

Council President Adam Yoder brought the Williamsport City Council meeting to order on Thursday, March 17, 2022 at 7:00 PM. at Trade & Transit Center II, 144 West Third St, Williamsport, PA.

Council members present:

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

Absent:

Also, Present:

Derek Slaughter, Mayor, absent
Mr. Joe Gerardi
Mr. Joe Pawlak
August Memmi
Sam Aungst, Fire Chief,
Justin Snyder, Police Chief absent
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 03/03/22 were approved upon a motion **Mr. Pulizzi and a second from Mr. Allison**

All were in favor. The vote was 6 to 0. Ms. Miele was absent for this vote

Mr. Yoder I would like to make a couple of announcements. We have had a couple of executive sessions here recently following our last meeting Impromptu on March 3 we had one, this past Monday on March 14. We are going to have another one this evening following the meeting. Each are related to agency business, so I needed to announce

Limited Courtesy of the Floor

There were none.

Public Hearing – Liquor License Transfer

Mr. Yoder opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Lubin stated The purpose of this public hearing is that when a liquor license is transferred from one venue to another, the receiving municipality has to hold a public hearing. The grounds for the approval are that the receiving municipality which will be Williamsport must grant the approval, unless doing so would have an adverse effect on the welfare, health, peace, and morals of either the municipality or its residents. This transfer, the entity that is purchasing the license is it foods LLC. It is the purchase of a license from a license holder in Jersey shore, and they intend to move the license 2151 E. third Street, Williamsport PA. In speaking with the attorney for the proposed licensee, unfortunately he has a meeting before another authority tonight but he indicated his client would be here and I guess they should really speak first.

My name is John Resouthski, this is my wife Andrea. We are partners in the John Ryan brewery representing our other two partners who couldn't make it here this evening. We currently have a brewery license which we are able to sell our manufactured beer as well as Pennsylvania produced spirits and wines, and we just feel like to better serve our community and our clientele with being able to open up two different varieties of wines and spirits we will be able to provide a better service to our community and our clientele there as well. I don't know, is there much more I need to say them that? It's pretty straightforward, I guess. No, none at all. We are already approved to sell, to us we see it as more of an extension of what we are able to provide to our clientele. Good? Any questions, concerns?

Mr. Yoder: Thank you very much.

We will open the floor to anyone that wishes to speak in favor of this liquor license transfer. Hearing and seeing none, we will open the floor to anyone wishing to speak against the license transfer. Okay, hearing seeing none we will close the public hearing for the license transfer. There were no comments.

Mr. Yoder changed the order of the agenda.

Resolution #9269

Resolution of The City of Williamsport, Approving the Transfer of PLCB License No R48016 into City from Jersey Shore, Lycoming County

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to approve the resolution.

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

Mr. Lubin Nothing really to add that has already been said, it just requires city Council approval in order for the applicants to obtain the liquor license. This will help with that, obviously. Be nice to expand a business in Williamsport.

Mr. Yoder: I couldn't agree more, I haven't partaken in the brewery yet. Certainly will at some point, at least from the outside it looks very beautiful. It's a great addition to that section of town, thanks for the investment you are making into the city for sure. It is great to see. This was reviewed and finance, I will defer to Councilman Allison with Miss Miele not here right now.

Mr. Allison stated this was pretty cut and dry, it hits all the benchmarks and pass it to the full body of council with a positive recommendation.

Mr. Yoder asked for the 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. Pulizzi voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Yoder voted yes. Ms. Miele was absent.

Public Hearing – Street Vacation Corner of Poplar & Webb St

>>

Mr. Gerardi what you have before you is a request by Mr. (NAME?) to vacate a portion -let me start over. In accordance with the Pennsylvania unicycle planning code were required to have a public hearing to the general public to let them know whether they have any interest or not in this particular area. A public notice was provided to both the general public and the neighbors, it was advertised in the Sun Gazette for three separate times which is required by the ordinance and we have not received any public comment via email or in person.

Mr. Yoder Thank you, I will open up the public hearing. Is there anybody in attendance this evening that would like to speak in favor of the Street vacation? Hearing seeing none, we will move, is there anyone that would like to speak against the Street vacation? Okay, hearing seeing none we will close this.

Bill #1795-22

Ordinance Vacating A Portion of Poplar & Webb St. in the Fifth Ward (first reading)

The City Clerk read the ordinance.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to adopt this ordinance in first reading.

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

Mr. Gerardi stated this request is for the city to vacate its interest in the section of the road on Poplar and Webb Street where they meet. Attached we give you a copy of the vacancy area, the plans are to vacate the area from West third Street to the intersection of Webb Street, and then from Webb Street to go from Trenton place to the intersection of Poplar Street. This was reviewed both by our engineer, John Sanders and Gary Karr The city has not and does not have any interest to do anything with the road. The ordinance was also reviewed by our solicitor and he found no problems with the ordinance. Planning commission reviewed this on March 7, and gave it a positive recommendation. The plan is located within the ML zoning district. Also, this was Mr. is the one that owns the property on both sides all around it. He would be vacating at both. This also went through public works, they came through with a positive recommendation to city Council and I can turn it over to Mrs. Katz.

Mrs. Katz this was sent to public works and was passed with a positive recommendation. Gary, he expended a lot of this been one of the problems that we have with this area is that people were using that as a pass-through, and it also a lot of garbage was dumped in the back there. It is also becoming very hazardous doing that. If everybody is familiar with that area, it's not the most easiest way to do anything in that area. To vacate that street, I think it is going to go to the houses and everybody around there. I will defer this to anybody else on public works.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the ordinance in first reading.

. The ordinance was carried in first reading with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

UPMC Land Development off Street Parking 699 Rural Avenue

Mr. Gerardi Okay, what you have before you is land developer and plan for UPMC. Currently right now it is vacant, it is a three-story office complex, I believe a three-story office complex. It is located at 699 Royal Avenue within the institutional district. The proposed plan is to demo the structure and construct a 85 off street parking area +13 ADA accessible spaces. Council approved the demo back in 2020 of January, the proposal of the plan is to create more parking for the hospital facility to create 13 ADA spaces within close proximity of the emergency room and the hospital entrance. The plan was reviewed by our engineering staff and Gary nor, everything has been maquiladora Linda Bellman ordinance. The planning -the plans also reviewed by Lycoming County and they approved it, they are recommending the approval. And the city planning commission also did review this and they passed it with a positive recommendation to counsel. If you have any questions for myself, or we do have a representative from UPMC.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

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

Mrs. Katz I take it this property come if I can ask these questions to you sir? Your name is -would you like to come up here please? Thank you, Mr. Hoffman for the question I have, when this first came up how many years ago?

Mr. Hoffman: Two years at least.

Mrs. Katz: There was plans in place for another building to be built. I take it the way this is going and proceeding at this point, those plans are no longer going to be there.

Mr. Gerardi That initiative has been tabled.

Mrs. Katz: It has been tabled? Temporary? Daily reason I'm asking, the plans were so exciting to see this not turn into a parking lot is kind of disappointing in a way.

Mr. Gerardi It is temporary at this point.

: It was approved for demolition, once approved it is forever on that property. I do want to say there are no time restraints in the ordinance itself. They never took the permit outcome of this got the approval. They will be coming in for a permit for the demolition.

Mr. Lubin could correctly, I'm positive that how it is. It's because of the ordinance, it stays with that property.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the Land Development.

. The Land Development was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

Certificates of Appropriateness, 328 Court St

Mr. Gerardi This is 468 court Street. This is a certificate of appropriateness request, the owner is requesting -this is 328 court I'm sorry. It is not the one we are at? Yes, this is the corner building at 328 court Street. The owner requests to replace the existing fence along the property line and replace it with a new block and brick wall. A 6 foot high would meet the requirements under the zoning ordinance. The brick is to match the existing old corner building that will be on that side of the building. At this time, they do not have an idea of what color they want to paint the other side of it, because the owner of that property has really decided what he wants to do in that area. He might make it a courtyard, then he wants to match that color and they both agreed they would do that. That would come back through for an

approval for the color of the payment of this point we are disproving the brick in the wall commit 6 foot high, it doesn't meet all of the zoning requirements, Gary did take a look at it. One thing I will add, we are also going to be replacing the sidewalks completely around the building, I did get a hold of Mr. Sander and what they will be doing is replacing that intersection corner with an ADA accessible curb ramp going across the street to the other side in a curb ramp on the other opposite side of the street that is the courthouse. That also has been ADA accessible. We try to do that with sidewalks.

That is correct, the brick facing will only be on the corner side.

Ms. Miele: I'm assuming the sidewalks down Willow Street are not handicap accessible.

Mr. Gerardi: They are not wide enough, so we will be going across to the other side.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion & second.

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

The certificate of appropriateness was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor. Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mr. Pulizzi voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Certificates of Appropriateness 468 West Third St

Mr. Gerardi This is the last one I have here tonight, what you have is a certificate of appropriateness request for man-made pools LLC. They are located on this street just further down in the city, they bought the former sure auto parts building for they are going to make that their new business. What he would like to do is do some painting and some signage. The painting, the existing metal roof right now is a red color, I believe could he want to paint it black. The main body of the building, the one-story building will be a dark blue with the bottom 48 inches being the dark gray. Then there is a two-story building in the rear of this that is attached, that will be a dark gray. Okay? He also has garage doors you want to put up which will be black, that was added I believe into the packet late, which will be black doors. He's also wanting to mount three wall signs and one roof sign, or poll sign. My fault. Going to present them later, he did get them and after I got the agenda to the packet, I can hold off but it would be easier to do it all right now. I believe we can do that? I've attached a picture of the signs, he's not putting any more signs of than what was originally on that, it does meet the zoning requirements. The last thing you'd like to do come around the back area of the building he wants to fence it to end. He is going to use a white vinyl fence, 6 foot hybrid is not because he was two-story little stuff, he's concerned about in his other business the trucks were left outside and I guess catalytic converters are the newest things to seal off of vehicles but he is already have several taken, he looked of a secure area to park his vehicles. We told him it couldn't be any kind of chain-link, in the area we would prefer not something nicer so he will go with a solid vinyl fencing 6 foot high. I think in that drawing it does show you where the fenced in area is going to be. First going back, you will see on the right-hand side as you are looking at the building and you are standing on third Street and you're looking at the building, is on the right hand side towards the rear where the you all is good again, there are several things he is approving on this, I would be more than happy to answer any questions. The building is definitely in need of some painting, which I think will come out nice. Blue of course is the color because the pool, he wishes to do the blues and grays but if you have any questions, I am more than happy to try to answer any of those.

Mrs. Katz : I'm happy to see something is going in there, is going to really improve that area. It was really sensual like an eyesore.

Mr. Gerardi: Mr. Miele did have the building from the liquid from that is all gone. Not the brick one, the one with the old Allen motor building is. They will be doing that, too.

They will have to re-stripe, Gary does require those type of things to be done for they want to re-stripe the lot.

Ms. Miele We will have to do any sort of -he doesn't have to meet any landscaping requirement there?

Mr. Gerardi: No, because it is an existing structure.

Ms. Miele: Existing lot, right? If he were to redo the parking lot.

Mr. Gerardi: If he were to dig it up and replace it, yes. If he just does an overlay or a mill, typically they will do an overlay on it. No, he would have to do anything at all. I think his intent is to plan some strawberry out front.

Ms. Miele That would be great, that is the one thing I could think of (indiscernible) okay. Did you email them to us?

Mr. Gerardi: Gary did give them to Janice, I can give you my copies if you like to see it.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion & second.

Mr. Mackey made the motion and Mr. Pulizzi seconded it.

The certificate of appropriateness was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor. Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mr. Pulizzi voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Bill #1796-22

Ordinance Amending the 42th Year (2016) Community Development Block Grant Funds (first reading) \

The City Clerk read the ordinance.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to adopt this ordinance in first reading.

Ms. Miele made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Mackey.

Mr. Memmi I realize we are only actually taking action initially on item number one, but these six agenda items are connected some going to try to explain all of it at one time, then as per Norm if you so choose can vote on them one at a time. I will try to be as brief as I can be, pending economic development is bringing six budget amendments to Williamsport city Council. These ordinances serve as house clearing measure to zero out any line items that has gone over the budget amount or had a product close under the budget amount. The remaining balances from program year 2016 through 2020 will be moved forward to program year 2021. It's convoluted just the way it is. We are amending closing budget years 2016 and 2017. \$69,797.71 From program year 2016, and \$39,824.85 from program year 2017 will be moved forward to program year 2020. We are amending budget years 2018 through 2020 to reflect actual project balances and moving \$4555.85 from program year 2018 and \$119,172.75 from program year 2019 to program year 2020. The funding total for FY 2016 through 2019 that will be moving forward to program year 2020 is \$233,361.20. The amendment for program year 2020 reflects the prior year entitlement, and of the actual entitlement received from the HUD. Once we amend the 2020 funds, we have a balance of \$102,334.76 to add to the prior year balance of \$233,361.20. And move the total, which is \$335,695.96 forward into program year 2021. The amendment

for program year 2021 reflects the actual allocation from HUD where we received \$24,786 more than anticipated with the original budget. The contingency balance and the prior year entitlement make up the \$360,481.96 line item for program year 2021 miscellaneous contingency. Based on the 2021 Street reconstruction estimate provided by John Sander, the 21 Street construction project is significantly less than originally budgeted where we budgeted \$400,000 for Street reconstruction and \$80,000 for removal of architectural barriers to the number we received for the product requires \$127,243 of CD PG dollars. We are going to lower the funding of our original budget line item from 319 518 four streets and \$30,000 for architectural barriers to a balance of \$349,518.04 will be added to the 2021 miscellaneous contingency balance of \$360,000 -- in program year 2021 in the amount of \$710,000 - \$700,000 for the purchase of the fire apparatus. \$10,000 For project delivery cost. The project will provide the fire department with the new apparatus, in part for economic and community development it will eliminate our shortfall on HUD's timeliness requirements. Which will become an issue if it happens in two consecutive years. On approval of the second reading of these amendments, we will undergo the necessary substantial amendments in the HUD's IDI S program in compliance with HUD's legal guidance but first of all, I would like to recognize Joe (NAME?) on my staff, he spent a lot of time going through all of the year's budgets and reconciling all of them so we could bring this to you this evening. At this point, I am here to answer any questions. This was reviewed in finance and recommended forwarding -forwarded to this body with a positive recommendation.

Ms. Miele This was reviewed in finance on Tuesday afternoon and forwarded with a positive recommendation, Mr. Memmi is) however in the interim, Mr. Memmi and discussion with John Sander he relayed to us that about \$440,000 of the initial \$480,000 allocation for Street in 2021 has been not expended, but promised for the streets program. So there is only \$40,000 remaining.

Mr. Memmi: We have corrected the issue going forward with our 2022 allocations that we will be bringing to you in the near future. We're going to be able to cover all of his Street project funds. Through CDBG.

Ms. Miele: You are planning to take the funding out of 2022 for the 2021 Street construction project? We don't receive that allocation until October of this year, correct?

Mr. Memmi: We probably will receive it May/June. As soon as we complete our plan that we are working on right now and we are going to discuss that in a minute. That will take care of the shortfall. There was a mistake or a misunderstanding with emails going back and forth, so we came up with a resolution to be able to fund the fire apparatus and to also take care of all the street projects that are out for bid right now.

Ms. Miele: Understood. What does that mean in terms of our funding for streets in 2022? As it a rule, community development countries about \$100,000 annually for our Street program in the city.

Mr. Memmi: Probably we will reduce the availability for any other streets in the LMI district for 2022.

Ms. Miele: Understood. I'll be honest, thinking about this since Tuesday, especially once we discovered the difference between community developments budget and Mr. Sanders planned budget for the streets in 2021 I have been a little concerned. What projects do we still have open from these prior budget years for which we are limiting contingency funding?

Mr. Memmi We are closing 2016 and 2017 completely. There are some redevelopment projects in 2018/2019 and 2020, specific ones I can't answer but we left the funding in place that was allocated to those projects. The money just hasn't been spent yet because these contractors are doing the work or whatever but we have covered all of the items that were budgeted in those years, all we did was remove the funds that weren't allocated to certain projects.

Ms. Miele: Maybe I misunderstanding the meaning of contingency. I understood the contingency funds in those budget years related to the fact that we might need extra funding for projects that we are still under, you know, like being worked on in those budget years.

Mr. Memmi: There is funding left to do what projects still remain that haven't been done.

Ms. Miele: I mean if they were to go over budget, I thought that was the meaning of the contingency funding in those programs.

Mr. Memmi: Based on what we have reviewed and discussed with Carl and his allocations there is sufficient funding to complete all of his projects speed in the line specifically, no need for the contingency funding?

Ms. Miele I guess what I'm understanding from the plan laid out by these six amendments and then from the further planning to take the 2021 Street product funding from the 2022 budget that we will effectively be eliminating any sort of wiggle room within the community development office until at least next May or June, assuming we reap timely allocation from the government.

Mr. Memmi: That is correct.

Ms. Miele: So if we were to have something that went over budget from a prior year or something like that, we would be needing to find that in the general fund or otherwise fund it. Correct? There wouldn't be any funding within community development to handle that.

Mr. Memmi: There is no funding in the community development budget for new projects, there is probably enough reserve left to cover any minor contingencies that might arise.

Ms. Miele: Got it. I guess what I would say is upon looking into the financial situation between Tuesday and now, finance did forward these with a positive recommendation. Personally, I no longer feel comfortable. I would certainly be willing to close at 16 and 17 if we have no further work going on in those budget years, I'm not certain that I feel comfortable moving on the rest of these ordinances this evening because it seems to me like we need to put some hard-fought both into the possibility that we're going to create some sort of financial hardship within community development, but also I do think we need to consider long and hard the street reconstruction program within 2020 wondered what we are talking about in this case, this funding is going toward fire apparatus buried the remaining funding for the funding apparatus is coming from American rescue plan act funds, the one thing we cannot use American rescue plan act funds is to pastries. To take this money out of community development that we could use to pave streets and utilize it for a fire apparatus might to me be shortsighted, and frankly just having sort of begun to think about that today I'm not quite sure. It seems to me that is the chair of the finance committee at this point, I would recommend tabling at least the final four agenda items. I think that would be 11 to 15, excuse me. Yes, exactly. And moving on 16 and 17, and maybe between the administration and council we can have some further discussions in the next two weeks just to see what the wisest course of action. Can you not hear me, Randy?

Must be close enough if I am making that noise. Anyway, I guess I think I would rather have the discussion with both

Community Development, also maybe with the Mayor to discuss what we think is the wisest use and I would like to go back and have a look at the 2022 budget that we passed for community development which I do not have an opportunity to do today but I'm not sure what other items in the budget we are looking at, what other contingency funds remain in the 2022 budget. I guess I hate to see ourselves when we all received community development funding by and large until at least halfway through the year, to see ourselves basically not only eliminating wiggle room through the beginning of this year in community development, but a limiting it for another 15 to 18 months seems to me to be perhaps unwise when we have alternatives there that might be a wiser use. I probably missed some of the finer points of the actual discussion in finance, if other members of the committee would like to time and please feel free.

Mr. Allison : I share some of the same concerns as well as the thought of taking community development funds coming in 2022 out of the street reconstruction segment. I guess I look at that as it is going to put us behind on our street paving schedule that we normally keep, and I think we have to calculate into the equation that a good portion of the re-paving and reconstruction on our streets that has taken place over the last several years has been partially funded by the gas utility and water company. Now the water company is going to be active, but the gas utility is winding down. They are just about done. So I hate to see us get behind on paving, that's one of those infrastructure things that when we miss a beat, it really snowballs and it's hard to catch up, and we had gotten behind for several years until all this infrastructure through the utilities came into play. They gave us paving that we couldn't afford to do, so we were able to double our allocation of streets that got paved. So we leveraged that and got a lot done, but I hate to see us fall behind again. Then like so many other things we have seen that haven't been maintained, catching up in this economic climate is particularly almost impossible, actually. I would just like to talk to John Sander and get more detail on his outlook on those kind of things.

Mr. Memmi stated this is not a problem, this is the first reading. There will be another reading in two weeks if this moves forward with the other element to this thing is the commitment of the \$700,000 to the fire apparatus purchase. Those have a clock ticking on it, not only the approval of city Council, but we have to go through the public participation to do a substantial amendment to fund those fire apparatus which takes another 30 days. We are dealing with some timeliness issues to have the funding available for the fire department when they need to be able to write the check to pay for the equipment they have already ordered.

Mr. Allison: I think there are some workarounds to that that would reduce the time constraint so we could still stay on schedule with that. I mean we are going to do that, we need to do that fire apparatus. You know, in the meantime we can work things out, and things need expedited. Council can always call a special session.

Mr. Memmi: Is not the council so much as I have the fact that I have advertised for 30 days for the substantial amendment. That is the time clock that is almost as critical if not more critical than when Council votes on this.

Mr. Allison: Right.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you, Mr. Allison. Are there any other comments or questions from members of council on this item, but any of the related CDBG items? Mr. Mackey.

Mr. Mackey: I do agree with Councilwoman Miele. I do feel like this needs to be looked at closer, but then also listening to Mr. Memmi this is the first reading pretty even if we pass it tonight, we still have two weeks to talk about it. I don't know, if this is a time issue and it sounds like it is it might be better off to pass it tonight and have those discussions that we were going to have anyway whether we table it or pass it. And if we are still not comfortable with it in two weeks, can we table it on second reading?

Mr. Yoder answered yes.

Mr. Mackey: That would be my recommendation, just to kind of appease everyone.

Mr. Yoder: Any other comments? We have had a potential adjusted table, a potential suggestion to hold off tabling if needed two weeks. Mr. Pulizzi.

Mr. Pulizzi: Honestly, I would be in support either way but I feel like if we table it here and now, we would then feel the pressure of the time constraint that we need to make sure we speak about this in a timely fashion. I would just hope if one way or the other if we did vote to pass the first reading now, that we would still move forward with treating this as such in a timely manner to make sure I get the attention that we feel it needs. Either way, as long as we make sure that we look at this quickly and thoroughly you have my support either way.

Mr. Yoder Let's do this, then. Is there a motion to table?

: We don't want to table this one specifically. Understood. It was decided to pass the first two ordinances and table the rest until further information is given.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the ordinance in first reading.

The ordinance was carried in first reading with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor. Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mr. Pulizzi voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Bill #1797-22

Ordinance Amending & Transfer 43rd Year (2017) Community Development Block Grant Funds **(first reading)**

The City Clerk read the ordinance.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to adopt this ordinance in first reading.

Ms. Miele made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Allison.

Mr. Yoder: Mr. Memmi you have given us a description, Miss Miele has given finances perspective. Is there anything anybody would like to add related to this? Hearing and seeing none, Mrs. Frank on the motion.

The ordinance was carried in first reading with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor. Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mr. Pulizzi voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Ordinance Amending 44th Year (2018) Community Development Block Grant Funds **(first reading)**

The City Clerk read the ordinance.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to adopt this ordinance in first reading.

Mr. Yoder stated after discussion, is there a motion to table this item.

Ms. Miele made the motion to table this ordinance and it was seconded by Mr. Pulizzi.

The ordinance was tabled in first reading with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 1

Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted no, Mr. Pulizzi voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Ordinance Amending 45th Year (2019) Community Development Block Grant Funds **(first reading)**

The City Clerk read the ordinance.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to table ordinances 45th, 46th 47th Years Community Development Block Grant Funds.

Ms. Miele made the motion to table the three items. Mr. Allison seconded it.

The ordinance was tabled in first reading with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 1

Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted no, Mr. Pulizzi voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Ordinance Amending 46th Year (2020) Community Development Block Grant Funds **(first reading)**

The City Clerk read the ordinance.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to adopt this ordinance in first reading.

The ordinance was tabled in first reading with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 1

Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted no, Mr. Pulizzi voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Ordinance Amending 47th Year (2021) Community Development Block Grant Funds **(first reading)**

The City Clerk read the ordinance.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to adopt this ordinance in first reading.

The ordinance was tabled in first reading with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 1

Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Mackey voted no, Mr. Pulizzi voted yes, Mr. Beiter voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Resolution #9270
Resolution Citizen Participation Plan

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to approve the resolution.

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

Mr. Memmi stated this was Prepared by Seda-Cog to assist us in compliancy for public outreach with the CDBG program. Presenting the cities point of view is our representative Kristen McLachlan. I'm going to ask her to come up and give us a brief overview, we will both answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you, Mr. Memmi. This was reviewed in finance. Is there anything to add? Sorry.

Ms. McLachlan: I appreciate the opportunity to come here and I also appreciate the opportunity to work with the community development office in the city of Williamsport to help administer the community developed block grant funds. One of the processes we are in the middle of is making sure that the city has all of its plans and policies that it needs for HUD compliance in place for this is the first one that is of utmost importance to us, it dictates how the citizen participation process will move forward for the annual action plan in 2022 to get back to some of the earlier discussion. The first public hearing will be held in two weeks on March 31, what this plan does is it outlines the process. It is not anything different than what has been done in the past, it is just in writing and it will be filed in a particular place so we'll know where it is in the future but a lot of times these plans get adopted, then they get filed somewhere and nobody remembers where they are. This is sort of an update to the plan that probably already existed from a long time ago. These are typically done just once, and they are good until they need to be amended. I can certainly answer any more specific questions about the plan.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you very much, this was reviewed in finance.

Ms. Miele This was reviewed in finance and passed on to the full body of council with a positive recommendation. Pretty much I think Mr. Allison, I would welcome discussion on who we are reaching out to encourage public participation in discussions on the community development budget. It pretty much just outlines how we plan to go after public participation, the sad fact of it is that generally speaking if we get input from one or possibly two people in the course of a public hearing cycle, that's a lot. I'm sure part of that is due to the nature of shrinking community development budget, and consequently our allocation has shrunk over the years. I'm assuming that the meat of it seems to be less interesting, because there is not a lot of discussion about should we fund this or that (indiscernible) but nonetheless, I think Randy if you want to speak a little more to the programs we are reaching out to, feel free. It's a good plan, hopefully it will garner some public input so we send it to you all with positive recommendation.

Mr. Yoder asked if any more questions and then a vote.

The resolution was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

Resolution #9271
Resolution Rejection of Bids for Lose Park

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to approve the resolution.

Mr. Memmi: Thank you again. I bring to you tonight the bid proposal for the lose Park amendment project are there was one bidder, that bid being land served in the bid from land served was approximately \$392,000, along with the cost for design from Larson which was \$30,000. That would take our project cost to \$435,000. The funding that was allocated to the project was \$250,000 from CDBG, \$145,000 from DCM are which was \$395,000. So we are basically

\$40,000 over budget, so we are recommending that we reject this bid, allow us to go out and rework the project, try to see what savings we can find come and rebid the project here in the next week or two. Any questions I will try to answer.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you, this was presented in finance. Miss Miele?

Ms. Miele: This was reviewed in finance, with a brief discussion that this is one of the things we would often put community development contingency funding towards is a big going over what we anticipate. That being said, Mr. Memmi made the excellent point that it is very hard to feel certain you have gotten a price reflective of the market when you only receive one bid which is I think the larger part of the issue with the current project. In rebidding the product, the city plans to reach out. Remind me again Mr. Memmi, what was the outreach we did this time?

Mr. Memmi: We used the process through pen bid. Through the product contract with Larson, they had put in place a different way of going about the bidding process through their website, their contacts, etc. So we are going to follow through using Larson to see if that doesn't promote more interest in the project. There were two or three interested parties, but they never put a proposal in pretty dealing one was land served.

Ms. Miele I do think part of the idea of rebidding was too slim it down and bring it into budget, if we succeed in getting more than one bid in Mr. Memmi I'm assuming part of the process will also to look at illuminating the need for a subcontractor or something like that?

Mr. Memmi: We will look at any and all opportunities to get this project completed, to get it in the ground this summer so that it would be available for use come spring of next year.

Ms. Miele: That would be good to see print one of the other discussions was of course if the project continues to come in over budget we would look at one of the other sources for funding, like the American rescue plan act funds good but the improvements to the park are needed. It is simply a matter of trying to find a way to make sure we have money allocated. We forward it to the full body of council with a positive recommendation.

Mr. Yoder: Any other comments or questions from members of the finance committee? Other members of counsel, Mr. Pulizzi.

Mr. Pulizzi quick question. We are going to move forward utilizing the following draft rebid schedule through Larson design group hopefully.

Mr. Memmi answered yes.

Mr. Pulizzi: Will we reject all bids for the lose Park project, does this mean that Larson design group will also be rebidding for this project track is not my understanding?

Mr. Memmi: We are only asking to reject the bid for construction on the project.

Mr. Pulizzi: Okay, we have already accepted Larson design group for the engineering? Okay. I was just wanting a little clarity, thank you.

Mr. Yoder : Any other comments or questions from members of council? Mrs. Frank on the motion please.

The resolution was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

Resolution #9272

Resolution Authorizing the filing of a Statewide Local Share Assessment through the Commonwealth Financing Authority and Designating the Mayor and City Controller as the Officials to execute all Documents

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to approve the resolution.

Mr. Mackey made the motion and it was seconded Mr. Pulizzi.

Teresa from Delta This is a new program, it is administered by the CFA. The regulations came out in January from 2022. We had originally been looking at this program for the splash pad, I think the timeframe for that wouldn't work for this program so we are looking at the other improvements for shop place Park and those include the installation of a pump truck, which has a beginner, intermediate, and advanced track. Demolition of existing pump house, bathhouse improvements, widening your existing trail, and then installing a new 8 foot walking path, installing a fence around the pump track, some parking lot upgrades for the basketball courts come and your main parking lot, tennis court improvements, installing new street trees, ENS control, then some drainage improvements. So the total cost is \$648,900. There is no match, as I had stated in finance our goal will be too get this fully funded. If by chance the funding amount comes in at a lower amount we will work with DCD to shape the request according to the funds that are awarded so that the city Council isn't required to match or put any funds into the project if there aren't any available. The application was submitted last Friday, and this resolution is just a formality. As part of the application process. Are there any questions?

Ms. Miele : This was reviewed in finance, is to make sure. Do I need to make a motion to amend this resolution to reflect the \$640,000 amount or do we have it updated. .

Mr. Yoder We will have to amend at.

Ms. Miele: That was the first part of the discussion in finance was the discrepancy between the amount the resolution had in the amount that Teresa had mentioned for the grant. Either way, this represents a large expenditure of funds and a significant improvement to shop place Park. The fact that the grant documents had already been filed of course makes a bit of a plea come I guess we can always vote against it. That said, I think the bulk of the discussion in finance or lease I know that I personally asked how competitive this grant was, because it is a new grant it is quite competitive for the reason the documents were funded last week is because they had to be in by a certain cutoff I think the grant only became available in January. It was a pretty tight window this year. Good on the administration, good on Delta for filing for us in a timely fashion read that said, that is not in any way –doesn't make it a certainty that we will get \$640,000 or any amount of funding, you know, that we have requested for this grant. Teresa did not give a particular likelihood, she said we would be following up with meeting with our state legislators to request their assistance in getting funding for this grant. It is a complex process and is putting in an application as in many places in the world doesn't necessarily get you real far, it is certainly the start. We forward this to the full body of council with a positive recognition, we did request and I believe we see further documentation. As you will note the document in our folder consisted of exactly one page. Thanks.

Mr. Beiter The limit to this grant is \$1 million from I do wish the administration would have pushed for the full \$1 million

to fully fund the splash pad project that we're going to fund regardless, it would have been nice to have a little extra help with that. That being said, as Liz Miele mentioned there will be some great improvements at that park coming for next year and I'm sure I will be there with my kids all the time.

Mrs. Katz Yes, the grant application was filed on Friday. When would you expect to hear any answers? Is there a time limit on this?

Teresa answered> We anticipate the awards will be made by July of this year.

Ms. Miele made a motion to amend the resolution to say \$648,096.

Mr. Beiter seconded it.

The motion was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

They was additional discussion about the grant and Mr. Yoder called for a motion for the resolution.

Mr. Allison made the motion and it was seconded by Ms. Miele.

The resolution was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

Resolution Awarding Brandon Park Ballfield Design Services to Larson Design Group (tabled)

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to approve the resolution.

Resolution #9274

Resolution for Fire Civil Service Rules & Regulation Changes

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to approve the resolution.

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

Chief Aungst. First is a resolution amending or changing the rules and regulations of the fire civil service board. Not of the board, but of the rules and regulations. We have basically for changes, on section 3 specifically 3-1.1 it was add "meet the following requirements" in the first paragraph there. Then on the first bullet point it was to minimize –I'm sorry. A minimum of two years of employment from three years. It used to be three years, now we are moving it down to two years. Back when she's good broad was the fire chief, he had moved forward and had the thought that after two years, that gives a guy a good understanding as a firefighter to be able to move into the engineer's position. We are kind of on the same mindset as that. His program was that as soon as you become –you have the two years, you have the training, and that your officer and that the administration all agree that yeah they would take the test and then be promoted. Right now we have a very young department, and we are finding that the younger guys, a lot of them are coming in already trained. They could jump on that truck and respond right away, but they still need that two years to get accustomed to the WBS. That is the only changes on fire engineer, then on fire inspector what we did was change the meeting. It did read it meeting all the qualifications as a fire inspector, we change that to meet the following qualifications. That was the only change there, then we removed fire investigator certification as one of the requirements for that position, and modified the 3-3.2 and cleaned that up a little bit. The fire investigator, we gave the firefighters two years, that would be a fire inspector, two years to complete that on promotion. Under the Lieutenant position, we changed the minimum years from 5 to 4 years, and it removed after the appointment to the position of the employee will have two years to obtain national fire certification essentials or the New York State fire investigator number two certification. We remove that, everything else got bumped up. The final thing that we added was verbiage addressing provisional appointments. Prior administration because of the young miss or the age of our department, there were provisional appointments made to positions for there was never any oversight by the civil service board. So what chief Lucas and I, what we have pushed forward was when we met with civil service board was to include this in the civil service rules and regulations. It keeps everything upfront, honest, and across the board. Basically what it says, did everybody get a chance to read that? Okay. The big thing is, the provisional appointments will be for a length not to exceed year, and if it does exceed a year or it is foreseen to exceed a year, we would go to the civil service board and ask that they approve it to be extended. That is it. Any questions?

Mr. Reeder: Again, our efforts of trying to get all of these rules and regulations updated (indiscernible). So what we did, we drop the requirement timewise down a year for them, but we gave them more time to receive the proper certifications they needed because of the difficulty of getting into some of these classes. There is far and few between, it makes it very difficult. Guys have been overlooked for promotions because they couldn't get this. This will give them an opportunity to get their proper certification within a two year time span. The provisional part is very important, it provides the civil service commission some oversight on what is being done, and it sets some time limits on their and I would also like to down the road do the same with the police department rules and regulations. Again, my mission is to try to get as much consistency as we can across the board between the two departments. Previously, years ago it was a separate Civil Service Commission for fire and one for police. The state pushed it all together so it kind of made a mess of things. So we are trying to do is bring things back up to today's standards based on the current staffing situations with both the police and the fire.

Mr. Mackey stated this was reviewed in Public Safety It was passed on with a positive recommendation, I think a lot of our discussion revolved around how young our department really is, which I think is a good thing. We get a lot of young, aggressive, willing firefighters. In two Mr. readers point, a lot of these trainings are hard to get into. So extending that time, I think is important as well good I will open it up to anybody else on public safety if there is anything else to add.

Mrs. Katz Chief, go over what you have here. I wrote down notes and can't read my handwriting. You have here seven or eight engineers at this point?

Chief: We have – I believe we have six provisional engineers and to provisional you lieutenants.

Mrs. Katz: As you said, it's really a young, young force and I think they are still doing an incredible job. For Jeff, I would like to thank you very much. You have been doing this a long time. It has been a long time, I think we really

appreciate it. We did talk about the board, there are three sitting people right now, you said you will fill the other two positions probably in the next few months right? Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Yoder: I would second that, thank you. Any other comments or questions from other members of Council?

Ms. Miele: This is not a comment at all, maybe a request just to across the board, a redlined document is useful when you're making amendments to kind of track your changes so when we see them we can tell what has been removed and added many of us especially with documents that haven't been updated for quite a while aren't updated with the original verbiage. We don't know what has been changed, you know what I mean. That being said, it's good work, and I think high time we have this done. If and when we get to the police one, maybe we could try to redline it.

The resolution was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

Resolution #9273

Resolution Memorandum of Understanding between City & Central Area Fire Chiefs' Association

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to approve the resolution.

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

Kris Black: What you have come you have a memorandum of understanding between city of Williamsport and (word?) which is central area firefighters Association. We have in our possession a laptop that has outlived any usefulness that we have for it, they could utilize it to keep their books which will allow them to get their books off of our systems altogether. And just need approval, here you go.

Mr. Mackey stated it was reviewed in Public Safety and sent to the full body of Council with a positive recommendation. Yes it was, he said it altered we are giving away a computer.

The resolution was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

Resolution Authorizing an Agreement between Williamsport Bureau of Fire & Witmer Public Safety Group

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to approve the resolution.

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

Chief, Before you is a resolution as Miss Frank said with Witmer public safety. We looked into them, they were the dealer that dealt with the turnout gear and some of the other various equipment that goes with our turnout gear, which would include the boots, the turnout gear is the coat and pants themselves, and the bail out kids. The bail out kids, I didn't have them on the original document that I had sent to you guys when I came up with the-what was it? 196 I think it was. Something. But we had messed around with some of the equipment, he is our turnout gear chief and we were able to remove some of the stuff or less than the number we would need. So like myself, excuse me. Chances are I won't need a face piece, so we were able to remove a face piece here, some boots there. That kind of thing. But that is where we stand on this, if you want I can go over all of these resolutions because we are all related to turnout gear.

And the second one would be with MES which is municipal emergency services, that is for the purchase of the turnout gear gloves, the firefighting gloves for that amount to \$3825. We did receive a demonstrator model of them, and the guys -of the dexterity that you have with them when your hands are wet and you pull your hands out of your gloves, a lot of times the gloves we have now, the liners pull out and it is a pain in the keister to get them back in there. These gloves eliminate that. The next one is for (NAME?) fire equipment, those are for particulate hoods and whether buyer helmets. Not to expend -- the particular hoods may sound a lot for the hoods, but the hoods, there is a real big push for cancer clean-what do they call them? Clean cab, yeah. Where you try to keep the carcinogens and stuff away from you as much as possible. Two years ago, we stopped allowing the guys in turnout gear come into the living side of the firehouse, that was one step towards that. Another step was purchasing these particulate hoods. There is a liner inside that prevents the carcinogens from getting in and making contact with the skin. That is why they are very expensive now. The next one is with (NAME?) safety, those are for the face pieces we utilize with our turnout gear. We bumped them, we originally wanted to purchase 45, and the reason for that was we have, like I said, two sets of gear. A lot of guys don't have a backup face piece. When they come in off duty, they end up using another face piece that is stored on the truck. It is an older version. So again, this is for 30 face pieces. That's it. Does anyone have any questions for myself or chief Herndon?

Mr. Yoder Thank you, chief Aungst but I will defer to Councilman Mackey. These were all reviewed in public safety, but 21 specifically.

Mr. Mackey: Three out of the four were technically reviewed because the fourth one wasn't officially on the agenda yet, that was more of a discussion item. I will speak to all four of these as a group. Again, keep in mind that the fourth one wasn't discussed. I think ultimately these were passed on with no recommendation, not because we don't think that we should be purchasing these, this is clearly defined in the ARPA ordinance we passed. Most of our discussion revolved around whether or not these resolutions should have even been brought to the city Council in the first place. I think there is maybe some confusion as to a comment or an idea that no future ARPA spending resolution should be brought to city Council until we have compliance in place, I think that is where most of our disagreements stems from. I mean, that is pretty much it. If not for that caveat, these would have been forwarded with a positive recommendation obviously. I will let Bonnie or Vince chime in here if they would like.

Mr. Pulizzi Just to mirror Councilman Mackey's viewpoint, yes we definitely do think that these are definitely needed for our fire department. Make sure they stay safe and protected, it was miscommunication like he said as far as we wanted to ensure we are spending everything appropriately and in line with how we are able to until we had that understanding we had mentioned I believe in the last Council meeting that we are going to hold off on bringing any resolutions forward for the relinquishment of ARPA funds for any expenditures. I think there was a little bit of a miscommunication there, since these were already designated specifically for PPE they were already understood to be in approved expenditure and those were the miscommunication came from. In no way, shape, or form do we think that

these are unnecessary because they very much are.

Mr. Yoder: Certainly, I appreciate that. I asked that specifically two weeks ago, yes. The intent of the ask, what I did mean was look, I know we approved all of these items but before we go through the process of spending any of this money, even things we did approve, it would be great to have compliance under contract and figured out before we continue going through that. So I think what you are speaking to, that intent is what I was getting to 100% and I think in the spirit of what you are discussing, it is in line with that as well. Certainly.

Mr. Pulizzi: I appreciate you putting my possibly confusing statement so eloquently.

Mr. Yoder: No, you did all right. Are there any other comments? Mrs. Katz.

Mrs. Karz: As we discussed, we know how vitally important this is good by the way, it is nice to see a face to the voice we heard during the zoom meeting. When we went through all of this, even two weeks ago, we understand where this is coming from but I think we were waiting for the mayor to come forward to us with compliance and he is at present here tonight. We don't know how far he has gone with this at this point, I think that is as you know, that is how I voice my opinion. I don't want to be put in a position where we are spending this money, and where the records are going it is not the front end so much I worry about. It is the backend of how this is going to be recorded and kept records and everything else. I want to know where that compliance person is going to be, and we were promised he was going to get something from you know, he is going to do more and we would have this command he said probably within, you know, either today or the next two weeks. I would like to really wait and have the mayor present to discuss this with him, where we stand with all of the compliance issues at this point. Everything that is coming to us has a time limit, I understand that. Be a community development, be at the fire department, be at the police department for there is always time limits, but we can't be pushed into something unless we know we are doing it correctly. And because the ARPA funds are so new to everybody and what is stated, we are all trying to digest everything continuously and we just want to make sure it is done correctly, that we don't want it to come back and bite us in the end. That is the only reason I would like to see this table, only for that reason but I want to see somebody who's in the know and knows where this is going, because there is nobody here in City Hall that can actually, you know, guide us in this process and that is what we keep on saying. We want a correct process, we are finding out when the process hasn't been done, what it has done to us in the city. That's where I'm coming from.

Chief: Just so you know, I through email and on the phone I spoke with Teresa from Delta development and she agreed that, you know, it probably would be best to look at taking it out of the-what was it? The revenue loss category. Teresa, are you there?

Teresa: I am here. As I explained this afternoon, the final rule from the US treasury had provided a sum of \$10 million for lost revenue without requiring municipalities and cities and counties to perform a revenue loss calculation for there is an automatic \$10 million for lost revenue, and eligible expenses under that account is anything that is provided for general government services. So the fire equipment would be considered general government services, and when you were speaking earlier about road reconstruction that also is a general government service. The all could be paid for under a line item that would be entitled "lost revenue". Then you would have an infrastructure line item in other like PPE and some economic development line items as well. This would fall under the category of lost revenue, general government service.

ADAM YODER: Can I ask you a question? : Could you clarify something for me? You said this could be paid for from lost revenue. Could also be paid for directly from ARPA funds under a public safety category? The reason I ask of that, we had some discussions surrounding that two weeks ago, and we were of the impression that how we had allocated this in our budget as a singular line item within the public safety category was indeed compliant and okay.

Teresa: Yes, yes. Let me clarify, President Yoder. Under the \$10 million category of lost revenue, you could have subcategories under that \$10 million line item for public safety, public works, and other categories that you typically would have within your budget. So whatever you have within your general fund budget, General services could be paid for under that umbrella of the lost revenue. And that you would be in compliance with the ARPA.

Mr. Yoder: Let me put it this way. So we have a separate umbrella currently budgeted that is completely separate from lost revenue that we are proposing to fund this directly from. Is having a separate umbrella of public safety that is not a sub umbrella of lost revenue compliance. I.

Teresa: Unless that were for expenses that are directly related to COVID. So if you were purchasing protective equipment that protects your emergency responders from the impact of COVID, then yes. That could be under the category of mitigating the negative impacts of COVID. What I would suggest you do is under that \$10 million umbrella, that is where you would pay for expenses related to this type of equipment.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you, Teresa.

Ms. Miele I think the issue of some concern here, Teresa is we have a total of \$25.8 million to spend and could only spend 10 of it as lost revenue. So what we are trying to figure out is which expenditures, for instance fire, equipment, you know. PPE for our firefighters, as well as potentially fire department vehicles can be considered a public safety expenditure, because obviously with more than double that \$10 million number to spend, we can't put everything under lost revenue.

Teresa: : Exactly, exactly. You have some of your recreation improvements, those wouldn't be under lost revenue. Those would be improvements in the impact of-the negative impact of COVID. Because we know that people need to be outdoors, they have to have outdoor recreation. It is also improving the neighborhoods which is addressing the negative impact of COVID. I think you could take some of those others that you are maybe thinking need to be under the lost revenue, probably could go into another category. Any of your infrastructure goes into its own separate category, your improvements to the levee would be under infrastructure and flood control. Your recreation would be under addressing the negative impacts of COVID, and that your economic development initiatives, anything you are doing with economic development, those are under a separate category as well.

Ms. Miele I think the issue we are looking at, currently between the Police Department and the fire department we have allocated -correct me if I'm wrong, something like five to \$6 million just from public safety expenditures. Right? And with only \$10 million in lost revenue in total and a hope to put a bare minimum of a million per year into the baseline general fund budget, those numbers just don't add up. You know, will have to take a long, hard look at exactly what we are spending where if all of these public safety senators, the body cameras, the radios, the fire PPE, the fire equipment need to be considered lost revenue to be a valid expenditure.

Teresa: It is true PPE, you know, as far as protecting from COVID then that would go in the first category of addressing the negative impacts of COVID. Because you are protecting those emergency responders. If one gets sick and starts to spread, it's like some of our business and industry where we don't have the labor in order to provide the service. And not only impacts them, it impacts your community because they're not going to be able to respond to emergencies within the city.

Ms. Miele I think we can make the case that anything that would protect a man or woman from fire could also protect them from COVID. We might be there in terms of this equipment. I do think the whole conversation is underlining the need for someone specifically handling the city's compliance and signing off on these items before we move forward with expenditures for given that my understanding is that you should have that documentation within the next two weeks, I think it wouldn't be deferring things too much for us to wait another two weeks but my fear of course is if we are outlining this as an expenditure, the verbiage within the resolution etc., etc. it needs to support the area of transit funding we hope to take this from. If it can be considered PPE, we need to call it PPE. If it needs to be something else, we need to call it that.

Chief Traditionally is what we call it. Yet. Our turnout gear is all considered PPE. It is always referenced as PPE.

Ms. Miele: I think that makes the most sense, too. Just further conversation with Theresa, the wisest thing to classify as could be something else. Thank you, Teresa for your input it is exceptionally valuable.

Mr. Allison To the first one, I spoke to the mayor today and he assured me next Council meeting we will have something to vote on for compliance. And I had a question, once these are ordered what is the timeline to get them?

Chief: Depending on the hoods and gloves, we should be able to receive them. They usually stock an item like that. The pants, coats, you are looking at close to eight months before delivery. The helmets, possibly a year. Just because of nationwide what is going on. Face pieces, I believe they are in stock.

Mr. Allison Two weeks or so, I don't have a problem with but for some of these things I think they are critical for our public safety employees across the board to have. For us it is a conversation, for them it is physical harm, life, those kinds of things.

Mr. Pulizzi Thank you, speaking to that point, the issue date for these quotations was March 11 and they do have an expiration date of April 10. That does still give us ample time to have the much needed discussion for the clarity on these expenditures and still be within the timetable before these offers expire.

Chief: It will be a significant price increase nationwide for PPE itself, it's going up roughly 15% by April 15 I believe is what the date was that they told me. If we don't act now, there is going to be a very large increase.

Mr. Mackey, Teresa, this is Councilman Mackey. It's unfortunate the mayor is not here, I also spoke to the mayor and he once again assured me I believe after speaking to you and with Delta again that the way we have this designed as a stance, pinko some of the public safety developer this is an eligible expense, and if you look for the first time we are hearing it potentially could not be. I feel like we need some clarification here, I thought this was all ironed out. We have been assured I feel like on two or three separate occasions that this was an eligible expense the we we have it hammered out. That would be our ARPA budget that we passed, we have a public safety section and a specific line item under that is PPE to the tune of \$200,000. And again, the mayor again assured me this was an eligible expense the way it stands currently. If you could clarify.

Teresa: Yes, if you classify those as PPE and protecting against the negative impact of COVID, they are eligible under a category outside of the \$10 million in lost revenue. So in your resolution, classifying those as protective equipment eligible would be eligible under a category-the first category for there is for categories under the ARPA of responding to the negative impacts of COVID. That includes your public safety.

Mr. Mackey: Again, correct me. I think this is the first time I am hearing this. You are explaining it the way you are explaining it crudely, I don't want to throw another log on to this fire, but if what you are saying is true how do we justify protecting against the negative impacts of COVID to the tune of \$2.3 million for buying fire trucks? Which we currently have allocated under the Public Safety umbrella. That would be a question for you, Teresa.

Teresa: Okay. And let me look at the final roll and send you guys an email tomorrow if that is okay. Because Public Safety is a category, it is a category within the CARES act and it is a category within the final rule and within the ARPA funds. I think of your discussion this evening as it relates to the protective equipment I don't think there is a gray area there. If it is protective equipment, it can be funded under that category of the impact of COVID.

Mr. Beiter I think the gray areas that fire protective equipment well yes, protective, is not protecting people like yes a facemask what was limit that from COVID. I think that is where we all have confusion, I think that is where we are trying to seek clarification right now. I understand what you are saying, I also think this is a much broader issue that we are not going to get resolved this evening. I appreciate your input on that.

Teresa: The coats, the pants, the gloves, they'll have what is called a vapor barrier. That is for blood-borne pathogens, any sort of vapors that could come in contact with your person. So yeah, turnout gear would be considered PPE. Again that is why we do call it PPE.

Mr. Beiter: I'm not disagreeing with that statement, I think it is a very gray area for us to be considering spending a few hundred thousand dollars on that we absolutely have to have the clarification on right now. I think that is the point that everybody is trying to make and get across, once again we are not going to come to that conclusion this evening. I appreciate everybody's inputs, specifically yours Teresa. Thank you very much.

I do have a question about the gear itself. We are purchasing 35 sets, do we have a plan in place so when I went to return around here and spend an additional \$200,000 every 3 to 5 years or so on?

Chief: Actually yes, and FPA which is the governing body for the fire protection agency recommends 10 year shelf life on turnout gear. Now, that 10 year is a baseline. If I have a guy that doesn't come into a lot of the off-duty fires, doesn't get a lot of exposure, I can make that gear probably last 15 years. Currently the way I have it set up now, we have two sets of gear per guide one is frontline, one is there backup. The backup gear is a maximum of 10 years old, and has to be retired. In order to test that from I would have to send that gear out. It would cost a lot of money to see if it could actually withstand the elements we are in. Frontline is 10 years, then we will take that tenure and move it to their backup. So they will get an additional five years when we go to purchase. I had come up with a plan, the first year, every guy for the first you will get a full ensemble. At his five year mark, he will get another one. They give me the buffer, I don't have to purchase another set of gear for this firefighter for five years. Then at their 10 year mark they will get another one which should take them into their 20 year, with typically a guy will go into their retirement. Look at the

five year, it would be just a pants and coat, it won't be the helmet and all that stuff. Helmets will last a little longer, the helmets that we are getting are pretty well constructed. As long as they are not getting beat up in a fire or extreme temperatures, they will typically last a little longer.

Mr. Beiter there maintenance that has to be done?

Chief: I do a yearly inspection on all turnout gear. Actually I am ramping that up here real soon, that we routinely inspect it to look for anywhere or tear, anything like that. Gear the gets torn or ripped we set out to get repaired. We have the barn fabric centre does all of our repairs were not, the lady that does that probably will be retiring soon, now I will have to send that out to more of a professional facility to get it prepared. It's \$200 one set just for them to look at it. To get repaired. As for the face pieces, we do maintenance on those, too. With two guys, I believe that our certified to do maintenance on those. They replace straps and things that get worn out, we do keep up on all of our gear.

Mr. Yoder: Okay, we've had a lot of discussion about this, specifically on the compliance and prayed before any further discussion, is there any other questions related to this item specifically? Bonnie, I know you had expressed your interest in tabling. I don't know where others sit come if you have that interest I would take a motion.

Ms. Miele made a motion to table this and it was seconded by Mr. Pulizzi.

The resolution was tabled with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

Resolution Authorizing an Agreement Between the Williamsport Bureau of Fire & Municipal Emergency Services .

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to table the resolution. **There was a motion and second to table these items.**

The resolution was tabled with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

Resolution Authorizing an Agreement Between the Williamsport Bureau of Fire & Susquehanna Fire Equip

The City Clerk read the resolution.

There was a motion and second to table these items.

The resolution was tabled with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

Resolution Authorizing an Agreement Between the Williamsport Bureau of Fire & Dival Safety

The City Clerk read the resolution.

There was a motion and second to table these items.

The resolution was tabled with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

Accept for filing::

Finance Committee Minutes 02/01/22

Controllers Report November 2021

Transit Oversight Commission 03/01/22

WMWA & WMSA Minutes 02/09/22

Veterans Memorial Park Commission 02/07/22

Williamsport Bureau of Codes Report January 2022

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to accept these minutes for filing.

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

The minutes were accepted for filing with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7 to 0. All were in favor.

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

Announcements

The next regularly scheduled City Council meeting will be held on Thursday, March 31, 2022 at 7:00 PM, Trade & Transit II, 144 West Third St. 3rd Floor, Williamsport, PA

Upcoming Meetings:

Friday, March 18	1:00 PM	ERC Committee
Wednesday, March 23	11:30 AM	Redevelopment Authority*
Tuesday, March 29	11:30 AM	Public Safety
	1:00 PM	Finance Committee
	2:30 PM	Public Works
Thursday, March 31	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:

- a. City Council
- b. Administration
- c. Members of the Public
- d. News Media

There were no comments on this meeting.

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 8:58 PM with unanimous ayes.**

Submitted by:

**Janice M. Frank
City Clerk**