

Council President Adam Yoder brought the Williamsport City Council meeting to order on Thursday, February 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 Beither, Councilman

Absent:

Also, Present:

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

Approval of the Williamsport City Council minutes for 02/03/22 were approved upon a motion **Mr. Pulizzi and a second from Mr. Mackey All were in favor. The vote was 6 to 0. Ms. Miele was absent for this vote**

Limited Courtesy of the Floor

There were no requests

Appointments/Reappointments

Brandon Park Commission

Dennis Loner, 226 Eldred St, Williamsport is appointed to a term commencing 02/17/22 & ending 01/01/25

Mayor Slaughter I am asking for your consideration to Mr. Dennis Loner to the Brandon Park/Shade tree Commission, he has played various roles in our community from recreation to coaching and he lives just north of the park and has always been very interested in a city government and I am very happy that he has volunteered to become a member of the Brandon Park and Shade Tree commission and he is before you and in attendance tonight, somewhere if you have any questions for him for your consideration. Thank you.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you Mayor Slaughter. Mr. Loner was interviewed in finance so Mr. Allison I will refer to you to open up the discussion on Mr. Loner.

Mr. Allison Absolutely. We had a good conversation about Park. Mr. Loner is a lifelong city resident and corrupt using the park in recreation himself and with his children, his coach there and took care of the ballfields. And lives near the park. And still frequents it and has a heart to work within the Park commission to make the park better and keep it that way so, it is a gem in the middle of the city of 40 some acres that people before us had the foresight to donate that land and turn it into a beautiful scenic, but useful area. For everybody in the community and people even from outside the community to come in. So Mr. Loner will be a great asset on the park team - he has given a lot back into the community and he is pretty well-known I would say and he has a lot of connections to people who live here and work here.

Mr. Yoder Thank you Mr. Allison. Mr. Loner, you are welcome to make any additional comments if you like, I know you talk to finance committee and members of Council are welcome to ask Mr. Loner any questions if they have any. But I would concur with Mr. Allison, this is a good take. I am excited to see what you're going to do with the commission and thank you for stepping up and being really to serve the community in this capacity, so thank you very much. Any other questions for members of Council? Hearing and seeing none, Mrs. Frank on the motion please?

The appointment 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.

President Yoder changed the order of the agenda.

Resolution #9250

Resolution Authorizing the Williamsport Bureau of Police to Hire Two Police Officers

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Mr. Yoder Thank you. Chief Snyder, good evening. We will move these two up. We have a pretty robust agenda tonight certainly, so I think for expediency of their time we will move them up and we certainly have a public hearing following this and we expect they'll take some time as well so chief Snyder.

Chief Snyder, I respectfully request your consideration for the officers to the Williamsport Bureau of Police -- of these candidates have recruited all requirements for deployment with the Williamsport Bureau of police. Jamie will commence her employment on federal 21st and police officer candidate Troutman will commence on May 31 -- (NAME) is 27 years old currently resides in Williamsport, she is the daughter of James and Teresa DeSanto, both of Williamsport Area. . Candidate DeSanto is a 2012 graduate of Williamsport high school and -- where she earned a bachelor's degree in psychology. Candidate DeSanto attended Mansell Academy where she received her act 120 certification. She is currently applied with McKinley and sons Julie stored in a Brickyard Brickyard her badge number will be 41. Anna Troutman is 29 years old, currently resides in Muncie area. He is the son of Vicki and Rodney (NAME)

of the Higgins PA. Troutman is a -- 2015 graduate of Lycoming College where where he played football. Troutman is a deputy sheriff and it is projected to attend the Harrisburg community college -- starting May 31, 2022. Candidate Troutman will be assigned badge 59. So, open up the floors if there's any questions from counsel.

Mr. Mackey state He said it all, we have got two great candidates here. And we passed this on to the full body with a positive recommendation. So - I would just like to say welcome aboard and glad to see one of you currently lives in the city, I think that is great. Tanner, good luck at the Academy and please keep your head down and I'm sure you'll be just fine.

Mrs. Katz: I want to welcome both of you, Jamie I'm sure that you work downtown, you're very familiar with logos on downtown. And welcome to the force, welcome to the city and looking forward to seeing what is going to go on and keep safe.

Mr. Yoder: The only other question I have, so we budgeted I think 48 - this gives us at 47 I believe.

Chief Snyder: This will put us up to 48, DeSanto's will be to replace her for our retirement in January and Mr. Troutman will be our 48th.

Mr. Yoder: I thought we had a second retirement coming.

Chief Snyder: That is coming up in April. And we have approval for that as well.

Mr. Yoder That was my question was a timing, because I thought there was a second retirement so that makes sense. I appreciate that. Any other questions? Mr. Allison?

Mr. Allison: I did not have a question, but I just want to commend the chief for moving so quickly on the vacancies. That was not the norm in the past, there were big gaps. So, I appreciate your diligence on that. Thank you.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote.

The resolution was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Public Hearing – Formation of a New Transit Authority

Mr. Yoder This is a public hearing of the formation of a new transit authority. And Mr. Lubin, give me a clarification, do we need a motion and second to openness or can I just open it? Opening closing, okay. Before I open it, I just want to have a couple quick comments. We have had this discussion informally for a while of starting to go down this process. And I am sorry not tonight, we are she started on Tuesday. As we started to talk about timeline, flush out some details of what this is actually going to look like. I think this is a good thing and I can at least say for myself, I thought this was a good idea for a while. And I'm excited to see it starting to come to fruition. I am excited for the process that we have outlined to make sure that we do this, but we do it in it the right way that is best for the employees at RVT to set this potential authority for long-term and to make sure we are covered for the city's perspective as well. And I'm excited for the process as well. So, I am anxious to see what everybody has to say, we have a good attendance tonight and I suspect this, so I will open the public hearing. If there's anybody that would like to speak in favor of it - please come up to the podium and ask that you state your name and your address and keep your comments to three minutes. So, anybody that is in favor, we would love to hear from you.

First speaker: Good evening. My name is Duane Forrest. I live at 339 Louisa Street. I lived in the city since 1990 and I have been employed at RVT for 16 years. As a resident of the city I'm in favor of RVT becoming an authority for a number of reasons. Recently we have learned what past Administrations have done and investigation has transpired. It is in my opinion that not past administration, but past city Council are responsible. How can a city residents have confidence in you, you wouldn't have let our historic City Hall fall apart in our parks faulty in shambles. Twice it was voted onto fixable Memorial Pool. They should have been fixed it the first time. When a resolution was put on the agenda for Council's consideration to form an authority it was brought to our attention that it had been removed. It is my understanding that when an item is put on Council's agenda, the only way it can be removed is by the administration by tabling the resolution or voting it up and down. If Council collaborated to remove this resolution outside of Council meeting, then to me you broke the sunshine law. The Council President did this on his own, then it can be construed as tabernacle behavior. It has been said that he was looking out for the employees. Where were you when you voted against our contract? It certainly was not looking out for our employees. These employees have been kept informed on every aspect of this process. If questions were asked, the mayor and the staff of RVT have gotten the answer if they did not know. I personally like to thank the mayor for at least having the guts to get the city out of the mass transit business. I might not agree with his politics, but I commend him for doing the right thing. Thank you.

Mr. Yoder I appreciate that and I will offer some clarity. This was submitted and I had a discussion with Mr. Winder about holding this off of the agenda for a couple of different reasons. He obliged - he was on board with that. And we had a conversation both within and our solicitor and a lot of it was questions about making sure we understood the process. And making sure that we are doing this right. And we have got a lot of clarity on what the specific needs were and we actually - it is on the agenda tonight and it is in the form of an ordinance which it should have been versus a resolution so I preach at the comments but I did want to offer that clarity. It is on the agenda and we will have two readings, the first reading tonight and the second reading in two weeks, but I appreciate your comments, thank you. Any other comments in favor? Good evening sir.

Next Speaker Good evening my name is Frank Perchinski, some of you know who I am. We are in favor of it, the ATU is and I am in favor of it myself I have been working with Adam on everything and we have gone through and keeps me abreast of everything going on. So anyhow, here goes. I have a few things I wrote down. On behalf of the workers who operate and maintain River Valley transit we take great pride in what we do and we stand ready to assist you with your efforts in restructuring RVT to address the recent issues. I wish to bring your attention to matters which we think are necessary for the success of the separation of RVT. First, we believe in the approval in bus services for our communities. Must be the primary goal that all amenities are planning in transition to separate the municipality to authority and grant the allegations of transit grants - excuse me - for the city. And improving goals cannot be the focus of our planning. Second, the ATU wants to avoid any non-understanding - just touch the wrong button Technology, right? Especially as it relates to the pensions that we require significant planning. We ask the city continue to console with the ATU and the writers and other stakeholders to ensure that the new RVT a not only addresses the mistakes of the past, but also create a platform for a safe, reliable, accessible transit service for our community. Thank you very

much.

Mr. Yoder Thank you Frank. Are there any other comments in favor of the formation of an authority? Okay, hearing and seeing none. Are there any comments in opposition of forming an authority? All right. All right, I will close the public hearing. Thank you very much.

Ordinance #6425

Ordinance Transfer Ordinance #6 (final reading) Bill#1791-22

The City Clerk read the ordinance in final reading.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second

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

Mr. Pawlak stated he had nothing further to add.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the ordinance.

The ordinance was carried in final reading with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes

Ordinance #6426

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

Bill#1792-22

The City Clerk read the ordinance in final reading.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second.

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

Mr. Yoder stated This updates our language in codified ordinances to incorporate remote meetings as well as expanding courtesy the floor for public participation. There were a number of questions at the last reading related to the language - I am pulling it up your, so give me a second. On the language on meetings. And I had talked with Norm and Janice you had sent out and updated reading based on how it should read, is that correct?

I think that was sent out to everybody. This I forwarded it to you specifically as well. Are there any questions on the language that was updated? We will have to amend this, but we will have to incorporate that, are there any questions on the proposed change language from anybody? Liz, I will give you a minute as well. If it looks okay to you.

Ms. Miele stated we talked about the language.

Mr. Yoder stated I can just summarize it. **I would make a motion we amend the ordinance to incorporate the language changes that were discussed at last reading and based on the document that you all received and we have just discussed.**

Ms. Miele seconded it.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the ordinance amendment.

The amendment to the ordinance was carried in final reading with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes

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

The ordinance was carried in final reading with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes

Bill #1793-22 Tabled early in meeting and then removed from table later
An Ordinance Adopting American Rescue Plan (ARPA) Budget (first reading)

The City Clerk read the ordinance in first reading.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second..

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

Mr. Yoder: Let me pull this up and I will walk everybody through this and then we will offer to Ms. Miele from finance. So, we have in front of you is a first pass budget for adopting the allocation of our American rescue plan funding. So, we have had a handful of work sessions where we have gotten a lot of ideas and projects and I think that we all agree that we want to do out there. And in our last work session, and our last session we wanted to wrap up a number of these and kind of close the loop on this process, at least initially here. So, what this is an ordinance that does that. You have a budget in front of you and there are five categories as we have all discussed this economic development and public works and public safety and there is an other, miscellaneous, what I did was all elected officials put together a quick spreadsheet and I took averages of every consistent project across the board and that is what you see in here. None of them should really be a surprise, we have all discussed these openly. The number that you see in there is the average consensus based on what everybody compiled and submitted to me. And I rounded up to get even numbers so we are not dealing with decimals. If you look at the overall actual category total - they are pretty close. To the category total so everybody had in there as well. Even incorporating additional projects that may be in particular individuals had. So, nobody else had. And the only other thing that I would add is under fiscal relief under the future projects reserve category, there is 2.4 million in change in there, that is what I use to even up the allocation so it zeroed out and we got to the full number. The reason I put it there versus the other category. This got us closer to what the total category number between everybody was on average. So - that is why put it there versus others, that is the background on it, I defer to Ms. Miele this was reviewed in finance.

Ms. Miele Oh, you're right, it is not on John. I was not close enough. The majority of the discussion in finance really centered - the project proposed I think perhaps a little bit of discussion on the amount of funding that was still left and adjust to what the public so far as the public attend those meetings the project on the table are not the only projects. They are simply the only project that will be authorized and that is in two readings. The secondary issue that we discussed is that we have obviously the ordinance that we are adopting this evening and presumably adopting this evening outlines how much funding is going into each specific area authorized by the ARPA budget in process so by

the ARPA funds process, but we are incorporating the invention in the ordinance a document that outlines the actual budget. Which then outlines the civic projects. So, Norm, unless you tell me otherwise that means that those specific projects and that funding is incorporated within the ordinance and in order to change that document, the budgetary document, we will need to come back and vote to amend the ordinance. Which requires two readings. That is not a major thing, but it is important to note that the document as well as the summary within the ordinance itself are incorporated into this about that we are taking this evening. And then the only other items that came up while in the course of the meeting (CHUCKLE) we then had all of those media reports to say and actually Adam - I know that we are very open to this and perhaps I should've mentioned this earlier - do we want to vote on this now or do we want to defer discussion unless until after we have dealt with the fire, the funding for the firetrucks? Do you understand what I'm saying?

Mr. Yoder That is up to the full body of counsel.

Ms. Miele : It should have occurred to me before now but it did not. Because later on in the finance meeting we discussed funding for vehicles for the fire department and I think in this document we were authorizing 1.2 million in ARPA funds for the vehicle for the fire department but it became clear in the discussions later in the meeting that we were simply wasting money by attempting to finance anything through the fire department instead of funding with ARPA funds. So, that may or may not be what the rest of counsel feels like, but I do think we will need to have that discussion at some point - that would be my recommendation instead of having to come back and amend this next week and then maybe go for another vote that we amended to begin with tonight if that is what we want to do. So, that way we can open a discussion now or we can wait - we can move on to the rest of the agenda and move this back to later in the agenda and amend as we see fit depending on votes later in the agenda on both the electrical panel and the fire department.

Mr. Yoder stated that's up to the rest of Council

Mr. Beiter: Being in that meeting, I think they'll be the best recommendation right now. I think this is as good of a process for tonight and also for next week.

I agree for now. We have a bunch of firefighters in the back of the room

Mr. Yoder: Norm, procedurally how do we do that? If we open up debate on this?

Mr. Lubin The easiest way would be to just table this until later.

Mr. Yoder: Okay. Is there a motion to table?

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

The ordinance was tabled with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to remove this ordinance from the table.

Ms. Miele made the motion and it was seconded by Mrs. Katz

Mr. Mackey I think it would be prudent to figure out the fire trucks first and then we can move on to some other things. Again - as I mentioned earlier we have about \$900,000 into COVID related expenses and I don't think we need to do that much money and we have 2.4 million in future projects reserved. We only need 1.4 million if we are going to count the outfitting for the \$86,000 pump. So - there is a lot of other places I feel like we have future projects reserved with a significant amount of money in their that you know - public works - future projects reserved, \$730,000 - Graphius Ron, our engineer is not here tonight, \$2.3 million, is just a stab in the dark of what Graphius is going to cost? 2 million - maybe we can get 300,000 from that?

Mr. Yoder: With Graffius Run specifically, they told us 3 to 5 million, so that is one area where we need to add more money in my opinion and I think at a minimum to get a 3 million at the bottom of the range. I would throughout the idea of taking future projects reserved money in public safety and putting that towards the fire apparatus and maybe we take the rest from other related expenses and I would prefer to keep as much in fiscal relief as we can because it gets unrestricted and we can do some damage in other areas that will I think help the root cause of why we cannot afford things, but that is just my opinion.

Mr. Mackey: Okay. I would just point out that if we are going to do that then I mean - chief Aungst you can this, the PPE is not 100,000, is it is like 150, right? Police body cameras, I know we are still working on that, but that is more than 200,000. That is like going to be close to 400,000. So, if we are saying that body cameras and PPE are a good thing, which I think they are then we also need to find somewhere to put more money into that line item which could come out of future projects reserved is what I see those line items for, but again without having a specific number of COVID relating expenses I think we can get the majority of this money from that line item and the rest from future projects reserved. What to.

Mr. Beiter: Are we looking for 1.2?

Mr. Mackey: 1.4.

Mr. Beiter, Because of the 86,000 on the pump - okay. I would like to suggest right up front and without having an exact number that we just look at 600,000 of COVID relief right now if that is a good starting point for everyone we can start to work her way back to the rest of that number.

Mrs. Katz: You are to put that in just for the fire or the fire in the police?

Mr. Beiter: Just for the trucks. Moving that from COVID relief to the line item for the fire apparatus.

Mr. Mackey: I was thinking 750, but -

Mr. Beiter: If we can get a more accurate number we can make a better determination of that.

Ms. Miele

: But I do not think we can get outside.

Mr. Beiter Can we get on second reading? So if we settle in the middle around 700, that is halfway there was COVID relief and if we need to lower that then we have the option to do so and then we are back in the same position where we have to take money from another line and so, 700,000 from COVID relief to start.

Ms. Miele: And that leaves us - if we take 700,000 from future projects reserved in public safety that leaves 400 in their to potentially add body cams and PPE. So I think that is probably the best way to do it.

Mrs. Katz: And chief you are saying the body cams would run close to 400?

: That would cover, is that the high end or low in?

Mr. Pulizzi: If I may jump in here real quick I was looking at where expenditures are allocated and just jumping through real quick - what my mind at least identified was if we pulled \$500,000 from COVID related expenses and 1.4 that leaves us with a balance of \$900,000 of our funding. If we jumped onto economic development and pull 300,000 from future projects reserved - jump to recreation and pull 300,000 from future projects and reserve and Public Safety future projects in reserve and pull 300,000, from each of those then there is the remaining \$900,000 that we would need to come up with the 1.4.

Mrs. Katz: But if you take them from the areas that you are saying - you will have a lot of accountability in these areas also.

Mr. Yoder: So, if my notes are right we talked about 700 from COVID related expenses from the fire apparatus and 700,000 from the public safety future projects reserved to cover the 1.4. So, Mr. Pulizzi you are referencing maybe some additional stuff for body cancer some of the other things that we've discussed.

Mr. Pulizzi: I was just merely providing an option for pulling funds elsewhere.

Mr. Yoder I appreciate that. I would - I'm okay with the two that I reference. I would urge us and to highly consider not dipping into those two categories specifically go beyond that, just because I mean we have a lot of needs and there is a lot of great projects that we've discussed that are in here, but the more money we put into expenditures down the line the more the fiscal issue we have is going to be exacerbated. It just makes me a little nervous. So, I just want to throw that out there to everybody. I get it and there is a lot of things we can do with this, but let's remember that, because if we are not careful it will only get worse. So - Miss Miele?

Ms. Miele: The fear I keep discussing is the more of this funding that we put into infrastructure in the city without a plan for how to pay to maintain the effort structure - it's a plea cost us money over the long haul. It becomes a budgetary issue and we have a splash park or something that we cannot afford to take care of. So - it simply - especially when we already had so much infrastructure that we have not been maintaining not to say that we have not been maintaining it at all, but not as much as we should - in putting money into infrastructure - but, I do not think that really applies to firetrucks which we need to replace and somewhat applies to body cameras that is a whole discussion that I think perhaps there are a number of issues there that will need to be refined.

Mr. Yoder: We are talking about the firetrucks, I will throw this out there, **I will make a motion to amend just to take care of at least one item that we know we want to do all make a motion to amend to take 700,000 from fiscal relief COVID related expenses and move it to Public Safety fire apparatus.**

Ms. Miele seconded.

The motion was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes

Mr. Yoder stated I motion to amend the Public Safety budget to move \$700,000 from future projects reserved to the fire apparatus line item. Mrs. Katz seconded it.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote.

The motion was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes

Mr. Yoder I'm going to go up to recreation - we also talked about the pool tonight and we had some discussion about ways that we could fund I think at least the pool liner, but also the electrical agreement as well. I think we may have talked about the electrical equipment coming out of the.

Ms. Miele: Memorial Park fund.

Mr. Yoder: Which goes against what we passed but nonetheless it is an option and then taking money from recreation future projects reserved into a new category for Memorial pool. So, that was an estimation of what we discussed earlier - is there any additional discussion on it that thought or process Jon you are pondering -

Mr. Mackey: This is what future projects reserved is for - is it necessary to make it a completely separate line item just for the pool liner, we do say we are taking it out of your project reserved, it does not seem like it is necessary, that is what future projects reserved in my mind is.

Mr. Yoder: Correct. I think we would want to just for tracking purposes and for oversight purposes as well. Let's say something happens where it is not all that money - we have a tracking of how much is left and then conversely if it runs over for some reason, we have a chance to figure out why and what happens in from an oversight perspective, as cumbersome as it is, I think that is the appropriate way. That is just my opinion. It is a safeguard. Miss Miele?

Ms. Miele : It would be my suggestion that we move it to Memorial pool without getting assist specific as pool liner, especially when we discover about compliance etc. So - if we put in Memorial pool, Elisa clarifies what our attendance is - and I would suggest that set-aside may be 110 with the remainder coming from Memorial pool budget and general fund.

Ms. Miele And doing it now prevents us from having two readings in the future related exclusively to funding a pool liner.

Mr. Yoder asked: Understood. Was that motion?

Ms. Miele stated: Yes I would move that we create a line within the recreation portion of the ARPA funding budget entitled Memorial pool and move \$110,000 into that line from future projects reserved. Which would leave us with excuse me 1200 \$90,000 in future projects reserved and \$110,000 in Memorial port.

ADAM YODER: Second any further discussion on that?

Hearing and seeing no Mrs. Frank on the motion to amend?

The motion was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes

Mr. Yoder stated Motion passes seven and zero. All right, so we took care of the items we talked about and voted on tonight. Is there any additional discussion on any other specific projects or anything else Jon -

Mr. Mackey: While we are in the recreation department, we consider a little bit longer - I personally do not feel like \$2.9 million total allocation to recreation reflects what the public has told us they want out of this money. We did do a survey - initially when we got this money and I feel like a majority of the people in that survey said recreation was important to them. My personal spreadsheet had \$4 million going to recreation kind of before anybody says explode

and I do not think I'm going to get 4 million - I personally would like to see recreation at the bare minimum be 3.5, not 2.9. So - where we get that money - again, I am looking at things like we are giving the redevelopment Authority 2.7 million and land bank 2.3, that is \$5 million for economic development in icy future projects reserved sitting at 750, could we get \$200,000 from that, probably. Future projects reserved public works, 730,000, could we get 200,000 from that? I know you said Graffius Run is going to be quite an expense. So, there is money that I think we can move around and like I said I do not think 2.9 million for recreation reflects what the citizens of Williamsport want them to spend this money on. So I personally would like to see it at 4 million, I'm not sure I have enough support to get it before, but I'm hoping that we can compromise and get it to at least report five. -- 3.5.

Mr. Yoder The thing that I would say Jon, I personally do not know how I feel about that and that is not any negative reflection I have on recreation or what have you - it is just in my mind recreation certainly supports economic development, but I think there are a number of more pressing things that will equally or more make our communities better through properties and tackling redevelopment in that kind of thing in conjunction with recreation. I do not know what other members of Council think about the recreation component tonight but I would say Jon if you feel that way in a second reading come with some ideas of where to take that money.

Mr. Mackey: I can give you some right now if you want.

Mr. Yoder: If you want to do that, absolutely. The floor is yours.

Mr. Mackey: Again - I would like to hear - I offered your opinion, I would like to hear some other people's opinions - I guess if I need to take two weeks and start making some phone calls, I can do that as well. But again, I don't think 2.9 is enough, I personally would like for, but can we get to 3.5, I think that is more doable.

Mr. Allison: I agree, that is a good compromise. It is a part of our infrastructure. When you look at it as a part - but it is a part of our infrastructure. It is our recreation infrastructure. And we promote all the time that we are not taking care of our infrastructure and we are not taking care of our parks - and I think we need to put more attention into that if we want the citizens to use them that makes them a value, (NAME) place is a diamond in the rough and there is so much land there that we can adapt for the kinds of things that people want to do and we can do some research into them and there are some plans in place for a bike park kind of run but if you want to use the tennis court there or the basketball court, good luck. And we have a big cat litter sand area (CHUCKLE)

Formally known as the volleyball court - in any case - we took the pool away and I think there are things we need to do there. Newberry Park - so, I agree with Jon. There is a lot of valuable things we can do there. And if we do not do them now - I fear they will not be done.

Mrs. Katz The grant were came through to start working on the parks, right?

Mayor: Yes it is.

Mrs. Katz: You are starting on that. Did you put - from what I understand I also understand that you're putting in funding for Newberry Park as well? : So, those are two of the parks that we are addressing already with funding that is not being taken care of by ARPA. And because of where it comes from - it is because the income level into those areas, right?

Mayor answered A combination of -- and also see BDG funds and Newberry Park would be COVID-19 money -) they can use those funds appropriately within those areas of the city.

Mrs. Katz: Okay, now there is nothing - is there any funding - are we going after any funding for Shaw Park at all? Is anybody -

Did not receive that -

Mayor Slaughter: We cannot use CDBG at Shaw, but we are going after a comprehensive planning grant which I talked about before with DCNR and we are actually going through that process right now and I will update all of our open space recreational comp plans that has been updated since 05406. So that is a planning grant we are going after right now and will get the index planning with DCNR and I just met with them, was that last week I think it was so we met with them last week and that is moving forward and the goal would be once we have the comp plan updated, which would also include green infrastructure projects and so that opens up additional money when you include green in for special projects on top of the regular comp plan. Or with any comp plan. And then we can apply back to DCNR for actual grants for implementation. So, to answer your question, yes, we continue to go after grants, but as far as CDBG specifically for Shaw because they do not meet the criteria. But, we are exploring other avenues with DC NR and we are also exploring a grant for local government services which we are looking to apply for that right now. And then as was mentioned just to get onto the microphone so public can hear it - Newberry we are exploiting recreational opportunities there related to COVID-19 funds as well as the CDBG for what was the other one we just talked about, I'm sorry DCNR - young will be a part of that as well. So, we are looking at projects for Youngs. So, if we get grants, then obviously that would offset it.

Mrs. Katz: I keep on reiterating this from the standpoint - not taking our funds if we are going to build to get funding for Mayor : Hopefully we get some of the grants we were fortunate to get a combination of DC NR and see BDG and that will start this year. But, yes - over the next 6 to 8 months if we are able to get some of these grants, then RBC -

Mr. Allison: What kind of money are we talking about?

Mayor: So, for the one we are going after - with the DC CD that is up to \$1 million so we can get from that grant and the planning grant that we are going after I do remember off the top of my head but that is through DC NR to update the comp plan and then the implementation grants they are a decent talk of money as well and again I do not have those numbers off the top of my head but I think it does number two you tomorrow first thing, whatever.

Mrs. Katz What is not touch that with any funding right now but we would have to use ARPA really at Shaw Park.

Mayor: If you're talking about the community development, yes, but because that does not meet the criteria.

Mayor: Right, and the nice thing about the DCED grant is if we can get that one there is no match to that. But the DC NR would be.

Mrs. Katz: So I'm trying to see what funding can come from instead of touching ARPA to make sure our parks are starting to be brought up to where they should be. I am looking at figures here, we need at least \$700,000 for Brandon Park for the ballfield. Am I correct in those numbers?

Mr. Mackey: You are in the right ballpark.

Mrs. Katz - and then \$700,000 for the splash pad at Shaw, only because Jon I asked about the plumbing and electricity would be with that and that is going to be close to 50 grand you give me a low-end and high-end - so, I am

thinking about \$700,000 for that.

Mayor: That is the grant we are chasing right now for Shaw, so if we get there, that will offset.

Mr. Yoder: I was under the impression that it was 500 all in at Shaw even after asking for the confirmation I thought he said that via email.

Mrs. Katz: 550 and then he sent out last week the plumbing and electric.

Mr. Yoder: Here's my ask. Jon, if you want to try to go after some more money to put in recreation category in general, we can get closer to where you want, I would go through that process and put more in future projects and my.[Bleep] Could be from the administration, come prepared in a second reading with the project you are to put some of that money towards and final numbers. Because, in my mind we have the splash park fully funded, but according to Ms. Katz, we do not and I think we need that to take care of all of that. That would be my ask and I don't know what other member of councils feel. But, two weeks should be a decent amount of time to go through that Ms. Miele had her head up and then I will go to Mr. Pulizzi.

Ms. Miele Oh, sorry - I was having a sidebar with Bonnie - at her nothing off - Jon I agree with you we need to put more money into recreation. I do believe it should be spent on rehabbing our existing assets and I do believe as we have discussed that nowhere near as much of it should be spent on those ballfield as what we have currently got allocated. If we could reduce the amount that we are putting towards the ballfields, I would be okay with shifting other money into recreation lines to try and find other projects for recreation.

Mr. Mackey: But, you understand that there is a minimum number that we need to get those fields playable. So, if you throw \$300,000 Adam it will not do anything. I just want to make that clear.

Mr. Yoder Jon if I remember, the minimum number was about what is in there. 800,000.

Mr. Mackey : I think it was closer to 650 or 700.

Mr. Yoder: So we may have a little bit of leeway.

Mr. Mackey: But we also have \$200,000 in contingency. So, that is what contingency is for, right? If we go over.

Ms. Miele: Per our discussion the other day I thought we are thinking about putting more money into the future, I'm not sure that I'm okay spinning the initial amount of money on a project like that, but I certainly would not be okay with the idea of getting the fields playable and then returning to plow another \$200,000 into them for amenities like concession stands and stuff like that that will be a little beyond.

Mr. Mackey: We have always taught that the goal has been to get them playable. Right?

Ms. Miele: My concern is that we get the fields playable and then we hear that they will not be usable until they have other facilities that we do not foresee the expenditure of and then we wind up putting more money into them and I am not particularly comfortable with putting any money in, but I'm really not comfortable with the idea of putting in enough money to get them playable and then discovering that we need to put \$150,000 more into the structure to make them usable somehow there. So, as I said I am really conflicted about the whole thing, because I'm not certain that that is the best location at this point for ballfields and also not certain that that is the best way to expand that large of a chunk of funds. But, if that is something that we are contemplating, then I think we need to contemplate spending exactly what it takes to get them playable and no more. Four. -- For me.

Mr. Pulizzi: I don't mean to throw another ball to the juggling act, but I'm going to.

: Where we are for funding for the bandshell? (SP?).

Mayor Slaughter: At the bandshell is under design right now. That was I forget, do member Councilwoman Miele I don't member off the top of my head.

Ms. Miele: I think it was under 200. Because, I remember questioning Mr. Sander multiple times that renters need to be aware that we are spending money on -

Mayor: Yes, that is a design and I can get that number to you.

Mr. Pulizzi: I appreciate that Mayor, I just wanted to bring that up. But, I am assuming that that is money that we will probably have on the back of her mind coming out of future projects.

Mayor: No, I don't think so. That money we already have for the bandshell.

Ms. Miele: We have the money generally have a certain amount of funding and.

Mr. Pulizzi : I am really glad to hear that.

Ms. Miele: That to me as part of the issue. We keep digging out the project and then deciding part way through oh, wait, we cannot go through that much money and at some point we need to figure out how to do it for that much money.

Mr. Yoder: So, Jon, are there amendments you want to make to put money in future projects reserved for recreation?

Mr. Mackey: I would like to see recreation get a three and half million dollars. If there is enough support for that here tonight, then let's figure out where that money is going to come from and move into future projects reserved yes.

Mr. Beiter If I might make a suggestion, as I look a a budget and doing quick research as I sit here, one of the biggest things that starts to send out to me that I would urge you to do some research on to see if I am correct is the overlap of uses of a redevelopment Authority and land bank authority. They do have some common functions where we may be able to get some of the money from one of those two places. But, I also do not want to see them underfunded as we go forward, because we do have some very viable economic development projects that as we have stressed prior to this conversation economic development is going to be the driver for all of our future financial problems. So, if we can see where we may have some overlap there I think that be a great place to start.

Mr. Mackey: I totally agree with that. I don't and I don't want to see the redevelopment Authority or the land bank authority underfunded anymore than - I am happy with where it is right now, but I do see \$750,000 sitting there in future projects reserved. And if somebody can tell me or give me even one idea of what that is going to go for, maybe it is going to go for an economic development study - right? But that is not going to be \$750,000. And again, that is just one - that is me leaking out it -- I want the racket three and half million, that is my opinion and I think Councilman Allison is with me as well so if we would like to wait two weeks and try to get it there in two weeks, that is fine with me. I would just - lives I can understand your concern maybe and there is nobody here from Walter -, but if wall could safely play on those fields as they sit now they would play on them, but they cannot, right? So, the idea that we would spend all of this money and Wall would say we still cannot play on this fields I don't think it's fair, I don't think it is, not after hearing Mr. Fox and Mr. Deemer speak a few weeks ago. They are committed to Little League baseball here in the city of Williamsport, Wall is not going anywhere, right? Little League baseball is not going anywhere. And if we make these

fields playable whether it is 650,000 or 800,000 or whatever that may be - if there playable, we are going to have baseball in Brandon Park and we will have baseball in Buena Park for a very long time. And that is where it should be. So - just to go a little bit further - we keep talking about not being able to pay for stuff 10 years down the road, that is what economic development is for. We are taking this huge gamble on economic development. And it is a gamble, right? There is no guarantee that this money is going to come back tenfold, but we are hoping that it will and that is what the redevelopment Authority where they come in and having the right people there to make those decisions, but the idea in 10 years we will be able to maintain and hopefully in five years we will be able to maintain. So, when I hear you say that kind of stuff, it - what I'm hearing is that you have no faith in the economic realm aspect of this project, because you are saying that we're going to build all the stuff and not be able to pay for it 10 years from now well - when you say that - you say that the economic development has not worked.

Ms. Miele: I'm saying the economic development could take 20 years to come to fruition. We are currently running a one point \$2 million deficit budget so even if economic development pays for us in 10 years which I'm not certain it will, the first job you will have to accomplish is to fill the hole in our operating offenses before we can begin to look at funding infrastructure that we have put in place etc. etc. I am just saying that the economic picture will not exactly be grim if not rose enough to allow me to say that putting \$5 million into the economic development in 10 years is going to resolve an additional \$5 million into the city budget on an annual basis in such a way that we can afford to increase our public safety complement and maintain our parks equipment on exactly the timeline that we are supposed to - and all of those things that we would like to do every year that we cut money for because we do not know where it is coming from I don't want to have the conversation every year where we can afford 47 or 48 police officers where we find economic development instead. But, I am not looking in the next 10 years and are not likely to be here anyway, but not looking toward an economic future where we are deciding whether we are going to put in two \$700,000/parks or three because we have an action fund - it'll never look like that, that is not what third class cities in the state of Pennsylvania are doing even the ones that are economically successful in a way that we are not currently. So, this is not me - this is not meeting economic gamble will fail, this is me saying that it takes a long time to bear fruit and that when it bears fruit - what it will do is make it economically sustainable and not economically wealthy I guess for lack of a better term.

Mr. Mackey: My hope is economically sustainable with some really great parks to boot.

Ms. Miele : We need to have really great parks to incentivize people to live here, but what I'm trying to figure out is how to spend money on recreation in such a way as to provide the maximum recreation capabilities for the maximum number of Williamsport citizens and that is where I am not certain about the ballparks. Having the cost-benefit analysis of other improvements to our parks.

Mr. Yoder: All right. Again, remember we have another reading to hash out a lot of the stuff and again we can go back and change this after the fact as well. This is not final by any means.

Mr. Mackey: I get there, I just know that it will be a lot easier to get to 3 and a half million in the next couple of weeks then a year down the line, right? So, I will not make any motions tonight I will wait two weeks and we will see what we can get there.

Mr. Yoder: I look forward to it. The one before if we want to wrap up this discussion tonight, the one thing that I would say - and Councilman Allison you brought up the point about Graphius Run, that to me - excuse me - that is one project specifically that to me is definitely underfunded based on the feedback we have gotten from Jon. I would like to get it to 3 million. I think you get to 3 million gets us at the low end of the range that we have been told and I think challenging the administration if we need more money to try and find it through external sources to try and maximize that is a good idea. And we can certainly go back and offset down the road if we need to. I - I think we probably all generally agree based on the spreadsheets and everything that is included in this - I don't know if that is something that we want to address tonight or in two weeks as well, but I do want to throw that out there. So -

Mr. Mackey: I think having time to look over the numbers - I think getting our idea out tonight and then maybe making changes in two weeks and Mayer, can you - what we are looking at?

I feel like Keller, Tom Keller said there may not - there is probably not a lot of money out there for something like Graphius Run, is that correct?

Mayor: Yes - Greg, there is not a ton. There is some, but it is not - from my understanding what is out there is a truly competitive, but I can follow up with them.

Mr. Mackey: Again, we talk about Graphius Run and this has been - this is like a legend now, right? I have lived here for 17 years and it is one of the first things I heard about want to move here was Graphius Run. So, we had this opportunity now to do something about it, so I think it is important Councilman Yoder, right?

Mayor: Determination as to the amount they are looking to get to the city, but we can follow up, but I did meet with them and Graphius Run was clearly one of the projects that we spoke about hopefully getting some funding from them.

Mr. Pulizzi: If we had that information in front of us as far as a commitment or whatever it may be as far as what the county was looking to add to our projects here, that can certainly help provide a little bit more clarity on if we did want to move some funding around anywhere we medial to take it from knowing that we have the counties support on this.

Mayor: And other commissioners were in favor of supporting obviously something for the city, clearly they got a break over the county, but they did want to give the city some allocation.

Mr. Pulizzi: Mayer, do you know when we may hear back from the county as far as getting any kind of -

Mayor: I can reach out in the morning and see what they are thinking. I do not know where they stand with their ARPA allocations. But, I can reach out to them in the morning and say we had this discussion tonight and if they have any thoughts on what they might be considering specifically for Graphius Run -

Mr. Pulizzi: Yes, I personally would definitely appreciate that, I think that would help all of us move forward with a better idea of where we should be finding our money, thank you very much.

Mr. Allison: Yes, I think 3 million is really bottom line for Graphius Run is not a pond, it is a big area. So, just to revisit - I know I mentioned it before, but the new floodplain map once it is certified takes the downtown on that floodplain that is affected by Graphius Run. That is how they are designing it and they already warned us ahead of time. So, it might sound like we are talking about one section of town that we are focusing on that doesn't affect a whole lot of people, but actually it affects the whole city downtown as well. So, that is why it is of importance to fully fund it so we do not find ourselves scrambling again like we are with the levy.

Mr. Yoder: Absolutely.

: Are there any other - we have thrown a lot out there - we are going to have I'm sure some very spirited and vigorous discussion in two weeks on second reading to finalize this first round here. I guess before we close up the conversation, are there any changes at this point anybody wants to make before we I guess close at first reading?

Mrs. Katz stated Mayor, you have talked with water authority? Sorry - I keep on jumping up and down, you're getting your steps in tonight!

Mayor: Yes, I did talk with Mike Miller from the authority, they have a very aggressive plan for the projects and any support from the city is appreciated, but he understands we have a lot of various projects that we are looking at, but my humble opinion, obviously water and sewer infrastructure is critical and it does offset some of the potential increases that the authorities are looking up. So, he is grateful he said he is grateful for any allocation that counsel may consider. But, they're moving along pretty aggressively.

Mrs. Katz: Because I think all of us when we got the email was like wow.

Mayor: To be clear, he was not saying he wanted \$5 million - he was just giving us a list of projects that is in her docket. So, he said any amount of money even if it is whatever, 500,000 or whatever the case may be there appreciate if and that would definitely then offset the rates if they need to increase. But, it is a get infrastructure and we will be discussing infrastructure and water infrastructure is important and as we saw Campbell a few years ago where we had that major sinkhole and that cost several million dollars so this should be proactive moving forward.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on first reading .

The Ordinance was carried in first reading with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes

FAILED VOTE 7 TO 0

Resolution Awarding Professional Architecture/Engineering Services for 2022 City Hall Building Evaluation to EADS Architects, Inc.

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Mr. Sander It is my understanding that some council folks wanted to see this done. This was discussed in public works on Tuesday and with no recommendation.

Mrs. Katz It was discussed in public works and it was passed on with no recommendation. We also had some discussion with Mr. Gerardi. Mr. Gerardi may I have your here to ask some questions? Number one, we looked at what this architectural firm was offering and I think the consensus was \$10,000 we are really getting nothing for our money because we have had all of these studies before. Mr. Gerardi, you are the building man and you know the building and you have been in and out of it and we have had numerous studies throughout and I know Jon keeps referencing the last inspection was 2017, but we are looking at what kind of repairs that can be done in the city. My discussions with you have been - we never really get an actual figure of what it would be if we did move back into City Hall. We go anywhere from 6 to 20 million, okay? And I would like to ask you looking at some of the infrastructure that is in that building - a lot of the things that even Mr. Sanders said was that it is going to cost a lot of money because of loadbearing walls that would have to be dealt with and you claim that loadbearing walls into bathrooms there really are not any, is that correct?

Mr. Gerardi: We had this discussion on the phone a couple different times and what I'm saying is that the space that you have presently right now in the restrooms are adequate size wise or handicap - without moving any walls in those particular areas. Basically, without the police department, the city has probably 22 employees. And then you figure you have about 22 occupants if they come to see people so you have 44 people on each floor you only need one toilet - excuse me, one toilet and one sink and that would be ADA, if you notice in the building we have now, we have two toilets, two urinals and two sinks, it is not necessarily to have all of that in there, not on the second floor you have an assembly space and maybe you need additional restrooms and so forth. And I know Jon has talked to the architect and they were saying with the information they are being given it is a total gut job and I disagree, you need to gut the areas that have been damaged by the moisture, you do not need to gut areas that were not damaged such as city Council Chambers, was not damage, we do not have to go in articles walls. Secular room yes, those areas that were damaged would be, so a total gut job and moving bearing walls are not necessary for this particular case. We do not have an exact number and I know Jon has some numbers that he came up with those anti-ADA numbers and I was hoping we could get a closer range instead of 6 to 20, that is a pretty wide range. I think it can be narrowed down with the studies we have only done in my own opinion and I'm disagreeing with the mayor, I'm not disagreeing with the administration, I think it can be done at the lower end of that number, not the higher end. And I also believe the police do not belong there, I don't think they fit in that building. I think they need to go somewhere - no beef with you guys, but their own building - but then I think the building could function as administration for say the first floor, you have space left over to rent if you wish and so forth, because with some scribble here and there we could fit the administration on one floor and maybe part of the second floor. So, I just think instead of using that 10,000, we can actually hopefully get the numbers together ourselves and bring a number two this committee or to counsel and let them determine what they would like to do or not. I know that the ad hoc committee said we needed to stay in this facility. And that is what I'm saying. My job as a code administrator is to inspect buildings. That is what I've done for 34 years. I expect residential, commercial - end of this building that we are in right now - if you want to know technically it is a 4B construction you can go three stories without a speaker system, the speaker system was put in this building because of insurance reason not because it is required by code. Once a speaker system comes in, the fire department internally people can remove it, they're not going to remove it which is - but as far as expanding a - you may not have to do that because it is not required for the facility. There is bearing columns, there is for subdomain columns that run the building - the choice system runs noise and south and anything that is East and West can be taken out without having a loadbearing wall knockdown. Okay? I think it could be done without moving loadbearing walls. If you want my professional opinion and that is what I'm here to tell you is what my professional opinion is.

Mrs. Katz: I felt very accountable with this resolution. With this company making broad statements and they have not even been in the building. That made me feel very uncomfortable.

Mr. Gerardi: I will say in Jons defense it was requested by a councilmember out one of the meetings that they said maybe they should I think it was Ms. Miele that they should possibly do another study on.

Ms. Miele: I think my suggestion was for occupancy actually, part of my concern is the structures moving forward pending all of the ins and outs of the transit authority and ownership and leasing and how we will work that out. But then also the structure itself. We need some kind of an evaluation I feel in part if we are looking at marketing the parcel as well. I think a part of that process is also knowing what you have and what the damage to the property is. So, I am not - whether we can do that in house or not, I just felt as though we had heard so many different things in house over the last 10 years or perhaps it was most wise to have somebody that was not tied to the issue at all evaluating it. But, if you feel that is not going to provide us with adequacy in either of them -

Mrs. Katz: If you look at what they're offering, couple workings, I think that could be in question, what they're going to give us. And I think mayor, you discussed that also that you do not think it was -

Mayor: As was mentioned, it was requested to do some sort of job like this, but.

Mr. Gerardi: Also, the evaluation would be for basically the building construction, it would not address any of the ADA users with John who has those numbers so it will be a combination plus adding the ADA numbers in for total cost of renovations for the building.

Mrs. Katz: I think I will address what Liz said, this has been thrown at us for so many years and because we had never gotten accurate figures all of these years, it always been put on the back burner and that have spent all of the statements all of the time, we never get numbers. And you can also load on anything when the - and Jon where are you Jon Okay - I know you're virtual, but your name was up on the screen before. When you're giving numbers from 6 to 20 million. How can you make decisions on that? You really cannot. And that is where our discrepancy is of everything from the past. It is not that we have avoided it, it is Chautauqua make that decision when we do not have all the facts?

Mr. Yoder: May I chime in here? If so, regarding this specifically, from what I read this is a architectural mechanical plumbing and electrical scope, right?

Mr. Sander That is correct, architectural, plumbing - that is correct.

Mr. Yoder: We have all of that already and we went through that in the ad hoc process and some of the studies are maybe five or six years old, but we validated that they were accurate through that process. I mean Jon do validated that as a certified engineer, to me this seems like we are repeating numbers that we already have. That is my concern. It would be different if this was looking at water damage or what have you which it is surprising that we do not have that yet. It has been about a year. We should - at this point.

Mr. Sander: It will include the water damage and the current condition -

Mr. Yoder: It does not say that - and it actually says - does not include environmental investigations, specialist, air quality, I would think water damage would be included in that. So, I don't think - it is not clear, so I'm going to lean to say that it is actually not included in that. It should be clarified in my opinion from a scope perspective. Again, with this in particular - it seems redundant and I don't think that we need it, because I think we have all of the information already. I think what we are missing is one, specific water damage and two a part of the recommendation from the ad hoc, if we are staying there, we need to go through and determine even just walls and what have you and this does not do that number one and number two - I don't think we need an engineer to do a study for that. I think we can easily put together an RFP and get an actual ferment number and a plan to do it to make an informed decision from that scope perspective and that was outlined in the recommendation. So - just some items of clarity, Liz and then Mr. Allison?

Ms. Miele: I think it may have been possible when we are discussing this that - another evaluation in City Hall as a synthesis of the options that we had in front of us which should involve a independent contractor only because there were a lot of assertions going around and a lot of different directions and it was very hard for me to tell what people knew what they were simply sure of. And so - not to much an understanding of City Hall, but an understanding of City Hall as compared to these two structures - the ongoing maintenance and how we would propose to fund those moving forward, versus the ongoing needs of City Hall and how we would propose to move those. More of a holistic thing and less of a one more person to look at City Hall and tell us we need to fix the walls and change the bathrooms - so, I'm not sure that this exactly does what we have discussed which would be enabling us to compare apples to apples so to speak. To let us know what our obligations were and possibilities were to be within trade and transit wanted to once it seems we have narrowed ourselves to those few possibilities are we going to occupy trade and transit wanted to or City Hall - in which of those in the long run in terms of cost-benefit analysis holds better promise? I actually was a bit surprised to see this on the agenda because I thought we had already arrived at a resolution without doing any of that research. And I was not sure I agree with any of it. But, it seemed as though we already had - so, if we are proposing to look at a - I would want to understand the highest and best use of these two structures and whatever research we were doing on City Hall I was hoping we'd be able to pass to a potential redeveloper if we are no longer proposing those and likewise - if the city is not using these buildings, what is our change moving forward? What is the best use for the structures? Because, we have an awful lot of office space with no particular plan.

Mr. Allison Yes, three things. We need water damage estimate, we need ADA cost estimate and Mark Deary did a study and he is an expert on these buildings as far as ADA and other things - that is what he does. And he has come to me and said there is a lot - the ramp is one thing, the elevator is another thing, but he said the extent of what we need to do in City Hall ADA wise he felt was cost prohibitive. So, we do not have Alyssa back, so we need to get that. And the other thing - I wonder whether it is \$6 million or \$10 million, where is that money coming from? I am not in favor of going into debt to fix that building up when it can be more cost-effective to stay where we are right now. We would have to figure that out.

Mr. Yoder: I second that. We have talked about this will be for most of us were here, we continue to talk about it. The work that the ad hoc committee did and came to a determination based on actual facts and we had a process to clear up those unknowns - they're not cleared up there, I agree, there is a couple things that have happened that you referenced ADA, what have you - my opinion - if we are not going to stay in City Hall - we need another solution that backs up why it is more justifiable, more advantageous for the taxpayer, how we are going to do a - and I mean I am looking to the administration to do that. I think they are starting the process, I am assuming based on what I have heard or understood from the real estate services thing with City Hall - but whatever that is supporting - we need to see the alternative if there is an alternative to not staying in City Hall and we need to see that backed up by accurate

quantifiable data just as we had with the ad hoc committee and demonstrate why that is more advantageous financially for the city and until we do that. I do not think this shows that effort at all and until we do that - I think we are just spinning our wheels on a problem that we came to a resolution on and I might be in the minority on, but everything that has happened since then does not change that for me the coil thing, it would've happened whether we were or were not in there. It could happen in here. It could very well happen in here. That is the risk you take of occupying your structure. The water damage we openly talked about that and that is an area we knew we had to figure out how to take care of. Nothing has changed from that perspective and we still do not know that. About a year later. So - that is just to wrap up eating that - but, Mr. Pulizzi?

Mr. Pulizzi Real quick Mr. Gerardi, just want to ask - is it in your opinion so that you do not believe we necessarily need this study? Because of all of the previous studies that were done?

Mr. Gerardi: I think you will get the same information that you have before, it is just a little bit older so it is not as recent as it should be, but I think the numbers are there to add up the figure of things, yes.

Mr. Pulizzi: And to Mr. Allison!, what is going to cost to fix this building and also what is it going to cost to get it ADA compliant? Are there any other costs that we need to figure out that we need to be fixed to make City Hall ready for us to move back into?

Mr. Gerardi: The other thing, if you do decide and we do decide to go - again - I do not believe the police should go there, it has never been set up for them, it never will be - they need a different space altogether which opens the building up now, because now you have half of the first floor and half of the lower level that is no longer used by the department, okay? But that is just my opinion, I do not think they belong there.

Mr. Pulizzi: So, we need a real number. We've never had a real number of what it is going to cost. So, Mr. Gerardi between your expertise with the building and members of the administration with the assistance of our engineer John Sander, do you believe between the resources that we have that within the city that we could come up with the numbers on what it would cost to fix the building and make it ADA compliant between all of the studies we have had done, your professional assessment of the building when you checked it out with water damage and working in an effort with the engineer to figure out - we have the ADA compliance that we need so, I feel like between all of the resources we have here at the city between Mr. Gerardi knowledge and Mr. Sanders and Mr. Terry - I apologize, along with the studies that we have only paid for - we should be able to come up with this without paying any more money for all of these studies that still do not give us a real number.

Mr. Gerardi: I think that was brought up at the public works meeting and I don't want to speak for John, but John if you can contest that basically putting the two numbers together, the handicap number and the numbers that we came up with, we can come up with a number that is pretty accurate to what needs to be done.

Mr. Sander: I agree, but it will still be arranged.

Mr. Gerardi: I agree, because it is an existing building and you have existing problems, so no doubt.

Mr. Pulizzi : But, between you two, you could say you know what? No damage, we do not need to touch a wall. The secular room, there is some damage, we need to open up that section of wall. Now, I understand that in renovating old buildings, it is pretty much a Pandora's box, you don't know what you're going to get into so, I expect a range and fetishes expected. You cannot get 100 percent assurance on a number when we do this, but between your skill set and John Sander and Mr. Dari - you tell me if you think you can do it, because my understanding is that we can do it, we do not need to spend this money on this study, so my next question would be how soon do you think you'd be able to have some sort of report for us -

Mr. Gerardi: I would turn that over to Jon and maybe he can answer that better than me then me?

Mr. Sander: Not really, I have a report from 2017 and does not include any of the water damages and off the top of my head, I don't know, but I am fairly confident in myself that we could do it, but we do have day-to-day responsibilities as well.

Mr. Pulizzi I understand that Mr. Sander, I know you guys have a lot on your plate, that is why I am asking, if we choose to not support this and we choose to support the resources that we have at the city - I know you have your daily job functions, but between the two of you and your resources and what we have here - do you think it is something that we can do and if so, how long do you think - I'm not looking for precise dates -

Mr. Gerardi: I think it could be done by at least two Council meetings which is roughly 30 days, 30, 45 days, something of that sort to make sure because we need Adams input as well because he is involved with of the building and Keith is also very much involved in at the building, so I'm thinking you probably have a good number or range within that timeframe.

Mrs. Katz: How about two months?

Mr. Pulizzi: If we did that, do you think you'd be able to provide us with some relatively solid number site A, USS to, your professional opinion, John's assessment with his professional opinion - with the knowledge of everybody we have here - we have to fix this and it is going to cost X amount, we can move this, make it ADA compliant - so, do think we could actually -

Mr. Gerardi: I think Mrs. Katz was saying two months, that is reasonable.

Mr. Sander: I think that is reasonable, I think we can do that show.

Mr. Pulizzi: That is what I was hoping to get us to, thank you sir, thank you.

Mr. Allison: John Sander - that \$6 million comes from.

Mr. Sander: Comes from a 2017 cost estimate by Reynolds construction and has everything except for the two recent water events.

Mr. Allison: So, that is \$6 million in 2017.

Mr. Sander: I actually escalated that with inflation.

Mr. Allison: Okay. Those are the kinds of dollars we want to look at -

Mrs. Katz: I just want to make a side note, when you do have resolutions, please go to our city solicitors be it Austin or norm because the city solicitor's - they are looked at -

Mr. Sander: I can touch on that for a minute. So, with this resolution, he has Ashley sent us a more broad scope which is all city buildings and we sent back - Jill was dealing with the buildings in regard to insurance, obviously. We called them back and said give us two resolutions, another one you have in front of you and another one is for all RVT on buildings and you do not have that yet. So, that is still a possibility in the near future. As you guys are talking about

earlier. So, the one you have before you is simply for City Hall obviously. So, that is why Miss Maggie was involved.

Mr. Mackey: A couple thoughts - Randy, you are talking about the ADA study and the upgrades. I believe the language and it will not be specific, but it will be a major investment for minimal return and when we are talking about making this - making City Hall ADA compliant - and to your point - and events, I completely understand where you are coming from, but number one is this how we want Jon spending their time, we should not go into debt fixing City Hall. So, do they take 60 days and do the study and come back with a number? \$50 Million? 10 million, whatever it is, okay - well, we have a number now, but where is that money coming from? So - I just - again may or you can maybe answer this or somebody else - what is it exactly that is wrong with the situation we currently find ourselves in?

Mayor: My personal opinion? I don't think there is anything wrong with the situation currently. I think you can reach out to employees and take unofficial Paul, I think that they would think it is okay. And I think to that point as well as far as the building - I don't know if we'll get a hard number - may be more along the lines it will be at least at this - because any contract worth their weight in gold is going to say - you can go into City Hall places and start peeling up the wall and it will crumble down. So - John and Joe and others can look at this, but I don't know - to me it is probably going to be more along the lines of it is going to be at least 10 million or at least 15 million, we had extensive conversations as was noted from Mr. Derry and he alluded - it is going to be significant.

Mr. Mackey: That would be 15 million and the police are still where they're at because we all agree the police do not belong in City Hall. So, again, I personally do not know why we are so even having this conversation.

Mr. Yoder: We are having this conversation, because we are in a temporary location.

Mr. Mackey, but, does this have to be temporary and that is what I'm asking the mayor.

Mr. Yoder: We do not know that, so Mayor Slaughter we have a police in a temporary location, they cannot stay there because of the infrastructure. We are leasing a space from ourselves and I am assuming that we are not going to own his property in a year or two, so we are going to lease it from another governmental authority and I cannot speak for everybody else but members of the ad hoc both from Castle and administration were not comfortable at that time doing any kind of leasing option and we actually had a leasing option that was better from another entity that was more cost-effective for the city and actually included rent. So, this has always been a temporary measure and if it is going to be permanent, we need to understand why that is better. All right? In my mind and we need to see that and we need to see that soon. And the administration needs to undertake that and leave that.

Mr. Mackey: If I could maybe go back to something - that Mr. Winder said, let's stop looking behind us and start looking ahead - so, let's figure all that stuff out and why don't we just - I don't hate to say, but maybe this is not popular, but let's exclude City Hall from this equation, right? Because, whether it is five, 10, \$15 million to fix the place up and move back in - we don't have that kind of money.

Mr. Yoder: We don't have the money for anything.

Mr. Mackey : Okay, my point is, let's figure out where we are going - looking ahead - right? And not behind us.

Mr. Yoder: To look ahead, we have to understand and look behind us to a degree, because as we saw it, a year ago, staying in City Hall was more fiscally prudent because again - I agreed, we do not have money to purchase a new building or have all the money to stay in City Hall - but, that was the least expensive option. Right? So - if you look at the recommendation - over a long term period of time, that was the most cost-effective approach. Staying in City Hall versus moving into a different option because of a number of factors, mainly purchasing a place and removing the police, that was a big factor in the equation, right? And again, look - if there is a better option out there that is more fiscally advantageous and doable, great, let's see it. But - I do not have the information today. That is they hang up for me. Right? In my head - I do not understand how being here is more fiscally responsible because we looked at that as a part of that study for the ad hoc and it was actually more expensive long-term to be here. Because, we need a place - where we could actually get more external funding sources for City Hall because of the historical nature of it. That helped to make it more cost-effective. So - that is where I need to see and again - in relation to the item in front of us I think this is redundant. I do not think we need it in the grand scheme of things, that is what I'm looking for and if counsel is going to make a decision on going somewhere else - we need a recommendation from the administration backed up showing why it is more fiscally responsible. And that is just what I am looking for Mr. Pulizzi and then I think we can wrap this up.

Mr. Pulizzi: Thank you, I do not mean to get us all in this big thing merely what I was saying and I'm not saying that I'm choosing to stay in City Hall I'm not saying I'm choosing to leave I am saying that for us to be responsible in the decisions that we are going to make regarding the future of this city and where we are located we need to have the numbers in front of us. And to both of your points, if you do not want - if we should not put any more money into a, great - I don't think we should support this - personally - and you will get my vote on it to the cost of \$10,000 when these gentlemen are already saying they can do this study, get a hard number for us - or a range for us that no real extra cost to the city. So, that is all I'm saying. Is that I want the real figures in front of us so then we can move forward responsibly, fiscally responsibly to make the determination of do we go or do we stay?

Mrs. Katz Jon, I want to answer your question about the numbers, we want to be transparent to our taxpayers, there are people that really want to know how much it will cost to fix City Hall. And I have heard that personally. From a lot of people - give us the numbers - and that is why. That is why we are going through this. And once we have those numbers and we can justify why we go or we stay, whatever -

Ms. Miele: All I'm hearing is that none of us feel that this is going to provide us with information to make a decision. For one reason or another.

Mr. Yoder: Correct.

Ms. Miele: Whether because we feel like we need more information or we never needed this information in the first place - so, I am not sure exactly where that takes the administration moving forward, but it does seem like if we were looking to provide this information, but I'm after two in a sound like Mr. Yoder's after the previous studies should be more than enough to provide that consultant to arrive at an assumption on City Hall. And then what we need to do is evaluate the other structures that are possible. And Bonnie what I've heard is that we need to make a decision.

Mr. Yoder: And we need these holes closed and we need a plan from the invitation to do so. I think we will get one within two months, I will look forward to seeing that plan, that is what I've heard in the discussion, I look forward to seeing that and I look forward to seeing that whatever the plan is, how will pay for, how it is more fiscally advantageous one way or the other and let's make a decision. And that is great. Any other final questions on the resolution?

The resolution failed with a vote of 7 to 0.

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

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Williamsport Regarding Formation of New Transportation Authority

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Mr. Winder stated This is an ordinance to start the process and the business reason for this ordinance is to get the process ardent with a EIN number. I know there has been a lot of conversation about this. It has been on a lot of people's minds for a lot of years. Based upon the public hearing tonight and the folks that are all sitting out there watching us - I think it is pretty well-known that is what is needed to be done. I agree this is proper. The biggest thing I can tell you is that Jill has done this numerous times over the last couple of years. We are not the first agency to transfer into an authority, we are the last in a state of Pennsylvania. So, it is not like we are reinventing the wheel. She knows the process very well and the EIN number is definitely going to assist with getting City Council answers they would like based upon our conversation in the transit oversight committee meeting. We tend to have a lot of those answers out to all of you probably by the end of the weekend, the ones we can answer right away minus the pension piece. I will say that this whole process we have been very open with all of the employees at River Valley transit, the mayor has been great with this whole process, he has really been pushing forward at two years through River Valley transit and COVID and internal general investigation has been very stressful so this finally gives them something to look forward to. The biggest piece of this is the employees are number one. So, that has been the biggest priority. I can tell you based upon our conversations - tension, seniority, anything you can think of, we have thought about and the employees will lose nothing and we will ensure the city loses nothing. So, I urge all of you tonight to give this a yes vote and less progress forward and hash out the rest of the details as we move forward. Thank you.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you Mr. Winder. And I can some of the conversation that we had in a transit oversight on Tuesday. So, we started - we had a 40 minute deception and it took up a lot of the meeting on this in general. What is needed, what does the process look like, what are the actual details that we need to flush out and identify - the big categories if you would that we talked about that we need to identify our - and I would say in order over the next what, three-ish meetings that we are going to put a focus in flushing those details out? First and foremost I think the city and the interconnections that exist between RVT and the city, there are a number of just shared services that have been going on for a long time and are still going on and we need a plan for on how we are going to formally cut those ties and mainly on the city's end. Makeup for getting those services and if we are rolling with RVT now, we should not be doing that and we have been trying to get that moving especially in accordance with some of the recommendations from PennDOT and their performance review. And the formal ask for the next meeting for you Mr. Winder and for Mayor Slaughter is to be ready to what that plan looks like. How are we going to do that? What is the timeline looking like to accomplish that so we can check that very important box off. The second big category was really governance. Okay? And understanding what does governance need to look like? How do we put this authority into a position of success to make sure that they are in a position to operate efficiently and in a position of growth, but how do we mitigate some of the bad practices that we have uncovered and how do we keep that from happening in addition to the process of severing out River Valley Transit, right? And a big part of that is identification of board members. So - what you'll see in front of you is there is five elected officials from the city listed in there and that is a temporary measure just so we can get the process started to get the EIN number what have you. The full expectation at least from transit oversight and with the administration and congealed is that in about four weeks we will have new board members identified and in addition to having them identified, we want to flush out how they going to be appointed and how are they - how are we going to incorporate what the community looks like? Go ahead -

Mr. Winder The only thing I will add is that Norm did say how they will be appointed. It will be appointed by the mayor with Council approval.

Mr. Yoder: The reason I'm saying this is - we don't need to get into the details.

Mr. Winder I just wanted to make sure you knew that was in there.

Mr. Yoder: It is in there, but I can say for one I'm not convinced that is the best approach personally as an officer of the city. I could be convinced there is a better way to go, I don't know if it is at the county level or somewhere else, but I think that is a part of the discussion certainly. So, that is all that I'm saying about what the discussion was in transit oversight. And the third component was the employees and this is not in order of importance, but how much detail needs to be flushed out really. We talked about it in six weeks having the details on what is the pension transfer process look like? Benefits, understanding the process and making sure that all of our T's crossed and let -- and all of the options and stuff. So, there is a lot of details over the next six weeks that we are going to focus on fleshing out and to Mr. Winder, this enables us to start the process of administratively adding that going. Jill needs a EIN with the state and that takes a little bit of time to get that started so this formally just simply enables her to do that. We fully will and expect to come back and make changes to this mainly with different board members, maybe more board members, that kind of stuff. So, that was the discussion in transit oversight. Two kind of sum up the process that we will go down at least from a committee perspective. I will open the floor and Mr. Allison has a question.

Mr. Allison To that point about who appoints the authority members - Norm, can you that?

Mr. Lubin answered of the appointment on the municipal authorities, it is by the mayor with the advice and consent of counsel. That is why we put that language into the document.

Mr. Allison: I thought we went through that -

Mr. Lubin This is the same statute as the water authority and sanitary authority. Previous to that council did appoint It is always a Council position. The use the term governing body which most places municipalities is their Council. It was challenged before the Supreme Court and they ruled unanimously for optional third class cities the governing body means appointment by the mayor with the advice and consent of counsel. So - and that was changed a number of years ago.

Mr. Allison Okay, just wanted clarity on that. I thought that law held true in this manner as well.

Mrs. Katz : During the meeting we did discuss that all employees of River Valley are safe, all of their benefits, their vacations - their sick time, there comp time, all of that will be transferred over into the authority, they will lose absolutely nothing, even the employees that are only there a short period of time, that is not quite be affected at all, I want to

clarify that.

Mr. Winder The best term to you is all employees made whole. They do have a contract that does not expire until 2024 and I know the term, termination was used, but it is actually - the best way to explain it is there and today under the syllable is what will be June 30 and their start date under RVT will be July 1. I guess the other big point I want to make is just quiver the board members become, naturally there will be a training process Angela spent a lot of time with other consultants and training these individuals, because let's be honest, all of us over the last two years have started to learn transit. It has been a big stepping stone and with the transit boards that take some time. It does. There are different things that pop up - so, trying to have counsel oversee transit right now is a big challenge, because different things come up and they need decisions right away. Endless mountain we will reach out to them and get a meeting or problem, it is just different things that will come up and transit is evolving everyday. There is a lot more to learn. So - that window of opportunity we need to train board members as well and board members whether it is in transit or affiliated with transit in some fashion, we don't want to look necessarily at politicians and no respecting that fashion - but we want people that are using it so they can give their insight as well.

Mrs. Katz: The best way to describe it is that it should not be political. They should be for the benefit and the best interest of are we still going to call it River Valley?

Mr. Winder It is River Valley Transit Authority will be the official name.

Mrs. Katz What is interesting with this and in the past administration and past general manager, he went after, he wanted to do the authority also in fact Jill, I think were brought on by him, because of your expertise in this. So, this is been a long time in the process and I don't know if everybody is aware of that. But, this has been talked about for a good many years. And it is good that this is coming to fruition at this point. The other thing that we did discuss about this was to make sure that this is not going to cost the taxpayers of Williamsport any money in this transfer at all. To make sure that does not come about and if it does, we should know this upfront.

Mr. Winder stated In Jill and I's opinion, this will save taxpayers money. Based upon the things that we looked into so far, expansion - tech and potentially save on local match. The other part is if we could expand River Valley transit, that actually makes more jobs and my vision is that River Valley transit touches every other transit so if you want to jump on State College you can have that ability. Right now we are kind of stuck. There is a lot of opportunity out there and I think that we should be on board with taking advantage of the opportunity. We managed endless mountain transportation currently - so, we are sharing - we are making connections with them - there is different opportunities that come to light and it is just right now with the current climate, we are gridlock basically.

Mrs. Katz Your gridlock because we are right in the middle. I do want to understand also you are going to go to regionalization?

Mr. Winder That is the goal, yes.

Mrs. Katz : And the elephant in the room - does the investigation have anything to do with let's create a problem with any of this?

Mr. Winder No.

Mrs. Katz : Is this guaranteed ?

Ms. Nagy At this point I don't think we can wait for the investigation to conclude. Separation is working towards cleaning up any investigation questions they had. So nothing also chose her willingness to clean up or correct any missteps that were made in the past. So, I think separating out is the appropriate measure and not waiting for that. They are aware and PennDOT is aware that through this initiative, mistakes are made in the past and we are trying to correct the moving forward.

Mrs. Katz: And how is this going to affect any of the grants that are either in process or you are going after right now?

Ms. Nagy That is a part of the reason why we would like to use the July 1 effective date for our RVTA, that would be the cleanest way. Without doing two separate audits, one for half a year for RVT under the city and one for RVTA, July 1 is the best day to use. I know there is a lot of questions and just to touch on your question about the investigation. When I came to RVT, I was told bluntly do not look backwards, just look forwards, just do whatever you can moving forward correctly to trying to look for. Forward is RVTA. There is no doubt about it. That is the best option for everybody, the city, the employees, the taxpayer - the county, whatever level you want to look at it. There is multiple ideas - we throughout - do we keep chasing minister pallets for local match order window to a county level and so -- so that way it is not just Lycoming County paying local match. There is so much to this, but the question of the buildings, I can tell you we look today there is \$25 million in FDA funds invested in all of the buildings whether it is this one, TT one, church history, about River Valley transit - the streets in parks building, there is federal dollars invested in them. So, there's a \$25 million federal investment that does not count the state investment, it does not count other grants - there is a lot and if you want to know how to save the city taxpayers money, create River Valley transit Authority, that is the best thing for all these employees I can tell you it is a blessing for the city and vesting for the taxpayers and best for the state and best thing everybody city in this room is too great River Valley transit authority and not drag your feet. I don't mean that as respectfully. Jill has done this numerous times. She has a pattern you know how it works. We will give you guys the details. We just need the EIN number to get started.

Mrs. Katz: Which is important. Jill you said it would take 4 to 6 weeks?

Ms. Nagy Yes, as soon as we passed the final reading of the ordinance, allotted to a secondary advertisement in the paper here in Lycoming County as well as the law journal and I will cement that to the Department of State, because of COVID and remote working they are about four weeks behind, so by the time I get it there, certainly I'll be asking maybe for some assistance to fast-track it there, but once I get that EIN number I have been in contact with the federal transit ministration and this is coming and that can store all of the grant processes as well as initiate the employee benefits, so pretty much by the time you are finally done we are looking at a four week turnaround.

Mrs. Katz: Which is a shame, because I never take that long before.

Ms. Nagy No, I used to be able to upload and get the next day (CHUCKLE).

Mrs. Katz: Thank you very much.

Mr. Yoder: Any other questions from members of Council? Liz? Ms. Miele?

Ms. Miele Lots of them are supposed (CHUCKLE) I would agree. I feel like we have been talking about River Valley Transit Authority for at least the last maybe five years? It has been an item of discussion for a long time and I am happy to see this moving along. And maybe a little sorry to see us trying to do it in a short timeframe because I feel like

it would've been nice to - I understand the fiscal your turnover and why that makes it hard. But, I wish we could've jump started the process a little earlier so we had more time to look into and understandable for we moved - not this item, but the stuff that is coming this is pretty straightforward. Norm, you are telling me that there is no alternative to the mayor appointed counsel approved membership, correct? Okay, so first off, it is five members that we are naming to the board?

Mr. Winder answered yes..

Ms. Miele stated: The documents state 7 in writing -

Mr. Winder answered There was a revised note.

Ms. Miele: Okay. Those members are all elective officials currently?

Mr. Winder They are just names in place, so what will happen - once we start appointing them, all five of those members must resign from that, they will not stay there. We will appoint five new ones under the criteria that they are appointed by the mayor and approved by counsel.

Ms. Miele: Excellent. Which then makes my second question about whether they are elected officials obsolete - that would take us a long time to get a decent membership - is this ordinance effective on a second reading or 20 days after?

Mr. Lubin answered 20 days after.

Ms. Miele: Can we file for the EIN before the 20 day mark?

Ms. Nagy During the 20 day period is what I have to advertise anyway, so it coincides with my advertisement criteria so that is about as fast as it can go.

Ms. Miele: Okay. And the redevelopment Authority are they not an authority of the city and the same with parking and sewer?

Mr. Lubin stated They are under a different statute. They are under a different authority statute and it is a parking authority statute and a housing authority statute.

Ms. Miele: So the parking authority should not be listed in this document?

Mr. Lubin It requires I think that they want to know the names of other authorities. It did not seem to indicate or limit it to solely under the municipal authorities. In order to be on the safe side.

Ms. Miele: But they don't care that it is an exhaustive list of our authorities.

Mr. Lubin It has to be an example to indicate to you about other charters in the past.

Ms. Miele: Got it. But they don't need to be on that she and also does not need to be all of them. Got it. Okay - upping the tax for the actual ordinance, where the additional services just for my understanding providing all public transit services permitted under the US public authorities are?

Ms. Nagy We put it like that you have CNG, so once these articles of incorporation's are filed, that kind of gives you the whole gamut of what you can do, so you don't want to as city Council change every time for instance you might do micro transit. Do you do not currently do that but that is something typical transit agencies do. Currently RVT does not provide shared right, that might be something that we start to do, some ADA services, so rather than change articles of incorporation all times, it is transit services that are sponsored by the Federal transit administration or PennDOT so it is listed like that. So that way you are flexible and do not have to change and do this entire advertising process, ordinance process every time.

Ms. Miele Okay. In public transit services does not cover that under that umbrella so defaults under unconditional services?

Ms. Nagy Under act 44 there is welfare to work and things like that so public transit is the term of work for the federal transit meditation but there are other services covered by the funding codes.

Ms. Miele: Got it. And I understand that we are giving RVT the power of disposing the structures that it currently owns and we have discussed that to some extent but help me to understand what happens with RVT's real estate where in this process we get to the discussion of who owns what and when

Ms. Nagy So as we move through the process, this is just creating the authority, they will have to be multiple agreements between the city and RVT which is one of the other reasons I need a board for RVT. You will have to do agreements on what happens with real estate assets and you'll have to transfer other capital assets such as vehicles, bus washes and things like that. You will have to be looking at all of those things, we will have to come up with a payment arrangement where RVT is probably going to be paying back the city or giving them some type of funding to offset pension issues, so all of those things will be happening down the road. I need the board first to enter into those agreements with the city. So, all of that will be happening as we go forward. Basically what will happen is the authority is being created, but it will go live when you authorize the swearing in of the officers so, basically until you have in your mind how all of those things are going to work, you're not going to be necessarily swearing of the officers of the authority that will give you the time as we wait for the EIN in situ deal of benefits to work out real estate and all those other issues which is going to have to be again a discussion and agreement between the new authority and the city, because there will be a lot of transfers there.

Ms. Miele: Right. So, Derek, do you have in mind names of people who will be serving on this board?

Mayor Slaughter I do not have a definite names for people in mind.

Ms. Miele: Okay, because I think that it sounds to me that Council either as individual members or a whole to get some idea of what we would like to see happen during this transition process, specifically I would say regarding real estate, but also smaller assets. And understand when we are discussing the up & coming appointees because so much has to happen quickly, I do not want to hold up the process, because we do not know what we want from that board and how to communicate to them what we expect. Or to have Derek bring somebody to us with whom we disagree on some things and of how to handle transit and how to go back to the drawing boards on certain members. So I guess Derek to the extent that we could try and start vetting those names as soon as possible, it seems like not be a wise idea and maybe engaging in discussions that I don't believe we need to be a public discussion necessarily about how we foresee the transition taking place so that we can keep the potential board members informed so we can make certain we are all on the same page. But - okay - and Randy I am really glad I saw everybody's names and I was like wow. This is going to be long - I'm not close reading - aside from that - I agree with you Adam, I agree with the administration in general, this is something that should have happened a long time ago. And I think that we all realize that, but certainly how to make the process happen especially with you know a staff at RVT that was less than

interested for the authority process for obvious reasons. So, it would be a benefit to us, I think that especially because the transit authority, the business of the transit system is so greatly divorced for the city already that to try to bring them together has seemed to me like a poor fit ever since I got elected. But, they are apples and oranges at this point and maybe it was not always that way. But it certainly has been for a long time. Especially not in the city of Williamsport, not just the county, but also other counties. It is just bigger than us. So - I'm glad to see it is moving forward and sorry about how quickly we are doing and grateful to the transit oversight board and to the leadership at RVT in the city that we are working on such a tight timeline and working hard to make this the best transition we can. Thank you guys.

Mr. Allison: I have a few comments. Having been formerly employed with a local utility that was sold twice in is the time I was there, I know somewhat of the stress that was on the structure, the people - to change over, the unknowns - all of those things - and I just want to commend the transit employees, the union - the staff members that are here tonight - you are showing tonight's in unison and it speaks more than words about what you care about, where your heart is at and I think that is evident in the function of our transit authority. All negatives aside around the periphery of all of this, at the core I think we have personally I think we have the best transit system in the state. And I think at times that has been recognized and they have just kept doing the job and serving the community and surrounding communities. And they have done A+ in my eyes and I am glad we are able to do this. And watch them and that part that has been under the city to launch it into new territory where they can function in the way that a transit business is supposed to function. Free of political encumbrances and just getting the job done. I do want to say obviously we are all in favor of this and I know that there are some details to be taken care of, but at least I can speak for myself. I do not know a whole lot about governance and how it works with transit. That is a whole field that I am not versed in. And I do know not want to step into it, I want to get out of the way so that things can move ahead and they can do what they do best and that is the goal that I have over the next few months as we see this process through and I just want to thank all who came tonight to show your solidarity and to show your love of the city, the communities you serve and the job that you do.

Mr. Yoder stated: Agreed Randy, well said.

Any other comments or questions from other members of Council? Hearing and seeing Don Mrs. Frank on the motion please?

The ordinance was carried in first reading with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Applause from audience.

Resolution #9251

Resolution Authorizing the Execution of a Purchase Agreement with Glick Fire Equipment Co. for the Purchase of Fire Apparatus

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Chief August This is a resolution for your consideration to add the mayor, controller and city clerk signatures to the original contract between the City of Williamsport and Glick fire equipment company. For the purchase of two pumpers and a ladder, a tower ladder truck to add a cost of \$3.2 million. The purchase was previously approved by resolution 9229 on December 16, 2021. At the finance committee meeting on Tuesday, three options were offered. With option of \$2.5 billion from ARPA funds and 700,000 from the community development block funds making the most fiscal sense. If we were to purchase - through finance through Pierce or PNC, we would pay \$183,000 in interest over the lifespan of the loan if we financed \$1.2 million over seven years. Doing any sort of financing could be an unnecessary burden on the taxpayers when ARPA and CDBG funds are available to pay the entire amount.

Mr. Yoder: All right, thank you chief. This was reviewed and discussed in finance.

Ms. Miele: It was indeed. And I think the numbers really -- obviously we already - we had discussed spending this much money from a different vendor and discussed taking some portion of the purchase price from ARPA funding and I think what we sort of broke out during the finance committee meeting is that we were fortunate to have some of the PNC Bank on the line talking about the breakdown of interest and payments over the next seven years if we were to finance and when we are talking about financing, we are looking at a seven year financing, it is not a 20 year financing option. So, in the course of loans 41.2 million are interest payments were about 180,000. We were paying about 180,000 in addition to the 1.2 obviously. And we were taking about \$180,000 out of the city's general fund budget every year and the net effect to me was the thinking that I came to and I believe my fellow finance members agree with me. We are looking at expanding ARPA funding for lost revenue over the next five years give or take to the tune of \$7 million. And simultaneously we will be taking funding from the general fund budget and putting the lost revenue funding to pay off this loan and paying \$100,000 more for it then we would pay if we just paid for it outright. So, it seemed the most sensible thing to take the funding directly from the ARPA pot even if part of that is moving it down from lost revenue to meet that need, because I do not believe we have that much additional funding in the public safety category right now. And eliminate the interest that we would be paying especially with this particular debt only last seven years and we could potentially be utilizing lost revenue over the next five through 2026. It just seemed to make more sense. To pay for this outright if that is in fact the route we are taking. We did discuss whether there were other sources of funding within the city budget and Mr. Pawlak at the time did not believe there was anything additional in act 13 and I'm assuming that did not change, correct? While we do occasionally find extra money, it is not that common of an occurrence of but, the \$700,000 in CDBG funding obviously we felt to be taken advantage of and it should also come from ARPA funds. So, the discussion in finance did not relate specifically to the apparatus largely at least not to my recollection, but related to the way in which we were funding the purchase of the apparatus because of course I believe we secure it may be \$114,000 if we pay within the next 60 days even though we are not required to make payment for the apparatus until 18 months out or something until we receive it.

Chief Aungst If I may jump in there. They also plan to have a 90 day window as well. So, they're coming up with a contract saying that as well.

Ms. Miele: Got it. Okay anyway - regardless, if we make payment well before we receive the apparatus we can

receive a substantial discount. So, if we are willing to authorize the funding out of ARPA, that will give us both a discount and not paying interest on a loan. It is not an opportunity that we often have, but it does seem like it may be wise. The only other point we discussed and I think we were unanimous in this is that the lifetime of these pieces of equipment is generally speaking - I had understood the tower actually was a longer piece of agreement but you're saying all of it is about 12 to 15 years?

Chief Aungst It varies by piece. Depending on the use, the tower probably we could probably get about 15 years out of it, maybe. The engine most likely 12 to 14, somewhere around there.

Ms. Miele: Got it. So given that we know it will cost us more than 3.2 million to replace those when they are eventually debunked in 12 to 15 years, we discussed that we should still be setting aside \$200,000 annually in the fire department budget escrowing it so to speak for 12 years down the road so we are not in the position of having to finance those either and enabling us to save ourselves what is likely to be close to \$500,000 in interest if we were to have to finance the entire \$3.2 million purchase. I will defer to other members of finance, because it is definitely possible that I have forgotten some of the details. But, that is at least the high points that we had on Tuesday.

Mr. Beiter: I would add to that discussion that Ms. Miele left out simply the maintenance fees that you're currently paying on the tracks and the fleet worked out to be about \$55,000. There will obviously be maintenance fees with new vehicles but substantially less than \$65,000. Which I'm sure he would love to see that out of the bottom line of your budget at the end of the year. We discussed as well and also mentioned the ARPA funding where that would come from and I am very concerned as to where those dollars - will be coming from simply because this is something that unfortunately you had to step into midstream and through this process I have been very curious as to what the plan was all along. Whether was supposed to be from ARPA funding or supposed to be financed, but then knowing that we have no option to finance because of the lack of audits that the city has. So, it was disturbing in that regard. I do appreciate you taking that on and giving us these options and I think there is much more that we as counsel need to discuss at this point.

Mr. Yoder: Mr. Allison?

Mr. Allison: Liz covered it well and Eric as well. I think the bankers there said other than the audits we could produce internal information that would suffice to make the loan? But, that again did not make fiscal sense. I think the three of us were of the mind.

Ms. Miele: They actually seemed relatively interested in giving us alone, but by the time you go through the hassle of appointing the financial information especially in the absence of an audit and then the additional cost to the city and frankly - it just did not make any sense to be putting \$900,000 in lost revenue into a budget over the course of five years while paying the hundred \$80,000 that would be directly back out of the loan.

Mr. Yoder: The counter I would make for that is - we had this a few times when we went through our last budget - we continue to deficit spend and I like the idea of putting money aside year-over-year to the tune of a few hundred thousand dollars for 15 years, but I can't sit here and tell you where we are going to get \$200,000 when we are already short \$2 million and this may be a minority opinion, but when we look at the ARPA budget I frankly think if we solve the fiscal issue, so many other issues fixed themselves and so I understand the logic and I can get there, but I don't know if I can get there pulling it from lost revenue given that there is an opportunity for us to hopefully address that root cause of so many other issues that we have in the city and if we can fix that - we can afford more officers, we can afford more fire?, we can afford more public works equipment and employees, we are at the phone.

Ms. Miele: Sorry, how is lost revenue - it seemed like economic develop it would be addressed.

Mr. Yoder: Both of them, for sure. But it gets the money unrestricted. Right? And when you start to look at deficit, it is growing revenue and minimizing expenses, so if you get that money unrestricted and you can put in areas that currently we could not do - to minimize expenditures that seems to be a very prudent option whether it was paying down debt or looking at our -- because those are large numbers every year that hurt us every year. In my mind -

Ms. Miele: I do think that paying down debt continues to be a wise use of any filing that we can throw at it simply because we are paying on that debt but we do also asked Mr. Pawlak has reminded us -

Mrs. Katz: Chief, I cannot find the email with the expenses that it would take to bring up the firehouse to speed? There is a lot of problems in the firehouse and like I said, I cannot find the email on my phone, driving me crazy. And if I remember correctly, we are talking several hundred thousand dollars in order to fix everything that needs to be fixed. If I remember correctly, which is racking my brain here, security, mold - what were some of the other factors that you need to get fixed?

Chief Cracking in the walls. The roof - the boiler, we have a boiler, but we are waiting for a part for.

Mrs. Katz: I'm sorry I'm throwing this value as well, I bring this up because we take a 3.2 out of ARPA, this gives you money than to start fixing up what needs to be fixed up there which has been put on the back burner for how many years? Constantly, every year a gets to we will get to a, that to it, and we never get to it. And this way, this would free up some money to at least bring everything up that needs to be done in that part of your area and I hate to think of what you are dealing with as far as the mold and the roof and things like that - but to me - I hear that all of the time and it should not be. It really should not be. So, that is where I would like to see the extra money if there is any extra money go towards the infrastructure of the firehouse.

Mr. Yoder: Are there any other comments or questions, Mr. Mackey?

Mr. Mackey: I did leave the finance meeting a little bit early, so obvious, I just want to be clear on these three options at the chief sent one and two are on the table? 2.5 ARPA and 700,000 CBG?

Ms. Miele: I think that is the one on the table - I don't think 3.2 ARPA -

Mr. Mackey: We are not financing anything, as far as I'm concerned, I want to make sure -

Ms. Miele: That is the discussion we are having right now.

Mr. Mackey I understand that, thank you for clarifying - my point is - what I'm trying to say is I understand we are having a conversation right now. As far as I'm concerned we are not financing anything, right? If we have 700,000 of CDBG money available, according to the first draft of this budget, we have 1.2 million four fire trucks, fire apparatus which tells me we need to come up with another \$1.3 million? And I know we are going to have this discussion here and little bit, but then I start looking at things like COVID related expenses. We have \$900,000 budgeted for that, Mr. Mayor - what have we spent on COVID related expenses to date - COVID seems to be going in the other direction as far as I can tell, so I guess what I'm saying is that almost gets us there and then I look at future projects reserve, there

is \$2.4 million in there as well, so in my mind get into that number is not going to be that difficult.

Mr. Yoder: Jon, I would agree. I am more than comfortable with option two. It is what, 2.3+700,000? Or what have you - I will be interested to see where everybody says about how we get there without line item when we get there. I personally would prefer to not take anything out of fiscal relief and that is just because a gets it unrestricted and we can use in areas where we are not able to right now. But, to your point though, there are other areas where we can find this. I agree with your point.

Mr. Mackey: And to Miss Miele's point, this is where the investment in economic development is hopefully going to rear its head in 10 years, right? So, again, for me - and I know we will have this conversation later on, I am in full support of buying the trucks outright. The idea that we would finance anything when we are sitting on this kind of money makes zero sense in my mind. So at any rate -

Ms. Miele: It would somewhat determine on the terms of the financing but in this case I think this is the most wise option.

Mr. Yoder Mr. Allison?

Mr. Allison: I would like to hear what the mayor had to say -

Mr. Mackey: Yes about COVID?

Mayor: I don't have the number on hand but we are not anywhere near 900,000 but I can get that number to you.

Mr. Beiter: Something else that I do want to bring up in the meeting was the addition of a pump on the ladder truck. That was good to be an additional \$86,000 that was quoted at present for that, because with this back that is currently being delivered it does not have the ability to carry or pump water is that correct? It will have the ability to do both going forward?

The answer was Correct.

Mr. Allison That is an important point, I do not think the ladder truck without a pump is going to serve the purpose if he gets there first - how many gallons will that carry?

Mr. Winder Anywhere between three and 500 gallons. As a matter fact today, just today both engines were out on a call in the upper parts of Campbell Street and they were dispatched to a car fire down by the recycling center and the tower was first there and pull the line off of the tower and put the fire out. With the water from the tower. So, that is just another example of why that truck does need a pump.

Mr. Allison: Exactly. That is all.

Mr. Pulizzi: Thank you. I just want to point out president Yoder that looking at fiscal relief, we are not comfortable necessarily taking the 1.3 million that we would need to out of fiscal relief to fund option number two. In my opinion it is not 1.3 million anymore, it is 1.4, presumably to make sure we have the 86 for the pump and the water capacity.

Chief The 86,000 for the pump would not come due until delivery of the apparatus.

Mr. Pulizzi: Okay, thank you chief.

I'm looking over here at economic developer, public works, public safety and economic development and if we break that down, we are at approximately \$350,000 that we need to find over those remaining areas if we don't want to touch fiscal relief. When we spread that amount out over everything that we have allocated - it is a relatively small impact to all of the other projects that we are looking to fund and I certainly think that this is something that we should definitely do. I certainly would never want to jeopardize the safety and well-being of anybody in the city or anybody for that matter and obviously their livelihood and well-being of our firefighters, so I definitely think this is something that we should find the money for to make sure we can get this going.

Mr. Yoder The only question I had and I did not catch this from your narrative from finance Miss Miele - do we have the savings? Because technically the contract executed is not valid because of the executed by the right person, so like the savings - that we are trying to obtain by executing that, are they

Guaranteed? Yes

Chief . Yes. : Talk to the vendor

Mr. Yoder: So even it is not valid, they will honor it?

Ms. Miele I would decide to point out that I misspoke Adam, I was actually - I did not want to take anything out of - had no place else to take it. Because we have that 2.4 million that we just threw in there. It seems like the most wise place to take it from. But yes, I would not propose that we take it from lost revenue, that you seem to like the broadest category we have. But, I am sure that we can find it somewhere and I think unfortunately is something we should be discussing before we discussed that budget. So, perhaps we - understanding that we can always go back and move funding around again, perhaps we agreed to take half of the future projects reserve from public safety and take the remainder from future projects through fiscal relief?

Mr. Yoder: I was going to say all of future projects reserve from public safety and the rest from fiscal relief.

Ms. Miele: That is fine with me, but we should have some sort of gameplay because we need to do this tonight.
Mr. Yoder: That is what I would personally say, but I am only one of seven.

Ms. Miele: We can all take some of the money from public safety from a minor project.

Mr. Yoder: Correct. You should've said something, I could pass them down - are there any other questions from members of counsel on this one? Okay.

The resolution was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Resolution #9252

Resolution Authorizing the Use of ARP Funds to Install & Upgrade Electrical Panel at Memorial Pool

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

Mr. Livermore stated What you have before you is a resolution authorizing ARPA funds to install and upgraded electrical panel at Memorial pool. The panel will consist of obviously a new panel, circus, a box, wiring and grounding rods. Making this upgrade will ensure that the pool will have a smooth start up once it gets put in. The work that will be done on the electrical will be done in-house by public works. Which will save four to \$5000 to keep it in-house. Obviously using the ARPA money or donations would be what you guys decide.

Ms. Miele I feel like I get to go first on all of these items today - this is just not fair tonight, anyway, yes, this was

reviewed and forwarded with a full body recommendation. According to Mr. Livermore into a certain extent Mr. Winder but prior experience with this, there is work being done by PP NL at Memorial Park that simply makes this a very advantageous time both cost wise and timing wise to take care of this. We will save some money, we will also have less pure credit castle all the way around. In terms of the question of whether or not to derive this from American rescue plan act funding, actually I do not recollect that we discussed during finance whether there is any funding within the recreation budget or the streets or parks budget that we can pull this from. Okay, we did not? Okay, we did not. We should have. (CHUCKLE) So, is there - it is \$12,000. It could of course come out of ARPA. I think the one thing we discussed is whether - there is some funding remaining in the memorial pool line and we can take it from there and I don't believe the imitation has any particular attachment although Mr. Livermore and the mayor - of where the money comes from, they just want to make sure it happens. But, Mr. Pawlak this early in the year we are not seeing any gaping holes in the public works budget that would allow us to take out of there. And you know how much money remains in that pool fund? For maintenance of Memorial pool?

Mr. Livermore believe it is around 100,000.

Ms. Miele: And we do not touch it? It was either 110 or 112.

Mayor Slaughter: Know what we discussed at the time it was going to come back and determine what portion we want to take out of the donation fund donation and what portion of ARPA.

Ms. Miele And how much was there? About 100,000 .

Mayor: Around 115 I believe.

Ms. Miele: So, what you're telling me is that we need to have - widen ARPA and the electrical? So, I think the initial discussion that needs to be, what extent do we want to have some sort of escrow funding for onboard maintenance of Memorial pool versus utilizing that funding now to make existing repairs at Memorial pool? And see what happens next time we need something done there. Or take it out of ARPA and leave in the budget so it exists in the next time we need any kind of repair but, looking at something like \$130,000 between the two and I believe we have 112 in escrow now that I think about it, but it could be 110. And that goes back to the reserve funds and recreation.

Mr. Yoder: Are there any other comments - other members of the finance committee or other members of counsel? If we are going to look at the pool liner and additional stuff and that, I can be okay with that, we have 1.4 million initially on future projects reserve for Parks and Recreation, I have no issue pulling from that. And just in general with ARPA as we start to spend some of this money - we really need to flush out the compliance aspect of this. Just to make sure - I know Mayor Slaughter you are working on that, that is great, hopefully we can see that soon. But, just to be better safe than sorry.

Ms. Miele When you say flush out compliance -

Mr. Yoder: Especially on the backend that we have the auditing requirements taking care of and that reporting is taken care of, it is not a big deal now, because were not spending a lot of money, but I suspect it will be a very big deal and we do not have the personnel and quantity that we need.

Ms. Miele: It sounds to me like what you're requesting is that we should look at bringing in a consultant with compliance for ARPA?

Mayor Yes, I have a number of RFPs other minister parties have used and I will be sending them to our solicitors for review to get that out, so yes.

Mr. Yoder: And I just - I am saying that simply because we are starting this fund money and this is great, let's get that taken care of and in concurrence and at the same time so we do not get too far down the road and then make that effort any harder.

Ms. Miele: Got it. The one thing that I would add to that discussion is - not that I am, but even if I was remotely of an expert, but it would seem like the pool liner might more meet the requirements of recreation then an upgrade to the electrical panel so if we are going to take funding from one from ARPA for the memorial pool fund, maybe we should be taking this particular item from the pool and the liner from ARPA.

Mr. Yoder: And I'll be okay with that as well.

Ms. Miele: All of my expertise, which is to say nothing. Leads me to believe that might be a wise idea.

Mrs. Katz : Mayor this is for you, you said you sent the RFP, have you had any response to?

Mayor: If they're not gone out yet, I reach out to other minister parties to see -

Mrs. Katz saw something that came down -

Mayor: I have a number of different ones that municipalities have used and looking over those - and I want to send to our solicitors for review and then we'll put it up. And I agree that should go out sooner rather than later so just as soon as he gets solicitor approval I will put it out there.

Mrs. Katz: McGee also does this and they talk about this at our last pension meeting.

Mayor: And actually ZA using our city audits do as well but there are a number of firms out there and (NAME) as well, so I think we will not have any issue getting responses.

Mrs. Katz: Because were to start spending this money now for some of the important things that we need. So, that is emotion.

Mayor: Yes, absolutely, already in motion. I agree.

Mr. Allison : As far as the recreation component - that panel, the current panel is how old?

Mr. Livermore 50 years maybe? It is to the point where our electricians do not even want to touch it because if they do and they break - and the one panel is actually in it the chlorine room which we want to move out of that room to make it safer for the people that are there.

Mrs. Katz: Now why would you want to move there?

Mr. Yoder People do things very backwards 50 or 60 years ago.

Ms. Miele: I have lived in a lot of houses with gas and electric fixtures -

Mr. Yoder: I hear you!

Mr. Allison: To make a point though, if that panel goes down, the pool is down and so there is not any recreation, so in a sense it is a part of the recreation. By that service.

Mrs. Katz : One more question for you Scott, we're doing LED lighting, will this light up the pool bar? Like more lights? Not anymore, just replacing the bulb so there two LEDs which will be more cost efficient, I did not get a price like we were talking and finance, I know it is about 30 to 40 percent difference in cost. In all depends on how many we have,

but it will promote more like -

Ms. Miele: And generally speaking LEDs are actually brighter

So, there will be more lie as well as less money.

: Just my final question.

Mr. Yoder: Any comments or questions from members of counsel? Similar to the fire apparatus discussion, we are going to take some of this out of ARPA and there is areas where we can, so I'm not too concerned about that. So, just related to any other -

The resolution was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Resolution #9253

Resolution Authorizing the Execution of Fee Increases for the Use of Bowman Field

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution

Mr. Pulizzi: If I may recommend that we move to agenda item resolution authorizing the execution of these increases for the use of Bowman Field, I know those people waiting patiently so if we can -

Mr. Yoder: Absolutely. For the item I'll turn this over to Mrs. Katz, I will be abstaining for the item, my employer is referencing this just to be safe. And I think Mr. Beiter will as well.

Mr. Beiter : Yes, my brother is employed by the agency's reference as well so I'll be abstaining.

Ms. Drummond Hello everyone. So, what you have in front of you is a resolution to increase the fees to utilize Bowman field. As you guys all are aware MLB has come into the city and upgraded our field tremendously, to a standard the city cannot do alone and in the process of that recently the scoreboard has been digitized, updated and come along with a bunch of features that have never been offered previously. So, previously our old school board was able to be utilized by a person of that team coming in and this now will have to have had a special person that is trained on this to program the screens and to do the scores and the endings and the hits and everything of that nature as well as the fee for rental per game. Everybody has a highlighted page and everything highlighted is what is going to be updated in change from previous years.

Mrs. Katz : This came to public works and this was passed with a positive recommendation. Anybody from public works, would you like to make any statements on this?

Mr. Pulizzi: Obviously it makes sense that this - that we would do this with the increase of technology and specialized training poet to bring those people in, there is no way around it.

Mr. Allison: Not to purposely make upon, but it is a game changer. In every sense, because it is more than a ballfield now. It is a major-league facility. In so many ways, so it needs to be protected. There is no doubt about it. And it is progress and could you read some of the fees so the public would know what we're talking about here?

Ms. Drummond What we are now going to be offering for is a base rental or enhance parental and that includes the opening of the facility, the PA system, the announcer, reprogramming the scoreboard itself along with the endings in music, the line score, pitch count, everything on the digital board, they are also able to put that school's logo up as opposed to Wednesday cutters play, they actually have their team player up to bat, the person's picture would be there, this would entail them to have their school logo and the number, that person's jersey number up so they can utilize and audience can see who is actually up.

Mrs. Katz: That is \$375 per game, a doubleheader would be 475 and if you went with a base rental - just opening and closing the facility the amounts and the national anthem, players and substitutions and so on and so forth, that would be a base rental of 225 and 325 for a doubleheader. What is going to our fees for renting the field that we charge as far as the city goes? What went up is that the rental fee for games - number one game would be 500 and the rental fee for additional games a continuous doubleheader would be \$200 each. These are much lower than most ballfield throughout the state. Kayla has done research on this and we are so much lower.

Ms. Drummond Other fields start at 1200 per game. We are now starting at 500 for one game.

Mrs. Katz: We are making it very affordable for our local teams to use the field. And seeing the field it is maintained by MLB grants person - and everybody should be thrilled to try and play on the field. But, like I said we are making this affordable, we did have to raise the prices and this is going to be for a year and we will see how this plays out for next year and see where we stand. Joe, we were talking to you about the cost of this. We need a breakdown, because you had told us that we are losing money and we have to make sure where we are and what people are getting and what we are losing money on. Okay? I think we need to address that, okay?

Ms. Drummond From what I was told is every time an outside team decides the cutters i.e. the high school team or pan college coming in, the city pays \$1000 per game and we are only charging 500 per game. But just to be clear, that is a 500 that includes now the base rental and enhance package so everything entirely would come to the city, so previous years the city has had to pay for electrical, cleanup, the scoreboard, this all is included, so the fee for the game is not going up 100, it is going up that amount of 325 two another 475 on top of that 500 per game. Depending on what the preferences of the organization using the facility at the time.

Mr. Pulizzi I was merely going to mention that I think we have a representative from the cutters here in the audience if they would like to come up and say a few words in regards to this they are welcome.

Mr. Gabe Sinicropi CrossCutters Thank you. I would like to make sure that it is clarified though that the total cost Councilman Allison asked and what are the total cost here? And I think Kayla alluded to it, but maybe to make it clear, the cost for a game under this proposal, the minimum cost would be \$725. For again. So, it would be between 725 and 875. For again and that includes all of the things that are needed. Without going into a 30 year history that is happened at the field as far as outside renters go, it has not been a great situation. For the city or for the people renting the field. At one time people had to pick up their own garbage, haul it away in their car - when they rented the field - that actually was how it used to be. Now, the cross cutters being paid by the city clean up the stadium. And MLB puts the field back and playable condition and all of those things used to be on the backs of the renters. Who would never put the field back and playable condition, nor did they ever clean up the stadium to a standard that would be accepted. So and the city of course does not have the manpower nor the dollars to devote to be able to do that. So, it is kind of the chicken or the egg with the amount of the city charges to rent the field. There has never been enough money to pay people to

take care of it properly and it comes back to because for a number of decades the fees were never there to cover that. So so, renters got what they paid for. Which was not much time and at one time you rented the field literally they flip you a key right and said do not break anything. That is how it was. Now, with a multi- millions of dollars put in over the last six or seven years and a new \$700,000 video board renters cannot just come in and work with the equipment and certainly we have \$100,000 investment in without equipment as well. So, we are hoping to implement this fee that would eventually we would reconcile after the rental. Each year and take that money off of the Cross Cutters base rent of what services we are providing which is opening and closing the stadium, cleaning the stadium, paying for the trash removal and disposal etc. and running now PA systems, scoreboard - they used to have to provide their own public address announcer, we will provide all that. And I think it is a much better situation for the city and for people who will rent the facility. And believe me, we are not going to be making money on this. We are really taking our employees away from what they ordinarily be doing. Which is doing work for the Cross Cutters and making this just better for everybody. And we are certainly very willing to do that, we have wanted to do that for almost 30 years. And finally we are going to get that opportunity, so thank you in advance and if there are any questions, that I can answer I would be happy to do so.

Mr. Mackey Hey Gabe, how are you? I was looking at this - my mind just went blank - this guidelines, the Bowman field event guidelines, I am assuming that these are all going to be in the contract that people are signing to use the field and what kind of mechanisms do you will have in place to make sure some of these rules are being followed, because there are some's pretty specific stuff in here.

Gabe That would be under the city, we will not be having people sign agreements with us, it will be 100 percent with the city.

Ms. Drummond There is a contract they have to sign so every organization that request to use the field has to go through a contract and that contract states a security deposit - they have to choose single-game, double-header and whatever additional rental package they would like that they signed for and they signed the agreement that this is what they choose. This is what they have to pay and the additional fees may occur if there was additional damage to anything on the field or anything of that nature.

Mr. Mackey the same question for you, what kind of mechanisms do we have in place to make sure the teams that are actually playing these games are actually following these rules. And if they are not, what are we going to do about it?

Gabe, Crosscutters I know cam, the groundsman is present on every game.

Mayor Slaughter: And MLB also, they sell a lot of the framework as well, I don't know this year, have they said you gave how many games they are going to allow? Have they said that already? And they give us a cut off time as well. So, MLB really has a lot of control over this mechanism and Cam is the head groundskeeper from MLB just to let everybody know who Cam is. He is there every day basically and so primarily the teams - will follow and if they don't, security deposit and all of that and will check in with Cam to make sure everything is the way it should be.

Mrs. Katz: I don't think we have had any problems over the last couple years in all. And the same teams are coming back. And there has not been a problem. This year will be more interesting with the new scoreboard and everything. You see how that flies. And I think it will be exciting.

Ms. Drummond Another was a change last year with the Cross Cutters starting earlier so we cut the games off at the beginning of May so that was really only the slight change over the last few years Councilwoman.

Mrs. Katz: And we have any dates with the MLB games yet?

Mayor Slaughter answered For the MLB game? From what I understand it is Sunday, August 21. I do not know who is playing, so do not ask me oh yes : Red Sox and Orioles.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the resolution.

The resolution was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Certificates of Appropriateness – 11 W. Fourth St. Heath Durrwachter

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

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

Mr. Gerardi Good evening, what you have before you is the certificate appropriateness request for the property at 11 W. Fourth Street and I have attached a picture of the signs and they are post, that is what the place is called, there is a sign above and there is two of the windows and these are plastic laminated onto the window. There is no lighting, if you have any questions, I will be happy to answer those they do meet the zoning requirements for downtown Williamsport.

The certificates of Appropriateness was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Certificates of Appropriateness – 331 Elmira St. –Lex Domus, LLC

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second.

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

Mr. Gerardi There is one presently, there is a signer presently and they would like to replace it with anyone and we do have a representative here from the organization if you have questions from him.

This is the area where the historic district is, the alley where the city (INDISCERNIBLE) .

The certificates of Appropriateness was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was seven to zero. 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, and Mr. Yoder voted yes.

Resolution #9249

Resolution to Amend Resolution #8880

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second on the resolution.

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

Mayor Slaughter what you have before you is a extremely brief one, relatively speaking to other items, this is a resolution to amend resolution 8880 which was originally - the original resolution was approved by city Council in 2019 April 11, 2019 and it related to a lease agreement with M and T bank relating to a 2019 Chevy Tahoe command vehicle that is used by the fire department and there is no financial - any issues at all with any of this. This has nothing to do - no finances, this simply is the original lease document that was never signed and sent via the U.S. Postal Service to M and T and they actually need the original documents for this original lease agreement. So, obviously the administration has changed in the previous administration is no longer here so working with solicitor Lubin and solicitor White this is the easiest way to accomplish this to just amend it given the current administration and the authorization to sign these documents and send the originals then to amity. So, that is the status. We have already made two payments on this and the third and final payment will be made this year and then we can purchase the command vehicle for one dollar. At that point if we so choose. So, again, no monetary changes related to this amendment. And it was reviewed and finance and public safety and both of those committees with a positive recommendation.

Mr. Yoder And that was an error on my and I meant to send that to public safety in the conversation with Janice. I misspoke, so my apologies for the duplication of efforts. So, Jon I will refer to you twice.

Ms. Miele: I enjoyed the fact that we spent 10 minutes discussing the item and I think it did lead us to a handful of other things, was this - wanting to understand how many lease vehicles there are in the city and a summary of all existing - that would've benefited Newcastle people, so frankly it was perhaps useful even though there is no good reason for it to be in finance. But we had a good discussion.

Mayor: So, we are working and the lease vehicles across all of our lease vehicles, not as public safety. Anything that we have, we will get that list to counsel as well as our deck, I was talking to Joe Pawlak about that today.

Ms. Miele: Are we still looking at a lease agreement with enterprise?

Mayor: Yes, still exploit not. Because of their governmental pricing and different things - we are still looking at those.

Ms. Miele: Chief Snyder at some point, if you can jog my memory, I have a whole list of questions from Rachel (NAME) when she was working on that - back when she was working on and I don't think I got answers to them, but I will try to remember in a second.

The resolution was carried with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7to 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.

.TABLED

Resolution Authorizing the Partnership Between the City & RecDesk for Purchasing Recreation Software

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Ms. Drummond This software is not just for the recreation department, it is for making the lives of our citizens that much easier and accessible through everything feasible throughout the recreation apartment as well as the city. We have had a recreation software prior probably three or four years ago and it covered everything everything we needed to but it was not functional and I sat with this company via zoom three or four times myself, IT - it is a one-stop shop and it covers everything that we need and then some to implement at later times if needed. This is just to see if we can get this software up and running, it is compatible with the city's current software that we have, it is one base, they handle everything and then we just process everything on our end. It was reviewed and counsel and approved with a positive recommendation.

Ms. Miele: This was reviewed in finance and forwarded with a positive recommendation. And the software looks as though it will do for us - you'll pardon me Ms. Drummond, but what line is this \$5200 coming out of?

Ms. Drummond It is under my general office equipment and software.

Ms. Miele: Thank you, Ms. Katz was asking and I should have remembered. And how long is that rate guaranteed for?

Ms. Drummond Is a year-to-year contract. There is no termination fee, if things do not work three months or six months down the line, there is no penalty for anything. The only additional charge that would be is if the city changes the way it processes payment then there would be an additional \$1200 fee, but where it stands now, the 5200 is the fee for the year.

Ms. Miele That is the fee for this year, is a relatively stable year-to-year?

Ms. Drummond Yes, that is what it is every year.

Ms. Miele: In the contract it was simply a one-year contract so at finance we did not have the contract, we only had the summary document. And in the contract it was a one-year contract with an option to extend next year so I wanted to make sure the price was locked in every year.

I think it will take us a little bit of time to transition with the software so I don't want to see with the scope -- I don't want to see with us going for a year and then a year later it cost \$6000 so, has the administration put any thought to use this contract covers RecDesk, but we need a separate contract with emergent provider.

Ms. Drummond They handle everything.

Ms. Miele stated no they don't it says in the contract they do not.

Ms. Drummond Okay I was under the assumption that it does.

Ms. Miele: It says we need a separate contract with a credit card processor and they will charge is about 3.5 percent on every transaction.

Ms. Drummond Unless we distributed to the user itself.

Ms. Miele: And are not certain, it would depend on the credit card processor if we could do that, it would depend to a certain extent on RecDesk software if we would be able to push that charge through to the end user. Because, their software would have to be able to calculate not just the initial fee, but also the 3.5 percent, you know an army and a way to return to us etc. - I would think we can figure that out, I apologize, because we did not review the contract that is something that I know it was not a part of the initial discussion. And if it were not possible for us to simply increase, we may need to increase charges across the board to accommodate the 3.5 percent because that would assume the

majority of our users would be purchasing online, so would be paying the 3.5 percent on the majority of transactions for recreation. I guess I'm sadly trying to make certain that we talked about how -- and how the city is never likely to take in 500 K in recreation, however I think we all have a vested interest in us not taking whatever we currently taken -3.5 percent (CHUCKLE) so, that was - I don't know, Derek, have you guys talk about that at all? Or anybody talk about it? I know that in any treasurer's office now we charge a fee to pay by credit card online. But, you don't know if RecDesk can do that as a possibility, correct?

Ms. Drummond From what I understand it is the same system that the tax office uses and it is the same using that we can use.

Ms. Miele: Right, so the system that would allow us to charge the user fee. RecDesk can allow us to do that as well, that would be the only question

Ms. Drummond If I understood correctly, yes.

Ms. Miele: That is the only thing that I would want to make certain of. You probably spent as much time with credit card stuff as I do, right there is a lot of really weird laws and regulations and rules and things like that that you have to jump through and it sounds as though it were using the same one that the treasurer is using, then the processor has a capability, but the software may not contain the capability for whatever reason. So, that would be something that we should look into, but I don't know what that - my apologies Adam for not having talk about this on Tuesday so we can have it squared away by today. But, I did not have time to review the contract until earlier today. So that would be my only concern of the weather software looks great, they do business with - they are the leading provider of this sort of service to communities - I would imagine that they provide that service as well, but if they did not I think I would feel comfortable moving on this item on the understanding if RecDesk does not provide the ability to add a service fee to individual charges within the system then the city would have to agree to increase our recreation fees to cover the service fee for RecDesk which is a shame because it means we are also charging that the people who pay by cash or check or a medium that we do not pay a fee for -

Mr. Yoder I can understand that and support that - is it better to proceed without understanding or better to wait until we can answer the questions.

Ms. Miele: The only issue is try to make sure that the software goes live at the rack -- at the recreation center. Because we want to have all the implementation out for recreation, so I'm not sure what the timeline is there.

Ms. Drummond They are saying the turnover with training and everything is between 3 to 4 weeks.

Ms. Miele: So there is time. We can pause. That is the one thing that I would not mind understanding a little bit better is to tell the relationship between the processor and the company runs. And the only other thing is I want to make sure - it seems like they're pretty clear on up that we are clear that we are not going to trigger that \$1200 fee - right? We don't have any data that needs to be imported - okay.

Mrs. Katz : Do they have a charge card system? And what software company are they using? And where they coming from? I know from my story it was PNC.

Ms. Drummond Are not entirely sure what (NAME) uses, I reached out to Shannon who is there recreation director and she said she would get back to me and I am not -

Mrs. Katz: Because it probably is a charge card system for all of their activities it would be interesting to know who they are using. I would really like to know.

Ms. Drummond I can reach out and hopefully get something by end of next week.

Mayor: I know Councilman Miele just ask that, so we are looking into that not just the recreation department, but across the entire department with our financial software and how that fits into if we start accepting credit card payments for whatever the case may be.

Ms. Miele: Yes, we need to make sure that we're getting those service fees. I would check with Nick to make sure if this is a time that we are not fully satisfied with our processor we should know could change now rather than wait until we have all these modules (INDISCERNIBLE).

Mr. Pulizzi: So, Kayla thank you - I think I know the answer already, but just for the sake of asking like I'm going to - do we anticipate over \$500,000 worth of transactions in a year? Through the system? I do not think so, but I had to ask, merely because I see that anything in excess of \$500,000 we will be charged three quarters of a percent for quarter transaction fee which at the momentum is 15 thousand dollars per year.

Ms. Drummond that is not anything we will have to worry about this year.

Mr. Pulizzi : Okay, thank you.

Mr. Beiter: With the credit card processing, will that be out to RFP.

Mayor: Not necessarily. We could go there if we wanted to, but we do not have to.

Mr. Beiter: Out extender process I would assume.

Mr. Yoder: No other questions - do we want to vote on or table it for two weeks?

Mr. Beiter: My suggestion is that we table until next meeting to get those questions answered and I'm assuming Nick Grimes would be the first person that we would take this to to find that out from and to pending upon his answer then we will need to see action on the administration side based upon what route we are going to go with processor. This is no reflection upon the software itself that you're looking at I think it is something that is beneficial for everybody considering how we live on our phones and I mentioned in the committee meeting in people's ability to pay so they can take part in these programs. So - really the credit card processing is why I suggested table that until next week.

Ms. Miele made a motion to table this and it was seconded by Mrs. Katz.

Mr. Yoder asked for the vote to table.

The resolution was tabled with seven yes roll call votes. The vote was 7to 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 #9256

Resolution Awarding Bid for Cleaning Services to Choice Carpet City Hall

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Mr. Livermore What you have before you is a resolution authorizing the granite between city of Williamsport and choice carpet cleaners to enter a contract with choice carpet cleaners for janitorial services for city facilities trade and transit one, trade and transit two 810 Trinity Place which is a complete apartment starting on March 1, 2022 and ending December 31 2022. Not to exceed 38,325. This was reviewed in public works and pass with a positive recommendation.

Mrs. Katz stated this was reviewed in Public Work and sent to the full body of Council with a positive recommendation. Mr. Yoder asked for 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 #9257

Resolution Awarding Bid for Cleaning Services to Choice Carpet – River Valley Transit

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Mr. Winder stated an RFP was put out for choice carpet cleaners and they were the only bidder that came back and this is to clean all of the services for all RVT facilities that are related to transit and it is from March 1, 2022 until June 30, 2023. Not to exceed \$50,365 and the only reason we put not to exceed and there is we will have them cleaning carpets and they do shampoo etc. so we did put all inclusive items out of bid not to exceed that number. In it was reviewed and transit oversight committee and pass with a positive recommendation.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you Mr. Winder very quickly, because he is a lot of her time to talk about the authority processor what have you - Mr. Winder covered it all. Any other questions from other members of Council? We are missing two right now it is okay. Ms. Miele?

Ms. Miele: Do we think we received no other bid simple because choice is the only process in the area that can handle that sort of a contract?

Mr. Winder No, we actually gave four other companies mature, I'm not sure why they're not bid on it, it was put on bid for John Sander and we did have advertise.

Ms. Miele: Okay. Just curious. It does not seem as though cleaning city facilities at this point would be something that most people would be interested in bidding on so I'm confused - anyway - that is.

Mr. Yoder: Crazy market right now and that is across the board. People are turning down work because for number of reasons, we all understand. I'm sure that is a part of it. But, understood. Any other questions?

The resolution was carried with five yes roll call votes. The vote was 5 to 0. All were in favor.

Mr. Allison voted yes, Mr. Pulizzi voted yes, , Ms. Miele voted yes. Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Yoder voted yes, Mr. Mackey and Mr. Beiter left the room.

Resolution #9258

Resolution Authorizing a Professional Services Agreement Between RVT & Blackbaud Inc. for a Financial Management Hosting Services

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Mr. Winder stated Between River Valley transit and Blackbaud incorporated and Blackbaud is the upgrade to the financial edge package that we currently have that we currently have had since 2011. It is in the amount of \$90,971.15 for a total of 41 months with us being the management team for transportation pending the approval of (INDISCERNIBLE) they would cover half of the cost so that reduces us to just over \$45,000 for that term of the agreement. For the RVT portion - it would streamline quite a few things. With our financial package. It would also reduce the paper load drastically and this was reviewed in the transit oversight committee and password with a positive recommendation and I do have Nicole (NAME) CFO back there that can come up and answer any questions you have as well.

Mr. Yoder: This was reviewed in Transit as well as a positive recommendation, the thing that I would point out if I recall from the conversation, this is pretty common in transit to be used so should be pretty seamless there and then the cost sharing if I understood it correctly and we are to have this as well, they need the same upgrade, so we are doing this together as we are able to, so in the time it is just easier from a management perspective as well, correct?

Mr. Winder Correct and we are just showing the full total to city Council as well as the reduced amount so they understand the full total of what the cost breakout is.

Mr. Yoder: Correct. This is a positive recommendation, I defer to other members for additional questions. Ms. Miele.

Ms. Miele: Real quick, what is the cost for the upgrade? It says or replaces RVT's existing support and maintenance fees, so what were we paying previous?

Mr. Winder Will repaying previously? A little over 10,000 for us and a little over 10,000 --

Ms. Miele: So this doubles the fee?

Mr. Winder This is with endless bucks so it is nearly the same fee when all said and done okay.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the resolution.

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 #9259

Resolution Authorizing a Service Agreement between RVT & Johnson Controls

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Mr. Winder we have an agreement between Johnson Controls and River Valley transit, they are our provider for our fire service or fire alarm service system and this would allow them to come in and do the speaker test as well as the inspections that are required by L and I and it would not to exceed 1000 \$7600 and this was passed with a positive recommendation.

Mr. Yoder: Mr. Winder explained it pretty well I defer to other members.

Mr. Beiter: The only question I have, why is this something the fire department cannot do it with a contract aside to company like Johnson Controls?

Mr. Yoder: Coming from the industry a little bit, there is a proprietary nature to the technology purposely, because I don't think you want anybody coming off the street and messing with the fire alarm system number one and that is a big thing and number two - you need to get into the system and test specifically, so that is a big reason why and again for my experience this is well within market value. So, this is nothing to squawk at.

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 #9255

Resolution Authorizing a Labor & Industry Elevator Inspection Agreement Between RVT & Kone

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Mr. Winder explained Similar situation, Kone is a manufacturer of the two elevators at trade in transit - I'm sorry, Church Street parking garage a few months ago we did bring forward a service agreement which was approved by Council and this is the load test inspection that is required and they do required a third-party to do that. So it makes the most sense to use Kone for both elevators to be done it is not to exceed \$4500 and based upon their time.

Mr. Yoder stated this was reviewed and transit oversight in one quick question and if this was - if you mentioned this Tuesday, I did not catch a - did you say this was for the parking garage?

Mr. Winder Yes, Church Street.

Mr. Yoder: Should the parking authority covering the?

Mr. Winder It is covered by city of Williamsport/River Valley transit

So, third Street garage is owned by parking authority with the land owned by the city and church history is 100 percent city/RVT.

Mr. Yoder asked for 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 #9260

Resolution Authorizing the Sale of Public Works Snow Plow

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Mr. Livermore What you have before you is a resolution authorizing the sale of public works snowplow. The snowplow is obviously no longer in service and try to clean up a little bit and this will be placed on public surplus with a reserve bid of \$1500 and the money will be going into a liquid fuels account. This was reviewed of public works and pass with positive recommendation.

Mrs. Katz : I think you said it all the only thing that is not the resolution is the cost. The lowest bid.

Mr. Livermore You are right. I think Vince said something about it. But yes, so it is a reserve, it will go on their and we will accept anything less than 1500.

Mrs. Katz So it read authorizing the sale of snowplow that is no longer being used with a minimum bid of \$1500?

Would that be appropriate just to put in that respect? **I make a motion to amend**

Ms. Miele seconded it.

Mr. Yoder: Any discussion on the amendment? Who reviewed this?

Mr. Livermore I don't know if I sent it to Austin - I'll have to check into that.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the amendment.

The amendment to 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

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the resolution.

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 # 9261

Resolution Approving a MOU between WBP & the U.S. Probation Office Middle District PA

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Chief Snyder: Thank you Council before you, resolution authorizing a new memorandum of understanding between Williamsport burial police and US proration office located here through the federal building here at 240 W. third Street. As of 2022 the immutable police officers education and training commission also known as (NAME) has made it mandatory for all police officers - Police Department to provide defensive tactics instructions for all Police Department members. Currently Williamsport police to permit does not have an area to do such training for defensive tactics. And so we are looking for approval or a memorandum of understanding to utilize US probation's office for defensive tactics. Room. That is it. Any questions?

Mr. Yoder: Thank you chief Snyder, that was reviewed and Public Safety so I will refer to Jon.

Mr. Mackey: He said it all, this is required. And this is of no cost the city, so we pass this along with a positive recommendation.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you Mr. Mackey, any other questions from other members of Council related to this?

Chief Snyder : Just for record Austin reviewed and approved.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you for that, I appreciate that.

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 #9262

Resolution for a Contract for Services Between the City of Williamsport & Blueline K9, LLC

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

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

Chief Snyder Every before you approval resolution authorizing a new contract between Williamsport police and Mr. Joseph (NAME) of the proprietor of Blueline K-9 LLC out of all forest PA. I do have a resume that is attached to the memorandum that I provided to you - their resume, Mr. (NAME) outlines his certifications as well as his achievements. As a result of this new contract agreement, the cost of training service would be for each prospective team member for a total of \$3800 and that is a annual cost. Just for note, this new contract in agreement with blueline K-9 will yield a cost savings of about \$6200 from what we were paying with previous trainers that we had. So, this also was approved and reviewed and approved by Mr. Austin white and I will give it to the floor for any questions.

Mr. Mackey It was, the most exciting thing here is more saving about \$6200. Compared to what would be paying with the previous certification. Instructor. We did have a good conversation about the program itself - and the fact that this was all funded through donations. And Bonnie, if you want to that little bit - but we did pass this along with a full recommendation.

Mrs. Katz: This is near and dear to my heart. Also, we were to find out what is left in the account.

Chief Snyder Yes, we are about 29,700.

Mrs. Katz: Which means we have to do some fundraising.

Chief Snyder : Yes ma'am.

Mrs. Katz Especially if we want a third dog,. But, we're doing fine here, the dogs are healthy and the other thing - they are such a great benefit to the city. These are two four-legged extra police officers.

Chief Snyder : Asked -- absolutely, we have Captain Bill overseeing K-9 program and some awesome officers that are out there and I making things happen so they are doing a great job.

Mrs. Katz Fantastic, I'm excited for this program, really amp and to hear why the change, not only was a cost - for us is a better cost, but also to know that the other instructor was not certified - the wife was, but the gentleman - do I have that correct?

Chief Snyder : Right now we do not have a certification. Captain Bell can speak a little bit better to this program, we are dogs over certified when we receive them over the course of time and in the past we have lost our certification, so now with this new instructor he is certified - through a national certification which is (NAME) and Captain Bell can that - PS got the training and experience - almost 20 years experience that he can but it will allow our dogs to be certified once again. So, for our purposes, obviously litigation and for the use that we have to defend.

Mr. Katz I was upset about that one when I found that out. Because, that was one of the first things we are asking to make sure everything was certified because of the litigation and things - so - I am happy that it is being corrected and that will go forward with a full recommendation. Thank you chief.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the resolution.

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

Accept for filing::

Transit Oversight Committee 01/18/22

Finance Minutes 11/30/21

Controller Report October 2021

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second to accept these for filing.

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

The minutes were 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

Announcements

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

Upcoming Meetings:

Friday, February 15	11:00 AM	ERC Committee
Wednesday, Feb.23	11:30 AM	Redevelopment Authority*
Tuesday, March 1	11:30 AM	Public Safety
	1:00 PM	Finance Committee
	2:30 PM	Public Works
	4:00 PM	Transit Oversight Committee
Thursday, March 3	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

Mr. Keller Good evening councilmembers, Ralph Keller 301 Hughs Street, most of you already know I - to be figured out my house gets quarter of use to Elizabeth and about 50 feet from those fields. Baseball fields. I have a vested interest in whatever is done could affect my quality of life as well as my property value. So, I am interested

in what you're doing, I know there are some issues with the fields but I want to make a couple comments. There may be some grandiose plan we all want I can imagine, but just those fields, it is hard to imagine how you could spend three quarters of \$1 million to move a little dirt around and my family has been there since 1936 before Little League existed. So, I am familiar with the whole thing. The inner field has been there since the 50s. The outer field was put in when I was in junior high school early 60s. Those two fields have been in play for half a century. Under (NAME) - they were not fine, they had some issues, but how all of a sudden did they go from being playable fields under Brandon and now they cannot possibly be used without three quarters of \$1 million, just throwing that out there for what it is worth. Now - I would ask this and Mr. Mackey specifically, because it seems you have taken the lead on the whole thing - sorry - any of you have Google Earth on your computer - please go on Google Earth and look at the aerial view of Brandon Park and a zoom in on those fields. Specifically what is considered the girls Little League field or the softball field next to the street. You'll see that they shoehorned it in there it is not a regulation size field or shape, it is more of this shape - it is squeezed in there, he should have never been put there. There is water problems - so, if you're going to do something, do something with that field, get rid of it, move it, It is almost aimed at my house I have at least 50 dents in my siding, I've broken windows, broken car Windows - also my garage door - broken screens - there has been broken windows on people parking their - balls industries where kids are chasing them - do something with that field and either get rid of it, move it, reorient it or just to something to fix the problems and get rid of that nuisance once and for all. Thank you.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you Mr. Keller, appreciate it. Any other comments from the public? Hearing and seeing none any comments from the news media I doubt that there is - I think everybody is gone - okay. I'll take a motion for adjournment

d. News Media

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 10:56 PM with unanimous ayes.**

Submitted by:

Janice M. Frank
City Clerk