



COMMITTEE of the WHOLE

CITY COUNCIL

SUMMARY

December 13, 2021
5:00 P.M.
Hybrid Meeting

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

S. Marmarou, (in person), D. Reed, L. Sihelnik, J. Cepeda-Freytiz, M. Ventura, M. Goodman-Hinnershitz, J. Waltman (electronically)

OTHERS PRESENT:

L. Kelleher, (in person), S. Smith, A. Acevedo, S. Harrity, J. Kelly, E. Stock, M. Oppenheimer, M. Rodriguez, M. Gombar, F. Denbowski, I. Litvinov, J. Long, W. Stoudt, E. Moran, R. Tornielli, A. Amoros, G. Mann, S. Keppen, A. Anyu, S. Rugis (all electronically)

The meeting was called to order at 5:04 pm by Mr. Waltman.

I. 5 Year Budget Projections

Mr. Mann shared his screen and stated that the projections were compiled by Ms. Anyu and that they are updated as of today's information.

Ms. Anyu reviewed the projections and stated that:

- Real Estate Tax revenue is reduced by 3% beginning in 2023 since assessed property values are flat
- Earned Income Tax revenue increases by 3% beginning in 2024 assuming a return to pre-COVID levels in 2023
- Water transfer revenue increases 1.5% through 2023 based on the current lease agreement. It was noted that lease renegotiations should begin in early 2022 and the new negotiations may change this projection.
- Sewer transfer revenue will remain at \$3 million until there is a change in, or the City is released from, the consent decree
- Employee Health Contribution will change after the City exits Act 47 and the cost to help offset increases in the cost of healthcare coverage is renegotiated
- Salaries and Fringe Benefits may increase after exiting Act 47 based on additional employees. This example assumes a 3% increase in salaries.

- Pension costs will be readjusted after the next actuarial report

Ms. Anyu stated that a deficit is projected and the City may not be in compliance with its Fund Balance Policy. She suggested that ARPA funds be used to replace revenue which will help offset the need to use fund balance to close the deficit.

Mr. Mann stated that Council has been completing a line by line analysis of the 2022 budget but the 5 year projection is designed for a higher level look. He stated that the results are similar to the projection completed for the 2021 budget. He stated that the City may not use the amount of fund balance budgeted for 2021.

Mr. Mann agreed that the City should use ARPA funds to replacement its revenue before earmarking it for other projects because ARPA fund usage has a deadline. He expressed the belief that the projected deficit will be unmanageable in 2024 but that it is sustainable for the next 2 – 3 years.

Mr. Mann made changes in the spreadsheet to show how the projections can change the City's financial position. He reminded all that the City will lose the Non Resident EIT after it leaves Act 47. He stated that resident EIT may also be adjusted in the future.

Mr. Mann expressed the belief that the 6 – 7% increase in EIT revenue is a combination of the growth of the tax base and better collection methods. He stated that the City can determine if resident EIT is placed in the capital fund or the general fund in the future to balance the needs of the funds. He warned against letting the capital fund fall to pre-Act 47 levels. He expressed the belief that revenue from the Water transfer will continue to grow and stated that if there is no new lease agreement it will continue growing at the 1.5% rate.

Mr. Mann stated that the salary caps will be removed after exiting Act 47 and additional employees can be hired. He noted that this will also remove the City's leverage when negotiating contracts. He noted the need to begin negotiating with all the collective bargaining units in 2022. He stated that this projection assumes that all employees will receive a 3% annual increase. He stated that there was a municipality that exited Act 47 and was mandated through arbitration to pay an annual increase of 10% to one of their public safety units. He noted the need for the City to determine the additional number of employees needed and then determine if that is affordable.

Mr. Mann stated that the City can also change the amount of health insurance coverage paid by employees.

Mr. Mann explained that the bulk of the pension costs are for former police personnel. He stated that this projection will change after the next actuarial report is received. He noted the need for deeper conversation on all these items as the City gets closer to the exit deadline.

Mr. Mann stated that the non-uniformed pension plan has been changed to a 401K type plan. He expressed the belief that this is a big tool for the City to take advantage of. He stated that this will shift the pension expense off the taxpayers and onto the employee. He stated that this does not affect current employees and is in effect for new employees only. He stated that this new plan will not include police or fire employees.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz thanked Mr. Mann and Ms. Anyu for their report. She noted the need for the City to be disciplined after exiting Act 47. She expressed the belief that the City cannot afford to violate its Fund Balance Policy. She noted the need to work with the Administration, especially those who did not go through the Plan process.

Ms. Sihelnik noted her agreement that ARPA funds should be used for revenue replacement. She questioned if there were other ways to be sure the funds were utilized. Mr. Mann expressed the belief that Reading already has a healthy capital fund. He expressed the belief that some of the capital fund can be set aside for specific purposes. He stated that Reading has ambitious capital goals and a \$20 million plan. He stated that to date in 2021 only \$5 million has been spent. He expressed the belief that the City needs to better prioritize projects and determine how much Earned Income Tax to put into the capital fund. He stated that the City is already unable to spend down the capital fund and expressed the belief that ARPA funding can be set aside for specific projects.

Ms. Sihelnik expressed the belief that the capital fund cannot be spent down because there are not enough Public Works employees. She noted the need to increase staff to increase project completion. She noted the need to find balance. Mr. Mann agreed and expressed the belief that the City cannot spend down \$20 million in one year. He suggested fewer priority projects and filling the vacant Capital Project Manager position. He reminded all that there is a spending deadline for ARPA funding and suggested that ARPA funds be focused on the highest priority needs and replacing revenue lost due to COVID.

Ms. Rodriguez questioned if it would be better to have a larger general fund balance or capital fund balance to be transferred to the general fund as needed. Mr. Mann stated that EIT must be used for capital at this time. He suggested that the ARPA funds be spent first to meet the deadlines. He stated that there is greater flexibility in spending from the general fund. He suggested earmarking funds to specific projects or programs including pension expenses, healthcare costs, blight remediation, economic development, etc. He expressed the belief that this is a better use of the general fund.

Mr. Waltman reminded all that the ARPA funds were only provided one time. He suggested that the capital fund be trimmed back slightly. He expressed the belief that the City needs to complete many projects. He expressed the belief that the projections from 2023 forward are critical to review closely. He noted that funding for sidewalks and housing were already set aside. He stated that there will be many unknowns after exiting Act 47 and that the City needs to be prudent. He noted the need for Council to be good fiduciaries. He noted the need for

salary increases to be fair to both employees and the City. He again stated that Act 47 is a State Law that protects municipalities from other State Laws. He noted his hope that Act 111 would become more flexible. He noted that continuing with 5 year planning is critical to the City's success. He suggested that the relationship with PFM continue after exiting Act 47 for consistency. He noted the critical assistance PFM has provided over the years.

Mr. Crespo arrived at this time.

Mr. Waltman noted the importance of paying people well but also being realistic.

Ms. Reed agreed that institutional knowledge will be critical moving forward.

Mr. Mann and Ms. Anyu disconnected from the meeting at this time.

II. Dumpster Ordinance Presentation

Mr. Harrity stated that an amendment regarding dumpsters and toters is being proposed.

Ms. Kelleher shared a Power Point presentation.

Mr. Harrity reviewed the presentation. He stated that dumpsters and toters are often unsafe and unsightly. He stated that they can cause problems for pedestrians and that they have been problematic for many years. He noted his hope that the end result will be a cleaner City.

Ms. Reed questioned how this amendment would interact with regulations in historic districts. Mr. Harrity stated that there is language in the amendment regarding historic districts and that there would need to be HARB approval of any screening.

Ms. Reed questioned the locations of the dumpsters and toters. Mr. Harrity thanked Mr. Estrada and Property Maintenance for helping to find and tally their locations. He stated that they are all not known at this time but that a good start has been made. He stated that enforcement would begin in early 2022.

Ms. Reed requested an update after enforcement begins.

Mr. Denbowski stated that historic districts and downtown locations are specifically addressed in the amendment. He noted the need for uniform standards of what type of screening is acceptable. He stated that this is why the incentive program will be available.

Ms. Reed questioned if the incentive program will be funded by the Sidewalk program funding. Mr. Denbowski stated that the program will be funded through the Solid Waste Fund. He stated that the sidewalk funding is restricted and cannot be used. He stated that the cost of the screening incentive has already been built into the 2022 budget.

Ms. Reed questioned if Council could assist with identifying dumpster and totter locations. Mr. Harrity stated that he would appreciate the assistance.

Ms. Sihelnik noted the need to ensure that the community understands the City's standards and that a list of materials / contractors is made available. Mr. Harrity stated that a letter will be sent to the owners of the locations that will include screening information. Mr. Denbowski stated that the Clean City Coordinator will also help educate the owners.

Ms. Sihelnik noted her hope for green screening and living walls. She noted the need to keep the program from feeling punitive. She questioned the amount of the fine. Mr. Harrity stated that the fine scale is \$100 - \$1,000 and stated that Solid Waste and Property Maintenance will have enforcement powers.

Ms. Sihelnik suggested a substantial fine to encourage compliance. She questioned if permits would be required to install the screening. Mr. Harrity stated that permits would be required. Mr. Abodalo stated that if vegetation will be used for screening there is no permit required.

Ms. Sihelnik suggested that permit costs be reduced or waived to encourage owners to comply. She suggested that the fees be reviewed since they were set in 2007. Mr. Harrity stated that the fees were not adjusted at this time because they were not yet collected. Mr. Denbowski stated that the process has been streamlined and the fees will be studied before they are adjusted. He expressed the belief that the fees most likely do not reflect the current costs. He stated that it was hoped that the owners would install the required screening so that they do not receive fines.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz questioned the locations of the dumpsters / toters. Mr. Harrity stated that the locations are currently being compiled.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz suggested that the dumpster information be part of the annual business and health license permitting process. She questioned if the new software could assist. Mr. Harrity stated that making dumpsters part of the annual permitting process is a great idea. Mr. Rugis stated that employees are undergoing training on the new software at this time. Mr. Kelly stated that Mr. Harrity should work with Ms. Kantner to include dumpsters in the annual permitting process.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz suggested that one uniform type of screening per block would be more visually appealing. She suggested that multiple types of screening and unkempt dumpsters behind screening can still be eyesores. She suggested starting with a pilot area. Mr. Rugis agreed with the need for consistent guidelines.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz noted that it should be extremely easy to comply with these new regulations.

Mr. Marmarou noted the need for enforcement or the program will not work. He noted the need for additional employees to address enforcement. Mr. Harrity agreed and stated that this has not been enforced in the past but will be starting in early 2022.

Mr. Moran noted his agreement with Mr. Marmarou. He stated that this is part of the Clean City Initiative. He stated that his summer clean ups are about pride in neighborhoods and about education. He stated that the Clean City Coordinator will be visiting dumpster owners to educate them. He stated that there are many eyes on the streets.

Mr. Moran stated that he also agreed with Ms. Sihelnik that the required permit process must be streamlined. He agreed that the construction permit fee may be waived and noted his agreement with Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz regarding screening uniformity. He expressed that uniformity is especially important when dumpsters are in front of buildings. He noted the need to ensure that the end result will beautify the area.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz stated that the frequency to empty the dumpster should be determined by the type of business that it is servicing. She stated that sometimes others also use the dumpsters as well. She stated that she likes the pilot idea. She stated that she works near dumpster locations and that they often fill quickly. She suggested that some locations / businesses may need daily pickup and stated that animals quickly find refuse. Mr. Harrity stated that the dumpsters will be required to be emptied weekly at a minimum. He agreed that there are different needs and pickup frequencies.

Mr. Denbowski stated that pickup was not regulated in the past. He stated that the minimum pickup is weekly but will be increased as needed.

Mr. Harrity explained that he discovered that when the dumpsters overflow the owner only requests pickup of items that are on the ground and it is not emptied. Mr. Denbowski agreed and noted the need to hold the owner accountable. He stated that it is difficult to hold the hauler accountable if the owner does not contract for sufficient services.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz suggested that checking the dumpster should be part of property / business inspections. She noted the need for collective efforts. She also noted the need to consider the accessibility by the hauler after the dumpsters are screened. Mr. Rugis stated that parks, streets, police, fire, and property maintenance staff will all monitor the dumpsters. Mr. Harrity agreed and noted the need for cooperation.

Mr. Waltman noted a great example of screening at the corner of Schuylkill Ave and Buttonwood St. He stated that this screening blends into the exterior of the property and suggested that it should be used as an example for others.

III. 2022 Solid Waste and Recycling Fees

Mr. Harrity stated that the solid waste fee is increasing \$5 per month in 2022. He stated that he did his best to contain costs. He stated that the recycling fee will remain the same in 2022. He stated that combined trash and recycling collection will be \$330 annually. He reminded all that this fee is less than many other municipality's collection fees.

Mr. Waltman expressed the belief that the hauler's fuel costs alone will increase more than \$5 per month. He also noted the need to consider the increased cost of labor.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz expressed the belief that it will be important to clearly communicate this to residents. She stated that residents become angered when they are not informed. She suggested using robocalls, texts, the website, etc. to educate the public.

Mr. Waltman also suggested printing the information on an upcoming bill. Mr. Rugis and Mr. Harrity agreed.

IV. Review Budget Amendments

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz reminded all that the Charter requires Council approval of a budget before December 15. If it is not approved by Council, the Mayor's originally submitted budget goes into effect.

Mr. Gombar agreed and stated that all Councilors took an oath to follow the Charter. He stated that the Charter does allow the budget to be reopened within the first 45 days when new officials are elected.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz noted her understanding of needing to follow the Charter. But she also noted that Council has a fiduciary responsibility. She stated that her questions were not answered and she cannot approve a document with errors and unanswered questions. She suggested that the budget be reopened to make corrections.

Mr. Waltman reminded all that the budget can be amended throughout the year. He stated that amendments can be used to address any errors or issues that arise when Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz's questions are answered. He agreed that the budget can be reopened in January. He stated that he saw Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz's email questions but did not see answers. He noted the importance of getting answers.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz stated that she sent another email with corrections and questions today. She stated that Ms. Castner is listed in the Position Ordinance two times in two different positions.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz requested that Mr. Kelly answer Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz's questions.

Mr. Kelly stated that he is willing to answer the questions but that he hasn't been provided with them. He stated that if he had been he would have provided answers and been able to better prepare for this meeting. He requested that he be copied on similar emails in the future.

Mr. Amoros stated that he has not seen the email sent today.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz stated that her questions from November 22 are unanswered. She stated that she sent today's email to Councilors only.

Mr. Amoros and Mr. Kelly stated that they did not receive the November 22 email either.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz questioned if these answers could be provided before this evening's meeting. She requested that Council consider reopening the budget in January. She stated that this is a lesson in communication.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz questioned who would be held accountable for not responding to the questions.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz noted the need for better communication. She expressed the belief that it is unfortunate that neither Mr. Amoros nor Mr. Kelly received the questions.

Mr. Kelly stated that Ms. Kelleher has forwarded the emails to him and he can answer the questions.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz stated that Council was instructed to send their questions to the Managing Director. She stated that she followed protocol.

Mr. Kelly answered Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz's questions. He stated that:

- Ms. Castner is now listed only once in the Position Ordinance.
- There are no MOU's or agreements with organizations that provide PILOTs. This contribution is voluntary and the City has no leverage to force payment.
- The RPA lease payment is not allocated to a specific program.
- The City does pay more for the crossing guards than the School District does.
- Fees are recovering.
- The Potteiger Trust is now a separate Agency Fund (Fund 31) so that the funding will roll over from year to year and will be outside the General Fund.

Mr. Amoros stated that the November 22 email did not include Mr. Kelly. He requested that if a response is not received in the future that he be contacted for follow up. He requested that Mr. Kelly be copied on all emails that are financial in nature. He stated that he will take responsibility for this miscommunication but that communication must improve. He stated that this oversight was not done with nefarious intentions and he is available to Council at any time.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz stated that there is much work to be done as a part time Councilor. She stated that she expects courtesy and respect and to get responses. She expressed the belief that full time paid employees should respond as needed.

Mr. Amoros noted the need for Councilors to get his attention when needed and he will address issues. He noted the need to address him specifically in the email as many emails are copied to many employees and it can be difficult to determine if all the proper people have been included.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz suggested resolving the communication issues at a later date. She noted that it is important to address the budget questions at this time.

Mr. Waltman stated that he also assumed that Mr. Kelly was copied on the emails. He noted the high frustration level and suggested that if a Councilor needs information and does not receive it that they contact Mr. Amoros or Mr. Moran directly. He also noted the need to continue addressing Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz's questions.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz noted the need for clear communication to legislate effectively. She questioned why Mr. Waltman does not relay information from his meetings with Mr. Amoros and Mr. Moran to the rest of Council.

Mr. Waltman stated that this is a conversation for another time. He stated that not all information needs to go through him. He stated that he shares information that is relevant to meeting topics. He noted the need for all to communicate with one another. He stated that there is much business to attend to by staff on a daily basis. He noted the need to address the specific questions at this time.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz stated that the communication issue will remain unresolved at this time but the budget questions need to be answered.

Ms. Sihelnik expressed the belief that the communication issue should not be dismissed. She stated that communication is vital. She stated that she has spoken with others about the need for all of Council to be briefed on information that is shared during the President's meetings with the Mayor and Managing Director but no action has been taken. She suggested that a second Councilor attend these meetings to allow for fuller sharing. She also noted concern with adopting a budget that contains errors. She noted the need to address Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz's questions.

Mr. Marmarou noted his concern with reopening the budget in January because he and Ms. Sihelnik will no longer be members of Council. Mr. Gombar stated that Council must vote before December 15. He stated that new elected officials should not be bound by a budget that was adopted by former officials.

Mr. Marmarou stated that this sounds like his vote won't count. Mr. Gombar stated that it counts today. He stated that the budget cannot be reopened without a majority vote of Council. Mr. Waltman stated that Mr. Marmarou had this same opportunity when he joined Council and after each re-election.

Ms. Reed stated that there are many questions that remain unanswered. She questioned if a special meeting should be held on December 15 to allow time for Mr. Kelly to answer additional questions. She stated that Council will feel less rushed. She stated that this is a possible compromise.

Ms. Kelleher stated that tonight's meeting would need to be recessed, not adjourned, and reconvened on December 15. She stated that there is not enough time to advertise a special meeting. She stated that if this path is taken, all the budget and tax ordinances must be tabled.

Mr. Gombar stated that this approach is unconventional but is allowed.

Ms. Sihelnik stated that she is not available on December 15. Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz stated that she is not available either.

Mr. Kelly addressed several more of Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz's questions:

- He is unsure what is meant by CD reimbursement
- He has no information about the Youth Commission. Ms. Sihelnik, via the chat feature, stated that the Youth Commission has not requested funding at this time.
- He explained that the temp agency fees are within the Finance Department, and not HR, because the Finance Department will be using the temp agency to hire several positions. He explained that each Department will receive this funding individually as needed.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz questioned if the City applied for the PCCD gun violence grant. Mr. Kelly stated that the City has not applied. He stated that staff does not have the capacity to run this program.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz questioned which organizations pay PILOTs. Mr. Kelly stated that there is an assortment of organizations that provide PILOTs including Albright College, Alvernia University and B'Nai B'rith to name a few.

Mr. Kelly stated that the Hope Rescue Mission will continue serving downtown. He stated that Ms. Castner reviewed the Downtown portion of the budget several weeks ago.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz stated that \$150,000 has been budgeted for Ambassadors and it is noted that there will be four of them. She questioned their hourly pay and the number of hours they will work weekly. Mr. Kelly stated that he will assume that they will be paid \$15 per hour as are the City's other part time employees. He stated that he does not know their specific hours.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz stated that mathematically this works out to \$37,500 each which would be 48 hours per week at \$15 per hour. She asked if this is correct. Mr. Kelly stated that he would need to defer this question to Ms. Castner. Mr. Rugis stated that the budget amount is correct but that there would be more than four ambassadors. He stated that shifts will also include weekends.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz questioned why four part time employees is listed. Mr. Rugis expressed the belief that the number hired should be as needed. He reminded all that additional assistance will be required around special events.

The questions continued to be addressed as follows:

- Chief Torielli stated that the Special Academy line is used to pay for Academy graduation ceremonies. He stated that cadets reimburse the Academy when they pay their tuition.
- Mr. Kelly stated that four new police officers are permitted per salary caps but the Department elected to use this funding to increase salaries of current officers to help with retention. Chief Torielli agreed.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz stated that the Position Ordinance contains names of employees who are no longer with the City. Chief Torielli stated that these employees left after the budget was drafted. Mr. Kelly agreed and stated that these corrections can be made. He stated that perfection is not necessary. Chief Torielli stated that new officers will be hired in January and the names will change again. *(Note: the Position Ordinance authorizes only the position, not the person filling the position.)*

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz noted the need for fairness and clarity.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz reminded all that a budget is a living document. She stated that all budgets become inaccurate over time and that fluidity is needed.

Mr. Kelly continued answering Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz's questions as follows:

- Non-departmental items were explained by Mr. Oppenheimer.
- The Non-departmental miscellaneous expense line item is used to pay the third party to administer the business license permits / taxes.
- The City is no longer engaged with the US Conference of Mayors or the National League of Cities.

Mr. Kelly stated that he does not have information about the RRA debt service. Mr. Waltman requested that Mr. Kelly provide this information to Council.

Ms. Kelleher expressed the belief that this is in relation to the Public Works Building. She stated that the RRA assisted the City with financing the building project and the City is now reimbursing the RRA.

Mr. Kelly expressed the belief that too many questions remain to be answered at this time.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz questioned if the vote should be delayed.

Mr. Amoros suggested polling Council to see if a delay is necessary. He suggested that the process not be upended if the answers can be provided separately.

Mr. Waltman stated that the ARPA approval will be tabled this evening. He suggested that Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz work with Mr. Kelly separately to have her questions answered. He noted the need to address any additional errors now.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz questioned if the cost of fringe benefits is allocated correctly in all areas. She expressed the belief that as salaries increase, the cost of fringe benefits also increases. Mr. Kelly stated that fringe benefits are allocated according to each individual within that area.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz stated that all fringe benefit costs are being reduced. Mr. Kelly stated that there is no correlation between salary and the cost of fringe benefits. He stated that the cost depends on the choices made by each employee.

Using the chat feature, Ms. Smith stated that employees have multiple choices of healthcare plans and some opt out of coverage with the City if they can be covered elsewhere.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz agreed that there is not always a direct correlation between salary and the cost of fringe benefits.

Mr. Kelly reminded all that if the budget had any significant deficiencies it would not have been approved by PFM through the Act 47 process.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz stated that the budget has also been reviewed by the City Auditor. She stated that it is important to get questions answered but she is confident that the process can move forward.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that she reviewed the budget and worked with Mr. Kelly to make corrections.

Ms. Sihelnik agreed that the questions that were brought forward are not major issues. She noted her preference to vote this evening.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz questioned if the corrections would be made before the vote. Mr. Waltman noted the need to be specific about corrections that are needed. Mr. Kelly stated that Ms. Castner has been removed from one position.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz stated that management staff will be receiving 3.5% salary increases but it appears that the Deputy Fire Chiefs will receive a 7% increase. Mr. Kelly stated that the Fire Chief approved these increases to retain current staff.

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz questioned if updated organizational charts are needed. She noted the relocation of the Pension Coordinator. Mr. Kelly stated that when Administrative Services was eliminated the Pension Coordinator should have been with Finance. He stated that this is now being corrected. He stated that there is an MOU with the Pension Boards to make this correction.

Mr. Waltman thanked all for their patience through this process. He expressed the belief that the budget review can be an overwhelming process.

V. Agenda Review

Council reviewed this evening's agenda including the following:

- Public Comment

Ms. Kelleher stated that one person has submitted written public comment on an agenda topic. Three others are registered to speak – 1 in person and 2 via Zoom.

- Ordinance amending Code of Ordinances Chapter 62 New Officers and Employees Pension Fund, Section 102 to prohibit the participation of new members where the employee is hired or rehired on or after January 1, 2022

Mr. Kelly stated that the O & E Pension Board solicitor has provided his opinion and this is now ready to move forward.

- Bill 93-2021 ARPA Plan

Mr. Waltman stated that this ordinance will be tabled for further review.

- Bill 91-2021 2022 General Fund Budget

Ms. Cepeda-Freytiz questioned if there were job descriptions for the new positions that are included. She questioned if a vote should occur without this information. Mr. Kelly stated that job descriptions are needed before anyone can be hired. He stated that this is an

Administrative function. Mr. Amoros stated that job descriptions have been prepared for all the new positions.

Mr. Waltman suggested that the ordinances for introduction this evening be reviewed at the next meeting.

Ms. Kelleher stated that ordinances A and F being introduced are duplicative and requested that ordinance A be disregarded.

Ms. Goodman-Hinnershitz read aloud all the ordinances for introduction.

The meeting adjourned at 7:33 pm.

*Respectfully Submitted by
Linda A. Kelleher, CMC, City Clerk*