

Council President Adam Yoder brought the Williamsport City Council meeting to order on Thursday, January 6, 2022 at 7:00 PM.

**Council members present:**

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

**Absent:**

Liz Miele

**Also, Present:**

Derek Slaughter, Mayor,  
Mr. Joe Gerardi  
Mr. Joe Pawlak  
August Memmi  
Mark Killian, Fire Chief,  
Justin Snyder, Police Chief  
Solicitor Norman Lubin  
Janice Frank, City Clerk  
Adam Winder, RVT  
Kris Black, ITT

Approval of the Williamsport City Council minutes for 12/09/21 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.**

**Limited Courtesy of the Floor**

There were no requests.

**Ordinance Bill#1790-22**

**Ordinance Transfer Ordinance (first reading)**

The City Clerk read the ordinance.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

Mr. Pawlak stated During deliberations there were discussions to money for planning for the CDB department and finalizing a budget for the IT department. This transfer reallocates the money that was placed in contract services for CDBG. - -

Mr. Yoder Thank you Mr. Pawlak. Are there any questions from members of council on the ordinance? Okay. Seeing and hearing none Mrs. Frank on the motion.

**The ordinance was carried in first reading with a roll call of 6 to 0. All were in favor.**

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

**Resolution #9233**

**Resolution Real Estate Exoneration 2801 Linn St**

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

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

Mr. Grimes stated This is for a real estate exoneration. This is where property located at 2801 Linn Street. This is a Habitat for Humanity bill. The agreement has been that these buildings are tax exempt until they are sold to the family that will later occupy that property.

Mr. Yoder: Are there any questions or comments from council this evening?

**The resolution was carried with six roll call votes. All were in favor.**

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

**Resolution #9234**

**Resolution Real Estate Refund 645 Campbell St**

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

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

Mr. Grimes. This is for a real estate refund of 645 Campbell Street read this property was damaged by fire and reassessed. The amount of the refund for this property would be \$516.79.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the resolution.

**The resolution was carried with six roll call votes. All were in favor.**

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

**Resolution #9235**  
**Resolution Real Estate Refund 700 W. Edwin St**

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

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

Thank you. This is a real estate refund for 2021 city real estate taxes. This is for the property at 700 W. Edwin Street on by Williamsport Family Associates. There was a court order to reduce the assessed value of this property but in January 2021 from 2,280,000 - - two \$1,202,500. The property taxes were already paid by the time the court order came in so they refund is due in the amount of \$16,250.07.

Mr. Yoder asked for comments and a vote.

**The resolution was carried with six roll call votes. All were in favor.**

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

**Resolution #9236**  
**Resolution Real Estate Refund 431 Park Ave**

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

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

Mr. Grimes This is the last one. I promise. This is damage that occurred on August 9. This is to refund the difference between the previous assessment and the new assessment for the remainder of the year at 431 Park Avenue. The amount of this refund is \$423.01.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the resolution.

**The resolution was carried with six roll call votes. All were in favor.**

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

**Resolution #9237**  
**Resolution Amending City Council Meetings for Year 2022**

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

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

Mr. Yoder I will walk you all through what is on the floor for this resolution. Every year we set a resolution for setting the dates for all of our Council meetings. Following our most recent budget deliberations I wanted to bring this forward to some dispersement discussion and potentially offer a resolution to spend the time we have to work through the budget annually. Outlined in the third Quest optional charter under section 418, the administration is to present the budget to council unless stated meeting November. Article 417 also states that leading up to and by November the administration is to go through the process with department heads to compile and put together, and prepare preparation to present the budget. Going through that and looking at last year's dates that we put together I came up with a proposal that I wanted to bring forward to council and get everybody's thoughts on. Originally - - and let me pull up the original resolution. I promise I can talk tonight. That we passed back in October. As it says today we have a meeting, a full meeting on November 10, November 22 or both Thursdays and we have work sessions on Monday, November 28, Wednesday, November 30. Under this structure the mayor would present the budget to us by November 22 leaving us around six-ish days to get familiar with it before we go into work sessions. The resolution before you on the agenda changes that, and I'm going to pull that up here and I will note the differences here. So the new resolution, the only changes of dates are in November. So it cancels the end meeting in November and moves the first meeting to November 3, which is the first Thursday of the month. Moves our work sessions to the middle of November, it would be Monday, November 13, Wednesday, November 16 and we would leave December the same, giving us two ratings to approve the budget leading to the ordinance. What this does is it rather than a 2 to 3 week process we have a roughly 6 week-ish process. That gives us much more time to digest the budget, come up with solutions to various things that we need to. It eliminates the time crunch that we have all expressed frustration over and I certainly think that we want to see fixed. That's what I brought forward for everybody. I want to disperse some debate and get everybody's thoughts on it and if everybody is in agreement we can certainly amend that tonight. I will yield the floor and hear from other members of Council. Mr. Allison.

Mr. Allison Yeah I like the idea that you have presented of looking at another alternative. Of course I think, the devil is always in the details as far as - - I guess as I was thinking of this, contingent upon doing this we would need a process in place, some kind of process through the year so that when we get to this point, you know, collaboration with city Council and the administration so that we are on track to get there and it is only common

sense. We get to that meeting - it is certainly something to have a meeting about. Also, I guess we would have room for regular city business, somewhere there and the rest of November because it does tend to come up around that time as well.

Mr. Yoder Certainly. Under this proposal we would only have one regularly scheduled meeting in the month of November for normal business. I think giving ample time and in January that gives the administration about 10 months to make sure that everything that needs to be done in November is done on the November 3 meeting. In the event of an emergency we could certainly schedule a special meeting in the event of a dire emergency for sure, but that would change that a little bit. We would have a gap for specific city business, but to your point Mr. Allison about, I think the collaborative process that we have asked for the last couple of years, that I think frankly council has asked for for probably a solidarity between that and trying to address this time crunch of a budget, you know, we can certainly do that. I think at a minimum, you know, some discussion items in the finance committee recurring would be a good medium for that. Making the mayor of finance personnel are all members of the committee. I think that's a great way to do that and I think we can proactively schedule that so that the administration is well aware of our asked and adamantly prepared for that. I agree with that completely. I think that is a great way to potentially handle that. To answer your question we would currently have under this proposal one meeting in the month of November. Ample time I think to plan for the ministrations perspective. The other contingency is that we would need in the event of a dire emergency I think. Thank you Mr. Allison are there other comments or questions from counsel? Mr. Pulizzi?

Mr. Pulizzi I like this idea. I think the more time we have to look over the budget, go over the budget, see where we are going, to councilmember Allison! Making sure we stay on track and obviously I'm not going to speak for the mayor, but I've spoken to the mayor and he has expressed to me that he is ready to go and very much looking forward to increasing the amount of communication between him and his office and the City Council throughout the entirety of the year and we are all in this together, we are all going to work together, and we can also succeed together. I'm actually really looking forward to it.

Mrs. Katz I like this idea from the standpoint, it gives us more time to digest everything going on and it also gives us more time with questions and if we have to come up with other alternatives. I think this would be better all the way around. I think everyone of us over - all of these years that I have been on counsel, always stated that we have not had enough time to really digest the budget and we are always being stressed out with trying to accomplish what we have to accomplish in such a short period of time. I think this gives the administration more time. Gives the departments more time and it also gives us more time. I am all for this process at this point.

Mr. Allison Not directly related to this point, but perhaps the mayor, or Joe can chime in on this. Are there other - are there different software's or formats that we can receive the budget in? We have always done it a certainly. Does it make sense to look at that? Knowing nothing about what kind of software is out there.

Mayor Slaughter Good evening President Yoder. There are. We are exploring those. We have been explained those actually pretty we started exploring them last year and just as soon as we have a clear picture of the finances. The goal is the real-time financial software, really it will be a continual budget process throughout the entire year, but as councilmember Pulizzi mentioned a few minutes ago and I did speak about that, I am in full agreement that this should be continuous throughout the year. So, yes there are various software, financial software's that are out there, that we are exploiting currently, have been exploring and looking at now and hopefully in the future we will be able to bring a resolution to council with that software. So yes, I don't think it will just be adventitious for the ministration, but for City Council as well who handles the day-to-day finances. You know, who is in charge of the city finances as well. We are very much looking forward to that and it will be beneficial once council decides on a technology, which we have been talking about for a while, too. That you have in real time during the meetings as well. So hopefully the financial software that is selected between administration and the Council, I think it will obviously assist the entire budget process and just the financial process throughout the year on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the resolution..

**The resolution was carried with six roll call votes. All were in favor.**

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

#### **Resolution #9238**

#### **Resolution Authorizing an Agreement between River Valley Transit & Guardian CSC**

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second.

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

Mr. Winder Good evening. This resolution is in regards to an agreement with Guardian CSC. This is for the heating system at the trade and transit centers. It is a closed loop system for the cooling and heating system for the heat pumps as well as the cooling tower. Guardian has been the company that has been doing the water treatment since the systems were put in place. It's for a total amount of \$3607 for a year. They do cover quite a few items. The biggest things are corrosion and deposition onto the metal surfaces of your closed loop heat pump system,

corrosion, deposition, biological growth in your cooling tower system and minimize the risk of (WORD?) by using recommended oxidizing by oxide. Like I said it's the company that has been used since the systems were put into place. I'm open for any questions you may have.

Mr. Yoder: Are there any questions from members of council on the resolution this evening? Hearing and seeing none. Mrs. Frank on the motion please.

**The resolution was carried with six roll call votes. All were in favor.**

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

### Resolution #9239

#### Resolution Authorizing a Public Hearing Pursuant to the Formation of a New Transportation Authority

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second.

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

This resolution is to authorize Mr. Nagy advertised - - February 17, 2022 Council meeting pertaining to the formation of a new Transportation Authority and solicitor Nagy is on zoom so we will entertain any questions from

Mr. Yoder: Thank you Mr. Winder. Are there any questions from Council members this evening? So the only question that I have, are we able to modify - so there's a proposal put together that is included in the resolution. You know, so this is something that we have been talking about for a while. You know, this is something certainly that I think our newly formed transportation intake committee will get into the weeds on to make sure that everything is in line, that sort of thing and manage that process or us. My only question is, are we able to modify the proposal after the public hearing?

Mrs. Nagy Yes. This is only to take public comment on the information itself. So the specifics of the formation and how that is going to ultimately look, if you want to change the number of board members, all of those things can change after. This is not like his zoning ordinance. It just to get, and the formation itself so thereafter council can certainly consider the resolution and the wording. They don't have to take action even that night. We just have to have a public hearing prior to formation with 30 days' notice.

Mr. Yoder: Okay. Then I guess a follow-up question. Should we begin the process publicly of going through the proposal, putting that together and have a, I guess, a vetted, agreed-upon proposal between council in the administration but - before we do a public hearing? Legally it seems like we are okay, but you know, in the event that we get public comment on this and we change it - it may not lend itself to maximum transparency and that maybe I'm looking too much into it. It's something else that struck me as maybe we are a little backwards in our initial process here. Wanted to get other people's thoughts on that as well. She.

Mr. Allison: I guess this would be for Jill. What format is the public hearing take on this kind of particular item?

Mr. Nagy So it's not going to be on any of the nuts and bolts of who owns property, who is getting buses, the timing of things, employees. It's just going to be a very general open floor public comment period on whether or not anyone from the public wishes to make comment on whether they have any questions or concerns about the formation itself. All of the technical nuts and bolts will have to be worked out afterwards. This just allows for the filing of articles of incorporation and it to Mr. Yoder's points, I think some of those things will be worked out in the committee and before council to ultimately vote on it summit meeting before the public hearing. It's merely for input on the formation itself. It's an administrative dialogue and it may be too your point President Yoder, you may end up changing some of the things afterwards based on public input so you are certainly working together in your committees as well as with the public before you get to a final version.

Mr. Yoder: Very good thought Mrs. Nagy. That makes sense to me, too. You have answered my questions. Other members of council have any other questions related to the motion? All right hearing and seeing none. Mrs. Frank on the motion please.

**The resolution was carried with six roll call votes. All were in favor.**

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

#### Lot Consolidation 605 Poplar St

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and a second.

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

Mr. Knarr When presented to you tonight is a lot consolidation of two parcels into one. It is currently located in the R two district. It's at the corner of Poplar Street and West third Street up in the Newberry section. One of the parcels has a garage on it. They are consolidating both of these parcels for the future building that is being placed up there now, which is a single-family dwelling with a storage area. As part of that because their crossing of the lot lines it requires these two parcels to be added as one parcel. It was reviewed by both County planning as well as the city planning, with both positive regulations and no comments. I can answer any questions at this time.

**The lot consolidation was carried with six roll call votes. All were in favor.**

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

### **Demolition 1033 Washington Blvd - David Raemore**

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion and second.

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

Mr. Gerardi stated Any demolition request that is a primary structure on the ground must speak - become before consult before that emotion. What we have before you is Mr. David Raemore is requesting a demolition at 1033 Washington Boulevard, which is located in the CC district, which is in a commercial district. The structure presently being used as a dentist office. What he wishes to do is remove the structure. Build a new one, a little more conducive to the area. Everybody understands this property is located on the southwest corner of Washington Boulevard and Sherman Street. A land of omen plan will be presented and of course you will see that before it comes - before it gets built. I'm here if you have any questions

Mr. Yoder asked for a vote on the demolition,.

**The demolition was carried with a roll call of 6 to 0. All were in favor.**

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

Accept for filing::

Williamsport Water & Sanitary Authority 12/17/21

Veteran's Memorial Park Commission 10/04/21

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

**Mr. Pulizzi made a motion and it was seconded by Mr. Mackey.**

**The minutes were accepted for filing with a roll call of 6 to 0. All were in favor.**

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

Announcements

The next regularly scheduled City Council meeting will be held on Thursday, January 20, 2022 at 7:00 PM, Trade & Transit II, 144 West Third St. 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Williamsport, PA

Upcoming Meetings: To be determined

Mr. Yoder asked if there were any comments from members of Council.

Mr. Mackey: Thank you President Yoder. I just had a couple of things. Most important I think it would be great before we all leave here tonight if we could get another ARPA meeting scheduled and more specifically, I don't want to say that we've been spinning our wheels a little bit because we've gotten a decent amount accomplished, but I think that there are certain things that are more ready to be done than others and I'm speaking specifically of recreation. So it would be my suggestion that as we hold these ARPA work sessions that we don't talk about the entire city and all of the things that we want to do in one meeting. It would seem to make more sense to break these meetings down a little bit and focus more on things that might be more ready to do than others. So specifically Mr. Mayor, I know you have splash pads in mind, which again I think is a great idea. It is no secret that I would like to get some money allocated to fix up the brand in the Park baseball fields. These are both projects and Mr. Sander is not here tonight, but these are both projects that from what I understand are ready to go. The sooner we get this money allocated the sooner we can break ground when it is time. That might even give us an opportunity to have splash pads and baseball and Brandon Park this summer. That's the first thing, but that's - the second thing that's a little less urgent. I have just been thinking. It is a little cumbersome for people to come here, citizens to come here and talk to us about things that are going to be on the agenda. We do have public comment, but that's at the end of the meeting let's face it, sometimes these meetings last three hours and it's really kind of - it's not okay to ask that the citizens sit here for three hours to be able to speak to us about something that probably we have already voted on and they really cannot change our minds so to speak. Wondering if we can think about ways that we can make limited courtesy of the floor, maybe we can call it something else. We probably have to amend the code, the administered of code? Just to make it easier for the citizens of Williamsport to come to these meetings and talk to us about things that are on the agenda before we actually vote on them. I know that there is a process in place for limited courtesy of the floor, but it is a bit cumbersome and I'm not really sure how many Williamsport residents know how that works. Even if we can get it out there, this is how it works. People are busy, people are working and maybe they decide the morning of city Council that, hey there is something on this agenda that I want to come talk about tonight and I want to talk about it before they vote on it, but I missed my window to get on the agenda to talk about it. I think that we need to think about - I know that this is how it has always been done, but I think that we need to look at kind of reworking that system just a little bit. Those are the two things that I have.

Mr. Yoder: Thank you Mr. Mackey. If I may I will go in reverse order to maybe offer feedback and thoughts. Regarding the public comment, you know, so that process has been in there for a while and it is structured that way for a particular reason, right? Limited courtesy of the floor is meant to be at the beginning of the meeting before anything is delivered and voted on to give the public an opportunity to speak to an item before we open deliberation so we can take that into consideration when we vote. General comments at the end are really anything in general that don't have to do anything with the agenda or what have you. There are two things that pop up to me that I think probably drive whether it is the lack of engagement from the community or whether it is the cumbersome this of the process. Number one it is frankly the process that we have in place I think to vet legislation, which is needed in a good process, committee process. We have roughly a six day window to get items from the administration, push them to the process before the next Council meeting, right? So limited courtesy of the floor is set up in a way that fits under the process currently because there are items that could come from committee, either be generated from committee or change in committee, or be added or removed after the agenda is set on Friday, right? So that's why there is a deadline for limited courtesy. It reflects that deadline. The other component of that, I would make the argument, and this is no ill reflection of anything. I think it is just society in general. There's just a general lack of engagement and I don't know that addressing the process would address that. We need a better communication medium to get that out there, I think whatever that process is. I would encourage you if you want to look at this. I'm happy to work with you on this. If we were to look at ways to make the process better. I think that would be a really great thing for us to look at and we can certainly do that, but I don't think changing the process is going to solve the issue in its entirety is my point, but certainly happy to entertain that and look at that with you. Regarding the ARPA funding, you know, I certainly understand where you are coming from and we have had conversations about this, John. I would say the counterargument to what you're saying is I think we have said this all along. We shouldn't rely on this money to do things that we want, necessarily focus on specific needs or what have you. It can help solve a lot of problems, but we have these problems if we didn't have this money anyway. We also, I think we generally agree that we don't think that this money should just be the easy button. We should still maximize how far it goes. We should look for grants for everything and recreation for example is an area where we typically do get a lot of grant items and at the other component of this, and I have struggled to articulate this to the public, to other members of Council and administration. We need to understand, at least I would like to understand what is, how we get the biggest bang for our buck. How do we get the biggest return because we just went through a budget process where we have a budget deficit. We have a revenue growth rate that far - is way behind our expenditure growth rate. If we do not fix both of those we can put \$20 million into anything and 5 to 7, to 10 years we are going to be in the same problem and those rates are going to be even more out of whack. I am all for figuring this out sooner than later and figuring out as fast as we possibly can. I would be more than happy to entertain putting a meeting out there and getting feedback on if we want to schedule a meeting later in the month, February, March, whenever council deems appropriate. I am all for that. I don't know that giving things up is effective because the additional component if that is, let's say that we can start to quantify finally areas that are going to get a bigger return and let's say that we have less money. We could get to the point where, all men we should have really put more here and in a couple of years we could've had more back and we could have done more of recreation. More of streets, that sort of thing. So I feel like we can finish that up and do that hopefully pretty expediently I appreciate where you're coming from, John. I think the way we get there looks different, but I guess with the end goal I am happy to entertain that setting something up and maybe just getting there in a different way.

Mr. Mackey Could we at least get a meeting on the books before February? I'm still unclear as to why we would still wait until the end of February beginning of March.

Mr. Yoder: And just throwing timelines out there.

Mr. Mackey is January 6. So yeah. I think at the very least I would like to see a meeting get set sooner rather than later so that we can start having some of these discussions because I completely understand everything that you're saying and I just don't think. You cannot quantify everything, right? At some point we need to show the citizens of Williamsport that we are willing to take this money and it really was, you call it a gift, you can call it whatever you want. This is a once in a lifetime situation here. We need to show the citizens of Williamsport that we are willing to spend this money on things that they think are important not only what we as a group and as an administration think might be the most fiscally conservative or financially sound things to invest this money because at the end of the day this is not our money. It's not the ministrations money. As the city of Williamsport's money and I think it is pretty clear that a decent majority of, a good majority, a good portion of the citizens of Williamsport value recreation and what I'm hearing is that we need more places for people to go. We need baseball in Brandon Park. We need splash pads. We need the pool to be open again. Again, let's get a meeting scheduled sooner rather than later and let's start talking about some things and allocating some money. Two things that are ready to go is what I would like to see and I'm just one vote, but I would be interested to hear what other people have to say on this and at the very least let's get a meeting scheduled tonight.

Mr. Allison I agree that we should have a meeting soon. I think we all agree on that. The administration as well. I have kind of calm, started in one position regarding recreation and after giving it a lot of thought and seeing how things are transpiring on trending more towards what John was speaking about. We're not talking about an amount

of money at, but I think we want to grow our whole area and we need to do that economically, but we need to do that in quality of life components as well so that we can draw more people that want to live and enjoy our city. Also the facilities that we have that they can be in good shape. Brandon Park is a good example, but so is East and Park, Shaw place. That's a Brownfield as far as recreation is concerned right now. There's a lot that we can do with that I think at a minimal cost, or a reasonable cost that can bring that place to life and there are things that are going on that the administration is already working on there, but there's a lot of land there that we could really develop and make that part of East End begin to be vibrant and for the families and people that are going to want to buy homes there and lived there. Anyhow, short form, yeah I think it would be good to talk about it. We only have half the money that we are going to get. It would be ideal if there wasn't that short time span that all of this has to be spent in because a lot of this needs to be, we want to think it out in plain it out as much as we can, but that's hard to do in the amount of time that we are being presented so we are going to have to do the homework, quantify as much as we can and put a decent plan forward so a lot of moving parts, but I do kind of trend more towards what John is saying now because those yes - our finances in our facilities are lagging behind both of them. I think we can do two things at once is all I'm saying.

Mr. Beiter Has a separate budget been treated for these ARPA funds so they are easier to keep track of?

Mr. Pulizzi I concur.. (SPEAKER AWAY FROM MIC). Not that we are to say how much money is going where, but I would like to make a move on this. I've spoken the city and members of Council Be nice to get everybody on the same page as far as hearing what the city wants our. There are a different between wants and needs. As we have heard there's a lot of people that want an awful lot and they want the Brandon Park baseball fields. Let's see if there's anything we can do to get them what they need. ) I do have a question from Mayor Slaughter. Mayor if we want to try to schedule a meeting, just hypothetically two weeks to go over some concern - -

Mayor >> Yes we have already started that process . I think within two weeks we could have that to you. We have also started meeting with D.C. and are to make a conference of plan in regards to recreation and open space.

Mr. Pulizzi So maybe we can look at scheduling something and then maybe in two weeks or more time.

Mr. Yoder> So if we are going to start throwing dates out there. What we've done in the past, what I thought has worked is using off Thursday because I think we typically have that time blocked off. Our next regularly scheduled meeting moving forward is every two weeks. That would leave open January 13, which is next week the 27th. February 10 and the 24th. So we have four dates in January. Between January and February. The way you are talking Mr. Pulizzi. Maybe the 27th might be a good starting point.

Mrs. Katz I haven't heard from you. What you think about the discussion on the ARPA funding here.

Mrs. Katz thank you. I cannot hear what Vince was saying because his microphone was very low. If I'm repeating anything that he said I apologize. A couple of the things with what John is talking about with recreation. Recreation has been near and dear to my heart ever since I've been on council and, you know, we have to emphasize what we need in our parks as far as family-friendly activities. One of the things with the baseball parks in Brandon Park. When we have the spinning set up I think we should also talk to, what is his name that came? I cannot think right now. Michael? Thank you. Thank you very much. I think we should also find out from him because he also stated that he is going after people for donations and see where he stands with that. I think we should incorporate that into our conversation. I really do want to make sure that we are going after some funding for our parks and see if there is any funding out there, which we should be talking to our lobbyist to see what all they can go after at this point. I agree with you atom that we should be leveraging some of this money also. As it states, let's make money with money. What I'm saying is let's get our ducks in a line before we have our meeting on the 27th. Let's ask Mr. Fox where he is at, where he stands. He was very enthusiastic about the baseball parks and Brandon Park. The baseball fields, I'm sorry. Using the wrong terminology. To see where he stands. Get in touch with our lobbyist to see how far they can go for funding, and go from there. As far as splitting the agenda with ARPA funds, everything we discussed. It does get mighty confusing and we feel like, I feel sometimes that it is a lot on our plate and we're not accomplishing a lot. I really want to make sure that we start digging into this and not just sitting on this, and you know, waffling back and forth about what we are going to do with this money. I think all of our objectives are to make money, to make our city better with this money and to use this money intelligently. I think we have to use all of our assets that we can get involved with as far as people that want to put in like for the baseball fields. There donations and our lobbyist. That's my input for this. You know, I think the 27th within a couple of weeks, let's see how much we can accomplish in that time to get some information. I'm finished.

Mr. Yoder Thank you Mrs. Katz. If I am hearing, January 27 for potential ARPA work session? You won't be available?

We will do that live? We have traditionally done them via Zoom, but I don't see any reason why we couldn't.

: I have no concerns or issues whether it is moving forward with Council meetings doing it live and doing work sessions live at this point. If that would change due to external conditions, it is either or for me. I would suggest live. Okay.

Mr. Mackey Would this work session have a public comment component?

Mr. Yoder: I think we can certainly do that. Let me double check. I would like to. Let me double check the rules. Whether we like them or not they are there for a reason and that they are legally binding what have you. Yes.

Mr. Mackey Just a couple of things. I did have some initial conversations with - my mind just went blank. The lobbyist - thank you. Keller. I don't know exactly how much grant money is out there currently for these specific things that we want to do. Just to be clear, again I know I have said this several times. Specifically speaking about Brandon Park and the baseball fields, this is a city-owned facility. We are not giving this money to wall. This is the city of Williamsport fixing up a dilapidated piece of property that we currently own and are currently leasing to the Williamsport baseball league and they are doing a lot of fundraising and they actually - their organization right now is running as well as it has ever run, but they cannot fund raise enough to do this kind of work. They can fund raise enough to take care of these places once they are fixed up. I have full confidence in that, but you cannot sell enough ice cream cones at a Little League game to do this kind of work. I just wanted to put that out there. This is the first step, right? We have the meeting scheduled and that was my primary concern.

Mr. Yoder Thank you Mr. Mackey. We will get that advertise. One item that I don't think we have any clarity on, but is probably actually the most important. I think we need clarity on compliance of this funding allocation of it. How we are going to achieve compliance. No disrespect to the administration and specifically our finance department. I don't think that we can do this in-house. That's not because of skill set, it is because of timing. I don't see us being able to pull that off and I don't think any of us want to be compliant wrong by any means and repeat what we have inherited here. I would ask the administration specifically to thoroughly understand what that looks like and, you know, that's a big piece that I think we need to discuss and figure out how we are going to achieve that.

Mayor Slaughter The final rule came out today so I started digging into that. I wanted to just cancel member Mackey on grants. - - For the recreation and open space, the comprehensive plan and we had a meeting with DCR to address that comprehensive plan and it DCR suggestion was to any recreational items we have now to move forward with those and simultaneously update the plan this year and then we can apply for grants for projects, additional projects for next year. The planning grant this year and next year, but going forward for any projects we have going on the docket, but we are moving concurrently with DCR and looking for grants with color and dealt us so by the 24th we will have an update on that as well. Thank you.

Mrs. Katz. Glad to hear that, Mayor.

Mr. Yoder: January 24 at 7:00 p.m.. Great. We will get to advertise. The other comments Mr. Mackey? Mr. Mackey I just gonna say they almost got us out of here in under half an hour as your first time as president

Mr. Yoder asked if there were comments from the administration.  
There were none.

Mr. Yoder asked if there were comments from the general public.  
There were none.

Adjournment

Mr. Yoder asked for a motion to adjourn.

**Meeting adjourned** upon motion by **Mrs. Katz and a second by Mr. Allison** **Meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM with unanimous ayes.**

**Submitted by:**

**Janice M. Frank**  
**City Clerk**