

Council President Randy Allison brought the meeting of the Williamsport City Council meeting to order on Thursday, December 16, 2021 at 7:00 PM per remote.

Council members present:

Randy Allison, President
Elizabeth Miele, Vice President
Bonnie Katz, Councilwoman
Adam Yoder, Councilman,
Vince Pulizzi, Councilman, absent
Jon Mackey, Councilman,
David Banks, Councilman

Absent:

Vince Pulizzi

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

Mr. Allison Good evening and welcome everyone to our Williamsport City Council meeting. It is December 16 2021. 7:05 PM. Tonight we are going to do some regular business, this is a special meeting that was scheduled to take care of some regular business, but also to finish up our budget work for the year. This will be our last meeting of the year and we will stick to that so, I need to make an announcement first, we had an executive /work session before Council, an executive work session before this meeting tonight. To discuss some legal issues. Regarding RVT and some other things. So, thank you for your patience tonight.

Limited Courtesy of the Floor

There were no comments.

Appointment

Historical Architectural Review Board

Mary Rucinski, 411 Arch St will be appointed to the HARB Board to a staggered 5 year term commencing 1/6/22 and ending 4/12/27

Mr. Allison stated that her term will be staggered cause these are five year terms and are appointed to the board, it says to a staggering five year term - it is staggering that she is willing to do it for another five years, but I think we do not want to say staggering meaning that her five years - all of the terms do not coincide and come to a start and end in the same year so there is overlaps. She will be having a staggering five year term starting in 5.6.20 22, and ending April 12, 2027. Mary cannot be here tonight - but I think we all know her in the community development department in her volunteer time to serve on the board - she was on there for many years and is a great asset to the city. Has been and still is, she has done a lot of work outside on her own in the historical district and part of her job was in community development to update our historical structures in the city from time to time. So that way we have an accurate depiction of what and where they are. So, she is more than qualified because she has been a driver and a force. So, I will ask for a motion and second on this appointment.

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

Mr. Yoder stated There are some other openings on the board and I think Skip, you and Chelsea are working in bringing some other names

Mr. Memmi answered Yes, we plan over the next couple of meetings to bring one or two or three possible candidates to fill vacancies on the board to get a backup to the number which I think is something like 11. We have received some letters of interest and we are reviewing them and getting ready to provide them to counsel for you to review and decide whether you want to appoint them or not. But, Mary was a no-brainer, she served on that board for I don't know, at least 10 years that I am aware of and probably longer. And she is still very interested, she has more historical knowledge than probably anybody on board so I believe she would be a valuable addition in that capacity I will answer any questions if there are any.

Mr. Yoder stated I was just going to echo some of the sentiments - I do not know Mary very well, but I know she is very thorough and detail oriented and brings a lot of expertise to the table and I would simply ask her - we had a very vigorous discussion earlier in the year about an appeal that was brought to us and I think a number of us were hoping to see some more work between the party and in the board and looking for more of a middle ground and as I have learned more about the Harb board, I think they are aware of that and so I just asked that they continue to make those strides on the HARB board and just keep in mind that not every application is the same - I know we try to apply equally, but there are areas within the historic district - that are probably not equal and probably deserves much more leniency compared to others so I would just ask her to keep that in mind as she serves and once more just thanking her for wanting to do this longer.

Ms. Miele stated My only thought when I saw this on our agenda was thank God, how lucky are we that she is willing to give back and keep doing this! She was instrumental in putting things together outside of the historic district, she is historic and so many elements, compassion and involved. We are extremely lucky that she is willing to continue to serve us in this capacity and on the HARB board. So much experience that we lost when she was retired and reports that she is bringing it back, thank you.

Mr. Allison asked for a vote on the appointment.

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

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

Mr. Allison changed the order of the agenda.

Ordinance #6423

Ordinance Forty-Eight Year (2022) Community Development Budget (final reading)

Mr. Allison asked for a motion to adopt this ordinance in final reading.

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

Mr. Memmi after our meeting last week - we were directed to go back and try to reevaluate the numbers and rework them and provide you with additional information which we did. And we are still looking for some funding out of the general fund in the amount of about \$150,000. That would cover the costs of SEDA COG and HARB/RDA . Unless you tell me the rest of the budget is the same as was presented. The HARB be broken down by hours and we came up to about \$18,387. For staff time. And we were able to with the SEDA COG element to it, that came out to approximately \$129,000. That is kind of how we did the math to get to 150,000 and I will try to answer any questions that you may have. It is up to counsel how they want us to proceed doing the things that we have normally done relevant to HARB and RDA and activities of economic development which are somewhat outside the scope of the CDBG and home program, that is why we are asking for the additional funds. Thank you.

Mr. Allison stated Okay, thank you Skip. And just as a refresher, the original ask was 250,000 from the general fund. That has been reduced down to 150,000. And last week's discussion centered somewhat on a contract with SEDA COG which was around 83,000 I think.

Mr. Memmi stated The total contract once we did all of the math came out to about 126 to be honest with you with SEDA COG

Mr. Banks stated All right - I want to attack this from the reverse skip, what did you cut from the original proposal?

Mr. Memmi Of the 250, we reduced some of the time that would have been staff time that would have been used for other projects. And that is how we were able to reduce that. The staffing time that we were all hoping for is for HARB and Chelsea in mind, part of it for our other economic develop and activities that we highlighted in the earlier presentation where we were putting time and with different organizations such as the chamber etc. We were able to cut a back - but at the end of the day if we cannot find the room within the budget to help fund HARB from the general fund to be able to cover our staff costs, we probably how to eliminate the SEDA CoG contract.

Mr. Banks Just on the record - I am for what is proposed now, I just wanted to make sure we were not doing anything to cripple your capabilities.

Mr. Memmi answered Mr. Banks I believe at this time we have worked the numbers really hard and with the direction of counsel feel comfortable that we can still do what we need to do at the lesser number. We may have been a little bit too exuberant, but after taking directions from Council I think we have a number that is doable that will maintain our ability to do what we need to do and we just need to be very judicious in how we allocate our time. I will say it like that.

Mr. Yoder With the revised ask - any thoughts or was there any investigation into - other areas of the general fund that we could change? I guess the simple question is, do you have any proposals of how to pay for it besides pulling it from starting balance essentially?

Mr. Memmi This is totally new to this office - I would not to know even where to look and I have been given no suggestions into where we else would look. We just know that there is not enough revenue anymore in the CDBG /home program to continue to cover the costs of the office. The allocation which is about \$1.3 million per year and you are only allowed to use 15% for administrative costs - the costs of administration continue to rise. Whether it is healthcare or other benefits or salaries, all of those costs continue to go up and the allocation from the federal government does not go up and therefore we start running out of money and we cannot cover staff costs let alone doing the things that we need to do to run a very efficient office and that plays back to the SEDA CoG contract where they would be able to provide us a level of expertise that we have not had in the past. Where else in the city budget could those funds be found? I just do not have that answer.

Mr. Yoder stated that is my only question, if the mayor has additional questions or comments, that is perfectly fine, but I just did not know without something that was looked out or not.

Mr. Banks stated Refresh my memory everybody, this will probably be everybody that I remember and I do not we passed this with a zero increase last time and so we would have to amend this, correct?

Mr. Allison answered Correct And that would take five votes. Five votes to increase.

Mr. Banks asked Mayor Slaughter? How does your office view this? As far as us moving forward?

Mayor Slaughter It is an investment upfront and I think it will pay dividends in the long run down the road each year and I think we will see a return on investment and we cannot quantify that fully right now, but I do think that will be the investment that we are making - we did the COVID budget at this point other than the fund balance there is nowhere else to start from. At this point. But, I do think the challenge that counsel and I agree with when Skip took over and for the administration as a whole was to advance this office and have it grow and I think Skip and Chelsea are capable of doing that. So, I think obviously we are making an investment here and I do believe that it will pay off and we will see a positive in the general fund.

Mr. Allison Thank you Mayor Slaughter and now Councilwoman Miele does have her hand up.

Ms. Miele Yes Randy I do. I just wanted to follow up a little bit. I know when we left off with this discussion last week the number that we heard from community development was maybe \$80,000 for the SEDA CoG contract and I know that we are about to authorize a contract that says 65, how does the final number come to 120?

Mr. Memmi Councilwoman Miele, those costs were some of the costs relevant to environmental reviews and other project direct costs where we made assumptions versus the administrative costs which were in the neighborhood of 69,000 if I remember correctly. That is why the number is higher. The administrative fees is 69, but when you start breaking down the projects where you have to do environmental reviews and have to go out and do a salary survey - those kinds of costs - those were not factored in.

Ms. Miele Got it, got it. So, the costs outside of the administrative costs are something in the neighborhood of 55,000? I guess 50,000?

Mr. Memmi It all depends on the projects, yes.

Ms. Miele So, our total allocation between home and CDBG is what again? Remind me?

Mr. Memmi The total allocation if we look at it - the CDBG funds is 1,063,000 and home is 245,000 and program

income is 115,000 and that is where we come up with the additional funds of 150,000 which would then give us an operating budget of 1,572,000.

Ms. Miele Got it, so the SEDA CoG chunk of it is about 10% of our total initial budget in that department?

Okay. And just to follow up on one more piece. The other thing that we discussed in last week's council meeting, I just want to make sure that this was still the understanding was that if we wanted to be sure that any sort of economic development planning entities initial budget years - that we were utilizing ARPA funding for that so the 125 that we are looking at budgeting within community development is not inclusive of anything other than perhaps membership on a committee that oversees an economic development

Mr. Memmi answered Correct.

Ms. Miele Just because I think it is very important to divorce those costs because there is another pot of money we could take those costs from. And when we are talking about where else we can find this money - certain amount of it can be found in the ARPA funding. That is all I have right now and I yield to other councilmembers.

Mr. Allison Okay. And Skip - I would like to revisit a thought that you brought up last time - not a thought, but a reality that you are dealing with as far as having a HUD audit and needing the capacity to have all of the records and everything researched and in line. Is not in the general program administration expense of 387? 387,002

Where that would be taken care of? Mr. Memmi answered yes. And that would adequately cover that?

Mr. Memmi As far as we can tell at this point in time, yes sir.

Mr. Allison And what part of that would SEDA CoG have a hand in?

Mr. Memmi They will be incremental in us moving forward Mr. Allison. Going back, that will be a review that we have to take on, but going forward - because of their expertise they have been doing this for municipalities all across Central Pennsylvania, entitling communities and non-entitlement communities - they have different contracts even from the state DC ED for municipalities in general to administer CDBG programs and with their expertise that will allow us to make sure that we are basically following the rules that HUD lays out. We are not saying that we have not followed them, but there may be things that we have missed and may be are not even aware that we have missed. So, we are looking to bring in somebody to help us do that and to do that correctly and doing it as an outside contract, not necessarily having to bring on more staff to the office community of economic development, because truthfully we do not have enough staff to adequately address those issues.

Mr. Allison That is more of an administrative cost than an economic development cost? The answer was yes, Okay, I am just trying to keep straight what money can be spent on one. ARPA can be spent on economic development, but maybe not that particular chunk of money that would go towards administratively checking the records and so forth. It did not really relate to economic development. I know that is a tough question

Mr. Memmi I do not have that answer

Mr. Allison This is why we need an ARPA specialist to give us some guidance on that, Mr. Yoder you had your hand up?

Ms. Miele That is just residual - although I do feel - and I apologize it is loud in the background, I do feel like the question - your discussing this community development budget but we need to be looking at this holistically and the issue that we are having is that we already had a \$900,000 deficit in the general fund budget and then out of the handful of things that were only fair, but bottom line is somewhere and Joe, correct me if I am wrong, in the 350, 350 range? 360? If we are looking at then tacking on another \$126,000 for community development, that takes us into a very dangerous range, so we are looking at a tax increase - but not for the reasons that I originally advocated for which was to bolster our deficit spending, but rather simply to support the additional deficit spending that we agree to engage in under pressure from the administration and due to our own decisions - it was city Council ... All employees within the city should receive a raise this year given inflation etc. But, there is a substantial difference in a bottom line that will take place if we passed the community development budget with 126,000 reservation and to Adam and I, I do not know where it is coming from, this is an open ended question. I am simply asking the administration - this as an ongoing cost - these are not one time cost and in fact if I had to guess community development will probably ask for more money next year, not less. So, how are we thinking about this in terms of how to keep the city within budget year over year? I hate to take you back to that - I know that is a big question, but we cannot very well act on this issue without looking into this - what is everybody else's thought?

Mr. Yoder If I could jump in there, to your point - we really have three ways to pay for this. It is raise taxes, it is dip into what small remaining balance we have at the bottom line on our balance sheet or it is increase the allocation of short-term lost revenue dollars for ARPA. None of which are good. ARPA is a short-term nonorganic revenue stream. None of us want to raise taxes and dipping into whatever we have left is not healthy either. And we are looking at deficit spending, so I would just - I would ask the administration of the three, what are they most comfortable with? I mean I do not know if I am comfortable with any of them but if they are going to make this ask - we need to have some guidance on what they are more comfortable with. They are the ones that will be figuring out the problems that we have been talking about the past couple of weeks and so I think that understanding their level with one of their options, they will use that to address these problems hopefully. I think we need to hear that.

Mrs. Katz I would really like to hear what Mayor Slaughter has to say about this. This was not presented to us in the original budget to begin with and now we are trying to figure out where to go with this. So, I would like to hear what the mayor has to say about this.

Mayor Slaughter Of those options I would be most countable with the leftover balance, we did try to meet for a while actually to discuss this development and unfortunately that did not happen, so in this situation, I do not think taxes is the way to go this year, but I would say again it is an upfront investment and I do think it is going to bring back some positive returns to the city with the way that office functions and the capabilities that they have. And also - as the end of January we will get a another report from the auditors and then we are always able to reopen and look at some things. So, once we get these initial reports, that can also change our perspectives on some of the balances and various pots of money, so that is my suggestion, but again I think President Allison met with Skip quite a while ago and we were hoping to get some new accounts. So, at this point now - but keep in mind that would be my recommendation and suggestion. And once the audit comes at the end of January we can revisit it at that point. But, I do believe the as I said with Skip and Chelsea, projects they will be able to work on - just developing projects in general like what Dave and ERC have been working on to be able to see our tax base increase.

Mrs. Katz I wanted to say, just to be clear what we discussed last week and what Skip and Chelsea proposed to us is just what they have been doing. This is not a budget that allows them to pursue economic development. That we would do through a study with ARPA findings. This funding just allows them to continue to deal with SEDA CoG and all of those items so basically we are not increasing services or looking towards the future, we are simply funding existing services at the cost of those -

Mayor I was just going to say, that I think it allows us access into the general fund to see and if we subsequently then do the SEDA CoG depending on where counsel is with that, we can start to see the capacity that this office could take on and obviously as that grows, I think we will be able to increase allocation, but of course I do want to see that office expand, we've had a number of conversations over the past year and around the I do believe that they will be able to handle that.

Ms. Miele Got it - I agree with you Derek I was made very nervous by the process of the community development budget and so I do want to put that out there. I know it has been in private discussion several months ago I have been asked about this 250,000 and we never received it on counsel, I do not know if you did there until after we received the budget, well after. So, I have had little time to review and think about it and have discussions with Skip and Chelsea about it and that makes me uncomfortable when we are talking about a department that is planning on doing planning, this particular step does not seem to have been that well-planned. That said - in order to maintain the services they are providing, I am willing to do this if it is necessary and that is what I am hearing, the development would rather not do some of the planning they will pass on to SEDA CoG and some of the CDBG planning, but I really think this is a snafu, I am sorry. I wish that we had gotten this documentation earlier and engaged in this discussion earlier. I wish the money had not been in the budget and the whole thing seems unprofessional to me. But be that as it may - we are where we are. But, I would caution you Derek against the idea of reopening the budget in January. We know that we are engaging in \$900,000 in deficit spending. We are more like 1.2 million right now. That is a lot of money, even if - even if we have money and savings from last year in our bottom line ends up starting up bigger than we think, we are still deficit spending and above all else not adding to our bottom line with this budget. That just seems irresponsible. But - it clearly is the will of the administration or a lack of will on a part of the administration that they are not proposing to try and do the right thing and bring forward a balanced budget, but I think that is usually the way it goes I guess. Anyway - I have said some of my piece on that Randy. I do not know where I stand, if this is what we need to make the services - I would have liked to be having this discussion sooner and I would have liked to have more clarity on what was being proposed. Thank you.

Mrs. Katz Yes I did. Did we get any reports from counsel about community development at all? Derek we were supposed to get the rest of the reports and we still have not gotten that. So - if there was anything in there, we should have been given that so we could have at least some explanations of where they were coming from and where we should be going. And why did we not get the rest of this report?

Mayor They are finalizing things right now. Obviously with all of the variables the city is facing, it has been a little difficult on some of the projections so they are working with

Mrs. Katz What variables? They were supposed to be doing a study of how to run the city but that had nothing to do - and if you are talking about an investigation, that had nothing to do with what they were doing. They were supposed to be feeding us information

Mayor Right, they are putting together a financial and strategic plan so it does impact their projections. So, with all the audits and some of the things they're working on it has been difficult.

Mrs. Katz What does the audit have to do with how to run the city? That is not what we were asking for them to do.

Mayor Yes, it is a financial and strategic plan. That they are putting together.

Mrs. Katz But that is the past, we are looking at the future.

Mayor Right - so what they are basing the future off of is where we are currently in looking at future projections, but where we are currently there are some variables around it. So, they have to project out the future based off of currently what is happening. So - we have to have a baseline and that is where it has been more challenging for them determining the baseline for future projections. Having said that, they are still working through this and are finalizing right now and will give us that but with understanding that it may fluctuate a little bit and be flexible after we start to see exactly where some of these baselines are. So, yes they are finalizing it and it has been difficult given the situation. So, although they are not going backwards 10 years ago, they still currently have done a review where we are and are projecting out. So, that is one thing that has been difficult. But, I spoke with them this week and they are finishing things up and finalizing and they will get that to us just as soon as they can.

Mrs. Katz I still do not understand because they should be working exactly - where we are striving to go forward and if they are looking in the past, the past has mistakes and those are not the things we are going to be told how to correct. This is a company that gives you guidance on how to move forward. So, anyhow - I will just say, I think we all have a lot of questions with community development as far as where we want to go with the money. If we are taking money out of the general fund, that was not in the budget to begin with, it is just - I just have problems with the way this is being handled. I don't have anything else to say right now.

Mr. Banks I agree with those sentiments. Where I would try to add something is to say this were included with the budget originally, we would be talking about cutting somewhere else to make sure we can maintain basic services. So, what I do not want to do is be punitive to one department. Based on the way the budget was handled. Above them. Do you know what I mean? I would like us to keep that in mind and what we are really looking at is seeing through that transparency in making sure that we are in line with HUD. And I wish we were talking about more money to expand capabilities - but just keeping up minimum services is what we are talking about. And are we comfortable with cutting those basic services and not cutting others somewhere else because this is the chronology of the way the budget was presented? We can point fingers, but it really comes down to what services do we want to provide or continue to provide? That is my piece.

Mr. Allison I am on the same page as Mr. Banks as far as that is concerned. I do think it is essential that we have this as accurate as we can get. An internal audit of where we are at, we already know what problems can happen with funding streams. So, it pays to make sure everything is right if we are going to have a regular HUD deeper audit. We want to be able to handle that. I also think that the whole economic development concept does not transpire as quickly as we would like it and I think we need to lay some foundational steps for that to be built on. And I see some value in

this particular budget as proposed by Skip and Chelsea. It moves us in that direction. To fund it, I would be in favor of taking some more of the lost revenue money. So, any other comments from counsel? Okay - so, we have the 48 year 2022 community development budget now stands without this extra \$150,000, so is there anybody that would make a motion to put that in? And again it would take five votes to do that.

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

Ms. Miele I have a question on that - is Norm out there somewhere? I am wondering how exactly we do this, we cannot just take one budget and put the other one in its place - what is the most simple way to change the budget?

Mr. Lubin Community development is a simple - it is an increase of 250,000. When you get to the city budget, it has to come out of something. Whether it be the bottom line or some other department.

Ms. Miele Yes - okay. So, we are making a motion to put \$150,000 of money from the general fund in the community development budget and then the are in charge of the distribution process?

Mr. Lubin answered Yes.

Mr. Yoder We have to pay from this from the bottom line, Randy you mentioned ARPA if needed - where is everybody else's head at? Because, this impact what we are going to do in the reading of the next budget.

We have not gone to deep and we had thoughts on the study and making that mandated, so if it can be covered by that - is that possible to leave it there? Is it possible to do this lost income? Or just a stray allocation from the general fund?

Mr. Allison The lost revenue calculation we are to check I think. That is the 960

Mr. Yoder And I thought there was a wiggle room to increase that if we needed to as a revenue item. I know the approach Mayor Slaughter if I recall was some uncertainty with some other revenue streams, but nonetheless based on the calculation I am assuming we can make it higher if we wanted to. So when I say ARPA that is what I mean.

Mr. Allison I will defer to Joe on that.

Mr. Pawlak When I did the ARPA calculation that is included I used the categories that I was comfortable - there are revenue streams that are not included as to what additional amount that would bring. Based on final audit numbers, I do not have that at this point. So, I am not sure the range that would be their potential.

Mr. Yoder And just to be clear while Joe and everyone - we talked about a handful of other things - this has additional carriers act funding of about \$700,000 that we received? Is that funding mostly expended at this point?

Mr. Memmi , a good portion of this is expended - we still have a couple projects that we are exploring to spend down the rest of it. But, to say it is all expended at this point, that is not a fact, but hopefully within the next six months to a year, we would have that all expended or at least programmed.

Ms. Miele Got it and a secondary question, during our ARPA discussions Derek mentioned 1.4 million in-home funds available in the CDBG budget, but this current budget only looks at expending \$90,000 and we don't to my understanding have staff in place to handle the reporting requirements for the other 1.3 million, right?

Mr. Memmi I would not say we do not have the staff, we just have not put the program together. We see that allocation a couple months ago and also a large payment of a 20-year-old mortgage, so that is where that funding comes up and we discussed it as a home buyer's program, we just have not established it yet. I believe we probably have enough staff to do that, we just need to release the program.

Ms. Miele So we just need to take care of that, please to hear it. So, I apologize and I have derailed this discussion a little bit - that which is something I'll try to consider their, sorry guys.

Mr. Allison Yes, I know I did not see anybody waving at me or any virtual hands up - we have a motion and a second - to raise the CDBG budget by 900 - Mrs. Frank on that motion please?

The motion to increase the line item failed with a 4 to 2 vote.

Mr. Yoder voted no, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted no, Mr. Banks voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes. Mr. Pulizzi was absent.

Mr. Memmi asked Would you propose the initial number of 126?

Ms. Miele If that is what it takes to do what we are doing now and not fail our constituents, I can compromise on that, I just do not like the idea of figuring this out on the fly and using ending balance, we have no clear way to pay for it. It just makes me uncomfortable. And I think we are all on that boat. If that is what I have to do to keep this department going - I can get to that number for betterment of the group.

Ms. Miele Yes - I don't know, I am torn, but I know that there are different levels and you can back me up on this - a community development would require additional funding. So, to see that come to the tune of \$125,000 is a little hard for me. Like in the first year. I would have preferred to see it phased in a little bit more slowly, rather than just saying okay, \$50,000 - but none the less, the concept definitely surprises me. To realize that does not get us any additional services is tough. But, as I said this is without forewarning.

Mr. Allison I agree with what you are saying, you want to see them do a good job - it all boils down to the dollar amounts. And where we are getting it from.

Ms. Miele And what I am hearing also is just the frustration from starting budget discussions earlier and now we start them a week later than usual and that is frustrating to try to be figuring these things out so late in the year is frustrating. His feet this is frustrating because it was not in the budget to begin with and we got that week later.

Mr. Yoder It was not in the budget we were presented.

Mr. Allison asked for a motion -

Mr. Banks I will make a motion that we add \$126,000 to the community budget from the general fund

Ms. Miele seconded it.

Mr. Yoder stated I thought that was just an amendment? That is right, yes.

May I ask a quick question? Norm, I am asking this because I voted against the budget in first reading and we were down one councilperson, how many votes are needed to pass these budgets? Can you clarify that for the record?

Mr. Lubin Yes, let's back it up a little bit, if you're going to increase a line item, it takes five votes, if you decrease, it takes four if you pass the budget finally, it takes four.

Mr. Yoder Okay, we are in the second reading, if this fails - then aside from reintroducing it - we are kind of stuck. So, I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you Norm, I appreciate that.

Mr. Allison We are back to the original motion on the final reading. Any more comments on that? I think we hit the one point that needed to be talked over - okay, Mrs. Frank on of the original motion?

The motion was carried with 4 yes roll call votes. The vote was 4 to 2

Mr. Yoder voted no, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted no, Mr. Banks voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes. Mr. Pulizzi was absent.

Resolution # 9227

Resolution Authorizing A contract for Professional Consulting Services with SEDA-Council of Government (remove from table)

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

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

The motion to remove this from table was carried with 6 yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.

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

Mr. Allison asked if there were any more discussion, there was not. He asked for a motion and second on the resolution.

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

The resolution was carried with 6 yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.

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

Ordinance #6421

Ordinance Adopting Various Operating Budgets for City of Williamsport, including General Fund, Utility Fund, Capital Projects Fund, Liquid Fuels Fund, City Hall Operating Fund, Unemployment Compensation Fund, Debt Service Fund, Act 13, Fund, & Pool Repairs Capital Fund (final reading) Bill #1787-21(remove from table)

The City Clerk read the ordinance.

Mr. Allison asked for a motion to remove from the table.

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

The motion to remove from table was carried with 6 yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.

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

Mr. Yoder stated Aside from the changes - so, with the operating budget itself aside from the changes, the other thing we discussed last week is a couple of directors salaries and personally I am more comfortable if we give those individuals raises in being more in line with what we gave our at will employees. I do not know what the rest of counsel thinks if there are any votes there to change that, so I figured I would throw that out there before we dive in and making changes and what have you.

Mr. Allison stated Okay, let's tackle that. Anybody else want to weigh in on that?

Ms. Miele I can Randy. So, Adam - like you I am looking at the difference in increases across different employees and administration. And I think this was made with a certain lack of transparency regarding salaries promised to directors to the hires we approved and apparently it was specifically tailored to fit into this year's budget not realizing that they were being offered significantly more in coming years, I would not have been - I would not have been surprised or dismayed to be told that, but I would have liked to have been aware of it at the time of the higher rather than at the time of the budget. Would you feel the same way item?

Mr. Yoder Yes, I would echo that and before I continue on I will let you finish.

Ms. Miele I guess this feels duplicitous. We were not extended the contracts, as a part of the resolution - that authorized to hire, so all of us just assumed that the salary and resolution and salary going forward, all of that said Adam - I feel two things, I do not personally - if the administration - I still have not seen the contract that was referred to regarding these salaries, if those salaries were indeed a part of a contractual with these individuals then we are bound to honor that and I also agree, that I think the city needs to be paying professional salaries in order to attract professional hires. I think both of those things are true. I am simply uncomfortable with the lack of discussion we had about that prior to the administration and this comes down to what we are looking at all over the budget. Like why did we not talk about this beforehand? And why was this not a part of a larger discussion within city government and how to best incentivize people? I feel that would have been more transparent. That said - while I agree with you incompletely echo your sentiments, I do not know that I would have a motion to lower the salaries - but I am open for other members of Council -

Mr. Yoder Liz, thank you for that and yes, that is a part of it for me. The other part of it is when we look at the total compensation package that all of our employees are getting and these three specifically - when you look at the total compensation package, compared to other opportunities out there, I think ours looks different. I am sure salaries are lower than out there, but when you look at our health benefits, and pensions and all of that kind of stuff, the uniqueness of working for 1/3 class city and the uniqueness of what you can get into - in my mind it would seem to mean that that total compensation package is competitive and that is more where I was coming from in addition to everything you outlined Liz which I agree with. And if we are going to see those types of increases moving forward, I think we need to see if we are going to compare market trends, we need to see what total compensation looks like. If I am wrong I am wrong and that is fine, but my gut tells me that this package is right there. And so I think with that in mind I would be more comfortable going that route but I am not going through an exercise of amending and what have you, so I just want to bring that up because I know we talked about it and that is where my head is at. I will yield to other members.

Mr. Allison I personally do not disagree with some of the things that have been noted so far. Just having been on counsel for 12 years now we knew that with some of the positions like city engineer - particularly being John (NAME) the individual was really serving out of the love of this city, we could have advanced his salary far beyond what he was getting and I think that was a known and we knew that we are going to pay market rate right now and this is to the point of being in the ballpark but we do not know until we have the figures, but we do have an operating engineer who does far beyond the scope with dealing with the everyday projects but is actually proactive in bringing grants and other ideas to the table that are helping our city along with reducing costs on some projects, a great one is the ramp that is in front of City Hall, a great example. In the same with our HR position. We went through various iterations of HR, contracting it for a few years and we needed somebody up-to-date with everything, all of the nuances and difficult complications of HR and also knowing that we have one person dealing with the multitude of individuals and venues and healthcare

systems and so forth and all of that. Could we have been a differently? It is hard as a councilperson to see things that are right, but not have the information in a timely manner that could help you do that process. Mr. Yoder?

Mr. Yoder Yes, I understand and I guess here is another struggle that I have with the argument., We are talking about directors and skill positions specifically. Under that argument, we should be giving Joe a much substantial raise than we are, he is in office of 1 and a half and technically he is an intern director of finance and we are not doing that. So, in my mind trying to be consistent across the board with the caveat of the total compensation package that is seems more logical and the other thing that I would add Mayor Slaughter, we ask for these contracts a week ago and I have not seen them, so I would really like to see those and norm - those contracts were voted on by city Council, are they voted on if they were indeed contracts?

Mr. Lubin Their contracts, but they have to be approved by city Council.

Mr. Yoder And so they were not approved

Mr. Lubin The only thing city Council approved was there 2000 - 2021 salary. Whatever else they were offered if it is beyond what a typical city employee would get, health insurance, vacation pay, sick pay, that type of thing - that would have to be approved by city Council. For example - we went through that a few years ago with former police chief. And he was under contract with the mayor and by the time it came to city Council it was significantly amended.

Mayor Slaughter And to be clear, there is no secret contracts. When I said before I cannot remember if we talked about at the time or not when we discussed this during budget, so if we did not then that is my fault obviously. And I thought we should discuss this during the budget for short. However, moving forward, for example if we do create the director of finance or administration, that would be a line item as well. So, from the very beginning we will know what that is to be. But, as far as any contracts, those are not out there. But I will make sure from the very beginning when I bring them to counsel that it is crystal clear on the salary and the salary moving forward and that would probably be with the director of finance. Moving forward. And I know we talked about that a little bit - as the director of finance and director of administration I know we also discussed possibly amending those as well, but nonetheless, once counsel and administration gets to that point - we will make sure that we haven't salary and that is some thoroughly discussed and the individual comes before counsel.

Mr. Yoder Yes I mean I would look forward to that. I think at least from my perspective I am waiting to see what your division of that department looks like. So, we will be here when you are ready. And just to clarify there are no contracts. Okay.

Mayor I know we said director of administration and finance, right now I believe it is separated, this is the exact direction we are trying to get away from currently and I would at some point here after the new year or whatever discuss what counsel and administration believes it should look like.

Mrs. Katz First of all I would like to say about our city engineer, we are lucky to have someone with a PE - simply have not -- simply having that does help and so where we are at and what grants are out there - so, we are well informed of what is going on. The only difficulty that I think some of us have with the salaries is the fact that you have been promised substantially higher than other people and what that does to your employees that you have working in City Hall - it is not good for their morale especially for two years, you never got that race and then you have new people that I moved into positions and they are there for a short period of time and they are getting substantially larger raises. This does not go well for the rest of the employees that are working in City Hall. That is one of the problems. When you do that with people. I want to go back to the mayor as far as contracts. All we have asked for is the contracts mayor and I guess what you're stating is they never had any contracts signed, right? Is that we are saying?

Mayor answered Right, there are no secret contracts

Mrs. Katz I am not talking secret

Mayor No contracts

Mrs. Katz Because when we asked at first you said there were

Mayor When they were hired it was my understanding that one about the before council, but I said I could not remember if we did or not.

Mrs. Katz Just wanted to clarify that I want to make sure moving forward that we do. Because you cannot sign a contract and one always the all of these have to come before counsel, so it is not valid unless it comes before counsel. So, moving forward with directorships, I will bring any contract before. Hang on, if you do not mind - these are just merit-based pay increases that you proposed this year?

Mayor That is correct. I talked about 84 four -- I thought we discussed it during their initial introduction to counsel and if I did not, I dropped the ball on that one, but no contracts are valid obviously without Council approval. So anyway, I think directorships in my mind anyway should hold a little bit more merit as a PE - they all bring a certain level of verifications and qualifications and as I mentioned last week - it is nothing against any of our employees, they all do great work. But you are looking at advanced levels degrees, certifications and so that is what I'm looking at with the directorships and Mr. Sander with his PE, but I will reiterate all of our wills do great work.

Ms. Miele I jumped in there, I apologize. None of this is about employee performance, but I think I do - I want to know that two of the increases were some of the things that we have not seen. I guess the thing is - the government work does not function like the private sector. How did it work when you are a teacher Derek? You are a union member so you cannot get a merit-based increase, correct?

Mayor Correct. Administration and at will, I have never been in administration at the school district excuse me - but it is similar for them, they can negotiate contracts. Outside of the union.

Ms. Miele Clearly any new hire can negotiate a contract. I am not disagreeing with that and they can negotiate a contract that includes a higher pay increase and what may be agreed upon with union or at will or anything like that. Can you guys hear me? Okay - sorry I just lost my earphone. I think what I'm struggling with here - the private sector functions such that you know - people get merit-based increases all the time, right? And there is no particular concept of one employee can always get an increase over another employee and all you are worrying about is whether or not you are taking off all the other employees in a given sector, right? But, government does not necessarily flow in the same way. That is the issue that I'm having here. As Bonnie said, even in the private sector that is hard to get away with. But, we really have to figure out - in my way of thinking if not now, then at least moving forward a justification for merit-based increases otherwise we expose ourselves to charges of favoritism or you know what I mean? Am I making sense?

Okay. Because, the whole thing is just a little - it is a little murky to me. And none of that is to say that frankly - that I do not think that these employees deserve to make professional salaries. None of this is a debate about any specific employee - it is just a debate about process. And I was under the understanding that we had promised two of the three employees that we have been discussing a substantial increase in pay that we had contracted with him to provide an increase of pay after a certain amount of service to the city. But, the fact that we did not and that that was not in agreement that we had with them - that is really questionable to me, I am sorry.

No, no. I just - I don't really know what to say to that except I think that is bad faith. It is what it is and maybe we allow it this year, but I think the administration has to think long and hard about what justifies a merit increase if that is something that we want to begin engaging in providing to our employees. In the past that has not been something that we have done. We have done a cost-of-living increase - I think merit-based increases are justified but we have to have a set of parameters for what creates the justification. And not just a willy-nilly oh, this person should be making more. So anyway I said my peace there, sorry guys.

Mayor So when we look at a director of finance - I think we need to discuss what would be reasonable then. From the beginning. Market analysis, current job climate etc. And as we look at these directorships especially, I think we really need to have in mind what that would look like and I did have a conversation with Scott and Molly after their six month and that is when we discussed this, but again obviously nothing is formal so nothing has come before counsel. But I would say - hopefully sooner rather than later I would like to have a conversation with the director of finance so when we advertise that position which we are ready to do, we know we can put it in there.

Mr. Yoder Randy, if I may - I would agree with everything Liz is saying again. This is again - I would completely agree, this is about process. We all approved of Molly and Mr. Livermore by a unanimous vote, I think we completely all agree that they are good people and doing a good job and that they are here and it is about process. And what makes this difficult and why this looks like why it is against a particular employee is because we are trying to figure this out in a very short amount of time with limited information. And Liz, to your point - and frankly I would make this ask of Molly if she is not already doing this, we really need a process in place for merit increases and performance reviews and what have you. That is a limited pool of people, but we need to do that rather than arbitrarily yes or no. And honestly as we are looking at future directors - whether it is a director of finance or administration or whatever we change it to be - I am looking to the administration to lead that effort. Whether it is market analysis of what etiquette conversation looks like, how they should be structured - we got the ball rolling when we did what we did, but we can provide input and conduct policy and what have you, but we really need that feedback from administration day in and day out. We need to understand clearly and articulately, what the city needs. So that is a bunch of rambling, but well said Liz.

Mr. Allison That is a good point that we have in HR director that can be very instructive in that area. Liz, do you have Mr. Yoder I think I made my points Randy. Just we can't willy-nilly give pay increases to people, it does not work like that in our sector. And we need to figure out a way to avoid that in the future. Thank you.

Ms. Miele I agree - it is top of the list, the finance department. This is argument said, but I agree with - okay. So, where are we on this? I think we have heard different opinions.

Ms. Miele Randy? If we are done with this - can I go on to another part of the budget?
Unless somebody had a motion to decrease anything like that?

I don't know that it would pass - I don't know that it would pass, so at this point we have had some vigorous discussion, let's hope that we see it next year.

Mrs. Katz Yes, I would like to go to the IT. On page 27. Norm, this is a question for you. What is in the budget here as contract services, if we are going to contract services for an IT position, should there not have been an RFP sent out? I am looking at page 27 - for contract services - there is no mandatory requirement for RFP. Obviously we will pay to do it - but, there is no mandatory requirement. >>

Okay, if we are doing a contract services, should there not be a contract?

Mayor There is no contract yet - if there is going to be a contract entered for whatever - I would have to come before city Council.

Mrs. Katz And since this is in the budget right now - or contract services for \$146,000, how do we progress with this with not having anything else in writing except a line item that says this is how much we are going to go for an IT contract services for IT For example, if the administration comes to you with a contract for that amount, the 146,000+, then it is up to counsel, yes we will higher this company for that amount - if they come in with something that is lower, they may be able to negotiate a better contract. If they come in with a contract that is higher than that amount, then you will have to do a transfer. To transfer money in. But, until a contract comes before City Council - there is no authorization to spend any money.

That is where my question is. Because, we do not have an IT person that is working for the city - obviously we are using an employee from RVT and we are paying them, but it is stated in the budget on a line item contract services. Contract services is - that is what it is, it should be a contract.

Mayor Yes, there has to be a contract with somebody

Mr. Banks So, Mayor Slaughter, correct me if I'm wrong, when you originally presented this to us. You presented it as salary and benefits into that line item so we can have a more robust discussion about it, when we did it that night, I do not think we ever came down to a decision per se as to whether or not it should be an internal higher or contracted out, so just to Bonnie's concerns. That is kind of why that is there. And so if we want to do a higher we would have to move it back. So just to get the conversation started.

Mr. Yoder Dave, thank you, you can offer that a little bit as well. I guess, my question norm would be - so, we are using RVT to provide services that we have traditionally hired employees out of the general fund - do we need a contract or a resolution to authorize that service?

It would be in a department transfer, but there should be something - even - it should be a resolution or some matter, because if an audit comes around then they will say you are paying RVT \$45,000 but the going market rate is closer to 100,000. So, there has to be something - it is sort of like what you just did with the agreement on the rental areas. With RVT. There should be something like that.

So how do we handle this in the budget right now?

It is right here because you can always do a transfer. After the first of the year. When the hard numbers come in. For example, if you're going to hire somebody as a city employee, you would just do a transfer to move the line item up.

>

So, I guess what we need to know is what the intentions are. I guess we are all uncomfortable. It is RVT that we are trying to disengage all of that

Mr. Pawlak There was just a lot of conversation a year ago, so that is why we put it in there. To get some direction from Council as Councilman Banks, we discussed a little bit, so we can always - city Council can always transfer back into the salaries in line item if that is the direction we would like to go to hire an individual on the city side. Obviously I am in favor of that. We kept in contract services though because there were some discussions last year about outsourcing a portion of IT so we just had it there for the moment, but it can obviously - Council can transfer it. I cannot speak for anybody else, but in other conversations we have talked about it and I think the city needs its own designated IT person or persons, whatever that would be. Mr. Yoder?

Mrs. Katz Regardless of if we do or do not - I do not want to be a dead horse, but we need to figure it out now, because if we leave in contract services, we need some kind of a resolution in the first meeting and we have a little bit of a window at this point where we will not technically have services, because we cannot spend that money until we approve that and if the administration based on market analysis, research, RFP or what have you - has deemed that it is more advantageous for us to hire somebody directly - we are not seeing that reflected in that. And we are only hearing that through this budget process. So, it sounds to me that if the administration wants to see us hire an IT person, but they did not reflect the budget that way - am I hearing that we need to amend that? I will defer to Norm, but I think you just make a motion to transfer it up to salaries.

Mr. Lubin We could just do a transfer ordinance, but I think also - I do not have the city ordinance book with me, but I think that within a department you can transfer up to 5% of the total amount in that item.

You are correct, you can do it within your own budget and if it is over that 5% goes to a Council for approval.

So that way, whatever the total budget is - fortunately it is almost the entire budget from that page. It would take a transfer ordinance on obviously - so that would take care of by the end of January it would be taken care of.

To my mind and to Adam's mind - would be much easier to do it right now then two readings of a transfer ordinance later on.

But what are you going to move up to salaries? If you move these up to salaries but you enter contract with an outside company, you have to bring it back down, that is all.

Joe Pawlak, do you have the breakdown of where everything should go if we make this internal?

Mr. Pawlak I do not have that right now. I am out of the office. But, I guess if that is the direction that counsel wants to do a direct hire to reflect that in the budget - perhaps reducing a portion of that, because I think that there are other items included in that line item and just moving it up into salaries with the intent that a transfer ordinance will come in January to break out and move the remaining amounts up from the contract service line item, I do not know if that is appropriate Norm

Mr. Lubin You could do it that way. The easiest way if you move it into the salary line item - when you pay the salary you have to pay the FICA and life insurance and workers comp

Mr. Pawlak And we can reflect that in the transfer ordinance to get everything else balanced out with the total salary for the year?

Mr. Lubin Yes, because if you move \$70,000 as an example for salary - until we do the transfer ordinance in a January - that would not be hard to move the other numbers up, because there would be 70,000 there at least to pay the person. I just want to make sure there is enough money in there if we hire somebody for the person to get the regular paycheck, that is all. Because, the other amounts are probably not paid out during the months of January anyway.

Mr. Pawlak They would be except with exemptions, because we make monthly payments on our life insurance, Worker's Comp. Would be at the end of the year - >>

In order to have the money in there to pay salaries and do that - may be putting

Mr. Lubin The other is that you can just copy the budget numbers that are there with transfers that comes out to 92,000 and you could approve that to the 2022 proposed and subtract that 93 from the 146. And once everybody makes the decision for which way to go, you can release both items to cover January's expenses.

Mr. Pawlak That would not cover

If you're contracting out, you are still leaving more than 1/12 of the amount in there. To cover January's if you decide to contract it out. So, I think that would be the easiest, just move all of those items from a budget with transfer to 2022 proposed. And that would cover January's expenses at least.

Mr. Yoder So, the administration is telling us that their preference is to hire somebody and if that is the easiest way to accommodate that and I am happy to support that. And I would certainly think that come January, pretty quickly we need to see some information, data etc. from administration both with a final transfer ordinance and just to back that up - I am hoping that they did their due diligence and I think we need to see that.

So, can we move this all as one?

Mr. Lubin We need five to move the person services section and you need four votes to reduce the contract services - so you need one to move the personal service line item and the other would be reducing contract services by 687 -

Mr. Allison asked for a motion and a second.

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

Mr. Allison Motion and second to increase the salaries line item 23505010 by 93,000

Mr. Pawlak Excuse me, I think we are going to do them all, the 52010 -

Mr. Allison Okay, I am sorry.

Mr. Pawlak It is all of the related personnel costs.

So, could be phrased as to increase the 22 proposed budget for salaries and related benefits to total the 93 687? In the 2021 budget?

Mr. Banks stated It was a collaboration! But, I will amend it to Randy's numbers

Mrs. Katz seconded it.

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

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

Yes, motion to increase asses six and a zero. And now we need to move down to 36060 line item - is there a motion

and a second?

Mr. Banks I will move to decrease that line item 760-6059 -- >

Ms. Miele seconded it.

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

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

Mr. Allison . Okay, we did that and now we need as soon as possible in January the information that backs all of that up to make that decision with the actual people. Okay, next item up from anybody - and if nobody has anything I would like to go to chief Snyder. Chief Snyder we had a discussion last time about Police Department? I would like to revisit that. We are right around the corner there, page 29 - page 30 rather. And chief you had some information about increasing, but also relating to information about retirees and how the budget would balance with that? Do you have that to share with us?

Chief Snyder Just did a small cost analysis with some numbers that were provided by Mr. Pawlak before last city Council meeting and I put some of the numbers together and we have two options this year. And I just did a cost comparative with the salaries that they are currently making including the benefits versus three new officers coming on, so we have two new officers that are going to be retiring and obviously they will be replaced and then we will be looking for an additional officer, so the cost of three new officers would cost within the realm of the two that we will be retiring.

Mr. Yoder Chief Snyder at one point in the lifecycle of having those three officers would we cross the threshold of becoming more expensive than having two officers on staff?

So you are saying that hiring three new officers would be revenue neutral or lower than what we have budgeted for the two officers that we are retiring this year?

So, at some point, we are increasing staff and short-term decreasing expense to do so, at some point because we have an extra officer, it will be more expensive, we will cross a threshold where it will actually cost us more money because we have the third officer, so I was curious when that point is.

Chief Snyder It is hard to determine, because if you're talking about those officers specifically, we have a whole entire Police Department where everybody has to increase increments and each year you will have officers whose salaries are increasing and the cost keeps going up, so it is a hard question to answer for just specifically those officers because you will have this happen throughout the entire police force each year. So, what I can present to you is I have two officers that are close to the thirty-year threshold with what they are making in terms of their salary and longevity which is included in their salary to include their benefits versus three Mac new officers coming on so you will get an increase with all of your staff. So, it is hard to make a determination because each year you would have to go down and that is a lot of manual work that we would have to do to sit there and look at each officer because you have a patrolman that increases and then three years and then for and then up to a patrolman C at five years and you have promotions and all of those increases - it would be difficult to give you a specific number right now without doing a lot of calculating.

Mr. Yoder So, chief Snyder, what do we have budgeted for the two years that are retiring this year?

Right now, if you look at because of the 30 years and the ranks - then you are looking at the salary for both of them is almost \$195,000. If you include the numbers that Mr. Pawlak gave me and tell me if I'm wrong - with benefits coverage for those two officers, we are looking at 259,000 dollars approximately. So, with looking at three new officers coming in with the benefits that we are looking at 43 officers that cost would be -- but, we actually will be coming under what we have budgeted right now.

Ms. Miele Excuse me, I am sorry, may I jump in? Chief Snyder - in your estimates for the officers that are retiring, did you include in your number the healthcare benefits?

Chief Snyder The healthcare will carry on for retired officers so we cannot reduce that cost. I just want to be clear on that, that the healthcare will continue on and we will just add the plan for the new officers coming in

Mr. Yoder So, the 264 that we have budgeted all in, does not need to be changed based on that healthcare comment? Or should it be lower is my question

It should not be included in the savings for the officers that are leaving, it should just be there salary and other benefits. >So, a number of 264, which of the actual number be?

>I do not have it in front of me - depending on family coverage or single coverage range from 14 to 34.

Chief Snyder Okay, so we will go somewhere close, so we will bump that down to 250. So, by that estimation, you figure a 2% annual increase which is actually probably lower at about six or seven years, it will actually cost us more, so the lifecycle of 30 years, that will cost us - over the life cycle of bringing in new hires - it will cost us more money, at that point that I was asking is about six or seven years. And it is probably sooner because if I recall, the rates of raises in the union contract that was passed last year are actually higher than 2%. On average. I think it is around two or three or somewhere in there - so, your average is probably about 2.3 or 2.4%. And that is just salaries, healthcare probably raises faster than that. So, you're probably actually looking at the diminishing point of return is probably three or four years. Roughly.

Mr. Yoder Chief - do you have a rough estimate of what point in the year the two retirees will be leaving?

Chief Snyder One will be leaving at the beginning of January and next in April -

Mr. Yoder Okay, so first quarter - so, if we hire just two new officers to replace those two. How long would that process take? Is our list -

Chief Snyder Right now we are currently in the middle of our list and we are doing background checks right now. We are getting those prepared and getting background on, for potential hires of police candidates right now.

Mr. Yoder Okay, so what is the timeframe from now until you would hire?

Chief Snyder It depends on whether or not they need to go to the Academy. >

If they did go to the Academy, You are looking at about six months for the Academy.

Mr. Banks Chief, I was just wondering, say we did hire three officers, what is the potential decrease in OT we are paying out?

Chief Snyder Again, you have one officer - we would need several officers to put a real dent in that it will help, do not get me wrong, but we are truly understaffed with the to Police Department, we cannot keep going at the rate we are

going, so as much as looking for 40 officers, I want much more and I get the dynamics of it. I do. I understand, but with the services we are asked to provide which seems to be more and more and we are asking more and more officers to do more - we cannot keep going at the pace we are going. 48 would certainly help but it will not fix everything. As we talked about before and a bunch of readings with over time, that is difficult to calculate because you have a lot of unforeseen incidents that will occur being family FMLA, babies being born, injuries - sicknesses - obviously this past year - we dealt with some of the COVID issues and whatnot and trying to cover for that. So, our efforts are trying to mitigate and with more officers that we can get out to provide service, we will be able to mitigate, but to give a quantitative number on that is very difficult.

Mr. Yoder Thank you chief. If you ask this I did not fully catch is so if I am repetitive I apologize. So, in the situation of a retiree chief Snyder, do we have to wait to hire the replacement till after they retire? Can we onboard them and bring them up to speed beforehand?

Chief Snyder We can hire them as soon as I bring them to you and you vote them through. So, as soon as that retirement happens, I would like to present the resolution to counsel to bring on that new hire.

Mr. Yoder But, do we have to wait until retirement happens? If we know that we have two people retiring -

Chief Snyder I see what you're saying -

They can do what they need to do and then they just take the place

Sure. It would be up to you. I can present them to you but I would defer more to Mr. Pawlak, because within the budget would be my concern. But I would defer to him on that.

Mr. Yoder I guess Joe and Norm - I'm not worried about the budget for that question, I am worried about the budget, but the question is not budget related - it is contractual and process related, like are we allowed to do that my process perspective? I will defer to Norm on the number that is specifically included on the salary detail, but I would think as long as we can project the cost to come in within the budgeted numbers, it would be okay. I think that is where we are bound specifically, not the number, but I will defer to Norm on that.

Mr. Pawlak You are bound more by budget than anything. What is the salary? You just have to make sure that it is not going to exceed the salary line item. Because, if you have the next two people that are hired and do not have to go to the Academy and they can go out on the street immediately, that will put a strain on the budget as opposed to the person being in the Academy, because I think they go at a reduced rate.

So some of the additional cost is absorbed is like a cadet versus a -

It is really a numbers issue that Joe is going to have to face and chief is going to have to face and that is why the decision is going to be made.

The reason I ask that, if we have retirees and if we need to budget for may be it is one officer, maybe it is 1 and a half to where we can hire them before they retire and get them on boarded so to speak so that way we do not lose any fee on the ground and we keep the number of 47 - I could be comfortable with that. I do not know that I am comfortable increasing our staffing, again, I understand the concerns and I totally get it.

What happens there is are looking at saving cost upfront that you are paying for not having the officer down the road because we are picking up the work like I said before with the numbers that we should be working with - we should be - for that statistic I gave you last time we should be at 68 to 70 officers. The thing is we are still providing a service for 68 to 70 officers but we are only doing it with 47 so we are talking about one officer here that is really not going to - it will help change it and get us in that direction. The thing is, we are paying for anyway. So, we are going to pay for in the end - if we do not pay for it upfront. So, my thoughts are, let's not paying for this stuff upfront and offset the cost in the end because we will be paying for that service at some point in time.

Yes, I understand that statistic, I would rather see a statistic of where we should be based on communities like us that have similar economic demographics like us, similar cultural demographics like us,

Already done it and we have put together - we are actually doing a PowerPoint for you, but we are looking at other class III cities that are around us, there is 10 of them and we are putting together all those instances it for you and what is happening is that we are the lowest in terms of what we are offering four officers per thousand of population. So, all of those are meeting the national criteria, we are maybe one of two that are not. So, doing the cost analysis - I can provide you all of those numbers. I know you keep talking about putting the numbers out there and stuff and we are looking into the numbers. You implored us to go and look and try to get numbers and we are getting those numbers. I don't know how else to say it. We are short staffed. And we are going to pay for it one way or the other. Whether we pay for now or if we don't we will pay for it down the line anyway.

I understand where you're coming from. The argument about the standard was the national standard is I am assuming all-encompassing with all kinds of different cities and what have you that look completely different across the board, right?

Chief Snyder Pennsylvania is actually higher than the national standard. National standard was 2.4 officers for every thousand, and Pennsylvania is 2.7 and we are 1.6.

Mr. Yoder Here's what I would say, I understand where you're coming from, you also understand the financial argument, we had this argument with community economic development. I don't know where we are paying for it. And honestly, the same question for community economic development goes for this - how are we paying for the extra proposed officers two I know we are revenue - we are saving money this year, but we won't be in three years

Chief Snyder I get that, but my concern is for 2022. We can revisit three years from now, but right now my focus was on 2022 and trying to get those officers. Without being said the two officers that are going out the door, there salaries are going to be more than if we got three new. Which two would be to replace them and then one additional. So, we will still be within our threshold for 2022. And I would propose to look down three or four or five years from now as projected and revisit it then. I'm concerned about 2022 right now sir.

Mr. Yoder I understand that, I respect we disagree with that. We need to be looking multi-years down the road with everything and I'm glad you're looking at data and all of that kind of stuff - we do not have that in front of us and if I'm going to make that kind of decision in the second reading of the budget I would feel more comfortable having not and understanding that so that I can understand and make a more informed decision if we are going to increase officers. So I appreciate it chief Snyder, we can agree to disagree, I would be comfortable entertaining if we need to increase it next year for two to onboard so we do not lose any staffing and end the year at 47, I could be comfortable with that. I cannot be comfortable increasing.

Mr. Mackey Thank you President, we may be a little past this part of the conversation now, but if we could go back to the list chief - did you say we are about halfway through our list? Is that what you said?

Chief Snyder We are down to number four. We have 12 on the list. It is hard to get police officers as well with the national narrative going on right now, so with our last test that we put in place we had 12 on the list. I believe it was. And right now we are down to the fourth one that we are doing background.

Mr. Mackey I guess my follow-up is shouldn't we know - background and that sort of thing, don't we know how many of those candidates left on the list we need to go to the Academy?

Chief Snyder Yes, but I do not make presumptions. They do not need the Academy, but they are going to the background so provided they pass the background, we would be able to put them right on and hire them right away.

Mr. Mackey Okay I was just curious, thank you.

Mr. Allison Any other comments about the Police Department? I do not believe it is safe to have a gap in there. And be down to 45. I think 47 needs to be held and 48 is actually helping a lot. Let me look at that again. So, we do have one ready to go -

Chief Snyder Let me just throw out there as well looking for 48 - we are having trouble right now just filling shifts with officers. 48 would obviously help that, it will not fix everything but it will get us in the right direction. I guess I get a little frustrated and I apologize, but I am looking for as many officers as I feel and just getting one extra one - I am not sure what we are arguing about.

It is a tough balancing act. Look at the budget and then try to quantify that to public safety in my mind it is not always work very well because what is the cost of life and those kinds of things, Mr. Yoder

Mr. Yoder I certainly understand that but chief Snyder I will answer the question, regarding how we will sustain it. I certainly understand we have the need, I get that and look, you are working through looking at some of these things, that is great, we do not have answers of how it will be sustained. And that is very very important.

Chief Snyder It is and I want to have better answers for you so when we have a better understanding of what is going on in the city with the money I'm hoping I can give you those better answers. And provide you a better picture of looking down the line. That is the intent, that is what we are looking to do. Like I said before - we are working, my team and I are working on a strategic plan for the next five years, so even if I am not here and pass this off, we can hit the road - they can hit the road running and keep the ball going and just keep bettering our department and focusing on officer wellness and in turn be able to provide a better service for the community. So, I am all about looking to the future and how we can do this and the best we can do it. And sustain it. Absolutely agree with you.

Mr. Allison asked for a motion and second.

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

A motion and a second to increase the police staff from 47 to 48. Is there any more discussion on that? And we would need - so, the salaries and all of that - Mr. Pawlak, would you have a quick estimate of what that would mean?

Mr. Pawlak So, looking at that, for a single coverage, and I think that I put - I think I put the two new hires health insurance in, the current budget and family coverage, so a single coverage for the year would be 70 1749. And that is for one. Everybody clear on that?

The motion to amend is to increase 40 officers, correct Randy?

Thank you for the clarification and we know what it would cost.

Mr. Allison asked for a vote on the motion

The motion was carried with five yes roll call votes. The vote was 5 to 1.

Mr. Yoder voted no, Mr. Mackey voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Banks voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes and Mr. Allison voted yes. Mr. Pulizzi was absent.

Mr. Allison - I would like to direct us to page 37 and line item 52010, we need to increase FICA in the Treasurer's office by \$700. I was not raised when the treasurers time wages were increased. So, we need to cover that.

Mr. Banks made the motion to increase as read.

Ms. Miele seconded it.

The motion was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0..

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

I didn't send out this afternoon based on the initial 150 recommendation from community development how to separate that, but in light of that, it changed tonight and I think my recommendation would be on page 28 of the budget to increase line 236-07-6060 contract services to the 126 and then when we present the IT transfer that we discussed tonight to also include breaking that out into salaries.

Okay.

So it would just be one line item increase at this point with the transfer coming in January.

What was that line item number?

Ms. Miele made the motion for contract services. Mr. Banks seconded it.

The motion was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0..

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

Ms. Miele I do not know if you have this or not, what is the new bottom line?

Mr. Pawlak Give me one second. I believe that puts us at 203272

Ms. Miele That is a better than a couple of the budgets we have done, but not all of them! (CHUCKLE)

That is just quick math, I am trying to -

Mr. Yoder It certainly does, but it does not negate the fact that we still have substantial structural issues that we needed to absolutely make progress on. We talked about sustainability of hiring more officers, addressing not and addressing it faster gets us there faster to where we can hire more officers and hire more community economic development staff, it is impossible to do that in two or three weeks between seven people that make \$22,000 per year combined. I am very much hoping and I do not know how us to express this, but I am hoping that we do not repeat this for 1/3 year and I'm really hoping that we can see some progress in addressing this. Because, this is the fundamental issue that can really position the city for success. I am very hopeful.

Ordinance #6422

Ordinance of the City of Williamsport, County of Lycoming & the Commonwealth of PA fixing the tax rate for all City purposes for the year 2022 (final reading) Bill #1788-21 (remove from table)

The City Clerk read the ordinance.

Mr. Allison asked for a motion to remove from the table.

Mr. Yoder made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Banks.

The motion to remove from table was carried with 6 yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.

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

Ms. Miele I will jump in Randy. I believe that it is no secret of my belief that while we cannot file - we are not going to raise taxes this year to recover the full size of deficit spending, we just engaged in which I think Adam will correct me if I'm wrong, but if you - if we ignore the ARPA infusion we are still looking at about 1.2 million dollars in deficit spending this year. So, I would nonetheless propose to raise taxes by 1/4 of \$1 million this year, you will pardon me that I do not have this number - but that should raise about 200,000?

Approximate 215. About one quarter -1/4 million >>

Approximate 215. Okay, sounds good. I think I made the case over the course of a couple meetings and I know at least a handful of people that agree and possibly none of you and I am opening to listening to arguments. But, I think that we owe it to the taxpayer staring down not only an uncertain financial future, but also a budget deficit issue that we know will only grow next year to begin at looking at trying to draw out what we spend. We have discussed a number of ways in which we look at that that did not involve raising taxes and I am completely on board with the economic development as the best driver for increasing the city's revenue. However, we're not going to find economic development between now and January 1, so I would propose that in the interim we make a modest tax increase to begin to bridge that gap and to make certain that we do not have a nasty tax jump into something in the near future. What do you all think?

Mr. Banks stated I second.

Mr. Banks And just to add onto that. Liz is right, it is very unfortunate that we cannot see those gains from revenue increases from economic development in the short-term but we will and we will go into next year hopefully having solved some of these issues that Councilman Yoder has brought up to the administration, but knowing that we will not solve all of them in the short run is to the benefit of the taxpayer that we do not have to increase taxes dramatically at some distant point in the future. So, it will be less painful over the long run if we do a modest tax increase.

Mr. Yoder Yes. I respectfully disagree with that. I understand the argument - if we come in on budget, we are looking at a multimillion dollar tax increase next year, 1/4 million dollars is not going to make a dent in that one way or the other and I think more importantly this group of counsel has spent two years together and we have talked about it, we have not seen any progress in addressing these structural issues that are beyond the need to be resolved and I do not think it is fair that we continue to put that burden on the taxpayer when we cannot see what those results would yield and then look like. I completely agree - was are not going to happen overnight. But this is our second budget together and if we would have seen progress over these first two years, we could have potentially mitigated that and started to see progress in these areas. I understand where you're coming from - I just do not think it is fair for taxpayers to suffer for the lack of planning and lack of progress that we are faced with. So, I don't know that I would support that. That is just my two cents and I appreciate you listening.

Mr. Allison Thank you Councilman Yoder. Other voices? Thoughts? It is a tough call either way. Especially with the economy right now. In all of the pressure on that that are waiting on people's pocketbooks. 1/4 million dollars is \$25 per year raise on real estate taxes, but we have already reached a threshold I believe that we do not want to - we really have to pull some things together Mr. Yoder. But, I would not support tax increases here.

Ms. Miele So, what I'm hearing is there is no point in making a motion for a tax increase this year?

Mr. Allison I thought you had made a motion I am sorry -

Ms. Miele Well - I actually do not know, Dave definitely had a second

Mr. Allison I do believe you made a motion

Ms. Miele There you go, fine! I thought I made a motion to discuss but I am a little loosey-goosey over here. So, I stand by the motion, I think we should probably just vote. We have all had ample opportunity to think about it, let's just go.

Mr. Allison asked for a vote to increase taxes.

Absolutely. Mrs. Frank on the motion.

The motion to increase tax rate failed with a vote of 2 to 4.

Mr. Yoder voted no, Mr. Mackey voted no, Mrs. Katz voted no, Mr. Banks voted yes, Ms. Miele voted yes, and Mr. Allison voted no. Mr. Pulizzi was absent.

Mr. Allison asked for a vote on the ordinance.

The ordinance was carried with 6 yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.

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

Resolution #9229

Resolution Authorizing a Purchase of Fire Apparatus

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Allison asked for a motion and second.

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

Chief Killian , the resolution before you is to approve a purchase with an amount not to exceed \$3.2 million for two fire engines and one tower ladder vehicle the Bureau of fire. As we have discussed here over the last several weeks our entire tree from an apparatus standpoint looking to make to sign a contract for these two vehicles sometime over the next several weeks - excuse me three vehicles over the next several weeks, we do not have the vendors or manufacturers selected yet, we are still waiting on two prices to come back to us, we are hoping to get by midweek next week. But, one positive note - I have heard from the last two manufacturers and we will be able to maintain that pricing through about January 14 prior to their price increases going into effect for next year. So, again, this is a top dollar figure just so we can get this in before, so we did not have to have a special Council meeting as we have discussed. So, I will entertain any questions, this was reviewed by solicitor white and we did add costars and vendor numbers in the resolution as well.

Mr. Allison asked for a vote.

The resolution was carried with 6 yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.

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

Resolution #9230

Resolution Authorizing the Excavation of Certain Streets for a Water Main Replacement Project by the City of Williamsport for Williamsport Municipality Water Authority. Water St.

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Allison asked for a motion and second.

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

Mr. Gerardi At long last what you have dinner resolution we do not authorize cutting or being in the street unless Council will approve it, this went through public works, they recommended approval of this resolution and to give everybody a little heads up, the weather has been so nice last week - we authorize the cutting and so forth of the street and basically we declared as an emergency to get in there and they are actually finished with the project right now. So, with them allowing until waiting until tonight, they actually have it completed right now. So, if you have any questions I am more than happy to answer.

The resolution was carried with 6 yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.

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

Resolution # 9231

Resolution Authorizing the Excavation of Certain Streets for a Water Main Replacement Project by the City of Williamsport for Williamsport Municipality Water Authority. Cliffside Dr.

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Allison asked for a motion and second.

Mr. Banks made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Yoder.

Mr. Gerardi I don't have anything to add, they will be starting soon and we will get approval on that and there will be another project that we will work with them at the end and hopefully get a completely paved street.

And they go through public works.

Mrs. Katz Yes it was and I think Joe has described everything that we need to be said. And this comes up approximately every year at this point in trying to catch up -

Mr. Allison asked for a vote.

The resolution was carried with 6 yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.

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

Resolution # 9232

Resolution for Various Insurance Needs for Policy Year 01/01/22 Through 01/01/23

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Allison asked for a motion and a second.

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

Mr. Pawlak, this is the resolution to approve our various insurance needs for calendar year 2022 and includes our property and liability package, the umbrella and excess liability, and Worker's Compensation and the total amount of \$936,791. This represents approximate increase of 5% over the prior year premiums. There are a couple things that contributed to the increase including what is going to happen across the world with the police departments along with losses that we have had over the past year. One of the things that during the review and finance committee last week - our insurance consultant expressed ignoring the changes throughout the year since Gallagher has represented us, there has only been 13% increase over the cost in that time from what we were paying our previous to what we are paying currently. With that being said, this was being reviewed through the finance committee last week and I defer to them.

Ms. Miele I would ask at this point are recovered?

Mr. Pawlak To my understanding that would fall under the current year policy and there were no changes related to City Hall. I believe that Mr. Fink indicated that there were some coverage changes as a result of the City Hall building being vacant and the 2022 policy, but I do not believe that would affect any coverage that we currently have. But again, that is something that we will need to submit through the insurance and have them assess a claim and damage.

The resolution was carried with 6 yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.

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

Resolution #9228

Resolution Honoring Councilman David Banks

The City Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. Allison asked for a motion and second .

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

Mr. Allison , let me read it - whereas David Banks was unanimously chosen by the Williamsport city Council on January 6 2020 two fill out an open city Council seat and whereas David Banks has served the city Council, the administration and its various departments and the citizens of Williamsport with dedication and integrity and a consistent level of excellence and whereas David Banks in sharing the economic revitalization committee to active involvement with property committee and with the formation of a land bank has been a leading advocate of economic development in the city in addition to all of his duties and interactions in the general business of counsel. And whereas David Banks has displayed a reason, thoughtful and insightful demeanor throughout his tenure on city Council which has been A time of national, state and local issues and challenges. Therefore, let it be known that it is with great appreciation and admiration that the Williamsport city Council, the administration and its various departments and the citizens of Williamsport do this day thank you to David Banks to the city and wish him success to all of his future endeavors. We mean that from the heart David. It has been a pleasure - and just a great experience serving with you - and just speaking from myself, having known you before kind of peripherally) through various encounters and in different ways - but getting to know you in a more person-to-person friendship basis as well it is our professional basis on city Council

that has been a great joy and a distinct honor. You have vast resources that you have used. We cannot - it would take a few pages to really describe a lot of the things you bring to the table and have done in your two years on council. It has been very beneficial to the city - you have helped put things in motion - and some things that we have talked about tonight - you've got your shoulder to the wheel and pushed things ahead and thought outside the box and grasped things very quickly in your time here and you surely will be missed. That does not mean you cannot come back sometime in the future, but I have run out of words. I love you as a friend and a fellow human being.

Mr. Banks Thank you, I am very touched by that. And as far as the areas I have carried the baton I will pass it off to Adam to carry the torch on the revenue generation side of things. It has been a true honor and especially to grow closer with each and every one of you and to learn about the administration and we are in a very odd political climate right now but the mutual respect we have on Council is a good example of what bipartisanship should look like. I do not think Adam and I agreed on the same vote once today. Except for the fire apparatus but we will be joking around about it tomorrow because you vote on what you believe your values are but you respect the other person's values and I think that is really a great thing to experience and I do mean that from the bottom of my heart and Mayor Slaughter and I will all send you Photoshop pictures of me in exotic locations - it sounds like a joke but I will do it! I joke when I get emotional and this is about as emotional as an Irishman can get. But I really do appreciate the opportunity to serve - and so this is in good hands no matter what. So, thank you for including me and giving me the opportunity.

Mrs. Katz I know we had a short period of time that we met in person but you are such a gentleman and we will all miss your sense of humor and also that glint in your eye when we know something is going to come out of your mouth! Do not be a stranger

Mr. Banks If it means anything to you I always move your window next to mine in zoom (CHUCKLE)

Mr. Yoder David it has been a true pleasure and honor, I do not know you before the election at all and I am honored to call you a friend now and we have been very fortunate to have some really good at stimulating conversations outside of here which the highest compliment that I can give you and I mean this sincerely is just - your ability to process and work through an argument and back it up. The qualities and ability you have there is rare and while we do not agree on everything, certainly you are able to make me think and I value that a lot and respect that. So, thank you very much. Like you said, you picked up the remainder of Mayor Slaughter term and he did not fulfill a term and was elected mayor and was very accessible and I bargained that you made those shoes much bigger which is no small task. So, a job well done and just thank you for everything, it has been a pleasure, I look forward to your memes!

Mr. Banks was touched.

Mr. Mackey All right - I am sad for the city of Williamsport. But, at the end of the day I know we will still be friends. And yes - I think I've said for a long time - maybe not publicly, but amongst friends and in conversation that as we get older - you kind of get your friend Benj kind of set, right? And a lot of times as you get older - you do not find a lot of room for new people on that bench, but you are definitely on my bench and I consider you to be one of my best friends, not only in Williamsport, but just overall. I just cannot tell you how much I appreciate what you have taught me about what it means to be a city Council person, so thank you for that. And I will see you - I was hoping I was went to see you after this meeting for a drink, but this is been like three hours now, so probably tomorrow night - but I love you man, thank you.

Mayor Slaughter He is not on my bench, he is in my starting lineup - (CHUCKLE) on a serious note, I echo all of the sentiments that have been shared, honestly I only knew you a little bit as well prior to all of the campaign stuff and clearly I have got to know you a lot better as you stepped in to the Council role. So, thank you for everything you have done for the city and moving so many items forward, particularly in the realm of economic improvisation that will continue to carry that torch forward, so, thank you for everything. Thank you for your time spent on Council and your dedication to that seat and to the citizens of the city of Williamsport and good luck in your future endeavors and I am sure I will still be calling you from time to time to get your input on certain items, so thank you and good luck with everything.

Mr. Banks Thank you Mayor Slaughter. As a point of order, am I allowed to vote on this resolution?

The resolution was carried with 5yes roll call votes. The vote was 5 to 0.

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

Mr. Allison I will vote yes, yes, yes for Ms. Miele and Mr. Pulizzi as well. It is unanimous. Thank you Mrs. Frank. And thank you again David.

Accept for filing:

Codes Report October 2021

Codes Report November 2021

Mr. Allison asked for a motion to accept these for filing.

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

The minutes were carried with 5yes roll call votes. The vote was 5 to 0.

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

Announcements

The next regularly scheduled City Council meeting will be held on Thursday, **January 6, 2022 at 7:00 PM**, and the **Re-Organizational - Inauguration Meeting will be Monday, January 3, 2022 at 7:00 PM** at Trade & Transit II, 3rd Floor, 144 W. Third St, Williamsport, PA .

Upcoming Meetings:

To be announced

All meetings held remote will be marked with an * otherwise meetings will be held at Trade & Transit Center II, 3rd Floor, 144 West Third St., Williamsport,, PA.

Mr. Allison asked for comments from Council

There were none.

Mr. Allison asked for comments from the Administration.
There were none.

Mr. Allison asked for comments from the general public.
There were none.

Adjournment

Mr. Allison asked for a motion to adjourn.

Motion to adjourn made by Mr. Banks and seconded with unanimous ayes. Meeting adjourned at 10:00 PM

Merry Christmas everybody!

Merry Christmas and thank you for everything David!

Thank you everybody here tonight. Administration - everybody.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janice M. Frank
City Clerk