

**COUNCIL MEETING - 7:30 PM
JANUARY 21, 2009**

1. Invocation: Julio A. Guridy

2. Pledge to the Flag

3. Roll Call

Mr. Donovan, Ms. Eichenwald, Mr. Guridy, Mr. Howells, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Schweyer, and Mr. D'Amore.

4. Courtesy of the Floor

Louis Hershman, 405 Gilmore Street, said he read where the Drop Pension for Police is going to cost \$73,000. What is the 4% raise in the arbitration award going to cost the City?

Larry Hilliard said they actually budgeted the 4%. It's approximately \$120,000 per percentage. It's slightly under \$500,000 on an annual basis.

5. Approval of Minutes: December 3, 2008

6. Old Business

7. Communications

8. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES:

Mr. D'Amore said the new committee structure follows. The new membership will be coming out in a few days.

Budget and Finance: Chairperson Donovan said the Committee has not met since the last council meeting; a future meeting is scheduled for January 28th, the 4th Wednesday of the month, at 6:30 PM.

Public Safety: Chairperson Howells said the Committee has not met since the last Council meeting; a future meeting has not been scheduled

Community and Economic Development: Mr. Guridy chaired the meeting in Mr. Schweyer's absence. The Committee met on January 3rd at 6:00 PM, a future meeting has not yet been scheduled.

Parks and Recreation: Chairperson Phillips said the Committee has not met since the last Council meeting; a future meeting has not been scheduled

Public Works: Chairperson Guridy said there was a meeting tonight to discuss the Lehigh County Authority water contract.

Human Resources, Administration and Appointments: Chairperson Eichenwald said the Committee has not met since the last Council meeting; a future meeting has not been scheduled

Rules, Chambers, Intergovernmental Relations and Strategy: Chairperson D'Amore said this Committee will be chaired by the President.

CONTROLLER'S REPORT

William Hoffman said they are trying to post on the website a 2008 Audit/Project/Review. It is to let the people in the community know what the Controller does and what we're looking at. Most of the things they looked at did not result in a formal audit or report being made. It's just to find out how the City works. They will make any reports available to the public.

Mr. D'Amore and Mr. Howells moved to bring R104 to the front of the agenda.

The motion was approved by common consent.

R104

Administration Sponsored: Authorizes the Administration to Execute a Water Supply Agreement with the Lehigh County Authority

Mr. Donovan said he wanted to reiterate his strong consideration that this is a good deal, not a perfect deal, for the City. It has strategic implications as well as economic implications. He's willing to go with the strategic implications. He does feel some of the

analytical questions that came up at the hearing are how one looks at the numbers and how one wants to determine the share of cost. That's a political and debatable item. Costs are costs and a lot of them are forecasted into the future. It's extremely important that we, in the City, encourage the LCA and the rest of the County and the Valley to take a very close look at our future water resources. That would include even the potential of having the City place, or someone from the City who is knowledgeable in water and related issues, on the Board of the LCA. The subject of social costs and environmental costs are becoming extremely important in policy discussions throughout the country, even the world. The more we're able to provide water to customers outside the City, at a price that is relatively attractive; the more we're encouraging sprawl; the more we're urging potential problems within the Valley, the residents and the businesses, it's important for us to bring that message throughout the Valley. He feels there are some environmental risks down the line, in terms of our aquifer. He thinks they need to move forward and look at a regional water management.

Mr. Howells said there's always a risk when you want to reach out and try something new. He's totally in favor of this. He intends to vote for it and encourages his colleagues to do so.

Mr. Schweyer said this was a crash course in regionalization. This is a very complex issue. He wants to keep alive the idea of regionalization. He'll be supporting this as well.

William Hoffman said you have the spreadsheet he provided. He took the numbers from the T&M Report and engineer's report and the structure of the agreement and how the escalation would take place. The agreement seems to result in a cash flow to cover some of our fixed costs. He did not consider additional capital expenditures. The debt service is available and it tends to drop off after 7 or 8 years. We will be saving cash flow on the debt service. There may be some years where costs may go through the roof and revenues stay level a year or 2.

Mr. Guridy said we are embarking on a long term contract. There may be some ramifications. We should look at this contract as a model for what we may be able to do in the future.

Mr. D'Amore said this agreement has been the subject of a long negotiation. He's concerned by some of the issues raised by Mr. Koplisch and others. In an agreement of this sort means we don't get everything we want.

R104 was approved, 7 Yeas and 0 Nays.

Mr. Schweyer and Mr. Donovan moved to suspend the rules to move R4 to the front of the agenda.

R4

Appointment to the Vacant Property Review Board: Jeffrey L. Lynn, Jr.

Mr. Phillips asked Mr. Lynn why he's interested in sitting on the Vacant Property Review Board.

Jeffrey Lynn, 2313 Greenleaf Street, said he works in real estate development and construction. He wants to use his experience to benefit the City. He looks forward to serving the City.

Mr. Phillips asked Mr. Lynn what he does?

Mr. Lynn said he's a project manager with Bucks Development Contracting Corporation. That entails finding land users, working with municipalities on zoning, planning, scope development, pricing, and contract negotiations

Mr. Schweyer said Mr. Lynn has been actively involved with the Network of Young Professionals. His goal is to try to change the board and commissions to reflect the diverse population we have. We constantly run into problems of having a quorum. It makes sense to take his expertise in real estate development and apply it to the Vacant Property Review Board.

Mr. Guridy said there are a lot of vacant properties in Allentown. What would you do with a lot of vacant properties, especially in center city?

Mr. Lynn said he has no interest in getting involved in a professional capacity. He currently does no work in Allentown. In a personal sense, he hopes to be able help Allentown. He hopes to strategically find those blighted and vacant properties that are under utilized and could economically and efficiently be redeveloped to benefit the City. His inclination would be to save residential redevelopment to help bring downtown with higher demographics with disposable income that would be able to support new business development.

Mr. Guridy said if you had a chance to compare what you see in other towns, what town would you pick?

Mr. Lynn said he would choose Jersey City. They did a great job fostering young professionals with disposable income. They did a great job with transportation, lighting, parking, etc. Cities should be run like a business.

Mr. Howells said welcome aboard.

R4 was approved, 7 Yeas and 0 Nays.

9. ORDINANCES FOR FINAL PASSAGE:

Bill 129

Administration Sponsored: Amending Article 143, Police Pension Fund, by providing for the outcome of the Act 111 award on the compensation for overtime, providing for a One-time Deferred Retirement Option Plan, and deleting provisions in compliance with the award.

Mr. Donovan said Bill 129 was forwarded with no recommendation as the actuary was not present to answer questions, 3-0. He is here tonight to take questions.

Mr. Donovan and Mr. Schweyer moved to amend Bill 129 as follows: Add in Section 143.189 "and the future minimum obligation of the City with respect to the Pension Plan"

The amendment to Bill 129 was approved by common consent, 7-0.

Randee Sekol, Beyer-Barber, said the top component of the Drop Plan is made up of the impact of having certain officers that were anticipated to work an additional 4 years. If you remember, in the 2005, contract we had a stipulation where the City offered officers a certain option. They could take cash or buy their 4 years and leave or buy 4 years and commit to stay and work toward 20 years of service and get a 24 year pension. For those who had taken the cash, they were not eligible for the Drop option, so they were revenue neutral. Those who we already anticipated were going to retire, there was a cost push. If they worked 4 years, we'd get an experienced officer on the street for 4 years. We already anticipated them going and taking their pension, so those people were revenue neutral. It was the group that had taken the option of buying 4 years and staying till 20 or 21 years and now would be eligible to start a Drop pension currently and start taking payments today instead of taking payments 4 years from now. That's where the cost numbers came from. Being an actuary and doing things that are not intuitive to normal human beings, we calculate the present value of all benefits ever expected to be paid from the fund. That's done by projecting the population out, assuming a certain percentage of the population will die, quit or become disabled or reach eligibility for retirement, and when they will retire. We made a certain set of assumptions based on the stipulation and those arrangements that had been made. The Drop plan brought a different look at this group of participants that we anticipated were going to start taking pensions earlier than we thought they were. That's really where the cost of it is. We're running our cash flows in the future; projecting when benefit payments are going to start and stop. Now we have more benefit payments going out earlier so there's a higher cost, a higher present value. We have the same assets we had whether they took the Drop or not, so there's a higher mortgage payment. That's how they arrived at that \$73,000.

Ms. Eichenwald asked if that's constant every year?

Mr. Sekol said for 20 years.

Ms. Eichenwald asked why doesn't it change?

Mr. Sekol said the present value today changes. Whenever a present value changes, you pay for it in one of two ways. You either pay for it at the current cost, an ongoing cost. When an active officer is earning an increase in salary and another year of service, his pension goes from 50.5% to 54%, that's an annual cost addition. That's a service cost. That's like if you think about this as running your household. You have a mortgage, lights, phone and heat. Things you need to do every day. Here where we know they're taking the Drop plan, we've locked that liability in. Under Act 205, locking that liability in sets it up like an equity loan on your house, it gets amortized over the future life expectancy, with interest.

Ms. Eichenwald said you figure out the total and just divide it. How certain is that amount?

Mr. Sekol said it's as certain as our assumptions are. We made certain assumptions when we went through the arbitration process. Those assumptions were very close to what information Larry gave him about those officers who requested reflected interest in the Drop plan. We were right on. If you don't take it, it's not a smart move; if you take it, it's a small move. It's almost counterintuitive not to take it. They assumed most of those people would take it. That's the interest level they're seeing.

Larry Hilliard said when you were doing the arbitration support to our legal team certain assumptions were made on the cast of characters at that time. When you got the actuals, when they declared their dates of retirement and we knew their final payments and payroll runs that additional data was nearly the same.

Ms. Eichenwald asked if it's based on those particular officers or actuarial cases?

Mr. Sekol said the individuals don't really matter. We had done some cash flow projections. Is it smarter to take 50.5% today, even at that level, so wait 4 years. We assumed virtually everybody would take it. We have a few less people taking it than anticipated.

Ms. Eichenwald said so it comes down to \$74,000 to retain experienced officers.

Mr. Hilliard said the one thing not built into the current MMO projections is the award that takes all new officers from the old pension schedules and puts them into the Third Class City Code. Only as we add new people to the plan, will he be ready to actuarially give us a benefit from that. That will have an impact of about \$4,000 per person per year.

Ms. Eichenwald asked if it had any impact on the financial soundness of pension funds?

Mr. Sekol said you're getting a higher liability and you have to satisfy that with the \$74,000. Maybe you were 60% funded before and now you're 59% funded. It does, but you're making a commitment to pay that money back so effectively with interest. It will be revenue neutral, as long as you're comfortable with the \$74,000 a year.

Ms. Eichenwald said from what your line item is budgeted, since we already approved the budget, what happens to that?

Mr. Hilliard said this doesn't take effect until 2010. What we're doing in the immediate time period is an odd year actuarial study, and once that's done it effects the following 2 years. Whatever we have in this year's budget is fixed; it will be in 2010 when it will reflect this, plus any benefit from – let's say we hire 15 people this year – it will be a different pension plan.

Ms. Eichenwald said knowing 2010 is going to be a difficult year, will we manage?

Mr. Hilliard said he thinks the \$74,000 is worth doing.

Mr. Guridy said 4 or 5 years ago when you did the actuarial report for the FOP, after everything was said and done, Lou Hershman and he had set up a committee where you came back and tried to help us. We found out that we really didn't know how these pensions were being calculated when we voted on it. Then everything came to public light, and we saw there was a lot more to the calculation of the pensions than anybody in the City knew. We were criticized for voting on it. You also told us some of the information you were given by the City was not accurate, therefore, it did not provide an accurate actuarial report, which got us into the mess we got ourselves into. People think we gave the City away to the FOP, but people like you know exactly what happened. How comfortable are you with the numbers and information that was given to you now to come to a conclusion of \$73,000, and is it a profitable agreement?

Mr. Sekol said he was trying to express the difference between the studies he had to do with this Administration and the legal counsel that represented the City. In 2005, we were really unaware of some of the arrangements that were being made and hadn't taken them into account at all. This time the legal counsel, particularly, and Larry and different people than those who negotiated that arrangement in 2005 were on sight all the time and kept him involved every step of the way.

Mr. Howells said historically the Police Department loses 8 to 10 people a year. We were assured they were going to watch the overtime. Neither of those statements ended up being true.

Mr. Donovan asked if Mr. Sekol is restricted by Pennsylvania law as to what method he uses?

Mr. Sekol said there are 2 methodologies that are required to be used in actuarial science. One is the funding method. There were 6 funding methods. The actual 5 requires you to use the entry age. That's a done thing; no change. The other methodology would be an asset valuation technique. You could use market value of assets or you could smooth assets over time. Gains and losses suffered. If assets return a lot of money, your costs go down significantly; if you lose money, your costs go up significantly. If you were using market value, your budget would be up and down constantly. Instead of that, there is a technique of smoothing the gains and losses in assets, so that assets would increase over time and your costs are more budgetable. They try to use one of those 2 methodologies. Over time, we've used market value in the 1107 valuation and 1107 studies for this arbitration. Actually, they updated it to 1108. This next valuation they'll sit down with the Administration and determine whether it's more logical to use that market value of those assets again. Probably not, because the market value is so low. We'll probably want to use more of a smoothing method to smooth out this rough patch the country is experiencing.

Mr. Donovan said for this, you are told you must use entry age.

Mr. Sekol said yes.

Mr. Hilliard said they're waiting to see what happens at the state given all the problems across the state – what they will do in the way of actuarial guidance to take the data he does the actuarial study on and how to calculate the MMO.

Mr. Donovan said the smoothing process has nothing to do with this? That's separate, but the technique of how you calculated the liability based on entry age. If you used a different technique there, you might have a different . . .

Mr. Sekol said you might have a different result.

Mr. Schweyer said playing off of what Ms. Eichenwald said earlier, ultimately we're retaining 22 of our most senior officers for \$73,000/\$76,000. For the 3rd consecutive year we've seen a decrease in violent crime and we've also implemented a new community policing strategy. It would be unwise for us to sacrifice all that experience, all the gains we've taken over that.

Mr. Phillips requested a full report because he'd like to do an analysis as well.

Mr. Sekol said what they have in front of them is the cost impact. He can give whatever background data he would like. It's all built up in the January 1107 valuation. We'll be having a valuation done relatively soon because we have to do one as of January 1, 2009.

Mr. Phillips said we do it annually now?

Mr. Sekol said yes. We'll be doing one as of January 1, 2009. That would probably be a much more complete thing you could compare to past results as opposed to the sheet before them.

Mr. Phillips said he would like to see something more comprehensive.

In response to Mr. Guridy's question, Mr. Hilliard said during the next 5 years, the 22 people who signed onto the DROP earn no more pension credits; their pension is fixed. It goes into a 401K type account which they can draw on in the future. Those who took the DROP, their pensions were fixed under the old program. They were getting that pension whether they took the DROP or not.

The Mayor said what would happen is you still have 20 that would go and we would still be paying their pension no matter what, and it would take us 16 months to replace these officers, and we'd have this massive gap like we had – as we listen to your comments – you've all said how do we continue to forego this exodus? We looked at the options that were available, and this was an option that was presented in binding arbitration. It was acceptable to us because it accomplished the task. We're not paying out any more than we would be paying anyway. It saves us the time lag where we'd have another 20 officers who eventually would be gone, which would take 1-1/2 to replace, which would take us through another summer with a severe manpower shortage. We have fixed the pension forever more. Part of this binding arbitration was that all new hires from here out goes back to Third Class City Code, which is a tremendous savings in the long run. It reverses the scenario we found ourselves in from the last Administration.

Mr. Guridy asked if there's an age limit?

The Mayor said he thinks it's 25 years of service.

Mr. Hilliard said the maximum pension drops from 75% to 62%. When the auditor general audited our pensions over the last 3 years, the audit comments, which influenced the third party mediator/arbitrator wanted us to return to compliance under the Third Class City Code.

The Mayor said (1) we were in violation of state law; (2) we had the opinion of the auditor general that was telling us to go back to the Third Class City Code which helped them influence the arbitrator to rule in our favor.

Mr. Guridy said when you say forever more, he's not sure that's correct.

The Mayor said forever more as long as no one screws it up.

Mr. Hilliard said it's now consistent with the auditor general and the Third Class City Code. Barring the state changing the Third Class City Code, which we don't control, an arbitrator in the future, 4 years from now, would not grant a violation of the Third Class City Code unless we consented to it, which happened in the past.

Mr. D'Amore said with collective bargaining, you can only settle something for the length of the contract. The Mayor did pretty good.

Mr. Howells said he wanted to reiterate something Peter said, and the Mayor indicated whether it was 16, 20, or 22 people, you just don't replace bodies and say we're going to hire 16 more people because you've lost the experience. If all those people who left are top brass, there's no way within this Police Department you could automatically make some new lieutenants, captains, assistants chiefs and police chief. That was a good consideration the Administration made

The Mayor said it's a 16 month process, and ours is a longer process. We have a longer field training period so they understand protocol policy.

Mr. Howells said the City's Police Department does far more in training than is required by the state. The more training you have, the lesser chance of having liability.

Mr. Bennington said those 22 experienced officers were retained for a maximum of 5 years and allows the younger officers to get 5 more years of experience than if they had been left in the cold and would not have had their 5 years experience.

Mr. Phillips said in 1986 there was a lawsuit forged by the FOP because there was a 2 tier pension system. How does that affect the pension system we have now? The state put both of those parties in one pension. Do you see a problem down the road.

The response was inaudible.

The Mayor said the FOP created the system. He doesn't understand how they can sue us when it's something their own leadership agreed to.

Mr. Phillips said new leadership comes in and they sue.

The Mayor said they agreed to binding arbitration. They can't go back, even with new leadership.

Mr. Hilliard said when he saw the auditor general's reports telling us to do it, he would suspect there's some substance to this.

Mr. Hershman said Mr. Sekol did a study, and they compared both studies. Did the FOP also do a study on the cost of the arbitration award?

Mr. Sekol said he hasn't seen it.

Mr. Hilliard said he hasn't seen it. In one meeting he was in the actuary the FOP used, Mr. Dudah, implied that he hadn't studied the DROP. He studied things that were related to their original request -- their actuary studies in their initial proposals.

Mr. Hershman asked what's the total value of those 22 officers' pensions if they would have retired on December 31st?

William Hoffman said approximately over \$49,000 every 2 weeks.

Mr. Hershman said 22 pensions only cost \$600,000 a year?

Mr. Hilliard said the annual amount is \$1,279,916.97. That's the 22 people as we have it now. That's not the value; it's the annual payment.

Mr. Hershman said as Julio mentioned before when we went to court, we didn't get any support from the Administration. Later on we got pressured by Mayor Pawlowski and The Morning Call to drop the lawsuit. He was never going to drop that lawsuit.

Mr. D'Amore reminded those in attendance, there will be no campaigning in Council Chambers.

Dennis Pearson, 942 East Tilghman Street, said you are simply making changes to an ordinance for compliance. There are some things in this that are eye raising, i.e., the cost of living adjustments. In private industry, once someone receives a pension, it doesn't rise by a cost of living. He's sure some of them will receive Social Security, where there will be a cost of living increase, normally that's not the case. Also, credit for CETA service. Having been president of the Allentown Community and Neighborhood Organization and also chairman of the C&O Parks Committee, he has knowledge of where this becomes an issue. People under CETA and hired under (inaudible) to merge when the Daddona Administration made it more appealing to the Police Departments and others to accept the CETA people because of giving them higher pay raises. Then the federal government said CETA is supposed to be paid the same. They can't work together if they don't earn the same rate. His committee was asked by Marushak to support certain CETA workers who could not work as City employees any more. When they laid off City, they laid off police, fire – in

everything they use CETA workers for. His committee said yes, they'll support CETA workers under the condition that the City not lay off additional personnel in Recreation. Past administrations were partly responsible for what is happening.

Mr. Donovan said Mr. Sekol made the point in his estimates for the DROP that considered almost everyone would take the DROP, which is the most conservative approach. The most conservative or any actuarial analysis is everyone leaves tomorrow, and you have to hire a total new crop of people. The problem that occurred in the last administration/arrangement, it sounds like you were not given appropriate information to conservatively make an estimate. Therefore, the estimate you made was too low.

Mr. Sekol said their initial study was that everyone would take it. When the Administration saw the cost impact of it, they asked why is it so high? We said we assumed everyone would take it because it was a good deal. They said no, you don't understand, only 20% of the people are going to take it.

Mr. Donovan said thank you for saying that. It would be an actuary's good fiduciary responsibility to take the most conservative approach. You did and were asked to change it.

Bill 129 was approved, as amended, 7 Yeas and 0 Nays.

10. ORDINANCES FOR INTRODUCTION:

Bill 2

Administration Sponsored: Amending Article 941, the Sewage and Industrial Wastes Ordinance to comply with EPA required changes as mandated by the National Pretreatment, Program(40 CFR 403). Pretreatment Streamlining Rule Required Changes

Bill 2 was referred to Public Works.

Bill 3

Administration Sponsored: Amending the 2009 Capital Fund Budget to provide for a supplemental appropriation of One Hundred and Eighty-Four Thousand Six Hundred and Sixty-Four Dollars and Three Cents (\$184,664.03), from the Parks and Recreation, Capital Fund, Arts Park Development, to Community and Economic Development Capital Fund, Art District Enhancements, for improvements, renovations and feasibility studies pertaining to the Arts District.

Bill 3 was referred to Parks and Recreation

Bill 4

Administration Sponsored: Amending the 2009 Capital Fund Budget to provide for a supplemental appropriation of One Hundred Fifty-Seven Thousand Four Hundred and Seventy Nine (\$157,479) Dollars providing for the receipt of a grant from the Lehigh County Green Futures Fund to fund the construction of the Arts Walk.

Bill 4 was referred to Parks and Recreation

11. CONSENT AGENDA:

CA1

Certificates of Appropriateness for 340½ North 9th Street, 924 Liberty Street, 937 Chew Street, 801 Chew Street, and 422 North 11th Street

CA1 was approved, 7 Yeas and 0 Nays.

12. RESOLUTIONS ON SECOND READING:

Mr. D'Amore and Mr. Schweyer moved to bring R76 up to the front of Resolutions on Second Reading.

The motion was approved by common consent.

R76

Adopts Allentown 2020 as the Official Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Guridy said we had a Power Point presentation and explanations on the Comprehensive Plan. He thanked them for all the work and time they put into it. R76 was forwarded favorably.

Mr. Schweyer said Mr. Hefele was very timely in providing a draft copy of the plan. There's concern from Council that we do our part to make sure we're monitoring the situation and make sure the plans are followed as we move forward. This plan will direct the City's development for the next 10 years.

Mr. Schweyer and Mr. Howells moved to amend R76 as follows: Be It Further Resolved that the Administration submit an annual report to City Council on the implementation of the plan.

The amendment to R76 was approved by common consent.

The City Clerk read minor amendments on pages 24, 53, 66, 86, and 88. There are minor revisions and changes to the maps.

Mr. D'Amore and Mr. Howells moved to adopt the above amendments.

The amendments to R76 were approved by common consent.

Richard Button, 2322 West Hamilton Street, said he wanted to make a public recognition of the work of the committee. The Planning Commission several years ago wisely decided to form an advisory committee to put together the Comprehensive Plan instead of having the Planning Commission itself update the plan. It was a citizen group. There were committee meetings over several years.

Mr. D'Amore said this is the product of a lot of hard working, intelligent people. In the future, he respectfully requests that a council representative be involved the next time we update the Comprehensive Plan.

R76 was approved, 7 Yeas and 0 Nays.

R1

Authorizes the Filing of a Proposal for \$50,000 in Funds with the Pa. Department of Community and Economic Development for the continuation of the Elm Street Program in Old Allentown

Mr. Gurdy said R1 was forwarded favorably, unanimously.

R1 was approved, 7 Yeas and 0 Nays.

R2

Authorizes the Filing of a Proposal for operating grants for the Seventh Street Program area in the amounts of \$40,000 and \$35,000 for years 4 and 5 respectively, and façade grants in the amount of \$30,000 per annum for years 4 and 5 with the Pa. Department of Community and Economic Development,

Mr. Gurdy said R2 was forwarded favorably.

R2 was approved, 7 Yeas and 0 Nays.

13. NEW RESOLUTIONS:

R5

Shade Tree Commission Appointment: Bernadette Cozart

Mr. D'Amore said R5 was forwarded favorably by the Appointments Committee.

R5 was approved, 6 Yeas and 1 Nay (Phillips).

R6

Authorizes the submission of a Main Street Planning Grant Application

R6 was approved, 7 Yeas and 0 Nays.

14. NEW BUSINESS

Juan Morales, 512 Tilghman Street, said he tries to do his part to keep a safe environment. One of the things that was brought to his attention was the fluoridation of Allentown water. Numerous studies have been put out that there is no real benefit. There are more cons than pros to fluoridating the water. It is actually recognized as a poison. You can't control the amount of fluoride the public is consuming. In the past, fluoridation was used as rat poisoning. There was research done that it can cause brain issues.

Mr. D'Amore said they'll take his comments into consideration.

Mr. Gurdy said that was Frank Concannon's legacy. It is something we can look into more deeply.

Mr. Donovan said he'd like to hear from Mr. Young.

Richard Young said fluoridation was a long, hard battle. Once the decision to add fluoride to our water, it became part of our daily permit at the plant. It's not as simple as just shutting off a valve.

Mr. Morales asked what would he have to do to get this done?

Mr. D'Amore said it's about organizing and presenting your case. Just like any political movement. You have to try to convince the Administration or 2 members of Council to sponsor a bill to repeal fluoridation.

Mr. Donovan said he wasn't aware until now of the seriousness of the debate that occurred in the City. It would be of interest to find out what cities have repealed it. We would need some technical information to understand the health benefits.

Mr. Howells said our Health Bureau will give you the whole rundown of everything.

Mr. Young said he doesn't know how many municipalities have removed it. The City of Bethlehem has had it long before us, and they still have it.

Mr. D'Amore said we'll contact Vicky Kistler so she can provide us with the pros and cons of fluoride, and Mr. Young send us a list of local water systems that use fluoride, and if there are any local water systems that doesn't.

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

16. **ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 PM.

Michael P. Hanlon
City Clerk