

StreamBox

>> Tfts test test test test test.

>> Test test test test test.

>> Why don't you start the countdown, please, Mr. Cooley.

>> Sure thing.

>> Welcome to our Williamsport city council meeting. We are meeting remotely as we have been. There are a few items on the agenda tonight, a few budget related and a couple others. We will start with item 1, dated 11/30/2020. Is there a motion?

?

>> O moved.

>> Second.

>> Second.

>> Motion and second. Any question or revision from councilmembers? Hearing and seeing none. A motion, please?

>> Before I take the vote, I sent out the second budget, too. Did everyone get that? I put that on the agenda.

>> Yes.

>> Yes.

>> Okay.

Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes. Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes.

>> Motion passes 7-0. Thank you. Item 2. Before we get to the next item, we will go down to item 5. And do item 5 and 6. I just want to announce that we are going to have an executive session immediately following the adjournment of our regular session for a legal issue.

We move to item 5. A resolution about paper reduction. You read that in short form, please?

Mrs. Frank?

>> Resolution for the city of Williamsport paper reduction policy.

>> Thank you, Mrs. Frank. Is there a motion and second from council?

>> Move.

>> Second.

>> Motion and second.

Mr. Banks, welcome tonight.

>> Good to be here.

>> So this came up during our last meeting that the city could have somewhat substantial budget savings by reducing our paper cost. I think councilmember yoder brought it up, there is a substantial savings we have. We threw this together and we did actually have an amendment to it, wanted to discuss it but I actually changed the now therefore statement to be a deadline to have paperless plan. By the beginning of the third quarter.

Of the year.

And instead of having a certain reduction by that time.

And so, I would like to amend it as we have it.

>> Are you making a motion to amend?

>> I would like to make a motion to amend, yes.

>> There a second?

>> Second.

>> Second.

>> So it would then read, now therefore be it resolved by the city of -- by the council of the city of Williamsport that all state departments shall submit a piperless plan by October 1, 2021 to be enacted by January 1, 2022. And shall be entirely paperless on January 1, 2022, except where hard copies are required by law.

That may be a little wordy.

>> That discussion, council, on that amendment.

>> Yeah, Randy, councilmember banks, I will say I completely agree with that. That is one of the two big, I guess, just observations that I had. I thought that might be a better strategy so a hundred percent agreed and I absolutely support that amendment.

>> Other comments?

>> We're just commenting on the amendment or this in general?

>> On the amendment.

>> I agree with Mr. Yoder. And thank you, Mr. Banks, foreseeing that change.

Did you get everything in the amendment Mrs. Frank?

>> Pretty much.

But I can also listen back.

>> Okay.

>> Any other questions on that amendment from any other councilmembers?

Okay. Mrs. Frank, the amendment please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Meely.

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes.

>> Motion to amend passes, 7-0. Thank you, Mrs. Frank. Now back to the original resolution. Anything else to say about it, Mr. Banks?

>> No, just want to thank Mr. Yoder for bringing it up. We are going into 2021. We should be paperless by now. A good observation. Glad we could take some action on it.

>> Yeah. Mr. Yoder ?

>> Thank you to councilmember banks for taking the initiative to put this together and job well done.

>> Any other comments or questions from councilmembers?

>> Mr. Allison and I would say, yeah, once again, thanks for taking the initiative on this one. I remember last year, I think I basically ask Mr. Bob Lott to cut a bunch of money out of each department's paper budget because it seemed ridiculous to me to need that much paper in the city. It is an entirely inefiskt way it accomplish the goal that Mr. Banks will hopefully manage to accomplish with this solution, which is the city should no longer be using paper as our primary method for communicating and/or recording items. With the digital age upon us, pretty much since ways in college, and it is time we caught up with it. Thanks a lot, Dave. And Adam. For getting this to the forefront.

>> Mr. Allison, this is nick grimes. Do you mind if I --

>> Yes, please.

>> I would like it see if some of the other staff agree. This is a wonderful idea and it should go through.

But I'm worried if we are taking money out of the I.T. budget that it is not realistic to get there. And what I mean by that is for us to be paperless, we need have pdfs on-line. I don't know they have the time to dedicate to that. We need devices at home for department heads and staff, you know. I don't have a lab top or phone from the city, so when I go out to meet with businesses and taxpayers, I can't take an electronic company with me. We need to have on-line Cloud storage to access from anywhere otherwise we need to have paper copies. So without a comprehensive plan for I.T. to have, office 365 and devices for employees and Google Suite or something like that, I don't think it is realistic unless we put more resources to it, which I think is a good investment and that is more efficient and save money and to be better for the environment but I don't think we can cut I.T.'s budget in the next origins that we will be hearing in at the same time and we will agree to paperless and 12 to 15 months.

>> Right. Well taken, Mr. Grimes.

Mr. Yoder, did you have your hand up? Mr. Banks?

>> I just had an amendment to the budget proposal later that was Mr. Cooley takes the health care buyout, so there is some money, I think Joe Pawlak will give us the exact number. We can move to number 4 for I.T. to try it get that moving. Depends if, you know, has an estimate on what that might cost it get us up to speed on paper flus 2022. If that amount will cover it. Think it is around \$18,000 but Joe Pawlak will have to give us the actual number on it.

Chris, are you there?

>> I am here. I don't have an exact figure off the top of my head but that 18,000 certainly would be helpful to get us to that point.

And we need to look at what department heads have laptops versus which ones don't and sort of go from there.

But if we can put money that we allocate specifically for that and we can work towards that number achieving the goal.

>> Can I also make a suggestion on that?

>> Yes, please do.

>> We are in exceptional times in a number of ways this year. Which we've been discussing ad nauseam over the last few budget sessions and council meetings.

But one of the things about these exceptional times is the interest rates are exceptionally well. And now might be the time for us to look at the digital infrastructure needs so to speak as Mr. Francis pointed out. Things like laptops and/or cell phones that would make it possible for us to go paperless and possibly the best way for us to finance that may might not be directly out of the federalland.

But the buy rates are so low and the savings recognized would pay more than the debt service moving forward.

The only reason I suggest that, is that gives us flexibility to look that early if 2021.

As a possibility for borrowing. For.

>> I think that's a very good point, Ms. Miele. Mr. Pawlak?

>> Yes. There is going to be a big investment, I think, in certain departments to get something that will enable the paperless capabilities. For example, the finance department, we are still running paper checks and there is the opportunity to go to electronic payments, things of that nature.

But we have to have the software along with the equipment to be table do so.

And the HR realm and I don't know if Joellen will chime in on this, but we will be own for benefits and if we had an on-line package where employees could log into a portal to do different things, there are opportunities out there but I think are is an upfront cost, so I think that ties in a little bit to Ms. Miele's comments about the potentially borrowing or potentially hunt for other sources but we need to come up with a solution to put those programs in place to be able to meet this need.

And I don't know what the time line it'll take to do that.

Just some thoughts.

>> I guess another thought I had was that what comes to mind is that a year sounds like a long time, but it's not. A year goes by pretty quickly. So I think that I would be interested in knowing what our plan is for the planning. How are we going to attack that. Who will be involved. What that will look like. I think we have to be intentional about that part or we might be able, not have a cohesive effort for concentrated effort to get to the place that we need to get. So I think that's a discussion to have early in 2021. With the administration to see how we can all work together and we should be on, we will probably need some kind of team work or team or group to oversee that effort. Since it was more than one person can handle obviously.

>> Any other comments?

>> And some sort of group to oversee it, I think that perhaps we have clearly delineated the actors in that order of Mr. Banks, Mr. Cooley and possibly Mr. Pawlak may have a lot of knowledge about it. Anyway.

That was all. Thank you.

>> Okay.

Sounds good.

That's a good first step. You will work on that. Any other discussion on this particular item?

>> Okay, a resolution, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Miele? Liz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes, 7-0. Thank you, Mrs. Frank. And Mr. Banks. And everyone else enjoying in on the discussion. We to item of. Resolution on the fire in emergency medical services on emergency medical services grant.

>> Resolution for COVID-19 crisis fire company and emergency medical services grant agreement.

>> Thank you, Mrs. Frank. Is there a motion and second from council?

>> So moved.? Second.

>> Motion and section. Welcome Mr. Killian.

>> Thank you, Mr. Allison, and city council. So before you currently is a resolution to accept a grant award from the fire commissioner for COVID relief. This grant has been awarded. Mayor and you signed off. Just waiting council's acceptance. Needs ton sceppep filed before December 31 of the first of the year and the money is allocated for fire department personal protective equipment. I would be happy to entertain any questions we have on the resolution.

>> Thank you, chief Killian. Any questions or comments from council?

>> We are all very happy to get a grant of any amount. That will be put to such good use. Hearing and seeing none, Mrs. Frank. And thank you for the initiative to go out and get this. I know the police department is also interested in getting similar type grants. So we hope it'll be successful in that, too. Mrs. Frank, the motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Cats?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks.

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele.

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 7-0. Thank you, Mrs. Frank. We move back up to item 3. Which is our ordinance about the various operating budget for city of Williamsport. This is the second reading and could be the final reading. Is there a motion on this?

>> So moved.

>> Second.

>> Motion and second by council.

Okay. We have the budget open back up.

So about a week, and I know everybody has been working hard.

Anybody that would like to get the discussion going this evening? Mr. Banks?

>> Since we were just talking about moving the \$18,000, I would like to make a motion to amend the on page 39. Remove \$18,000 from that line.

Do I need it make two motions to move it no another line?

>> That's all. Yes. I believe so. Right many?

>> Yes, you should be doing two separate motions. One is decrease and one is increase.

>> Yes, understood.

>> What is the number again, Mr. Banks?

>> 235-05-2090. The health insurance --

>> Okay.

>> And Joe, is that the correct number?

>> That's the health insurance account. My question would be not knowing the direction if we are going to hire someone, that would only leave \$10,000 in that account for any direct title. I want to know the direction so I want to make sure that everyone is clear that that potentially underfund the insurance depending on --

>> Does \$18,000 directly correspond to Mr. Cooley's --

>> No, no.

>> You will see in the 2020 budget, it was around 9700 for 2020 and 4% or so increase for health care. So maybe around \$10,000. If you are looking at it from the 2020 standpoint. We're not showing that in the estimate. So --

>> Why increase that substantially?

>> I don't know. That was my understanding that we were looking to hire someone. That's the coverage for family coverage.

>> Mayor slaughter, can you give us guidance there? You that I would be enough?

>> To hire someone in the I.T. department?

>> No, to leave 10,000 in.

>> As far as?

>> Future occupant in that --

>> Oh, yeah. I think Chris Cooley is probably going to be going back, we've had discussions, given the paperless discussion we just had, and you know, some things we want it see in 2021, and some of the current situations that we are having, that we may, Chris may be best suited if he justed to go back and does full-time I.T.

>> So in that case we should be able to take the 18,000 out and leave --

>> Yeah, in that case it sounds like an appropriate number.

>> Okay. Mr. Yoder ?

>> Quick question. If this was asked a couple weeks ago, I missed it. What is the equipment line item 23506410? Mr. the I.T. budget?

>> Joe, Chris?

>> That is the point to point link between fire headquarters and city hall. It is adding cameras to fire headquarters. There is \$10,000 in there to buy office monitors and all of the other parts that go to the computers that need to be deployed throughout city hall for the departments that never budget money. Then some money in there for potential network hardware that may be required when we bid out the fiber connection for the city and fire headquarters.

>> Okay.

>> And then what's the line item below that software?

>> That is the, our spam filtering software annual maintenance. And the upgrade for VMware, which is the OS that the servers are running.

>> Okay.

The only thought was, there is some important things in there that I think are pretty fundamental to day-to-day.

But if we are looking at or if we are putting together a plan to go digital, it does seem like some of that could potentially be pulled from there as well. I would think the plan would effect all of that anyway. So if we are concerned about the strategy of the I.T. department, whether it is Mr. Cooley a different hire or talking about that being a department that we won tract out, that might be an option for us if we are concerned about the health insurance thing. Just an observation for everybody.

>> Did we get a motion and second on Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks make a motion? Can we have a second?

>> Yes, we did.

>> Okay.

>> Other discussions from council?

>> Just one thing here for Chris. If we do move this and we are looking no change our PDF readers to go digital and things like that, would it be best to put it into software instead of equipment.

>> That or if Joe wants it create an account specifically for the paperless project, that would be fine as well.

>> I think that my recommendation, because we have the account there, let's put it in the equipment with the -- it is on the record here that that's what that is intended to be used for

and when we come up with the plan in October, and if necessary, we can move the money into more suited line items, if that's what council desires.

>> Okay.

>> Mrs. Frank, a motion to reduce that line item budget.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 7-0. And your second one, Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes. So a motion to amend the line item 2, 3, 5, 0, 6, 4, 50150 to add \$18,000.

>> Is there a skd? >> Motion and second.

Discussion?

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Just that we could have the discussion here. Thank you, Mr. Cooley.

>> Thank you, sir.

>> Any other discussion from council? Hearing none.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 7-0.

Thank you, Mrs. Frank.

Any other motions?

Mr. Banks?

>> I will keep rolling here, Mr. Allison. On page 25, amend line 224-06-4010. That is the parks department and reduce that from 60,000 to 0.

>> Is there a second?

>> Second.

>> A Megs and second.

Any discussion from council?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yeah. Just a quick question.

What specific equipment is that, just as a reminder?

>> This is the new tractor.

Mr. Winter was generous enough to put it forward for pups they said that old tractor can make another year.

>> Any other discussion? Hearing none, Mrs. Frank on that motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison? Yes. Thank you, Mrs. Frank. Motion passes, 7-0.

Are we still on a roll, Mr. Banks?

>> If Mr. Banks doesn't have one, I've got one since we are on this page.

>> He raised his hand.

>> Please go ahead.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yi. So since we are on page 25, a question on linity em 244-07-6052 bowman field improvements. Joe, how much money do we have in the bowman field account?

>> Around 150, 160 right now, which is around the rack project.

>> So it is scheduled to be u used, right?

>> Correct.

And then this money is part of the 210 that's in the capital budget. This is the final year for that. Being that the project is expected to conclude this year.

>> Okay.

That kind of shoots down my idea. So never mind.

I didn't know if -- not knowing the amount of money that is in the bowman field account, I didn't know if this is the -- it seems like this would be a year if we had a good surplus in there to tap into that for this.

>> You will see on page 55 there is 150 coming in from there. The remaining stays for utilities.

>> Never mind. It would be fantastic if we could try to, you know, with the MLB draft league announced, I don't know if there is way to capitalize on that and raise some money to offset that

a little bit. And it is just a thought. Seems like something we may be able to adjust, even if it is half. Even if we can reduce by 35,000 and raise money this spring, that would help. I don't know what everybody else from council thinks, but it is certainly an idea.

>> If I can jump in, Mr. Yoder, that was actually going to be my proposal this evening as well that we assume by naming rights that we would see some amount of money in terms of cutting this line any expectation we would be able to recognize income that could be dedicated toward this later in the year.

But I feel strange saying this because I'm generally speaking a very debt allergic person. I don't like debt. I don't like to see the city to take on debt. I don't like to see my friends take on debt. It doesn't seem like a wise decision.

But for this with greater return on naming rights that we've had in past years, I was going to make a suggestion that administration look to reduce or eliminate this line item as well as obligations in terms of infrastructure work on the pool this year. And take out a small borrowing item that would address what our remaining needs at bowman field, any repair needs for the pool at memorial park and then as we have just discussed perhaps also any digital needs remight have related to going paperless. With the exception of the pool, those are items we can look to offset any interest we might pay which we know would be exceptionally minimal in the current economic climate with income from other naming rights or from no longer spending on paper in the city. So I think, ways going to discuss that perhaps a little later in the meeting but I think that my suggestion would be, I would be comfortable with the move to cut all of the funding if you would like out of this.

But an eye looking toward borrowing as the wisest option for this.

Given the impact on the general fund this year.

But please let me know your thoughts.

>> I personally share a lot of those sentiments with you., Liz. I think in this circumstance, that is a strategy that I think I could get on board with. With the interest rate environment and everything we see there. I could get on board with that. And so I suppose I would make a motion to change item 22407650 bowman field from 70,000 to 0.

>> I'll second that.

>> Motion and second.

Is there more discussion from anybody?

>> I have a question, this is Jon Sander. This will effect the school board bidding a month from now?

>> It is removing the funding, so we will have to have another funding source in place. And then we will have to consider whatever debt service.

>> So I'm awarding the project essentially a month from now and now down to 500. I was at 570. Okay. That's an issue for me.

>> Okay.

>> Mr. Slaughter?

>> Did we want to, with that in mind because we don't want to fumble this project a third time, so to speak, do we want to sooner rather than later start it look at possible funding and how much we want that to be. The bowman field project is moving along pretty well with the school board. I don't want any hiccups and definitely don't want to have to call the senator and say, we

have another roadblock. I guess I'm looking for direction on that front as far as, we are pretty close. We have somewhat of a tight time line working with everyone to make sure the score board gets up here in the spring. I guess I'm asking council for direction on where do you want me to look for funding and what's the goal here?

>> So John, can you reiterate the date that you are looking for? What is it again?

>> Sure, hold on.

We are looking to have it advertised in two weeks and through January 12. Then have it select the winning contractor by January 15.

And have them start as soon as humanly possible. So as to get this score board up by a date of April 15.

>> So I would suspect we're not going to have any clarity on naming rights within a month. Joe, how difficult would it be to have clarity least if not be substantially through the process of securing bond funding for what councilwoman Miele mentioned over the next month?

>> I think that that could be tricky as well. I don't think it would be a bond in this case, I think it would be a note.

But I don't know with the holidays that that would be -- I'm not sure.

>> Okay.

>> So I don't know -- I would be willing to -- I have a number of -- I think we all have a number of questions that will come out of the discussion tonight. I would be willing to ask council to vote no to this with the expectation we probably table this entire budget after discussion until next week. And I would ask the administration to start that process to figure out how feasible it will be to secure some kind of funding so we can eliminate that line item by next Thursday.

>> Do we have an amount that council is considering. Understood. Understood.

>> Is this a borrowing amount that you are asking, Derek --

>> Well, if we want to, you know, as you were saying, if we want to do some I.T. things and bowman field, score board, just have an idea of all we want it tie into this and what that note kind of would be.

>> I think that the information we are looking for from you by next week. That is to say, I don't know precisely what we feel comfortable with spending on I.T. stlmed or what the I.T. director will have the sense that we might need for funding there. As well as whether we want to offset just the 70,000 this year or whether we want to go ahead and look at the entire 210,000 we set aside over the last three years. That is partially depending on interest rate. And what our interest rates winds up being right now. Then, you know, then once again, depending on the tra interest we can get and what the debt impact would be for us, are there things we could pull in this other things to take care of now rather than wait on them if interest rates could get with us. So I think that is the question that we need to answer by next week. Obviously we can finness things but we need a baseline minimum to would be. And whatever the recommendation might be. Just make sure that fits within our vision, I suppose.

I too am inclined to table the budget and get back to it next week because we need to get it lowered.

But that to me, is what the administration needs to come back with next week.

>> Okay. Yeah. Now I'm just thinking out loud. I will get with Chris then. We will get I.T. comprehensively along with the bowman field, scoo will board project, and try and get some

detail put around it. What we might be at minimum borrowing for that.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes, sir, just whiler with on this subject, I would like we would want to try and throw in the repairs to the swimming pool to that number as well.

Correct me if I'm wrong, but with the score board, and correct me if I'm wrong, you don't pay for that job up front. We technically don't have to pay off the score board until it's done, correct? So if we are looking at having this job complete in April, right? Correct me if I'm wrong.

>> Well, this is gentlemen Girardi, typically you pay so much up front, so much through construction, then the final fee at the end. That's how I typically understand how it works.

>> You're right, Mr. Mackey. However we are talking January, February to April, it won't take long to get to the middle of April.

>> I guess my pointcy would think by April we would be able to secure funding for that. Maybe not by January 15, but we should by April.

>> We can look at the note, but I want to make sure we don't start into the project and get to March or April and say, wait a minute, we don't have the money in place here.

>> Yes, I will include the swimming pool then, for repairs.

>> Okay. We have this motion here.

Mr. White, should we withdraw the motion or vote it down?

>> I think withdrawing the motion would make the most sense. It is okay to withdraw and consent to the second.

>> I'll make a motion to withdraw the motion.

>> Second. Consent.

>> Okay, motion is withdrawn. And up for discussion. Next Thursday. Thank you, everybody. We are engaging.

P okay.

Who is up next?

Mr. Banks?

>> Small item. Page 15, city clerk budget. Since we are going paperless, we shouldn't be receiving packets. So the auto allowance, 12007 it 020.

Reduce that from 700 to 0.

>> Okay.

There is a motion. Is there a second?

>> Second.

>> Discussion?

We won't be paperless immediately, though.

Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes. You have to understand that's part of her contract.

\$700 was part of her pay for when she was hired.

So to take it away or deducting her pay by \$700.

So either you keep it or you know --

I mean, you can't take somebody's pay away from them when they signed up for the job to begin with. This has been an ongoing cost from previous city clerks.

So when she was hired, this is what was promise id her.

>> Correct me if I'm wrong, my understanding would be that Ms. Frank is driving -- she won't need to spend that \$700.

In fuel if she is not driving packets.

>> I know.

But when it is part of someone's contract, you are pulling away. And second of all, we aren't going paperless for almost year.

>> Except I think that as far as council packets go, we already are.

>> There are some of us that still get hard copies and packets.

>> Okay. I have not been receive packet for most of this year.

But if that is still something that there would be a need for for a part of 2020, or 2021, excuse me, then we can look at reduction instead of complete elimination?

>> Okay, for me, I don't have all of the programs on my computer. For some of the things that are downloaded. So therefore, I don't get to see some of the stuff. And that's why I need the hard copies. Unless or I'm going to have a program or tablet that will be given to me, I'm not going to be spending money on programs that I'm not being paid for. And I think can you fully understand that. I mean, there are things I just can't see that come down.

And I can tell you this much, norm is the same way.

>> So just a thought, I don't think -- I don't get hard copies either. I have my own filing system that I use every two weeks. It works for me. If people ask for it, I send it to them.

I think as a group we are somewhere in the middle.

I think we would be probably wise to walk with this one before we run. It is a good thought. And ultimately by this time next year, this is what we will be looking at but I don't want to leave anyone on the team between council and administration in the dark if they are either not comfortable or not able to access stuff completely digitally while we would save money, we are going to lose efficiency as a group. So we might be wise to wait a little bit on this one.

>> Just a thought since we are kind of in between.

>> I'm comfortable with withdrawing that motion. It is \$700. And we are not going paperless until next year.

>> It is a goal.

>> Yes. And a good g goal.

>> So I would withdraw that motion.

>> Second.

>> Motion withdrawn.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes, if we are throwing ideas out there and we may need feedback from the administration, on page 17, legal services, we have a pretty substantial jump in that contract. From last year to this year. I know that is as a result of RFPing those services. I voted and supported that procedure in hopes that we would either validate what we are getting or potentially leverage the theory of competition driving efficiency from that. It doesn't appear to have worked and I feel like if we are month to month, if we are in line or under budget in 2020, I think it would be a good idea to continue that into 2021 if solicitors would do that. And really try to take it either another stab or work to negotiate something to Whitel that down. That jump is almost double. And it is, I just don't think it is feasible with what we are facing.

I don't know if the administration can take a look at it and see if there is any progress that maybe be able to be made or maybe even something that could be committed to, to be worked on for early next year. Just a thought for everybody else on council.

And I'll throw that out to the group before we make a motion to so we can maybe alleviate some administration stuff.

>> You want it look into that in the meantime?

>> Sure. We can look into that. Also a reminder that council does have responsibility over legal.

>> Yes, sir.

We do the hiring of the slit tosser. Yeah, that is council's responsibility but we can look into that.

>> Perfect.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Sure. I'll keep going. I have another big one.

It is between the police and fire departments. Let me pull up the pages for everybody.

Let me find them, sorry.

Next time before I raise my hand I'll make sure I have the right page.

So they are in regards to with the fire, line items 242-05-1040 on page 43 overtime. And then with the police the similar components, or time and comp time on page 49 line items 410-4510 and you know, I understand the need with public safety perspective and what have you and ensuring the city is safe but especially this year I just think this level of overtime we need to either do better at managing it or we need to push for more mutual aid from our surrounding municipal partners. Maybe the state police. Maybe south Williams port.

Mutual aid is a two-way street. We need to did a better job of I think leveraging that and I don't know if there is something that needs to be looked at over the next week in regards it that.

But I would feel comfortable minimizing each of those budgets now to push the administration to leverage or use that strategy next year to help save us money while keeping the city safe.

And not losing service potentially.

>> So, are you making a motion? Or you want it to be looked at?

>> It is something the administration can look at. I have rough numbers for each of those that I was initially thinking of reducing each 30,000 each. That would be \$90,000. I see a couple hands. So I don't know if we want to have discussion before making a motion.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Thank you, President. To piggyback off of what councilmember yoder is saying, to get into more specific numbers, chief Hagan, can your mind me again of that 180,000 overtime budget? How much of that is allocated to the two officers we have working in the county wide task force?

>> Numbers, rough numbers from January through the middle of November, if they weren't assigned there and they were on patrol, then 60 to 70,000 could have been prevented. That is spread out over overtime and comp time. It is not from one, they can choose either or, when they work over time they can make it comp or overtime.

But I think there may be a, for the benefit of those of you in the first year, these numbers were historically higher and what occurred was a couple of years ago, the overall number of officers was reduced by 4. So what that means is, unless you remove all of the special assignments and that means the one officers assigned to the marshals, two officers assigned to the task force,

potentially officers were at the school, though that salary is reimburse id.

But being up at the school means that officers can't control over time. When that occurred and then also the minimum manpower standard was reduced on six shifts a week out of 21 from 4 to 3 on two of the shifts.

And we believed and made the argument last year that that was unsafe for a city this size. I still believe that.

There were also other issues in the last administration. There was a what we believe was an over use of the cic policy. Some 777 shifts where there was in supervisor on duty at all and our administration believes that is unable. We do have do once in a while. We do have necessity when there is no one available but to choose it not have a supervisor on given the level of liability we face in this city is unacceptable if we have one available. So over time is affected by those things and also affect had by unforeseen things like how many people have babies that year. How many people get injured. How many suspensions occur.

And how many people get hired and have to good to the police academy and are gone for six months and don't count toward manpower and how many on the list and how many get hired and that the luck of the draw. It can't really be planned for. So what we did is we changed the minimum manpower back it where it was before. And we assigned a couple guys to the narcotics unit, knowing that would create overtime. However, realizing the extraordinary value of having those incredibly high skilled individuals in that unit and the dramatic effect it has on public safety.

We can't, according to my college of the contract, and the existing situation, we capital say that Penn college or state police are manpower at the beginning of the shift. We do want it on a regular basis call them for mutual aid and they call us and I have many times over the course of this year called the state police for assistance. The most recent example when we had the big COVID outbreak, I called them for help with the shooting on Penn street and they took that call for us.

We do this on a regular basis. We don't believe that overtime is mismanaged. We believe we have to have a certain number of people on the street and if we are cutting overall number of people or not have enough what we believe is enough people we will pay more overtime. The more staff we have the less overtime. The less staff, the more overtime. We believe the special assignments that we have right now are very necessary and productive. We could pull that, if that's what you want.

But then we won't have a direct link with officers in the fugitive task force. It'll be more difficult to find one with people particularly those involved in violent crimes than it is now.

If we don't have people in the county drug task force, then we will not have a direct effect, the same sort of effect we have on all of those investigations. We would not see the productivity from the county unit that we did have sh th year. We believe the value is there. We lowered the number here recently from 180 last year down to 160.

And some things occurred that we did not plan on and we came in over budget. So we believe after speaking with finance director and the mayor that 180 is appropriate. If we lower it then we need to make changes to services, in my opinion. We just need know what you want.

>> Yeah.

I appreciate everything you s said. Maybe with the exception of brick street's money, none of

these cuts have been easy for me. Sorry, Brooks streets joke.

But my question for with you be chief, is if we pull those two officers back from task force, what would be an appropriate number for us to lower overtime and comp time by. Without causing any, too much trouble?

>> I think if we pull those two positions out we could safely go 15 to 20 lower in each category. Given the fact this their presence in patrol, those positions, presence in patrol this year, would have saved between of 60 and 70 between January and November. I think we could safely go down 15, maybe 20 at the most. In each one.

>> Okay. Sorry, Mr. Banks?

I see Mr. Banks has his hand up.

>> I think we are talking about two different things here. I want to address fire over time. Before we get into police overtime. The fire, chief Killian, can elaborate more but I think they are making up for not having enough firefighters to work every shift. Is that the case?

>> Not necessarily. The vast majority of our overtime is simply maintaining minimum staffing. We have that over in time number has been reduced by some \$150,000 over the course of the last throo he years.

You will see a reduction down to 230,000. As must administration came in we made changes and eliminated administrative chief and put that position back on the floor. Leveled shifts off at eight person ail signed to each shift. Minimum staffing at six personnel Monday through Friday during the day and seven nights and weekends.

That minimum staffing has existed since the late 90s.

And is extremely important for fire apparatus.

It could -- you know, we won't for safety sake operate a vehicle with one person on it. So it would be a significant challenge to get that number lower. Mind you, that is a projection. As of this year, overtime numbers projected to come in lower for 2020 than previously expected. So there is a good likelihood that that number could come in lower again for 2021.

To directly answer your question, it is not that we don't have enough firefighters to fill the shifts, we do. It is just maintaining minimum numbers specifically around high vacation times like this time of the year. Generally quarter 41 our highest as firefighters take vacation and their shifts need to be filled. I have been working with union on create ef solutions with how vacation is taken and when that vacation can be taken and atiment to further reduce that number.

But those discussions are still ongoing.

>> Thank you, chief. Back over to police. Didn't mean to side track everybody here.

>> I do like having the two officers in the county. I think they do a great job.

But they are not paid for entirely by county enforcement unit. In terms of what the city puts out. City doesn't have the officers on the street. We don't have the equivalent number of officers on the street while they are over there. I think that's wh we are facing is a decision about the levels we have versus what the men are doing. Can we afford that? Is that what you are getting at, Mr. Yoder ?

Yeah.

>> I can provide a bit of history there. The city used to make up the main element of that unit. The county had bun detective historically or none. Until for many years until 2010 when the D.A. at the time, Eric Lindhheart, decided to bring it back under local control and started hiring

detectives. At any moment the county can decide to stop doing that. They are funding the salary and benefits of the entire unit but there was a day not so long ago when they did not do that. They may decide not to do that plus our officers are more familiar with the city and the people in it than detectives hired from other areas to come in here and work.

So our officers provide a particular service. Right now, one of the two officers assigned there is actually in charge of the county narcotic enforcement unit.

So this unit is also available to do very important surveillance and things like that for us.

P not that they wouldn't still be there but we don't control whether ut city funds that unit or not.

My concern is in years it come, that could dry up. We thought based on their talent level, some violent crimes and some things I can't talk about in public, it was good decision the mayor agreed this year, we knew we would take a bit after hit on overtime, but I think it was a responsible decision to make this year despite the cost.

Now I haven't said that, I spoke earlier about savings that could occur. What I don't know right now this year, two officers that were assigned over there in January would have been on different shifts and that's why they would have been able to cover as much overtime, you know, estimate involved overtime on two different shift.

I don't know if we brought them back this year where they would fall on the seniority roster. If they ended up on tw different shifts they would be able to cover similar amount of overtime. But if they all end up on the same shift then the number would be quite different. They wouldn't be able to cover as much.

I would have to look at where the bids are for shift and seniority, assuming next year is the same to this year, 15 to 20 would be I think accurate. Also we could pull the officers back from the marshals as well if we needed to.

That would save money, manpower, vacation, high seasons when we have injuries. That's an option as well.

I just wanted to let you know that.

>> Thank you, chief. I think the issue that we talk about regionalization of the police and fire all the time. As some sort of, what we are doing now is providing some of those services a the cost of the taxpayer. Especially with people going to the county and the sheriff's. We are giving at part a part of that funding to a broader audience that is not specific to wanes pours.

So in terms of just dollars and cents, I don't think we can afford to pay for county services.

>> That would be accurate with regard to marshals. More than 97% of narcotics cases in the county are within sit aye limits. The vast majority of their work is here already. It is the county in this particular case and really a big gift from them. Like I said, it doesn't exist before.

But everyone understands. We understand the dilemma this year. If we need to pull them back, that's what we will do.

>> That's ugly either way, thanks.

>> If that's the case, I really appreciate you saying that, and you know, this would be maybe the caveat of not knowing what 2022 will look like. Maybe we can be involved in that task force again. You're saying 15 or 20 from each of the budgets would, do I need to make separate motions as line items or can I do them both at the same time, aughtin'?

>> Two separate.

>> Two separate motions. Okay. Then I make a motion in reference to line item 244-05-1040

overtime, to reduce that from 180 to 160.

>> I'll second that.

>> Motion and second. Any further discussion from councilmembers?

>> Hearing and seeing none, Ms. Frank on the motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi?

>> I don't think he is here, Janice.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Alice?

>> Yes. Motion passes 6-0.

>> All right. Should I just keep going then?

>> yes.

>> I'll make motion on line item 244-05-1057 comp time to reduce that from 180 to 160.

>> I'll second.

>> Motion and second. Any further discussion from kowns snil Mr. Banks?

>> Given that the range that she gave us is twine 15 and 20, shave that down by 5,000 just because we don't want to max out both of those estimates.

>> I'm okay with that.

>> So I will make a motion to amend that comp time from 180 to 165.

>> Who seconded that. Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes, I'll second it.

>> On motion to amend, Mrs. Frank, please.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Passes. And the original motion to make the cut, is there any other discussion on that?

Okay, Mrs. Frank on that motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Pulizzi? Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Passes 6-0. Thank you, Mrs. Frank.

Mr. Mackey?

>> I can keep going.

>> Yes.

>> If I could take everybody to page 32.

>> I would like to make a motion to zero out the swimming pool budget from 101,691 to 0 and suggest that we keep the pool closed this year. And finally fix it for good. Again, as we talked earlier, that would be through some type of a loan as Ms. Miele mentioned.

>> A motion. Is there a second?

>> Second.

>> Motion and second. Mr. Pawlak?

>> Hey, I sent an e-mail out earlier today going through the question from last week.

So looking that, I think if all sources are there, we have to also eliminate any pool admissions and the concessions planned.

So reducing all those line items the amount to 70,691. I would like to keep some money in the electrical along with water and worker's comp which is allocate find that another line item. I'm not sure if emp follows me on that.

There are certain things that will happen whether the pool is open or closed.

>> Joe, if I can interrupt for a minute. If you do that with the pool, aim assuming chemical supply answers so forth would also be in a different line item would also be dropped.

>> Correct. If everything was taken out, it would result -- initially there was a net loss of \$70,691.

But we would have to add back in electric to run the pool lights that are there. And the minimum water around 200. And allocate workers' comp along all departments and the allocation we have there is 24 pun plo posed to are 2021. We have to regentleman willcate that to another apartment or just keep it there.

>> So you say keep the workers' comp. What do you think would be a safe number for the electric?

>> I don't know if we can do it this way.

>> Just let me now hoe we neat need to do it.

But it is my suggestion we keep the pool closed this year.

>> I understand that.

Let me run some numbers. I think the total change would be around an increase to bottom line of 67,091.

>> Mr. White, would we have to reduce each line item separately?

>> Yes, you would.

I'm the attorney, but yes, would you. You would have to go with each individual line item and reduce it by amendment.

>> Mr. Allison, if this is a, if this is all part of one reduction and they are all reductions, so long as each one is being set, what it is being reduced to and it is done in a way that is clear for the record, I'm okay combining a few of them so far as they are all reductions and all part of the same overall reduction.

>> Okay.

Would it make more sense to us to give Mr. Pawlak time?

>> I can read them right now based on what I sent out this morning. Can we include expend user together, Mr. White?

>> Yeah. If you are reducing something in the budget, yes.

>> Okay.

>> Should I read them out to everyone? All the changes.

>> I think that would be best, Joe. Perhaps a motion to amend the budget for pools and the pool incomes as specified. Is that the best way to do it Randy in?

>> Sound reasonable.

>> Unless you make the motion Mr. Mackey.

>> I'll try get that terminology right. I will make an amendment to reduce the pool swimming pool program budget as read by Joe Pawlak. Does that work?

>> Yeah.

>> And pool income lines.

>> Sorry.

>> Is there a secretary. This motion and second and -- are there any other comments on that?

>> Should I read them in before we --

>> Yes.

>> Please.

>> Okay. So on page 9, line 050-44-4220 pool admissions from 30,000 to zero.

Same page 9. Four concessions from 1,000 to 0.

On page 32, 2291, 5050 seasonal salary.

From 51,591 to zero. Line 229-15-2050 pch fininga.

3,900 to 0. Workers' comp will remain the same.

Line 2291, 75081 electric from 3,700 to 1,000.

Line 229-1610. Pool supplies from 4,000 to zero.

Line 2291 wrb back out supplies to line 0.

Pool preparation from 10,000 to 0.

Pool equipment repairs from 7,000 to 0. Line 1 '02 29176050 Pam house equipment or repairs from 1,000 to 0.

Line 229711 water from 3,000 to 200.

Line 229-16-4010 equipment from 5,000 to 0.

And line 229-16-2150 chemicals from, from 6,000 to 0.

>> Thank you. Any changes on the amended motion?

We never voted on the motion to amend, though. I don't believe.

>> No, we didn't.

>> So motion to amend. Mr. Frank?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 6-0. Amend motion that Mr. Pawlak just read through.

Any discussions on that? Seeing none.

>> Thank you, Joe, for doing heavy lifting.

>> This is Joe Gerardy again. Can I ask a question?

>> Yes.

>> If we are shutting the pool down again this year and we do know we have leak problems, I don't know if it has been set aside, but it may be in the best interest of the city to set aside funds to research it. Not necessarily a study but qualified master plumbers who know where to find leaks. Mr. Allison you've been involved in that business to find leaks. Might be a good suggest tossing set aside money for that.

Just wanted to throw that out there.

>> I'm not talking a lot of money, maybe 10 or \$15,000 to cover air testing and so forth on some lines coming in and doing excavation and plugging lines. And I just want to throw that out there.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes, very good point.

I know previously we had talked about looking at potential bond or note for I.T. in the pool. I don't know why we couldn't include that in that.

Food for thought.

>> Just thought if we are closing the pool down this is the year it look for that leak.

>> Yes. I think we all absolutely agree. Very good point.

>> Since we are talking all things pool, we haven't really discussed it, but regardless of what we do to make preparation, and relating to what Mr. Girardi said, we should have a discussion about the pool, the if you toor of the pool period.

Do research and talk to the administration about is this really the way we want to go. Food for thought. Mrs. Katz?

>> Good point you're bringing up, Randy.

How many times have we said, we don't make money with the pool. What if we get the pool fixed up, and I think this has been brought up by John Sanders even, why don't we look into leasing the pool to a private entity and they can maybe make money with the pool. For some reason we have never, I don't even remember that we even break even. Joe, is that true? Since I've been on council, I don't know that we have ever broke even.

>> Correct. I don't even think when it was private that it broke even.

>> Maybe private entity would be more conducive to making bigger plans that we aren't capable of doing and don't even have the knowledge or stamina to go after something to make it bigger or better. I would hate to see the pool close down completely. I really would. I would like to have a discussion with council of maybe pursuing a private entity to see if we could lease it out.

>> I think they are all good points and nothing to solve this evening.

But the discussion is started. We will pick that up in the future. And keep that, make that a one of our discussion points for 2021.

Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes. To that point, if we are talking about different options for the pool, something else that we as the city may want to consider, just maybe the strategy of a recreation department as whole, I know that in the past I think the recreation programs have been done by somebody else externally then brought back to the city given the financial picture. Because I believe we don't make any money. We lose money in that area as well.

That may be something else. Maybe we approach another nonprofit in the city that may be better equipped to run those. That saves us a lot of legacy cost and additional costs by transitioning both of those off of our books.

>> Good point.

>> I don't think recreation to a governmental agency is anything that is design id or the intention is to make a profit. It is simply to provide a service to the community. And we probably wouldn't find the best most economical way to do that.

So again something to put on the front burner in 2021. That would be great.

>> Okay, I think we are done with that discussion there.

We have a vote.

So we haven't voted on the amended motion. I suppose we should do that, right, Mr. White?

>> Yes.

>> Trying to keep my notes tight strait here. Mrs. Frank, original motion.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Thank you, Mrs. Frank. Motion passes 6-0.

Okay. On to -- Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes, still talking about the rec department, one of the things that has been under the rec department is special events. Special events has to be a topic of conversation for the rec department. Some things done with special events are money-makers for the city.

But on the other hand, make it will behoove us, and this is just all for discussion, that could run special events and maybe do a percentage that the city would get back from it I don't know how we could do that but again the city shouldn't be into special events.

>> Thank you.

>> That will be a discussion, yes.

Thank you, Mrs. Katz.

>> Okay, back to the budget. Mr. Banks?

>> I'm on page 60.

And looking at the line item for the PRP. Since we are looking to the water and sewer authority to manage our MS4 permit and the reduction plan and then we I think we are looking to switch that over in short order.

I think we should reduce this maybe not entirely but I'm proposing to amend this to reduce it to 50,000 so take 125,000.

>> Motion. Is there a second?

>> Second.

>> Motion and second. Reduce line item from 175 to reduce by 125,000 to 50. Discussion?

>> Say that again, please?

>> 60.

>> Okay, thank you.

>> Randy, one thing, I apologize had not occurred to me in earlier discussions I had about this is Mr. Banks which is that after there is specific and limited uses. So I want it double-check because I'm not familiar with the funding.

That by cutting the budget and 125,000, and effectively, and I know the money can be used which we have reduced and can be for other storm water needs. What other things can it be used for within the city?

>> Can you give me a few minutes to pull it up, the record?

>> Yeah, sure. I'm fine with moving ahead on this one way or the other, guys. I'm just trying to figure out, that money is dedicated to certain items. So we need to figure out exactly where we want to dedicate it moving forward.

I talked about this and this should have occurred to me. I a I apologize. I wanted to bring it up now and if we don't deal with it this week we can deal with it next week if we table the budget.

Okay?

>> Okay. I'm a silly person. I don't mind being silly.

>> No, I knew about it and I should have -- I'm sorry.

>> Under the fund budget we have a line item for technology. We can talk about this need for upgrades, could that be used for I.T.

>> I just pulled up this report. I will send this out to everyone tomorrow. Under information

technology, the class indicates, geographic information and information technology. My understanding is that they were very general with classifications and we need it make sure it is something that falls within the specific categories are listed.

I can send you ought to categories tomorrow.

>> Thank you Mr. Pawlak.

>> Good point there.

>> Regardless of where it goes, I mean, for members of council, it would be wise to reallocate that if we are moving forward with having these authority and water authority manage.

>> Yes, absolutely.

>> Yes, absolutely.

>> That is moving along nicely.

Any other discussion from council on this particular item?

>> Hearing none on the motion. Please, Mrs. Frank.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 6-0. Thank you, Mrs. Frank.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes, sorry. Just to stay with and go back to the swimming pool here. Recreation, since it is just maybe close this one out, page 30.

I would like to make an amendment to line item, 222-05-1010 salaries. Reduce that by 10,000. I don't think if we have a pool that we need a rec assistant.

>> I'll second it.

>> Motion and second.

>> Discussion?

>> Hearing and seeing none. Ms. Frank, the motion, please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Ms. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Passes 6-0. Thank you, Mrs. Frank.

>> Soar by, one more councilmember yoder, then I will be quiet.

>> Before I make a motion, if we could go to page 57, and this will be a request for a guess the administration, the mayor. Rental income in 2020. We budgeted 300,000 but looks like we will only collect about 251,000.

Why is that? And I guess that would be my first question.

>> That's my first question.

>> You will answer that one?

>> In an attempt to save everywhere we could, there is a balance in the city hall fund. So we felt that we would reduce essentially only putting 25 additional or putting additional it 25,000 toward the bottom line. Getting us closer to what we are expecting to spend versus what we are anticipating it spend.

>> What is the balance of city hall?

>> I want to say in the 800. That was intended to be used for other renovations and past projects that were let for bid.

>> So I guess my question would be, would it be wise it set that back for 300 for 2021?

>> Depends on the fewer of city hall.

It is ultimately a question there if we want it keep building money for renovations.

>> Correct me if I'm wrong, that money can help us to move, too, correct?

>> Currently we are sitting around aside for building and operation of the building it self, I'm not sure if there are restrictions or if council could lift any restrictions.

I believe so, yes.

But I can't confirm that. I would have to look into it.

>> With that said, I would like to make a motion to align item 46230 to raise proposed rental income from 250 to 30 300,000.

>> Mr. Pawlak?

>> With that motion, there also needs to be an amendment to general fund budget to increase city hall rents to cover that payment. Since that payment is coming from the general fund.

>> There's a motion. Is there a second?

>> I believe Dave seconded it.

>> Oh, sorry. Motion and second.

Discussion?

>> Yes. Joe, will we have to go into every line item to increase the rent? Austin we have to did that?

>> We can increase space on building if council puts it in one line item, I think we can pay from that one line item and it will reflect in estimates. You are looking a the 2020 or 2021? I'm sorry.

Mr. Mackey?

>> I'm looking a the 2021. Set at 250,000. Last year set at 300.

>> If do you that I can come back with an allocation to increase every one or if council chooses we can just do one specific budget. I don't know that it matters either way.

>> Austin, what do you think we should be doing?

>> I think if 250,000 is for all of the units, I'm okay with it being reduced.

It can be allocated, that's wh I heard.

>> We have to increase a number of items. So would the other side to this change be an increase to the office space use and the general -- is there some way I can allocate it to get to that \$50,000 number without specifically naming tonight the line items?

>> Let's just pick one. Pick a department and line item. Who cares?

>> Fine either way.

>> I don't know if -- I mean, all we are doing is putting money into an account.

>> That's all we are doing. It wouldn't reflect the space they're using. That's fine. We can fix it going forward.

>> We are taking 50,000 from the bottom line, right?

>> Am I correct, increasing from 250 to 300 so we have to increase one line in the general fund by 50,000 to match the change to fund the number coming into this one.

>> Let's put it in the mayor's office.

>> Oh, sure, Bonnie, pass the buck.

>> If we decrease the amount by 50,000, I think Joe needs to go back through and equally distribute that amongst the departments so it comes out to be 50,000. Am I correct?

>> That's why I ask. That would have to go to every line item for rent.

>> All going to the same account. Who cares?

>> Which ever is easiest. It won't show space usage. You can pet it into my office.

>> I think you should allow Joe to allocate it as a result after vote tonight and then I'm assuming it would be in the budget for the next meeting and if someone has an issue with the way this looks can you deal with it at that time.

>> So the motion would be to increase the office rental lines in general fund by 50,000 per an allocation financed by the finance department.

>> And equally allocated.

>> I just want to allocate rather than go through each one.

>> This is where we are going.

>> I'm glad somebody does.

>> Okay, motion and second. Any further discussion?

1234-Z Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes. Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes.

>> Yeah.

Two questions an then potentially.

Amendments to the budget.

I'm on page 14 city council. Line item 1007 020 other expenditures, what is that?

Remind me of that.

>>> This year I included some of the remote fees. The transcribing of the meetings.

And then also in the past included meeting supplies.

I believe.

>> Okay.

>> Then I will make one motion for amendment. Line item 11079540 legislative contingency. I move to reduce that from 100,000 to 75,000.

Seems to me that the past two years we haven't used anything out of that. And so taking a little bit out of that shouldn't hurt us.

And if others feel that we can take more out of it, that's up for debate.

But I will make that motion.

>> Is there's the motion. Is there a second?

>> Second.

>> Discussion?

>> Mr. Banks?

>> I would like to hear from you, President Allison, and Ms. Katz and Ms. Miele, you're the elder statesmen. How has this been used in the past?

>> We have used this legislative contingency in the past for across the board for the entire city government.

To use as needed for legal issues. Things like that. That have come up.

So p you know, it has been a cooperative.

P a resting place for the whole government.

>> I think generally speaking, the money from this line item often winds up falling to the bottom line at the end of the year. It is basically a holding place in case we need a little bit of money or something legislative say unfor seen.

We are reducing it shouldn't make a dramatic difference, just means we might have to find the money elsewhere if there were a need for it somewhere in government.

>> For 2020 budgeted at 175 and we have contracts that we negotiated and that was the contingency for some of that.

So I don't think we have any expected high dollar items. I look forward to the administration in that.

>> I just ask that council use caution in doing that as we are cutting lines, you know, everywhere. You're not leaving contingencies within other lines. This will be the only place that there is money set aside potentially for unforeseen expenses. So I just exercise caution with any changes. Because this year could be a different year than others where there was flexibility throughout the other departments.

>> Thank you, Mr. P Pawlak.

>> Randy?

>> Yes. You know, Joe, that's really a good point.

Because we are really treading in different waters especially coming into next year.

You don't know what's going to happen. We haven't used it all over the years but we don't, you know, we are really getting into sketchy areas at this point.

So what Joe said could be I let's tread softly.

>> If I could chime in. I completely agree. I only have data for the past two years from last year's book and this year's book. And I mean, by haven't touched it the last two years. I would agree, you know, without hearing much from the administration if there is anything on the horizon that we may or may not know about, but you know, it doesn't seem like there is much on the horizon and leaving 75,000 in there still gives us a little bit of a cushion. Whether it goes to the bottom of the line at the end of the year or we have something in there in case something happens, and in a situation we're in every 25,000 helps.

It just seems like a place to easily take while leaving in cushion in there.

>> Leaving some cushion, I don't want to deplete it down too low, because again, like I said, we don't know where we are treading next year.

>> And to Joe's point, I think it is one thing, most cuts are geared toward visual and actual place that the cuts are coming from. When we cut the police overtime budget, the idea was that we were removing manpower that had been allocated to a county task force. When we cut this budget, we are not cutting it with anything. The number is falling on the bottom line. Whether or not it gets spent is not changing.

There is nothing we are not spending the money out. You understand what I'm saying?

>> Yeah. I don't know that we are effecting anything. If we cut it that's fine. I don't know that we are effecting anything one way or the other.

>> I understand your point.

>> I guess my question, kicked back to you, Randy.

How far is it drawn down than in years we have drawn it down.

>> That's good -- you're asking me to dust off my --

>> I'm asking you to go through 11 years.

>> Yeah.

>> We generally don't use it all.

There have been years that it was -- there were specific things we had it allocated for.

And we did use a lot of it. I would have to look it up and see it to actually have a specific way to address that.

>> How much has been transferred from this fund. Does it ever get depleted is what I'm getting at.

>> If there is not money in other funds to move money from then we transfer from here. And in other years we are able to give ourselves flexibility within the individual department line items so that we may not necessarily have needed to use this contingency line item. I think this year has proven, there's a lot of unexpected, and in trying to get where we started, we are removing a lot of things within the department so that's why I'm saying please exercise caution because I don't think that the flexibility or the room within the departments in the past is currently there.

>> I agree. It could be trouble down the line.

>> Thanks pup.

>> Any other discussion?

>> I think the points are well taken.

>> We are treading water.

And I'm kind of leaning -- and is there any discussion?

>> Mr. Franklin, motion please?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> No.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> No.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes.

Motion passes 4-2.

>>> Thank one Mrs. Frank.

Mr. Banks?

>> This is going to be a difficult one. Page 49, I'm looking at line item 244-05-1010. I would like to reduce that by 40,000.

Which is in regards to our nonuniformed services.

>> Sorry, did you say account 51010.

>> Correct.

>> If you're talking nonuniform, that's 51080.

>> Oh, thank you for the correction.

>> Just want it make sure we're looking at what you're looking at.

>> Yes.

Thank you. 51080. Thank you.

>> Second.

>> This is a difficult one.

But we have a discussion about this software making the area more efficient.

But we still have the same number of personnel.

That's where this comes from.

>> I guess I should speak.

>> I said all I can say about it.

We will operate with what you provide us with. We will do the best we can.

And we will report back to you on the success or failure of those operations. Thank you.

>> Thanks, chief.

>> Thank you, chief.

>> Okay. We have that on that particular line item and we will have to change some others in relation to that.

But are there any other motions on that? Discussion in that motion?

>> Hearing none. Mrs. Frank?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes.

Motion passes, 6-0. Thank you, Mrs. Frank.

>> Mr. Pawlak, can you help us here?

With the related?

>> Yeah. Was that a flat 40? That last motion?

>> I believe so, yes.

>> Okay.

>> Okay. I think 40,900.

>> That's the budgeted salary. I just wanted to know. So the 4911 was the reduction?

>> Yes.

>> Yes.

>> Okay.

So reduce 3,000.

Ment.

>> And I think everything else will stay the same.

>> Did you cover pensions?

>> Pensions will be allocated amongst all departments so a reallocation again. We are fixed on our 2021MMO. So in total there would be no change.

>> You want to make a motion on --

>> Yeah. I picked this cross up so I'll carry it. 2440, make a motion on 2440, 52090 to reduce that by 12,500.

>> Second.

>> Mrs. Frank?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 6-0.

>> Motion.

>> Second. Motion and second.

Mrs. Frank? The motion, please.

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. Motion passes 6-0. Prs.

>> Thank you.

>> Mr. Pawlak, do you have a running total of where we're at concerning the bottom line, what we have added? Added to our --

>> Before we review the changes that I've wrote down, I think a I've caught them. I'm at 599594.

>> Okay.

>> So if you are running a total, that would be -- 502, yeah.

>> 243 is 502 so pardon me.

>> Yeah.

>> For those keeping score at home.

>> Actually, no, because that will go down by \$50,000 for the change that Mr. Mackey made on city hall.

>> Okay.

>> I didn't throw that one in there yet. I have to allocate that across the group.

>> So 193.

>> We are 149, 594 and 502, correct?

>> Okay.

>> Anything else?

>> I caught it just as I raised my hand. So yeah.

>> I just want to make sure we don't forget. So we took the MS4 money out but we have to reallocate it. So Joe, did you get -- did you get the items we can put that towards?

>> Yeah. I will send it out here.

>> Dave, I think we are looking at reallocating that if we're potentially tabling the budget for even more cuts, I think we are looking a the reallocating that funding next week.

>> Yeah. Yeah.

>> So we got a bit of time yet.

And Joe you gave me that documentation and I can't find it right now, I'm sorry.

>> That's all right. I'm working on sending the e-mail right now.

>> Thanks, Joe.

>> So talk to me again. How much is in the bottom line right now, Joe?

Since we're not working on anything else.

>> 550.

>> We took the tax rate down to 1.5 mill increase as of last week, correct?

>> I believe so, yes.

So 550, if we leave anything bottom line, this would leave us with room to reduce taxes by about another half mill this evening. Correct?

434.

>> Yeah.

>> Right.

Sno.

>> That would leave us with 116 bottom line?

>> Right. Yes.

>> Okay. Is everybody following me here?

So we are currently sitting with all these cuts with all the cuts that none of us wanted to make, and with all of the, of all the ones that are really hard, cuts that involve staffing are potential staffing we are sitting at 1 mill tax increase in a year where not only is the city not having any money but edger into are the city's taxpayers.

So I think the question moving forward is while I'm exceptionally pleased with the amount of, I'm pleased would be the wrong term. While we have made good progress and accomplished a lot toward the goal of lowering the burden on city taxpayers for this upcoming budget year, I would like to see us go further. How does the council feel about that?

>> I second that.

>> I concur. Yes.

>> Okay.

>> I'm going to say this all of us concur, even though Vince isn't here right now.

>> Having spoken to Vince, he definitely concurs.

>> Exactly.

>> I believe that all of us would like to see the tax rate stay as close to its current level as the day is moving forward. That said, I think that I am looking personally to table the budget and revisit it next week when we have already scheduled special meeting related to a second vote on another ordinance.

And look at the budget yet again next week.

I will make that motion to table but before I do, I would like to talk about, I would like to revisit a couple of topics that we have discussed already this evening and add a couple of new ones.

The budget that I feel comfortable building on for the 2021 budget year include the half a mill tax increase.

And we're currently at 1 mill. That means we need to trim another 434,000 in spending out of this budget or find another \$434 in revenue for ourselves next year.

We have discussed a couple of ways in which that might happen or we have discussed naming rights. We are, we will be next week, increasing our TV cable franchise fee to bring in a little bit more revenue for the city.

And we need to find more.

And at this point, those of us on city council, those of us over the last several weeks, help me out here, Joe, found a little better than a million dollars in cuts from 2021 budget. We have reduced the tax rate by 1 point-quarter millis. We have reduced proposed tax increase by 1 1/4 mill.

But we need to get it further. We have discussed hand full of things, and that the administration could consider reducing.

As well as potentially money we set aside for bowman field in prior areas.

>> While it has been exceptionally generous of certain members and certain department heads to step up and say, look, we can sacrifice this in my department or sacrifice that in my department. Believe me, everybody is doing their best. We haven't heard a lot from the top down administratively in ways we can cut or tight yep our belt or ways to find income and that needs to happen between this week and next week. So we got another 434,000 to go. And anybody else on council have any other areas in which we think the administration can econmize or recognize additional revenue?

>> Mr. Yoder ?

>> Liz, I would agree and I appreciate all the Septemberments and ideas that you've backed up that we have discussed over the past couple of weeks. Thank you. The only other thing that kind of came to mind and realized we are just diving into everything, this may not be feasible. This may be easy answer, I don't know.

But our CDBG money, I know that's allocated for various economic development things. There are lobbyists or better codes off and are there ways where we can leverage some of that money to offset or even enhance the needs of the general fund in those areas. You know, that may be a creative way this year and ease the burden on the taxpayer. And look at the \$600,000 loan program. I love the idea. So far early on it seems to be very cumbersome for small businesses to use so if that is something that we can't fix and get to more businesses, is that something that can be leveraged another way? Whether it is a business or whether it is a taxpayer, how do we get that money to ease the burden? That's another thought but I don't know the answer to but maybe administration if they don't know the answer to to look at for the next week as well.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> I'm going to try and go back in time and I don't know whether you, Randy, or Joe Pawlak. I remember bill hall was President of of council and we did have a huge tax increase and what we did that point, if I remember correctly, I wasn't on council. I was sitting on benches watching and trying to absorb and listen. And MOU was taken out it cover the cost of the tax increase. Joe Pawlak, do you remember this?

>> What was taken out, beeny?

>> We took out a loan to cover the tax increase. It was a three-year loan so we didn't have to put the burden on the taxpayers.

>> I don't recall that.

I know when pensioned went crazy there was a ten year note to cover that I think it is restrictive on what you use that for and you have to look up information but typically you can't borrow to you can only do it for things that are long-term in nature.

So I believe this is what you are remembering.

>> It is kind of fuzzy. Not sitting on council that point. I remember we were trying to cover costs instead of doing a tax increase.

>> I don't remember that one.

But I do remember borrowing for operating cost answers it was our annual pension obligation and that was ten-year and we paid that in advance of the ten years.

>> Joe, I remember something for like three years.

>> I'll have to look back into that.

We are getting into the bare bones and we don't want to neglect our services to the city but on the other hand what can we afford at this point. I look forward to going through the bureau of fire on page 43. And their training process, line item 242-07-9530, that's \$30,000. Is that training in-house? Out of house? Is that -- can we cut back on that? You know, I think we're all looking at different areas to cut back on for next year.

From the standpoint of trying to keep us going but yet on a strict budget.

And chief Killian, can you answer me on that one?

>> Yes, Ma'am, I would be happy to. Our training budget was cut by a third this year.

Those are training certification classes.

>> You are breaking up. Can't hear you.

>> Is that better?

>> I think you're good.

>> Yeah.

>> Okay.

>> You're good.

>> O that training line item is maintaining what we had last year and with giving approximately 10,000 of that back in 2020. And there's, because of the use of our department there's multitude of classes that we need to certifications that we need to have for our newer firefighters and so, most of our, we do a tremendous amount of training in house but there are certifications that are required of us to maintain services such as water rescue. Would be one that I can just off the top of my head certifications for our personnel when they transition to driving fire apparatus. And all those are pretty critical and again with losing a third of that budget net 2020 it is pretty imperative that we maintain that and that budget, that line item is budgeted down to the dollar. To get in the courses that we need to get in for 2020. Or excuse me, for 2021.

>> I think like I said, we're questioning everything. I don't know about other councilmembers, but I'm getting blurry-eyed trying to go through every page and see what we can do and I agree with Liz we do have to table this and come up with more money because I don't want to see a tax increase at all for anybody. Too many people are hurting already and we haven't even gone into 2021.

>> Yeah. It is a very difficult discussion to have.

And I know I said it before and we have all talked about where the money is at in the budget, and I see what we are doing and we are all working hard. Administration and council, to make changes and cuts where we are.

But a lot of these are one-time savings. A certain amount of them.

The ones that are salaries, those are year over year. Which really speaks to the point, the 75, 80% is tied up in salaries, benefits, and associated cost there.

And at some point, we are saving, we are scraping, we can get leaner to a point. But you reach a point where you are beginning to can balancize your structure. That's true if any industry or governmental entity.

And so the positive side of this, we need to make it a big priority and it is focusing on how to increase revenue income as Mr. Yoder was referencing earlier. With the CDBG. We have to do that across the board.

We have to ramp up in-house. We have to find a way to do that. There is an area of things we can talk about and plan for but I think we can v a cooperative effort with the administration and council to produce, produce a positive effects on plumbing treat and that's the long-term solution. If we don't do that, we are eventually going to be cutting very deep in personnel. There is no other way around it.

So we have our work cut out for us during this coming week.

But then I really think we need to focus as well keep things tight next year.

But be looking in the direction where everything will increase. That's just my two cents. It all work together.

Mr. Yoder?

>> I agree with that as well. Councilmember Miele made a motion. I second the the motion.

>> Mrs. Franks, the motion?

>> Mr. Yoder ?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes. This item is tabled.

And we have item 6.

Would you read that in short form, Mrs. Frank, please?

>> P ordinance of the city of Williamsport and in the common wealth of Pennsylvania fixing tax rate for all city purposes for the year 2021 in final reading.

>> Okay, we need a motion to table that as well.

>> So moved.

>> Second.

>> Motion and second.

Mrs. Frank, on the motion?

>> Mr. Yoder?

>> Just to clarify, this is voting to table, correct?

>> Yes.

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes.

>> Mrs. Katz?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Banks?

>> Yes.

>> Ms. Miele?

>> Yes.

>> Mr. Allison?

>> Yes.

>> 6-0.

Motion is tabled.

Thank you, Mrs. Frank.

Excuse me a moment.

I lost my agenda.

Item 7 is accept for filing. We don't have anything to file. Many 7, next meeting will be on Thursday January 7 at 7:00 p.m. Remote. That will be in 2021.

There will be a special city council meeting December 17, next Thursday, at 6:30. Upcoming meetings, we have a finance committee meeting. December -- that's next Tuesday. What is that, Mrs. Frank?

>> The 15th.

>> The 15th, at 1:00. That will be remote. And those are all the meetings we have for the rest of the year. Are there any comments from council tonight?

Mr. Mackey?

>> Yes. This is just more so an announcement. Williamsport business association is hosting a late night shoppers event tomorrow from 5:00 to 8:00. There will be a strolling a cappella group with masks singing. I would encourage as many of you that are able to to come downtown tomorrow and safely support all of our local businesses downtown. You still have an opportunity to I guess go out to eat one more time until next year, I suppose. Again I would ask that you do it safely, follow your social distancing. Wear your masks.

But all of our like AI stores downtown and restaurants need our support. So I will be down there as far as Williamsport business association and I hope to see anybody that can make it down there as well.

>> Thank you, Mr. Mackey. Any other comments from council?

Commentes from administration?

>> Yes, Mr. Allison, just one.

>> Yes.

>> This is Joe Girardi. We are going to have a meeting by Zoom op Wednesday for the Betty crocker committee as well as our attorney agrees with it and we are set up to do it, we will have that meeting.

>> Okay, thank you, Mr. Girardi.

>> I just wanted to say this I'm really looking forward to us all being in the same room again soon.

>> Thank you.

>> You got a hundred percent second on that.

Chief Hagan.

>> Chief Hagan, if you can say that after everything we cut out of your budget tonight, you're a fine man.

>> He said that so he can reach out and grab us.

>> He did serve me with a subpoena today so I don't know what that's for. Don't put that in the headlines. That's a joke.

>> Okay. Anything from the public tonight?

Mr. White?

>> No, no requests from the public.

>> Okay, no comments from the public then. And I will entertain a motion for adjournment.

>> So move ed.

>> Second.

>> All in favor?