Thursday, May 24, 2018
Williamsport, PA

Council Vice President Randy Allison brought the Williamsport City Council meeting to order on Thursday, May 24, 2018 at 7:30 PM in City Hall Council Chambers. Chris Cooley did televise the meeting. The invocation was given by Councilman Randy Allison and was immediately followed by the "Pledge of Allegiance".

Council members present:
Jonathan Williamson, President absent
Randy Allison, Vice President
Bonnie Katz, Councilwoman
Derek Slaughter, Councilman
Don Noviello, Councilman
Elizabeth Miele, Councilwoman
Joel Henderson, Councilman

Absent:
Jonathan Williamson

Also, Present:
Gabriel J. Campana, Mayor absent
Mr. Joe Gerardi
Mr. William Nichols, Jr.
Mr. Joe Pawlak
Mr. Gary Knarr
Adam Winder
Dave Young, Police Chief
Sol. Austin White
Janice Frank, City Clerk,
Todd Heckman, Fire Chief
Mr. Joe Gerardi

Approval of the Williamsport City Council minutes of May 10, 2018 was approved upon a motion from **and Mr. Slaughter made** a second from **Mrs. Katz.** All were in favor. **The vote was 6 to 0. Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes. Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes, Dr. Williamson was absent.**

Mr. Allison announced that Dr. Williamson would not attend tonight's meeting.

Limited Courtesy of the Floor
There was no request for limited courtesy of the floor.

Appointments/Reappointments
Planning Commission
Matthew Vanaskie**,** 845 Grampian Blvd. is appointed to a 2-year term commencing 5/24/18 & ending 2/17/20.
Mr. Knarr stated we are requesting this appointment, and is in two-year term, everyone has a copy of his bio, his qualifications are wonderful and he has lot to bring to our Planning Commission.
Mr. Allison asked for motion and a second on the appointment.
Mr. Slaughter made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Henderson stated this came to the Public Safety committee and we did get a chance to meet Mr. Vanaskie. He is very well qualified, he is a young man and he is ready to get involved and we are very excited about him being an important part of our Planning Commission. We did asked some questions and he won't have any problem making the meetings.
Mrs. Katz stated when you read this bio, you want to kidnap him and bring him into City Hall. This is what we are looking for in the city engineer. He has all the qualifications. She felt that he is happy that is going to be on the Planning Commission, because he will be such an asset to the City.
Mr. Allison asked if there were other comments or questions.
The appointment was carried with a vote of 6 to 0. All were in favor.
Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Mr. Allison changed the order of the agenda.

Demolition – 343 West Fourth St – Dkumal, LLC (remove from table)
Mr. Gerardi stated this is a request for a demolition at the property at 343 W. 4th St. This was tabled at last meeting and at this point I do not have any other comments.
Mr. Allison asked if there is a motion to take it off the table.
Ms. Miele made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Noviello.
Ms. Miele stated she would like to begin with an apology to councilmembers, Mr. Gerardi, Mr. Logue, because she has been caught up with the Water Authority for the last week or so and she did not have enough time to research this as she had intended. She said it is usually her preference to reach out before attending a meeting but she just did not have the time. I would like to request that Council take a step that we very rarely take in the demolition ordinance, and deny the demolition permit tonight. I doubt that anyone else has reached out to any of our solicitors, because she has been the most passionate about this, but if you have, you would've found out that both of our solicitors represent Mr. Klingerman and consequently neither of our solicitors could offer any legal advice. There is the fact that in our original agreement with Mr. Klingerman, he had promised in good faith, best efforts, to maintain the structure at the corner of Fourth Street and Elmira Street. Not only as that clearly has not happened, but it seems to be that it has never been his intent. He also as, part of the renderings that we have received and we submitted for grant funding for a project that included the Liberty Arena, it was shown as a standing structure, and if that building does come down, there is a potential, that is to say that we are no longer meeting our agreement with the State for the Re-development and Capital Assistance funding grant that we have submitted. All of that being said, I guess I will go back to the beginning because Mr. Slaughter has not been with us from the beginning. There was an agreement in 2014, so the building on Fourth St & Elmira was our very first, YMCA in Williamsport. Over the years they have added facilities, when Mr.

Klingerman acquired it from the Y, his intent was to build an arena behind it and retain that structure as either office space or apartments. The building had been occupied until it was acquired by Mr. Klingerman. It was included as a step in the design process, members of Council here can verify that we saw umpteen renderings of the buildings, some of them created by Mayor Campana himself and not just the developer. The building was included in the final drawings that we submitted for the grant funding. Several members of Council and the administration were interested in seeing the building maintained. On page 12, in the developers agreement, it says that the developer would use good faith, best efforts to retain the structure and to reuse it. To the best of her knowledge, we have performed very little oversight as to whether or not there were any best efforts being used. Her understanding was that the utilities were all severed when the remaining buildings were demolished four years ago, which would make it seem as though good faith was never part of the equation. She had a stack of newspaper articles quoting the developer saying that Dan Klingerman, CEO and President of Liberty Group says he also wants to convert the existing YMCA into high-end apartments and a conference center. There have been four or five years of quotes in the paper by either the administration or Mr. Klingerman saying how he intended to remote the structure. Despite the fact he has not taken care of it in the past four years in any particular way, structurally it is still in pretty good shape. Cosmetically it is a hot mess. That is in part because even as she walked over here, she could have walked through it. She wanted to remind everyone that as part of the arena project, and I'm not saying this because this is in the way the funding should've gone, I am saying it merely to make it part of the record. Mr. Klingerman received a $1.5 million in direct subsidy from the City, half $1 million direct grant from the Visitors Bureau, and ½ of million dollar direct grant from the Parking Authority. Additionally he received $1.5 million in infrastructure and utility work on the site. For a total of $4 million in subsidies towards that project. There were a handful of conditions attached to that. One, of course was he construct and operate the arena, one of them was the Mayor's Town Green, and the final one was that he reuse the building on the corner of Fourth & Elmira. He did a portion of the town green, the building is more or less what we thought it would be, and we have no good faith on the corner of Elmira. When the demolition came to the table, she reached out to several people, first and foremost our solicitors, and all of this actually began several years ago and Mr. Klingerman actually talked about demolishing it. She started doing some outreach there, thought that she had resolved the situation, but it came back up. Our solicitors are all conflicted, but she has spoken to a handful of other attorneys, and the Historic Preservation Office. Her understanding is that our demolition ordinance does not give us any legal standings in preventing demolition, but backed up by our historical preservation, we should have every legal reason to deny a demolition based on the promises originally given. I speak to Mr. Klingerman, and that's for a very good reason, I feel that Mr. Klingerman has not held up his end of the agreement that we have had for over the past five years. Mr. Logue has absolutely no relation to that, he just has acquired a structure. But that said, the covenants that Mr. Klingerman agreed to, do travel with the land. That means that for better or for worse, you're in a situation where she would recommend that we deny the demolition to Mr. Logue, and in recourse to Mr. Klingerman, I know that there has been talk, she has talked to the Chamber of Commerce, and asked Mr. Gerardi about the information that he has received.

Mr. Gerardi stated he did receive information from the developers that were involved, one was Matt Showers, one was Mr. Hutchison, and he could not remember the third one. They went out and checked it out, and as Mr. Logue and Mr. Klingerman said, it is not monetarily feasible. It did go through that there were three developers that were interested in it.

Ms. Miele stated that she assumed it did not make past the local pool of developers, it was supposed to go out not just to the local pool but people within the State who had a greater level of expertise in dealing with these particular structures. The structure is very interesting, it actually has an identical twin in York Pennsylvania and a number of them obviously have similar constructed buildings across the State. If we do lose the structure, we lose a historic level, not just for the City of Williamsport, but we lose a bit of State history as well and the history of the YMCA. One thing she did check with, the historic preservation office should help us to deny the building, because the building is eligible for not only State, but also federal tax credit related to its status. It is not listed on the National Historic register. It is not a part of our State historic district, but it is listed as a supporting structure in the city both at the State level, which makes it eligible Federally and State wide. She would suggest that we would deny the demolition this evening and work towards the structure to make a workable solution with either Mr. Logue or Mr. Klingerman. She has been reading in the paper all week long about how desperate the mayor is for foundation here in the city, and we gave Dan Klingerman $1.5 million as part amount agreement and he did not hold up to his part of the agreement. Therefore, I would suggest if the mayor is looking for funds, perhaps he should look towards the agreements that we have executed and folks that have not entirely been faithful to them, instead of looking at other assets. That is all she wants to say about it and she is happy to share thoughts with everyone.

Mr. Noviello asked the solicitor if we had to take this off the table before goes any further?

Mr. White stated you already did that.

Mr. Noviello stated he agrees with everything Ms. Miele stated and his concern was the cost it could cost us in litigation issues. It was mentioned that there could be the demolition, can we look into that before we make a decision?

Mr. White responded with his suggestion was that Council take a look at what was reviewed tonight before it makes a decision on the record tonight. If you're going to deny anything, then you should put it into the record. It is not on the table now, but the way the ordinance states is if you put it on the table again without the agreement of the applicant's and don't act on it tonight, then it will be deemed denied under the ordinance.

Mr. Gerardi stated he did reach out and he did step out, he went back to our attorneys, and Mr. Smith said there is nothing in the agreement that he sees that is binding. Also it was not a contract we had with Mr. Klingerman, we had an MOU which is very different. His understanding that it is completely different than the contract.

Ms. Miele stated we had an MOU and a verbal agreement, which would be a binding contract.

Mr. Gerardi stated that she should ask the attorney if that is true. Even if it was, from the representation that we have, and the information that we got from Mr. Smith, he hasn't found anything that is legally wrong with Mr. Klingerman.

Ms. Miele stated that Mr. Smith or Mr. White cannot represent us, she has sought out legal advice with place of different attorneys.

Mr. Gerardi responded with, is that for all of Council or just yourself?

Ms. Miele replied that she is asking for legal advice in the same way that we would be asking for opinions.
Mr. Gerardi stated that he guarantees if we go to a couple of different attorneys, that they will have different opinions.

Ms. Miele stated well our Attorney could offer us advice on whether or not we would be wise to seek the permission of the developer and to look into it over the next couple weeks which she would be fine with it. It is not a deemed denial if we don't have permission from the applicant.

Mr. White stated that is correct if the applicant gives permission for it to remain under consideration by the Council, the demolition ordinance allows meetings as in plural, but realistically if it stays on the table, you are going to be deemed denial.

Ms. Miele stated she reached out to a handful of attorneys, and that was all of their opinion, and no one wants to turn this into a legal matter, we don't want the building to come down, so anything we can do so it doesn't become a legal matter, will be helpful. Consequently, there hasn't really been time to seek another avenue or to seek another developer or look a little bit out of the scope. She doesn't want to get it turned into a parking lot.

Mrs. Katz asked if any of the money that was given to Mr. Klingerman, were there any grants attached to this?

Mr. Nichols stated as he remembered there was a change in the language, originally it was more stringent about not demolishing the building but we ended up with the language that said that the developer would do his best effort to try to renovate the building for whatever purpose it was intended. I don't think it was attached to any of the agreements we gave to the developer at the end of the day.

Mrs. Katz stated there was so much money that went to so many different directions, and it was hard to keep track of it.

Mr. Nichols replied, it started out as a RCAP grant that was received for Destination 2014, specific to the arena project and then we were able to negotiate a swap for funding, with a $3 million was invested in other parts of the Downtown Revitalization Project, and specifically the Trade & Transit II project and the City was able to provide funding for this project, the arena in the amounts that were stated that included direct money to the developer as well is an agreement to renovate lot E and the infrastructure related to the project. I remember vividly there was a lot of debate about that, and at the end of the day, everybody agreed to put the language that said the developer will use his best effort.

Ms. Miele answered but the part of what we received of redevelopment assistant program grant for, was the Destination 2014 project. That is to say the Destination 2014 project was entirely included in the description that was sent to the State that received the grant money. The grant money got expended on that.

Mr. Nichols answered you are exactly right because he was part of the team that went down to the governor's office to present the project, and clearly that building was part of the presentation. Many jobs that were referenced to be created by, and I think at one time it was an innovation center, recalled a lot of different things, but I think not directly as part of an agreement, but part of the overall project at one point in time.

Mr. Allison asked if we have the applicant here tonight?

Mr. Logue stated he'd be happy to answer any questions tonight.

Mr. Allison stated specifically to the point if this was read tabled, it would be considered a denial unless you would agree to that it be tabled for another period of time.

Mr. Logue stated he had a 30 day notification and it would take a couple of weeks, if you could get a developer, he would be willing to wait, and he does not disagree with Ms. Miele at all, but he would agree to getting a reasonable price, he can't afford to extend this much longer. **Voice was inaudible.**

Mr. Allison asked, in lieu of that, you would entertain any reasonable offers?

Mr. Logue stated up to 30 days from now if someone would come forward, he would prefer to that.

Ms. Miele stated to Mr. Logue that he stated to her in private, that he would give the building to someone.

Mr. Logue answered yes he would.

Mr. Gerardi stated, well you have two choices, number one you can deny it, in which Mr. Logue could appeal and eventually win his case. The second choice is if Mr. Logue would agree to an extra 30 days to find a developer.

Ms. Miele stated that she appreciates him entering into the record, that the City did have a deal with the developer who did not live up to the promises that were made, and she is sorry that despite all of those promises, she will still vote to deny the demolition. In her years on City Council, it has made her very sad to see the city get taken advantage of, and she doesn't want to have to tell many people from the historic district, that she voted yes on something because she had an arrangement and the arrangement could fall through. She used to be a woman who was a handshake sort of woman, and her experience on City Council makes her feel otherwise.

Mr. Gerardi stated he noticed that Mr. Klingerman is here, and he wanted to say that the building sat there for several years, and it sat there for two years because of an issue with the contractor and a legal battle, and nothing could be done with the building. But would I want to keep a 50,000 square-foot building heated for two Winters, I wouldn't. That is probably one of the pipes are broken because for two years he was going through litigation, and that is not something that he could recoup as a person. You did mention it, but there was a reason why it sat for a period of time.

Ms. Miele stated that she said the utilities were severed, not being able to be attached.

Mr. Gerardi stated well they could be, but would it be worth for Mr. Klingerman to keep the utilities up because it did sit vacant during the two-year timeframe.

Ms. Miele stated she always had a difficult time with that time logic. She has reached out to pretty much nearly everybody and every channel that she used, and has exhausted all options, and has received some potentially communications with some people. But it takes more than two weeks to get somebody to agree to take on a project, and it may take more than 30 days. She believes that any advice from the solicitors that she has spoken to, that says there may well be a case here. So consequently, she cannot approve the demolition. She apologized to Mr. Logue potentially getting caught up in this position, it was never her intention, she thought she was being Into the loop, but she got a little blindsided.

Mr. Henderson stated so we could approve the demolition and put a condition on the demolition. Could we put a condition on that the demolition, any action is delayed for 30 days? Is that what you were implying, if we were to approve that condition to give Ms. Miele the 30 days? Mr. Logue replied from his seat and it was inaudible. Mr. Henderson continued it is really hard to keep tying this up, he would love to save the building as much as anyone, but he does not want a legal battle either. He is not sure that we

are prepared for it. He would recommend that we would put that condition on an approved that demolition in order to prevent any legal battle.

The solicitor was asked if we could approve it with a timeframe of 30 days, in which he replied, that Council can do that and whoever is going to make the motion, should make that motion. He stated that in the demolition ordinance, if there are conditions attached, there are provisions in which to accept. It does not have to happen now, there is a five business day window after.

Mr. Noviello stated if this 30-day provision does not interfere with Mr. Logue's plan then he would go a long with the provision itself, and vote for the demolition with the provision. He stated he is a little leery of going against something that this body has put in place itself legally, and we have already seen, that we don't come out good in these kind of litigations. That alone is the reason why I would vote for the demolition. But if we could give Mr. Logue some breathing room, I am certainly happy to do that and provide time to satisfy everybody.

Ms. Miele stated with all due respect, Mr. Logue will have then notified the DEP that he is taking the structure down, and he has admittedly entered into a contract with the demolition company. Those steps would perhaps make it difficult for him to back down, moving forward. She stated that Mr. Henderson make his motion should be a 30 day timeframe until the demolition starts, and in that 30 day that any reasonable proposal for the structure be entertained within 30 days.

Mr. Henderson stated he would agree with that additional condition. **He made the motion that there will be a 30 day, that no action is taken for 30 days, and in that 30-day time, if there is a viable option, it will be entertained. Mr. Slaughter seconded it.**

Mr. Gerardi stated, he has a question, should we make sure that the person who gets this building, as the capital to renovate the building? Because if not, he will have a nightmare on his hand for the next 20 years. We should make the person who gets it has the money to invest it.

Ms. Miele stated the time to think about that would've been before the demolition permit came through the building.

Mr. Gerardi answered and they did do that, and you got five developers, five of them all had money, that it was feasible to do.

Ms. Miele stated to Mr. Gerardi she is merely saying that she is trying to solve a problem that could've been sold in other ways. She tried solving it before-hand and did not meet with a lot of collaboration and would like an additional 30 days to solve it. And in giving an additional 30 days, she will make her best good faith, best effort to locate a developer with the capital.

Mr. Gerardi answered I am sure you will, but his concern is that someone does have the capital to renovate it.

Mr. Allison stated we have a motion and a second, and so he asked the owner for his input.

Mr. Logue stated he will agree to the 30 days, ..voice inaudible…..

Mr. Henderson stated he felt he did make the option, if there was a viable option within the 30 day, then that demolition can be stopped.

Mr. Allison asked for a vote on the amendment.

The motion to amend the demolition was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0. Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes. Mr. Slaughter voted yes and Mr. Allison voted yes. Dr. Williamson was absent.

Mr. Gerardi stated to be clear, 30 days from now, if nothing occurs, he can issue a demo permit and 30 days.

Ms. Miele stated you can issue a demolition permit tomorrow.

Mr. Gerardi stated he will not issue a permit until 30 days because that's what Council decided to do. But after 30 days, he is assuming if nothing happens, he can issue the permit and Mr. Logue will start demolishing that day.

Ms. Miele stated whatever Mr. Logue would need to apply to the DEP to demolish the structure, you would be able to give it to him as of tomorrow. So you could issue that instantaneously, if the demolition is approved. You are free to do what you want.

Mr. Gerardi stated he just wants to make sure that he will not issue the permit, until the 30 days are up.

Mr. Allison stated now he would like a vote on the original demolition item.

The demolition was denied with a roll call of five no roll call votes. The vote was 5 to 1. Ms. Miele voted no, Mr. Noviello voted no, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted no, Mr. Slaughter voted no, Mr. Allison voted no, and Dr. Williamson was absent. The demolition was denied.

Mr. Gerardi stated that he did not understand what just happened.

Ms. Miele answered that we denied the demolition even with the condition.

Mr. Gerardi stated well wasn't there two votes?

Mr. Allison stated we voted on the amendment first and then the demolition.

Mr. Gerardi stated he thought we should clarify what just happened.

Mrs. Frank stated to clarify; the vote was 6 to 0 on the amendment to amend the demolition, and then a 5 to 1 vote to deny the demolition. The votes were considered to be clarified by the City Clerk.

Certificate of Appropriateness – 6 West 4th St.

Mr. Gerardi stated this is a certificate for an erected business sign, there is a photo attached for the size and color. The sign meets all the zoning requirements. The Planning Commission did review this on Monday, March 14 and did recommend this to city Council. He'd be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Allison asked for motion and a second on this.

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

Mr. Allison asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Miele stated it is really nice to see some signage there.

Mr. Gerardi stated that these funds are already up, and they are aware of it, they did take a permit out for it.

Mr. Allison asked for a vote on the certificate of appropriateness.

The certificate of appropriateness was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0. Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Certificate of Appropriateness – 47 West 4th St

Mr. Allison asked for a motion and the second.

Mr. Slaughter made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Noviello.

Mr. Gerardi stated, this is an identification sign, it does meet all the signing and zoning ordinance. It is a little bit smaller than the one that was originally there, this one was where Ozzie and Mae's was before. This is an in-home health care.

Mr. Allison asked for a vote on the certificate.

The certificate of appropriateness was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0. Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Certificate of Appropriateness – 416 W. Third St.

Mr. Allison asked for a motion.

Mr. Slaughter made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Knarr stated what he is presenting tonight is a certificate of appropriateness at Farrington place, this is outside the CDB what does not need a design review, however the awning will sit in the public right away, and it does require a liability agreement. You do have a copy of it and it was reviewed by our solicitor, Norm Lubin, and it was made positive that it was a good to go agreement.

Mr. Allison asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Miele asked if Farrington Place was in the historic district.

Mr. Knarr answered no, it is not.

There was a small discussion about the sidewalk, it was stated it was a standard sidewalk.

Mrs. Katz asked about the parking situation and about the parking ordinance for that area.

Mr. Knarr answered they actually went before the Zoning Hearing Board and got granted additional parking. They get a variance for 200 parking stalls. They made the exception, they were initially denied, and the appealed through the Zoning Hearing Board, and the Zoning Hearing Board granted them that exception not meeting the 200 stalls. It was not appealed, so therefore it was approved.

Mrs. Katz stated so they don't have the 200 parking spaces?

Mr. Knarr stated the Zoning Hearing Board met and granted them the exception.

Mr. Allison stated there is a representative here.

Mr. Eric Winters, stated we have five buildings on that street, we have been in business over five years and the variance was over three years ago, so he is wondering why it has been brought up. They own over five properties that have dedicated parking and we rent a parking lot as well, not to mention all the public free parking on the street, both sides of the street. He'd be happy to answer any questions at happened over five years ago.

Mrs. Katz stated it came up because this was brought to us, we would not have remembered if this was brought up to us three years ago. What you are doing with your business is terrific, that is fine, but we do have a right to question.

Mr. Winters stated he is definitely not upset, but he came prepared for the awning, not what we went through three years ago with the whole board. He didn't bring any of that stuff at all. He doesn't mean any undertone, he just didn't bring any of that information.

Mr. Allison asked if there were other questions on this item.

The certificate of appropriateness was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0. Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Resolution #8775
Resolution Certifying the Local Match for State Operating Financial Assistance

The City read the resolution.

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

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

Mr. Nichols stated the first two resolutions are companion documents required by Penn Dot for inclusion in our annual State Operating Assistant grant for the next fiscal year starting July 1. As determined by a formula in ACT 89, section 1513, RVT receives operating funds $4,348,063 and requires a local share of $386,580. This resolution certifies that the local share will be secured. The second resolution certified the source of the local funds that will be provided during the fiscal year. The City will supply the local share in our transit authority will reimburse the city for their perspective year. Finance committee did review this.

Mr. Allison stated Finance did review this and this is a standard resolution that we handle every year. We talked about the funding match and where that is coming from.

Mr. Nichols stated we have about 20 partners, approximately 70% of local share by formula comes from the city, the other 30% is from various local sources, municipalities and businesses. The question was raised about the Lycoming Mall. There is obviously a concern there, and he is reaching out to the new owner to try to assess what is going on there. When he gets in answer he will report back.

Mr. Allison stated Finance did forward this to the full body of Council with positive recommendation.

Mr. Allison asked for a vote on the resolution.

The resolution was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.
Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Resolution #8776
Resolution by Municipality Certifying Provision of Local Match for State Operating Financial Assistance

The City read the resolution.

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

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

Mr. Nichols stated this is the companion resolution that certifies where the local share is being provided with the caveat that the City will be reimbursed by the various partners that we have from the local share.

Ms. Miele stated this is a standard resolution and Finance committee did review this and sent it to the full body of Council with a positive recommendation. This is something we go through every year, and aside from the Mall discussion.

Mr. Allison asked if there were comments or questions.

Mr. Nichols stated he did forget to add that we have not had to raise the local share for over 20 years, and we are able to secure this.

The resolution was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.
Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Resolution #8777
Resolution Consolidated Capital Grant Application to File Application & Certify Local Match

The City read the resolution.
Mr. Allison asked for a motion to approve the resolution.
Mr. Henderson made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Slaughter.

Mr. Nichols stated in the first time in many years, we are not getting a grant for buses. We are well in advance of keeping our fleet up-to-date because of our conversion to CNG. This year we are requesting $4.9 million for construction projects, one is a resubmission, and the Third Street Parking garage and the facilities that were designed for that connection and yet this was envisioned to be the last project. The second is for upgrades to the Trade & Transit project which is 20 years old, and our garage facility needs to updated because the State wants us to do it. And we need to have this resolution to go in with that application, and some ongoing projects like some computer upgrades and software updates, and they are a requirement for Penn DOT so we submit them now to this grant process. There is still an ongoing issue that is being looked at, there was a class action suit filed against the Turnpike commission, this is for all the Transit system in the Commonwealth, a lion share with the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. There is a lot of on known factors going forward about that revenue source for capital projects, so it is of some concern, and it is a concern for funding projects. Some projects have been put on hold and I don't know what ours will be.

Mr. Allison asked if there were comments or questions from Council.
The resolution was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.
Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Resolution #8778
Resolution Authorizing the Execution of Two Construction Contracts for Expansion of RVT's CNG Fueling

The City read the resolution.
Mr. Allison asked for a motion to approve the resolution.
Mr. Slaughter made the motion and it was seconded by Mrs. Katz.

Mr. Nichols stated we are very fortunate, we were the first system to commit to our CNG conversion, and the second system in the State, State College was the first about 20 years ago. They will begin construction, and they will be adding a 3 compressor and the State will do that because 75% of our fleet is CNG. We will be going to Hawbaker for some paving work, and the design team is funded by the State. This will complete our fueling station for five years, that is the only thing left to do at this point in time, is to add some additional storage, we are pretty well almost to the end of the road in terms of our conversion. We are very pleased to present this and thanks from Penn Dot. This was reviewed by Finance Committee.

Ms. Miele stated this did come before Finance Committee and we forwarded it to the full body of Council with a positive recommendation, pending the answer to one question.

Mr. Nichols stated we did get approved $700,000 for additional CNG projects, related projects and this came well underneath what the state expected, we do have $200,000 set aside for additional projects. He was surprised that we were well under budget.

Ms. Miele stated so the $200,000 is being put away for something CG related.

Mr. Allison asked if there were comments or questions from members of Council.
The resolution was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.
Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Resolution #8779
Resolution of the City of Williamsport Authorizing the Submission of an Application for Funding to the Commonwealth of Pa for the RCAP Grant in the Amount of 2 Million Dollars for Lycoming College Gateway Project

The City read the resolution.
Mr. Allison asked for a motion to approve the resolution.
Mrs. Katz made the motion and second by Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Nichols stated this resolution authorizes the City of Williamsport, on behalf of Lycoming College to submit the necessary paperwork for RCAP grant, and this will be a pass-through for Lycoming College Gateway project and the details of this pass-through grant is also through an agreement which is attached to the resolution. This grant is part of the funding for the overall strategy for the E. 3rd St., Gateway project. This will provide funds for the site work, demolition, excavations, utility relocation, parking lots, sidewalks etc. As you have noted Dr. Trachte from Lycoming College is here tonight and the college is and has been a tremendous partner in the overall project and recently announced that a key component is ready to advance. The City and the college are married to this project in terms of the City will be advancing the Franklin and Basin Street improvements. The college is proceeding with its Gateway project that is a tremendous asset to the City and it will be a new gateway to the college. We were excited to be able to put together this funding strategy, and with the college improvements it is well over $20 million

Dr. Trachte stated he is delighted to be here tonight, and he feels that he has been attached to Mr. Nichols for the last three years. He wanted to share a couple of words of gratitude and reflection. It was somewhere over three years ago that the City appointed an E. 3rd St., Gateway Commission and he was honored to be able to serve on that commission among several other members. At that point in time we went to work on developing a division as to how the college could collaborate with the City, private

developers, and Penn DOT. We came to you with a plan which you enthusiastically endorsed, but it was just words on paper with some diagram, we identified some potential sites for development. The first priority that was identified was the basin Street quarter for a potential or Gateway entrance to the college. So at that time we went to work on the college and we have been working very diligently to develop a design for the building, and to raise the capital needed to construct the building. It will be a 12 and a half-million dollar to construct the building. What has really motivated he and the college to pursue this, it's not about just building a building on campus, this project is part of a larger vision. It is part of a vision for how all of us can work together to create an exciting venue and exciting part of the city. Hopefully this will attract people from beyond Williamsport and Lycoming County. This represents the first tangible step to begin the work on this project. He expressed his gratitude to Council for the support and to the city administration. He thinks it is time to roll up our sleeves and bring in some construction commitment and I hope you will agree to accept this grant and we can get started.

Ms. Miele stated we are very excited to see this get started and we are equally excited to see the grant portions rule and for other portions of the project. Especially a grant that came in hundred thousand dollars and what we were expecting and what we asked for. The finance committee did forward this to the full body of Council with a positive recommendation. We had a big discussion about the college taking all the reporting elements of the grant and that is a huge relief for our staff. The college is also taking on the responsibility, so the been no money from the city. The next step for this project, we will see it land development from the college for the new building and then we will see the college memorialize our understandings. And instead of Penn DOT moving back there paving date, we want to get this project moving, due to discussions with Penn DOT they have agreed to pay asked to pay to ourselves.

Mr. Nichols stated there will be a reimbursement agreement to Council to approve, right now it is in the hands of Penn DOT reviewing our comments, and again that would be a pass-through from Penn DOT to us. So we would let the project on Penn Dot's behalf and that would move it forward when they would do the rest of third Street. It's been a great partnership. A couple other points, the county agrees to step forward and provide a allotment and allocation to this project, equal to what the city burled for this project. We were very pleased and excited about the County stepping forward and this is turning out like we did with West of Market St., Project, with the lead partners working together in a funding partnership way. That was exciting when that happened recently. Again Lycoming College has been very supportive. The college is taking responsibility for the administering of the grant, and it is very similar to the last time the city was involved with this was like with Hope Enterprise. The last time it was $2 million and they took on the responsibilities of submitting the application in dealing with an engineering firm that the State provides. The college is geared up to do that and we are doing everything to support them as well.

Dr. Trachte stated we are so grateful to Sen. Yaw for helping us with this grant, and both representative Wheeland and Senator Yaw have been so helpful.

Mr. Allison stated we are pleased to hear that as well and thank you for sharing that. This is an example to Council and to the administration is how a public/ private partnership should work to facilitate development. We are happy that we can do our part for the things that we do best which allows the college and hopefully a lot of others to develop and do the things that they do best.

Mr. Nichols thanked the city staff, Gary Knarr, Joe Gerardi and the staff, and John Grado for coming back a day a week. These projects are less complicated when you have more than one entity involved.

Mr. Allison asked for a vote on the resolution.

The resolution was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.
Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Resolution #8780
Resolution to Approve a 2016 Sub Recipient Monitoring Agreement between the County & the City

The City read the resolution.

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

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

Ms. S. Young stated this is a sub recipient agreement with Lycoming County for $225,000 of 2016 PHARE Funds. These funds will be provided to repairs for rentals and owner-occupied homes on the city's list of Historic properties and sites. The City will give preference to units that are occupied by tenant or owner occupied households with income below the Lycoming County 2016, 50% area median income. The plan does require that 50% of those households does receive that funds. Any rental units must be affordable to low income households. Each applicant may apply for up to $25,000, funds are at a 0% interest rate and terms are at a 10-year forgiveness term and a 15% match from the homeowner is required. We do a mass mailing to notify the residential property owners about the program. Initially we will not be included any residential properties that are in the historic district, because we had budgeted 2018 funds specifically for the historic district. A solicitor has reviewed this agreement, and it was sent to the Finance Committee.

Ms. Miele stated Finance did review this and forwarded it to the full body of Council with a positive recommendation. We have known we've had this funding for quite some time and we are acting on it, the City is still working on a final list of historic structures within the City, the merge will be merging the 2005 list with the 2015 list. This funding is exciting, there are a lot of times when it pays to have an older property in the city of Williamsport, and this is one time we can provide a certain amount of funding. Just for the record, 50% of the medium income is $29,050. That is not able to be adjusted depending on the number of people in the household. The income limits are fixed.

Ms. Young stated the PHARE Funding is only for residential properties, but the city has a façade program for commercial properties, so were going to look at that as well to see if that could be a program that could be tweaked a little bit and be more advantageous.

Mr. Allison stated we are certainly grateful anytime we can access a program that helps us with our housing stock. He asked for vote on the resolution.

The resolution was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.
Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Resolution #8781

Resolution Authorizing the Petition for Renewal Under the PA Liquor Control Board Liquor Code for Noise Regulation, Approved by the PA Liquor Control Board on July 15, 2015

The City read the resolution.
Mr. Allison asked for a motion to approve the resolution.
Mrs. Katz made a motion and it was seconded by Mr. Noviello.

Mr. Knarr stated the resolution is a renewal request in order to extend a noise waiver to allow amplified music played outside, under the Pennsylvania liquor license establishment. The waiver expires July 5, 2018. The city still maintains three different zones that authorizes an extension requests by the PLCB. Providing that Council approves this resolution, PLCB will again hold three hearings, one here in City Hall, and one in each zoned area. At that time we will make a determination if we can get another extension of that. If they do, they will provide us with the length of time to do that. Initially they did a one year, and then the next year to year, so hopefully the make it a little bit more lengthy so we don't have to keep coming back in order to have the entertainment order into effect.

Mr. Noviello asked if we have had any complaints?

Mr. Knarr answered we have not had one complaint.

Mr. Allison stated when this initially came up, we had a long discussion on this, it is nice to know that it is going as it should go now. He asked for vote on the resolution.
The resolution was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.
Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Resolution #8782

Resolution Real Estate Refund – 163 Catawissa Ave

The City read the resolution.
Mr. Allison asked for a motion to approve the resolution.
Mrs. Katz made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Slaughter.

Mr. Grimes stated this is for a refund for property located at 163 Catawissa Ave. A few weeks ago Council approved a reduction for this property. The owner has requested for overpaid taxes in 2017. He has attached information sharing it.

Mr. Noviello asked why we have had so many reductions by this property owner.

Mr. Grimes stated he felt that it was the warehouses, and the business values are down which causes the real estate value to be down, the warehouse was too high and that was challenged through the court and the settlement agreement happened based on the owner thinking that his property was assessed higher than what it's worth.
Mr. Allison asked for a vote on the resolution.
The resolution was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.
Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Resolution #8783

Resolution Real Estate Refund – 2406 Reach Rd

The City read the resolution.
Mr. Allison asked for a motion to approve the resolution.
Ms. Miele made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Grimes stated this is another warehouse owned by Mr. Stopper, is the same circumstances, and timeline, and he is asking for a refund and the refund for this property is $10,406.60.
Mr. Allison asked for vote on the resolution.
The resolution was carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.
Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Certificates of Appropriateness – HARB

Item 2. OURSE GROUP LLC
771 West Third Street
65-003-344 1880 Three story brick Victorian Queen Anne style house with multigabled asphalt roof. Triangular roof dormer with a fanlight. Protruding three-story bay in front. Decorative brick panels and chimney. Front gable with clapboard, a large window, and wood trim. Part of front porch enclosed with stone and windows.

A. Replace 2, rear third-floor porch support columns and 2 second floor rear porch columns with new wood columns. Match the existing square columns.

B. Replace damaged rim boards on 3rd floor rear porch. Match existing trims.

C. Replace any joists on the 2nd floor deck that are damaged.

D. Install new nailers and replace second floor porch deck with yellow pine Tongue & Groove.

E. Secure the rear metal stair system at all points in contact with the building.

F. Remove asphalt brick-look siding and replace with smooth clapboard Hardie Plank similar to existing clapboards.

G. Paint previously painted surfaces same as existing.

Item 3. City of Williamsport – Ways Garden
Maynard & West Fourth Streets
65-004-126 - Park given to the City in 1913 by Roman Way.

A. Construct 22' x 36' roofed, rough oak timber pavilion with a composite deck, on concrete piers, at the south end of the park (near the alley). Appearance will be similar to the attached drawings dated 5/8/2018. Timbers will be finished with a semi-transparent stain. Roof will be charcoal architectural shingles. Framed, tight weave lattice between foundation piers. Vinyl ramp railing with appearance of a Victorian porch railing. The applicant will return for specific Colors and Material update after bidding is completed.

Mr. Allison asked for a motion and second.

Mrs. Katz made the motion and the second by Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Allison asked if there were questions or comments, he asked for a vote on the certificates.
The certificate of appropriateness for HARB were carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.
Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent.

Accept for filing
Veterans Memorial Park Commission 03/05/18
Public Safety Minutes 02/27/18
Controller Report 03/31/18
Finance Committee Minutes 02/27/18,03/27/18 & 4/24/18
Mr. Allison asked for a motion to accept the minutes for filing.
Mr. Noviello made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Slaughter.
The minutes were carried with six yes roll call votes. The vote was 6 to 0.
Ms. Miele voted yes, Mr. Noviello voted yes, Mr. Henderson voted yes, Mrs. Katz voted yes, Mr. Slaughter voted yes, Mr. Allison voted yes and Dr. Williamson was absent

Announcements
The next regularly scheduled City Council meeting will be held on Thursday, June 7, 2018 at 7:30 PM, in City Hall Council Chambers. (**Enter through the police department at rear of building for meetings after 5:00 PM.)**

Upcoming Meetings:

Monday, May 28	Closed – Memorial DAY
Tuesday, May 29	12:00 PM Planning Commission
	3:30 PM ERC Meeting
	7:00 PM Citizens Corp
Thursday, May 31	4:30 PM Pension Boards Review
Monday, June 4	5:30 PM Government Study Home Rule
Tuesday, June 5	11:00 AM Historic Preservation Committee
	1:00 PM Finance Committee
	2:30 PM Public Works
	3:30 PM Public Safety
Wednesday, June 6	4:00 PM Charter Commission
Thursday, June 7	7:30 PM City Council Meeting

[Meetings Held in Council Chambers Unless Otherwise Noted – [scr] = William Sechler Community Room]

Mr. Allison asked for comments from members of the Public.
There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Allison asked if there were comments from City Council.
Mrs. Katz asked Adam Winder if we were still picking up brush.
Mr. Winder replied yes and we will be for another month.

Mr. Allison stated that members of council have expressed an interest in publicly speaking about issues. We would like to speak about the water and the authority issues that have been in the press, very public and the other is the hiring of a new engineer.
Mr. Allison stated so with the first subject of the authorities, he thinks there has been things that have been the newspaper, and we feel we need to make some kind a statement because there has been a lot more published in social media, Facebook, getting out press releases and drafts of press releases. The public has a lot of questions and there has not been a lot of answers and when they do get information they get piecemeal, and have to read into articles from the newspaper. So he believes for himself and each member of Council, the court issues, and we always wanted to protect the assets of the Authorities from sale or lease to extract more money than is from the authority in a way that legally they can't give us more money. They can't contribute to our budget each year. But we haven't wanted to try other avenues because we have also been cognitive to the need to protect the ratepayers. Any money taken from the Authority beyond what they normally raise would have to come from ratepayers in the end. Those are two areas. The other thing we don't want to put at risk is our relationship and cooperation with neighboring municipalities. That kind of activity would affect them negatively as well and our relationships with them. We are working with them on a lot of important issues, like the levy and MS4 and Graffius Run. That is not just a Williamsport issue, we are working with our neighbors on that and we need a cooperative effort and we don't want to put that at risk by going for the dollars in that way. He asked if there was anyone else who would care to speak.

Mr. Henderson stated that he has a few comments and a statement he would like to read. As I see it, the administration has lost sight of the fact that government elected officials are only stewards of the people's resources, that is money, property, and water. Unfortunately, there has been no communication with

Council or the people prior to and concerning the recent hiring of an engineer or concerning future plans with the Water Authority. In light of the recent meeting to elect a new chairman, May 16, the possible sunshine violations on the 23rd, it seems obvious that no attempt is being made discover the will of the taxpayer of Williamsport, before rash and highly consequential decisions are being made. Recent resignations at the Water Authority, and the fact that three board members are leading decisions while on expired terms, the chairman, being both displaced and replaced in the last six months. And the fact the Authority is running with administrative vacancies, suggests there is great instability there. That being the case, this is no time to make decisions that would disregard most of the work done the past two years concerning the storm water authority. It must be stated while such actions may technically be legal, although that remains to be thoroughly investigated, they are certainly not right. While the mayor does have certain authority, I feel that his unilateral actions and abating of accountability will have costly repercussions for the people whose resources he is to advantage. This is what I see. And supposedly as a Councilman, I have the inside scoop, what must the people think?

Mr. Noviello stated that he agrees with that 100% and he also feels that there has been a fair degree of disrespect and a lack of consideration to advance Mr. Henderson's thoughts in regards to the work that has been done over the last several years by both Public Works committee and the Finance committee. Hours upon hours of work, and special meetings and meetings outside the normal schedule of meetings that we generally approve of. This has compounded to the extent that I think the citizens need more informative answers on a routine kind of way. I would put the term resignations that you mentioned in parentheses as well with respect to the hiring of a new engineer. I certainly have no dispersions to cast upon the person who was named, however as I understand it, and I always predicate my comments with someone who is free to correct me, as I understand it, this person does not have the qualifications necessary that we are seeking to fulfill. There is a PE that is required, I don't think that this person has said in hand, I would like to seek someone having that credential in hand, considering the types of projects that the city is facing over the next several years. They are demanding projects, and certainly you want to have that qualification and a certification that we are looking for. Again I am hoping that we can find a better resolution, certainly some communication with leadership would be greatly appreciated and frankly I think by way of public, that communication is expected and anticipated. I am having a difficult time responding to the questions from individuals who have been keeping an eye on what has been made available to them by the way the public of the discussion that we have had and what is been available in social print.

Mrs. Katz stated she has to reiterate what Don is saying, we have put so many years into working with the Water Authority, unfunded mandates, and trying to come up with the solutions. We have been working with the Water Authority so long, and we have made contacts throughout the county, throughout the State. And to watch some of this get torn apart in a matter of weeks, and not having the answers that we need to follow through, I don't think people understand, we have a lot on our plate right now that encompasses millions and millions of dollars. And not to have an engineer that is qualified, bothers us tremendously. Some of this has been put on Mr. Nichols plate that all of the projects, and bringing John Grado back, God love the man for back one day a week. It is a lot, and it is a lot to ask anybody when you don't have the right person in that position. This concerns us, not only because of the money has to come through, but because of the projects. We don't want someone coming in and making mistakes, and that is what might happen at this point. Because we are all watching every penny, because I don't think the public realizes that we are left out in the cold a lot, we don't have the answers, and we don't give the answers. So we are questioning a lot. It is interesting, this is my second term on City Council and now people are asking about so many different things, it is not like it was almost 6 or seven years ago where okay this is the way things were done, we are all questioning a lot and we are trying to come up with finding the right answers. We also want to have the right people in the position to help us find those answers.

Mr. Slaughter stated that he of course wasn't here for those years, but just looking at it, starting in January, none of this has made a lot of sense from what he has seen. He doesn't want to repeat everything that has been said, but obviously he is in agreement with all of it. He would hope moving forward, that there would be some rational process, judgment and decision-making that can be backed up with some common sense justification for the decisions that are made, both from members of Council and the administration. Again I don't want to repeat everything that has been said, I am in hundred percent agreement with them, and hoping to move forward with some type of reliable process that makes sense.

Ms. Miele stated the members of the Finance Committee attended a special Finance meeting issuing an insurance RFP a couple of weeks ago. At the time, the mayor was present and use the phrase several times "open and transparent. " I found it ironic, that day in particular, and I find it ironic now as well because there has been little that has been open and transparent and aboveboard, both that has been happening in the Water Authority and what has been happening with our hiring process, especially with this last position of engineer. I don't by any stretch question our engineering higher per se, but the process itself was deeply flawed, there was no process. Whether you are running your city as a business, or you running your city is a city, it wouldn't matter, as a business owner, I don't hire somebody off the street. I engage in a process, I request applications, and that is an important thing to do no matter what level you are operating at. And it is particularly at this level, our process has to be impeachable and I don't feel that our process has been unimpeachable in any shape or form. As regards to the Water Authority, I look forward to speaking about it in the next few weeks, without a doubt. I am saddened even as it stands, when I attended the Water Authority meeting on Wednesday afternoon, to see that not only were Mrs. Katz, Mr. Allison and myself were present but several members of the public were present, several past members of the Water Authority, and members, managers of the public that participate in our Water Authority were there. And that unfortunately did not speak to their sudden interest and incitement about what was happening in the Water Authority or to their nervousness about the mayor's proposals in the paper. That in turn makes me nervous, because we are stewards of a very remarkable resource that will only gain in value. There are many parts of the country that are not fortunate to have water in the way we do here. We have spent decades building relationship throughout the valley, and relationships that I would like to see in other arenas of municipal business, but we have been water and sewer, and to put those at risk for the idea of some short-term financial gain which would be exceptionally foolish and

shortsighted. I am open to discussions on any topic whatsoever, but I am not open to jeopardizing my children's water supply. I look forward to future discussions in the coming weeks.

Mr. Allison stated in regarding the Water Authority meeting we attended on Wednesday, we were all encouraged by the tenor and the direction in the things that we heard there, and are supported of the expression of the board members, that publicly stated that they look at it the same way, no sale, no lease. The ratepayers they stress more than once were their main concern as well. So we want to move forward in that tone, and that kind of cooperation and I think that speaks in everything that we have addressed tonight. We have said this many many times, whether it's hiring or bringing forth a plan, or investigating something, or floating an idea, it is about the process. There has to be a rational, logical, well stated, well-thought-out process that can substantially the light of day and can be transparent. That today is almost universally in this country is the problem with various levels of the government. There are too many things that are decided outside of the light of the public introspection, or any kind of contact with the public. We don't want that in the city, and we don't want that in city government, and we are part of it and that is where we are coming from. Everybody has been able to hear the hearts and the minds of Council tonight. And we are going to move forward and keep pushing that agenda because that is the best for the city, and the best for the citizens and the best for our neighbors that surround us and border us. He thanked everybody.

He asked if there is any comments from the administration,
There was none.

He announced that Council will have a brief executive session in the matter of personnel and possibly a legal issue.

Adjournment
Mr. Allison asked for a motion to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned upon motion by **Ms. Katz and it was seconded by Mr. Slaughter.**
Motion was carried by a **unanimous at 9:30 PM** "ayes'.

Submitted by:

Janice M. Frank, City Clerk