SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING PUBLIC HEARING

IN RE: FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 49 OF 2012, AMENDING THE REVISED RECOVERY PLAN FOR THE CITY OF SCRANTON PURSUANT TO THE FINANCIALLY DISTRESSED MUNICIPALITIES ACT AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO ISSUE AN ORDER DIRECTING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REVISED RECOVERY PLAN DATED AUGUST 1, 2012, ATTACHED HERETO AS EXHIBIT A IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 245 OF THE FINANCIALLY DISTRESSED MUNICIPALITIES ACT.

HELD:

Thursday, August 16, 2011

LOCATION:

Council Chambers

Scranton City Hall

340 North Washington Avenue

Scranton, Pennsylvania

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL: JANET EVANS, PRESIDENT PAT ROGAN, VICE-PRESIDENT ROBERT MCGOFF (Not present) FRANK JOYCE JOHN LOSCOMBE NANCY KRAKE, CITY CLERK JAMIE MARCIANO, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK BOYD HUGHES, SOLICITOR

MS. EVANS: I call this public 1 2 hearing to order. Roll call, please. 3 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff. 4 Rogan. MR. ROGAN: 5 Here. MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe. 6 7 MR. LOSCOMBE: Here. 8 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. 9 MR. JOYCE: Here. MS. MARCIANO: 10 Mrs. Evans. 11 MS. EVANS: Here. Notice is herby 12 given that Scranton City Council will hold a 13 public hearing on Thursday, August 16, at 14 5:30 p.m. in council chambers, second floor, municipal building, 340 North Washington 15 16 Avenue, Scranton, Pennsylvania. 17 The purpose of said public hearing 18 is to hear testimony and discuss the 19 following: 20 File of Council No. 49 of 2012, 21 amending the revised recovery plan for the 22 City of Scranton pursuant to the Financially 23 Distressed Municipalities Act and 24 authorizing the mayor of the City of

Scranton to issue an order directing the

25

implementation of the revised recovery plan dated August 1, 2012, attached hereto as Exhibit A in accordance with the provisions of Section 245 of the Financially Distressed Municipalities Act.

In response to citizens' requests for additional participants and in light of the collaboration among the Pennsylvania Economy League, Mayor Doherty and the Scranton City Council, we asked Mayor Doherty, Scranton Business Administrator Ryan McGowan, and Mr. Domines, policy specialist for the State Department of Economic and Community Development to attend tonight's hearing.

Before I call upon the first speaker, Mr. McGowan will present the most recent adjustments to the proposed plan which were completed on August 15, 2012, and Council Finance Chair, Frank Joyce, will elaborate on them during our regularly scheduled council meeting.

I ask that all council members would reserve their comments until the Fifth Order motions portion of tonight's meeting in

order that as many citizens as possible may be heard prior 6:30 at which time our regularly scheduled city council meeting will commence.

Any Scranton resident who is unable to address us during the public hearing due to time constraints may speak during the citizens' participation portion of the council meeting. At the conclusion of tonight's hearing Mayor Doherty will provide brief remarks.

Please silence all sell phones, refrain from private conversations, and step away from the podium when the bell rings so that all speakers receive an equal opportunity to be heard. Phone calls and conversations should be conducted outside council chambers.

Mr. McGowan, please begin.

MR. MCGOWAN: Thank you. Can you hear me all right?

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. MCGOWAN: I would first just like to say thanks for the last few weeks of collaboration. I think we have come up with

a very good solid plan moving forward and I
especially want to thank Mr. Joyce and
Mrs. Evans for some of the numbers that you

have provided with this and so forth.

I think everyone has the mandate sheet in front of them. If they don't, I do have some copies here. If we can just start with 2012 and talk about the estimated revenues and expenditures. At this time, with the debt refinancing unrealized of about 2.9 million we were looking at a deficit of around \$7.7 million, along with the carry over last year of close to \$9.4 million worth of deficit, our total deficit for the prior two years is about \$17.12 million.

So going forward here with budget initiatives with this, with the mandates for the recovery plan, obviously we have already approved the \$9.85 million of unfunded debt that was approved in January by Scranton City Council and we are currently hoping the next few weeks to work with some type of financial institutions to receive those funds.

We are additionally looking at another \$80.9 million worth of unfunded debt for this year, \$6 million would be attributed to the cost overruns with the budget at this point, \$2.9 is due to the unrealized savings from the debt service refinancing. The \$1 million loan from DCED along with the DCED grant of \$750,000.

Obviously we have discussed that the initial amount was suggested at \$250,000 and we are going to speak with DCED and PEL proximate reworking the numbers of asking additionally -- not for any additional funds, but for some greater flexibility in the \$2.25 million in the state has so generously offered us.

With that, we have a couple of other cash outflows that we'll need to go through this year to end the year. The first is the worker comp, obviously, we used that back in April to fund the payroll so we need to put \$1.5 million back in there to be at the suggested level that the state has required us to be at through Labor and Industry.

And then the additional costs of

bringing the firefighters back in April of this year through June would be around \$200,000 from June forward. We have the SAFER grant to cover the cost of that. With those budget aspects done, we come to the end of the year of a surplus of around \$1.6 million.

For 2013 the suggested deficit would be at about \$2 million. We are hoping to see some work done at Geisinger and some other places that would increase our operating revenues through the permit fees of close to \$1 million.

Additionally, the city will be putting out an RFP for third party fees associated with the construction in the next few months that should have the city somewhere around close to 300 to 450 thousand dollars a year.

With that operating revenues up, obviously, as I stated, the deficit looks close to \$2 million. When you take in the surplus from the prior year we are sitting at close to around \$400,000 deficit for 2013.

4

5

3

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Looking forward into '13, we have spoken with DCED and worked out a number of the commuter tax of \$2.5 million. The city administration and council will work together in going to Court once this is approved to get the commuter tax moved forward.

Additionally, we are looking to raise the real estate transfer tax to 2.9 percent, that would see an increase of about \$185,000 a year. Health care savings with the approval of the fire and police contracts and they will now be making a contribution to health care along with the city putting out the pharmacy RFP, which this week has been in the paper, we are proposing a savings of around \$815,000 for next year. The amusement tax for \$200,000. PILOTS for 1.3. The increase of some other small licensing and permits fee will net us around \$185,000. The increase BP merc back to the level it was in 2010. The municipal based revenue opportunities for \$353,000. We are looking at department expense reductions of \$500,000, along with the sale

and leaseback borrowing of \$5 million, and then the parking enhancement program that we are awaiting on proposals back at this point for around \$700,000.

Less in the cash outflows, you have the repayment of the unfunded debt borrowing "A" for \$1.8 million. The repayment of the unfunded borrowing "B" for close to \$1 million. The repayment of the DCED loan, the \$1 million loan, we are hoping that be put over ten years and we can pay about \$100,000 a year for ten years. The additional borrowing for the Supreme Court award for the fire and police along with the sale of the leaseback debt service will cost the city close to \$1.5 million, and then the additional costs of the pension obligation, the MMO, at \$5.1 million.

With that, going forward we would have a surplus of about \$2.3 million. An additional real estate tax increase of around 12 percent in 2013 would take place that would net us around \$1.6 million to have a surplus of \$3.9 million.

When we jump to 2014, obviously, we

. .

see the expenditures due to increase to a high level due to the debt service along with other incremental costs, and the deficit is roughly at \$10.9 million with a surplus from the prior year of \$3.9 we are looking at a \$7 million deficit. In '14, with the commuter tax we would hope, as we are approved since it would be a year in existence, would net us \$4 million.

The only other changes similar there are an additional savings of \$850,000 in health care as opposed to 815 in '13. The additional fee and PILOTS of another \$650,000, that would net us \$1.9 million, and then additional revenue with the municipal based revenue opportunities along with the additional department expense reductions. At that point, the parking meter enhancement program would give us a net of \$1 million.

The cash outflows are pretty much the same other than the fact that the \$700,000 would be the end of the SAFER grant in the middle of the 2015, so for half the year we would have to cover the costs of

those 29 additional firefighters. It is the hope of the administration and council to work together. We are aware of individuals at that point who may be able to retire so we will work with the department on seeing if that is a possibility for an additional cost savings as well.

The net deficit at the end of '14 is about \$8.1e million. An additional increase of 44.32 percent of real estate taxes would net us \$6.9 million and leave us a net surplus of \$447,000 in 2014. When you carry that surplus over to 2015, the total deficit would be \$10.9 million.

Additionally, we will hope to continue to have a commuter tax, additional savings within health care, which is what we talked about prior. Increase in PILOT fees to \$2.4 million. Also, increase in departmental expenditure reductions, along with parking meter enhancement program of one to 1.3 million dollars.

Debt service would stay the same for everything, the only other thing that would really change is a full year of additional

firefighters at \$1.5 million. That takes us to a net deficit of \$11.2 million, an additional tax increase of 12 percent in 2015 for another \$2.7 million would leave us a net surplus of \$68,000.

So in total over the three years span if the sales tax is not achieved we are looking at a tax increase of 68.56 percent.

If the sales tax is achieved we would be looking at 35.89 percent. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: And thank you. Our first speaker tonight is Andy Sbaraglia.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia, citizen of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians, I read the outlook report as well as this recovery plan and we all know the figures don't jive and will not jive. When you talk about health care, way back when they retired -- I don't know, somewhere around maybe '91, '92, somewhere back in there, they had a buyout and we bought out so many police and firemen that were allowed to retire with full-time health care for the rest of our lives.

Okay, that in turn is one synopsis

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of the here health care costs. The other synopsis, of course, is the active employees Now, how do they expect to get all of the savings other than the fact is when a person reaches 65 goes on Medicare. true, they go on Medicare, but we are still responsible for 20 percent of that. the medical costs will still be there, unless they get on some kind of a payout, which I doubt. Why would they want to take something that's less than they got, so we are going to be stuck and we are not going to save a real lot of money on health care because them costs are going to be continued and there is no way out of it. That's just one part of it.

Now, we got added debt coming in from different authorities. Now, true, the authorities to me it's not worth \$2 million to us, the taxpayers of Scranton, nor is the Connell building. They get more obligated because of those two garages they come up with \$2 million. Is that right? No, it's not right.

And the whole fiasco in the very

beginning on that deal I talked about many, many times on it. The original Hilton people were supposed to build their own garage, we weren't supposed to give them free parking for life at the costs of the citizens of Scranton. Now why are we paying for them to have free parking at the Hilton? That's adding to the costs. That's where we are going to come with this \$2 million you are struck with.

And you can keep going to these different projects. They keep talking about this project or that project. None of them projects have really bought a lot of money to relieve the taxpayers of Scranton. All they did was sink us deeper and deeper in holes. I looked at the figures, they are right. If everything goes like they should we will be like \$30 million dollars in debt in the next couple of years. So, obviously, we got to have a tax increase. The problem is how much of a tax increase and how many of these things are going to come to fulfillment.

He is already talking about taxes

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going up from your estimate of 33 to 58, maybe 57, maybe even 100 percent if they don't go through. This is true. We may end up with 100 percent tax hike if all of these things don't come true and they are down there talking about a commuter tax. yeah, let's get them commuters. They are already paying something. Their companies are paying for them, too, with the products that they produce. That's taxed. So they are actually a benefit to the city and here we are trying to tag them with the things that we have done wrong and that's not right.

As far as the sales tax, I take it here's another thing if you go through with that, that's not the way to go. If you want to really do something get down there and try to get that school bill tax passed where the state would take over all of the funding of the schools within the state, that would free up a lot of money that can be used to fill the holes in our budgets. That's the way to go instead of making everybody in this community, in this county mad at us.

I'm hearing a lot of static saying,
"Why should we bail you out? What have you done for us?"

And the truth is, they did very little for us. All of the malls aren't, of course, in the city. Anybody that wants to come in this city, don't want to come in the city. How many people left the city? You talked about Verrastro, they have left, they got out, and the reason they got out because whatever they did down there in Old Forge it's they can pay for it and move ahead and pay certain taxes. Well, my company moved out of Scranton, that's what he told me. Well. No since going into those.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Matt

MR. MCDONALD: Good evening,

Council. My name is Matt McDonald, I'm the vice president of the International

Association of Firefighters, Local 60.

Coming here tonight just to let the public and that the entire council know that our union is opposed to some of the nonfinancial aspects of this plan.

As Mr. McGoff, who isn't here, can tell you for years we have been meeting with PEL, and more recently at the meeting we have brought up issues that we have with this recovery plan. A lot of the issues that we have, you know, issues with involve firefighter safety, the public safety, stuff that is being eliminated from, you know, how we operate right now. We are also concerned with some of the management rights that took away some of our basic labor rights that we enjoy and have for years.

So last Monday, I believe, I wasn't able to attend the PEL meeting, other members of this union brought up some of the concerns to PEL, the state, and Mr. McGowan. I believe they ran out of time and we will be bringing the rest of our issues up at the meeting next week, I believe on Monday, but I guess I just wanted to come and say that a lot of these issues that have nothing to do with the finances of the city moving forward, the city financially has stripped, like I said, a lot of our safety rights right now and our basic labor rights, and

like I just want to publically state that we are opposed to those issues in the plan.

Thank you very much.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Fay Franus.

MS. FRANUS: Fay Franus, Scranton.

I'd like to thank Mayor Doherty for coming today, I really appreciate it. It was very, very nice and I'm grateful.

MAYOR DOHERTY: Thank you.

MS. FRANUS: It shows he really cares about the people in the city. Thank you, Mr. Doherty. I'm sorry to see the PEL isn't here or DCED, I think this is what it's all about. I want to thank council and the mayor for working together and getting this recovery plan as low as possible for the taxpayers, I know you have worked very Hard, Mr. Joyce, Mrs. Evans and Mr. Doherty and Ryan McGowan, thank you for that. You should have been looking out for, you know, to bring this tax increase down as much as you can because we can't afford it.

Now, when I see PEL's plan, when they rejected almost everything you said because it wasn't reasonable, they were like

blackmail. It's, like, you either do what we want or we are not going to give you the \$2 million and the \$250,000. To me, that's like extortion. It's like they could take that and shove it. If they had it their way they would just take every debt in this city and put it on the backs of the taxpayers. They have been here how long, 20 years to get us out of distress and they haven't done one thing. They have gotten us deeper in debt and I would wish they were here to hear this because this is what they have done. They should be gone. They have never helped us.

And DCED, all they have done is -and PEL, this firemen and policemen union
contract they took it right to the Supreme
Court. They never wanted the mayor to
negotiate, they just want to keep going,
keep going, keep going, we'll win. Well,
they didn't and where are we now, \$30
million in the hole.

So as far as this recovery plan, I hope you stick to your guns and don't fall for this bribery, you do what they want or

else because lock at their track record?

What have they ever done? I wish they were here so I could have asked them what have they have done to the city except bury us in debt. I mean, where are they when we need answers?

That's about all I have to say and I want to thank you again for all of the hard work you have done. Thank you, Mayor Doherty.

MS. EVANS: Mary Ann Wardell.

MS. WARDELL: Good evening, Council.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MS. WARDELL: Mayor Doherty.

MAYOR DOHERTY: Mary Ann.

MS. WARDELL: Before I start, this gentleman, and I don't know who he is, he is a photographer, he has a camera that's extremely loud and when someone is up here speaking and he is clicking that we can't hear what anybody is saying. Maybe he could wait while we are speaking and take one after.

MS. EVANS: Yes, council would appreciate that.

MS. WARDELL: For the past ten years this city has borrowed and sold assets to meet their financial obligations. Now we are in a position where we can't borrow anymore, banks don't want to give us money. We can't meet our payroll. We are taking from, well, workers' comp, workmen's comp we borrowed from early in the spring. Our vendors are suing us. I would say that this city is bankrupt and I think your recovery plan is unrealistic.

I think when you can't pay any bills without having to borrow, when you are talking about a recovery plan that's going to give you still a deficit year after year after year, you are bankrupt. This recovery plan to me is very unrealistic. You are counting on revenue that has not ever been materialized yet. You are looking to people that have never donated money to us before and you are counting on them giving us millions of dollars. They don't have to give us a nickle. You are looking at a 1 percent sale's tax. You are looking at you think

millions of dollars, that has not even been passed. That's got to be passed.

This recovery plan has not done enough to cut expenses. There are a myriad of different ways that you could cut expenses that are not -- that have hot been explored in here and I think this recovery plan should be put on a ballot and you should let it be voted on and decide what they want or maybe you want to Harrisburg to come in and appoint a receiver which could increase taxes immensely, but you know what, with this recovery plan you are not going to see the revenue that you expect to see and we are going to wind up paying more in taxes anyway.

So I would think very carefully about this before I would pass this. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Ozzie Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Ozzie Quinn. Scranton
Taxpayers' Association.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. QUINN: Good evening, mayor, Mr. McGowan, city council. City council left us

21

22

23

24

25

holding the bag. You know, you got to see farther than your nose in this situation and I have to support what Andy had said before and that's regarding the Senate Bill 1300 and House Bill 1776 now in Harrisburg legislation which has to do with the elimination of real estate taxes. school district would pay 58 percent of our taxes towards the school district. could eliminate those school district taxes, and it's on the sales tax as a matter of fact, okay, and it's getting a lot of approval across the state, and if we could eliminate the school tax, I mean, we could possibly afford a little bit of a tax or something to start this recovery plan, but right now we are just -- let me just give you an example, okay?

I went Tuesday night to a public hearing at the Scranton Sewer Authority on the impact of the combined sewer overflow in our community, the 25-year plan. \$140 million. Now, I asked that the Janet Dawson and Mr. Barrett, who were on the stage, I asked them, you wouldn't know this if you

2

4

3

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

weren't there or if ECTV because the

Scranton Times didn't cover it, even though
it was a public hearing \$140 million of
people's money, okay?

Now, I asked them, I asked --Mr. Barrett is here, is the city council, is the city planning commission, is the Dunmore planning commission, is the Lackawanna regional planning commission going to review Why? this \$140 million project? No. tell you why, because when the mayor get off the hook with Anglican American when he paid back what's in the contract what he owed Anglican American, he at that time on May 15th of 2007 said, a quote in the Scranton Times, that the Scranton Sewer Authority is They don't have to go to anyone autonomous. to raise their rates. What do we have? We have anarchy.

You know, we say your vote counts, my vote don't count. I don't want an appointed official of that man telling me what my rates are when he is doubling people down there for job after job after job and for since 2001 he has had the support of the

Scranton Times financially supporting his campaign and distorting everything that come out of here. At one time there used to be a newsman, a newswoman right here stationed in city hall until Mayor Doherty came. Then it went goodbye, okay? Everything they do they distort or they hide. They hide. And this is what the problem is today.

Now, Mayor Doherty arbitrarily took it upon himself to say to heck with the Home Rule Charter. I'm the king. Here's what happens, okay? You look at the Home Rule Charter, Section 502, which was voted on by the people, okay, and it says in addition to other acts, there are 17 acts that have to go before the city council for ordinance, and it's required by the law or by specific provisions of this charter to be done by ordinance. These acts of the city council shall be done by ordinance.

Number one of 17, adopt or amend the administrative code or establish, next word is the key word, alter or abolish any city department, office or agency. He altered the Scranton Sewer Authority arbitrarily

without coming back here for approval, and for the two last rate increases that the Scranton Sewer Authority you people did not review and who did it? Appointed officials of this man who has put us in the worst financial fiasco in the history of Scranton and thanks to the Scranton Times and the electronic media who does nothing about it but the electronic media reacts, they don't proact.

Now, what do we have here in the Scranton Sewer Authority? We have -- Boyd, excuse me, I did go to what's the name, a paralegal school, de facto privatization, okay? Because we don't have, you don't have, the voters don't have, any control over the Scranton Sewer Authority. How are you going to ever control what's going on here in the city hall?

MS. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Quinn.

MR. QUINN: He screwed up the Parking Authority, he screwed up the Sewer Authority, he screwed up city hall. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you Mr. Quinn. I

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

think just quickly I want to clarify something because I was seated on city council when the return of the Sewer Authority to let's say home base occurred, there was never a vote taken because only two of the three entities had to approve that and the three entities would have been the City of Scranton, the Borough of Dunmore and the Scranton Sewer Authority, and I attended meetings with representatives of the Sewer Authority and Dunmore, Dunmore Council, and it actually was the vote of the Dunmore council and the Scranton Sewer Authority that caused the turnover. Scranton was not required to vote at that It became irrelevant because the time. other two insisted that this is what was going to occur.

Our next speaker is Dave Dobrzyn.

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council, Mr. Mayor. Dave Dobrzyn. Okay, I have done some basic studying on the fine points and I'd like to suggest, and especially with the mayor here, we are doing 50 percent of our recycling are thrown in trash, so I would

3

1

4

6

5

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

myself as a personal taxpayer would be okay with the increase in trash fees as opposed to taxes and that would require certain institutions, small institutions and stuff to pay a little more of their fair share, also.

And as far as bankruptcy is concerned, if I never heard that word again it would be too soon. You can't propose to pay a few percentage points back on your debts and expect people to want to loan to vou. It just won't happen. We took all of our money back in 2007 and we took it right out of the stock market because we lost so much and put it into the savings. We did just like the big dogs did. It's still there. It's not really decreasing very much, but -- and also food for thought with the Parking Authority, I used to park over there when I came to the meetings and for five bucks I could give the guy a dollar tip and attend the whole meeting, and it's empty right now see, so why don't we consider lowering the rates at least in the evening, get people in there parking. If you have to

walk a block and a half or two blocks it's like seven or eight bucks, ten bucks to get out of there tonight by the time we are done here.

And another suggestion with the Affordable Care Act, commonly known as Obama care, it's my understanding that lot of the savings could be extracted from that and it's time that we start to do some research and consider as that most hospitalization plans are very, very expensive.

And for the outside people, I don't really consider a commuter tax as fair. It may be necessary, but I'd like to once again remind them that 35 percent of our city is nonprofit or tax exempt and with hospitals and colleges and county buildings and everybody else, we have a huge defense manufacturer that pays nothing in taxes, that is my understanding anyway, well, you know, that's something they should consider and maybe talk to their neighbors if they don't like the tax and for a change they could chip in or at least encourage their local representatives to start doing

something about our plight because that's a big part of our problem.

And I'd like to remind everybody once again that with outsourcing of jobs we are losing tons of money in wage taxes and people's wages have gone backwards and as egregious that the property taxes are necessary people really don't have the money to pay them, so do your best at whatever the best deal we can get and do consider that with the trash fees because it's zero dollars to dump at the recycling center per ton. That's a lot of money. I would estimate how many trucks do you have go down there multiply it by two and deduct if off DeNaple's landfill. Thank you and have a good evening.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Marie Schumacher.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening,
Council, mayor, business administrator.
First, I would like to say how much I wish
that we would have had these changes at
least by noon today because it was
impossible to write all of these changes

down let alone digest them and formulate intelligent questions to them, and in that regard I saw -- I heard of a \$5 million sale leaseback and I know Mr. Joyce will address that later, so I don't know what is being sold in a leaseback. I'm also disappointed that it's only a three-year budget, I think it should be a five year.

The sales tax, I would like to point out if it does go through that that also is the de facto increase of property taxes if, in fact, you would vote the exception to usurp all the taxes instead of giving the taxpayers the 60 percent that was the bill calls for, so that's even more.

And then without getting too
wonkish, the StreetSmart-type savings in
your plan was shown as a net, I would like
to hear the costs, what are considered the
costs in that and what are the -- so we can
see what the savings are because I did a
quick calculation and it's for the out year.
The last year you are saying is 2015 was
\$100 to \$300,000. We have 1,200 parking
meters, at least that was used in the prior

analysis, that's \$1,083 per meter, you have got 250 operating days, because I assume they get two weeks vacation so you've got 50 weeks times a five, and if you divide that 250 into the \$1,083 it's \$4.33 per day or one \$20 parking ticket per week and I would think that depending on what the costs are that are revealed later I hope that -- I think that probably adding another citation person to what we already have would bring in that same amount of money or very possibly more.

The commuter tax, again, I think it's immoral and unconscionable, but you already know that, but I do have also have some concerns about the unintended consequences. I didn't have time to check to see whether there is a third class -- that any third class city would be allowed to do a commuter tax, but if they are I think there might be some retaliation and there are people who will be paying four and a quarter instead of three and a quarter.

I would rather see a tuition tax, which I understand is not beyond the realm

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of allowable under state law. That would make more sense to me. They are here using our facilities, that certainly makes more seen and they are not contributing very much.

I have some concerns about the outstanding liabilities, for instance, the Medallis property, I don't know if that's ever been resolved I would ask the question here and have not received an answer, but if that has not been changed, as I recall that ruling, if the developer did not fix the Medallis', and I assume other people on Philo Street flooding, it falls back on the city to do, so that should certainly be included if it hasn't already happened, and I recall the last audit I did ask after the last audit came out there were some lawsuits that were pending, and I don't see any cushion in here for lawsuits at all.

And then finally reassessment. Not one word about pressuring the county or even asking DCED to put pressure on the county through the state level to do a recent reassessment. That is so overdue and I'm

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

really disappointed that you have not pursued that and I hope you will reconsider that and we will get a reassessment going.

Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Is there anyone else who cares to address council?

MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council.

Doug Miller, Scranton.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. MILLER: Obviously, I know the issue tonight with the recovery plan, I'm going to pretty much abbreviate on, I'm going to go through a lot of the comments that I have been making the last few weeks and reiterate a lot of the statements. know, we have talked an awful lot about the proposed tax increase, 33 percent, and as I stated many times from this podium the fact that we had a council who is willing to sit down and work with the administration to come up with a compromise to reduce that tax increase as much as possible. You know, we remember when the plan was initially sent down it called for a 78 percent tax increase

and we knew full well we couldn't put that burden on the taxpayers' shoulders, so we fought vigorously to cut it down to 33 percent, nearly half of what this administration wanted it to be.

The commuter tax, as I've stated before, you know, there is many issues as to we feel we are punishing noncity residents for our problems. As I stated, I don't see it that way. I feel when you have individuals coming in within the city who are sharing the services that the taxpayers of this city pay for, such as public safety, utilizing our roads and our bridges, and every other service that you are entitled to, I only find it fair for those to contribute a 1 percent towards that.

The sales tax, obviously that needs to be approved under the state legislature, but we have the opportunity to generate close to \$16 million over a three-year period and have the ability to generate that revenue certainly as an asset to us moving forward. Obviously, we are looking to generate all revenue possible and any

2

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

possibilities that we have we need to take advantage of.

But, you know, it's truly unfortunate that, you know, we stand here tonight having to discuss all of these issues knowing full well the situation we are in that, you know, we have had to deal with ten years worth of fiscal mismanagement by this administration who ran the city recklessly, and what truly disgusts me overall is that we have a Pennsylvania Economy League who sent a letter, as I stated last week, with many objections that they had to this plan and usual as they are notorious for doing their solution to everything is tax increases, continuing to place the burden on the residents of this city, you know, and they said it's wishful thinking, it's pie in the sky figures.

Well, no, it's called accountability. You know, the nonprofits they stated we are not going to see a dime. It's time they are held accountable. They've gotten a free ride for decades. The University, \$175,000. Everybody says we

3

1

4

6

5

7

10

9

12

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pick on the "U" but the best prime example we can use, an institution that generated over \$230 million in 2010 and they are going to come forward and hand us \$175,000 like they are doing us a favor and, oh, and then they come early this year like they are doing the city a favor. As I stated, it's pocket change.

We need to put a fee on all of the nonprofits within the community or better yet assess the fee all across the board. Everybody. Everybody pays their fair share and let's hold them accountable, let them pay their fair share, they have gotten a free ride, we have missed out on millions and millions of dollars over the last ten, 15, 20 years because we have sat back and never did anything about it, but now we finally have a council who took the bull by the horns and you put them in their place and you met with them and you tried to reach out, you tried to get more from them and they still refused. Well, now here is the opportunity. You put a fee, 1 percent fee all across the board and we'll generate

2

4

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

millions. It's something we need to look into, it's something that should be part of this plan, and as I stated, you hold them accountable once and for all.

One of the other issues in the plan we talked about reduction in personnel, cutting back, something we should have done a long time ago, and I'm glad to see that we finally realize that we need to cut back. We have the opportunity to save millions of dollars, but most importantly the opportunity to save millions in professional services that we have squandered millions on over the last 10 years with this administration on individuals, legal fees, millions on Carl Greco and others who we sat back and we just let it go. We have run the city reckless here. That's where we need to go, professional services. They have totally destroyed this city and it's driven us to where we are today.

You know, as far as PEL and their \$2 million they want to offer, the interest free loan and the \$250,000 grant, I see that as a ploy by the Pennsylvania Economy League

to buy a recovery plan, it's extortion and I don't think we need to get to their level and to adhere to their requests that if you don't do what we tell you, if you don't impose our measures we are not going to give you the money. That's not the way -- this is our city, this is our town. That's why we elect a mayor, that's why we elected council to make these decisions for us. We run the city. Bankruptcy, not the answer. We have stated many times here a receiver comes in and they raise taxes at will. As I have said, 78 percent tax increase would look quite inviting compared to what they come in and do.

You know, and again with PEL, where they talk about the unrealistic revenue, it's basically real simple the bottom line is this, you go with this plan it's a 33 tax increase or we can go with PEL's plan and raise taxes and you are looking at a tax increase well over 129 percent.

MS. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else?

23

18

19

20

21

22

24

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CHILIPKO: Good evening,

Council. Mary Chilipko, Scranton resident.

I dread getting up here at this point every
week. Hey, Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR DOHERTY: How are you doing, Mary?

MS. CHILIPKO: It's a shame there is such tension. I have observations, I don't know the ins and out and details, it's nice to see you here. It's a shame there is tension in this room that you can cut with a knife. It shouldn't be that way. I do see a lot of the goals in the recovery plan. The thinking in this area, like 33 percent is a gift as compared to 78 percent, that's not a gift either, but something has to be done. PEL, DCED, DECD, whatever they are, I think I picture them as the grim reapers. Ι don't understand why we can't get rid of them, I don't know why we are held hostage with this \$2 million.

My theory with the nonprofits we need to get another term for them, that's like nobody even -- that's not even that anymore. I don't know how you can -- and

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it's an epidemic. The "U" is only the tip of the iceberg. There are more and more and more and I don't know if we can all work -- I mean, we are all neighbors here. Everybody in this room, we are all neighbors, but there has to be a way. I don't know what it is. If there not a legal way what can we do with the nonprofits?

We need to cut. Cut, cut, cut. Mr. Mayor, you have let the authorities go crazy, you really have. I am so angry, and I'll save that for later, the appointment of Mr. Washo, I went so far as to call a judge's office this week, which I have never done in my life, called it corrupt, called it horrendous, I don't know if there is any repercussions for that either calling a judge's office, Judge Mazzoni. They say all the time there is no shame. Honor, integrity, honesty. Clean house. Make When the new budget comes up cut, cuts. cut, cut. Don't be so nervous, Mr. Mayor. You are here with friends and neighbors.

As far as the Chesapeake Sewer hike to get rid of the -- clean up the Chesapeake

or whatever, after the appointment of Mr. Washo as the receiver to the Scranton Parking Authority just forget that because there is already something in the water. We can't change that by that, what is it \$39 now? Work hard, people. Work together and this will pass, but find solutions after this. Don't end here like in the next year we are here with the same thing, nobody wants to be here and everybody is all tensed up.

So good luck, Mr. Washo. You should be so ashamed of yourself as Judge Mazzoni.

Thank you.

MS. EVANS: I believe we have only time for one more speaker.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Bill Jackowitz, founder of the Legion of Doom. Good evening, Mr. Mayor. Mr. McGowan. You know, I have been bringing this for several weeks. Remember what that is, Mr. Mayor? That was out in 2001 when the original recovery plan that the voters passed in 2001, I believe it was, it didn't work. And one of the reasons why it didn't work is because the mayor

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

didn't support it. The mayor -- the mayor actually violated the recovery plan several times, and I think we all know that, but that's in the past, okay?

My concern now is with the new recovery plan. Like I asked last week, is there a stipulation in the recovery plan that the mayor cannot violate the recovery plan or city council cannot violate the recovery plan? Is there a stipulation in the new recovery plan? Because if there isn't a stipulation the mayor will violate it again like he has in the past or if we have a new mayor he might violate it, also, or city council will violate the recovery So let's make darn sure that we get a stipulation in the new recovery plan that the mayor cannot violate it nor can city council violate it. And if it comes to a draw between the mayor and the city council on violating it, then take it to the people. I hope it's in there.

You know, I was driving in my car today and I was listening to -- I listen to the oldies because I'm an old guy, anyway, a

this been going on." Does anybody remember that song? Well, I'm going to tell you how long it's been going on I hope everybody listens and writes these figures down.

7,524 and 248 months the City of Scranton has been distressed. Think about that.

7,524 days of living in a distressed city.

Two mayors. Mayor Connors and Mayor Doherty and numerous city councils. How long has this been going on? When is it going to stop? The citizens have had enough. We really have.

Now, another song came on and the

song came on and the song was "How long has

Now, another song came on and the song was, "All I need is a miracle." Does anybody remember that song? Well, the next line is, "All I need is a miracle, all I need is you." Well, in the City of Scranton the miracle is all we need is money. That's the bottom line. The rest of this stuff is smoke and mirrors and everything else. We need money. We need real money, not Monopoly money, not play money, not money that we might get, money that we might not get, we need real money. The only way we

can get real money is raise taxes.

I'm going to make a lot of friends tonight because I say let's raise taxes 129 percent. Let's get it over with. Because what's going to happen if we can't make payroll come next month or two weeks from now? We are going to have to borrow more money. Or next January when we are going to have to raise taxes again. So why don't we just cut through the chase, I'm a realist. I believe there is three ways of doing things, the right way, the wrong way and the common sense way. Why don't we do things the common sense way? If we have to raise taxes 129 percent raise them 129 percent. Let's get it over with.

You know, people are tired. People are tired of hearing fighting and fighting and arguing. They really are. They are tired of it, and if we just continue to raise taxes and beat around the bush let's get it over once and for all.

Okay, without the money we have two options, okay? We can either go bankrupt or we can raise taxes. Those are the only two

options that we have. Yeah, we can count on the commuter tax. It might get passed it, it might not get passed. Why? You know, how many times have the commuters used our services? I hear that all the time. They use our services. How many times do the commuter actually use the fire department and the police department? Probably not very often, okay? I have never used the fire department in Scranton or any other city I have lived in. I have never used the police department in Scranton or any other city I have lived in, and I'm pretty sure that the majority of the commuters have not used our services.

As far as our roads, I think we should pay them to drive on our roads because of the mechanical bills they receive from hitting all the potholes. That's what I think. That's my opinion. If we are so worried about our roads let's pave our roads and let get them straight, you know?

I mean, it's over and over and over again, repetitive, all the time, all the time. You know, and basically I'll save the

rest for later. I appreciate you being here, Mr. Mayor, and I have been talking behind your back and now you are here so I'm talking to you face to face, just like I did that night we had the meeting and I was sitting in the chair you were in and you sitting across from me with Judy Gatelli with the nonprofits and I asked you eyeball to eyeball, "Are you going to support collecting taxes in lieu of money from the nonprofits?"

And you told me you would and guess what, you let me down.

MS. EVANS: Thank you,

Mr. Jackowitz. Because we must begin our regularly scheduled meeting shortly, I ask the remaining speakers to address city council during citizens' participation.

Very briefly though, I do have just two or three questions to pose to our guests, city council did not request or require a revised recovery plan, the administration did not request or require a revised recovery plan. Mr. Mayor, would you agree that is correct?

1 MAYOR DOHERTY: Yes. I think you 2 are 100 percent right. 3 MS. EVANS: And, Mayor Doherty and Mr. McGowan, Scranton City Council 4 5 collaborated with you on the development of this revised recovery plan; is that correct? 6 MAYOR DOHERTY: Yes, it is. 7 8 MR. MCGOWAN: Yes. 9 MS. EVANS: And Scranton City Council collaborated with the administration 10 11 and PEL in the development of the city 12 budget; is that correct? MAYOR DOHERTY: Yes. Absolutely. 13 14 They were conversations back and forth, yes. MS. EVANS: Thank you. 15 Therefore. 16 it is a city budget and the revised recovery 17 plan is not a council plan or the mayor's 18 plan, it is a City of Scranton revised 19 recovery plan and city council and the mayor 20 have pledged to continue to work together for the betterment of our city and 21 22 taxpayers. 23 Mayor Doherty, I ask you now for any 24 comments you may have?

MAYOR DOHERTY: Well, thank you, all

of council. Mrs. Evans, thank you very much. It's been quite a period of time where we have been working together and I have to say over the last, you know, several months council has really come up with a lot of great ideas and we have worked very hard together and I believe the revisions in the plan and our communications with the state have brought us here tonight to a plan that will be accepted. We have all made some tough decisions for the betterment of the city.

they think the city should be run and what plan should be put into place, but in reality everybody has to come together to come for the betterment of the city, just as you said, it's not the City of Scranton plan, it's not the mayor's plan or council's plan or the state or PEL it is the city's plan. As elected leaders of this city, we need to come together and develop that.

These are all tough decisions and decisions that people normally wouldn't want to make, but we realize we do have to make

2

3

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

them and by doing that we protect the people we represent, the people of Scranton who live in our city who love their city just as much as we love our city.

And I have to say, I think we made tremendous progress, I think we are on the right track. I think, also, through the efforts of the staff of council and the administration and particularly the attorneys have done an unbelievable job because we are juggling a lot of things right now. Not only are we putting a plan together but at the same time we are talking to financial institutions, we are telling them of the progress we are making and, you know, I think we are headed in the right direction and I am confident that this is going to work, but it's worked because we have all worked together and you have my commitment and we talk on daily basis.

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MAYOR DOHERTY: Not only this, as one of couple of speakers had mentioned it's not only this, but it's also after this is done that we continue to work together and

2

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

. .

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we push the city forward in the right direction. We have tremendous challenges, as all cities do. That's the purpose of government, we take care of everybody, not just the wealthy and the middle class, but the poor, those who are challenged in life.

You know, we are in the midst of a great immigration boom in our city today and the reason people come to cities is because they know they can get help. In Scranton high school today 30 different languages are spoken. That is an example and also an indication of the direction of the city. Ιt is going through a second rebirth because of immigration that's taking place. We have an obligation to take care of those people and because one day they will be the leaders of our city and I want them to remember how they were treated because when they're in charge there will be a whole new group of immigrants coming in and I want them to treat people the way they were treated and I think with the plan we have come together on we will be able to achieve that.

I want to thank you because these

are not easy times and they are difficult decisions that we have made, but we have put everything aside for the betterment of the community. So thank you very much and I appreciate all of your hard work and as I know tomorrow we will be back in discussions all over again as we push the city ahead. Thank you very much and have a great evening.

MS. EVANS: And I thank both of you, Mayor Doherty and Mr. McGowan, for your participation this evening. And, Mr. Mayor, I respectfully invite you to attend any future council meetings if your time permits.

> MAYOR DOHERTY: Right.

MS. EVANS: If there is no further business, this public hearing is adjourned and thank you again.

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes of testimony taken by me at the hearing of the above-captioned matter and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the same to the best of my ability.

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER