plans were. What Chief Killian's goals were. We had a brief meeting and we met with each platoon and gave his idea and that night is when we spoke with this new vendor and things changed. We came in on this very late game. We had one week to do everything. I apologize for not being more clear and concise on things. But coming into a new position, trying to learn the position. And trying to come one the budget information or the financial information is poor on our part. We apologize.

Mr. Yoder: I want to ask a follow-up question to what you were saying, Chief. I can understand and appreciate the situation you were in to sign that contract. But the worst case scenario what are the ramifications if we deem this contract not to be in the best interest of the city.

Chief Number one, it would delay the receipt of the trucks. And we would continue paying the \$63,000 plus each year for maintenance costs and that will probably go up.

Mr. Beiter: Is there any financial ramifications with the company you signed the contract with. That's okay, are there financial ramifications with the company we currently signed the contract with?

Chief No, the only ramification would be if we go beyond that 60 days an amount would increase how much we would owe them.

Mr. Beiter : Should we decide to say this contract is null and void and we decide not to go through with it. : If we were to decide -- if we as City Council decide to not vote for this contract, are we going to be fined by this particular company? Or are there financial ramifications for this company for backing out of it?

Chief Aungst can't answer that, sir, I have to find that information out and get it back to you on that.

Mr. Beiter: I do apologize. I know there's a lot of information you have to present to us. Within the next two weeks time. So I mean a just trying to get as many questions before you as possible.

Chief> Sure. And also for the record, this truck wasn't exactly designed the way we wanted it designed. But we were able to make it work. Given some operational changes. So we were satisfied with the final build as far as the fire department goes.

Mr. Beiter: You mentioned that. And I appreciate you being up front with the change in operations as well. And I appreciate that the -- I can understand how much of a difficult thing that would be.

Chief Also just so you know so had we not signed by Monday, the 31st, the on Tuesday, the 1st, the price difference would have been between \$200,000 and \$250,000 increase.

Mr. Yoder: So looks like we'll have this brought forward to you in two weeks and with some backing information to guide our decision one way or another.

Which I think is good. And will be needed certainly. Are there any other questions from members on council on topic in general before we move on I want to talk about ARPA but anything else before we move on.

Mr. Allison: I don't have another question but in the interim, we should be in contact. To see how things are transpiring. In these two weeks. So we can kind of keep up -- keep pace with the developments. Possibly you can do that. President Yoder.

Mr. Yoder: Certainly. Chief, I'll email you my cell phone, text, email, call, whatever you need. And send me yours. And we can just touch base every once in a while and see how you're making out. Sounds like a plan.

Mr. Allison: The other thing is, I'm speaking from myself, but I think everybody feels the same way. No apologies needed for me from the Chief or assistant Chief they were thrown into right in the middle of a situation. So thankful you gentleman are taking the bull by the horn. And working with council and the administration to get this done one way or another.

Mrs. Katz : Both Chiefs I think you have to understand, we were thrown a curveball also at the transit meeting. The ARPA meeting. We thought we were going to have 20 months to come one all the funding and everything. And it kind of threw all of us. So this is why I think we are all scrambling at this point.

Chief, we have -- we are -- we're not really -- I shouldn't say that. If we were to not utilize this prepaid, the prepaid discount, that would put us -- I'm not exactly sure how much more it would cost but that we could find that out and get that back to you as well.

Mrs. Katz: Terrific. Thank you so much. I know you guys have been thrown into things and coming up with so many things in a matter of days and we appreciate what you are going through and we will work together with you on this.

Mr. Yoder Thank you, I appreciate it. And I do want to circle back generally on ARPA while we are talking about A Adsm PA in this discussion item. We had a work session Monday. And going back and looking at it I was not able to make it. And I appreciate you guys all continuing through with it. If I thought there were some good discussion in there. In catching up with all of you, there's a consensus to get moving on some things and it was clear in meeting and it was clear in my discussion with you and the meeting in gem. In those discussions I expressed my desire I think to close this process out of allocating this. And it seemed like there was a consensus of doing that also. And there was a lot of discussion on trying to full-timize that through an ordinance process. And to be clear a lot of the discussion was let's use an ordinance process to out -- legally allocate this money. Use mechanism that is we are tried and true. And that will ensure we do this in a responsible way but also so we can go back and make changes and provide checks and balances as we should. But we don't want to hinder and hold us projects discussed that I think there's a consensus that we want to progress. And so I wanted to just validate that in discussion here. And just especially following up on the discussion with the fire apparatus. I think it reinforces my desire to start to finalize this initial allocation process here. And bring it to a conclusion so we can move forward on some important things. And the Councilman's got a lot of needs and that's across the board as we saw in public safety and in other areas. And I think we had a lot of good discussion. And I think we got a lot of good ideas out there. And we have a lot of rough ideas on where we want to start. And I think we can wrap this up through that process.

But I wanted to throw it out and make sure that that was the consensus of the group. If it is, we can start that process in two weeks. So we can get moving on things. So I hope that sums up a lot of conversation briefly that we all had individually. If I missed things, say so, and would love to hear your thoughts on progressing forward with ARPA and allocation discussion in general. I'll yield the floor to members of council. Mr. Allison.

Mr. Allison: Yeah, President Yoder, thank you. I was just having had conversations in the interim and thinking about it.

The -- we -- with the resolution process would not produce the same result that we want?
Doing an ordinance process?

Mr. Yoder: Yeah, I mean, I think it certainly would. And in my mind, I think the ordinance process is a legal process. It's a legal process versus a policy process. Which I think when we are allocating and authorizing spending of money we should certainly to. Let's just my opinion. And I think in spirit we do this through both general fund and in more importantly the general fund. I think it's a bit of a burdensome process but it's a good process. And when we are I think talking money, I think codifying it through law is probably very appropriated. That is just my opinion. But again, it was evident in the conversation, and I think we can do this do it in a way where we are not holding things up. For example, let's use a project that was discussed between in the recreation category. All of those need RFPs developed and contracts that initial process done. That can happen and should happen without our approval. It doesn't take our approval for to them them go -- let the administration do an RFP, we can do that work anticipating what we are planning to do. And authorize the resolution that were planning to allocate. And again, I don't want to hinder that. And I don't think it does. But to answer your question, Councilman Allison, I guess we could. It's an option. I hope that answers that for you.

Mr. Allison: Yeah, you explained the different dynamics of that. Yeah, we have the levy, that's ready to go to cross pipes. The pumps. I think I just there's that extra vote in the ordinance to amend the ordinance to release the money. It just given that through all of this, we do have a limited time to allocate the money.

Ms. Miele: Yeah, Adam, I do. One other thing I should mention about the ordinance process. In addition to second reading I believe then there's 20 days until final enactment, correct?

So we are looking at more like slightly better than a month. More or eases less from that amendment coming to council for a first vote to appoint when that money could -- is allocated in that particular line.

Just putting that out there. I too think a resolution might be a wiser mechanism to utilize. I don't think -- my understanding is there's no specific requirements in terms of how we deal with dispersing this funding. So all of this is something that we are making up to make sure we feel as though we are spending the funding fairly and getting the proper amount of oversight, correct? Other the funding. And none of that is to say the most oversight is not the wisest approach. That's not what I'm I'm saying. I am not saying we should throw caution to the wind and spend \$25 million and see what happens. But I do this is there's not like an established pattern for this in other municipalities that received this funding that we are bucking in some way or another if we go with a resolution process or a ordinance process or frankly just starting spending themoney and sees what happens. But I think in this case this money represents an opportunity for us to make some large-scale changes in Williamsport we are eager to spend it well and not slow the process down but take the proper amount of time to think what we can best use it for. Even though \$25 million is a huge number for us, we all know we could spend \$200 million and probably still have things we would like to do. So it's a drop in the bucket to a certain extents against our needs. And it's an unanticipated opportunity. And those two things have us trembling with anticipation in a way that we want to be careful.

That said n terms of an ongoing discussion with resolution and ordinance I think the format of the budget needs to be the same way one way or the other. We need to have a page within each category. And in that page to my thinking we need to have projects approved and an amount of funding that had been at least sort of initially allocated for that project. And then we would also need to have an amount of funding that had been initially allocated to that particular sending area of the five spending areas but that hadn't been allocated to any particular project. And then I think we would need to accompany it with some kind of narrative just describing the projects. And if it exists other funding that we might be Utah utilizing for the same project. So the money for the levy we are also looking for other state funding to fund the levy work in addition to the \$2 million we have from our budget. And that helps provide a fuller picture of our intentions in case we get to 2025, I think this money has to be allocated in the particular term of this council. But it does help explain our intentions to the future in case that's a necessary step.

So but yeah from my two cents I with Mr. Allison think that perhaps given that we can approach this any way we want to and perhaps an ordinance would give us more maneuver ability in the process. Thanks, Mr. Winder.

Mr. Yoder, Norm, can you verify the waiting period after an ordinance, I'll be honest, I did not think of that.

I do want not want to stall these things at all. And that's a good point that Miss Miele brought up.

I -- regard regardless of that, Norm, can you speak to that? I'm thinking if we were thinking of our regular budget process and if we were to allocate something for 2022 we want to spend at the beginning of January we would approve it at the end of December and be within that window that Miss Miele specified. So I think clarity is warranted there regardless of what we want to do here.

Mr. Lubin Well, generally ordinances require 20 days. Budget ordinances do not require the 20 days.

Mr. Yoder: Gotcha, that's good to know. And Liz that's a good point. But that's good to know. So that would not be applicable here. I'll try and get the order correctly. So bear with me. Mr. Beiter I noticed first then Mr. Mackey and Mrs. Katz.

Mr. Beiter A lot of what Liz said I do agree with. But I think it's imperative we put those funds in their own separate budget so they can be tracked diligently because of the requests we'll get continuously over this project and the size and scope of this project will be different compared to others.

And we need to make sure if there's things left over from one project to the next we need to know where the excess funds are or if a project is deem deemed not worthy of it, we can go ahead and transfer those funds.

I do not want to see us get into a situation in a few years where we are audited because we cannot account for the funds in a way that we are being audited.

Mr. Mackey: I think it's no secret this money is burning a hole in my figurative pocket and to be clear none of many money is in my pocket. However we can wrap this up and get this started is what I'm for.

Maybe to Mr. Allison's point, Randy, I know you and I talked on the phone. And Adam you and I talked on the phone. When we talk about putting this into an ordinance, and correct me if I'm wrong, President Yoder, if it's specifically outlined in the ordinance, so levy, splash pad, that sort of thing. We don't have to amend the ordinance, is that correct? We would only have to amend the ordinance if, say, if recreation there's a contingency to be determined line item where there's money not specifically allocated then we would have to amend the ordinance to move that money to a different -- is that correct?

Mr. Yoder Yeah, that is correct. And to piggy back on that Mr. Mackey, I would and want and frankly hope if we were

to get into the situation where we need to dip into a contingency for a particular project like the levy or the run or anything in we know would much further in advance than it becoming a critical emergency and delaying anything. That's just project management. And that's just financial management that the administration does and needs to do regardless of where the funding source is coming from. But yes, you are correct.

Ms. Miele: For clarification, I think Mr. Mackey meant contingency in unallocated funds under resolution. Funds contingent on council approval still.

Mr. Mackey: To be determined, not specified there's a bulk a line item of money there we know we want to put in recreation somewhere, we're just not 100% where that's going yet. And the administration brings us something and we say yes or no. And again, I don't want to slow this process down at all. That's no secret. So again, I'm for whatever gets this money allocated. And gets things moving. And on that vein, whichever direction we decide to go, I do think that there are things that are ready now. And I think that we need to be able to do both at the same time. Whether it is putting it into an ordinance and when we do that, we say well, we already spent X-amount of money in this department in this category and you came forward in this process. But there's certain time sensitive thing that is we don't want to probably delay anymore. And I mean, just -- I was not a part of the splash pad conversation. Was it yesterday or Tuesday? So someone can speak to that more. But I feel like we had final numbers on that. And I feel like it was a time sensitive project if we don't approve pretty soon we might not be using that until 2023 maybe. And maybe I'm wrong on that. There's other people here that could correct me. But I want to make sure that regardless of which direction we're going, first reading of the ordinance on the 17th or not that we need to get this money allocated and we need to not get in the way of projects that are ready to go right now.

Mr. Yoder: Certainly, I appreciate that, Mr. Mackey. Mrs. Katz you had your hand up as well

Mrs. Katz stated I really feel that we should have an ordinance. We should have a spreadsheet. I also we should speak with Joe Pawlak because he's the one working on this and this is another huge department for his department. And we have to clarify every project and like you said, Eric, how every penny is spent and we can look at the spreadsheet immediately and see how this is done. And I think the order will help tremendously in that factor. So I would like to see this done as quick as possible. And as Mr. Mackey is saying, we have projects that people are just, you know, they're set to go. I mean, the gears are there. And they are just grinding and waiting to go. And we can't sit on this money forever. Just trying to analyze every nook and cranny. We have to work on things and get it moving. And I think Mayor, I think you would probably feel the same way, don't you? There's projects you want to see started and come to fruition.

Mayor Slaughter Absolutely, I agree. With the general conversation of let's get the money allocated and sort of sounds like we would be working on parallel tracks here, where we allocate the money, and then city council formalizes in whatever fashion you also choose. And then I bring resolutions with projects that are ready to go simultaneously. So I would agree that we formal -- or city council the collective we, the City, formalize this and keep the projects moving forward at the same time.

Mrs. Katz: That's what I wanted to hear, Mayor, you are ready to start working on resolutions we thought we kept talking and talking and talking and let's put things in action and keep things moving and boil it down to the things we want to get started at least.

Mr. Yoder, Mr. Beiter, I see you have your hand up, give me one second though. And Mr. Lubin the root of my desire for a particular process is really from a just a spirit of the wall compliance perspective. Can you shed any light into from a legal perspective, any direction one way or the other we really should go? Or legally or is this really a moot point?

Mr. Lubin I would go with the moot point. But if you were going to do the budgetary method through ordinance it doesn't stop the administration from putting these projects out for ad by. Because you'll put bid out tomorrow and it will be 20 or 30 days until it's opened and reviewed and rewarded.

So -- it's going to be about the same amount of time no matter which process you take.

Mr. Beiter: Yeah, for personal education what was the process that was done for the police radios and how is that money tracked currently? Joe Pawlak if you can answer that question for me, please.

Mr. Pawlak the money hasn't been spent yet. I expect based on the Mayor and some other conversations we should be receiving the radios here shortly. So we created a separate fund for it. And I think the budget approach authorizing the funds in a different category may be appropriate. But again, it's up to council how do they want to allocate that money. And show their authorization to spend via resolution or ordinance.

But we will be tracking these separately through those own funds so it's not mixed in with other monies.

Mr. Yoder: I appreciate it Mr. Pawlak. Tonight we are missing one. As we sit here, we don't necessarily have a consensus one way or another. Which is fine. I think what we do have a consensus to wrap this up one way or another. And I think for the next meeting, one way or another, I think we can do that. It seems like that's the common thread here, which is great and perfectly fine, Mr. Mackey, did you have another comment?

Mr. Mackey: Sorry, I think just to reiterate what you said, regardless of which direction we go, I'm hearing a consensus for the next City Council meeting on the 17th to put down some hard numbers and sticking to those numbers to certain departments and certain projects.

Mr. Yoder: Yep. And I would concur with that. That's what I'm hearing certainly. And again, regardless of the mechanism one way or another we'll do that for the next meeting.

For the public's perspective it's to be determined what the mechanism will be. But nonetheless we'll be finalizing this process one way or another starting in the next meeting which is good. And like we said woe don't want to stall progress. Mayor Slaughter I know you are working on some of that process already, which is great. We had a discussion earlier today, Mayor, on compliance for this. I asked you to formally go through the RFP process for compliance specifically. You are welcome to speak is to what you had and your approach. But I think regardless of how far you are able to progress through that process and an update in two weeks would be welcomed and appreciated. I think getting that right and again, regardless of the mechanism we use I think getting that right is very important. I think we can all agree on that. Because it will get crazier probably sooner than later, which is good. And in maintaining compliance. So I would ask you to start that process ASAP. Certainly. Perfect. Well, I appreciate the discussion. And if affirmed the commitment to wrap this up starting next meeting and that's great. So I very much appreciate that. What I'll do if everybody is okay with it, I'll ask for -- I'll send you -- I'll send everybody a spreadsheet to get a sense where everybody's head's at. And whatever mechanism we use and whatever the starting budget we have looks like, we can

include that data into that document so that the public knows where all of the -- where the budget that we look at and deliberate on came from I think for transparency sake. So I'll do that by tomorrow morning if everybody would be get that to me maybe Tuesday night, that would give us time to populate it, put it together, and get it zipped up regard less of the format of the mechanism, ordinance versus resolution, sound good?

Everyone thanked Mr. Yoder

Mr. Yoder: My pleasure. And again, we had a handful of discussions and I'm glad we were able to circle back on them. In this mechanism so the public is aware. And I appreciate everybody's thoughts and perspective. Likes, we may not have an agreement on the mechanism but we want to get this tone and I'm glad and excited for that. So I would applaud all all of your work and leading up to this point, and I'll early applaud the work we are going to go through at least in two weeks and maybe in four as well.

Announcements

The next regularly scheduled City Council meeting will be held on Thursday, February 17, 2022 at 7:00 PM, Trade & Transit II, 144 West Third St. 3rd Floor, Williamsport, PA

Upcoming Meetings:

Monday, Feb. 7	12:00 PM	Planning Commission*
Wednesday, Feb. 9	10:00 AM	4 th of July Committee*
	3:30 PM	O&E Pension*
Monday, Feb. 14	4:00 PM	Recreation Commission
Tuesday, Feb.15	11:30 AM	Public Safety
	1:00 PM	Finance Committee
	2:30 PM	Public Works
	4:00 PM	Transit Oversight Committee
	6:30 PM	HARB*
Wednesday, Feb.16	10:00 AM	Blighted Property*
Thursday, Feb. 17	10:00 AM	Zoning Hearing Board*
	7:00 PM	City Council Meeting*

MEETINGS MARKED WITH * are in person at Trade & Transit II, 144 West Third St. 3rd Floor, Williamsport, PA

Comments:

City Council

Mr. Allison I just have one. We all know that the member of city government,, our city controller lost her husband last week. And just want to let her know and we have in different ways, but publicly that we all feel for her and her family. And they are in our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Yoder: Certainly agree, Mr. Allison. Very much so. It's very sad. And we are thinking and praying for her certainly.

Administration

Mayor Slaughter I would echo what Councilman Allison said and offer the same sentiments to former chief family and loved ones.

Mr. Winder If I could jump in quick. I don't know if it should have been announced when you did your announcements but the public hearing on the 17th for the transit authority

Mr. Yoder: That is correct. Thanks for the reminder. We are having a public hearing on the next council meeting February 17th. So I would encourage the public to be there. And we'll kick start questions on creating a transit authority for a number of different reasons. And it will impact the City. Certainly we think and hope in a positive way. But nonetheless, it will have an impact on our constituents directly. So we welcome hearing from you in one another or another. And that's February 17th at the beginning of the meeting at Trade & Transit II, 144 West Third St.

Members of the Public

There were none.

News Media

There were none.

Adjournment

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned upon motion by Mrs. Katz and a second by Mr. Allison Meeting adjourned at 9:21 PM with unanimous ayes.

Submitted by:

Janice M. Frank
City Clerk