

BETHLEHEM CITY COUNCIL MEETING
10 East Church Street - Town Hall
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
Tuesday, December 7, 2021 – 7:00 PM

INVOCATION

PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

1. ROLL CALL

President Waldron called the meeting to order. Present were Bryan G. Callahan, Michael G. Colón, Grace Crampsie Smith, Olga Negrón, J. William Reynolds, Paige Van Wirt and Adam R. Waldron, 7.

Ordinance 9 L pulled from agenda/Responsible Contractor Ordinance 9 L and Resolution 10 A

President Waldron announced prior to our agenda this evening the prime sponsor of Bill 31-2021, Item 9 L and the companion Resolution Item 10 A from Councilwoman Crampsie Smith has been requested that the items be removed from tonight's agenda. If those items are removed from the agenda the Administration's amendments to that Bill will also be removed from the agenda. At this point he will turn to Ms. Crampsie Smith so she can give us her thoughts on her request to remove those from the agenda.

Ms. Crampsie Smith noted she is requesting those be removed from the agenda; she has worked on this for almost 2 years and has been working with the city for over a year on it. At the 11th hour, you could say, the Administration introduced amendments and she has not had time to really prepare well to present this tonight for a vote.

President Waldron queried when Mr. Evans brought those amendments forward to Council.

Mr. Evans remarked he would say about six weeks ago. He has a cover memo with the current date which states October 14, 2021.

President Waldron related this has been a pretty long journey to get us to the point where we are at and he just wanted to make sure that we are taking the best course possible for the city and try to get everybody on the same page. He was not sure if Mr. Evans wanted to make a statement at this point.

Mr. Evans stated he would turn to our Controller George Yasso.

Mr. Yasso explained he would say that what Council has before them is ready to be voted on. However, if it is the will of the Council to pull this from the agenda he will say that until there comes a resolution and there is a responsible contracting ordinance eventually done and codified which he can say everyone here agrees is a good idea. Everyone can rest easy as responsible contracting has been going on in the city and has been a priority in the city for the last six years. We have a comprehensive all-encompassing process that we go through which will

continue. From a logistical standpoint there are no worries on the city's end and he would think there are no worries on the Administration's end from moving forward without anything in place. He would say that he does believe what you do have in front of you is at this point the best option. If it remains on the agenda he was going to be very brief, you all know where I stand. It will be a strong urge from the Controller's Office for Council's support of the amendments. If it is pulled, everything is in place already as is and when the time comes to codify something he does think it is a good idea, we can all agree on that. Mr. Yasso thinks we want the best possible ordinance in front of you and if you do not feel that way right now that is okay to pull but what you have is pretty good in terms with the amendments.

President Waldron asked Mr. Evans if that is the opinion of the Administration as well.

Mr. Evans stated that is correct. We agree with the comments made by Controller Yasso that if it is will of Council on the deciding factor on which way you would like to move on it this evening. We did work hard on the amendments and we were looking forward to having discussions. We thought the amendments were able to meet the goals of both sides in the way they were prepared and presented and we would be happy to answer any questions or have any discussion about them tonight.

President Waldron remarked this is slightly an unusual situation where we have an ordinance that is introduced by a Council Member and then requested to be pulled. It is up to Council as a whole to set the agenda. He did have an opportunity to speak with our Council Solicitor Spirk earlier today and he said essentially if there is unanimous agreement from Council we can remove this from the agenda without a vote. He asked Solicitor Spirk to confirm that.

Solicitor Spirk informed by tradition, custom, and practice the agenda is prepared by the President of Council and the Clerk usually the Thursday before the meeting without any input from the rest of Council, without a vote. The agenda then after it is received sometimes someone who is an initiator of an item on that agenda will ask to pull it. Sometimes that can be the Administration; it could perhaps be an appointment or a nomination to some position or Board. Sometimes that comes from the Administration and sometimes it comes from the sponsor of the legislation as tonight. Sometimes it is a citizen initiated zoning amendment that we are considering and the citizen will call after the agenda is released and ask to have it pulled. Then by custom and practice the President of Council will announce as he did tonight that Item so and so on the agenda has been removed at the request of whomever. Solicitor Spirk noted then there is usually silence after that and the meeting continues and that item is not on the agenda. He always deemed that to be unanimous consent. Sometimes in the United States Senate you will watch on television and the presiding officer will say without objection it is so ordered. It is like that so he always deemed that when the President of Council reads the statement that something has been removed from the agenda and no one says anything, to him that is unanimous consent. It is in Roberts Rules of Order also, they see it that way. But as the Council President stated the agenda is completely for Council as a body. Council is in complete charge of its own agenda. It could vote to create an agenda, it could vote to delete from an agenda, it could vote to add to an agenda. He would say that if any member tonight is not in agreement in pulling this they can raise that objection, there could be a discussion. If the member feels strongly enough that it should remain on the agenda in his estimation a motion to keep it on the agenda, second, and discussion and then a majority vote would keep it on the agenda. That is how he views it as he reads Roberts Rules and parliamentary procedure.

President Waldron remarked at this point he would ask if there is any Member of Council who would have objection to Ms. Crampsie Smith's request to remove the ordinance from consideration this evening, if we want to keep it on the agenda and have further discussion and potentially a vote later on this evening or to defer this ordinance to a future time. The only reason we are in a little bit of an unusual situation is because it is at the request of the Administration to proceed after the remarks that Mr. Evans made this evening. So if there is no objection from Ms. Crampsie Smith's request Bill 31, Item 9 L and Item 10 A would be removed from our agenda this evening.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT (on any subject not being voted on this evening - 5 Minute Time Limit)

Handicapped Accessibility

Bryan McCrickerd, 1940 Airpine Avenue, stated he would like to talk about accessibility for people with wheelchairs. He noted that even here outside Town Hall it is very hard to navigate since they put up the nativity. People are not thinking about anybody in a wheelchair. There are things that he cannot do, he cannot go into a park and play in a park. He has talked to the Recreation Bureau people and he keeps getting pushed everywhere else. You spend a lot of money on the Golf Course, parks, and swimming pools and this comes out of his tax dollars and he cannot go to those places and take advantage of it. We have a track and field team for the State of Pennsylvania but that track and field team does not practice in Pennsylvania; we practice in Bayonne, New Jersey. Why do we have to travel that far when we have all this stuff around us that the taxpayers paid for? We built a brand new stadium, we have practice fields for all athletes that are able bodied but there is nothing for a disabled person in this town. Mr. McCrickerd is a disabled veteran and ended up in a wheelchair because of the job he did, not because he was in a motorcycle accident or out drunk driving or anything like that. He is disgraced to say he is a disabled veteran because there is nothing for us. People in wheelchairs do not have a chance. He asked about setting something up so he could throw a javelin or discus so he could time his throwing chair down to the ground without destroying the grass around it and he got pushed off and told to call different people. He found out he could play golf and that was a dream come true but he cannot play anywhere in this state, he has to travel to North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, or Florida to do it when he has a golf course 5 minutes away from his house and some of his taxes pay for it. You are going to vote on a bill tonight for \$1.7 million dollars. He called and asked the Golf Course Superintendent if there is a way he could play but he said no, we do not have a golf cart that you can use; it is not in the budget. But Mr. McCrickerd found out that they are going to spend thousands of dollars on a simulator for able bodied people with this next budget. He does not know where to go. He loves sports but the thing is he cannot do it, he cannot practice any of his sports in this state, and he has to travel out of state. It is the same way in the schools; a lot of money is spent in schools for able bodied kids in schools but nothing for disabled. He hears people say they wished they had a little disability so they could have a front parking space at a shopping center. This is the mentality of people. He hopes no one is upset but we really need to start thinking about disabled people all the way round. As for Musikfest, Celtic Fest, you should see what he has to go through to get down there. His wife drops him off, goes to

a shuttle site and then comes down and he sits there waiting for almost an hour and they do that routine when leaving. Thank you for your time.

Shawna Knipper, 439 E. North Street is a new resident of Bethlehem. She is here to talk about accessibility as well. She has been a disabled person for 10 years now and accessibility is one of the biggest obstacles for disabled people in any community. Some of the issues we face are due to income disparity because we know that disabled people tend to make substantially less than able bodied people. Some of that is simply due to a lack of understanding of some of the issues that face disabled people in general. She agrees there are quite a few things that need to be addressed as far as accessibility in the areas of activity, athleticism, and those sorts of things in the area. But she is specifically here tonight to talk about parking accessibility in the residential neighborhoods and the disparity that is occurring there. When you apply for a parking permit that provides you accessibility and she does not use the word handicapped because we all deserve that same accessibility to our home, to a business, to a restaurant and that provides us a quality of life that we all deserve. Specifically in Bethlehem you are required to obtain a license plate. Ten years ago she obtained a lifetime permanent disability placard. There is no difference between the placard and the license plate. However in order to get a license plate she needs to return to her doctor, fill out the same form she already filled out, go to a notary, pay a fee to get it notarized and then reapply paying a fee to the state for that same license plate. She understands the need to determine that parking place is associated with that vehicle, however, what that also does not take into consideration is the need for the placard by specific members of the community. If she would get a license plate that would stay with her vehicle, there are times she is not able to utilize her vehicle but someone needs to take her places. That someone may not have a license plate for her to be able to park close enough. So she needs to be able to take her placard with her and that is not possible with the system that is set up here in Bethlehem. Right now what we are looking at is the need to make things within reason accommodating to all people. That is what she is seeing not happen in some of the rules and some of the things that are easily being asked. If you are talking about creating a standard where it creates equity for all people that simple accommodation is what is required by the ADA and she would suggest looking into other methods of numbering and labeling disability handicapped, accessibility parking spaces. She is sure there are other methods with other issues across the city. This is directly impacting her and several residents of her block across the street from Thomas Jefferson Elementary School with the significant drop off and pick up issues that happen at that school. There are multiple elderly folks in the community there that do not have parking spaces because they cannot jump through the hoops that have been created.

President Waldron encourages Ms. Knipper to reach out the Director of the Parking Authority, Steve Fernstrom. He will send a note to him to reach out to you directly and possibly come up with a solution for your situation and anyone else who is affected by that situation moving forward. City Council and the City Administration does not set the ordinances or the rules for the Parking Authority but Mr. Fernstrom is a reasonable person and if there is an issue with some of the process in permitting and fees he is sure that would be considered by the Authority and Board as well if enough people let the know this is an issue that is affecting people's quality of life and their accessibility. They could come to a solution.

Water Authority

Steve Antalics, 737 Ridge Street, 1201 Butztown Road, noted he was informed by another citizen that his comments last meeting were incorrect, either he misunderstood or was given poor data. What he has done is he has taken a page from the budget to make sure his numbers are accurate. Where it says actual numbers for revenues from water sales for 2021 rounded out at \$20.9 million. But also as he said before that number represents only 70% of possible billing. In other words 30% is not billed or that water is unaccounted for. And not accounted for means they have no accounts so you cannot bill it. If you calculate what that number might be if it were 100% billing, that number would then become \$29.9 million, which represents a shortfall of \$9 million dollars. That is not a small piece of change. Even though his numbers were incorrect no one on Council or the Administration cared to comment on that. He does not recall reading or hearing this in any public discussions so it seems to be a well-kept secret. Of course you would not want to advertise that because you might have some irate citizens. Mr. Antalics noted this needs to be told to the general public and say why are we not getting \$9 million dollars. There might be a legitimate reason for it but we do not know. That brings up the issue that the Bethlehem Authority is controlled by two other entities other than themselves, the City Council and the Administration. Maybe it is depriving them of the ability to do their job properly. It amazes him the City Council pays for the bills for the water system and never questions anything about the bills because the report they get only says who it is and how much, not how it was either bid or awarded. That is clearly a lack of oversight; you are not doing your job. In the past the Administration borrowed money from the water fund to put in the General Fund to make their fiscal policies look good. Mr. Antalics stated that should not be done. So beyond finding out what is going on with this \$9 million dollars he thinks the City Administration and Council seriously needs to divest themselves of the authority and make it like the Housing Authority, Parking Authority, and Redevelopment Authority who do a good job. But we need and explanation because you are our representatives in our welfare.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT (on ordinances and resolutions to be voted on by Council this evening – 5 Minute Time Limit)

None.

5. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Members of Council
- B. Tabled Items
- C. Unfinished Business

6. COMMUNICATIONS

- A. *Director of Public Works – Recommendation of Award – Mohawk Contracting and Development, LLC – Traffic Signal Upgrades*

The Clerk read a memorandum dated November 11, 2021 from Michael Alkhal, Director of Public Works recommending a contract change order with Mohawk Contracting and Development, LLC for additional work related to Traffic Signal Upgrades. The change order cost is \$47,875.25 and the total cost after the change order is \$125,233.00.

President Waldron stated Resolution 10 B is on the agenda.

B. *City Solicitor – Use Permit Agreement – ArtsQuest - Peepsfest*

The Clerk read a memorandum dated November 30, 2021 from City Solicitor William P. Leeson with an attached resolution and associated Use Permit Agreement. The Permittee is ArtsQuest and the event is for the 2021 Peepsfest with a 5K and Fireworks on December 30, 2021 and December 21, 2021. The location is 1st Street from Polk Street to the Eastern Terminus, Founders Way between 1st Street and 2nd Street and Sand Island East for Fireworks only.

President Waldron stated Resolution 10 C is on the agenda.

C. *Director of Budget and Finance – Recommendation of Award – Engle-Hambright & Davies, Inc. – Workers’ Compensation Program Management Services*

The Clerk read a memorandum dated December 1, 2021 from Mark W. Sivak, Director of Budget and Finance recommending a contract with Engle-Hambright & Davies, Inc. for the Workers’ Compensation Program Management Services. The term of the contract is January 1, 2022 through December 31, 2025. The cost of the contract is \$57,500 annually. There are no renewals.

President Waldron stated Resolution 10 D is on the agenda.

7. REPORTS

A. *President of Council*

B. *Mayor*

1. *Administrative Order – Elena Ostock – Fine Arts Commission*

Mayor Donchez appointed Elena Ostock to membership on the Fine Arts Commission effective through December, 2024. Ms. Negrón and Mr. Reynolds sponsored Resolution No. 2021-217 to confirm the appointment.

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 6. Ms. Crampsie Smith, was absent for the vote. The Resolution passed.

8. ORDINANCES FOR FINAL PASSAGE

A. *Bill No. 32-2021 – Amend Policies and Regulations for Determination of Stormwater User Fee Credits and For Appealing Stormwater User Fee Determination*

The Clerk read Bill No. 32-2021 - Amend Policies and Regulations for Determination of Stormwater User Fee Credits and For Appealing Stormwater User Fee Determination sponsored by Mr. Colón and Mr. Reynolds and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,

PENNSYLVANIA, AMENDING THE POLICIES AND
REGULATIONS FOR THE DETERMINATION OF
STORMWATER USER FEE CREDITS AND FOR
APPEALING STORMWATER USER FEE
DETERMINATIONS

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Colón, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 5.
Voting NAY: Mr. Callahan, 1. Ms. Crampsie Smith was absent for the vote. Bill No. 32-2021 now
known as Ordinance No. 2021-30 was passed on Final Reading.

9. NEW ORDINANCES

President Waldron related before we consider the 2022 Budget Ordinances he wanted to
remind everyone that there will need to be another vote on the Budget Ordinances at the
December 21, 2021 meeting. This is the first of our two votes to pass the 2022 Budget Ordinances.

A. *Bill No. 33-2021 – Adopting the 2022 General Fund Budget*

The Clerk read Bill No. 33-2021 – Adopting the 2022 General Fund Budget, sponsored by
Mr. Colón and Mr. Reynolds and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ADOPTING
THE GENERAL FUND BUDGET FOR 2022

The Clerk read amendment No. 1 to Bill No. 33-2021:

AMENDMENT TO

BILL NO. 33-2021

THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM HEREBY ORDAINS:

That the following paragraph in Section 2, that read as follows:

SECTION 2. Appropriations in the sum of Ninety Three Million, Two Hundred-Fifty
Thousand (\$93,250,000) Dollars are hereby made from the General Fund as follows:

To Civic Expenses: \$ 3,142,804

Shall be amended to read as follows:

SECTION 2. Appropriations in the sum of Ninety Four Million, Seven Hundred-Fifty
Thousand (\$94,750,000) Dollars are hereby made from the General Fund as follows:

To Civic Expenses: \$ 4,642,804

Sponsored by: /s/ Ms. Crampsie Smith

/s/ Ms. Negrón

Voting AYE on the amendment: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, , Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 6. Ms. Crampsie Smith was absent for the vote.

Voting AYE on the ordinance as amended: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Colón, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 5. Voting NAY: Mr. Callahan, 1. Ms. Crampsie Smith was absent for the vote. Bill No. 33-2021 was passed on First Reading.

B. Bill No. 34-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Water Fund Budget

The Clerk read Bill No. 34-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Water Fund Budget, sponsored by Mr. Colón and Mr. Reynolds and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ADOPTING
THE WATER FUND BUDGET FOR 2022

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, , Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 6. Ms. Crampsie Smith was absent for the vote. Bill No. 34-2021 was passed on First Reading.

C. Bill No. 35-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Sewer Fund Budget

The Clerk read Bill No. 35-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Sewer Fund Budget, sponsored by Mr. Colón and Mr. Reynolds and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ADOPTING
THE SEWER FUND BUDGET FOR 2022

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 6. Ms. Crampsie Smith was absent for the vote. Bill No. 35-2021 was passed on First Reading.

D. Bill No. 36-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Golf Course Enterprise Fund Budget

The Clerk read Bill No. 36-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Golf Course Enterprise Fund Budget, sponsored by Mr. Colón and Mr. Reynolds and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ADOPTING

THE GOLF COURSE ENTERPRISE BUDGET FOR 2022

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 6. Ms. Crampsie Smith was absent for the vote. Bill No. 36-2021 was passed on First Reading.

E. Bill No. 37-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Liquid Fuels Fund Budget

The Clerk read Bill No. 37-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Liquid Fuels Fund Budget, sponsored by Mr. Colón and Mr. Reynolds and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ADOPTING
THE LIQUID FUELS FUND BUDGET FOR 2022

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. Bill No. 37-2021 was passed on First Reading.

F. Bill No. 38-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Capital Budget for Non-Utilities

The Clerk read Bill No. 38-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Capital Budget for Non-Utilities, sponsored by Mr. Colón and Mr. Reynolds and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ADOPTING
THE CAPITAL BUDGET FOR NON-UTILITIES FOR 2022

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 6. Voting NAY: Dr. Van Wirt, 1. Bill No. 38-2021 was passed on First Reading.

G. Bill No. 39-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Capital Budget for Water Utilities

The Clerk read Bill No. 39-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Capital Budget for Water Utilities, sponsored by Mr. Colón and Mr. Reynolds and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ADOPTING
THE CAPITAL BUDGET FOR WATER UTILITIES FOR 2022

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. Bill No. 39-2021 was passed on First Reading.

H. Bill No. 40-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Capital Budget for Sewer Utilities

The Clerk read Bill No. 40-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Capital Budget for Sewer Utilities, sponsored by Mr. Colón and Mr. Reynolds and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ADOPTING
THE CAPITAL BUDGET FOR SEWER UTILITIES FOR 2022

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. Bill No. 40-2021 was passed on First Reading.

I. Bill No. 41-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Community Development Block Grant Budget

The Clerk read Bill No. 41-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Community Development Block Grant Budget, sponsored by Mr. Colón and Mr. Reynolds and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ADOPTING
THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
BUDGET FOR 2022

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. Bill No. 41-2021 was passed on First Reading.

J. Bill No. 42-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Storm Water Fund Budget

The Clerk read Bill No. 42-2021 – Adopting the 2022 Storm Water Fund Budget, sponsored by Mr. Colón and Mr. Reynolds and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ADOPTING
THE STORM WATER FUND BUDGET FOR 2022

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. Bill No. 42-2021 was passed on First Reading.

K. Bill No. 43-2021 – Fixing the 2022 Tax Rate for All City Purposes

The Clerk read Bill No. 43-2021 – Fixing the 2022 Tax Rate for All City Purposes, sponsored by Mr. Colón and Mr. Reynolds and titled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BETHLEHEM,
COUNTIES OF LEHIGH AND NORTHAMPTON,
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, FIXING
THE TAX RATE FOR ALL CITY PURPOSES

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 6. Voting NAY: Mr. Callahan, 1. Bill No. 43-2021 was passed on First Reading.

- L. *Bill No. 31-2021 – Establish Article 124 – Responsible Contractor Ordinance (RCO)*
Pulled from the agenda

President Waldron announced that 9 L and the amendments for 9 L were removed at the beginning of the meeting as well as 10 A with no objection from any Member of Council.

- L. *Amendment No. 1 to Bill No. 31-2021 – Administration Amendment No. 1*
Pulled from the agenda

- L. *Amendment No. 2 to Bill No. 31-2021 – Administration Amendment No. 2*
Pulled from the agenda

- L. *Amendment No. 3 to Bill No. 31-2021 – Administration Amendment No. 3*
Pulled from the agenda

- L. *Amendment No. 4 to Bill No. 31-2021 – Administration Amendment No. 4*
Pulled from the agenda

10. RESOLUTIONS

- A. *Approve Resolution – Companion Resolution to RCO Bill- Pulled from the agenda*

- B. *Approve Contract –Mohawk Contracting & Development, LLC – GC Traffic Signal Upgrades*

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Reynolds sponsored Resolution No. 2021-218 that authorized to execute a contract with Mohawk Contracting & Development, LLC for additional work related to Traffic Signal Upgrades.

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. The Resolution passed.

- C. *Approve Use Permit Agreement – ArtsQuest – Peepsfest*

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Reynolds sponsored Resolution No. 2021-219 that authorized to execute a Use Permit Agreement with ArtsQuest for the Peepsfest Fireworks Event.

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. The Resolution passed.

- D. *Approve Contract –Engle-Hambright & Davies, Inc. – Workers’ Compensation Program Management Services*

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Reynolds sponsored Resolution No. 2021-220 that authorized to execute a contract with Engle-Hambright & Davies, Inc. for the Workers’ Compensation Program Management Services.

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. The Resolution passed.

E. Certificate of Appropriateness – 125 East Third Street

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Reynolds sponsored Resolution No. 2021-221 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new casement-style window replacements that are much larger than the existing upper-level double-hung windows at 125 East Third Street.

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. The Resolution passed.

F. Certificate of Appropriateness – 13 West Third Street

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Reynolds sponsored Resolution No. 2021-222 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to paint the exterior walls and trim, to replace the existing front awning and to replace existing signage to reflect a new corporate logo at 13 West Third Street.

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. The Resolution passed.

G. Certificate of Appropriateness – 24-30 West Fourth Street

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Reynolds sponsored Resolution No. 2021-223 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new, six-story, mixed-use structure at 24-30 West Fourth Street.

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Dr. Van Wirt, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 7. The Resolution passed.

H. Certificate of Appropriateness – 128 East Third Street

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Reynolds sponsored Resolution No. 2021-224 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the existing single-story building and construct a new, six-story, mixed-use structure at 128 East Third Street.

Dr. Van Wirt remarked we are dealing with a lot of Certificates of Appropriateness for the south side tonight. She cannot be quiet about a phenomenon that has happened here which is not just that we have seen and are all aware of the development happening on the south side. But we have had some rigorous discussions here about the tension between the underlying zoning in the Historic District versus the Historic Conservation Commission (HCC) guidelines which mandate very clearly that new structures be appropriate and in context with the other structures. This motion for 10 H and 10 I are both not appropriate in terms of the height that the buildings are being proposed. There is some vigorous discussion in the HCC; we now have the invaluable service of being provided the HCC draft minutes, which she reads thoroughly. There is some discussion about how this building basically has an inability to satisfy the Secretary of Interior Standards concerning new construction specifically that new work will be compatible with historic size, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment under Bethlehem Ordinance 1714.03, the purposes of Historic Conservation District as well as Historic Conservation Commission guidelines concerning new construction. Both of

these buildings violate those standards and yet they were approved by the HCC. She wants everyone here, but particularly anyone who might be watching online to understand why. Because what we have done is we decimated the structure of our own HCC by putting people on board who are not experts. They are people who are pro-development and do not have the expertise to understand the impact that this mass and density of buildings in an inappropriate area has on our historic district. We have an historic district on the north side that has been protected from development of this type and she hopes that our Board of Historical and Architectural Review (HARB) is not going to be influenced by the same development pressure as well. She would argue that the integrity of our historic district on the north side, we do not have enormous buildings out of scale. We do not have massing that is making pedestrians feel uncomfortable. We have adhered to historic standards on the north side and it has brought us the gem that is Bethlehem. Yet, we are not obeying or paying the same credence to the south side. So the fact that the HCC approved these last two buildings to her only speaks to what we have done to the commission itself by populating with people who truly do not understand the significance of density and massing for a building in an historic district. Dr. Van Wirt stated in addition to this, she is not sure which one she is referring that casts shadows in the Greenway, but there were no studies about what the height of this building would do for shadows on the Greenway. The fact that our historic commission itself passed this without that data tells her how we have undermined our ability to protect our historic districts. She thinks there are some changes we can make in terms of the fact that one of the voting members of the HCC is employed by the Mayor. This is an inherent conflict of interest. He will never vote against his own best interest in preserving his job. Dr. Van Wirt thinks this Council and hopefully the future Council needs to pay specific attention to the people we appoint to these historic commissions because it is those people who are the experts who can help us preserve. They have actually said no to a building. There was a building here that was discussed and tabled at 317-327 South New Street because it the massing was off and it was also casting shadow on the Greenway and had a lot of aesthetic tweaks it needed to do. The developer was not ready to fully commit or not commit so they tabled it. We as City Council are the ones that will have to own these buildings and the development pressure on the south side is there because the land is cheap. We are not looking at a whole lot of request to build on Broad Street, are we? So we are seeing equity here happening. This type of development is happening on the south side because the land is cheap there. When we talk about equity we need to talk about how we handle development and preserving our historic districts. She does not need to repeat all of this for 117 East Fourth Street, but the same exact phenomenon goes on. She encourages everyone to get these draft minutes from the HCC and read what the members had to say and for City Council, this one and in the future to make sure that the people we put on this commission do not have a conflict of interest and have an expertise in the subject area in which they are asked to rule.

Ms. Crampsie Smith remarked she wanted to get specifics on where exactly are they located, 128 East Third Street, and 117 East Fourth Street. She asked if they are the intersection of New Street, what street are they on the intersection with.

Mr. Reynolds then asked Alicia Karner, Director of Community and Economic Development for an explanation of this.

Ms. Karner informed the resolution in front of you is the building in the block where the Rite Aid Strip mall sits back and has the parking in front, this is to the east in that block. So a landmark design building is across the street, if you are familiar with that building, it is a landmark. It is a vacant building and has been vacant for a number of years. It is demolition of

that existing structure that is built on half of the parcel. The other half of the parcel has kind of a parking driveway area. The last building to occupy the building was Home Brew.

Ms. Crampsie Smith asked if it is about two blocks east of New Street.

Ms. Karner stated it is.

Ms. Crampsie Smith asked if 117 East Fourth Street is Holy Infancy.

Ms. Karner noted that 117 East Fourth Street is the former Boys and Girls Club building.

Ms. Crampsie Smith then asked for clarification on the use. It does say mixed-use, but will it be retail and then also residential and do we know what price the residential units will be.

Ms. Karner explained when we talk about mixed-use the first floor has to be either retail, restaurant, personal service, that complies with our zoning. It is a commercial space. That building does have a number of apartments associated with it and that developer is someone we talk to about affordable housing all the time but she does not have a commitment to bring to you today for that. She pointed out that it is misleading to look at stories of a structure. This property at the height proposed in front of you is only about 7 feet higher than the Goodman Building which is located at 30 East Third Street. When you talk about the height of buildings we really need to be talking about what is truly comparable to it. Just because it reads as a 6 story structure does not mean it is double the height of the Goodman Building which is 3 stories. It is 7 feet higher than the Goodman Building.

Ms. Crampsie Smith is concerned about parking and that is why she did not vote for the New Street building, that area is so congested now.

Ms. Karner stated that parking is not something we obligate in our central business district. We very much rely on our public parking and we have a new parking garage that is going about a block to the east of this building. The market will drive that. We are not obligating parking, that is not a way to attract what we want which is truly best development in our downtown.

Ms. Crampsie Smith asked if we have any idea the number of residential units. It looks like 55 on the 128 East Third Street property.

Ms. Karner noted that sounds right.

Ms. Crampsie Smith then asked about the height on 117 East Fourth Street.

Ms. Karner stated that is 80 feet. There was a lot of conversation about that. She queried if it is appropriate to talk about this now.

President Waldron stated yes, these two are together.

Ms. Karner wondered if Council has looked at the designs of these proposed projects but that one is flanked by the Holy Infancy School and the Brinker Lofts which is a residential property, the former Ice House Property owned by Lehigh University. A lot of effort went into the effort of the Brinker Lofts Project. They really improved that corridor which was used for storage by Lehigh for many years. The renovations, the adapted reuse for that project was something we completely got behind and they may have even gotten tax credits for that property,

they spent time with the historic board making sure they were in compliance with what the state was looking for from an historic preservation standpoint. The conversation at the HCC last month around the massing and height of that structure was, can we bring the height of that building down. But if we bring the height of the building down and we squish it and move that same unit count to the east and west of the large portion of the structure you can detract from both the school and architectural elements of the school and detract from the Brinker Lofts project. So there was a lot of deference given to those buildings. Ms. Karner pointed out when you look at the design of the structure it is an unbelievable design and the HCC had a lot of good dialogue with this architect. He is the same architect for the 3 projects, both at the corner of Fourth and Vine and the one at Third Street that is in front of you and the one where the former Boys and Girls Club building is. These designs are as she described at that meeting, the designs that people 50 years in the future will be holding projects to. They are really good design projects and bring an element of our historic district, they bring elements of the surrounding properties, they give them the space to breathe, they give access to the Greenway, and it is a perfect complement to the surrounding structures. Most of the HCC Board was in agreement with the project on Fourth Street at the former Boys and Girls Club. We actually have had individual Board Members say to us how much they appreciate that the architects give and take. It is not just about height, it is about elements of design, materials we use, it is about style and they finally feel like they are getting some of the respect they sought, not just having an architect say here is my project and they will not modify it. They are hearing give and take with the architect. She hopes that is reflected in the minutes because that is what has happened. Ms. Karner believes the projects that have been presented to you; particularly the one on Fourth Street which is the last one on the agenda is a really good project. The architect took into consideration of comments made by the public and HCC and agreed to make changes to the project.

Ms. Crampsie Smith remarked for that project, it will look like retail and residential and do we have any ideas if it will be market rate pricing for residential.

Ms. Karner related this is very early in the process so she cannot say to you what those prices will be, she has no idea. We do obligate retail, restaurant, and personal service on the first floor of all our central business district projects.

Mr. Colón appreciates this background information and remarked that for the property at 128 East Third Street he does understand height is variable but it is the most front facing thing that comes to mind. More people are commenting on the height of the building than the style and façade and building materials, that is a fact. That being said, he does understand it is important to consider height. He noted that Ms. Karner said that the project at 128 East Third Street is about 7 feet higher than the Goodman Building.

Ms. Karner stated yes, the Goodman Building is almost 61 feet.

Mr. Colón mentioned as we have looked at the project at 117 East Fourth Street that is flanked by each side by the Brinker Lofts and Holy Infancy School and at its highest point is 80 feet.

Ms. Karner noted that is correct.

Mr. Colón asked how many feet tall the Brinker Lofts is.

Ms. Karner stated she does not know.

Mr. Colón mentioned the Brinker Lofts was a complete repurposing of that old building.

Ms. Karner related that was a very misleading building, from the outside it was a certain number of floors but we knew that those building floors never lined up. Those windows were always decorative and not functional. So when we talk about stories, it may look like it is a 3 story building, it was interior, whether it was 4 story it may have been 5, she cannot say with certainty.

Mr. Colón noted the previous one we just voted on 10 G/24-30 West Fourth Street passed without objection, can you paraphrase why there was no objection to that versus the objections to the last two agenda items.

Ms. Karner stated that is a project that has been before the HCC several times. It first came to the HCC in 2014 as a demolition of just the corner property and then the proposed building, she does not have the design in front of her so she does not know how many feet it was but it was a 7 story building. It came back a year or so later and was actually approved by the HCC and City Council at 9 stories. At that point it encompassed the property adjoining the 4th and Vine parcel and became a bigger project. To the Mayor's credit he had worked with that developer over years and requesting he come down in height. What they saw was a better design building, more contemporary in design but a smaller structure. It has residential mixed use, residential and with first floor commercial space. It is a much more flattering project for that corner.

Mr. Reynolds wanted to follow up on the comments made by Dr. Van Wirt about the members of the HCC. It looks like for these 3 votes there were 7 people there for the votes.

Ms. Karner believes that is correct, there were some abstentions on different projects and different for each project.

Mr. Reynolds noted that Dr. Van Wirt had mentioned Mr. Simonson who is a city employee which he believes is part of the HCC board.

Ms. Karner explained a building code official is required by the state act.

Mr. Reynolds noted it is required by the state that the building code official be part of the HCC board. When he looks at the rest of that list of people, Seth Cornish, Craig Evans, Roger Hudak, Gary Lader, Kenneth Loush, Chaz Patrick, he believes that Mr. Patrick is the only one that has been added and that the other 5 have been all there for a significant amount of time.

Ms. Karner agrees.

Mr. Reynolds does not remember when we put any of those 5 individuals on for the first time but he does not believe it has been the last couple of years. One of the things we have seen from the HCC and he has read the minutes, he added that in the future it would be good if City Council also could get some drawing or illustrations of these buildings. It helps to add context to the information that City Council is getting. This is absolutely and improvement over before where often time we would get the occasional email. Seeing what these drawings look like would help. As for the height conversation, height is one part of it but when he looks at the building at Third and New Streets which we approved there are elements of that design other than the height. Looking back on it he wished the HCC had been a little bit tougher on the developer towards. We had approved that building after the HCC approved that building. When he drives

by there it is not the height that necessarily bothers him about the building but there are some other design guidelines that he sees. He understands we are dealing with conceptual drawings but that proves how many elements of these designs are important as far as walking by them on the street, how big are the windows, what types of materials are being used. Mr. Reynolds was impressed with the level of dialogue in what appeared in the conversation here and in the minutes. He pointed out that he believes for the purpose of the comparison he would ask Ms. Karner, the building that is on South New Street was tabled.

Ms. Karner stated yes, it was tabled. They asked them to come back. There had been some back and forth with the architect and he agreed to make some changes. The HCC very much felt heard and expected to be back on the agenda.

Mr. Reynolds remarked the developer that came obviously did not come with enough information to get to the confidence level of the HCC.

Ms. Karner noted that is correct.

Mr. Reynolds remarked that the motion to table would send it back which is important. He believes that some of the times what we do not do enough is talk about those stories, the things we push forward, the things we say and when you read those minutes it is pretty clear that there was some direction given to that particular developer by the HCC and by the Community and Economic Development Department. Then when they brought something forward that did not meet the standards it seems to be an agreement that it was not good enough and they need to come back.

Mr. Karner mentioned the materials that were being proposed were not a standard that the HCC wanted to see. It is not always a conversation about massing, design elements are critical to make sure that the space we are interacting with is of high quality was really very much what they were after. There was not enough attention to the rear of the property, you can see the side of that from the Greenway from the back of the property and they demanded that they address those issues and come back.

Mr. Reynolds remarked that nuance about the Boys and Girls Club building that is coming down with the step back on the top of the building, the recess, when we get stories it becomes an incomplete conversation if we do not have what the buildings look like. Mr. Reynolds remarked with this project at 128 East Third Street we do have the Goodman Building which has seen a ton of progress. Anybody that knows what that look like 8 years ago versus what it looks like now can understand, it was a disaster, it is on its way and thankfully it will be saved. Then you look at this building that will go up a block down and the thing in-between the Rite Aid which is absolutely a development mistake once upon a time. Everybody hopes at some point that building will be replaced or will match the rest of what we have in there. The Rite Aid is not a building that comes close to any type of HCC standards or anything we should be proud of. Hopefully we see something go on there where we have a building that goes up to the street and have a nice little corridor that connects the Goodman Building with the Rite Aid building and with this new building on down Third Street with the new parking garage and other projects. If that building comes down, the cost versus putting one up will be more expensive than it is just to take down the Boys and Girls Club building and this building. As great of a use as the Boys and Girls Club was the building is not a building that should be saved.

Ms. Karner related that building at some point had been multiple stories and something happened and a number of stories had been removed so it is not what it had originally been constructed to be.

Mr. Reynolds noted we had one change on the HCC but a lot of these members on the HCC have been on there for a long time. The votes here, the 128 East Third Street, was 5-2 and the 117 East Fourth Street was 5-1 with one abstention.

Ms. Karner explained those abstentions are conflicts; they recused themselves because of a conflict of interest. She wanted to be clear; these are not people who are refusing to vote.

Mr. Reynolds informed if anybody on Council or anybody is able to listen to the comments from the meeting and not just read the minutes but listen to the actual meeting you will hear tone and context and nuance from these members who often have been critical. He would agree with Ms. Karner's context that they appreciated the back and forth and the multiple times they have had conversations with the architect.

Ms. Karner emphasized that quality is critical. With the comparison to Main Street we do have a 9 story hotel at the corner of Main Street that is not to be overlooked. She is not sure that it is so daunting and overwhelming and intimidating people on the street. It is something we would be a lesser community without. Please, when considering these projects it is a much about quality and design and making sure that we have height, quality, and good design at the end of the day.

Mr. Reynolds pointed out that one of the reasons why we do not see development on the north side is that we do have historic old buildings and we do not have the parking lots and different things we have on Third and Fourth Street that we do not necessarily want in our downtown. He does think these buildings do often become flashpoints of microcosms for other bigger conversations that we end up having about what are we doing in a lot of different areas. Often times these buildings become situations where we spend a lot of time talking about these buildings as if they represent every single thing we work towards. He added whether or not it be recreation or affordable housing or cultural displacement on the south side. Those are issues that everybody in this room takes seriously. He is looking forward early in January and February to release some ideas and plans about what we will do in all of those areas.

Ms. Crampsie Smith is thinking about the 117 East Fourth Street building, and as Councilman Reynolds said it would be helpful if we had the diagrams in front of us. She did see the design of the building but she needs to see in comparison if there are any other buildings nearby that it would be comparable height wise.

Ms. Karner noted what the HCC asked for was a schedule drawing for the block. Those materials are included as part of the online materials for the meeting. She does not have the south side streetscape to look at what is comparable. To compare recent projects it is shorter than the building at Third and New. It is shorter than the one approved by Council earlier this year on New Street.

Ms. Crampsie Smith remarked this is difficult because there is a lot of development on the south side for sure and we have a housing crisis and we need inclusive housing. She added that density even in our housing solution workshop through NYU, people throughout the country are saying even though people are negative about density if we want to solve the housing

affordability issue we need to look at density. That is for mixed income housing. She feels this whole process is a little bit convoluted in that she wishes we had the specs because she does not have the time to go to all the Zoning Hearing Board meetings and pay attention. She wishes we had more dialogue up front before these projects, what are we looking at as far as who will be the tenants in these projects and what will be the cost of these rentals. That is a big problem we have in this city, the cost of rentals, we need to address that. Ms. Crampsie Smith feels at a disadvantage that she has to vote for projects where she does not even know what it would cost, they could charge \$2,000 a month or they could charge \$800 a month. She also worries about the infrastructure and when we do development we do not think about that enough, especially on the south side. When we look at Third and New, Third Street is nightmare with traffic and why she feels more negative towards the Third Street project than the Fourth Street project that is because we are already be looking at developing the Flats so there will be more residential there. We will have residential on New Street and Third. She is concerned about putting another 55 more units which means either 55 or 100 more people in this building and they will probably all have cars and that is an issue with a street that is bumper to bumper. As for Fourth Street while there will be congestion it will not be as congested as Third Street. She is more in favor of the Fourth Street project.

President Waldron mentioned he is looking over the minutes of the HCC and in reference to the Brinker Lofts the corner structure at Adams and Fourth is 68 feet at the peak which is not the dominant height which is closer to 55 feet. So that gives some context if you look at the dominant height of that corner building which is the Brinker Lofts at 55 feet as the dominant height with a peak of 68 feet. It is in the neighborhood of what is being requested. The issue is height and that has been the flashpoint in recent conversations about development on the south side. He would reiterate there is a much longer conversation here the occurred about the overall aesthetic of the building and design element. He currently has a picture up of the Boys and Girls Club and right now it looks like a warehouse, it creates no energy, no walkability within that Fourth Street corridor and putting something in that space that works well that would balance out that building to the east and west of it is in his opinion a great thing for the city and the neighborhood. It would create some vibrancy in that space. He hopes for a positive use and maybe consideration to what that space previously held and some thought go into trying to create some connection to the community there, not just building a large warehouse for people but something that would help benefit the community as well. He would support this resolution this evening.

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 5.
Voting NAY: Dr. Van Wirt, and Ms. Crampsie Smith, 2. The Resolution passed.

I. Certificate of Appropriateness – 117 East Fourth Street

Ms. Negrón and Mr. Reynolds sponsored Resolution No. 2021-225 that granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the existing single-story building and construct a new, seven-story, mixed-use building with a lower-level parking garage at 117 East Fourth Street.

Voting AYE: Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Colón, Ms. Crampsie Smith, Ms. Negrón, and Mr. Waldron, 6. Voting NAY: Dr. Van Wirt, 1. The Resolution passed.

11. NEW BUSINESS

Accessibility/American Rescue Funds

Ms. Crampsie Smith wanted to thank the people who came tonight and talked about accessibility. That is an important issue to discuss and it is a great thing that we will have a Director of Inclusion and Equity and that person will be part of the inclusion and that will include accessibility for people who are differently abled. We adopted a lot of the budget tonight and at our meeting last week we talked about community input. She has been getting a lot of input from people asking how they request money from the American Rescue Funds, different entities and individuals. She hopes that we look towards doing some type of process for community input as well as defining what the process is for people to request the money. Right now she does not know what to tell them, she just tells them to submit a memo stating what they need it for and the exact amount. Ms. Crampsie Smith noted that Dr. Van Wirt had brought up about maybe earmarking some money for a survey and that would be great. Perhaps we can even tap into the local universities or colleges and they have PHD and doctoral and masters programs where they have research methods and perhaps they can do some kind of survey for the community to see where they think the priorities should be as far as the money for the American Rescue Funds. So we can have a process so we know how to respond to the constituents that ask how to request funds.

Mr. Reynolds explained we will be doing public outreach in the New Year with that goal in mind. At this point the biggest thing to talk about is how we will need to create flexibility to be able to get to the dollars where we and the community feel they need to go. One of the things we have been reviewing over the past few weeks and will continue to look at is how do we get those dollars to where they need to go in the community, places where organizations have not been able to access the funds that have come from the state and federal level. The name of the game is flexibility and we are looking forward to do some things to reach out to the community about different ideas they have. We will have some new ideas through how we will communicate which will be announced in the New Year as well. He could not agree more with the necessity of the comments by Ms. Crampsie Smith. This will absolutely be a public conversation and one that will include City Council as early as we can come up with some type of guidance. Dollars will not be spent before we have some of those conversations on any type of large scale.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 pm.

ATTEST:

Robert G. Vidoni, Esq.
City Clerk