

**COUNCIL MINUTES
JULY 2, 2008**

1. Invocation: Julio A. Guridy
2. Pledge to the Flag
3. Roll Call
4. Courtesy of the Floor

Kay Pickel, 1523 Liberty Street, said once again we're going to celebrate our freedom. She dreads Friday nights. It's out of control in the City. Something has to be done. They're frightened. She doesn't know what their solution is, but she's asking them to tighten the controls. The last 2 years have become extremely bad.

Mr. D'Amore said Police and Fire are taking extra measures.

5. Approval of Minutes: June 4, 2008
6. Old Business: None.
7. Communications:

Mr. D'Amore said he received a communiqué from the Finance Director and also from Council's Financial Advisor at PFM saying that as of July 1st the bond refinancing was finalized, and we can expect to realize the savings of over \$600,000.

8. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES:

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

There will be a Committee of the Whole Meeting on August 6th, at 6:30 PM, to review the police reorganization.

ADMINISTRATION – Chairperson Donovan

The Committee has not met since the last meeting. The next committee meeting is scheduled for July 16th at 6:00 PM.

COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT – Chairperson Schweyer

The Committee has not met since the last meeting but has scheduled a marathon session for July 8th at 6:00 PM.

PUBLIC WORKS – Chairperson Guridy

The Committee has not met since the last Council meeting; the next meeting has not yet been scheduled.

PUBLIC SAFETY -Chairperson Howells

The Committee has not met since the last council meeting; a future meeting has not yet been scheduled.

APPOINTMENTS - Chairperson D'Amore

The Committee has not met since the last Council meeting; a future meeting has not been scheduled.

LEGAL AND LEGISLATIVE – Chairperson Phillips

The Committee has not met since the last Council meeting; a future meeting has not yet been scheduled.

RULES AND CHAMBERS – Chairperson D'Amore

The Committee has not met since the last Council meeting; a future meeting is not yet scheduled.

OTHER COMMITTEE REPORTS

Connect the Parks – Mr. Phillips said there was a meeting scheduled tonight to settle St. Elmo Street. We hope there is something we all can agree upon.

Pension Board – There has been no meeting since the last Council meeting.

Presales Inspection Meeting – Mr. Donovan said the committee met on June 25th at 5:30 PM in Council Chambers.

Blighted Property Review Board – The Committee met on June 9th.

Lehigh Valley Planning Commission Report – Mr. D’Amore said the commission met last Thursday. They discussed sustainable communities, such as how to build communities in which people can live, work, play, and shop within a reasonable walking distance.

CONTROLLER’S REPORT

Mr. Hoffman said he has no report.

9. ORDINANCES FOR FINAL PASSAGE:

Bill 16

Stop Sign on Chew Street at 16th Street

Mr. Guridy said they’ve had several meetings in regard to this. They requested a traffic study report, which was presented to us about 2 weeks ago. After discussing the study, they recommended it favorably after listening to a number of testimonies from individuals. They felt the sign should be reinstated.

Mr. D’Amore said Council received a letter from Richard Young stating his professional opinion that will be made part of the record.



City of Allentown Memorandum

TO: Michael D'Amore
President, City Council

FROM: Richard A. Young, P.E.
Director of Public Works/City Engineer

DATE: July 2, 2008

SUBJECT: Multi-Way Stop
N. 16TH Street and Chew Street
Bill 16-2008

In response to Bill 16-2008 I would like to give my position as City Engineer. Title 67, Chapter 212, Subchapter A, Section 212.2 of the Pennsylvania Code establishes the Federal Highway Administration’s Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) as the rules and regulations for the State of Pennsylvania. Section 2B.07 of the MUTCD contains warrants for when a Multi-way Stop can be installed and Title 67, Chapter 212, Subchapter B, Section 212.106 of the Pennsylvania Code modifies the MUTCD. I have also attached a copy of a legal memorandum from the City Solicitor’s Office.

The warrants state that at least 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours on the major street are required to install a multi-way stop. Chew Street at this intersection has 2 hours each day that meet this requirement, the AM and the PM peaks. The warrants also state you need a total of 200 vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles entering the intersection from the minor street for the same 8 hours. The minor street has a maximum 188, but these volumes are only in the AM and PM peak hour. Neither the major street nor the minor street maintains these volumes for 8 hours. Both streets meet this requirement for only 2 hours per day.

Another warrant is a crash history. This warrant states “a crash problem, as indicated by 5 or more reported crashes in a 12-month period that are susceptible to correction by a multi-way stop installation. Such crashes include right- and left-turn collisions as well as right-angle collisions.” Prior to the installation of the multi-way stop in 2007, the accident history showed 3 to 4 accidents per year at this intersection. After the multi-way stop was installed we had 3 accidents at this intersection. Therefore, there did not seem to be any reduction in the number of accidents at this intersection with the multi-way stop in place.

The "Multi-way Stop Analysis" prepared by Benchmark Civil Engineering Services, Inc. provides evidence that this intersection does not meet the requirement for a Multi-way stop. While I can only advise the governing legislative body of the rules and regulations governing the installation of stop signs and realize that said legislative body has ultimate authority to act as they deem necessary in the public interest, I would like to state for the legislative record that as the official and licensed Chief City Engineer, I cannot support the passage of Bill 16-2008.

Mr. Dougherty said they have no report on it. The Administration is in favor of this bill, but they do respect the professional concerns that our Engineer has.

Mr. Donovan said he is a stickler for standards. He has a stickler for the fact that the state and federal government have warrants for what is required for a stop sign. He honors the fact that the City recommended they follow the warrants of the State of Pennsylvania. He respects the fact that some residents would like a stop sign there. If he goes with that particular desire, he goes against his own principles about standing up for standards that are held by society and the State of Pennsylvania. He'll be voting no.

Mr. Howells said he was one of the sponsors of the original bill. He is also one of the sponsors for the current legislation. He supported it then. He was not at the meeting when they voted to remove it. We have 4 way stop signs all over the City. He doesn't know how they can deny 16th and Chew when the neighbors feel it's necessary, and he concurs that it is necessary. We are really not bound to follow the guidelines of the Commonwealth. If we were, we wouldn't have any 4 way stop signs in the City. He feels safer with the 4 way stop signs. He is going to support this as he has throughout. If there is a need anywhere else in the City, and 3 of his colleagues go along with it, he'd vote for another one. He also respects Mr. Young's opinion.

Ms. Eichenwald said she, too, will support the bill. She listened to the citizens when they expressed their viewpoint. She's a strong believer there are times when the will of the people must be listened to. She'd also like to address the issue of standards. If this were simply a matter of following regulations, then City Council would not be granted to issue the final approval. That leads her to believe the 7 of them are charged with the last responsibility of placing the stop sign there. Having listened about all the accidents that occurred and the safety of the citizens, one can see this is a matter of interest. She will vote yes in support of the stop sign.

Assistant City Solicitor Burianek said Council is in possession of an opinion by Attorney John Marchetto on this issue.

Mr. Donovan requested the opinion be read into the record.

The following opinion was issued by Assistant City Solicitor, John Marchetto and read into the record.



City of Allentown Memorandum

TO: City Council

CC: Ed Pawlowski, Mayor
Richard Young, Director of Public Works

FROM: John T. Marchetto, Asst. City Solicitor

DATE: March 6, 2008

SUBJECT: Erection and Placement of Traffic Control Devices
Stop Sign at 16th and Chew Sts.

Mr. Philips raised a question regarding whether or not the City was required to abide by the State statute and regulations governing the placement of the proposed stop sign at 16th and Chew Sts.

This legal memorandum is being expedited in order to promptly address this issue and provide sufficient time for review before the next scheduled meeting of the Public Works Committee. This memorandum addresses the applicability of State law, it does not address the mechanics of whether or not the placement of the sign is in conformance with the legal standards. Mr. Young should be consulted in this regard.

Previously, Rich Young has accurately opined that the City was in fact required to follow State regulations and that the stop sign at 16th and Chew Sts. is required meet one of the prescribed warrants.

The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation ("PennDOT") is authorized under Pennsylvania law to promulgate regulations governing traffic control within the Commonwealth. *See* 75 Pa. C.S.A §6102(a). More specifically, the Bureau of Highway Safety and Traffic Engineering, is the office within PennDOT responsible for traffic regulations and statewide policies regarding traffic-control devices. 67 Pa. Code 212.1.

"Authority to erect traffic-control devices

(a) General rule.--The department on State-designated highways and local authorities on any highway within their boundaries may erect official traffic-control devices, which shall be installed and maintained in conformance with the manual and regulations published by the department upon all highways as required to carry out the provisions of this title or to regulate, restrict, direct, warn, prohibit or guide traffic." 75 Pa. C.S.A. § 6122. emphasis added. *See also*, 67 Pa. Code § 212(a).

PennDOT has promulgated and adopted the Federal Highway Administration standards related to traffic-control devices.

“Adoption of Federal standards.

(a) General provisions. Consistent with the authority contained in 75 Pa.C.S. § § 6103(c) and 6121 (relating to promulgation of rules and regulations by the Department; and uniform system of traffic-control devices), the Department hereby adopts the MUTCD, as published by the Federal Highway Administration. The MUTCD is adopted in its totality except where this chapter clearly indicates that it is not being adopted, or that additional warrants or criteria are being provided.” Pa. Code § 212.2.

The State Regulations regarding the installation of traffic-control devices apply to all streets and highways in the Commonwealth.

“Application.

(a) General. This chapter applies to the approval, location, installation, revision, operation, maintenance and removal of all traffic signs, signals, markings and other traffic-control devices on all streets and highways in this Commonwealth. All signs, signals, markings and other traffic-control devices erected shall conform to this chapter. Traffic restrictions, which were posted or erected prior to February 4, 2006, in accordance with any regulations in effect at that time, are not subject to this chapter.” 67 Pa. Code § 212.4.

In conclusion, although the City does not have to obtain PennDOT approval prior to installing a stop-sign at 16th and Chew Sts., the City must follow the requirements established by PennDOT.

A comprehensive publication on this subject can be found at:

<ftp://ftp.dot.state.pa.us/public/PubsForms/Publications/PUB%20212.pdf>

Mr. Donovan said he respects the fact that citizens may make a request for any item or any situation in City policy, he defers to the State of Pennsylvania’s guidelines in this matter.

Ms. Eichenwald said if we follow the guidelines, you could imagine how many stop signs we would have to remove.

Mr. Donovan said from what he’s reading, anything prior to 2006 is grandfathered.

Ms. Eichenwald said there are others that have been put up post that. If we wanted to totally follow the statutes, we would have to investigate every stop sign.

Mr. Donovan said it's possible that prior Councils have not followed the rules as prescribed, and that concerns him.

Mr. Howells said he thinks this Council should get the State to change their rules and regulations, because he's heard so many times, in this City, that we are unable to enact legislation that we would like to enact because of preemption. Whether it's smoking or whether it's the Police Department using radar. We sent a letter to the Commonwealth many years ago about our municipality being able to use radar. We need to put our 7 heads together and see if we can't come up with something that would permit us to send them something with suggestions and have that part overturned. He's getting tired of the state always dictating to us. We're the legislators for the 3rd largest City in the Commonwealth and they can hogtie us, and we cannot do what we wish to do. We should be able to do what's in the best interest of the citizens of our community.

Mr. Phillips said again, we're talking about quality of life. We've put up numerous stop signs since 1976 and have prevented and saved lives and property damage, etc. He's not sure they should be circumventing state law. Sometimes state law is in a broader sense. We can be more restrictive than state law. Sometimes we have to think of the people we're serving. Government doesn't always serve the little person. Ordinances are enacted to cover things the state or federal governments don't cover on a local level. When it comes to issues such as this – where intersections are very dangerous – 16th and Walnut, 16th and Chew – they're for the safety of those who we serve and protect. He again is going to support this. He's the author and Mr. Howells is the co-author. We certainly believe strongly, as public safety officers, but we think we know best what serves us.

Mr. Donovan said he totally agrees with him that we disagree with mandates that come from the state, therefore, we should ask for changes in that mandate, or ask for an appeal. In this particular case, he would be willing to follow whatever appeal processes are necessary for the State of Pennsylvania. It took us 3 months exactly to find out what our relationship was with the State of Pennsylvania, which he finds unreasonable. He doesn't disagree a stop sign might be needed there. He would like one at West Street and Chew. He doesn't disagree there are safety issues throughout the West End and Lehigh Valley, but he does what he does disagree with is us trying to make a change in light of what is clearly Pennsylvania regulations. Sometimes we end up doing things that fly in the face of standard procedures and get caught down the line. In this particular case, he's going to hold firm and vote no. He would like the Engineer to find out what our appeal process is and if it's appropriate when we do not satisfy the standard. If that appeal process is something we can follow, he would gladly follow it, but he wants to do this right. If that makes him look like a rational fool, than that's okay.

Mr. Guridy said we've gone through this many times. He was the co-author when we first introduced to erect a stop sign several years ago. It was up for awhile and then we took it down, now it's going back up. He appreciates Mr. Young's opinion as well as the study that was done. He was not totally convinced that this was the right thing to follow. We have to trust our judgment sometimes. People have been asking them for weeks and months to keep the stop sign up. He is not here to please any single law. He's here to support the City and its residents. If he wanted to support the state law, he would run for state representative. He will support this stop sign again.

Mr. Howells said he wants to make it abundantly clear to Michael Donovan that he respects the fact that he makes his own decisions. He doesn't want anyone in this audience to think less of Mr. Donovan simply because he is of a different mind. This situation reminds him of one they had on Emaus Avenue, at Albert and Emaus Avenue. We had quite a number of accidents over there. There were no red lights. That means you could come from Fountain Hill all the way to 4th and Emaus Avenue, at whatever speed you wanted to go. We had a hard time putting a traffic light there. They fought for years to get a light there. It wasn't until they had people severely injured, that the state turned around and said okay. He was a police officer at the time. The accidents are less and their severity has been reduced. Nobody knows better than what needs to be controlled than the people in the community.

Mr. Young said if you decide to vote to put this stop sign in, would it be possible to add another stop sign, "stop ahead" on Chew Street to give people an advanced warning that there is a stop sign there? They sat there for one hour and they saw 8 people go right through the stop sign.

Mr. Dougherty said you're not the first legislative body to address such an issue with PennDOT. In Philadelphia, we have 134 square miles of roads. He'll tell them they have such a thing called a political warrant. When it doesn't meet the PennDOT regs, Council goes ahead and they pass a political warrant. It's put on file in Traffic Engineering and PennDOT does nothing. It's not because it's a Home Rule Charter or a 1st Class City.

Mr. Donovan said he thanked Mr. Dougherty for bringing up something that is important to him. You have added something. There apparently is a legal precedent that is accepted by PennDOT. If something like that is acceptable, he doesn't want them to set a precedent by not following procedure.

Attorney Burianek said PennDOT does not oversee. They establish the standards. The question of the lack of a warrant goes to enforceability. It does not go to a PennDOT audit. That's fine. PennDOT will say nothing and they will do nothing. But if someone goes through the stop sign and gets a ticket, they can ask for the warrant back.

Mr. Donovan said the Solicitor said if we approve this without satisfying the State of Pennsylvania's warrants, and a person who goes through a stop sign and is stopped and given a ticket, and asks for the warrant and asks for proof that it was an enforceable violation – it is for that reason that he is hesitant about voting yes. He respects the residents' desire for it, but he wants to follow procedure. If City Council passed an ordinance saying that in their wisdom, they believe this is suitable, is that a permissible warrant?

Attorney Burianek said no, not to his knowledge.

Mr. Donovan said that's simply a political statement in Philadelphia.

Mr. Dougherty said he doesn't know the legalities of it, but it has been the practice for the last few decades.

Mr. Donovan said it's quite clear where the vote is going. He knows where he's going to stand.

Mr. Schweyer said he voted to remove the sign. There's one significant difference now than there was several months ago. That is the job this Council has done in notifying the neighborhood in letting them know. One thing that was abundantly clear several months ago, he doesn't think there was one person from the West Park neighborhood. That was a failure of this Council. Regardless of where our votes may go, it's still our responsibility to not only notify the public, but more specifically when we know there's an issue that we know is of local importance, we should notify as many people from that particular neighborhood as directly as possible. From that perspective, there is one major difference. Over 3 months, there has been a lot of study done on this particular issue. A lot of the ambiguity in his mind has been cleared up. In light of that, and also the number of the accidents that have happened since the removal, he is going to vote in favor of returning the stop sign to 16th Street, and err on the side of caution. His colleagues have been convincing on both sides of the argument. His 2 colleagues who have spent their years in law enforcement have been particularly influential. He thanked the Administration for all their hard work.

The Pastor of Emmanuel Church of Christ, 16th and Chew Streets, said on behalf of the group, he thanked everyone for their hard work. Chew Street is a very busy street. From the residents' perspective, they've seen a lot of excessive speed. There is a need for this also because of poor visibility. The parking lot at the church would benefit from this also. Sometimes we need to make changes to the law. They would appreciate your vote on this.

Dan Mest, 940 East Jackson Street, said he applauds them for their wisdom and decisions. The right thing is to get the stop sign back.

Peter Terry, 413 North Jasper Street, said he has seen the crash data and the concerns of the residents. Putting up the stop sign may not provide the safety this neighborhood deserves. There's probably more that should be done. The things that were discussed by the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission in making walkable communities. These things need to be thought about. If we look at the crash data in another 3 years, and it's the same thing, you haven't solved the problem. Whichever way you decide to go with this multi-way stop, you've still got to solve the problem in the neighborhood.

Mr. Donovan said he asked the same question. Does the stop sign solve the problem? There are significant speed issues throughout the City and significant stop sign running.

Mr. Guridy said he agrees with what you are both saying. Unfortunately, we only have the stop sign at this point.

Mrs. Nuss, 1608 West Chew Street, said the study says multi-stop controls can be used as a safety measure at intersections if certain traffic conditions exist. She's worried about pedestrian safety.

Ernie Atiyeh, 1909 Congress Street, suggested an amendment.

Mr. Howells and Mr. Schweyer moved to amend Bill 16 by common consent.

Mr. D'Amore said he is impressed with the citizens from the West Park neighborhood. You have his admiration in fighting for what you believe in. You have succeeded once, and it is very likely you will succeed again. On a personal level, he deeply disagrees with putting the stop sign back. It's not that he doesn't want to say yes to this stop sign. Absent the warrants processed from PennDOT, he doesn't know at what point we should say no. It's easy to see the benefits of a stop sign but not the detriments of a stop sign. He feels the only responsible thing for him to do is to stay with the warrant and our legal counsel's advice. Beyond that he wouldn't be confident anything else he did would be correct. Dan Mest had his own case for a stop sign in his neighborhood, which we did not say yes to.

Mr. Schweyer and Mr. Howells moved to amend Bill 16 by installing a sign that reads "Stop Ahead."

The amendment was approved, 7 Yeas and 0 Nays.

Bill 16 was adopted, as amended, 5 Yeas and 2 Nays (Donovan and D'Amore).

Mr. D'Amore said he will do everything in his power to assure this does not come up again. You fought once, you won. You fought twice, you won. You shouldn't have to fight any more. The stop sign should stay.

10. ORDINANCES FOR INTRODUCTION:

Bill 49

Authorizing the Lehigh County Board of Elections to place the following question on the November 4, 2008 ballot, for the Allentown electorate that would amend the Home Rule Charter, Section 815, Bidding Process, by allowing Allentown City Council to adopt the Competition Principle and New Competitive Policies Code. 1

Bill 49 was referred to Legal and Legislative.

Mr. D'Amore said it will be before the Legal and Legislative Committee and a final vote of Council on July 16th.

Bill 50

Amending the General Fund by creating a new Captain at an 18(N) paygrade (salary range is \$65,306-\$80,831) and eliminate the position of Lieutenant 17(N) (budgeted at \$70,903).

Bill 50 was referred to the Committee of the Whole for August 6th.

Mr. Donovan said whenever they hold committee meetings, as well as Council meetings, we receive, in writing, a plan on the community policing operation, whatever justifications are necessary and a schedule.

Ms. Eichenwald requested any information from the consultant that was hired.

Bill 51

Amending Article 951 by amending regulations as they relate to the gating of parks.

Bill 51 was removed from the agenda and not introduced.

Bill 52

Amending the 2008 General Fund Budget to provide for a supplemental appropriation of Sixteen Thousand Eight Hundred (\$16,800) Dollars; to provide for the grants from the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency and the U.S. Department of Justice to the City of Allentown for Weed and Seed.

Bill 52 was referred to Public Safety.

Bill 53

Amending the 2008 General Fund Budget to provide for a supplemental appropriation of Fifteen Thousand One Hundred (\$15,100) Dollars from Lehigh County Office of Children & Youth to the Health Bureau's Injury Prevention Program budget and the Nutrition and Physical Activity Program budget to enable the purchase of supplies and equipment for each program and to reimburse the City of Allentown for costs incurred in coordinating and conducting the Alliance Hall Summer Recreation program.

Bill 53 was referred to CEDC.

Bill 54

Tree Well Encroachments

Bill 54 was referred to Public Works.

Bill 55

Amending the General Fund by creating the position Police Community Relations Officer at an 8(N) paygrade (salary range is \$42,061-\$51,600).

Bill 55 was referred to the Committee of the Whole for August 6th.

Mr. Schweyer and Mr. Donovan moved to suspend the rules to introduce Bill 56 and Bill 57.

The rules were suspended, 6 Yeas and 1 Nay (Phillips), and the following bills were introduced.

Bill 56

Amending the Zoning Code by providing for Seasonal Dining in a Commercial District and modifying the parking requirements in the B-1/R District

Bill 57

Amending the Zoning Code by modifying the parking requirements in the B-1/R District

Bills 56 and 57 were referred to CEDC

11. **CONSENT AGENDA:** None

12. **RESOLUTIONS ON SECOND READING:** None

13. **NEW RESOLUTIONS:**

R42

Encroachment for a Handicap Accessible Ramp at 24-32 South 5th Street

R42 was referred to Public Works.

R43

Encroachment for an Overhead Pedestrian Walkway at 26 North 17th and 102 North 17th Streets

R43 was referred to Public Works.

R44

Adopting the National Incident Management Systems (NIMS)

Mr. Phillips and Mr. Guridy moved to pull R44 out of committee.

Fire Chief Robert Scheirer said they need to adopt this in case of a disaster. It's the only way Allentown will be able to seek assistance through the County, State and federal levels. It's the only way we're going to get state and federal funding. It basically sets up an instant command system.

R44 was approved, 7 Yeas and 0 Nays.

14. **NEW BUSINESS:**

Mr. Phillips said he understands we're looking at hiring part time police officers. Is there a proposal or plan going to be brought before Council before any action is taken?

Mr. Dougherty said he knows it's been advertised in various medians. We've received a number of applications. That's the extent of his knowledge of that idea.

Mr. Phillips asked if Council will be receiving a presentation or proposal?

Mr. Dougherty said he would be directed to come to Council on some capacity if the Administration has some concrete plans to go forward with part time police officers.

Mr. Phillips said there are rumors that applications are being submitted.

Mr. Dougherty said he can confirm there have been applications submitted. There have been no actions on those. He does not know the details that may have been worked out with the police chief or the Mayor, or whether an ultimate decision has been made to go forward with the hiring of part time police officers.

Mr. Phillips said he has some reservations, not only because he's a former police officer, but there are some hurdles we have to get over way before we get to advertising it. We have state regulations; we have contract issues to get over; and, we have to go through our own civil service people. You have at least 2 people who are going to vehemently oppose it. He would hope if the Mayor wants to have dialogue, he should be talking to some of us about it instead of using the splash in the paper to gather headlines. He hopes he's not trying to garnish support in the community. He wants Council to be kept in the loop in this one so we are well aware of what the Administration is bringing to the table.

Mr. Dougherty said he will go on record as saying the Mayor is looking at all options of putting more police on the streets as quickly as we can. We are learning the feasibility of doing that presents a great many challenges. Will we have part time police officers on the streets this summer? At this rate, the answer is no.

Mr. Phillips asked if we've looked at shortening the field training time for police officers that are here versus looking to get options bringing part time people in? We would find out what is vitality important on our field training, and we'd cut their time from 3 months to 6 weeks and get those people on the street quicker. He would go to the Administration and task them with trying to cutting down the field training process versus . . . we already have full time, paid status, who are already trained and in uniform and can get on the street because we cut their time down versus us bringing people in that we have to retrain – even though they're trained by state law, by state training requirements, they still have to be trained by the City of Allentown which means they go on the street because they have to go through the same field training process.

Mr. Dougherty said that is on the table with the consultants and the master plan. You will hear very shortly.

Mr. Phillips said you know we'll lose our accreditation with part time police officers?

Mr. Dougherty said he does not know that. He doesn't know all the implications of part timers. There are challenges. Our intentions and aims, he thinks we have in common. We want more police officers. We may differ about the means. We'll have this discussion in more depth on the 6th of August.

Mr. Howells said he's been waiting to see what the Administration is going to do with part time police officers. He cannot support part time police officers for a host of reasons. If it looks as though the Administration is going to move forward on that, he's going to put that on the Public Safety agenda. He'll do whatever he can to thwart the effort of part time police officers.

Mr. Hoffman asked how are we paying for these officers?

Mr. Howells also asked how is he paying for them without some sort of transfer, or is he going to pull it from Account 45, Contractual Services?

Ms. Eichenwald said her concern is more basic than the issue of yes or no to part timers. Her concern is a procedural one. It's distressing her, as a Councilwoman, about this change being proposed without it going through proper channels. She would appreciate it that when we have this meeting on August 6th, that we begin a correct process. If this is a possibility, then it should be presented, discussed, have the information and come to some conclusion rather than reading about it in *The Morning Call*.

Mr. D'Amore said he's held his tongue on this publicly, but he think it's still open for discussion. The Mayor has quite an uphill battle here, because he joins Mr. Phillips and Mr. Howells, and he will absolutely not authorize part time police officers for a number of reasons. 3 things have to go through Council: One is Personnel, the creation of any new position. His question, perhaps the Mayor can answer for us, if there are applications being taken, under what job descriptions are they being taken? Whatever that job description is it certainly wasn't a job description

created by Council. The 2nd is a question of budgeting. The budget lines would have to be changed, and this is such a major issue, it couldn't be done simply by a transfer. The 3rd is the hiring process for civil service. All 3 of those issues would have to be cleared through Council. Before that happens, he suggests what you've heard tonight should tell you it is an unlikely possibility.

15. **GOOD AND WELFARE:** None.

16. **ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 PM.

Michael P. Hanlon
City Clerk