



# The City of York Pennsylvania

Office of City Council  
101 S. George St.  
York, PA 17401

Edquina Washington, President  
Betsy Buckingham, Vice President  
Elizabeth Bupp, Member  
Teresa Johnescu, Member  
Ryan Supler, Member  
Dianna L. Thompson, City Clerk  
P: (717) 849-2246  
F: (717) 812-0557  
dthomps@yorkcity.org

## COMMITTEE MINUTES May 27, 2026

6:00 p.m.

Council meetings are streamed LIVE for viewing only on the following social media platforms:

FACEBOOK: <https://www.facebook.com/CityofYorkPA/>

YOUTUBE: <https://www.youtube.com/c/WhiteRoseCommunityTV>.

2026 MEETINGS: Click [here](#) to view 2026 Council Meetings Dates

LIAISON ASSIGNMENTS: Click [here](#) to view full list of 2026-2027 Liaison Assignments

### LIAISON ASSIGNMENTS

Fire/Police	Public Works	Econ & Comm Development	Business Admin
Ryan Supler	Betsy Buckingham	Teresa Johnescu	Elizabeth Bupp

\*Bold text indicates Chairperson

Note: General Committee is chaired by Council President or designee and includes all Council members.

CALL TO ORDER: President Washington called the May 27, 2026, committee meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chambers, 101 S. George St., York, PA, with the following members present: Ryan Supler, Elizabeth Bupp, Teresa Johnescu, Betsy Buckingham, Vice President, and Edquina Washington, President.

Members of the Administration in attendance included: Mayor Sandie Walker; David Mackereth, Chief of Staff; Joe Jefcoat, Treasurer; Commissioner Michael Muldrow, Police; Monica Kruger, Director of Health; Tammy Harvey-Betha, Interim Director of Economic & Community Development; Capt. Matthew Irvin, Police; Capt. Dan Lentz, Police; Jim Gross, Interim Director of Public Works; Gere LeVelle, Chief Accountant; and Assistant Solicitor Brett Flower.

City Council Staff in attendance included: Dianna L. Thompson, City Clerk.

- I. Call committee meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.
- II. Committee Issues for the June 2, 2026, legislative Agendas as follows:

#### FIRE/POLICE (Supler)

1. **Resolution authorizing an agreement with Motorola Solutions.** (\$24,486.22/yr. for mobile video recorders and body-worn cameras.) ([View](#))  
Submitted by: Capt. Matthew Irvin, Police  
► Legislative Agenda: June 2, 2026

**Councilman Supler** initiated the discussion by identifying a possible correction needed on the agenda. He clarified that the \$24,486.22 is actually the projected annual savings, not the total cost. He stated that the actual contract cost is \$372,568.88, which breaks down to about \$74,513.78 per year for five years. The contract is for 24 in-car cameras and 48 body worn cameras.

**Solicitor Flower** said the figure in the resolution is correct as it is indicating the savings, not the total

contract price.

**Captain Irvin** explained that this agreement consolidates three separate, expiring contracts into one, covering 72 devices: 24 mobile car systems and 48 body-worn cameras. He emphasized the necessity of upgrading the 24 mobile car systems as the manufacturer no longer produces parts or brackets for the older models.

**President Washington** thanked Captain Irvin for answering her emailed questions about this contract.

**DECISION:** A motion was made by Supler, seconded by Buckingham, to place this item on the June 2 agenda. The motion passed by the following vote: Yeas - Supler, Bupp, Johnescu, Buckingham, Washington - 5; Nay - 0.

## GENERAL (Washington)

---

### 2. **Bill amending Article 307 (RETAP).** (To update language) ([View](#))

Submitted by: Joe Jefcoat, Treasurer

► [Legislative Agenda: June 2, 2026](#)

**Treasurer Jefcoat** provided a detailed rationale for the amendments to Article 307 (Residential Tax Abatement Program - RETAP) and Article 308 (Local Economic Revitalization Tax Assistance - LERTA), explaining that these updates were the culmination of ten years of development. He clarified that the revisions were not intended to change the core eligibility or general guidelines of the tax abatement programs, but rather to modernize the language and codify the practical operational steps that have evolved since the articles were last updated in 2017.

He explained that a major focus of these amendments is improving the flow of information between several different governing bodies and city departments. Jefcoat noted that the process requires constant coordination between: the Treasurer's Office, the Mayor's Office and the Chief of Staff, the Economic & Community Development Department, the County Assessment Office and the County Commissioners, and the School Board, which the city hopes will continue to participate in these projects. By formalizing these communication channels, the city aims to ensure that all taxing bodies are aligned and informed at every stage of an abatement project.

Jefcoat went on to explain that one of the most significant procedural changes addresses a recurring issue where the city would not find out about a project until months after a resident had already applied for permits. The new language requires applicants to formally notify the city as soon as they apply for their permits, ensuring the Treasurer's office is aware of the project from the start. Also, to simplify the process for residents and business owners, the application procedure now includes a comprehensive checklist. This document outlines every necessary step, making it easier for applicants to track their progress and communicate effectively with the various city and county departments involved.

Jefcoat then highlighted the distinct purposes of the two articles to ensure the language was correct:

- **Article 307 (RETAP):** This program is strictly for dwelling improvements, such as housing, condos, and apartments. He explained RETAP's importance as a housing support initiative, noting that in 2025 alone, the city invested \$268,000 through this program.
- **Article 308 (LERTA):** This article is designed for commercial improvements. He identified an error in the first whereas clause of the ordinance draft where Article 308 incorrectly referred to "dwelling" improvements, which should be corrected to "commercial" improvements to maintain the proper distinction between the two programs

**Councilwoman Johnescu** commended the Treasurer for providing a detailed memo that clearly spelled out every amendment and the reasoning behind them.

**Councilman Supler** pointed out that in the drafts for Articles 307 and 308, some of the numbers were mislabeled, which he detailed. **City Clerk Thompson** said she would correct the discrepancies.

**DECISION:** A motion was made by Washington, seconded by Buckingham, to place this item on the June 2 agenda. The motion passed by the following vote: Yeas - Supler, Bupp, Johnescu, Buckingham, Washington - 5; Nay - 0.

3. **Bill amending Article 308 (LERTA).** (To update language) ([View](#))

Submitted by: Joe Jefcoat, Treasurer

► [Legislative Agenda: June 2, 2026](#)

See discussion on item 2 above.

**DECISION:** A motion was made by Washington, seconded by Johnescu, to place this item on the June 2 agenda. The motion passed by the following vote: Yeas - Supler, Bupp, Johnescu, Buckingham, Washington - 5; Nay - 0.

## **ECONOMIC & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (Johnescu)**

---

4. **Bill amending the FY2026 Budget.** (For various Health Dept. related programs) ([View](#))

Submitted by: Amanda Ziegler, Health

► [Legislative Agenda: June 2, 2026](#)

**Councilwoman Johnescu** listed the programs impacted, including Healthy Moms and Babies, HIV Prevention, and Public Health Preparedness. She expressed being amazed by the depth of the Bureau's work, much of which is grant-funded.

**Health Director Kruger** explained that the bureau operates on a fiscal year (ending June 30), creating a mismatch with the city's calendar-year budget. Amendments are necessary once actual grant numbers are confirmed. She clarified that these funds sustain existing operations and do not include additional staff. Occasionally subsequent additional funding becomes available from the state, requiring further amendments.

**Vice President Buckingham** noted that in previous years, Council had to hold special summer meetings to approve these grants, and she applauded the department for better aligning the schedule this year.

**DECISION:** A motion was made by Johnescu, seconded by Washington, to place this item on the June 2 agenda. The motion passed by the following vote: Yeas - Supler, Bupp, Johnescu, Buckingham, Washington - 5; Nay - 0.

5. **Bill No. 5 - Amending the FY2026 Budget.** (To amend ARPA funding budgets) ([View](#))

Submitted by: Tammy Harvey-Bethea, Interim Director, Economic & Community Development

► [Legislative Agenda: June 2, 2026](#)

**Note:** This item was previously released from committee, introduced, and subsequently withdrawn from Council's [4/21/26](#) legislative agenda for additional amendments by the city's administration. As the Bill has already been released, no further release is required. It is being presented for discussion in advance of Council's consideration of final passage on 6/2/26.

**Councilwoman Johnescu** explained the bill, noting that it had previously been released from committee in March but was pulled for final amendments to ensure the city crossed out t's and dotted our i's regarding Treasury audits. She emphasized the urgency of expending these funds before the end of the fiscal year.

**Mayor Walker** stated that she wanted the consultants from Accenture to join the meeting publicly to ensure everyone was on the same page regarding compliance and eligibility as the program neared its

end. The Mayor explained that when she took office in January, she expected reconciliation to take a few weeks because the funds were already approved in the 2026 budget. However, the administration found they had to start from ground zero because proper processes, legal reviews, and communications between finance and consultants had not been followed under the previous administration. After four months of intensive meetings, they reached a consensus on eligible scopes of work that could be completed by the end of 2026.

Mayor Walker provided a specific list of the proposed reallocations, which included but was not limited to:

- **Penn Street Market (~\$1.5 Million):** Reallocated from Project 490 (Affordable Housing). These funds will cover masonry repair, window/door replacement, electrical and plumbing repairs, and fire safety systems. The Mayor noted the project had stalled, and COVID-related inflation had doubled or tripled original costs.
- **Park Master Plans (~\$480,000+):** Funds moved from housing to design and recreational infrastructure for Arles Park and Bantz Park.
- **Police Salaries and Staffing:** Multiple reallocations were directed toward police salaries to cover budget overspends, including \$20,000 from housing, \$100,000 from another housing line item, and \$191,000 from the first-time homebuyer program.
- **Sylvia Newcomb Center (~\$955,000):** Allocated for "bare minimum" renovations to address long-standing infrastructure issues.
- **City Hall and Infrastructure (\$250,000):** \$250,000 was moved to City Hall improvements and \$25,000 was allocated for generator cost overruns.
- **Unfeasible Programs:** The Mayor explained that the First-Time Homebuyer Program and several Affordable Housing acquisitions were reallocated because organizations like "Tenfold" lacked the staffing to manage them within the remaining timeline, and the Redevelopment Authority (RDA) confirmed they could not be completed this year.

A full breakdown can be viewed [here](#).

**Lisa Rainey & Jennifer Maldonado (Accenture)** joined the meeting via Zoom. Ms. Rainey defined their role as providing objective guidance on ARPA compliance, eligibility, and reporting. She clarified that Accenture does not advocate for specific funding decisions; instead, they review city-provided project descriptions to issue an eligibility statement. She confirmed the city met the December 31, 2024, obligation deadline through internal agency MOUs, a method specifically permitted by Treasury FAQ 17.6. Rainey warned that any funds not spent by the end of 2026 must be returned to the Treasury.

**Councilwoman Bupp** expressed concerns regarding transparency and data access. She requested an expanded worksheet to track original obligations against reallocations and current expenses. She also noted that since the public dashboard was discontinued, Council has lacked a regular way to monitor project status. Discussion occurred regarding access to bi-weekly meeting minutes, with Bupp stating she was told Council did not own them and could only see them at the administration's allowance.

**Councilwoman Bupp** asked about the ARPA bi-weekly meetings and stated she was unaware she could attend or that meeting notes were available. **Vice President Betsy Buckingham** clarified that Council members attend by invitation and do not make decisions. **Bupp** noted that while two members of Council are invited to bi-weekly meetings with the administration and ARPA consultants (Accenture), she was under the impression that Council members were not permitted to share the notes or minutes from those meetings with the rest of the body. She stated she had learned that Council did not "own" the minutes and that they were shared only at the allowance of the administration.

**Mayor Walker** clarified that there was no bottleneck and that Council members could alternate attendance at these meetings, provided no more than two members were present at once to avoid a quorum issue. **Bupp** expressed appreciation for this clarification and reiterated her goal of ensuring the entire Council remained informed.

**President Washington** added that she had received no requests from Bupp to participate in the bi-weekly ARPA meetings.

**Councilwoman Bupp** questioned why a \$500,000 allocation for veterans' housing seemed to disappear between reports. **Mayor Walker** explained that the numbers Council approved in the March budget were inaccurate due to discrepancies in the city's software (OpenGov) and past accounting errors. She reiterated that the administration had to bring all parties to the table to hash it out and ensure the final numbers were 100% compliant. She told Council they cannot go off the numbers that they approved in the budget because those numbers were fundamentally flawed.

**Councilwoman Bupp** emphasized that the city and the administration share the same goal: spending the remaining funds to avoid returning them to the U.S. Treasury. However, she highlighted the significant fiduciary risk, noting that if the city spends the money outside of the rules, it will be required to pay those funds back.

**Councilwoman Bupp** specifically addressed public concerns regarding the reallocation of funds from one category (such as affordable housing) to another (such as police salaries). She mentioned that the public had posed specific questions to Council members regarding Treasury requirements (FAQs 17.15 and 17.17) which govern how funds can be moved between program categories. She sought an expert answer on whether moving funds originally slated for affordable housing to police use was permissible. **Councilwoman Johnescu** said she believes Bupp is discussing a whistleblower post that alleged inconsistencies in the movement of affordable housing funds. She specifically asked if moving funds from housing to police or parks violated scope continuity rules.

**Lisa Rainey (Accenture)** explained that scope continuity would only apply if a valid contract had been executed with a developer for the housing project. Because Project 490 never resulted in a final agreement with a contractor, the money was not legally tied to that scope. Therefore, the city was free to return those funds from DCED (the original awardee) and reallocate them to other already approved and eligible projects, such as police staffing, to ensure the money was spent by the deadline.

**Mayor Walker** clarified that the reallocated funds were to cover overspends in existing salaries and did not involve hiring new officers.

**Councilman Supler** asked if there was any way the city could direct additional funding toward housing. **Mayor Walker** responded that the administration had tried every possible avenue. She explained that the Redevelopment Authority (RDA) had explicitly informed the administration that starting or completing new affordable housing construction within the 2026 calendar year (the federal deadline for expending ARPA funds) was not feasible. Walker stated we desperately need affordable housing now more than ever, but clarified that after exploring options up, down, and around, they simply could not find a way to make new projects work within the legal timeframe.

**Councilman Supler** observed that the proposed budget included a return of funds for the first-time homebuyer program, noting that it appeared the program is not going to happen. **Mayor Walker** confirmed this was correct, explaining that the primary partner organization, Tenfold, did not have sufficient staffing to manage the program. She further detailed that the city had reached out to other entities, such as the Planning Commission and affordable housing advocates, but no one could take it on due to staffing shortages and the current economic climate.

**Councilman Supler** then asked about alternative construction projects, and if there were any other housing developments the city could look into. **Mayor Walker** asked, "What projects?" Supler replied, "Any projects." The Mayor's stated that the administration's position is that no viable, shovel-ready housing projects existed that could meet the end-of-year expenditure deadline.

**Councilman Supler** then asked if the current allocation could be expanded. **Mayor Walker** stated that once Council approved Bill No. 5, the administration would monitor how quickly funds were utilized

over the summer. She noted that if the city successfully moved through the initial allocations they would consider returning to Council to ask for further reallocations to assist more seniors.

**Councilman Supler** pointed to a bullet point in the Council Summary stating that the reallocations supported emergency housing and homeless shelter support and asked for the specific location of those funds in the budget document. **Mayor Walker** clarified that the phrase was just the label used to define the eligible scope for those funds. **Supler** asked if more money could be put toward emergency housing specifically, and **Walker** explained that those funds had already been reallocated to organizations like LifePath and Friends and Neighbors. She emphasized that the city's current focus is ensuring these organizations spend the money they have already been awarded. The Mayor warned that if these groups are not on track to spend their allocations by the end of the summer, the city will be forced to recapture those funds and reallocate them elsewhere to ensure they are not lost to the federal Treasury.

**Councilwoman Bupp** asked if the Sylvia Newcomb and Penn Market projects could be finished by year-end. **Interim Public Works Director Jim Gross** stated that while there is a schedule to complete the Sylvia Newcomb center by the end of the year, the timing is of great concern. He warned Council that the summer recess (between June 2 and July 21) could create a problem for project approvals that need to move quickly.

**Councilwoman Johnescu** noted a significant inconsistency between the financial reports provided to Council in March 2026 and the new summary presented at tonight's meeting. In the initial March report, the project was listed with a \$500,000 deduction, bringing the total down to \$2.5 million. Johnescu sought a clear explanation for where that half-million dollars had gone and why the figures had changed so drastically in just two months.

**Mayor Walker** again explained that the information Council received in March was fundamentally inaccurate because the administration was still untangling a lot of discrepancies inherited from the previous administration. She stated that when she took office, she discovered that proper processes, legal reviews, and communication between the Finance Department and ARPA consultants (Accenture) had not been followed. She explained that the administration had been relying on numbers from Open Gov software, which had not been updated to reflect actual expenditures or prior transfers. For example, a specific \$250,000 payment for the Prodigy Spectrum acquisition had been approved the previous year, but because it wasn't recorded correctly in the budget software, it appeared as available funds in the March report.

**Mayor Walker** explained that to fix these errors, the initiative special meetings to hash it out and ensure the city was in 100% compliance with federal Treasury guidelines. This required bringing four key groups together (Accenture Finance, DCED, and the Solicitor's office). She emphasized that this ground zero approach was the only way to ensure the city would not be forced to pay back funds following a federal audit. She stated that the administration, Finance, and Accenture finally agreed on the numbers, scope, and eligibility of the remaining funds.

**Councilwoman Bupp** questioned the inclusion of a \$250,000 reduction for the Princess St. Center in the proposed budget amendment. She argued that this specific project funding had already been addressed and reduced to zero on October 21, 2025, under [Ordinance 25 of 2025](#). **Mayor Walker** responded that while Council may have authorized the reduction in 2025, but it didn't happen administratively. When Bupp followed up by stating she did not believe the item was even in the 2026 budget to begin with, the Mayor insisted that it was indeed present in the current budget. **Mayor Walker** said the Princess St. Center doesn't even have the necessary paperwork to even move forward, making it impossible to complete within the 2026 deadline.

**Vice President Buckingham** sought clarification regarding the funding for the Penn Street Market, specifically asking if the proposed American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) reallocation was in addition to

funding that had already been allocated to the market several years prior. **Mayor Walker** confirmed that this was indeed a new allocation of \$1.5 million on top of the original funding

**Jasmine Rivera (Resident)** expressed concern that despite the significant budget reallocations discussed, there was no mention of support for the homeless population. She questioned how the city intended to help the unhoused, noting that while encampments are being removed, the city has sat on money for three years and residents should not suffer due to a failure to follow through on project goals. Ms. Rivera stated that grant money should be used for its intended purpose at the time it is awarded and criticized the practice of redirecting funds simply because time is running out, urging the city to implement a system that actually works to address the ongoing housing crisis.

**Brian Goodin (Resident)** spoke about the impact of the housing crisis on York residents, specifically emphasizing the financial burden of the renter application process. He noted that application fees typically range from \$40 to \$65 per property, which can quickly add up to hundreds of dollars for residents already under financial pressure, often without transparency or a guarantee that a unit is available. Mr. Goodin urged the city to move beyond addressing property conditions alone and take proactive **measures to stamp out slumlords and ensure true access to fair housing**

**Manuel Gomez (Resident)** argued that the city bears all legal risk for ARPA expenditures and questioned the dramatic shift in funding from housing-focused initiatives to policing. He requested clarification on when the city met its obligation threshold for the previously defunded housing projects and asked for a formal risk assessment of what he termed "risky expenditure category swaps". Gomez called for greater public assurance regarding eligibility and a clear narrative on how the city arrived at its current situation with nearly \$1 million being diverted away from affordable housing and veteran support

**Mayor Walker** provided a specific breakdown to clarify exactly how much was being diverted from affordable housing to police services. She stated that out of the Affordable Housing (Project 490) budget, only \$400,000 from those housing funds is being directed specifically to Senior Emergency Housing. She noted that other reallocations were coming from three or four other line items that originally fell under work related to the police department.

**Manuel Gomez (Resident)** spoke again to challenge the narrative of the reallocations, arguing that the shifts were much more substantial than described. He stated that \$1 million has been dramatically shifted away from their original stated scopes of affordable housing, veterans support, and emergency housing. He argued that even if the funds remain technically eligible for other uses, they are no longer addressing the critical needs for which they were initially intended.

**Mayor Walker** responded by emphasizing the lack of viable alternatives, asking, "What else are we supposed to do?". She explained that while she would prefer the money to go to affordable housing, the administration had exhausted all options, and the Redevelopment Authority (RDA) confirmed new housing projects were not feasible within the 2026 timeframe. She maintained that the city must use the funding for eligible purposes, noting that the police department provided gun violence statistics to justify the eligibility of the police salary allocation. She stated that the city faces a binary choice: either utilize these ARPA funds for police salaries or be forced to pull that money from the General Fund.

**Councilman Supler** questioned the long-term risk of these moves, asking if all the proposed recaptures and reallocations comply with federal guidelines and if they will be audit defensible. He specifically inquired whether the narratives provided for the new allocations would stand up to scrutiny during a Treasury audit.

**Lisa Rainey (Accenture)** confirmed that the proposed moves are ARPA compliant. She clarified that the city met the December 31, 2024, obligation deadline through an internal agency MOU, a method specifically permitted by Treasury FAQ 17.6. Rainey explained that once those funds were obligated but no enforceable development agreement was executed with a contractor, the funds had to be

returned to the city from the DCED (the original awardee). **Supler** asked if the new reallocations were acceptable uses. **Rainey** confirmed they were, as they are being moved to projects that were already approved and eligible prior to the obligation deadline. When asked if funds left over in September could be reallocated again, she said yes, provided the city meets the December 31, 2026, expenditure deadline.

When **Councilman Supler** asked for a suggested deadline for making last-minute reallocations, **Mayor Walker** responded, "That's where we come in," and explained that a firm date cannot be given because every project has a different scope of work. **Rainey** added that Accenture cannot provide a recommended deadline or suggest specific projects because they are not in a decision-making position; their role is limited to compliance guidance while the city manages day-to-day operations. **Mayor Walker** added that as a Council member you should know that as Council is updated through bi-weekly meetings and is responsible for staying informed on the progress of these various scopes of work.

**Councilwoman Bupp** recalled that during the previous year's updates on Project 490, there was talk of a "Plan B" (such as giving funds to the RDA to spend). She expressed concern that the city is currently moving forward while praying everything can be spent as planned and asked if the administration had a similar "Plan B" in their back pocket should projects stall. She then requested monthly status updates on expenditures. **Mayor Walker** replied that these updates are provided during the bi-weekly ARPA meetings which Council members are invited to attend. **Bupp** noted that hopefully, by the end of the summer, the city will have a clearer picture of where the spending stands.

**Commissioner Muldrow** supported the administration's plan, characterizing the use of ARPA funds for police salaries as a strategic move to save the city's General Fund balance. He explained that by covering these existing obligations with ARPA dollars, the city frees up general fund money that can then be reinvested into other projects or tasks that are not eligible for ARPA funding. He noted that this approach allows the city to meet its current financial needs while preserving capital for future vision-oriented projects.

**Vice President Buckingham** stated that throughout the pandemic, millions of dollars in federal rental assistance were distributed to support residents. She noted that while this money was not necessarily funneled directly through the city government, it consisted of federal dollars that were directed to the Community Progress Council (CPC) and other groups over several years. Buckingham emphasized that substantial funding has been allocated toward housing via the city, the county, and various community organizations, though she acknowledged that housing costs rose unrealistically during the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Mayor Walker** informed the public that the [ARPA recommendation plan](#) is accessible on the City Council website. She extended credit to City Clerk Thompson for maintaining the document and ensuring it remains up to date. The Mayor highlighted that the plan features interactive links, allowing individuals to click through to view the specific details of each amendment and fund transfer that was approved by Council.

**Michael Walker (Resident)** credited President Washington during the last year budget meeting. He stated that she said Council was forced to approve numbers that were questionable. He said City Council needs to take accountability for its fiduciary responsibility, noting that the issues with inaccurate budget numbers have existed for several years. He pointed out that multiple Council members have held their seats during the years these funds were available and should have scrutinized the information more closely in past sessions. Mr. Walker stated that the current sense of urgency does not excuse the lack of oversight over the past four years and emphasized that Council must take responsibility for the scrutiny that should have occurred earlier.

**Councilman Supler** addressed the consultants from Accenture to ask for perspective on the city's current situation regarding the recapture and reallocation of funds. He specifically inquired whether other communities of similar size, who received similar amounts of ARPA funding, are experiencing these same challenges or if the City of York is a kind of like the outlier.

**Lisa Rainey (Accenture)** responded by clarifying that she could only speak on behalf of the specific ARPA clients that she and her colleague, Jennifer Maldonado, personally manage, noting that other Accenture employees oversee different clients. However, for the communities they do work with, she confirmed that they are experiencing similar struggles. She explained that these communities often find themselves with projects that just don't work, necessitating a last-minute effort to find eligible ways to spend the money. She said that in this regard, York is not an outlier.

**Councilwoman Johnescu** said since Bill No. 5 was previously voted out of committee and introduced, consideration of final passage will occur at Council's June 2<sup>nd</sup> legislative meeting.

President Washington thanked the administration and Accenture for their presentation.

---

### III. Council Comment

**Councilwoman Bupp** requested more frequent and comprehensive financial reporting regarding the city's ARPA funding status. She noted that while the city received a total of \$35 million, \$10 million remained available for the current year, with a \$5 million balance being spent down. She stated a desire for the administration to provide a status report at least once a month at a Council meeting so that the information can be shared transparently with the public.

**Councilman Supler** thanking the Mayor for engaging the consultants from Accenture in this public meeting. He highlighted several community events he attended, including a leadership conversation at the York County History Center regarding youth engagement and a service provider program at the fairgrounds that showcased recovery, drug treatment, and LGBT programming. He also noted his participation in a wreath-laying ceremony at the Veterans Memorial Gold Star Healing Garden. Supler urged residents to [apply](#) for current vacancies on the Human Relations Commission (HRC) and mentioned public interest in the municipal equity index. Additionally, he promoted the third annual "Nays Kids Community Giveback" event scheduled for May 30 at Penn Park. Finally, he acknowledged the recent death of an individual at a local encampment and reminded the public that emergency services, including meals, hygiene kits, and treatment support, remain available for the unhoused.

### IV. Administration Comment: None

**V. Next Committee Meeting** September 23, 2026 at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chambers. Agenda items due by 12 noon and 9/16/26.

**VI. Adjournment:** There being no further business, the May 27, 2026 committee meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dianna L. Thompson, City Clerk

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Edquina Washington, President of Council