

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING

HELD:

Tuesday, January 18, 2011

LOCATION:

Council Chambers

Scranton City Hall

340 North Washington Avenue

Scranton, Pennsylvania

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL:

JANET EVANS, PRESIDENT

PAT ROGAN, VICE-PRESIDENT

ROBERT MCGOFF

FRANK JOYCE
(Not present)

JOHN LOSCOMBE

NANCY KRAKE, CITY CLERK

JAMIE MARCIANO, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

BOYD HUGHES, SOLICITOR

1 (Pledge of Allegiance recited and moment of reflection
2 observed.)

3 MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.

4 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.

5 MR. MCGOFF: Here.

6 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.

7 MR. ROGAN: Here.

8 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.

9 MR. LOSCOMBE: Here.

10 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. Mrs.

11 Evans.

12 MS. EVANS: Here.

13 MR. LOSCOMBE: Mrs. Krake, at this
14 time I would like to make a motion to
15 appoint Mr. McGoff as temporary chair on
16 finance.

17 MR. ROGAN: Second.

18 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
19 those in favor signify by saying aye.

20 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

21 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

22 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

23 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
24 have it and so moved. Mr. McGoff will serve
25 as this evening's finance chair in the

1 absence of Councilman Joyce who is ill this
2 evening. Dispense with the reading of the
3 minutes.

4 MS. KRAKE: 3-A. AGENDA FOR THE CITY
5 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TO BE HELD ON
6 JANUARY 19, 2011.

7 MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?
8 If not, received and filed. Clerk's notes.

9 MS. KRAKE: We don't have any
10 clerk'S notes this evening, Mrs. Evans.

11 MS. EVANS: Thank you, Mrs. Krake.
12 Do any council members have announcements at
13 this time?

14 MR. MCGOFF: I have two things that
15 I'd like to mention. First, there is a
16 comedy night fundraiser at the 20th Ward on
17 2028 Pittston Avenue, that is on January 21
18 at 8 p.m. I believe it -- I didn't write it
19 down, I believe it was to benefit breast
20 cancer and it's featuring a gentleman by the
21 name of Joe Mataris, I'm personally not
22 familiar with him, but in the bio that was
23 in the e-mail it was impressive, so that's
24 January 21, 8 p.m., at the 20th Ward Club,
25 2028 Pittston Avenue. If you are looking

1 for tickets you can contact PS Pratt at
2 PSPRATT.COM.

3 The second one, Fraternal Order of
4 Eagles is having a chili feast to benefit
5 the American Colon Cancer Society, that is
6 in memory of Shirley Wido, wife of Ed Wido,
7 friend to most of us, to all of us, I
8 believe. She passed away in October of
9 2010. That is going to be held January 22
10 at the Eagle's Club, 493 Meridian Avenue
11 from 3:00 to 8:00.

12 MS. EVANS: Thank you. Is there
13 anyone else?

14 MR. ROGAN: Yes. I would just like
15 to announce that the 500 block of Lackawanna
16 Avenue has their first tenant, Post
17 Redevelopment. The name of the company is
18 Bellafonte's. They're at 516 Lackawanna
19 Avenue. They make personalized chocolates
20 and gifts, so we encourage everyone to check
21 out their business. I tend to do so myself
22 and hopefully it will be the first of many
23 new businesses on that block. We already
24 have two great bookends with Buona Pizza and
25 Coney Island and hopefully we'll fill up the

1 middle of that block as well. That's all.
2 Thank you.

3 MS. EVANS: While you are there you
4 might pick up some chocolate for the
5 president.

6 MR. ROGAN: Sure thing.

7 MS. EVANS: Thank you. Once again,
8 I wish to review the Rules of Council
9 pertaining to the public. Turn off cell
10 phones before entering council chambers.
11 State your name and address before
12 addressing council and be sure to provide
13 your list of questions or problems in
14 writing to Ms. Carrera or to Mrs. Marciano.
15 Please remain quiet while citizens are
16 speaking. Adhere to the five-minute time
17 limit for citizens' participation in order
18 that all may have an equal opportunity to
19 speak. You are welcome to return to
20 successive meetings to continue your
21 comments, suggestions and questions.

22 Thank you for your continued
23 cooperation in these matters as we strive to
24 maintain a working environment of respect,
25 concern and professionalism in city council

1 chambers.

2 The West Scranton Invader Mat
3 Wrestling Boosters will conduct it's annual
4 "Night at the Races" on Saturday January 29
5 at the Tripp Park Community Center at 7 p.m.
6 Admission is \$10 and includes food and
7 refreshments. Tickets are available at the
8 door and you must 21 to attend. There will
9 be 15 horse races and you may wager any
10 dollar amount on any or all races. You need
11 not purchase or bet on a horse to attend
12 this event. Come and join the Invader Mat
13 Boosters for an in expensive night of fun on
14 January 29.

15 The Interfaith Friends United will
16 host a family fun night at Friendly's
17 Restaurant in Dunmore on Tuesday, January
18 25, from 5 to 8 p.m. to benefit the Elm Park
19 men who assisted in raising \$1,500 for St.
20 Francis of Assisi Kitchen. The' Elm Park
21 men are raising funds for youth programs and
22 to thank them for their past assistance
23 United Faith Friends is organizing this
24 event. Enjoy a delicious dinner and help to
25 support the projects of the Elm Park men

1 next Tuesday at Friendly's.

2 Finally, yesterday our nation
3 celebrated Martin Luther King, Jr. Day in
4 honor of a great leader of courage,
5 compassion and wisdom. Numerous local
6 events commemorated the life and lessons of
7 Dr. King, but it is equally important that
8 we strive to live his lessons of equality,
9 humanity, dignity, respect, and compassion
10 daily. And that's it.

11 MS. KRAKE: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS'
12 PARTICIPATION.

13 MS. EVANS: Our first speaker
14 tonight is Andy Sbaraglia.

15 MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia,
16 citizen of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians, I
17 notice they sold the old chamber building.
18 We bought it, the people of Pennsylvania
19 bought it with that \$3 1/2 million grant,
20 but we don't get anything out of it. You
21 got to stop -- we got to stop the giving
22 away of money. Loans, okay, but not
23 give-aways. Too many people are being
24 thrown out of their homes. Don't anybody
25 down in Harrisburg look at that? If you are

1 going to throw millions like on these old
2 buildings something should be done to rehab
3 houses where these people are or even
4 keeping the houses.

5 This is ridiculous, 3/12 million,
6 and it works this way. You give me 3 1/2
7 million, I buy the building with the money
8 you gave me and then they go to the bank and
9 get a loan for the other 3 1/2 million. How
10 much of my own money is in it? Not a penny.
11 And then you got this other went in down
12 there at the old Silk Mill. That's even a
13 nice one. That's a little more, \$4,500,000.
14 Now, I don't anything about the project, but
15 for \$4,500,000 it's got to be a real big
16 project, I hope, but you don't know. I
17 didn't look at it, but it's still
18 ridiculous.

19 Why not loan people that much and
20 take a share of the business. I told you,
21 we need to take a piece of the action on all
22 our give-aways. That's the only way we can
23 stop this head long run to bankruptcy. The
24 state is \$4 billion in debt, but yet they
25 can give money away like crazy. I mean,

1 this is ridiculous. Something got to be
2 done somewhere. I know you can't do much
3 other than that \$4,500,000, find out all you
4 can about the project and so forth and so
5 on, but as far as, I don't know, I don't
6 know if it's worth \$4 1/2 million the old
7 Lace Works. I have been there many times
8 and it's like I say, it's fairly run down
9 now, but that's what is happening.

10 But nobody cares about the little
11 guy. Nobody cares about the man up on the
12 street who can't pay his bills but yet we
13 have -- and yet we are taking money from him
14 everything he buys we want that 6 percent,
15 but what do we get back? Very little, so
16 somewhere along the line we got to either
17 get a piece of the action or loans. I have
18 nothing against giving the guy a \$4 1/2
19 million loan, but you know what, the bank
20 probably wouldn't give him a loan on top of
21 it unless you are willing to give up the
22 loan again like they have been doing. Okay.
23 Thank you.

24 MS. EVANS: Thank you,
25 Mr. Sbaraglia. Bill Jackowitz.

1 MR. JACKOWITZ: Bill Jackowitz,
2 South Scranton resident and member of the
3 Taxpayers' Association. Most memorable
4 political embarrassing events in Scranton
5 and Lackawanna County:

6 (1). Several years ago the
7 Lackawanna County jail warden and also an
8 elected city council member charged with
9 crimes such as using inmates to work on his
10 car, decorate his home, and others for
11 Christmas and hiring out inmates to do
12 favors for his friends.

13 (2). Elected city councilman and
14 school principal forced to resign because of
15 inappropriate conduct.

16 (3). Past county commissioner and
17 current minority commissioner charged with a
18 federal crimes. Minority commissioner does
19 not exist.

20 (4). County controller sues county
21 commissioner. Remember this is the same
22 controller lost all of the money in the
23 Single Tax Office.

24 (5). Single Tax Office raided by
25 federal agents.

1 (6). Baby born on floor of county
2 jail.

3 (7). Woman arrested for cursing at
4 her toilet.

5 (8). County jail warden re signs,
6 reason unknown. Current warden -- or past
7 current warden, I should say.

8 (9). Man beaten in jail as
9 correction's officers vanish.

10 (10). Inmates beaten while being
11 transported by sheriff's deputies as they
12 watch same inmate who previously beat
13 another inmate in the Lackawanna County
14 Prison.

15 (11). Federal investigations into
16 corrections officers selling tobacco in
17 prisons to inmates for lucrative profits.

18 (12). Scranton police officers sues
19 city and mayor for inappropriate conduct of
20 Scranton police chief. They win \$153,000.

21 (13). Scranton firefighters vote 93
22 percent "no confidence" in Fire Chief Davis.
23 Nothing happens.

24 (14). Scranton School Board members
25 act like children, leave meeting instead of

1 voting.

2 (15). Scranton School Board wife
3 recommended for promotion of principal.
4 Member should resign or wife's name should
5 be removed.

6 (16.) School board meeting
7 cancelled, nobody shows up for the meeting.
8 Everybody sick same day plus two leave
9 early. This is the board that is
10 responsible for the education of the
11 Scranton children.

12 (17). City solicitor, also
13 solicitor for Parking Authority, Recreation
14 Authority and who knows what else.

15 (18). Mayor of Scranton not aware
16 that city has sexual harassment and
17 discrimination policy in effect for six
18 years. Finds out after taxpayers pay
19 \$153,000 out to the plaintiffs and
20 attorneys.

21 (19). Mayor of Scranton not aware
22 of qualifications and educational background
23 of appointed cabinet members. Cabinet
24 members supervisor other cabinet members.
25 No records kept of cabinet meetings.

1 (20). Important issues such as city
2 policy changes, recommendations not
3 discussed at cabinet meetings.

4 (21). Mayor of Scranton does not
5 agree with City Scranton lawfully passing
6 the amended budget, but vetoes anyway.
7 Council McGoff supports later and councilman
8 reads the amended budget.

9 Cell phones removed from everybody
10 including emergency personnel. Very
11 intelligent. Mayor blames council then
12 admits to not reading council's amended and
13 lawful budget. Remember 2002, Doherty?

14 (22). \$12 million appears in the
15 Single Tax Office, nobody has an
16 explanation. Only about \$7 actually can be
17 accounted for. What happened to the \$5
18 million? Your guess is as good as mine.

19 (23). 2009 audit to complete
20 January of 2011 by Scranton business
21 administrator who, by the way, quite because
22 his salary was reduced, only eight months
23 late with the audit.

24 (24). DPW supervisor threatens
25 garbage not going to be picked up or streets

1 plowed because his position removed from the
2 budget. Another dedicated public employee.

3 Director Brazil complaining about
4 snow removal money. We have yet to have a
5 major snow stop. Where is the DPW union
6 president? Director Brazil quoted in
7 today's Times-Tribune, "We will be out there
8 today covering the roads and then we will
9 see what happens at night."

10 Director Brazil, that is your job
11 and the DPW employees' job. By the way,
12 what are Director Brazil's qualifications?
13 Does anybody know?

14 (25). Firefighters, police officers
15 not given raises for years. Positions being
16 eliminated by yet professional firefighters
17 and police officers state they will do their
18 best to keep the residents safe.

19 (26). Scranton mayor takes council
20 to Court. Another bad decision by local
21 Judge Mazzone. Oh, well, welcome to
22 Scranton and Lackawanna County where justice
23 is just a word with no meaning.

24 (27). City council president
25 Gatelli takes Dougherty Deceit to Court, wins

1 at the local level, Judge O'Brien overruled
2 by the Pennsylvania Superior Court. Judge
3 O'Brien ruling 100 percent wrong. Gatelli
4 produced no evidence to support her claim.
5 Again, another example of judges not
6 understanding the First Amendment. They
7 fall right into the category of past
8 Scranton City Council presidents.

9 I hope Gatelli is required to pay
10 the 300 -- correction, the \$30,000 insurance
11 money that was paid by the residents of
12 Scranton for her legal bills. Remember,
13 residents were locked out of city hall by
14 the Doherty three, Gatelli, Fanucci and
15 McGoff for no legal reasons. Read the
16 Superior Court ruling. You are out of
17 order.

18 (28). Lackawanna County Prison
19 being raided by state corrections officers
20 and others. Why? They are searching for
21 illegal contraband provided by the
22 corrections officer.

23 (29). Director of Housing
24 Arrested-- I'm also done, arrested on
25 federal felony charge if convicted.

1 (30). Speakers arrested for
2 speaking at city council meeting.

3 (31). ECTV what a joke. The board
4 selected by Mayor Doherty selected this
5 company. Another example of poor
6 leadership.

7 (32). DPW, does anybody remember
8 St. Valentine's Day massacre a few years
9 back? St. Valentine's Day over \$300,000
10 spent on one snow storm, roads still not
11 passable for ten days.

12 Three years ago the Times-Tribune,
13 District Attorney and public safety director
14 and police chief and the Honorable
15 Christopher A. Doherty were adamant that
16 there were no gangs in Scranton. Now
17 Senator Casey is praising the Times-Tribune
18 for reporting about gangs and the District
19 Attorney states there is no denying that we
20 have gangs. Mr. Jarbola, where you have
21 been for the last nine years? Listening to
22 Chris Doherty, Ray Hayes and Dave Elliott
23 and the Times-Tribune editorial staff and
24 staff writers?

25 And my favorite is Sherry Fanucci

1 and Judy Gatelli standing up in chambers
2 yelling, "Officer, Officer, Officer," and
3 there was absolutely nothing happening and
4 we were shut out of city council meetings
5 for two weeks.

6 MS. EVANS: Thank you,
7 Mr. Jackowitz. Doug Miller.

8 MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council,
9 Doug Miller, Scranton. I'd just like to
10 begin tonight by asking council if they
11 would possibly please send a letter to the
12 appropriate official whether it's
13 Mr. Dougher or DPW, I'm not sure at this
14 point who is charge of the parks, but I'd
15 like to see if we can inquire about the
16 city's plans in regards to the operation of
17 our pools this summer and if we can try to
18 get to the bottom of whether or not the
19 pools in the city are going to be closed
20 whether it's Capouse Avenue, Connell Park so
21 maybe we can request that information.

22 The second thing I have tonight is,
23 you know, for awhile we have been talking
24 about creativity in the city and I have
25 brought it up before, you know, we've had

1 things brought up like StreetSmart and other
2 projects and proposals, but an idea that I
3 had brought forward in the past to council
4 to cut back on energy costs was the idea of
5 installing windows throughout the city. We
6 see parts of the area, Wayne County and
7 Luzerne County have taken such action as
8 well as other parts of the state and I have
9 begun to do some research on this and I hope
10 to present this to council in the near
11 future. You know, I feel strongly about
12 saving the city and the taxpayers' money
13 because I think that's what it's all about
14 and I would just like to see that occur.

15 The other issue I have tonight is
16 regarding 5-E on the agenda tonight, the
17 \$4.5 million dollar grant to be used for the
18 Scranton Lace Redevelopment and I just -- my
19 question for council tonight would be what
20 exactly does this project entail, do we
21 know? And the other issue I would add, and
22 it's been brought up in the past is maybe if
23 we considered once again putting backup
24 legislation on the city's website I think it
25 would serve as a good purpose, I would think

1 it would be certainly quite educational for
2 the residents of this city because as myself
3 tonight looking at this piece of the
4 legislation I can honestly say that I don't
5 know what this project entails and maybe
6 council has some answers, maybe you know.
7 If not, I would hope maybe next week you can
8 find out what this is about.

9 Also, on the agenda, 5-F regarding
10 the appointment of Ryan McGowan to the
11 business administrator. I understand this
12 gentleman is already performing his duties,
13 but I would just have to ask council if you
14 are going to be continuing to your procedure
15 and that is that you have always in the past
16 requested a cover letter and a resume for
17 any appointments that you will be voting on.
18 I would just like to ask if you will be
19 doing that.

20 And also, my other question would be
21 is to why wasn't this position advertised
22 and why didn't we seek other applicants? I
23 think there is probably a lot of other
24 qualified individuals, and I don't mean this
25 in a disrespectful way to Mr. McGowan, I'm

1 sure he has the experience, but I would just
2 ask why we didn't make this an open
3 invitation for others and maybe we can get a
4 response to that.

5 And finally tonight regarding 5-F on
6 the agenda, the garbage fee legislation, I
7 would just have to question this. You know,
8 I believe strongly that I think that this
9 should be included in the residents paying
10 their taxes. I think that when you pay your
11 taxes it should include all of the services
12 that are provided to you and I think that if
13 we are willing to create a fee on garbage
14 collection then I just don't see how it
15 would be problem, as I said last week and I
16 have stated other times, why we can't create
17 a fee on KOZ's and nonprofits or anyone
18 else. I strongly believe it's about
19 everyone in this city paying their fair
20 share. It's not a secret there is what I
21 believe in and I have said at the council
22 before and I would just hope that tonight is
23 the first step in really seeing what's going
24 on here and really seeing the opportunity we
25 have here because if we can vote on

1 legislation such as this, well, then I don't
2 see why we can't vote on legislation to
3 enact a fee all across the board. You know,
4 the residents of this city are paying their
5 fair share and we have other people in this
6 city who are not yet they are taking
7 advantage of the services and the other
8 assets that the residents of this city have
9 to pay for and I just don't think it would
10 be right I would hope we really take this
11 serious in moving forward. Thank you.

12 MS. EVANS: Thank you. Bob Bolus.

13 MR. BOLUS: Good evening, Council
14 Bob Bolus, Scranton.

15 MS. EVANS: Good evening.

16 MR. BOLUS: On the \$4.5 million
17 here, is this the same individual that will
18 be receiving this that was going to do the
19 ST. Peter's square and then didn't do the
20 project and sold the property?

21 MR. LOSCOMBE: I don't believe it's
22 the same.

23 MR. BOLUS: I believe it may be and
24 I think this should be tabled until we are
25 really sure who the principals are that are

1 going to be behind this, so that we don't
2 wind up in the city again picking up someone
3 else's debt. I think we need to know a
4 little bit more about who they are or what
5 they are and what resources they have that
6 are going to sustain them in a project of
7 this size.

8 And on 5-F, I brought up many, many
9 times in the past, I see here now we are
10 going to vote on a fee. Well, a fee is to
11 be passed across everyone within the city
12 limits and that should include KOZ's,
13 nonprofits or anyone else in there. You
14 cannot just separate the fee and put it on
15 the people and not put it on everyone else.

16 So if this fee could be enacted then
17 a fee could be enacted, as I said, to pay a
18 fee whether we want to call it a clean air,
19 whatever the fee is and put that across
20 everyone in this city including KOZ's and
21 nonprofits. The same teeth that was put
22 into this fee in lieu of our tax or paying
23 our taxes that should give us garbage,
24 police, and fire protection we are now
25 paying again to dump our garbage and other

1 people are getting a free ride. So I
2 believe that's what council needs to start
3 looking on this fee. Find out how it was
4 enacted a long time ago, copy it and pass it
5 across everybody on some other type of fee
6 that we include every non profit and KOZ
7 here. The free ride has got to come to an
8 end with them.

9 I have a couple of requests here in
10 writing, one is that can Solicitor Paul
11 Kelly be the solicitor for the City of
12 Scranton and the Scranton Parking Authority
13 without their being a conflict of interest
14 or any other Scranton city authority; and
15 the second request is can the city solicitor
16 involve the city in a private litigation on
17 behalf of one of the parties if the city is
18 not a party to the litigation at taxpayers'
19 expense?

20 In other words, is the city getting
21 the involved in something they shouldn't be
22 to benefit one party, and I'll give you
23 those if I could get them back in writing.

24 The next issue I have is on the
25 different Griffin -- the shelter. I saw

1 \$1,000 from Blakely Borough, I think it's
2 time now that every Borough, every township
3 in this community should contribute to it.
4 Don't put the burden just on the City of
5 Scranton and think that we should be the
6 only ones doing it. You know, it's nice to
7 see someone starting to chip in, but more
8 importantly, I think it's time now for the
9 county commissioners, you know, to step up
10 to the plate and make a contribution to the
11 shelter as well to cover the county costs
12 and everything else that goes on with it,
13 but it's nice to see that the city took the
14 lead and you are to be commended for it.

15 Now, maybe that you are showing the
16 leadership the rest will start following and
17 I would hope they do that because the
18 animals are an important part of our society
19 and our families and everything else, so
20 it's time people start paying attention and
21 loosen the purse strings. Maybe you don't
22 buy that extra pack of cigarettes today and
23 contribute to the shelter. You'll live a
24 longer and so will the animals.

25 The parking meters, I disagree with

1 the fact that it should be computerized,
2 spending all of this money that you pull
3 out, bingo it goes to zero. We are paying
4 for an hour whether somebody gets a free
5 ride on it so be it because eventually what
6 we are going to do is chase everybody off
7 the city streets into the parking garages or
8 they are going to keep parking for free in
9 the mall. The money is going to go to the
10 parking authority which guess what, we can't
11 control or tell them what to do with their
12 money. So the city losses every time a
13 meter doesn't produce money, so for 15
14 minutes you are paying a quarter. That's a
15 steep price to pay, but why hurt the
16 merchants and the people downtown of
17 Scranton, the people that want to come here
18 by putting something on that says as soon as
19 pull out you got to monitor a computer, the
20 computer goes haywire and guess what, we are
21 back to zero we have no control.

22 Leave it like it is, it's producing
23 money. Look at what happened down by the
24 munition plant. All of the meters went in
25 and no one is down there. Take that cost

1 associated and figure the net loss not the
2 net prove profit, so I think it's something
3 you should just put away with and let
4 business as usual go and try to revitalize
5 the city by giving something to the people
6 and not taking it from them.

7 Another thing that I'd like to do is
8 do something. I was driving through the
9 city the other day and saw one of our police
10 that really looks like they should be in the
11 demolition derby. I mean, our cars look
12 terrible and you can't ask the police
13 officers to be proud when they've got a car
14 dented or needs a little paint or touch up.
15 So what I'd like to do is propose something
16 tonight, and maybe every other business and
17 everyone in this community may follow the
18 lead, we would like to take one of the
19 police cars that has minor repairs needed on
20 it and I'll send to one of my shops, we'll
21 repair it at absolutely no cost to the City
22 of Scranton and put it back in service and
23 put some pride back in the city and into our
24 police officers at least maybe a little
25 touch up paint will help go a long way.

1 Just like we would do in here if it was all
2 chipped and painted, a little paint helps,
3 so I'd like to put that offer on the table
4 and see where it goes with council if you
5 would like to do that and talk to the city
6 and maybe we can get all of the other
7 businesses in this city to give our police
8 back some of the pride that they are
9 entitled to and the city residents.

10 So we'll take one and we'll touch it
11 up with paint. I mean, I'm not going to
12 take a demolished car, but even if we did we
13 would give a rate that would be so low
14 nobody could compete with it anywhere if
15 they tried to get it fixed, but we want to
16 take the lead and let's put the city back.
17 Thank you.

18 MS. EVANS: Thank you.

19 MR. MCGOFF: Mrs. Evans, before the
20 next speaker could we perhaps now request a
21 caucus with someone from OECD and also from
22 the Leased Building Affiliates, L.P., since
23 that seems to be a topic that a number of
24 speakers have already addressed.

25 MS. EVANS: Certainly. I can tell

1 you though at this point -- you can be
2 seated, Mr. Bolus.

3 MR. BOLUS: Okay. Thank you.

4 MS. EVANS: That the redevelopment
5 of this brown field area includes a mixed
6 use destination integrating arts and
7 heritage resources with residential,
8 commercial and health facilities. In
9 addition, the involved organizations are:
10 Applicant, City of Scranton; sub-applicant,
11 Lace Building Affiliates, L.P. Architect,
12 Hemler and Kamaick. Civil engineer, Reap
13 and Peterson, Incorporated. Construction
14 management, Sardoni Construction Services.
15 The officers of the Scranton Lace Affiliates
16 are Claud Lamoge, chief executive officer;
17 Jody Cordaro, president and
18 secretary/treasurer; and Joseph Casey,
19 director of land development.

20 MR. ROGAN: I would also add in the
21 packet that we have here about the jobs that
22 will be created, 44 construction jobs with a
23 total salary of \$2.5 million combined just
24 in the construction; 469 direct full-time
25 permanent positions will be created by the

1 project at full build-out. The total
2 estimate employee compensation for the 469
3 jobs will be \$19.5 million. In addition to
4 the 469 direct jobs an additional 320
5 indirect jobs will be created by the
6 project. It's estimated that the project
7 will have an annual state and local tax
8 impact of more than \$5 million.

9 MS. EVANS: And finally, I'll
10 elaborate more on that as we vote to
11 introduce this legislation this evening, but
12 the state will be overseeing all of the
13 requirements and guidelines for the
14 affiliate the Lace Affiliate, OECD will not
15 oversee the compliance issues, the state
16 itself will. The grant, the \$4.5 million
17 grant is being issued through the State
18 Department of the Budget and they will, as I
19 said, be overseeing this.

20 Our next speaker is Marie
21 Schumacher. Oh, I'm sorry, I'm so sorry.
22 First we'll hear from Ms. Schumacher
23 followed by Mr. Morgan.

24 MS. SCHUMACHER: Yes. Good evening.
25 What really brought me down here tonight was

1 a troubling announcement in the legal
2 notices section of today's paper which
3 announced two meetings, scheduled meetings
4 for 2011 for the Scranton Library Authority.
5 I thought the Scranton Library Authority was
6 dissolved back in January and how can they
7 be meeting if they don't exist any longer?
8 Maybe during motions somebody could explain
9 that to me. I find this very troubling.

10 Also, the audit, I would ask that a
11 copy of the audit, is it available yet? Has
12 that meeting -- exit meeting or --

13 MS. EVANS: The exit conference is
14 being scheduled and as soon as that has
15 occurred then the audit will be
16 disseminated.

17 MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. I would is
18 ask again that one copy of it be provided to
19 the Albright Memorial Library so that people
20 can look at it when city hall is not open.

21 Again, I don't know if anybody took
22 my advice to start checking Grassroots.Pa,
23 which is sort of the drudgery report of
24 Pennsylvania, but again, there is more
25 legislation that will affect our

1 municipality regarding streets -- well,
2 signage. While it doesn't take full effect
3 until 2015, I would suggest is it --
4 Mr. McGoff, are you the liaison with DPW
5 still?

6 MR. MCGOFF: Apparently.

7 MS. SCHUMACHER: That, too. Well, I
8 think we really need to be proactive and if
9 we are going to start doing any new signage
10 that we should make sure we are in
11 compliance because it's going to be an
12 expensive project in complying by 2015 and
13 we may as well get on board now and not have
14 to replace things within two or three years.

15 StreetSmart, I was very disappointed
16 last week after the caucus the gentleman who
17 made the presentation sat next to me and he
18 took a paper that I had, I thought we were
19 going to be able to ask more questions and I
20 had a lot of questions on the assumptions
21 that were used, one of which maybe you all
22 know. Are you planning to use all 1,200
23 parking meters for this project or is this
24 just a downtown project and there were a lot
25 of others. And what really disappoints me

1 is he took the paper and he said, "Oh, yes,"
2 --he took my e-mail and he said, "I've got
3 all that, I will e-mail you," and I have not
4 heard anything from him and I really think
5 knowing all of the assumptions that were
6 made, as I recall, for instance, at the
7 first caucus the gentlemen said it would be
8 six-day a week enforcement but --

9 MS. EVANS: I believe he said that
10 would be ideal, that would bring in even
11 more revenue, and actually according to the
12 agreement that the city has with Parking
13 Authority that I read through, oh, several
14 weeks ago, the city is listed in that
15 agreement as having parking six days a week
16 to include Saturdays.

17 MS. SCHUMACHER: Yes, I understand
18 that. The ordinance is on the Scranton
19 Parking Authority's website and, yes, it
20 does, but we have not enforced that for many
21 years and I did check at a Parking Authority
22 meeting regarding their intent to enforce
23 Saturdays in 2011 and they had none. So
24 that's, you know, just 1/6 of the revenue
25 gone.

1 Now, with respect to CMC, has
2 anybody checked with the Rec Authority, I
3 know that they get a lot of their revenue to
4 operate from the rental of the pavilions up
5 there which for the last several years have
6 been fully rented out and, you know, if all
7 of these parking -- I didn't realize the CMC
8 thing was going to go on so long and that
9 could certainly affect the ability to rent
10 out the pavilions if there is not adequate
11 parking for the people who are renting them,
12 and even also, again, just being up there
13 during the day I know that -- I think that
14 it wasn't clarified what parking lot they
15 are talking about, but I think it's the one
16 going down to the Davis Trail that's packed
17 every day, but I know they also used the --
18 it's very difficult to find a parking space
19 in the one by the museum during -- you know,
20 during the week, and all of the events up
21 there, is there going to be adequate parking
22 for people to actually enjoy what is
23 supposed to be our park, so I hope you will
24 look at that, and certainly that \$4 fee, I
25 mean, I know people that go up to visit

1 parents at, you know, at noon on their lunch
2 hour and then they come back and that's
3 eight bucks a day, so that's a little bit
4 too much.

5 And just one point on those RACP
6 grants, it's not the face value, the \$4.5
7 million and then now apparently the Chamber
8 at 3.5, that is all borrowed money. That is
9 money that is being borrowed in a bond, and
10 so we have to pay -- we, the taxpayers, have
11 to pay back not just that 3.5 principal, but
12 one boatload of interest on top of that, so
13 while these private individuals get the
14 benefits once again we get stuck with debt,
15 so the rest I'll bring up next week. Thank
16 you.

17 MS. EVANS: Thank you. I just
18 wanted to add though with regard to the
19 parking issue, the meters, the on-street
20 parking program, is a revenue of the City of
21 Scranton and the City of Scranton pays the
22 enforcement officers and all employees who
23 are in any way connected to the on-street
24 meter program. So, in fact, I would think
25 if the city decides to go with a Saturday

1 enforcement program as well that it can and
2 should be done because the Parking Authority
3 has actually no authority over that. That's
4 the city's income, we are paying the
5 employees to do that job, we pay for the
6 meters, etcetera.

7 MS. SCHUMACHER: But then that
8 changes the assumptions because now you got
9 to pay an employee or somebody overtime, so
10 it does add a cost which detracts, so but --

11 MS. EVANS: We have greater than
12 that with Mr. Scopelliti.

13 MS. SCHUMACHER: Hopefully I'll get
14 those assumptions.

15 MS. EVANS: Mr. Morgan.

16 MR. HUGHES: If I could, Madam
17 Chairman?

18 MS. EVANS: Yes.

19 MS. HUGHES: Just to respond about
20 the library.

21 MS. EVANS: Yes, please.

22 MR. HUGHES: Council's function is
23 legislative. We adopted -- not "we",
24 council adopted the resolution and enacted
25 it to dissolve the authority. It's up to

1 executive branch to follow through. I
2 attempted to file the papers with the
3 Department of State for the dissolution,
4 however -- I even paid the fees, they were
5 returned to me to file them, and they have
6 to be done by whoever incorporated the
7 authority, which is the City of Scranton, so
8 the mayor's office has never done that.

9 I did negotiate leases between --
10 the one thing about them dissolving the
11 authority was that the authority wanted a
12 lease between the City and the Scranton
13 Public Library, actually, the Board of
14 Trustees of the library that were formed
15 under the Albright Trust, the leases were
16 negotiated for the three properties.

17 As I remember it, and I'm going back
18 over close to a year, one of the
19 requirements of the lease was that the --
20 that the trustees would pay all of the
21 insurances at amounts requested by the city.
22 It came down to the point where I have had
23 the leases drafted in final form, they were
24 out for execution, the trustees refused to
25 sign the lease and right after that the

1 deeds had not -- were not recorded from the
2 city to the authority. Immediately after
3 that they recorded the deeds, so council has
4 no control over this, it's up to the mayor
5 to take the action. Everything has been
6 done by ordinance that the authority has
7 been dissolved. The only thing that is
8 required right now is the actual filing of
9 the Articles of the Dissolution with the
10 Department of State and it would dissolved.
11 That's totally up to the mayor, not the
12 council. As I said, I tried to file, but
13 they why rejected since council did not --
14 even though we approved the authority it was
15 filed by the solicitor's office, it's up to
16 the solicitor's office and not council.

17 MS. EVANS: Mr. Morgan?

18 MR. MORGAN: Thank you. You know,
19 I'd just like to say that two previous
20 speakers came up here and I really agree
21 with what Mr. Bolus said about the meters
22 and about the Griffin Pond Animal Shelter
23 and I think everybody should make
24 contributions to them, you know, all of the
25 communities in the county, I think they

1 fulfill a very important role here.

2 And the other thing I have is
3 Mr. Sbaraglia, I agree with what he said. I
4 do have your plan for the Scranton Lace
5 Works here and I think it's time to table
6 this. I think that's going take the
7 Scranton Lace the wrong way, that's my
8 opinion, and I really would like to see that
9 redeveloped. I had a conversation with
10 Mr. Austin Burke about that when the
11 discussion was spinning about the KOZ's. I
12 think that there needs to be a lot more
13 consideration giving to the effects of this
14 project proceeding forward.

15 I think we have to really look at
16 what's happening in the community, we have
17 taken the Connell building, we are making
18 living units out of that, we're allegedly
19 going to take the Chamber of Commerce
20 building across the street, we are going to
21 make living units out of that.

22 There is going to be units for the
23 same thing here. It's a 500,000 square foot
24 project, you know, I have read most of it
25 and my point is, you know, we keep talking

1 about revitalizing neighborhoods, well, if
2 we take hundreds and hundreds of people out
3 of the neighborhoods who is going to live
4 there. Are we going to sustain the downtown
5 that way? Is that the way we are going to
6 sustain downtown? Are we going to take a
7 building that has the ability to be a small
8 business, light industry incubator in the
9 city and turn it into housing units and who
10 is going to pay that rent? You know, a lot
11 of these are subsidized whether it's the
12 Finch Center or many others, it's all
13 subsidized by the tax base, and then you see
14 what the federal government is talking
15 about. The federal government is talking
16 about the collapse of the bond market in the
17 next year or two, and then we are talking
18 here, your solicitor just talked about
19 authorities and the inability to abolish
20 them, are we going to create more
21 nightmares?

22 I think this is a very important
23 structure, I think it should be saved, ut, I
24 think we need to consider what's around it.
25 It's light industrial. There is a

1 manufacturing plant right across the street.
2 I don't think there is another building with
3 the capabilities this building possesses in
4 this city at this time. I don't think there
5 is a building in this city that can carry
6 the weight load these floors are rated at,
7 and I just think that we keep giving people
8 money and then we keep talking about how we
9 are going to help people in our
10 neighborhoods.

11 You know, I had a discussion with
12 one of the people who comes here regularly
13 this afternoon when I was outside waiting
14 for, you know, council and asked him, you
15 know, what he thought his opinion was about
16 blight in the neighborhoods and if his
17 neighborhood is getting better and he
18 doesn't think so, and to be honest with you
19 I think most people don't, but if we take
20 all of the residents off the neighborhoods
21 who is going to live there?

22 You know, everybody is talking about
23 so many things. Everybody is against SAPA,
24 okay, but we are going to take something
25 that could be a business incubator and, you

1 know, Mr. Rogan, you are talking about
2 increasing revenue. I don't know, you know,
3 what would -- what would 5,000 jobs there,
4 what kind of revenue would that give you if
5 you had an incubator that there employed
6 5,000 people in three shifts? You know,
7 let's start talking common sense here.

8 I think Mr. Sbaraglia and many
9 others have talked about how it's always
10 public money. I don't -- to be honest with
11 you, when is money going to go into these
12 neighborhoods. I am watching South Side
13 just be decimated. I mean, I'm watching
14 them rip houses down continually, and I
15 really don't see any revitalization to be
16 honest with you taking place on any large
17 scale. We have heard about this corridor,
18 we are going to do this or that initiative,
19 but the truth of the matter is the
20 neighborhoods are suffering and there hasn't
21 been any real change and we keep giving
22 money to special interests and what I'm
23 asking this council to do is table this.

24 I think that we continually talk
25 about the amount of debt that the City of

1 Scranton is under and then on an unrelated
2 issue, the CMC situation, why aren't we --
3 they have shuttles so is it possible for
4 them to use the parking garage across from
5 the Hilton? I mean, can't we put them into
6 one of our parking authority garages
7 temporarily?

8 Because I think, Mrs. Evans, you
9 talked about a lack of parking in the
10 neighborhoods and then we are talking about
11 revenue from meters, and I just think the
12 they have the -- they have a beautiful
13 parking lot right adjacent to Nay Aug Park.
14 I just think, you know, let them use their
15 shuttles and utilize our garages and maybe
16 it might cost them a little money. Thank
17 you.

18 MS. EVANS: Thank you. Les
19 Spindler.

20 MR. SPINDLER: Good evening,
21 Council. Les Spindler, city homeowner and
22 taxpayer. Did somebody forget to pay the
23 heating bill this month, it's a little
24 chilly in here.

25 MS. EVANS: I do wonder.

1 MR. SPINDLER: For the last month or
2 two I have noticed activity at the Mt.
3 Pleasant Corporate Center. There is a
4 trailer there like at construction sites and
5 I notice some heavy equipment and a concrete
6 truck there a couple of days, dump trucks
7 there, and this has been going on for like a
8 month or two now. Does anybody know is
9 something actually going to be built there?

10 MS. EVANS: I don't know.

11 MR. LOSCOMBE: We are not privy to
12 that.

13 MR. SPINDLER: It sure looks like
14 that.

15 MR. ROGAN: Hopefully.

16 MR. SPINDLER: I saw a machine
17 digging there one day and then it was a
18 concrete truck, maybe they're pouring a
19 foundation, but I don't know. It sure looks
20 like a construction site which is good news.
21 I hope something is going to be built there.
22 You can see it right off the expressway as
23 you are going down into the city. It's way
24 in the back on the left-hand side.

25 Moving on, Mr. McGoff, for years

1 Chris Doherty was giving out contracts
2 without being bid and all of a sudden you
3 want the StreetSmart program put out to bid.
4 It's amazing how all of those years when the
5 mayor was putting out these contracts you
6 didn't say anything about putting them out
7 to bid and now all of a sudden you want this
8 parking program out to bid. It makes me
9 scratch my head and wonder why.

10 I brought this up last year, the
11 mayor plugged in \$5 million that we were
12 supposed to get from the tax office in last
13 year's budget and when I asked Mrs. Evans I
14 think you said we got three million of that?

15 MS. EVANS: That's an approximation.

16 MR. SPINDLER: And I think you told
17 me Mr. Courtright is looking into the other
18 \$2 million? I asked him what happened.

19 MS. EVANS: I think it might have
20 been closer to \$1.5 million.

21 MR. SPINDLER: Okay, but if we
22 didn't receive that how is that -- how is
23 that -- how was that \$1.5 million filled in
24 with the budget if we didn't receive that?

25 MS. EVANS: Exactly.

1 MR. SPINDLER: Maybe we could ask --
2 send a letter to the mayor and ask him that
3 because he keeps questioning all council's
4 ways of raising revenue and I'd like to know
5 what happened to that money that he had
6 plugged into the budget.

7 It's been brought up before about
8 since Chris Doherty has been this office he
9 just lied and lied and lied. He said he was
10 going to be the sixth councilman, we all
11 know what happened there. He said he was
12 going to get us out of distressed status, we
13 are still in distressed status after like 18
14 years. He is shutting down engine
15 companies, during the last election he said
16 he would not close firehouses. Well, he is
17 not closing firehouses, but he is closing
18 engine companies which is almost the same
19 thing in my eyes. He is putting people's
20 lives in danger, and you know what, I called
21 the mayor, I can't believe people aren't up
22 in arms about this. People all over the
23 city should be calling his office, knocking
24 on his door to see him, I just hope it
25 doesn't take a tragedy for people to wake up

1 in this city and call this mayor and tell
2 him not to close all of these engine
3 companies. You know, the people's safety is
4 number one in my eyes. So I hope people
5 wake the heck up and get with the program.

6 A coworker today told me that she
7 went to put on ECTV at 8:00 Sunday night to
8 watch a replay of the meeting, the meeting
9 wasn't on. Now, I think we should be
10 showing more replays and it seems like ECTV
11 is cutting back on them. There is supposed
12 to be a replay at 8:00 Sunday night, she
13 said she put it on at 9:00 it still wasn't
14 on.

15 MR. ROGAN: Every time I turn on
16 ECTV it keeps scrolling by and has our
17 e-mail addresses and, you know, a couple
18 other announcements, but that's it. There
19 is hardly any programming.

20 MR. SPINDLER: That's what she said
21 was on Sunday night, just the regular
22 scroll, and I said in the past I hope
23 council looks into taking proposals from
24 other people who want to run this channel
25 and get somebody else in there.

1 I agree with what Mr. Quinn said
2 last week when Councilman Joyce asked
3 Mr. Scopelliti a question and Attorney Kelly
4 said, "We are not here to answer questions."

5 Well, what were they here for? Did
6 they just want to ask the questions, they
7 didn't want any asked of them? I don't
8 think that's right. If they were here they
9 should have answered any questions that was
10 asked of them. What are they trying to
11 hide? It seems like this administration has
12 been hiding things for nine years now.

13 And as far as the garbage fee, as
14 other speakers have said, we are paying
15 taxes, I think our taxes should go towards
16 collecting garbage and I don't think this
17 fee is right and if they could charge a
18 garbage fee, as Mr. Bolus has said, charge
19 KOZ's, charge the nonprofits, everybody
20 should be paying this, not just the normal
21 taxpayers, they are struggling. And that's
22 all I have tonight. Thank you for your
23 time.

24 MS. EVANS: Thank you. Ron Ellman.

25 MR. ELLMAN: Hello, Council.

1 MS. EVANS: Good evening.

2 MR. ELLMAN: Ronnie Ellman, member
3 of the Taxpayers' Association. Oh, well,
4 before I get everybody alienated at me again
5 I want to say nobody that ever stood in this
6 spot wants you guys to be more successful
7 than me. Sometimes I just don't how to say
8 something in the right way and I might
9 offend you, but I certainly don't mean to.

10 You know, I asked somebody this
11 morning why the Chamber of Commerce building
12 hasn't been brought to the assessor's office
13 because that statement says something like,
14 in fact, I'll read it, the statement says
15 they would not discuss the purchase price.
16 Somebody jokingly told me that all they are
17 doing is killing time so they can cover up
18 that part and let the taxpayers suffer like
19 everything that we encounter in this
20 administration and that seems to make sense.

21 Right now they said they are going
22 to spend six, seven million dollars. When
23 they get a building permit you will see how
24 much it will be. It will end up just like
25 Lackawanna College building and the Medical

1 School building, they lessen everything
2 where the city gets beat out of money and
3 all of these multi-millionaire concerns are
4 ahead. Your own budget shows there is not
5 enough money for what Mr. Doherty says is
6 spent in the city on all of these building
7 plans, you know, it's got to be one way or
8 the other, and it's the other for the city.
9 They are spending all of this money, but
10 when it comes to paying for it, it's like
11 Austin Burke having a \$19 permit on that \$33
12 million dollars project he wanted.

13 You know, I still have people ask me
14 why you've never done nothing about the two
15 or three houses on that 1500 block court
16 that were made KOZ's. This is just
17 inexcusable that houses in a residential
18 neighborhood were made KOZ's. You need
19 money, why don't you go after people like
20 that? Paul Mansour hasn't done nothing in
21 13 or 14 years except his property has come
22 up in value. That's as phony as it comes
23 that Lackawanna Institute, hasn't done a
24 thing to the Woolworth House or nothing.
25 That's why he is supposed to -- that's what

1 he got it for. Look at all of the -- it's
2 just KOZ's that aren't KOZ's like the houses
3 out there on Keyser Avenue, you know. The
4 city is just beat out of millions of
5 dollars.

6 Now, Jack, don't get mad at me, but
7 I don't know how many business people you
8 have talked to, but I was told right here on
9 my -- I was -- on this little napkin from my
10 lunch last Thursday what a lawyer said. He
11 said that you need to go down and see
12 Mr. Rinaldi and ask if he wants to have ten
13 times as many tickets and go down Spruce and
14 Adams and Washington and talk to business
15 owners. This is a bad idea. We put in
16 parking meters in 2009, now we are going to
17 disregard them. We are not going to do
18 without any pensions, we are still going to
19 have six salaries. You know, all of the
20 benefits they have, we are still going to
21 have a truck they use. In fact, you need
22 all of these people to implement this new
23 plan. All we are doing is assuming more
24 expense with it. It's not -- it's not
25 thought through. You know, you talk for

1 five or ten minutes about the merits that
2 they told you, but you hadn't talked to the
3 business people.

4 Let me tell you something, I don't
5 know, before they tore down the new piece
6 of the courthouse, I come downtown and I
7 parked, I parallel park there and the meter
8 was expired and I looked up and down the
9 street there wasn't no meter maid. I mean,
10 I could see no meter maid. I went across
11 the street to Mr. Powell's office and
12 dropped off an envelope of receipts and I
13 come back and I had a ticket. Now, that's
14 diligent. The paper right here says they
15 are not being diligent, and I still didn't
16 see a meter maid, but if you wanted to --
17 instead of spending all of money tell the
18 people we got to write ten times as many
19 tickets. We won't have to spend a small
20 fortune that you guys are talking about.

21 You know, to change the subject, I
22 was talking to Mr. Santoli Friday I think
23 and he told me something I didn't know, we
24 have three or four grants to plant trees
25 with and he says every time he cuts down a

1 tree they plant two, you know, not
2 necessarily right there, but I didn't know
3 that and I thought that was great because he
4 and I are at odds all of the time about him
5 cutting down so many trees.

6 I was in Allentown this weekend and
7 I was in a restaurant talking to a young guy
8 that worked in Harrisburg, I don't know what
9 he did, he worked for the city and the state
10 or something in Harrisburg and he said
11 Scranton is a joke up there. That's
12 terrible that this city is known like that.
13 I mean, that's exactly the words he said. I
14 don't know how we can overcome such a name,
15 but we got such a bad name with people in
16 the state, you know?

17 MS. EVANS: Well, thank you,
18 Mr. Ellman.

19 MR. ELLMAN: Thank you. Is my time
20 up?

21 MS. EVANS: Probably about two
22 minutes ago. Is there anyone else who cares
23 to address council?

24 MR. ANCHERANI: Good evening.
25 Nelson Ancherani, resident and taxpayer,

1 recording secretary of the FOP.

2 MS. EVANS: Good evening.

3 MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

4 MR. ANCHERANI: First Amendment
5 Rights. Not much tonight. I see
6 Mr. Loscombe is checking on the parking
7 problem around Carmando's at ST. Ann's and
8 Main, Landis and Main ever since they put
9 the new lights in there. I just want to
10 bring your attention that traffic stops for
11 a red light on St. Ann's or Landis Street to
12 enter South Main wait at times during
13 morning traffic, work traffic, traffic in
14 the evening, okay, it seems like it's two
15 minutes for the light to change, and on many
16 of those occasions traffic traveling South
17 Main, north and, south directions for north
18 and south the traffic is light. Any help or
19 relief that you could get for the people in
20 that area, the neighbors, the residents, the
21 visitors, would be greatly appreciated.

22 Also, I see that the city received
23 \$47,000 in donations for the Christmas
24 lights. That's great. That's very good. I
25 believe that the PPL electric bill was

1 evening, I have something else that I would
2 like to address, I did say that to the
3 benefit of a lot of people where I'm going
4 to start on that.

5 Since my appearance here two weeks
6 ago, I have received e-mails, letters, and
7 phone calls that were voluminous in nature
8 and copious in caveat-laced content which
9 volume compels me to respond. Not
10 surprisingly, most of the caveats urged that
11 I proceed very carefully while others warned
12 that I better not proceed at all. The
13 former I can comply with by very carefully
14 insuring that my facts are all true and
15 correct, the latter simply falls on deaf
16 areas.

17 When so many people communicate to
18 me how upset they are because I'm going to
19 name corrupt judges and lawyers that
20 imposition is intrinsic to processing how
21 corruption has imported itself as the rule
22 and not the exception in this area. It
23 invites discussion of how this area became
24 so corrupt and how it stays that way which
25 the population needs to hear because there

1 is something very, very wrong in this little
2 part of the world.

3 Where Mayor Doherty provoked me into
4 politics six years ago, I created
5 DohertyDeciet.com and the pursuit of all
6 things corrupt was on. Two years into my
7 pursuit, my view was that the mayor was the
8 cancer of this city and that I regarded him
9 with no mercy. I repeatedly pummeled him on
10 the Internet, all of which was
11 well-deserved.

12 However, four years into peeling off
13 layer after layer of our political
14 structure, my view has changed. I view the
15 mayor as a puppet, merely a symptom of the
16 cancer and not the cancer itself. The media
17 which imposes upon us a 1935 version of
18 journalism that supports oppression,
19 conceals corruption, and manipulates
20 elections with no shame whatsoever replaced
21 the mayor as the cancer in this city.

22 However, six years later my
23 experiences in politics have painfully
24 graduated me to the realization of what the
25 real and only cancer is in our area, which

1 is the people who live here. They do the
2 voting. It's not everyone, but there is a
3 small percentage of people wanting on this
4 government that they strive to get it, but
5 when 70 percent of the voters stay home on
6 election day and machines corrupt candidates
7 will do well and this area will continue to
8 suffer with them.

9 For every political cancer there is
10 political chemotherapy available. The
11 cancer this area suffers from it's very own
12 people can and will be cured, which this
13 happens to be on my list of things to do
14 this year.

15 The moral of the story is if we can
16 understand how this area became so corrupt
17 then we can fix it. We must stop looking
18 only at elected officials as the cancer and
19 look at ourselves, the electors of these
20 pro-politicians as the cancer because that's
21 the absolute truth of it.

22 As understandable as apathy may be,
23 we are the enemy onto yourselves when we
24 stop voting and we stop organizing ourself
25 to vote for who the right person is to lead

1 our government. This will not be an easy
2 task, the people need a leader to ensure the
3 process begins and that the process stays on
4 course. That person stands before you.
5 Once this plan is put into effect, the
6 voting numbers will rise and we will rid
7 ourselves of these corrupt politicians one
8 by one as we have been doing over the last
9 several years now if you notice we are on a
10 little bit of a roll, so that eventually
11 their staunch and arrogant supporters can
12 stop threatening that I better not speak.

13 To those people who have threatened
14 me and my family for fear of what I will say
15 related to the courthouse, I say to you that
16 you can be assured that your fears are very
17 well-placed and I will see you next week and
18 I will begin my presentation on the
19 corruption at the Lackawanna County
20 Courthouse. Thank you for your time.

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

23 MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening. Dave
24 Dobrzyn, member of the Taxpayers' --

25 MS. EVANS: Good evening.

1 MR. DOBRZYN: --- resident of
2 Scranton. I'd also like to mention the
3 changing the taxes to fees as a possible
4 advantage because we get so little, we can't
5 charge the trash fee, for instance, on or
6 income tax, but we get so little out of our
7 income tax as a rebate that if you spread it
8 around it might be a little exponentially
9 better than paying a tax where everybody
10 doesn't pay.

11 On Balding, did we get a chance to
12 look at that?

13 MR. ROGAN: The video?

14 MR. DOBRZYN: Yes.

15 MR. ROGAN: No, I'm going to watch
16 it tonight after the meeting for sure.

17 MR. DOBRZYN: And if you can, I will
18 try to get another copy, I think Janet has a
19 copy, pass them around.

20 MR. ROGAN: Yeah, I'll pass it
21 around after I watch it.

22 MR. DOBRZYN: Yeah. We take an
23 awful lot of heat with the taxes for the
24 city and in reality school districts are way
25 higher, way higher in the city.

1 And I would just like to mention
2 everything possible to preserve fire
3 stations and public safety that -- somebody
4 just seems to insist on going about life
5 like you people don't exist. It would be
6 lovely if you could take them to Court for a
7 change.

8 On these audits, is it my
9 understanding that they're constantly late
10 because different authorities don't
11 cooperate or turn in their information on a
12 timely basis or --

13 MR. LOSCOMBE: That seems to be
14 pretty much it.

15 MR. DOBRZYN: That's what it is.
16 Well, if we could do anything, you know, you
17 people are only in here one year, but
18 anything we can do to speed those people up
19 or light a fire under their butt, you know,
20 it would be great because I don't know how
21 anything can ever can get done with planning
22 with an audit when you are looking at an
23 audit two years back, you know, it just
24 seems to me like it's nearly impossible, you
25 practically have to throw the book out and

1 start all over when the audit come in.

2 Okay, on this Griffin Animal
3 Shelter, Marie asked me, this is her little
4 project, if you go to Pepsi.com and go to
5 Refresh Project 50K category, and you could
6 vote for the Griffin Pond Animal Shelter and
7 get a \$50,000 grant from Pepsi Cola, so if
8 anybody out there in TV land would like to
9 help and likes animals and would like to see
10 them dealt with on a nicer basis that these
11 shelters can afford to keep them for
12 adoption instead of euthanizing and so
13 forth, that's where you go Pepsi.com and
14 Refresh; am I right there, Marie?

15 Well, this week on the golden parrot
16 we have two golden parrot awards, one is for
17 Evergreen Industries in Massachusetts, they
18 took \$47 million in subsidies and tax relief
19 and so forth and they are a solar industries
20 technology company and they moved to China,
21 so thank you, Evergreen Industries, you get
22 the golden parrot.

23 And I just heard this on the news,
24 it's very disturbing, the banks that were
25 given Tarp funds and so forth for all of

1 this trouble housing, they are tossing
2 servicemen into foreclosure that are on
3 active duty. These people are maybe like
4 reservists and so forth, they get called up,
5 they are not working their normal job, they
6 only have the military salary and they are
7 over in Iraq or they are over Afghanistan
8 taking bullets and these lovely banks are
9 tossing them out of their homes. Isn't that
10 wonderful? They get the golden parrot, too.
11 They get the super duper golden parrot this
12 evening. Thank you and have a good night.

13 MR. ROGAN: Is there anything else
14 who would like to address council?

15 MR. SLEDENZSKI: Last one, Pat.
16 Always the last one.

17 MR. ROGAN: Chrissy.

18 MR. LOSCOMBE: Chrissy.

19 MR. SLEDENZSKI: Always the last
20 one, Jack. Hey, Jack, Dunkin Donuts on
21 Luzerne Street, Jack, I'll tell you right
22 now, it's the best in the city. Go for
23 coffee over there, I'm telling your right
24 now, go for coffee over there. It's the
25 best in the city. Thank you.

1 MR. LOSCOMBE: All right, Chrissy?

2 MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else.

3 MS. KRAKE: 5-A. MOTIONS.

4 MS. EVANS: Councilman McGoff, do
5 you have any motions or comments?

6 MR. MCGOFF: Yes, please. Just to
7 reiterate, I think it would be appropriate
8 if we had a caucus with someone associated
9 with the development at -- the redevelopment
10 at the Lace Works. I think it's a great
11 project, any time that there is that sum of
12 money that is coming into the city and that
13 will employ that many people and I think
14 it's good, but I think also that -- it's
15 also -- it's been a good thing to bring
16 people in and at least have them explain
17 what the projects are and where the money
18 will be spent and how it will be spent.

19 So hopefully we can do that in the
20 near future, and just to respond I don't
21 think it's appropriate to table this
22 legislation at this time. I think it's
23 something that needs to go forward, but I
24 also think I would like to certainly hear
25 from someone.

1 MS. EVANS: I would agree. I would
2 agree with you, Councilman McGoff, and I
3 ask, Mrs. Krake, if you could please
4 schedule a caucus with Lace Affiliates,
5 L.P., and Ms. Aebli as soon as possible.

6 MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. Second,
7 there has been some talk about the Griffin
8 Pond Shelter and I know that in the budget
9 we designated a certain amount of money, I'm
10 not sure what that amount was at this time,
11 but I would like to see if we are going to
12 give money to the Griffin Pond Shelter that
13 there be some type of agreement between the
14 city and the shelter, a written agreement.
15 I know we have, you know, argued over
16 something like ECTV where there was no
17 written agreement and while, again, I'm not
18 opposed to the money given to the shelter, I
19 think that with a written agreement we have
20 at least some idea of how the money will be
21 spent and maybe a little bit of oversight
22 over how that money is spent by the shelter,
23 I think that would be an appropriate thing
24 to do.

25 MS. EVANS: And I do believe though

1 when the members of the board were present
2 at a caucus of city council they indicated
3 that they were seeking written agreements
4 with municipalities, so I would agree with
5 that and, Mrs. Krake, if we could send a
6 letter to the board and the director of the
7 Griffin Pond Animal Shelter, please,
8 requesting a written agreement with the City
9 of Scranton, and we did actually make a
10 donation for 2011 I believe in the sum of
11 \$37,500.

12 Now, I have read in the paper that
13 Griffin Pond intends to charge \$50 per
14 animal and when we reach our maximum of
15 \$37,500 I believe we be informed and
16 thereafter charged \$50 per animal. Well, if
17 that indeed is going to be the case then I
18 think that is something that has to be
19 included in this agreement and discussed
20 with the city.

21 MR. MCGOFF: Absolutely. Thank you,
22 again. And the last thing, the gentleman
23 was here from the CMC talking about the
24 permit parking, but I think one of the
25 things that we need to look into and the

1 question that I asked him was what, you
2 know -- were those parking garages taxable.
3 They do operate for profit and I think it's
4 one of the things that we need to look into
5 is what is taxable for the nonprofit
6 organizations that exist in the city. I
7 know we talked before about the University
8 of Scranton and whether something like the
9 cafeteria which operates for profit, whether
10 that is taxable or whether the Starbucks
11 that's there is, you know, taxable.

12 These are things that I think need
13 to be looked into and not only what is
14 taxable, but what is being collected from
15 these organizations in terms of tax dollars.
16 I think that there is money out there that
17 should be collected and there are things
18 that should be taxed and they probably can
19 be taxed and maybe that's something that
20 would help improve our revenue stream, maybe
21 not significantly, but at least we would
22 have an idea of, you know, some additional
23 revenue that may be available, and that is
24 all. Thank you.

25 MS. EVANS: And thank you,

1 Councilman McGoff. Councilman Rogan?

2 MR. ROGAN: Yes, thank you. One
3 announcement I forgot to make, the Hyde Park
4 Neighborhood Watch meeting is this Thursday
5 in the basement of St. Pat's at 7:00, and I
6 hope to see many of my fellow Westsiders
7 there.

8 A few comments about StreetSmart, I
9 know it's been brought up week after week,
10 and the administration has said that they
11 are going to put it out to bid. Personally
12 I don't have a problem with it going out to
13 bid, I don't see how -- I don't see a
14 competitor that is going to come in a
15 cheaper price for the same service. If
16 there is I would be the first one to vote
17 for the cheaper proposal and saving the
18 taxpayers' money just s I did in the case of
19 the audit.

20 With the caucus last week Mr. Bolus
21 mentioned this, when Mr. Joyce had questions
22 for Mr. Scopelliti, I had questions for Mr.
23 Scopelliti, and I just find it so strange
24 how soon as he asked that one question that
25 Mr. Kelly basically grabbed the microphone

1 right out of his hand and said, "No, we are
2 not here to answer this."

3 What are they trying to hide?
4 That's my question, and what are they trying
5 to hide from the people. We are just trying
6 to get to the bottom of everything to make
7 sure everything is working properly, to get
8 this new system implemented, to bring in
9 more revenue for the city, decrease the
10 burden on the taxpayers and, you know, it
11 seems this is going to be another battle
12 here just trying to get information.

13 You know, every week we get numerous
14 requests, put them in, and it seems nine out
15 of ten go unanswered. It's just very
16 frustrating at times. On that note I do
17 have a request, it's from resident that the
18 following stop signs are faded and barely
19 readable: The corner of the Price Street
20 and Hyde Park Avenue, Shackler Street and
21 Hyde Park Avenue, and Main Avenue and
22 Pettibone Street. So, Mrs. Krake, could we
23 please forward these to the DPW? And that
24 is all I have for tonight. Thank you.

25 MS. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Rogan.

1 Councilman Loscombe, any comments or
2 motions?

3 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes, thank you. I
4 have a few items. I just want to respond to
5 some of the speakers that were here this
6 evening, Mr. Miller he had a lot of -- made
7 a lot of good points. Again, he was -- he
8 discussed finding other things that we could
9 charge fees on and stuff like that, I think
10 we have mentioned it here before, this body
11 has been actively looking at different ways
12 of generating revenue, but there is legal
13 issues we have to check out first and
14 foremost and that's what we have been doing.
15 It's not something that could be done
16 overnight.

17 Again, I agree with Mr. McGoff as
18 far as the Lace Works, have a public
19 meeting. Anything that's comes into this
20 area to bring jobs and development could be
21 a great thing, but I am very skeptical based
22 on past history here, they are claiming 469
23 full-time jobs. We have been told that
24 previously and seeing them fizzle out, so it
25 would be a good point to, you know, be able

1 to ask some kind of questions when we have
2 the panel here, and basically we just
3 received this tonight, so just to look in
4 our backup we just found out tonight, so we
5 are all in the same level as far as the
6 knowledge of this development, but I do
7 think all of us will be asking some good
8 questions and research it, make sure I think
9 you have witnessed us in this past year that
10 we will do due diligence for all of you, all
11 of the taxpayers.

12 Lee Morgan was concerned about
13 developments like this and the neighborhoods
14 being neglected, again, this council over
15 the past year has turned our focus more
16 towards the neighborhoods with our CDBG
17 funding and different things like that to
18 try and clean up of the blight and, you
19 know, with the inspectors with our rental
20 registration and stuff like that, so our
21 focus is to get back into the neighborhoods,
22 but again, a project like the Lace Works may
23 benefit everybody. I can't say at this
24 point until I find out more about it, so I
25 will be voting to introduce it.

1 Mrs. Schumacher, I apologize if
2 Mr. Miskell didn't get back to you with that
3 e-mail, but I will contact him and he has
4 been very straight forward with anything we
5 ever requested so I'm sure either he lost
6 your e-mail address or he was busy this
7 week. He is traveling all over because of
8 the programs, so I'll make sure he gets that
9 response to you, also.

10 We had a couple of -- and again, we
11 have had a couple of people question the
12 idea of the meter system and at the same
13 time everybody is in favor of supporting the
14 animal shelter. You know, we got this
15 budget and we are stretched pretty thin what
16 was thrown on us. We could forget about the
17 StreetSmart and raise the taxes. How else
18 are we going to pay for the animal shelter
19 and stuff like that? We have tried to look
20 at projects that only benefit all of the
21 taxpayers in this city without coming out of
22 all of the taxpayers' pockets, and that's
23 what this does. This is something that only
24 the users of the meters will pay. It's
25 not -- again, I described it last week, we

1 are not increasing the tickets by 100 a day,
2 it was based on a five-day a week program,
3 we could generate on a six day, I'm going
4 to-- actually I'm going to detail a little
5 bit more in my -- as I get further down
6 here, but I just wanted to address some of
7 the issues that were brought up. Let's see
8 here, and Mr. Ellman was interested in that,
9 also, they apparently have left, but I hope
10 they can hear my response.

11 And I recently read in the
12 Go Lackawanna newspaper about Mayor
13 Doherty's park ideas. You know, parks are a
14 great idea as I have stated before, I'd love
15 to see a park in every neighborhood, but the
16 problem is right now I think the mayor has
17 to take his head out of the sandbox and
18 provide the adequate public safety concerns
19 that the taxpayers deserve, the compliment
20 that the taxpayers deserve. I mean, there
21 will be nobody to police these parking lots
22 -- or playgrounds and to me constitutes that
23 I have spoken to public safety is their main
24 concern right now.

25 I know for a fact Engine 9 has been

1 permanently closed and I know at least one
2 occasion this week Engine 4 next door here
3 at headquarters covering all of these
4 downtown buildings was closed. It may have
5 been closed more than once and this is a
6 disgrace.

7 I believe he is thumbing his nose at
8 the taxpayers I don't know if he is trying
9 to spite us or what, but he has got to get
10 over it. You know, we are all in this
11 together and there is nothing the people in
12 this city deserve more than to be able to
13 sleep at night and we just hope he would
14 take heed and, like I said, take his head
15 out of the sand box.

16 Last week we had a public caucus on
17 the meter technology bidding and we had to
18 have a caucus because apparently our prior
19 caucus either people didn't understand, I'm
20 not talking about the public, I'm talking
21 about the administrative personnel or
22 whatever, did not understand the pictures
23 and the graphs and all of that, so we had
24 another caucus last week. I find it quite
25 interesting that the city administration is

1 apparently showing an interest in a smart
2 meter parking system and wants to suddenly
3 initiate a request for proposals on such a
4 program.

5 The StreetSmart Technology program
6 was presented to business administrator Stu
7 Renda and Scranton parking Authority Bob
8 Scopelliti in person by John Miskell of
9 StreetSmart Technologies on at least two
10 occasions in 2009 along with numerous
11 unanswered follow-up letters, e-mails and
12 phone calls from Mr. Miskell to Mayor Chris
13 Doherty and Misters Renda and Scopelliti in
14 2010. Since that time, they all have
15 decided to ignore a program that would
16 potentially help the Scranton Parking
17 Authority meet it's financial obligations
18 instead of borrowing their way out of debt
19 over the past several years.

20 It wasn't until after our public
21 caucus at our city council meeting January
22 11, 2011, which was attended by our new
23 business administrator, Ryan McGowan,
24 Scranton Parking Authority director, Bob
25 Scopelliti, and Scranton Parking Authority

1 solicitor Paul Kelly that these individuals
2 appeared to be showing an interest in the
3 system that was proposed by city council as
4 a way to generate much needed revenue.

5 I have taken the lead on city
6 council to research ideas for revenue
7 generation in an effort to reduce taxes,
8 maintain our public safety and provide all
9 of the taxpayers of this great city with the
10 quality of services that they deserve and I
11 am happy to say that all of my city council
12 colleagues have played an important role in
13 this process.

14 City council has expressed our
15 intention to initiate a Smart meter program
16 several months ago with ongoing discussions
17 at previous council meetings along with a
18 previous public caucus in early December of
19 2010. During this time, city council has
20 responded to numerous negative articles and
21 editorials by the Times and negative
22 comments by the administration. City
23 council has included a conservative figure
24 of \$300,000 in additional parking revenue in
25 our 2011 amended budget in the anticipation

1 that the administration and the Scranton
2 Parking Authority would welcome the
3 additional annual revenue since the only
4 revenue that was generated in prior budgets
5 were one-time sales of city assets.

6 It took a personal invitation by
7 city council to embarrass these
8 administrative officials to attend our, most
9 recent public caucus with the mayor
10 declining to appear. I do not believe that
11 the administration has had a change of heart
12 and is now willing to work with city council
13 to bring such a program to fruition. On the
14 contrary, I believe this administration is
15 yet again taking efforts to stall yet
16 another budget initiative in an effort to
17 reduce the projected income from such a
18 program as a way to embarrass city council
19 in the hopes that our projected numbers will
20 not be realized.

21 As I stated previously, this
22 administration was aware of this program
23 since at least early 2009. Why didn't they
24 initiate a request for proposals at that
25 time? I am truly a strong advocate of

1 bidding all city services as was evidenced
2 by this city council's ordinance requiring
3 bidding for professional services over
4 \$10,000 to be placed out for bid.

5 However, this particular technology
6 is unique to StreetSmart Technology and as
7 such is exempt from the bidding process
8 according to the city code Section 6-4 (d),
9 Article E, Subparagraph II. I have
10 thoroughly researched the other company's
11 technologies currently on the market and
12 have found none that are on par with
13 StreetSmart Technologies as evidenced by
14 their unique features such a vehicle
15 detection, integrated meter reset, and
16 anti-meter feeding features, and others as
17 spelled out on their sole source
18 justification declaration.

19 I believe that the program as
20 presented by StreetSmart Technologies would
21 provide the accountability and transparency
22 that city council has fought so hard for
23 this past year. If the administration of
24 the city and the Parking Authority are truly
25 interested in the taxpayers' welfare, they

1 will include these items in their request
2 for proposals:

3 Will the bidding companies provide
4 their documented accuracy rate?

5 Will the bidding companies allow the
6 city to test drive their system at no cost?

7 Will the bidding companies install
8 their system with no upfront costs to the
9 city?

10 Will the bidding company system be
11 fully managed by the vendor?

12 Will the bidding companies be able
13 to guarantee 99 percent uptime of their
14 communications network?

15 Will the bidding companies guarantee
16 a minimum 95 percent sensor accuracy rate.

17 Will the bidding companies
18 technology be adaptable to all parking
19 configurations such as parallel, angle or
20 perpendicular parking in a lot, street or
21 garage?

22 Will the bidding companies
23 technology be adaptable to all types of
24 surfaces such as blacktop, brick, concrete,
25 gravel and earth?

1 Will the bidding companies
2 technology have multiple sensor types to
3 work in a variety of environments?

4 Will the bidding companies
5 technology be able to be used on single
6 space meters, multi-space kiosks and even in
7 non meter spaces?

8 Will the bidding companies have an
9 already established integration partnership
10 and history of successful cooperation with
11 Duncan Solutions, the city's current parking
12 equipment vendor.

13 Will the bidding companies
14 technology integrate with Scranton Parking
15 Authority's current Duncan Solutions ticket
16 writing equipment, meter housing and polls?

17 Will the bidding companies
18 technologies be able to transmit all ticket
19 data to the city?

20 Will the bidding companies
21 technologies provide the enforcement
22 officers in the field, service staff and
23 parking managers with realtime data
24 regarding vehicle arrival times, meter time
25 out time and payment amounts?

1 Will the bidding company technology
2 provide Scranton Parking Authority managers
3 and maintenance staff with realtime
4 maintenance alerts and work order generation
5 and tracking?

6 Will the bidding companies
7 technology provide Scranton Parking
8 Authority managers and financial staff with
9 the realtime canister and ticket auditing?

10 Will the bidding companies
11 technology provide complete parking space
12 regarding space occupancy, paid occupancy,
13 length of stay, space and turnover rates
14 24/7?

15 Will the bidding companies
16 technology be able to integrate with other
17 companies parking equipment if the city
18 switches from Duncan Solutions to another
19 vendors?

20 Will the bidding companies
21 technology be able to stream data from the
22 street level to the back end server in under
23 60 seconds?

24 Will the bidding companies
25 technology be synchronized with the United

1 States National Institute of Standards
2 Atomic clock?

3 Will the bidding companies
4 technology utilize optimize power
5 transmitting which is needed to have
6 reliable smart power transmissions to save
7 batteries, but push signals through any
8 electronic noise?

9 Will the bidding companies
10 technology mount flush to street level and
11 not create a potential trip hazard or be
12 prone to damage from snow plowing.

13 Will the bidding companies be able
14 to begin the installation of their system
15 within 45 days after receiving a signed
16 agreement and have the installation
17 complete, commissioned and fully operational
18 within six weeks after the installation
19 begins?

20 Will the bidding company be able to
21 provide on-site training, support, and
22 troubleshoot for the life of the contract
23 without charging additional fees to the
24 city?

25 Will the bidding companies be able

1 to provide 24-hour customer service hotline
2 with no additional fees to the city?

3 Will the bidding companies be able
4 to provide pay by cell service without any
5 additional fees to the city?

6 Will the bidding company provide
7 guaranteed replacement of malfunctioning
8 meters for the life of the contract without
9 charging additional fees to the city?

10 Will the bidding company be able to
11 provide a list of municipalities where there
12 technology is successfully installed and
13 operating?

14 Will the bidding companies provide
15 guarantee that there is no payment due for
16 the system if the gross parking revenue in
17 any month does not exceed the baseline
18 amount as derived from Scranton Parking
19 Authority audits?

20 Will the bidding company provide a
21 realtime interface of the system and it's
22 income it the appropriate administrative
23 officials along with a city clerk?

24 Will the bidding company system
25 provide realtime enforcement alerts

1 integrated to a way finding application on a
2 mobile handheld device directing the
3 enforcement officers to actual parking
4 violations?

5 Will the bidding companies provide a
6 secure web base management and reporting
7 interface to track all meter space status
8 for maintenance, enforcement and occupancy
9 events?

10 And will the bidding companies
11 provide the same level of the service as
12 StreetSmart has provided to their current
13 clients?

14 If all of these features are
15 included in the administration's request for
16 proposals then I will rescind my prior
17 comments questioning the tactics of the
18 administration and accept this new spirit of
19 cooperation between the administration and
20 city council in what will ultimately prove
21 to be a monumental benefit to all tax paying
22 individuals and businesses alike.

23 This letter was sent to the Scranton
24 Times, obviously it's too long to go in an
25 editorial, and I also e-mailed a copy to Mr.

1 Mrozinski, but, you know, anybody could put
2 out an RFP or request for proposal, but the
3 specifics of the StreetSmart Technology far
4 outweighs companies that are out there.
5 That's why they have them, sole source
6 justification. No one has the quality that
7 they have. I mean, again, if they don't put
8 those in a request for proposal I don't know
9 what we are going to get, but I'll make sure
10 we question them pretty well.

11 If another company had this
12 technology, they came in \$100 less, I'd be
13 the first to vote for them just like
14 Mr. Rogan, it's all about saving the city
15 money, but for all of those that are against
16 this it's not costing us a penny. They are
17 doing this upfront, no cost out-of-pocket,
18 no grants, we are not using taxable money
19 for grants or anything like that, it's not a
20 tax, it's a fee on the user and Mr. Ellman
21 said he met a lawyer, well, he should have
22 met somebody else, nothing against Boyd,
23 but, you know, who has some concerns about
24 the issues and all of that, but we should
25 speak to business people.

1 You don't -- the business people
2 before something comes into town like this
3 are going to be up in arms and we are
4 expecting that and we want them to be part
5 of the dialogue. You speak to the business
6 people where it's already in effect and find
7 out from them how it's benefited them and
8 how they have changed their mind, and that's
9 what I have done, and I have seen a positive
10 reflection from these business people. So
11 to say business people here are up against
12 it -- or are against it they have no
13 experience with it yet. The business people
14 that have the experience with it are all in
15 favor of it. It's actually produced more
16 business for them because of the parking
17 turnover, so that's all I have to say on
18 that, and I'm complete. Thanks.

19 MS. EVANS: Good evening. First, I
20 apologize for my absence from council last
21 week. Like so many others in our community
22 I caught stomach virus that was generously
23 passed to me by my husband who suffered with
24 it during the previous days.

25 Next, the parking meter program

1 included in the 2011 amended budget will be
2 put out to bid according to the Doherty
3 administration. I am a strong advocate of
4 the bidding process and I hope this process
5 will determine the lowest responsible bidder
6 and generate new revenue for the City of
7 Scranton while simultaneously providing
8 strict oversight and accountability for
9 parking meter and ticket moneys.

10 The success or failure of the
11 parking meter program rests on aggressive
12 enforcement by Scranton Parking Authority
13 employees and the daily oversight of SPA
14 director of Robert Scopelliti.

15 Mr. Scopelliti's apparent decisions to cut
16 an enforcement employee to fund Mrs. Renda's
17 and Mr. Shield's management positions and to
18 remove each remaining enforcement officer
19 from the street for two hours daily will
20 directly and adversely affect the success of
21 this new revenue program regardless of the
22 bidder selected. The bottom line is that
23 the success or failure of this new program
24 lies in the hands of Mr. Scopelliti and it's
25 aggressive and full enforcement.

1 believe this should be put out to bid and
2 because of time constraints we will be
3 approving this renewal, however, I will not
4 place on this agenda any further brokerage
5 services with Knowles' Associates until the
6 brokerage services and the city's insurances
7 are put out to bid, and that means for any
8 future contracts. Now, Knowles' Associates
9 is certainly most welcome to bid on this
10 contract as are other companies. We are
11 encouraging all at a future date, but there
12 will be no further automatic renewals.

13 Finally, I have citizens' requests
14 for the week". I have read File of Council
15 No. 29 of 1995, an ordinance, as amended,
16 prohibiting truck traffic having a
17 registered gross weight of 10 tons or more
18 on three streets in the Bellevue Section of
19 the City of Scranton, namely, Seventh
20 Avenue, from it's intersection of Lackawanna
21 Avenue to it's intersection of Railroad
22 Avenue. Railroad Avenue from it's
23 intersection of Seventh to it's intersection
24 with Fourth Avenue, and Broadway Street from
25 it's intersection of Railroad Avenue to the

1 west end of the bridge over the Lackawanna
2 river. Mrs. Krake, please forward a copy of
3 this legislation to DPW Director Brazil
4 requesting the immediate installation of the
5 a sign "Trucks over ten tons gross weight
6 prohibited," and the removal of the "Heavy
7 Truck Traffic" sign before the underpass at
8 Seventh Avenue and Lackawanna Avenue heading
9 toward Railroad Avenue in compliance with
10 File of Council No. 29 of 1995, as amended.

11 I know I made this request
12 previously at the January 4 meeting, nothing
13 has occurred in the interim, the sign
14 encouraging truck traffic remains and that
15 is why I wish to point out to Mr. Brazil and
16 his employees that there is, indeed, an
17 ordinance of city law governing the signage
18 at that location and the proper signs are to
19 be installed and the improper signs are to
20 removed.

21 I received a letter from a city
22 resident regarding the Weston Field indoor
23 pool, she states that she and numerous other
24 residents with health issues have enjoyed
25 using this pool for many years. However,

1 traffic signs on both sides of the block
2 while there is another sign posted that
3 states "Two-way traffic." Residents also
4 report that numerous vehicles park against
5 traffic on this one-way street. This is a
6 bus route, a school bus route, and heavily
7 traveled by traffic on route to John
8 Marshall School. Please determine whether
9 this is a one or two-way traffic block, post
10 the appropriate signs, and remove incorrect
11 signs that are causing confusion for drivers
12 and area homeowners.

13 Residents of West Scranton report
14 that the traffic pattern at the intersection
15 of South Main and St. Ann and Landis Street
16 is confusing. Further, they report they
17 cannot access the turning lane to St. Ann's
18 Street because of parked cars. Please
19 forward their complaints to the city
20 engineer.

21 Also, a letter to the mayor,
22 Mr. Brazil and Mr. Dougher, what city pools,
23 if any, will be closed this summer, and
24 that's it.

25 MS. KRAKE: FIFTH ORDER. 5-B.

1 APPROVING THE TRANSFER OF A RESTAURANT
2 LIQUOR LICENSE CURRENTLY OWNED BY DEPE,
3 INC., 108-112 PROSPECT STREET, DUNMORE, PA
4 18512, LICENSE NO. R-14820 TO CARL VON
5 LUGER, LLC FOR USE AT 301 NORTH WASHINGTON
6 AVENUE, SCRANTON, PA AS REQUIRED BY THE
7 PENNSYLVANIA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD.

8 MS. EVANS: At this time I'll
9 entertain a motion that Item 5-B be
10 introduced into it's proper committee.

11 MR. ROGAN: So moved.

12 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

13 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
14 those in favor of introduction signify by
15 saying aye.

16 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

17 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

18 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

19 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
20 have it and so moved.

21 MS. KRAKE: 5-C. CREATING AND
22 ESTABLISHING SPECIAL CITY ACCOUNT NO.
23 02.229598 ENTITLED "PUBLIC SAFETY MANPOWER
24 DONATIONS" TO ACCEPT DONATIONS FROM PRIVATE
25 CITIZENS AND/OR ENTITIES FOR COSTS RELATED

1 TO PUBLIC SAFETY MANPOWER.

2 MS. EVANS: At this time I'll
3 entertain a motion that Item 5-C be
4 introduced into it's proper committee.

5 MR. ROGAN: So moved.

6 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

7 MS. EVANS: On the question? The
8 legislation creating a special city account
9 for public safety manpower donations will
10 allow the city to keep such donations in a
11 separate account. The city will then
12 transfer these funds to cover fire and
13 police salaries as needed. I wish to again
14 thank Mr. Watson H. Cramer, Jr., of Scranton
15 for initiating these donations, for his
16 \$50,000 -- or his \$50 donation, and for
17 supporting the men and women of the Scranton
18 Fire and Police Department.

19 MR. LOSCOMBE: He just had a heart
20 attack. He thought he wrote a \$50,000
21 check.

22 MS. EVANS: Oh, that he did, we wish
23 he did, but we are very grateful for his \$50
24 contribution and for his initiating such a
25 much needed program. All those in favor of

1 introduction signify by saying aye.

2 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

3 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

4 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

5 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
6 have it and so moved.

7 MS. KRAKE: 5-D. ACCEPTING A TWO
8 HUNDRED (\$200.00) DOLLAR CONTRIBUTION
9 FROM CHRISTIAN SCIENCE SOCIETY OF LACKAWANNA
10 COUNTY PRESENTED TO THE CITY OF SCRANTON
11 FIRE DEPARTMENT.

12 MS. EVANS: At this time I'll
13 entertain a motion that Item 5-D be
14 introduced into it's proper committee.

15 MR. ROGAN: So moved.

16 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

17 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
18 those in favor of introduction signify by
19 saying aye.

20 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

21 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

22 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

23 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
24 have it and so moved.

25 MS. KRAKE: 5-E. AUTHORIZING THE

1 MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS
2 TO APPLY FOR AND EXECUTE A GRANT FOR THE
3 REDEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE CAPITAL PROGRAM
4 ("RACP") THROUGH THE COMMONWEALTH OF
5 PENNSYLVANIA'S OFFICE OF THE BUDGET
6 IN THE AMOUNT OF FOUR MILLION FIVE HUNDRED
7 THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$4,500,000.00). IF THE
8 APPLICATION IS SUCCESSFUL, ACCEPTING AND
9 DISBURSING THE GRANT; AND COORDINATING THE
10 USE OF THE GRANT FUNDS WITH THE "LACE
11 BUILDING AFFILIATES, LP", FOR THE PROJECT TO
12 BE NAMED THE "SCRANTON LACE COMPLEX
13 REDEVELOPMENT".

14 MS. EVANS: At this time I'll
15 entertain a motion that Item 5-E be
16 introduced into it's proper committee.

17 MR. ROGAN: So moved.

18 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

19 MS. EVANS: On the question? The
20 Pennsylvania State Office of the Budget
21 oversees this grant. The Lace Affiliates,
22 L.P., must meet strict eligibility
23 guidelines. They will be closely monitored
24 before the state grants it's approval to
25 release any funds. For example, since the

1 project is located in a flood zone, Lace
2 Affiliates must present proof of flood
3 insurance to the state. Thus, the
4 responsibility for proving the project is
5 operating within state guidelines rests with
6 Lace Affiliates, L.P., not with OECD.

7 MR. ROGAN: I would also like to
8 mention I'm looking forward to a caucus next
9 week or the week after, I think from the
10 reading I did this is a great project, the
11 Lace Works has been deteriorating over the
12 last eight years since it's an eyesore it
13 would be good to see it revitalized and get
14 some people in the city back to work.

15 MS. EVANS: I know there have been
16 arrests made at that location as well. It's
17 certainly going to be a boon to the lower
18 Greenridge area if that property can be
19 successfully redeveloped. It is blighted at
20 this time and in addition to that I believe
21 it will be putting many, many individuals to
22 work at a time when unemployment is also
23 much needed in this area. All those in
24 favor of introduction signify by saying aye.

25 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

1 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

2 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

3 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
4 have it and so moved.

5 MS. KRAKE: 5-F. APPOINTMENT OF RYAN
6 MCGOWAN, 735 NORTH BROMLEY AVENUE, SCRANTON,
7 PENNSYLVANIA, 18504 TO THE POSITION OF
8 BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR EFFECTIVE JANUARY 10,
9 2011. MR. MCGOWAN WILL BE REPLACING STUART
10 RENDA, WHO RESIGNED.

11 MS. EVANS: At this time I'll
12 entertain a motion that Item 5-F be
13 introduced into it's proper committee.

14 MR. ROGAN: So moved.

15 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

16 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
17 those in favor of introduction signify by
18 saying aye.

19 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

20 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

21 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

22 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
23 have it and so moved.

24 MS. KRAKE: 6-A. READING BY TITLE -
25 FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 1, 2011 - AN ORDINANCE -

1 AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 6, 1976
2 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED) IMPOSING
3 A TAX FOR GENERAL REVENUE PURPOSES ON THE
4 TRANSFER OF REAL PROPERTY SITUATE WITHIN THE
5 CITY OF SCRANTON; PRESCRIBING AND REGULATING
6 THE METHOD OF EVIDENCING THE PAYMENT OF SUCH
7 TAX; CONFERRING POWERS AND IMPOSING DUTIES
8 UPON CERTAIN PERSONS, AND PROVIDING
9 PENALTIES", BY IMPOSING THE RATE OF THE
10 REALTY TRANSFER TAX AT TWO AND FIVE TENTHS
11 PERCENT (2.5%) FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2011.

12 MS. EVANS: You've heard reading by
13 title of Item 6-A, what is your pleasure?

14 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-A
15 pass reading by title.

16 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

17 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
18 those in favor signify by saying aye.

19 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

20 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

21 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

22 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
23 have it and so moved.

24 MS. KRAKE: 6-B. READING BY TITLE -
25 FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 2, 2011 - AN ORDINANCE -

1 AMENDING FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 11, 1976,
2 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED)
3 ENACTING, IMPOSING A TAX FOR GENERAL REVENUE
4 PURPOSES IN THE AMOUNT OF TWO PERCENT (2%)
5 ON EARNED INCOME AND NET PROFITS ON PERSONS,
6 INDIVIDUALS, ASSOCIATIONS AND BUSINESSES WHO
7 ARE RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON, OR
8 NON-RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON, FOR
9 WORK DONE, SERVICES PERFORMED OR BUSINESS
10 CONDUCTED WITHIN THE CITY OF SCRANTON,
11 REQUIRING THE FILING OF RETURNS BY TAXPAYERS
12 SUBJECT TO THE TAX; REQUIRING EMPLOYERS TO
13 COLLECT THE TAX AT SOURCE; PROVIDING FOR THE
14 ADMINISTRATION, COLLECTION AND ENFORCEMENT
15 OF THE SAID TAX; AND IMPOSING PENALTIES FOR
16 THE VIOLATIONS", BY IMPOSING THE WAGE TAX AT
17 TWO AND FOUR TENTHS PERCENT (2.4%) ON EARNED
18 INCOME FOR THE YEAR 2011 FOR RESIDENTS.

19 MS. EVANS: You've heard reading by
20 title of Item 6-B, what is your pleasure?

21 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-B
22 pass reading by title.

23 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

24 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
25 those in favor signify by saying aye.

1 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

2 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

3 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

4 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
5 have it and so moved.

6 MS. KRAKE: 6-C. READING BY TITLE -
7 FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 3, 2011 - AN ORDINANCE -
8 AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 7, 1976,
9 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED) IMPOSING
10 A MERCANTILE LICENSE TAX OF 2 MILLS FOR THE
11 YEAR 1976 AND ANNUALLY THEREAFTER UPON
12 PERSONS ENGAGING IN CERTAIN OCCUPATIONS
13 AND BUSINESSES THEREIN; PROVIDING FOR ITS
14 LEVY AND COLLECTION AND FOR THE ISSUANCE OF
15 MERCANTILE LICENSES; CONFERRING AND IMPOSING
16 POWERS AND DUTIES UPON THE TAX COLLECTOR OF
17 THE CITY OF SCRANTON; AND IMPOSING
18 PENALTIES", BY IMPOSING THE MERCANTILE TAX
19 AT THREE QUARTERS OF A MILL (.00075) FOR
20 CALENDAR YEAR 2011.

21 MS. EVANS: You've heard reading by
22 title of Item 6-C, what is your pleasure?

23 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-C
24 pass reading by title.

25 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

1 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
2 those in favor signify by saying aye.

3 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

4 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

5 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

6 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed?

7 MS. KRAKE: 6-D. READING BY TITLE -
8 FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 4, 2011 - AN ORDINANCE -
9 AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 8, 1976,
10 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED) PROVIDING
11 FOR THE GENERAL REVENUE BY IMPOSING A TAX AT
12 THE RATE OF TWO (2) MILLS UPON THE PRIVILEGE
13 OF OPERATING OR CONDUCTING BUSINESS IN THE
14 CITY OF SCRANTON AS MEASURED BY THE GROSS
15 RECEIPTS THEREFROM; REQUIRING REGISTRATION
16 AND PAYMENT OF THE TAX AS CONDITION TO THE
17 CONDUCTING OF SUCH BUSINESS; PROVIDING FOR
18 THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF SUCH TAX;
19 PRESCRIBING SUCH REQUIREMENTS FOR RETURNS
20 AND RECORDS; CONFERRING POWERS AND DUTIES
21 UPON THE TAX COLLECTOR; AND IMPOSING
22 PENALTIES", BY IMPOSING THE BUSINESS
23 PRIVILEGE TAX AT THE RATE OF THREE-QUARTERS
24 OF A MILL (.00075) FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2011.

25 MS. EVANS: You've heard reading by

1 title of Item 6-D, what is your pleasure?

2 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-D
3 pass reading by title.

4 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

5 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
6 those in favor signify by saying aye.

7 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

8 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

9 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

10 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
11 have it and so moved.

12 MS. KRAKE: 6-E. READING BY TITLE -
13 FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 5, 2011 - AN ORDINANCE -
14 AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 100, 1976,
15 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED) LEVYING
16 GENERAL AND SPECIAL TAXES FOR THE FISCAL
17 YEAR 1977", BY SETTING THE MILLAGE FOR THE
18 YEAR 2011.

19 MS. EVANS: You've heard reading by
20 title of Item 6-E, what is your pleasure?

21 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-E
22 pass reading by title.

23 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

24 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
25 those in favor signify by saying aye.

1 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

2 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

3 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

4 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
5 have it and so moved.

6 MS. KRAKE: 6-F. READING BY TITLE -
7 FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 6, 2011 - AN ORDINANCE -
8 AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 17, 1994
9 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED)
10 AUTHORIZING THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY
11 OF SCRANTON TO ENACT 'A WASTE DISPOSAL AND
12 COLLECTION FEE' FOR THE PURPOSE OF RAISING
13 REVENUE TO COVER THE WASTE DISPOSAL AND
14 COLLECTION COSTS INCURRED BY THE CITY OF
15 SCRANTON FOR THE DISPOSAL OF REFUSE", BY
16 IMPOSING A WASTE DISPOSAL AND COLLECTION FEE
17 OF \$178.00 FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2011.

18 MS. EVANS: You've heard reading by
19 title of Item 6-F, what is your pleasure?

20 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-F
21 pass reading by title.

22 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

23 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
24 those in favor signify by saying aye.

25 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

1 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

2 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

3 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
4 have it and so moved. At this time I'll
5 entertain a motion that council suspend it's
6 rules and place all of Sixth Order items
7 into Seventh Order for final consideration.

8 MR. ROGAN: So moved.

9 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

10 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
11 those in favor signify by saying aye.

12 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

13 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

14 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

15 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
16 have it and so moved.

17 MS. KRAKE: SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A.
18 FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON
19 FINANCE FOR ADOPTION-RESOLUTION NO. 1, 2011
20 - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
21 APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AND
22 ENTER INTO A CONTRACT, NOT TO EXCEED THE SUM
23 OF TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS, (\$10,000.00), WITH
24 KNOWLES ASSOCIATES, L.L.C., FOR INSURANCE
25 BROKERAGE SERVICES FOR INSURANCE WITH GREAT

1 AMERICAN, CNA, INDIAN HARBOR INSURANCE
2 COMPANY/XL INSURANCE, PHILADELPHIA INDEMNITY
3 INSURANCE COMPANY, ARCH INSURANCE COMPANY
4 AND NAUTILUS INSURANCE COMPANY FOR CITY
5 INSURANCE COVERAGES FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY
6 1, 2011 THROUGH JANUARY 1, 2012 AND TO
7 RATIFY ANY AND ALL ACTIONS AND SERVICES
8 PERFORMED SINCE THE EXPIRATION OF THE PRIOR
9 INSURANCE CONTRACT.

10 MR. LOSCOMBE: I would like to make
11 a motion to amend the coverage for the
12 period by deleting January 1, 2011, through
13 January 1, 2012, and inserting the period
14 January 1, 2011, through June 30, 2011.

15 MR. MCGOFF: Why?

16 MS. EVANS: We have a motion on the
17 floor, is there a second? Second. On the
18 question?

19 MR. MCGOFF: Why?

20 MR. LOSCOMBE: Well, since you
21 asked, Mr. McGoff, you and Mrs. Novembrino
22 last week were insistent on placing
23 contracts out for bid even with companies
24 with a documented sole source justification
25 declaration as witnessed in our meeting. In

1 came across to me as we introduced this
2 legislation last week that our insurance
3 coverage has never been placed out for bid
4 at least in my memory.

5 With this amendment it will give the
6 city a chance to draft a request for
7 proposals, giving the many other qualified
8 insurance brokers in our area an opportunity
9 to perform their due diligence and submit
10 competitive proposals with proper
11 replacement cost coverages on our current
12 structures and a chance to review all of our
13 policies for the best available coverage or
14 the best premium. The bid specifications
15 must not be authored by the current
16 incumbent broker agent, that would be
17 defeating the purpose.

18 In reviewing our current coverages
19 through the proposal as presented by Knowles
20 Associates, it is my belief that several
21 structures are underinsured. I have
22 questions on who is responsible to place
23 coverage on certain structures such as the
24 library buildings which had been deeded to
25 the Library Authority who still maintains

1 the deeds. We have building coverage with a
2 \$25,000 deductible on all schedule
3 structures, including a \$13,000 snack shop
4 at Nay Aug and a \$29,000 clock at Providence
5 Square. We have scheduled equipment with a
6 \$10,000 deductible where only four out of
7 the ten items are actually worth more than
8 the deductible.

9 We have two alternate quotes for
10 public officials and employment practices
11 liability with a spread of nearly \$30,000 in
12 premium. Who is to determine which one to
13 put in force, the broker, the mayor?

14 I believe that the insurance
15 coverage should be reviewed and put out to
16 bid every three to five years especially at
17 this time when we have seen the softening of
18 the market which ultimately benefits the
19 consumers and the taxpayers. We should see
20 a premium reduction of 15 to 20 percent at
21 current coverages over last year.

22 In their defense, the current
23 proposal from Knowles Associates does show a
24 reduction in premium of approximately 10
25 percent over last year. The reason for

1 bidding this coverage out is not solely to
2 reduce the premiums, but rather to have a
3 chance to review the coverages for accuracy
4 by reviewing the scheduled vehicles in their
5 coverages, by reviewing the scheduled
6 structures for proper replacement cost
7 coverage, and reviewing the scheduled
8 equipment for proper coverage and also
9 reviewing all of the pertinent coverages
10 that apply to our municipality.

11 This is exactly one of the services
12 that should be placed out for bid and I
13 would like to quote from an article by
14 Richard Matthews writing for "The Empowered
15 Municipality" which is e-mailed to all of us
16 on a regular basis. "Today we examine the
17 next common sense step on a path to lowering
18 your expenses by putting your property and
19 liability insurance out to bid soliciting
20 alternative quotes. My question to every
21 municipal entity in Pennsylvania remains,
22 can you afford not to at least every five
23 years review your policy coverage, claims
24 history, and how your premium compares to
25 your fellow municipal entities as basic due

1 diligence to your respective community?"

2 I am urging the administration to
3 work in the best interest of the taxpayers
4 who are also the co-owners of the municipal
5 property as previously discussed and to
6 draft proper bid specifications in a timely
7 manner to assure a competitive bidding
8 opportunity to provide the proper insurance
9 coverages at the best premium and to allow
10 interested bidders an opportunity to perform
11 their surveys and acquire quotes in a
12 sufficient amount of time.

13 Now, a little history, we received
14 this legislation on January 4 with a
15 revision on June 10 for coverage beginning
16 on January 1. The proposal was submitted to
17 the city on December 1 by Knowles
18 Associates. As Evans stated before, our
19 backs are against the wall. We cannot allow
20 a lapse in our current coverage. I would
21 suggest that the policies as proposed be
22 implemented for six months with an initial
23 payment to cover the six months, all with
24 the exception of the water slide which has a
25 full earned premium we are going to have to

1 eat that for the year and rebid that next
2 year so we don't lose any of that.

3 But I think it's in the best
4 interest of everyone since there is no
5 incentive for an agent to go out and find
6 the cheapest premiums when they are getting
7 paid a commission on those premiums. When
8 you have competitive bidding there may be
9 brokers out there that have companies that
10 aren't available to this particular broker
11 and I think it would be a benefit to all of
12 us and with the soft market and exactly
13 saving some money and I think part of our
14 reducing the bid scope, the qualifications,
15 I had this definitely in mind at that point,
16 too, as one of the items that we should bid
17 out, and I hope I answered your question,
18 Mr. McGoff.

19 MR. ROGAN: I would say I'm all for
20 bidding things out, the amendment reduces
21 the time from January 12 -- or from January
22 1, 2012, to when?

23 MR. LOSCOMBE: Until June 30. It's
24 a six-month -- we are giving it for six
25 months and the reason for that is, first of

1 all, you know, for an insurance broker to do
2 due diligence he has to go around personally
3 to all of these buildings and come up with
4 his own assessment and it's not something
5 that can be done overnight.

6 MR. ROGAN: I have no problem with
7 that part, but we are not reducing the
8 dollar amount so it could still cost us
9 \$10,000 for six months?

10 MR. LOSCOMBE: I don't know where
11 they are getting that \$10,000 unless they
12 are being paid separately on top of their
13 commission, that's not stated, and I think
14 Attorney Hughes might be able to address
15 that issue?

16 MR. ROGAN: Yeah, because my concern
17 is, you know, it says not to exceed a sum of
18 \$10,000 with Knowles Associates, and then we
19 would just amend it from January 1, 2011,
20 instead of a full year for six months, but
21 if they used up -- if they billed us for
22 \$10,000 for that six months that's --

23 MR. LOSCOMBE: Correct.

24 MR. ROGAN: That's what my concern
25 is because we are not reducing the dollar

1 amount.

2 MR. LOSCOMBE: An insurance broker
3 doesn't bill you, they receive their
4 commissions from the company, that's how
5 they are paid, anywhere from 5 to 12 percent
6 is the norm, so in essence, I mean, the
7 commission on this here is anywhere from
8 \$45,000 to \$100,000. That's well in excess
9 of \$10,000.

10 MR. ROGAN: I'm just worried that --

11 MR. LOSCOMBE: No, after the six --
12 when that -- if those policies are renewed
13 or a broker record after six months if they
14 receive their full commission upfront they
15 would have to be -- they would have to
16 reimburse the company their commission after
17 six months.

18 MR. ROGAN: What I'm trying to say
19 is we are reducing the length of the
20 contract --

21 MR. LOSCOMBE: Correct.

22 MR. ROGAN: -- to six months. But we
23 are not reducing the dollar amount.

24 MR. LOSCOMBE: There really is no
25 dollar amount. That's a nonfact.

1 MR. HUGHES: If I could, if you read
2 the resolution, and what's really perplexing
3 about this is that when it was originally
4 sent down, as Mr. Loscombe stated, and if
5 you compare with the resolution that was
6 originally submitted, it did not have in
7 there anything regarding the amount to be
8 paid, not to exceed the sum of \$10,000, that
9 was not stated in what was originally sent
10 down in January.

11 When council adopted the amendments
12 to the Administrative Code -- or to the Home
13 Rule Charter regarding bidding professional
14 services, that all professional services
15 must be bid, that anything that was under
16 \$10,000 of professional services did not
17 have to bid, so the original resolution in
18 January 4 I believe as Jack said, was then
19 supplemented with the resolution of January
20 11, and the only change was, was not to
21 exceed the sum of \$10,000. There is no
22 contract attached to the resolution.

23 Any time council approves a contract
24 the legislation this comes down from the
25 solicitor's office has the contract attached

1 so you can see what the contract is. This
2 resolution does not attach a contract
3 between the city and Knowles Associates for
4 the payment of any fee. There is no
5 contract. The only thing that's attached to
6 this ordinance is the proposal of Knowles
7 Associates to provide these services
8 allegedly as a professional service which is
9 exempt because it doesn't have to be bid.

10 And as Mr. Loscombe said ordinarily
11 -- or not ordinarily, the custom is that the
12 insurance companies pay the broker his
13 commission so if the city were now to
14 execute a contract with Knowles and pay him
15 \$9,999 he would be getting paid from the
16 city and also getting paid from the
17 insurance companies, but there is no
18 contract attached.

19 However, we are involved, you are
20 painted into a corner because I think the
21 letter stated that the payment had to be
22 received or something January 17 which was
23 yesterday, a legal holiday, under ordinary
24 interpretation it would give us until today
25 because it's a legal holiday, right now the

1 city has to approve this or council has to
2 approve it from the standpoint of providing
3 the insurance because we wouldn't be
4 insured.

5 How Knowles is going to get paid for
6 professional services when there is no
7 contract attached even though we are saying
8 it's authorizing the mayor and other
9 appropriate city officials to execute the
10 contract, there is no contract attached, so
11 by the amendment what we are doing is
12 stating that the insurances will be -- the
13 insurances that are in the proposal are
14 acceptable, the premiums will be paid for
15 six months, and in this time period
16 hopefully the administration would have put
17 our for bid the brokerage contract.

18 In my opinion an insurance broker's
19 contract is not a professional service. It
20 should be bid. Whether it's a dollar or
21 it's \$100,000 that broker is being retained
22 to provide a service, but it's not the
23 professional services that are set forth in
24 the Home Rule Charter, and in order to
25 protect the city I think the amendment has

1 to be approved or that's up to council, but
2 anyway, at least do it for a six-month
3 period in which time between now and June
4 hopefully it would be put out to bid, all of
5 the city's insurance needs and policies
6 would be reviewed and updated and whoever
7 the broker is that submits the best policy
8 with the most coverage for the least amount
9 of premium would get the bid, but there is
10 no contract attached to the ordinance to be
11 signed that we are approving tonight.
12 That's the complexity of the whole thing.
13 It just doesn't make any sense what was sent
14 down.

15 MS. EVANS: Are we to assume it's
16 simply a renewal?

17 MR. HUGHES: I don't know. All I
18 know the proposal of Knowles Associates to
19 place all of this insurance with all of
20 these insurance companies is attached to the
21 ordinance.

22 MS. EVANS: Yes.

23 MR. HUGHES: There is no contract
24 for professional services between the city
25 and Knowles that is being approved tonight

1 even though that's what the ordinance says.
2 What we are doing is approving the proposal
3 to provide the insurance for a period of six
4 months. That's the way that I look at it.
5 I mean, I think if you go back through the
6 history as long as you have been on council
7 you would see that every time an ordinance
8 or resolution comes down for approval to
9 approve a contract that contract is there
10 and that contract is reviewed should the
11 legislation be approved authorizing the
12 approval of contract or should it be
13 amended. That's not here.

14 So it would be my interpretation, my
15 opinion, that what we are doing is approval
16 approving the proposal submitted by Knowles
17 to provide the insurance as submitted in the
18 proposal for a period of six months, but
19 there is no contract for professional
20 services that is really being approved here.
21 It's going from here to Binghamton by way of
22 Pittsburgh, but anyway.

23 MS. EVANS: And you believe, also,
24 this is not a professional service. This,
25 indeed, should be bid.

1 MR. HUGHES: In my opinion it's not.

2 MS. EVANS: And the language that
3 was added by the administration to avoid the
4 bidding process, that language being "Not to
5 exceed \$10,000", I believe that amount of
6 money is paid by the insurance company to
7 Knowles Associates. It's not paid by the
8 City of Scranton to Knowles Associates.

9 MR. ROGAN: Well, my question is --

10 MR. HUGHES: That would be a very
11 interesting point because if Knowles does
12 make, pick a number, let's say his
13 commission is \$75,000, does this mean that
14 he is only collect \$10,000 and the city then
15 is to get a rebate of 65,000 in the premium
16 for Knowles?

17 MR. LOSCOMBE: I believe that was--

18 MR. HUGHES: That could be the
19 interpretation. I don't know.

20 MR. LOSCOMBE: I don't believe the
21 state would allow that.

22 MR. HUGHES: Well, I don't know
23 would his fee then be limited to \$10,000
24 from the insurance companies? I have no
25 idea, but there is no contract to be signed.

1 There is absolutely no contract that's
2 attached to this legislation to pay Knowles.

3 MR. LOSCOMBE: I would just like to
4 add I have nothing against Knowles
5 Associates, I don't care if it's John Doe
6 Insurance, I just think we should have a
7 look at all of our policies based on what I
8 reviewed and go from there and possibly
9 Knowles will have the best deal coming in
10 and that's exactly where I'm coming from.

11 MS. EVANS: And I know Councilman
12 Loscombe does have experience in the
13 insurance industry which is why I asked him
14 to look over this agreement and the city's
15 coverages and he did actually discover that
16 some of our coverages are quite
17 inappropriate, anywhere from inadequate to
18 let us say overinsured, whereby a premium
19 paid by the city -- or not a premium, but
20 the deductible paid by the city would far
21 exceed the worth of the actual structure.

22 Now, these are certainly items that
23 need to be reviewed and corrected, so I will
24 be voting to approve Mr. Loscombe's motion.

25 MR. ROGAN: My concern is that

1 Mr. Hughes mentioned there is no contract so
2 we don't even know what we are getting into?

3 MR. HUGHES: This is really a
4 quagmire from the standpoint that --

5 MS. EVANS: The city has to be
6 insured.

7 MR. HUGHES: The city has to be
8 insured, the insurance companies are
9 demanding their payment I believe between
10 the 17th and the 24th, that the legislation
11 as sent does not have a contract for
12 professional services to be executed between
13 the city and Knowles. All that's attached
14 is Knowles' proposal to provide the
15 insurance with these various companies so
16 that if -- that it would be passed to accept
17 a proposal. Knowles would still get his
18 commission from the insurance companies, but
19 there is no contract here that council is
20 approving to say that we are going to
21 approve the Knowles contract, we are going
22 to pay him \$9,500 and that will approve all
23 of the insurances that he has placed in
24 accordance with his proposal.

25 What we are doing is accepting the

1 proposal to provide the insurance and pay
2 the premiums for six months, but there is
3 nothing here, no contract that's being sent
4 to council for review and approval even
5 though that's what the ordinance says.

6 MR. ROGAN: When I'm reading the
7 backup it says execute -- the mayor and
8 other appropriate officials are hereby
9 authorized to execute and all documents
10 necessary to enter into a contract, so we
11 are voting to allow them to enter into a
12 contract?

13 MR. LOSCOMBE: There is no contract
14 to enter into. We are just voting to cover
15 our insurance for the next six months as
16 proposed.

17 MS. EVANS: In other words, as our
18 attorney said, our back is up against the
19 wall, if we don't approve this we risk the
20 city being without insurance coverage for a
21 period of time and that we know is a risk
22 that it cannot be taken, but the best we can
23 do in the situation we have been placed in
24 by the administration is to shorten the
25 length of the contract and straighten it out

1 in the interim period for those six months.
2 At the same time that coverage continues,
3 the administration should be issuing an RFP,
4 brokers should be responding, inspecting all
5 of the city's buildings and assets,
6 etcetera, and then placing their bids so
7 that by July 1, actually before July 1, we
8 should have that legislation in front of us
9 in the beginning of June so that we can
10 approve a contract at this point effective
11 July 1 through at least the end of the 2011.

12 MR. ROGAN: I understand that, but
13 getting back to my main point, the way I
14 read it, it seems that the city is paying
15 \$10,000; am I wrong?

16 MR. LOSCOMBE: I believe you are
17 wrong, but, you know, the city is capable of
18 anything. They may have a side deal with
19 him. He still getting his commissions.
20 That's governed by state law.

21 MR. HUGHES: I'll try respond to Pat
22 as best I can. The original legislation
23 that was sent down that did not contain the
24 language, it was -- did not contain the
25 language "Not to exceed the sum of \$10,000".

1 If that were not changed, if that were not
2 inserted in there and the original
3 resolution was up for adoption tonight, it
4 would have authorized the execution of a
5 contract with Knowles to provide the placing
6 of the insurance for the city to pay the
7 insurance premiums.

8 If you take out in the ordinance
9 tonight the second line, the middle of the
10 second line, "Not to exceed the sum of
11 \$10,000" that was put into this legislation
12 which was not in the original legislation so
13 the contract would have been with Knowles to
14 provide the insurance, to accept his
15 proposal and provide the insurance and the
16 city would pay the premiums. Where the
17 thing got mucked up, and I don't know why
18 and what caused it unless they said, "Maybe
19 this is professional services and we don't
20 have to bid it now," so it was jam that in
21 there because now it's less than \$10,000.

22 MS. EVANS: It occurred, Attorney
23 Hughes, because I asked the question, "Was
24 this put out to bid and when was the last
25 time," and those questions were then asked

1 of the administration, I believe the city
2 solicitor, the business administrator and
3 rather than getting involved in a bidding
4 process they returned legislation to us
5 containing the new phrase which thereby
6 eliminated in their eyes the need to put
7 this out to bid. They were calling it a
8 professional service saying that it would
9 not exceed \$10,000, therefore, no need to
10 bid this, council approve it.

11 MR. HUGHES: But we know that
12 Knowles cannot provide all of these
13 insurances for \$10,000.

14 MS. EVANS: Exactly.

15 MR. HUGHES: That's what's
16 contradictory and that's why this whole
17 thing is contradictory, it doesn't make any
18 sense.

19 MS. EVANS: Right. But it all
20 happened to avoid the bidding process.

21 MR. HUGHES: It was put in so now
22 the city is going to pay Knowles, the way
23 that this reads even though there is no
24 contract attached, is that he is going to
25 provide the professional service for less

1 than \$10,000, so is the city going to
2 execute a contract and pay him \$10,000, but
3 in the mean time he never would have
4 received that money just would have gotten a
5 commission from the insurance companies that
6 he is placing the insurance with and the
7 city is paying the premiums for.

8 So now it would seem that he is
9 double dipping, that in order to cover it
10 and to say this is a professional service we
11 are going to pay him less than \$10,000 to
12 place all of these insurances and he is
13 going to get the commission from all of
14 these insurance companies for being the
15 broker of record and then the city is going
16 to pay him again for it in order to evade
17 the bidding.

18 MS. EVANS: Might we be best then to
19 after we have voted on Mr. Loscombe's
20 amendment we can amend again to remove the
21 phrase "Not to exceed \$10,000."

22 MR. LOSCOMBE: I was just going to
23 suggest that.

24 MR. ROGAN: Or reduce it to \$5,000,
25 not to exceed \$5,000.

1 MS. EVANS: Or that.

2 MR. LOSCOMBE: Or take it right out
3 like the original proposal. It wasn't in
4 our original proposal.

5 MS. EVANS: In other words --

6 MR. HUGHES: It would revert to the
7 original proposal, so --

8 MR. LOSCOMBE: Correct.

9 MR. HUGHES: So what you have now is
10 that you would have the one motion to amend
11 that's been seconded, if you are going to
12 make that motion so that Knowles would not
13 get paid the \$10,000 that would be a second
14 amendment, then you would vote on the second
15 amendment, the first amendment, and then on
16 the original motion, and then really what
17 you are doing is passing the first ordinance
18 or the first resolution that was sent down
19 on January 4, I don't know the date, but you
20 would be passing -- you would be back to the
21 original ordinance that was submitted and
22 Knowles wouldn't -- there would be no
23 contract executed, you would be approving
24 the proposal and the insurance would be
25 placed for a period of six months instead of

1 one year.

2 MS. EVANS: And we are not risking
3 the city having to pay Knowles at all.
4 Knowles then will be paid purely by
5 commission with the removal of that -- with
6 the removal of that phrase; is that correct?

7 MR. HUGHES: Strictly as a broker of
8 record by the insurance companies; correct.

9 MS. EVANS: Right, so the city -- by
10 removing that language the city will not be
11 in danger of having to pay Knowles
12 Associates any amount of money.

13 MR. HUGHES: That's correct. There
14 is no contract attached. You would be back
15 to the original --

16 MS. EVANS: Yes.

17 MR. HUGHES: -- resolution as sent
18 down by the law department. So then --

19 MS. EVANS: Except for the fact that
20 we would like to make this a six-month
21 agreement as opposed to a one-year
22 agreement.

23 MR. HUGHES: That motion to amend
24 has been made and seconded. There would be
25 another motion in order to delete that

1 language "Not to exceed the sum of \$10,000,
2 (\$10,000)" a second on that, you would vote
3 then on the second motion first to delete
4 the \$10,000, then on Jack's original motion
5 to reduce it to six months, then you would
6 vote on the original motion as drafted, as
7 amended.

8 MS. EVANS: Then I will entertain a
9 motion to delete from Item 7-A the phrase,
10 "Not to exceed the sum of \$10,000,
11 (\$10,000).

12 MR. HUGHES: And that would also
13 include and a now therefore clause starting
14 at the third line, "Not to exceed the sum of
15 \$10,000," end paren. It's stated two
16 places. It's in the caption and it's also
17 in the now therefore clause, so it would
18 delete --

19 MS. EVANS: So my motion will
20 include the "now therefore" clause as well.

21 MR. HUGHES: Correct.

22 MS. EVANS: Is there a second?

23 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

24 MR. ROGAN: My only --

25 MS. EVANS: On the question?

1 MR. ROGAN: On the question, my only
2 concern with deleting that clause "Not to
3 exceed the sum of \$10,000," could it be any
4 number. Could it be \$100,000, a million
5 dollars?

6 MR. MCGOFF: Now you are just
7 allowing them to enter into a contract for
8 any amount.

9 MS. EVANS: It's a possibility,
10 however, it's not paid by the city.

11 MR. LOSCOMBE: When you pay your car
12 insurance or your home insurance, you don't
13 pay your broker or your sales agent it comes
14 out of that premium from the insurance
15 company, that's the way it works. There is
16 a set figure.

17 MR. HUGHES: If I could, I think
18 it's too late and there is too much verbiage
19 and this is jammed -- this should have been
20 probably done in December so it could have
21 been considered. What we are doing is to
22 enter -- it's enter into the contract which
23 I believe is the proposal. That's what's
24 attached to the ordinance is Knowles'
25 proposal to provide all of this insurance

1 with all of these different insurance
2 companies with him as the broker of record,
3 so we are accepting that. That's the
4 contract. That's the acceptance of Knowles'
5 proposal. That's the contract we are
6 entering into. The city is not then going
7 to pay him any money. The money that's
8 going be paid is for the insurance premiums
9 and he as the broker of record will then
10 receive the commission from the insurance
11 companies.

12 And as I said before, this is going
13 from here to Binghamton by way of Pittsburgh
14 the way this whole thing was done. It's
15 very convoluted, but I think that with
16 deleting the \$10,000 that eliminates any
17 contract between the city and Knowles for
18 him to get an additional \$10,000 in addition
19 to the fees that he gets as the broker of
20 the record from the insurance company which
21 really goes back to the original ordinance
22 that was sent down to try to say this is a
23 professional service so we could get around
24 the bidding requirements. Now council has
25 eliminated that, we are approving that for

1 six months, send it out to bid.

2 MR. LOSCOMBE: Exactly.

3 MR. ROGAN: I'm just not --

4 MR. HUGHES: This is like whose on
5 third, your know. Whose on first, I'm
6 sorry. Whose on first.

7 MR. ROGAN: I'm just not comfortable
8 with this. I'm just not comfortable with
9 voting on this right now. You know, I know
10 our back is against the wall, as you said,
11 but there is too much confusion around it for
12 me. I wish we could table it, but I'm not
13 going to vote for this.

14 MR. LOSCOMBE: The problem is --

15 MR. HUGHES: Well, Pat, if I could,
16 the problem with it being tabled is that the
17 city will then be uninsured and --

18 MR. ROGAN: Yeah.

19 MR. HUGHES: And the thing is that I
20 think we have to make the best of a bad
21 situation and to not table it -- or to table
22 it or not to vote on it would make a bad
23 situation worse. I think that with these
24 two amendments if the two amendments are
25 passed and then the resolution is passed we

1 would be back to the original resolution
2 that was submitted by the solicitor's office
3 to council to be passed. It would be
4 identical.

5 MR. LOSCOMBE: There would be
6 coverage as normal.

7 MR. ROGAN: There is still no
8 contract; correct?

9 MR. LOSCOMBE: It's the proposal.

10 MR. HUGHES: I believe that what we
11 are voting on is to authorize Knowles on
12 behalf of the city to enter into the
13 contract with the insurance companies based
14 on the proposals so that the city will be
15 insured. That's the contract that we are
16 entering into with Knowles for him to
17 execute the contracts with the insurance
18 companies as broker of the record and the
19 city will then pay the premiums and he will
20 get his commission for six months only.
21 That's what we are really voting on. That's
22 the contract is to accept his proposal on
23 behalf of all of these insurance companies
24 to furnish the city with the insurance and I
25 know it's as clear as mud.

1 MR. ROGAN: What's that?

2 MR. HUGHES: I said and I know it's
3 as clear as mud.

4 MR. ROGAN: Exactly. I wish we
5 attempted to amend this before Seventh Order
6 then we would have had time to look things
7 over more, but I'm not going to vote for
8 this.

9 MS. EVANS: Okay. We have a motion
10 on the floor to delete the phrase, "Not to
11 exceed the sum of \$10,000" from item 7-A as
12 well as the "now therefore" clause. It's
13 been seconded. All those in favor signify
14 by saying aye?

15 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

16 MS. EVANS: Aye.

17 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

18 MR. ROGAN: No.

19 MS. EVANS: Opposed. The ayes have
20 it and so moved.

21 MS. EVANS: We will now return to
22 the original the motion whereby I believe
23 the legislation would be amended --

24 MR. HUGHES: As amended.

25 MS. EVANS: For the period --

1 deleting rather, January 1, 2011, through
2 January 1, 2012, and inserting the period
3 January 1, 2011, through June 30, 2011.
4 That was seconded. Anyone else on the
5 question? All those in favor signify by
6 saying aye.

7 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

8 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed?

9 MR. MCGOFF: No.

10 MR. ROGAN: No.

11 MS. EVANS: Well, what you have then
12 is the approval of -- well, that motion
13 fails and so now we go back to the original
14 legislation under 7-A; correct?

15 MR. HUGHES: Correct.

16 MS. EVANS: On the question? My
17 concern here is now, frankly, the
18 administration has what it wanted and if
19 council says "no" the city is not insured.

20 MR. ROGAN: Well, I'm not
21 comfortable voting on something that I'm not
22 completely clear on. I don't know why we
23 waited to the last minute to amend it when
24 we could have--

25 MR. LOSCOMBE: You received this --

1 MS. EVANS: Well, you'd have to ask
2 the administration though while they waited
3 until the last minute to submit it.

4 MR. ROGAN: To submit it as well.

5 MS. EVANS: Yeah.

6 MR. LOSCOMBE: Mr. Rogan, I would
7 think you would listen to your -- the advice
8 of our solicitor, I mean, I have some
9 knowledge of it, I thought I explained it
10 pretty clearly. They are -- the only
11 commission they receive is from the policy
12 itself just as your auto and home policy.
13 You don't pay your insurance agent out of
14 your pocket a separate amount, it comes out
15 of your -- it comes out of his commission
16 for selling the policy, that's how this is.

17 They only threw that \$10,000 in when
18 we started questioning the amount for
19 bidding. There is no doubt in my mind that
20 the commissions are far in excess of
21 \$10,000, however, by throwing that statement
22 in they tried to show -- they tried to make
23 us believe that they -- they are not paying
24 him \$10,000. They showed some fees in there
25 which are stamping fees for surplus alliance

1 companies and stuff, had nothing to do with
2 the commissions or anything like that.

3 I am totally confident in the
4 legislation as we amended it with the two
5 amendments that they are not going to make
6 anything other than their commission and
7 their commission is only for six months.

8 MS. EVANS: But right now as the
9 legislation stands it's only been amended to
10 delete that phrase. It has -- it is not
11 amended for a six-month period.

12 MR. LOSCOMBE: Well --

13 MS. EVANS: Well, I think at this
14 point because I don't see how we can leave
15 the city without insurance --

16 MR. LOSCOMBE: Exactly. We had an
17 opportunity to save some money.

18 MS. EVANS: If something were to
19 happen tomorrow with the fire department,
20 with the police department, etcetera, and
21 someone were killed or injured the city then
22 has no insurance and if the city is sued for
23 what occurs at this time the city is going
24 to be the one responsible for coming up with
25 that money and in that instance it could be

1 a multi-million dollar lawsuit, so the city
2 does have to be insured. The city can't
3 even go a 24-hour period, you can't take
4 that risk without having full insurance. I
5 just think it's ashame we won't be able to
6 put this out to bid in six months, but I
7 would say the -- probably the beneficial or
8 the positive side of this is the fact that
9 it will be put out to bid in 2011 for 2012
10 coverage and brokerage services because it
11 will not be placed on the agenda in this
12 manner again. It hasn't been bid in many
13 years as Mr. Loscombe indicated.

14 All municipalities throughout he
15 tell Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are
16 putting insurances out to bid to try to save
17 the taxpayers' dollars, so I can assure you
18 that that will be get done this year and if
19 it shouldn't this is not going to reach
20 council's agenda for 2011. Now, I guess we
21 will take a vote.

22 MR. ROGAN: On the question, I would
23 agree that it should be put out to bid and I
24 would hope that next year when this comes up
25 the administration won't wait until the last

1 minute or we are in a situation like this
2 and I would hope that any amendments that
3 council makes would be made before the final
4 vote on the final day.

5 MR. HUGHES: The only way would be a
6 motion for reconsideration to reconsider
7 that vote again and if Mr. Rogan abstained
8 then the motion would pass, however, I
9 didn't know if he voted for it or if he
10 abstained, but that's the only way you can
11 redo it.

12 MR. ROGAN: I voted "no".

13 MR. HUGHES: Yeah. Well, if you
14 voted "no." If you don't want to --

15 MS. EVANS: I don't quite understand
16 what you are saying now. If he had voted to
17 abstain we could make a motion to
18 reconsider, however, minus that there is no
19 motion to reconsider; is that correct?

20 MR. HUGHES: The vote was taken, it
21 would have to be another --

22 MS. EVANS: A motion made to
23 reconsider.

24 MR. HUGHES: To reconsider that
25 motion to open it up and then vote on the

1 motion again, but that's -- I have no idea
2 what -- if the vote is "no" and if that's --

3 MS. EVANS: Is there anyone willing
4 to reconsider?

5 MR. ROGAN: Like I said, I'm not
6 comfortable with this legislation at all and
7 I don't see the point of reducing the
8 contract term to six months if we are not
9 reducing the \$10,000 to five then we would
10 just strike that term we get rid of that
11 whole part the "Not to exceed \$10,000."

12 MS. EVANS: What if we reduced it
13 to, "No more than a \$1." Not to exceed the
14 sum of \$1."

15 MR. ROGAN: Well, if we are cutting
16 it to six months we should reduce from
17 \$10,000 to \$5,000 if that makes sense.

18 MS. EVANS: Yes, but in order to
19 protect the city and since the city is not
20 paying the commission anyway, the insurance
21 companies are, we can change the verbiage to
22 "Not to exceed the sum of \$1."

23 MR. ROGAN: Are we already past that
24 point in the legislation?

25 MS. EVANS: It's a new motion that

1 can be made. Would you consider that?

2 MR. ROGAN: Sure. I'm thinking
3 about it as we speak. I don't like making
4 decisions last minute. I wish somebody
5 would have called me before the meeting and
6 informed me of these motions, but that
7 wasn't the case.

8 MS. EVANS: Well, you also could
9 have spoken with anyone on council about it.

10 MR. ROGAN: I spoke to Councilman
11 Loscombe earlier before it was put on the
12 agenda that we were talking about some
13 concerns about the deductibles.

14 MR. LOSCOMBE: Correct.

15 MR. ROGAN: We talked about that and
16 then that was the end of the conversation
17 and we agreed that the deductibles were too
18 high on some of the --

19 MR. LOSCOMBE: Right.

20 MR. ROGAN: And I --

21 MR. LOSCOMBE: We discussed this
22 last week.

23 MR. ROGAN: Last week on the phone.

24 MR. LOSCOMBE: Correct.

25 MR. ROGAN: And that was the end of

1 the conversation, I assumed, you know,
2 everyone was fine with the legislation the
3 way it was.

4 MR. LOSCOMBE: It wasn't until late
5 today before we finally got, you know, the
6 amendment together and stuff to be honest
7 with you. I didn't -- I was running late
8 myself, so --

9 MR. ROGAN: Well, that's the thing
10 when you made the motion to amend was the
11 first I heard of it.

12 MR. LOSCOMBE: Okay, but I thought
13 we gave you an educated discussion on what
14 it was about. You know, the way I look at
15 it if you told me something about political
16 science that you are studying or whatever I
17 would have to take your word for it because
18 I don't study political signs.

19 MR. ROGAN: Even Mr. Hughes'
20 explanation, as he said, it's very -- you
21 know, it's not real clear and I don't think
22 it's clear to any one of us what we are
23 voting on tonight here, that's why I'm
24 concerned.

25 MR. LOSCOMBE: The only thing -- the

1 only thing I can say and to try -- and I got
2 it perfectly clear maybe because I
3 understand that business a little bit, they
4 added that comment about \$10,000 to try to
5 avoid this whole scenario where we are
6 putting it out for bid specifically, it was
7 never put in there before, it wasn't in the
8 original. When we started asking questions
9 that's what they put it in there for to try
10 and avoid this. It's incorrect. A broker
11 doesn't usually get paid double, like Mr.
12 Hughes said, double dip. His pay is through
13 commissions. If he sells \$100,000 policy he
14 gets paid his commission on that \$100,000
15 policy. That why I'm saying there is no
16 incentive for a broker that doesn't have any
17 competition or bidding to get the lowest
18 premiums because he makes more money on the
19 higher premiums.

20 MR. ROGAN: So we agree it should be
21 bid out. We agree on that.

22 MR. LOSCOMBE: But we are not going
23 to pay anybody \$10,000 or zero or anything.
24 That's totally irrelevant to be honest with
25 you. They added that in the 10th, our

1 legislation on the 4th did not have that
2 until we requested about bidding and then
3 that's what prompted them to throw that in
4 there to try to throw us off, that's the
5 only way I can look at it.

6 MS. EVANS: And the amendment wasn't
7 produced until today. It was today when I
8 spoke with Mr. Loscombe --

9 MR. LOSCOMBE: And it wasn't until
10 late today.

11 MS. EVANS: -- and asked him for an
12 update on all of this. He explained to me
13 what he has explained publically tonight and
14 at that point I agreed that an amendment
15 should be put on the floor for all of our
16 consideration.

17 MR. ROGAN: Okay. Let's vote.

18 MS. EVANS: Now, are we making a new
19 motion prior to the final vote?

20 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes. I would like to
21 make a new amendment, the amendment would be
22 worded "Not to exceed the sum of \$1."

23 MR. ROGAN: You are making the
24 motion, not me.

25 MS. EVANS: Well, he is doing so in

1 order to gain your concurrence, so what is
2 that you are looking for?

3 MR. ROGAN: Yeah, that would be
4 acceptable.

5 MR. LOSCOMBE: Okay, "Not to exceed
6 the sum of \$1."

7 MS. EVANS: We have a motion on the
8 floor, do we have a second?

9 MR. ROGAN: Second.

10 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
11 those in favor signify by saying aye.

12 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

13 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

14 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed?

15 MR. MCGOFF: No.

16 MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so
17 moved. And now we shall return to item 7-A,
18 what is the recommendation of the Chair for
19 the Committee on Finance?

20 MR. MCGOFF: Could we reread it as
21 amended what it's going to say? I'm not
22 quite sure what we have actually changed
23 here?

24 MS. EVANS: I believe it will say,
25 "Authorizing the mayor and other appropriate

1 city officials to execute and enter into a
2 contract not to exceed the sum of \$1 with
3 Knowles Associates, LLC, for insurance
4 brokerage services for the insurance with
5 Great American, CNA, Indian Harbor Insurance
6 Company/XL Insurance, Philadelphia Indemnity
7 Insurance Company, Arch Insurance Company
8 and Nautilus Insurance Company for city
9 insurance coverage for the period of January
10 1, 2011, through June 30, 2011, and to
11 ratify any and all actions and services
12 performed since the expiration of the prior
13 insurance contract.

14 MR. MCGOFF: As temporary chair for
15 the Committee on Finance, I do not recommend
16 final passage of Item 7-A.

17 MS. EVANS: Do we have a second?

18 MR. ROGAN: We have to second to
19 vote?

20 MS. EVANS: Yes.

21 MR. ROGAN: I'll second.

22 MS. EVANS: On the question? Now
23 this will be in reverse order. The chair
24 has not recommended final passage and so if
25 you are in agreement with the chair you will

1 vote "yes." If you do not agree --

2 MR. ROGAN: If you want the
3 legislation to pass you vote "no."

4 MS. EVANS: Yes. That's correct.
5 That's correct. Roll call, please.

6 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.

7 MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

8 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.

9 MR. ROGAN: Abstain.

10 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.

11 MR. LOSCOMBE: No.

12 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. Mrs.
13 Evans.

14 MS. EVANS: No. Attorney Hughes,
15 does the motion -- is the motion legally and
16 lawfully adopted? Not the motion, is the
17 legislation legally and lawfully adopted, as
18 amended?

19 MR. ROGAN: It would be a 2/1 vote.

20 MR. HUGHES: It would be a two to
21 one vote to adopt the resolution as stated
22 or as amended over the negative
23 recommendation of the Vice-chair of Finance.
24 I'm --

25 MS. EVANS: I hereby declare Item

1 7-A, as amended, legally and lawfully
2 adopted, assuming that we have a majority
3 vote here.

4 MR. HUGHES: It's two to one. First
5 of all, there is a quorum, the vote was two
6 to one to adopt with one abstention. The
7 only thing I'm -- when Mr. McGoff
8 recommended that not to vote in favor of the
9 legislation, that was his opinion. I'm
10 not sure that that was -- that's not his
11 motion, that was his recommendation that
12 council defeat it. So, therefore, the
13 motion was introduced, made and seconded,
14 then the amendments were made and seconded,
15 I think you have to vote on the motion and
16 not on Mr. McGoff's recommendation.

17 MS. EVANS: You mean the
18 legislation?

19 MR. HUGHES: On the legislation.
20 The fact that the vice-president of finances
21 recommends not to adopt it, you don't vote
22 on his recommendation.

23 MR. ROGAN: I make a motion we take
24 a five-minute recess.

25 MR. MCGOFF: Second.

1 MS. EVANS: On the question? All
2 those in favor signify by saying aye.

3 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

4 MR. ROGAN: Aye.

5 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

6 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
7 have it so moved. There will be a
8 five-minute recess.

9 (A brief recess was taken.)

10 (After the recess as follows:)

11 MS. EVANS: Mrs. Krake, I believe
12 now we have declared Item 7-A legally and
13 lawfully adopted, as amended, and we are
14 proceeding with 7-B.

15 MS. KRAKE: Yes. If you revert to
16 your addendum to the agenda this is: 7-B,
17 (WHICH WAS FORMERLY 6-A) - FOR CONSIDERATION
18 - BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE - FOR ADOPTION
19 - FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 1, 2011 - AMENDING
20 FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 6, 1976 ENTITLED "AN
21 ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED) IMPOSING A TAX FOR
22 GENERAL REVENUE PURPOSES ON THE TRANSFER OF
23 REAL PROPERTY SITUATE WITHIN THE CITY OF
24 SCRANTON; PRESCRIBING AND REGULATING THE
25 METHOD OF EVIDENCING THE PAYMENT OF SUCH

1 TAX; CONFERRING POWERS AND IMPOSING DUTIES
2 UPON CERTAIN PERSONS, AND PROVIDING
3 PENALTIES", BY IMPOSING THE RATE OF THE
4 REALTY TRANSFER TAX AT TWO AND FIVE TENTHS
5 PERCENT (2.5%) FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2011.

6 MS. EVANS: What is the
7 recommendation of the Chair for the
8 Committee on Finance?

9 MR. MCGOFF: As Temporary Chair for
10 the Committee on Finance, I recommend final
11 passage of Item 7-B.

12 MR. ROGAN: Second.

13 MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
14 call, please?

15 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.

16 MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

17 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.

18 MR. ROGAN: Yes.

19 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.

20 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.

21 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. Mrs.
22 Evans.

23 MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare
24 Item 7-B legally and lawfully adopted.

25 MS. KRAKE: 7-C, (WHICH WAS FORMERLY

1 6-B) - FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON
2 FINANCE - FOR ADOPTION. FILE OF COUNCIL NO.
3 2, 2011 - AMENDING FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 11,
4 1976, ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED)
5 ENACTING, IMPOSING A TAX FOR GENERAL REVENUE
6 PURPOSES IN THE AMOUNT OF TWO PERCENT (2%)
7 ON EARNED INCOME AND NET PROFITS ON PERSONS,
8 INDIVIDUALS, ASSOCIATIONS AND BUSINESSES WHO
9 ARE RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON, OR
10 NON-RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON, FOR
11 WORK DONE, SERVICES PERFORMED OR BUSINESS
12 CONDUCTED WITHIN THE CITY OF SCRANTON,
13 REQUIRING THE FILING OF RETURNS BY TAXPAYERS
14 SUBJECT TO THE TAX; REQUIRING EMPLOYERS TO
15 COLLECT THE TAX AT SOURCE; PROVIDING FOR THE
16 ADMINISTRATION, COLLECTION AND ENFORCEMENT
17 OF THE SAID TAX; AND IMPOSING PENALTIES FOR
18 THE VIOLATIONS", BY IMPOSING THE WAGE TAX AT
19 TWO AND FOUR TENTHS PERCENT (2.4%) ON EARNED
20 INCOME FOR THE YEAR 2011 FOR RESIDENTS.

21 MS. EVANS: What is the
22 recommendation of the Chair for the
23 Committee on Finance?

24 MR. MCGOFF: As Chair for the
25 Committee on Finance, I recommend final

1 passage of Item 7-C.

2 MR. ROGAN: Second.

3 MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
4 call, please?

5 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.

6 MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

7 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.

8 MR. ROGAN: Yes.

9 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.

10 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.

11 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. Mrs.
12 Evans.

13 MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare
14 Item 7-C legally and lawfully adopted.

15 MS. KRAKE: 7-D, (WHICH WAS FORMERLY
16 6-C) FOR CONSIDERATION - BY THE COMMITTEE ON
17 FINANCE - FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF COUNCIL NO.
18 3, 2011 - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO.
19 7, 1976, ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED)
20 IMPOSING A MERCANTILE LICENSE TAX OF 2 MILLS
21 FOR THE YEAR 1976 AND ANNUALLY THEREAFTER
22 UPON PERSONS ENGAGING IN CERTAIN OCCUPATIONS
23 AND BUSINESSES THEREIN; PROVIDING FOR ITS
24 LEVY AND COLLECTION AND FOR THE ISSUANCE OF
25 MERCANTILE LICENSES; CONFERRING AND IMPOSING

1 POWERS AND DUTIES UPON THE TAX COLLECTOR OF
2 THE CITY OF SCRANTON; AND IMPOSING
3 PENALTIES", BY IMPOSING THE MERCANTILE TAX
4 AT THREE QUARTERS OF A MILL (.00075) FOR
5 CALENDAR YEAR 2011.

6 MS. EVANS: What is the
7 recommendation of the Chair for the
8 Committee on Finance?

9 MR. MCGOFF: As Temporary Chair for
10 the Committee on Finance, I recommend final
11 passage of Item 7-D.

12 MR. ROGAN: Second.

13 MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
14 call, please?

15 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.

16 MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

17 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.

18 MR. ROGAN: Yes.

19 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.

20 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.

21 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. Mrs.
22 Evans.

23 MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare
24 Item 7-D legally and lawfully adopted.

25 MS. KRAKE: 7-E, (WHICH WAS FORMERLY

1 6-D) FOR CONSIDERATION - BY THE COMMITTEE ON
2 FINANCE - FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF COUNCIL NO.
3 4, 2011 - AS AMENDED - AMENDING FILE OF THE
4 COUNCIL NO. 8, 1976, ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE
5 (AS AMENDED) PROVIDING FOR THE GENERAL
6 REVENUE BY IMPOSING A TAX AT THE RATE OF TWO
7 (2) MILLS UPON THE PRIVILEGE OF OPERATING OR
8 CONDUCTING BUSINESS IN THE CITY OF SCRANTON
9 AS MEASURED BY THE GROSS RECEIPTS THEREFROM;
10 REQUIRING REGISTRATION AND PAYMENT OF THE
11 TAX AS CONDITION TO THE CONDUCTING OF SUCH
12 BUSINESS; PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND
13 COLLECTION OF SUCH TAX; PRESCRIBING SUCH
14 REQUIREMENTS FOR RETURNS AND RECORDS;
15 CONFERRING POWERS AND DUTIES UPON THE TAX
16 COLLECTOR; AND IMPOSING PENALTIES", BY
17 IMPOSING THE BUSINESS PRIVILEGE TAX AT THE
18 RATE OF THREE-QUARTERS OF A MILL (.00075)
19 FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2011.

20 MS. EVANS: What is the
21 recommendation of the Chair for the
22 Committee on Finance?

23 MR. MCGOFF: As Temporary Chair for
24 the Committee on Finance, I recommend final
25 passage of Item 7-E.

1 MR. ROGAN: Second.

2 MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
3 call, please?

4 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.

5 MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

6 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.

7 MR. ROGAN: Yes.

8 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.

9 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.

10 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. Mrs.
11 Evans.

12 MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare
13 Item 7-E legally and lawfully adopted.

14 MS. KRAKE: 7-F, (WHICH WAS FORMERLY
15 6-E) FOR CONSIDERATION - BY THE COMMITTEE ON
16 FINANCE - FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF COUNCIL NO.
17 5, 2011 - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO.
18 100, 1976, ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS
19 AMENDED) LEVYING GENERAL AND SPECIAL TAXES
20 FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1977", BY SETTING THE
21 MILLAGE FOR THE YEAR 2011.

22 MS. EVANS: What is the
23 recommendation of the Chair for the
24 Committee on Finance?

25 MR. MCGOFF: As Temporary Chair for

1 the Committee on Finance, I recommend final
2 passage of Item 7-F.

3 MR. ROGAN: Second.

4 MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
5 call, please?

6 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.

7 MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

8 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.

9 MR. ROGAN: Yes.

10 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.

11 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.

12 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. Mrs.
13 Evans.

14 MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare
15 Item 7-F legally and lawfully adopted.

16 MS. KRAKE: 7-G, (WHICH WAS FORMERLY
17 6-F) FOR CONSIDERATION - BY THE COMMITTEE
18 ON FINANCE - FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF COUNCIL
19 NO. 6, 2011 - (AS AMENDED)- AMENDING FILE OF
20 THE COUNCIL NO. 17, 1994 ENTITLED "AN
21 ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED) AUTHORIZING THE
22 GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO
23 ENACT 'A WASTE DISPOSAL AND COLLECTION FEE'
24 FOR THE PURPOSE OF RAISING REVENUE TO COVER
25 THE WASTE DISPOSAL AND COLLECTION COSTS

1 INCURRED BY THE CITY OF SCRANTON FOR THE
2 DISPOSAL OF REFUSE", BY IMPOSING A WASTE
3 DISPOSAL AND COLLECTION FEE
4 OF \$178.00 FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2011.

5 MS. EVANS: What is the
6 recommendation of the Chair for the
7 Committee on Finance?

8 MR. MCGOFF: As Temporary Chair for
9 the Committee on Finance, I recommend final
10 passage of Item 7-F.

11 MR. ROGAN: Second.

12 MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
13 call, please?

14 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.

15 MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

16 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.

17 MR. ROGAN: Yes.

18 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.

19 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.

20 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. Mrs.
21 Evans.

22 MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare
23 Item 7-F legally and lawfully adopted.

24 I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

25 MR. MCGOFF: Motion to adjourn.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. EVANS: This meeting is
adjourned.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

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