		1
1	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING	
2		
3		
4		
5	HELD:	
6		
7	Tuesday, October 25, 2011	
8		
9	LOCATION:	
10	Council Chambers	
11	Scranton City Hall	
12	340 North Washington Avenue	
13	Scranton, Pennsylvania	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23	0.70505 0 0.005077 000 000077 00007	
24	CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER	
25		

2 ||

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL:

JANET EVANS, PRESIDENT

PAT ROGAN, VICE-PRESIDENT

ROBERT MCGOFF

FRANK JOYCE

JOHN LOSCOMBE

NANCY KRAKE, CITY CLERK

KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

BOYD HUGHES, SOLICITOR

JOID HOURES, SULICITOR

1	(Pledge of Allegiance recited and
2	moment of reflection observed.)
3	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
4	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
5	MR. MCGOFF: Here.
6	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
7	MR. ROGAN: Here.
8	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe.
9	MR. LOSCOMBE: Here.
10	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Joyce. Mrs.
11	Evans.
12	MS. EVANS: Here. Dispense with the
13	reading of the minutes.
14	MS. KRAKE: THIRD. THIRD ORDER.
15	3-A. MINUTES OF THE NON-UNIFORM MUNICIPAL
16	PENSION MEETING HELD SEPTEMBER 28, 2011.
17	MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?
18	If not, received and filed.
19	MS. KRAKE: 3-B. MINUTES OF THE
20	COMPOSITE PENSION BOARD MEETING HELD
21	SEPTEMBER 28, 2011.
22	MS. KRAKE: Do we have any clerk's
23	notes tonight, Mrs. Krake?
24	MR. KRAKE: No, Mrs. Evans.
25	MS. EVANS: Thank you. Do any

council members have announcements at this I'm?

MR. MCGOFF: I have one. St.

Patrick's parish is sponsoring a Where's the Beef Roast Beef Dinner Harvest Festival that's Sunday, November 6, at the All Saints School auditorium. Takeout dinners begin at 11:30 and the sit down dinners are from 12 noon until five p.m. Adults \$10, children \$6. Events also include children's games, basket raffles, instant bingos. Tickets can be purchased in the parish office, 344-2679 or chairperson Terry Gabriel, telephone 343-0947 and that's a roast beef dinner at ST. Patrick's parish Sunday, November 6.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Just one brief announcement. Last week's meeting when the CDBG amendments were announced, one of our residents asked if there were any future changes, last minute changes, that I would announce them, and there is three minor changes. One is that the \$7,000 allocated for the Healthy NEPA Suicide Prevention for Seniors will be eliminated due to the fact

that they are not based in the City of Scranton, they are out of the Abingtons, and that \$7,500 will be reallocated at follows:

\$3,500 for the Downtown Senior

Center Parking Paving Lot program, and

\$3,500 for First Friday busing, and that is
it.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Councilman Loscombe, do you have any announcements?

MR. LOSCOMBE: No, I have nothing.

Thank you.

MS. EVANS: St. Joseph's Malachite Catholic Church located at 130 St. Francis Cabrini Avenue in West Scranton will hold it's annual spaghetti dinner tomorrow, Wednesday evening, from 5 to 8 p.m.

Takeouts will be available beginning at 4 p.m. Tickets are \$8 for adults, \$4 for children ages five through ten, and can be purchased at the door.

Attention dog and cat owners,

Dr. Ramsey is a local veterinarian and will provide a 20 percent discount on treatment of medical problems for pets adopted from the SPCA during their first visit to his

office. In addition, the first visit will be free of charge. Dr. Ramsey formerly practiced at the Dunmore Dog and Cat Hospital and currently practices at VCA located at 417 East Drinker Street in Dunmore. We recognize and thank Dr. Ramsey for his outstanding care and concern for our pets and his generous offer of veterinary assistance for the many pets who desperately need good homes, and that's it.

MS. KRAKE: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS'
PARTICIPATION.

MS. EVANS: Our first speaker tonight is Bob Martin.

MR. MARTIN: Good evening, Council.

Bob Martin.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. MARTIN: President of the FOP, citizen and taxpayer of Scranton. I just wanted to come tonight, I mean, everybody knows what the latest news with the Supreme Court ruling and our situation, not necessarily a win. Everybody has ben saying, you know, it's a win. It's not really a win. All the Supreme Court did was

21

22

23

24

25

reaffirm our rights to collect the bargaining, what we said since day one since this started, and the problem is that this has been protracted for so long that the amount of -- the dollar amount has swollen to, you know, huge numbers, the numbers that are being thrown in the paper this morning, I'm not 100 percent sure they are accurate, I don't have a grasp on them, I don't know exactly where they are. We are still picking through all of the little nuances that are in the contract and what were afforded to us in the two awards and, of course, the affirmative of the second award is still yet to come. It won't change things much, but it's pretty much there, but I want to reassure you that we want to help resolve this. We don't -- you know, we are not here to bankrupt he city, that's the last thing we do. We are stakeholders in this just as well as everybody else in this room and every other citizen in Scranton.

You know, we hold a great deal of this and we want to help you resolve this. We know that there is a budget process

coming up. I, as the president of the FOP,
will do everything in my power to help
resolve this, but then you have to help me
help you, so I know what to do. I will go
back to my members, but you have to remember
that, I'm just the bus driver. My members
tell me where to drive.

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

I mean, you know, I have got -ultimately the decision is going to come down from then. I know that it was in the paper, and I'm sure there would be nothing greater to the citizens if we could forgive everything, but I just don't think that that's possible. Me, being a senior, probably some of the few grayer hairs in the department and in the leadership of the FOP realize that the big picture is the fact that our collective bargaining rights were reaffirmed by the Court's, that those are our rights, and that's what this fight has been about since the beginning. We didn't pick this fight, someone else picked this fight and we stayed in it and we are going to stay in it and continue on. But again, we are not going to do it at the expense of

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the taxpayers and hopefully that's the culmination at this point.

I mean, I know the fight is going to I just left Harrisburg, I just continue. drove back and walked right in here from Harrisburg, but I want you to know and I want to the taxpayers to know we will do anything we can. I'm sure there can be some forgiveness of some of these back dues and backowings and we surely come up with some kind of a schedule to help work this through throughout going into the future, you know, I'm hearing rumors that they want to did it all at once, that's just not feasible, I understand that's not feasible, and I think my members do, too, so we just want to, you know, let everybody know that we are part of this and we are going to help it come to a resolution the best we can, and if anybody has any questions.

(Whereupon while Mr. Martin was speaking, Mr. Joyce takes the dais and joins the meeting.)

MS. EVANS: Mr. Martin, are you willing to sit down with the mayor of

Scranton and mitigate this Court award for the benefit of the taxpayers of Scranton?

MR. MARTIN: Absolutely.

Absolutely. We will sit and whatever we can do. Again, I mean, we have some constraints, but, I mean, we will do whatever we can do to lessen this blow. You know, it's catastrophic. It's catastrophic at this point already on top of a catastrophic situation. I mean, you know, this is someone that just got hit with an earthquake and now a hurricane is coming up Main Street, so we will certainly if the mayor is willing to sit down we'll sit down and we'll see what we can do. I mean, we will help as much as we possibly can, you know.

Our big thing, my big feeling is the fact that we just maintained our collectively bargaining rights, that's the most important thing to me and that, you know, the rest of it we just need to fix.

MS. EVANS: I think what I find most upsetting about the current financial disaster is the fact that the mayor has

proclaimed almost immediately a significant tax increase and a significant cut in public services and evidently his target once again is the police and fire departments, and I don't believe that that is the proper way to approach the situation. I think it is very -- what he is proposing is very painful and harmful to all of the taxpayers and residents of the City of Scranton, and there are other and better ways to address this, and I think the first and best approach is to sit down with the IAFF and the FOP and do your best to mitigate this Supreme Court award.

MR. MARTIN: The thing that bothers me the most, and I heard it a couple of times this afternoon and I have heard it in the past couple of days, that this was done. This was done in 2008. We had settled this, and I don't know if anybody realized it, but 50 percent, at least 50 percent where we were or where we are right now. In addition to we would be making contributions to the health care. We offered 2 1/2 percent of a second year patrolman. Maybe it wasn't what

was needed, but at least at that point we would have it. Again, we didn't start this fight, we tried to finish it -- we attempted three solid good times and it didn't happen and we surely don't want to be responsible for tax increases. We will sit and we'll mitigate and keep that either off the table or very minimum that it ever has to be because we are not going to be the cause of it. I mean, this isn't our fault.

MS. EVANS: And, furthermore, I don't believe that the residents of Scranton are going to sit by and allow their taxes to be increased I'm hearing rumors of up to 100 percent and yet have their services cut in half, which means you would be losing half the fire stations in your city, maybe more, and downsizing the police force, which was already sorely effected in August. I don't believe the people of the City of Scranton deserve that and I'm hoping that they are not going to stand for it.

MR. MARTIN: I hope that doesn't happen. I mean, we are at a critical juncture right now. We are at critical

stages when we go on the streets every day now. We just had a big board meeting with the chief and we have kind of moved some things around and it's going to make things a little bit better, but, you know, I left the house and I don't know if anybody had time to watch the 6:00 news what happened in Wilkes-Barre this afternoon, there was a shootout right outside of a DayCare.

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: And those -- that name has come up in investigations with us, I know it has. I mean, as soon as I heard the name of the suspect I said, "Hey, I know that gentleman," you know. And we can't digress to that. We surely cannot allow anymore police officers to be cut. We are at the critical stage right now. We will not able to operate and maintain the same level of the service.

MR. ROGAN: Mr. Martin, I just want to make sure I'm hearing you correctly, the union is willing to negotiate spreading out the payment of the award?

MR. MARTIN: Absolutely.

MR. ROGAN: That's very good to hear, because as Mrs. Evans stated, many of the people I talked to over the last few days, the residents of Scranton cannot afford a tax increase. People are leaving the city in droves already. If the taxes go up more people are going to leave and those who of are left are going to be forced to pay even more in taxes, so I hope that something can be worked out if the mayor will sit down and --

that we can forgive a lot of it, I wouldn't even want to use the word a lot, again, I have to take this back to my members and they are going to make the decision, and you know, I know it's difficult for people on the outside, you know, to stand there and think we are just greedy pigs, but we have been through this for ten years. I mean, we have been bearing this for ten years and so it's going to be difficult to sell.

The SIT is still out there, you know, I'm hoping that we could get some forgiveness and that some of that stuff can

22

23

24

25

go away or we can help with some of these other things. You know, again, how the taxpayers are going to end up bearing this boggles by mind. Somebody has been given this administration advice and bad advice for the last 10 or 15 and 20 years in total, and I think they should be held responsible for some of this. I mean, I don't know how all of a sudden the taxpayers are going to be the one caught in the middle of this when-- and I know, and I know, that there were times when the high priced attorneys that the city was paying, this administration was paying, they were told -they told this administration, "Settle this and settle it now because this is the best it's going to get," and they didn't. didn't heed their high priced lawyer's advice, but I don't know who -- but somebody should be held responsible other than the taxpayers of this city.

MS. EVANS: Mr. Martin, I'll be addressing that under motions this evening.

MR. MARTIN: I hope everybody gives that some serious consideration because

1 those are the people that have been going down the path. 2 3 MS. EVANS: Absolutely. MR. MARTIN: Again, like I said, we 4 5 settled this in 2008 and, I mean, that was reasonable for us and, you know, it wasn't 6 7 quite what we wanted, but at least it was 8 reasonable for us and it was reasonable at 9 least for the taxpayers and the citizens at the time, and we wouldn't be at this 10 11 juncture. 12 MS. EVANS: Well, thank you very 13 much. 14 MR. MARTIN: I hope you are in 15 touch. Thank you. 16 MS. EVANS: Thank you. Andy 17 Sbaraglia. 18 MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia, 19 citizen of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians, 20 for many years I have been coming to the 21 podium and telling you that that sword 22 that's hanging over the taxpayers is going 23 to fall, and it has fallen and it's struck 24 into the hearts of the taxpayer. There is 25 no way you are going to come up and say you

can't have a tax raise. The figures tell you, you can't have a tax raise, and besides, the firemen and policemen, you remember how many years they were denied a pay raise? They are going to want that and that's substantial. I don't know about the lawyer fees, I'm afraid to ask on both sides, God knows how much it costs us, but where we are now is a very dire position.

No one could say any different.

We are not going to be in trouble what they're saying, PEL says 11 million or something next year, another ten, and they don't even know how much. The Times since 6 million to 10 million. I don't know where they have their accountant from, I have never heard anybody of such a broad spectrum of how much we owe, so you can't put much faith in it. I just hope the administration would be here, somebody from the administration would say what they know, if they can know or what their accountant might say, I don't know, but somebody has to explain to the taxpayers the fixed amount, the money that is owed.

And that I don't know what kind of terms you can give. I don't know what kind of release they can sign. As you know, when is fine is leveled the interest is compounded from the date of that decision so it's going to be compounded up, and if they don't -- they can't come up with \$10 million, there is no way. We can't even come up to buy the rock salt according to the mayor. We are going to be out there

using ashes if some of the people with coal

are still around, but this the situation we

have been in. Now, who the lawyers were that

advised the mayor in the very beginning is

where it lies, whether the mayor, I don't

know. I don't even know if the mayor is lawyer. I assume he want to college, but I don't know if he want to law school.

MS. EVANS: No.

MR. SBARAGLIA: But whoever advised him must have told him this or that or what the consequence could be. I mean, when you got a lawyer giving advice you assume the advice you are getting is a sound advice. You know, there is all kinds of

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

interpretations, we had that with our Pocius and Hazzouri who got their pension because of a slipup in the wording that went before the Courts. So, yeah, a word here or a word there can really mean a lot of difference. It's just too bad the city is taking a hit and the taxpayer is taking a hit and there is no recourse.

They tell you -- the Court's tell you wait four years and then do something. The damage is done and we have to live with all of the damage that has been incurred by all of the previous councils and the mayor. We have to live with that damage. We can't say, "I can sue this councilman or that councilman for their decision," because they are immune from that. All they are really -- you can sue a man for malfeasance, and I don't think any councilman has ever been in that position, but their decisions were bad all of the way. I don't know what they were thinking of. Where do they expect the money to come from? Fall from the sky? Maybe we should invest in lottery tickets. The think the lottery is up 100 some

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That would help a heck of a lot, million. but somewhere we have to get money other than from the pockets of the taxpayers, but you and I know that's where it's going to come from. There is no sense lying to the people, it's going to come from them, and no matter what we do we are going to have to have a tax raise and there is nothing you can do about it because where we are now I don't blame you, because you explained it very well what happened when you come up with your budget. Everybody that ever listened to this council on the air or read it in the paper or somewhere knows what happened and what he said this year the same thing that happened last year, he is not going to pay the bills until next year.

And again, we are going to be stuck with all of the TANS, you can't -- that money from the TANS is supposed to push the government a little until the revenue comes in, but he has taken the TANS to pay off TANS. That's not the best either. This man has been a flimflam all the way through, all of the way through. I don't know where

people got it because even when they sold
the DPW site so many times how the heck
would you figure that this man knew what he
was doing when he is doing that much?

But, I'm sorry we are here and I'm sorry I told you that the before you took office. Okay, bye.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Mr. Sbaraglia, you spoke about a backup plan, honestly, I don't think that the administration or PEL had a backup plan because I don't think that they were expecting to lose.

MS. EVANS: No, there was no plan.

There is no plan in place by either the mayor, DCED or PEL. Our next speaker is Bob Bolus.

MR. BOLUS: Good evening, Council.

Bob Bolus, Scranton.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. BOLUS: I'd like to first start on advising Jack tonight that we have put up at least six signs up by my residence on East Mountain and all six signs have been taken down. Fortunately for you, we have

3

1

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

video of the people taking the signs down and when the meeting is over I will be meeting with the Scranton Police Department and give them the information and copy of the videos. I think it's unheard of any more that people would stoop to stealing someone else's property, and I find is embarrassing I even have to come up here and say we know who you are and we are going to deal with you and it's about time.

Next thing I would like to do is kind of talk a little about where we are. Ι believe we bought a ticket on the Titanic. It's not in council it's members of past councils, the rubber stampers, the people who ignored where we should be and what we They ignored the pleas of should be doing. the people, they ignored common sense, logic and business sense, and this mayor has been at the head of it. We have brought many, many issues up that could have generated capital here. We brought up about the leachate line, but they don't want to upset DeNaples by charging a fee as a host community, even though the Sewer Authority

treats the fluent that goes down it. They don't want to do anything about the gas line coming from Alliance Landfill, charging so much for a cubic foot. They don't want to go after KOZ and nonprofits in the city that have literally prostituted the people in this city by taking everything for free and giving very little in return yet they reap a tremendous harvest in income from students and everybody everywhere else and by being tax free.

We saw that a couple of weeks ago.

The DeNaple's family brought I believe it's

Holy Family Church. They are tearing it

down. They are tearing history. They are

tearing the culture out to make a black

paved parking lot, and they didn't pay a

dime in tax because they found a loophole,

and that's what's wrong in this city. This

mayor, the past administration, helpers that

were council members have allowed them to

circumvent the people and the tax base that

we need in this city.

Recent tax rates have increased the tax rate, it's basic mathematics yet nobody

has pushed it. Well, we need to start pushing it. We need to charge for our police and fire to KOZ's and nonprofits because they don't pay for that protection. They don't pay taxes. They are not entitled to protection unless they pay for it. There is revenue there. There is revenue when the police and fire department respond to an accident. We need to change how we do business in the city and charge for our services and us stop paying for it.

What we have seen here is an example of a giveaway. Politics. The Connell Building, the old former DPW building for a dollar. If the medical college needed parking they should have went there and shuttled people and left our history. The culture that 100 years ago people brought here and we're tearing it apart. That's our infrastructure. That's what made Scranton what it is today.

We have Paul Kelly right now denied that the city owns the piece of the property that Todd Hartman built his house on. It's been an issue of a major dispute. Mary

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Dunleavey and other people that I want to see at East Mountain Resident's Association last week. They are telling me about fines, but they don't understand the house was not properly condemned legally. condemned by Graziano who has been charged with stealing \$100,000. This is the credibility that we have to deal with. They watched a 16 second interview on Channel 16 about the damage to my home and the issues that I'm facing. These were created by other people, but the house is not a condemned home. I live in it and I dare anybody to challenge it, which it's in Court.

Which brings up something here that we need to do, the Sewer Authority allows people, their supervisors, to use their vehicles to drive around, go home in rather than report somewhere because they are a supervisor yet they get to an issue. They can't do anything, they got to call out union personnel, so why are they driving at our expense city-owned vehicles for no reason, gas and all? So if we're going to

cut, let's start cutting at the pennies, that saves the dollars.

One thing I would like to ask is

Paul Kelly be ordered to come here and prove
that the city does not own the 16 1/2 foot
piece of property here. I put a \$50,000
offer on it, it's being ignored. That's
what happening in the city. There is vacant
land all over that could be sold and
developed, it's ignored. There are many
ways to generate money. Windmills on the
mountain here. We could generate electric,
save us money.

The thing I would like to ask Jack tonight is if you, sitting here tonight, could ask your two colleagues, Mr. McGoff and Mr. Rogan, since they are on a first name basis with the mayor, he has ignored us, he has ignored everybody else, but they can have him. Hot dogs, donuts, they could have meetings privately out of here. The mayor could travel anywhere, they could pick up a phone and call him. I would ask you tonight to ask them with their influence what the mayor there was a seat put here,

and I have watched it on TV, an empty seat that Chris Doherty gave his word he would be the sixth councilman. Well, he has lied to everybody here, he has never kept his word. Maybe tonight you would ask them to join you, because I know the other three want to see him here, and so do we. We need accountability, we need transparency. It's not their private meetings, Mr. Rogan, Mr. McGoff, I don't appreciate them as the taxpayer. This is an open forum, bring Chris Doherty here, use your influence. You make the first move, bring them before all of you now and the people now under these cameras, under the firefighhers and everybody else here. Let's show some credibility now. Now do the job interest you that you're appointed to do. If you would do that, Mr. Loscombe, I would appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Doug Miller.

MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council,
Doug Miller, Scranton.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

25

22

23

24

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. MILLER: I would like to begin tonight the recent Supreme Court ruling regarding the public safety arbitration awards. You know, it's been stated recently in the paper that this will cost the city as much as \$10 million, and I think it's safe to say that we all know that this all could have been avoided had the mayor been willing to sit down years ago and work out a fair deal for both sides. Unfortunately, the mayor chose to appeal each decision throughout the years and ultimately it's lead us to where we are today. Due to the mayor's actions, he has added even more to a financial mess that he has created.

The mayor's solution to all of this was to layoff more police and firemen as well as close more engine companies and to raise taxes, and for years we have had public safety officials come up to this podium and warn the residents that this day was going to happen, but it was lead with cries from the critics who claim that it was scare tactics and lies and the mayor made

his infamous statement of, "I'm not going to close fire stations."

Well, we see where we are today.

When are the residents of this city going to step up and realize that this mayor has no regard for our public safety, but most of all he has no respect for the taxpayers of this city because his actions have proven it time and time again, and we have been put in this tough spot because for the last ten years we haven't had anybody to stand up and hold this man accountable, whether it was members of the administration, past rubber stamp councils lead by Mr. McGoff, nobody stood up and held this man accountable.

But now finally we have a council majority that stood up on behalf of the residents of this city and held this man accountable and exposed his politics, his games, and all of his nonsense, and now you are fighting a battle, really a struggle, of trying to clean up the mess that was thrown at you and I truly feel sorry for the situation that you are in because he has caused one heck of a problem as well as all

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of his little helpers along the way here.

Regarding the budget, we have been talking an awful lot about that. I want to commend council and Solicitor Hughes for the public presentation of your deficit plan that you made last week. I certainly feel that your plan addresses a lot of the issues that we had, a lot of long-term issues we had regarding losing assets and losing parking meter revenue, but that was all answered in your proposal which sees us realizing 100 percent of that parking revenue as well as holding onto an asset that we would have lost under the mayor's plan which, if I may add, also included tax increases and borrowing and, as I have said many times, you don't borrow your way out of debt, and anybody that would make a statement that they would consider borrowing, I think needs to go and take a look at basic math principal that borrowing doesn't get you out of debt, you have seen what's that done for the last ten years, and anybody that's been paying close attention to the city's finances, like I have,

understands that and comprehends that, as well as the rest of the residents in this city.

The borrowing and the spending needs to come to an end, and I know that this council has been holding back on the purse strings and we are not giving out blank checks to this man anymore because it's caused one heck of a problem, and you realized that, unlike past councils that let it slide by.

You know, I believe your plan is in the best interest of this city both long-term and short-term. As I said, we are keeping an asset. We are generating millions rather than losing that like we would have don in the mayor's plan. I believe your presentation last week defined openness and transparency and to anyone who would state otherwise, I know Mr. McGoff took issue in the paper stating that this council showed a lack of openness and transparency, well, I think that maybe you should march downstairs to our honorable mayor and demand that he come forward and

3

1

4

5

6

8

7

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

lay out his proposal, because I certainly don't believe anybody like Mr. McGoff should be talking about openness and transparency after his tenure on council and the way he treated the residents of this city and the burdens he placed on them, I don't think he should be talking about openness and transparency.

So if we do want to talk about that, let's demand that the mayor come forward, be held accountable to the public, and layout his proposal. As a speaker just said, we have had a chair here waiting for him, the big boy chair, and the reason I call it the big boy chair is because the mayor made it quite clear on Channel 16 that he deals in the big boy world. Well, the big boys and girls are waiting for you, mayor, and we haven't seen you yet, and if it's going to take coffee and donuts to get you here, as I said, we can make arrangements, but it's time to be serious here, it's time to find solutions, and you can't continue to play games jeopardizing the health and safety of the residents of this city because, as I

said, when it comes to this issue, I take it very serious, I'm passionate about it and when I hear layoffs and engine companies being shut down that truly disgusts me, and I'm truly disgusted with this man and what he is trying to do.

And the rumor out there, 100 percent tax increase? When is it going to stop?

When are we going to finally wake up and realize that we can no longer place these financial burdens on the residents of this city? We saw what the 26 percent tax increase did. Mr. McGoff could talk about that. I mean, the games have to end. This man needs to be accountable, he needs to come forward, he needs to stop hiding behind his closed door and come forward and be the sixth councilman like he said he was going to do.

And I'm asking tonight to the residents of this city to stop hiding back.

Don't sit home. Come here every week, every Tuesday, demand that he be held accountable, demand he hold himself to the public. He has a lot of explaining to do, and I'm

asking you to come to council, in fact, take a step further, protest his office and demand that he stop playing games and jeopardizing the health, safety and well-being of the residents of this city. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Les Spindler.

MR. SPINDLER: Good evening,

Council. Les Spindler, city resident.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. SPINDLER: I, too, want to talk about the Supreme Court decision. I guess everybody saw it today in the paper, it's going to cost up to \$10 million the taxpayers are going to have to shell out. There is solely due to Chris Doherty's ten years mismanaging this city and the rubber stamp council that he has for his first eight years in office. I hate to say we told you so, but we told you so.

The Legion of Doom and the leaders
of the unions have been saying this for
years and years and years that this is going

to happen and it fell on deaf ears and now the taxpayers are going to pay for it. This all could have been avoided if Chris Doherty sat down from day one, negotiated a fair contract with the unions, we wouldn't have \$10 million to pay out, and it's probably going to be more than \$10 million because the 21 he just laid off when their Court decision comes through, when they are reinstated, we are going to have to pay their backpay plus interest, also, so it just never seems to end with this mayor.

That's just like with the SIT

That's just like with the SIT clerks. You had to hire them back with interest and backpay the same thing is going to happen with the 21 people we laid off recently.

It's time for the citizens of this city to get off their butts and do something and tell this mayor not to put up with it.

But, Mrs. Evans, I respectfully have to disagree with you that the citizens don't care what happens. I mean, where are they?

Look at this crowd here. It's the same people that come here week after week. I

have been asking the questions, why aren't they down there picketing city hall? ridiculous. The people of this city don't care and I don't know why, but there should be hundreds of people in front of city hall telling this mayor that they won't put up with it, but they are not doing it. Like I said, it's the same people coming here week after week for the last ten years since I have been come here.

Oh, and in the Sunday Doherty newsletter the headline said, "City has no easy way out."

Well, I have a very easy way out, if Chris Doherty would resign as of tomorrow there would be a very easy way out and that would be the best thing that would ever happen to this city. One question with the new rental registration ordinance, does that include duplexes/-GS or doubles? Like, I live in a double, would that be included in that?

MS. EVANS: Mr. McGoff?

MR. SPINDLER: I live on one side and rent out the other.

23

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. MCGOFF: I don't have --1 I have 2 it somewhere here, Mr. Spindler, but I'll 3 look -- I believe it was an individual who was -- anything that in which it was 4 5 owner --MR. JOYCE: If the owner occupies 6 7 one side --8 MR. LOSCOMBE: Up to four units I 9 think it was. 10 MR. MCGOFF: Then it's not subject to the ordinance. 11 12 MR. JOYCE: It's not subject to the 13 fee. 14 MR. SPINDLER: Okay, Mr. Loscombe, the Linden Street bridge, have you heard 15 16 anything about that recently? 17 MR. LOSCOMBE: No, actually, to 18 honest with you, I haven't had the chance. 19 I was going to take a ride up to PennDOT. I'll have to call them tomorrow. 20 21 spoke to them the engineering was just about 22 done, he had told me what they had planned 23 on doing and everything, it was just a 24 process of getting the right of ways from 25 the railroad and stuff, so that may still be

1 a holdup, but I do have to check on that. 2 MR. SPINDLER: It's a terrible 3 inconvenience down at Seventh Avenue there. MR. LOSCOMBE: They pretty much 4 5 assured me it would be done before the end of the year, I though he had mentioned 6 7 Thanksgiving --8 MR. SPINDLER: It was supposed to 9 start in September and we are almost into November now. 10 MR. LOSCOMBE: Sure. 11 MR. SPINDLER: As I said last time, 12 13 pretty soon they'll say, "Oh, it's snowing, 14 we can't do it." I wouldn't be at all surprised if 15 16 it's not done until spring and it's 17 terrible. I was in a Redner's this 18 afternoon and getting out of the parking lot 19 the traffic was backed up into the parking lot in Redner's. It's terrible. 20 21 Lastly, in the Doherty newsletter the other day, "Parking Authority faces 22 deficit." 23 24 Once again, city has to bail an 25 authority out, \$1.6 million. It never seems

to end. First it's the Recreation Authority 1 2 -- or was it the Redevelopment Authority. 3 MS. EVANS: The Redevelopment Authority. 4 5 MR. SPINDLER: Now it's the Parking Authority. I know it's hard to do, but you 6 7 explained it, Mrs. Evans, but these 8 authorities are killing us. 9 MS. EVANS: Yes. MR. SPINDLER: Too bad there wasn't 10 11 some way we could do away with these 12 authorities. Where are we going to find 13 \$1.6 million when we have to pay \$10 million 14 to the police and firefighters' union. as far as Chris Doherty showing up and 15 16 negotiating, I think you have a better 17 chance of pigs flying. Thank you for your 18 time. 19 MS. EVANS: Thank you. Bill 20 Jackowitz. MR. JACKOWITZ: Good evening, city 21 22 Bill Jackowitz, South Scranton council. 23 resident and member of the taxpayers' 24 association. 25 MS. EVANS: Good evening. For nine

years now I have been attending Scranton
City Council meetings. Why? Because I feel
that all citizens should be aware of what
their local elected officials stand for.
You have a better chance of making a
difference locally then you do statewide or
nationwide. I first started watching city
council meetings back when the Honorable
Mayor Doherty was Finance Chairperson and
the Honorable Mayor Connors was mayor.

Councilman Doherty asked citizens to contact him if they had any questions, so I wrote Councilman Doherty a letter with one question, where has the money gone?

Councilman Doherty responded by sending me an invitation to attend a campaign rally for his election of mayor, which I refused and did not attend. For the next four years I received a Christmas card from the Doherty family, a picture card with the Doherty family picture.

After the Honorable Mayor Doherty's first reelection, I scheduled a meeting with the Honorable Mayor Doherty immediately after the election. When I arrived for the

meeting on a Thursday at 10 a.m., I was informed by his secretary that the Honorable mayor was busy and would not be able to make the 10 a.m. meeting. I informed his secretary that I would wait and that I came prepared, I brought my lunch. Five minutes later, the Honorable Mayor Doherty appeared and we had a 30-minute meeting. I presented the Honorable Mayor Doherty with a copy of ten questions that I had prepared for him.

We went overall ten questions, although, when I asked him the first question, why did he attend the Syracuse basketball game on the same date that the 109th returned from Iraq, he threatened to have me removed from his office. I retreated and went onto my second question. After asking my nine remaining questions and not getting an answer to any of the questions, including what happened to the money, I again asked the mayor why he chose Syracuse basketball game over the returning war fighters. This time I was asked to leave the office without getting any answers to my ten questions. You must remember that

the 109th sustained numerous causalities including war fighters losing their lives.

As a side note, I never received another Christmas card from the Doherty family.

Six years later the Honorable Mayor
Doherty and the Doherty real people and the
Doherty one council member still do not
answer questions that are asked of him by
citizens. Instead, they like to makeup
excuses and alibis and evade the questions.
Why? I feel because they have no answers
that they want the public to know.

Everything has been done behind closed doors and not in the view of the residents, taxpayers. I still remember six people being crammed into the city council clerk's office for out of sight council causes by past city council presidents.

Ruling could cost \$10 million. City administrative voiced concern over bond rating. I would like to remind the citizens of Scranton that three years ago the administration and the Doherty Three passed a 26 percent tax increase. Again, I must

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ask, what happened to that money? 26
percent is nothing to sneeze at, so I must
ask again, what happened to that taxpayers'
money? Can someone please answer that
question during motions tonight?

My answer, the Honorable Mayor Doherty got his three votes and the taxpayers got the screwing of their lives. Here we are broke, distressed with no way out. Audits are six months late, budgets are not balanced, although, counsel past council members assured the residents every year that the budgets were balanced, the bills were being paid, and that the city under the watchful eye of the Honorable Mayor Doherty and his cabinet members, city council, OECD, and city controller were making sure that everything was being done properly and legally. Again, the wool is being pulled over the eyes of the taxpayers. The only exception is the Legion of Doom and the regular speakers at city council meetings.

On the other hand, the Doherty Three and the past Doherty rubber stampers were

stumbling around blind because the Honorable Mayor Doherty refused to remove the wool from their eyes. Result, the city is broke, cannot pay bills, reduced public safety employees, sold assets and the citizens were being lied to. Why should hardworking Scrantonians pay for the mistakes and the lies the elected and appointed officials have told people for years?

Finally, the truth from the Scranton city controller. She put out a letter dated October 19, 2011, to all department directors, "Absolutely no purchases are to be made from this point forward. Only in the event of an extreme emergency can a purchase be made, but not before being approved by contacting me and my office. This is a serious matter and your cooperation is expected. There is no money."

Finally, Roseann Novembrino put out an honest letter. Remember, residents and city council, hold the Honorable Mayor Doherty and the remaining Doherty One and appointed cabinet members' feet to the fire.

No tax increase or layoffs. The employees and taxpayers have not responsible for the mess the Honorable Mayor Doherty and his real people create.

And also, again, don't forget Kevin Murphy. Kevin Murphy was the city council president to approved all of this back when he was the president of the city council, so let's not forget Mr. Murphy, Mr. Gillhooley, Mr. McGoff, Mrs. Fanucci, and Mrs. Gatelli and the school principal, I can't remember his name, Bob whatever his name was, because they are all responsible.

They are the ones who refused to listen to the people, and you know what? The people were right. City council members were wrong because they were told what the vote for, when to vote for it and how to vote for it. They brought computers in, they got cell phone messages, they got text messages, we all know what was going on, you know, and it's just too bad that now the citizens of Scranton have to pay for this, and they are going to pay dearly. Old people like me we are not going to, but the

younger people if there is any left, people like Pat Rogan, Frank Joyce, Doug Miller, they are going to pay dearly if they remain in the City of Scranton. So, again, thanks to all of you people who put us in this position and I wish you would man up and admit to it.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Mr. Jackowitz, about there is no money statement, I do want to point out I have Mr. McGowan's cash flow report in front of me. In the beginning of October there was \$5.6 million in the general fund. At the end of October he projects that we'll have \$4.1million in the general fund, so obviously there is some money in the general fund.

MR. ROGAN: The next speaker is Ron Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: Thank you, Council, in another public forum I guess. Again, I have to read in the paper about Mr. Doherty and a bunch of losing attorneys he keeps hiring.

This time I noticed he said to sue him. It seemed like there is more that meets the eye

with him with these attorneys all the time. You know, we are talking about a man that just has run this city into the ground for crying out loud. You know, everything is just borrow or sell. He wants to sell the Audubon School to the hospital that's owed us \$500,000 on the building, the parking garage for years, they are not going to pay us. That's the kind of thinking.

He just doesn't seem to follow through on things, sell the parking meters to an organization that's completely broke and has to borrow. What sense is there in that? You know, it just doesn't stop with him. One thing they could do to save \$100,000 in the Parking Authority is fire the executive director who allowed this organization to just go to the blazes for crying out loud. It's been misrun year after year after year.

These are things that people just tell me when I stop at the grocery store and all. You can't imagine all of the things in people's minds in this city, and there is a lot of positive things, but I'm just talking

about quick conversations.

25

1

I had a young man tell me today at that there was a bond issue in the 80's to build a school which they didn't build, where did that money go? He said some better people than him tried to find out, The school board comes along and, you know. you know, we build the other school with new There always seems to be a shortage around here of accountability where money went in this administration. You know, this is a complete runaway school board. just -- we just spent \$28 million for that school for hundreds of KOZ parents that aren't paying a penny in taxes. Let the school board to go to them and get some money. Let the school board go out there to the project and ask some of these welfare unwed mothers with five or six kids tell them to start paying something. I pay. The people -- half the town is senior citizens they pay. They could -- the city acts like they just want to see more foreclosures and more abandoned houses. I got probably 15 of them in my neighborhood. The Smith house

has been sitting there for eight or ten years, it's not torn down. I got one in my back adjoining my property that the foundation is washing down on my property and my fence fell down two weeks ago.

Nobody wants to claim it. The place is -- you know, it brings a bad group of people into your neighborhood and I got plenty of them around my house now.

Well, I guess I have alienated the Parking Authority tonight and unwed mothers in the project, let's see who else I can get. You know, my mother lived in the Peckville project and at 4:00 or so when the manager left the playground was replaced with a dozen, 15 guys that come out of the apartments. See, they are not paying no rent or nothing. That goes on all over the place. I don't know.

I stood right here on a Thursday
night, I don't know, years ago and I said,
"It's time that somebody investigate
Scranton Counseling for what's going on.
The next day is when they picked up the
books. Anybody can see the handwriting on

the wall. There is just nobody seems to be looking. I stood here for two or three weeks and I complained about -- I said it's not the guards at the jail. I said, there is no supervision. The people on the upper echelon just don't care what's going on there. The warden should have been fired, not the guards. This is the warden's fault. He has got to take the blame. Nobody wants to take the blame. Every time something happens adverse Doherty got an excuse. It's this or that, we got to fire the police, the firemen, we got too much -- nobody wants to take the blame for it.

I don't know, you people -- not you people, but the school board continuously talking about the future of the children.

There is no future for children in this town. Who is going to pay a half a million dollars in debts when they grow up?

Something has got to be done, you know.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you for your comments. Mr. Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: It's sure not going to be done by the University of the Scranton.

They are a bunch of deadbeats that don't care nothing about the people in this city. It's not going to be done by Lackawanna College, they don't care. They have to write nice letters about everybody except their host. I don't know. I'm in the November or the September years of my life so this won't be my property like it will be some of yours, but it's a bad thing going on in this city. These children that everybody is so worried, build schools and build and build, that seems to be the battle cry of the school board.

You're going to see a bunch of houses up there in Keyser Avenue in two years when they have to start paying taxes, I have already heard, I think he is a policeman, but I had a fellow tell me a lunch at the club a couple of months ago he just grins. You know, he is talking about like \$100 a week on taxes for his house. He said he got a couple of hundred thousand dollar house.

MR. ROGAN: Mr. Ellman, thank you for your comments. We have a few other

1 speakers that are waiting. 2 MR. ELLMAN: Well, I thank you for allowing me to speak. 3 MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you. 4 5 MR. ELLMAN: Let me tell you why I'm so mad, it will take a second. I had an 6 7 accident with my '69 Firebird. Six months I 8 have been fighting with these people, 9 finally they totaled the car, I sent the 10 title in. Today they phoned me and said I 11 have to -- they are sending my title back, I 12 have to give them a notarized bill of sale. 13 See, they just want to work with my money. 14 You know, I'm not stupid. This has got me so mad I get upset since 1 or 2:00. I mean, 15 16 these things always seem to just go wrong 17 for me. 18 MR. ROGAN: Best of luck in your 19 situation. MR. JOYCE: Yes, best of luck to 20 21 you. 22 MR. ROGAN: John Judge. Good evening, council. 23 MR. JUDGE: 24 MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening. 25 MR. JUDGE: My name is John Judge,

I'm a Scranton firefighter and I'm secretary with the union. I'm here tonight to talk about a couple of different issues, the first one being the spirit of cooperation.

When this Supreme Court award came down last week, none of the members that I spoke to in my local said anything about the money. They were concerned primarily about what this department was going to be like after Mayor Doherty got through with it knowing that they lost a Court case.

In that spirit of the cooperation, we wanted to come to the mayor, work things out like President Martin from the FOP said, we were basically told no. Some things have changed here, the firefighters are now one of the city's creditors. You owe us money. Tell me which one of your credit card companies, your utility companies, comes to you when you owe them money and says, "Let's make a deal. Let's work things out."

When was the last time one of you got one of those calls? Ever?

MR. LOSCOMBE: I'm still waiting.

MR. JUDGE: No. I don't think you

ever will either. We are here now, we are stakeholders in the city, we want the city to be successful and we also know what the impact of this award can potentially mean. We are realists. We want cooperation and we want it returned.

If the mayor wants to continue this war, fine. We will be here. We are resilient. Ten years the FOP and the firefighters. We were resilient and we were vindicated. I don't believe in my heart that the mayor was the one that put us off every time we went in there. I think there is other people that should be held accountable for what's happened to this city. DCED, PEL, whoever it was that told the mayor on a couple of occasions "No" to handshake deals we had. Let's see them pay.

But until that point comes, this mayor needs to sit down and speak with us any time, anywhere and that's what we are willing to do. We want to see this city succeed just like everybody in this room, just like the mayor, just like the taxpayers. Everyone has been talking about

how this is going to affect public safety.

This is not just going to affect public safety, it's going to be affect public safety, it's going to be affect my trash getting picked up, it's going to affect the clerical union, this has broad sweeping issues that need to be addressed.

The mayor needs to sit down, personalities aside, it's done, it's over. It's time to talk about this. I don't want to see my firehouse closed where I live. I don't want to see no police cars going up my street. I don't want to have my trash picked up every two or three weeks instead of every week. I want this to end now and the only which that happens is two parties get together, us and him. We are ready. Where is he at? It's unfortunate we have already heard from him and he said absolutely not. I don't think that that's the right answer.

And I would imagine that -- and me and Councilman McGoff have spoke about this at length about it. It's time to cooperate. It's simple. Put the personality conflicts

aside and let's act like adults and let's move the city forward. Fire department wants to do it, sounds like the police department wants to do it, and I'm sure DPW and clerical doesn't want to lose any of their employees either and I don't think they can afford it. They are going to get the bone at this point just like the rest of us.

But one other thing I find kind of disheartening is, is the Scranton Parking Authority is asking you for \$1.6 million or something for the next budget or whatever it is?

MR. ROGAN: The Parking Authority wants the meters.

MR. JUDGE: They want your meters, but they don't have a shortfall next year.

MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

MR. JUDGE: They have a shortfall next year. Well, if you use the same logic the mayor uses maybe they can't afford to have all of the people that are over there as well, maybe they need to trim that back on that side. It's time to put everything

aside and let's sit down and talk. I would hope that those of you who know the mayor or make contact with him, it sounds like Councilman Rogan has had a couple of discussions with him, I know Councilman McGoff has discussions with him, it's time to put the gloves down, act like gentleman and do the right thing for the city.

We are here, we have always extended the olive branch. My two brothers, Brother Gervasi and Brother Shriver, who lead this union through this tough time have always told me always extend the olive branch, always try and work something out. We are going to continue to do that, and that's how this union is going to continue to operate as well.

If there is anything council needs from us or anything we can do to help you with your budget, we have ideas. We have good ideas to kind of limit this burden for the taxpayers and for us as well. None of us what want to see our department in disarray. We are not going to let him. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Mr. Judge --

MS. EVANS: Excuse me, I just want to -- I see that we have the IAFF president in the back of the room and if you had intended to speak tonight if you would like to follow Mr. Judge so that council might be able to hear what you have to offer.

MR. LOSCOMBE: If I could just ask a quick question, just so I understand clearly, did you meet with the mayor today and face-to-face he told you he didn't want to work with you or --

MR. JUDGE: No, I was in with Brother Gervasi yesterday and we were at the PEL/DCED meeting and they all -- and Mr. McGoff was there and he can attest to the same fact, they all said the same thing it's time for all parties to begin to talk and business administrator Ryan McGowan said that he would go over and ask the mayor if he would be willing and we received word back today that absolutely not.

MR. LOSCOMBE: This is why we are in the position we are here.

MR. JOYCE: Mr. Judge, just to give

5

4

8

9

7

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you and the residents of Scranton a situation of what kind of impact that's going to have on the city if the city pays \$10 million all at once, we realize about \$13 million in real estate taxes every year on an annual basis. \$10 million is roughly about 77 percent of that, give or take a few decimal points, so by not meeting with you the mayor is then suggesting that we are going to have an 80 percent tax increase in order to makeup that \$10 million, which is absolutely ludicrous. If I were him, I would be begging you to meet with me to resolve this issue and spread these payments out over "X" amount of years, because that is the only way to not have this be a catastrophic blow to the taxpayers of this city.

MR. JUDGE: I agree.

MR. LOSCOMBE: And I commend you and your brothers and the police union for being willing to work with him, the public and the taxpayers. As we are all know, you're taxpayers yourself. This is, like Mr. Joyce said, it's ludicrous that he would not even

consider something like that. It's ludicrous that we are in this position now as we are because of those kind of decisions.

MR. JUDGE: Yeah, and I agree and we spoke with this, myself and Mr. McGoff, and the past is the past and it's time to move on at this point. We need to put these personality issues to the side and we need to -- what's done is done, it's time to work out whatever we are left with, and make this right for everybody.

MR. ROGAN: I think you hit the nail on the head when you said, you know, when does your creditor come to you and say, "We are going to cut you a break."

You know, I have \$60,000 in student loan debt. I wish they would come to me and say, "Oh, we'll take 40."

It's not going to happen. Both the police union and the fire union, like you said publically tonight on camera, they are willing to negotiate with the mayor and spread this out, and that's absolutely what the mayor should do. And, you know, I agree

with what you said. We have to work together. I have took a lot of heat for meeting with the mayor a few weeks ago. I don't agree with what the mayor is trying to do, you know. You know how I feel and we all know, but we have to get through this.

MR. JUDGE: Yeah.

MR. ROGAN: We can't have -- I live in West Side, I have seen just from when I graduated high school a few years ago until now how West Side has gone downhill and the rest of the city. You know, we cannot afford to lose more cops. We can't afford to have our firehouses closing in the city and we absolutely cannot afford to increase taxes. The people are broke. There is no more money to squeeze out of the residents of this city, and I think the mayor is neglecting his duties as mayor if he will not sit down and meet.

MR. JUDGE: Well, I think in the past where maybe other parties were influential in the bargaining process with us and the FOP, those parties no longer are here, they don't have a stake in it. They

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

were told by the Supreme Court you no longer have a stake in this, so now it's the mayor's sole decision, so if we are not meeting he has no one to blame it on but himself. It's his decision and we'll be here though. Always here. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: I agree completely.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. GERVASI: Good evening, city council. Dave Gervasi, president of the firefighters' union. Just to add what he was saying, just giving you a little more detail, at the PEL meeting we did reach out to the city, and we were actually encouraged to do it by Mr. McGoff and we were encouraged by the Pennsylvania Economy League and the DCED representative that was there and we let the business administrator know that, you know, we need to talk. thought this would possibly motive the mayor to sit down and we were -- the message came through our deputy chief today that, no, he is not interested, and his plan, what we are told, is going to be raising taxes 100

percent, massive layoffs in the police and fire department, and he wants to borrow all the money and pay the whole bill right at once immediately. I don't know how you do that. I mean, it's a little unrealistic. We understand it's unrealistic.

As my colleague said, John said, we have ideas, we have plans, we have things that we can talk to the mayor about. I don't know if you can drag them to negotiations with us, but we are willing to do it, and like told them at the meeting, put out the olive branch, we asked for cooperation, and he turned it down.

Other than that, we really have nothing else to say other than, I mean, there is a lot of ramifications of living with this Court case and I'm here to answer any questions you might have.

MR. JOYCE: Yes. Any ideas or anything to that nature, would you be able to e-mail me a copy of them or send them in writing or whatever your ideas you are planning on proposing to the mayor?

MR. GERVASI: Sure.

MR. JOYCE: And also I understand, I was doing some research on grants available for fire departments, and I understand, and perhaps you would be able to confirm this, is that Harrisburg's fire department is actually having five firefighters' salaries paid for by use of the SAFER grant; correct?

MR. GERVASI: That's correct
Wilkes-Barre was also successful with that
grant.

THE COURT: Has the City of Scranton ever applied for a such grants?

MR. GERVASI: The mayor refused to apply for the SAFER grant year after year. They wouldn't allow us to.

MR. JOYCE: Hum.

MS. EVANS: I know that Mr. Loscombe asked me prior to this evening's meeting if council members might be willing to sit down with the unions, since the mayor has refused to do so, I still hope that he would reverse course and act as a leader and mayor of this city and sit down and try to mitigate this on behalf of the people he serves, but should he fail to do so I think we have a

number of council members who would be willing to sit down and listen and try to work this out and then, of course, present this to the mayor for his approval, but as you know, as I said to Mr. Loscombe earlier tonight, the problem you can lead the horse to water, but you can't make him drink.

MR. GERVASI: True.

MS. EVANS: And you know, we certainly would be available to do whatever we can in the hopes that perhaps the mayor would have an interest in the people of our city, have enough respect and concern for them that he would be willing to consider what you have to say.

MR. GERVASI: I wish he would because the layoffs he is talking about, there is no real numbers being thrown around, but what we have been hearing coming out of city hall in the past, this would generally close Engine 15 permanently, Engine 10 permanently, Truck 4 permanently. There would be brownouts. We would really be running with three stations and four pieces of apparatus out of eight stations

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and ten pieces of apparatus. 60 percent of our department will be closed. It's not necessary. It's really not necessary. I don't know if he is just lashing out at us, but it's in the necessary. I think we all have to act like adults here and sit down and work our differences out. That's really it.

The only other statement I had was Mr. McGoff I saw his interview today on Channel 16, you think it's ashame that arbitrators make these decisions and not the elected officials, and I just want to ensure you that that's how it works, that's the law, and your elected official, the mayor, the one who didn't tell the truth, not him personally, but his administration and the ones who didn't tell the truth to the arbitrator which resulted in this whole thing. If they told the truth about the city's finances and they had factual information during the arbitration process then none of this would have happened and we would have had our cost of living raises, that's all we ever asked for, cost of living

adjustment, which is what we got. There would be no back pay, there wouldn't be any of this pain, and I don't know how they thought putting illegal things within the Recovery Plan would pass muster in Court. I don't know how they thought that doing none-economic things, things that has nothing to with the city Recovery Plan would past muster in Court. I don't understand it. I don't know who gave them that advice, but it was terrible advice.

MS. EVANS: Well, actually though, I think that public officials were involved in that the mayor had the opportunity to negotiate and settle for a far less amount --

MR. GERVASI: Far less.

MS. EVANS: -- than what the Supreme Court has awarded. It was his decision not to settle and to continue to appeal court cases. So in fact, he had opportunity after opportunity after opportunity after opportunity to make these decisions, which he did. So, you know, I don't think you can have it both ways.

MR. GERVASI: That's correct.

Mrs.

Thank

MS. EVANS: And talk out of both

sides of your mouth. 2 3 MR. GERVASI: That's correct. Evans, just so you know, too, I asked DCED 4 5 was in the room at the meeting, PEL as in the room at the meeting, and two officials 6 7 from the City of Scranton were in the room 8 at the meeting and I asked them straight 9 out, Mr. McGoff was there and he can verify 10 what I'm saying, I said, "Who told the 11 mayor -- who killed our deal in October of 12 '09 which would have been pennies on the 13 dollars that we negotiated and agreed to and 14 we shook hands with the city and they reneged on it?" 15 16 And PEL says, "It wasn't us, we had 17 nothing to do with that." 18 The guy from DCED, the lawyer from 19 DCED said, "I have no knowledge of anybody 20 else making that decision." 21 So apparently it was the mayor that 22 made those decisions. 23 MS. EVANS: Thank you. 24 MR. GERVASI: Or they don't know if 25 someone from the state did it, too.

1

you for your time.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

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

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council.

Dave Dobrzyn, resident of Scranton and taxpayer. About two weeks ago Pat mentioned maybe -- two or three weeks ago about studying the DPW for efficiency, and I would like to commend him on that idea, but also I feel that if you do you have to study the bogus practices of people because I think there is a lot of money to be saved there. I see newspapers out in the trash, I see cans, bottles and so forth. Well, the newspaper don't weigh too much, but we are paying by the ton and if they get wet and they weigh a lot.

MR. ROGAN: I agree. We do everything we can to promote recycling in this city.

MR. DOBRZYN: Right. So I think
there is lot of money to be saved and it
wouldn't even be -- I have spoken to some
DPW guys and they are all for it. You know,

people have -- those people are actually feeding off of us by their laziness.

And I also support you on the meter idea that I heard last week and I might note, I don't know where their sense of intelligence is coming from or whatever, but I think I read \$5 by 2014 to park at a parking garage, \$5 an hour, and if that would be the case, I mean, we are trying to loan people money in town here and get them in business and everything and then we turn around and chase them out of town because it's already an issue down the mall. They have way more people parking there than what they have inside the mall, you know?

And on this business with the safety unions, you know, there is a nationwide attack on labor, especially firemen and teachers and police and so forth, and one thing I would like to point out is do we really need somebody involved with public safety that's been overworked? Do you need to get pulled over by a police officer that's been on the job for 16 hours? You know, there is different reactions that

22

23

24

25

could be improper or they may make the wrong decision and either get themselves killed or going into a building that there is nothing and it's just wrong. You can't overwork people and you are going to stress their families out, too, so then they have home problems and everything else, I would like to deal with somebody with a human head because I turn the -- turn a dome light on and I'm rarely ever pulled over, but I'll turn the dome light on to assure them that, you know, I'm not pulling out a gun or something like that or if I'm reaching for a registration card or something, but in reality we put these people out in the street and then we are paying the next guy 50 percent as much just to fill their spots where the savings are just about negligible and then when you wind up with a workers' comp or something because you overworked somebody into an early grave or just about, where are you?

And my buddy Ron brought up about a school board, and he should consider going down to the school board about it, but I'd

like to recommend to you people, because I read now they are talking about replacing two more schools, Audubon and Prescott, and at this point with all of the troubles that are facing the city do we really need to spend \$30 million as opposed to five or six million dollars? And what I would like you to do is consider sending them a letter asking them to practice a little constraint on this because the schools have rebuilt several already and replaced several already and what they take out of our pockets certainly don't have for the city because it's no longer existing.

And, well, last week I mentioned about a letter of support for Steamtown, and we don't have the bother with this right tonight, but I have some pamphlets here that I collected over my different trips and stuff and you can pass them around amongst yourselves, I'll try to get more, so if I can approach, John?

(Mr. Dobrzyn approaches the dais.)

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. DOBRZYN: I'm not asking for any

money from Scranton for that, but, you know, maybe we could get a few amenities out of them like a free visit for each family, head of household or something once a year, and it's a really educational experience and it does bring tourists into the city, so they are dining at restaurants and so forth and patronizing somewhat.

Well, the golden parrot goes to PEL for all their legal advice and using us as legal lab rats. Thanks a lot, PEL. Bawk, bawk, bawk, you won't have to pay, bawk. Have a good night.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Take care.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening.

Marie Schumacher, citizen and taxpayer.

Regarding 7-A on tonight's agenda, first I would like to thank the council for increasing the forestry and vacant properties budget. I know that Tony Santoli will be a good steward of this funds. What I don't understand, however, is why the neighborhood police patrol is still programmed for \$200,000, when there was

\$300,000 left in the account at the end of last year and per a Right-to-Know letter that I sent to the business administrator there have been no charges against the current year budget, so -- and then we know that we can't draw down any more money for neighborhood police patrol per HUD until 12 months from the last layoff that's been passed -- has passed, so I don't know why all of this backlog of funds is just sitting there when it could be put to use.

And I would also request that you put back in the \$50,000, an additional \$50,000, to the Neighborhood Properties Review Committee to fully fund their These are the funds that will get request. some of these vacant properties off the -off the vacant properties and potential condemnation list and possibly get them rehabbed and occupied again.

MR. ROGAN: Would you like me to answer that now or in motions?

MS. SCHUMACHER: In motions, that's fine, or when you take up 7-A that's fine.

> MR. ROGAN: Okay.

22

21

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

3

2

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SCHUMACHER: Regarding the paving, the request that 150 blocks would be paved if they their full request of \$2 million was funded, so this equates to about \$13,333 per block, so council's recommended \$838,000 would round out to about 63 blocks that could be paved. What I would like to see is more elected official involvement in which streets are to be paved. I don't necessarily know how you do it. I know your attorney is a municipal law expert, perhaps he has some ideas or you could research it yourself, but I think you should request the list of those streets and they should be -you all should be making the decisions and not people that we don't elect.

I would also ask, I guess Mr. Joyce probably would have the answer to this, I would like to know if our existing bonds are tied to -- our interest rates on the existing bonds are tied to our bond rating, and they are maybe going up next year if our -- in six months. I understand we have been given a six month grace period on that bond rating, but if it goes down do our interest

2

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

rates go up? So I would very much like to know that if you can answer that during motions that would be wonderful.

The rental registration that was discussed last week just really rubbed me the wrong way, but then so has the foot dragging for the last week. I don't see anything the matter with what was passed in 2007. I think it was a good piece of legislation, and I don't -- the purpose of the legislation was to eliminate blight to keep residents safe, it was not to be a revenue generator. As a matter of fact, it is a fee. Fees are for services rendered. Taxes are taking above and beyond for I guess the common good for lack of a better term, but using rental registration as a means to raise revenue, I think is beyond the pail.

And, I mean, you will get -- if you increase the rental registrations you will get probably more sewer bills, more trash bills paid, and so there will be some revenue that's being missed currently, but it should not be a revenue generator, it

21

22

23

24

25

should be for inspections, and I would like to know why I think keep hearing about these four people at DPW who were not budgeted for and are still working, you also put two inspectors in for this rental registration legislation, so what have they been doing?

Personally I think, and I think and I'll talk more about this probably next week, this is a program that should be put out to one of our Scranton companies. a perfect job for people who handle data all the time, who have access to data basis. have someone in here who was willing to do it for a very nominal fee, at least establish the database. Once the database is established, it's just a matter of getting the bills out on a regular basis and then if there are any delinquencies they could go in with all of the rest of the delinquent taxes and fees that are due and I'll be back next week, good lord willing. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MS. ROSKY: Good evening, Council, and welcome aboard I'm so happy, the

- -

taxpayers are very fortunate to have you as council members.

MR. JOYCE: Well, thank you.

MS. ROSKY: And I wasn't even going to come up tonight, I have been wanting to come for years and I wasn't even going to come and I thought, wait a minute, I have to come. I am so frustrated with this mayor and you think of repercussions, so you don't come.

MS. EVANS: May I interrupt you?

MS. ROSKY: I'm sorry, my name is --

MS. EVANS: We need your name --

MS. ROSKY: I'm sorry. I am a taxpayer in the city, obviously. Mary Ann Rosky, and I have been a taxpayer for a number of years now, but I have been meaning to come and voice my opinion, and I'm not going to be afraid of repercussions anymore. This is my First Amendment Rights right here and anybody who voted this mayor in again maybe the taxes on those taxpayers should be higher. Maybe people who have not voted him in -- I mean, maybe they can afford it, I don't know who they are, you know, but maybe

they can -- maybe they deserve it. We don't deserve it. We don't deserve it. We deserve to have public safety. We deserve to have police and fire protection at all times. At all times. And they can't be in North Scranton, I have a scanner, they can't be in north end and come all the way to West Side at the end towards Taylor one car racing to go and catch a call in West Side, and that's what I'm hearing. I'm hearing them all coming from here, there and everywhere else to go back there. It just doesn't cut it.

So I don't know if the mayor -maybe he should like ride with the police
officers every now and then or go to a fire
with the firemen every now and then see what
they go through, because I don't think he
knows. I don't think he knows. I don't
know where he came from that he wouldn't
know, but I don't think he knows.

And I'm so frustrated, I don't know where to begin with this man. He put us in the hole that we are in. He, himself, and only himself. The police officers did not,

Не

this man, but he won't work with them. won't come here, sit here, talk to you like a social person and just like tell the taxpayers what's going on. He will tell you something, he will tell you something, he will Mr. Rogan something. No, we don't want to hear hearsay. We want the mayor to come, be able to sit at home, hear what he has to say to all of your council members and also to all of us taxpayers. We want to hear for ourselves out of his mouth, out of the horse's mouth, and we are tired of his ball We are so tired of them. players. And I have people complaining in the stores, why they are not here tonight I don't know. I have no idea unless they are also afraid of repercussions, whatever they I know what mine are, you know, I may be. have different neighbors that I know voted for him and whatnot and I don't want an

argument in my neighborhood, we all have to

work together, but our police protect us

the firefighters definitely did not, he put

council as great as you that wants to work

us there. He put -- and then we got a

3

4

5 6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

all, our firemen protect us all. They don't protect me and not my neighbor up the street or around the corner, they protect everyone.

If there was a house on fire on the corner here and there was one down there where are they coming from? How many fire trucks are they going to rent out from different areas? But he dug us in this hole and even more so by everything that you guys suggested up there and everything that you guys made good he appealed. How much do those appeals cost? How much do they cost? Where does he think we are going? I mean, we are going to pack our bags and get out of here and I don't care if it's across the line to Taylor. It's not going to be in Wilkes-Barre, obviously, but I don't know care if it's Taylor. I don't really don't.

We have had it. We have had it. I hear people talking, I see the newspaper which, of course, maybe some of these people who are not here tonight may, maybe they don't read the paper like myself, maybe they don't talk to people as myself, so they don't quite know what's going on, and a lot

of them I'm sure are elderly and don't know what's going on.

But I have seen people come here at all ages when there was different things going on in favor of Mayor Doherty, I have seen them show up, so if the taxpayers don't come here they don't want to complain then maybe they deserve to pay the taxes for us. People who come here and complain should not, should not be paying this, and our police officers and firefighters should get what they have been entitled to for eight, ten years.

People who work in fast food restaurants, people who work retail, they get a quarter an hour, they get 50 cents an hour, they get a buck an hour, what do our policemen get? They don't get tips from anybody nor our fire department get, they don't get a tip from anybody. Waitresses get paid and then they get tips, too. Thank you. I'm sorry I was so aggravated, but it's been a build up of so many years and I'm sure I will be back. Thank you. God bless you.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this whole discussion, I think we have been

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you very much.

MR. JOYCE: I just want to add to

focused a lot on the cost of the award and

the impact it will have on city taxpayers,

but also I think what we are forgetting in

this whole mix is the cost of attorney fees,

and I could be incorrect on the saying this,

however, I believe from my knowledge that

the city will be obligated to pay the fire

and police unions and attorney fees if they

lose, but -- and also in addition to the

attorney fees that they have been paying,

but I very well would be mistaken on that,

but I know that there will be a very -- that

there has been a large amount of attorney

fees on the city's end over the years

leading up to this Supreme Court decision.

However, I do -- you know, I think I

can actually correct myself, I do think that

the union would be responsible for paying

their own attorney fees, however, the

attorney fees incurred by the city are also

at a great cost to the taxpayers.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Chrissy.

MR. SLEDENZSKI: Jackie.

MR. JOYCE: Hey, Chrissy. How about West Side beating Abington?

MR. SLEDENZSKI: Hey, Frank, you know something, Frank, remember your face Saturday. I was up there. I froze. I froze. I want you to remember, the firemen downstairs, keep their jobs down there.

Dave, I care about you guys down there.

Remember that. Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good job, Chrissy.

MR. HOLDEN: Hi. Marilyn Holden, resident of Scranton, Hyde Park.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MS. HOLDEN: Has anyone thought of the repercussions as far as, okay, we are closing -- they are going to close these more firehouses, okay? Sooner or later the residents homeowners' premiums are going to rise. This whole debacle it has a snowball effect. It's just not you close a fire station, sooner or later the residents of Scranton, homeowners, their premiums are going to rise. Right on my homeowners' insurance premium, the rider, the bill, what

have you, how close are you with respect to a fire hydrant? Well, what good is a fire hydrant if there is no one -- no firemen to come to hook up to it? I mean, that's an issue that I believe the residents of this city they need to digest that as well because sooner off later down the road our homeowners' premiums are going to go be increased.

MR. LOSCOMBE: That's a fact.

MS. HOLDEN: What do you think, Mrs. Evans? Do you think I'm wrong there?

MS. EVANS: No, I think you are right on target absolutely because I think we are not only talking about fire hydrants, but perhaps even -- and Mr. Loscombe may know more, but the proximity of your home to a fire station and when those fire stations are closed up go your premiums because you are no longer --

MS. HOLDEN: Exactly.

MS. EVANS: -- in a situation where, you know, God forbid a fire can be addressed as quickly.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Let's face it, you

are going to be charged higher rates when there is more burglaries, there is more 2 3 fires, more damaging fires because they've had a longer time to burn. I mean, that's 4 5 all impacted. That's all part of the 6 process. But I think the 7 MS. HOLDEN: 8 residents of Scranton need to digest that 9 fact as well, and it may not be next month, 10 it may not be next year, but it's coming and 11 people can't afford it. They can't 12 afford -- we have residents leaving the city. I mean, people cannot afford it. 13 14 MS. EVANS: I agree. MS. HOLDEN: Okay, thank you. 15 16 MS. EVANS: Thank you. 17 MR. JOYCE: Thank you. 18 MR. ANCHERANI: Good evening, Council. Nelson Ancherani, resident and 19 20 taxpayer. 21 MS. EVANS: Good evening. 22 Recording secretary MR. ANCHERANI: 23 of the FOP. First Amendment Rights. 24 not going to beat a dead horse, but I'm just 25 going to say a couple of things. I'm just

1

going to say it did not have to be this way.

All it took was good faith bargaining,
that's all. It did not have to be this way.

I've been coming here for ten years and I
have been saying, and as recently as a
couple of weeks ago, that we are borrowing
from Peter to pay Paul. Peter is here. He
is at the door. Now it's going to be
interesting because we are going to see how,
and it's already started, the scrambling has
started, and it's going to be how do we
correct the situation. That's going to be a
good guestion. How do we correct it?

And that's basically where I'm going to leave it, but just to say about PEL, 20 years for PEL. PEL has been year 20 years and look where we are. If anybody should be responsible for all those millions it should be PEL, it should be DCED. They came here and they failed. 20 years. 20 years. But anyway, thank you.

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

Mrs. Krake?

MS. KRAKE: FIFTH ORDER. 5-A.

MOTIONS.

MS. EVANS: Please turn off cell phones. Councilman McGoff, do you have any comments or motions?

MR. MCGOFF: Please. I guess the first thing that I will respond to is the Supreme Court decision. There are two things that concern me with the decision, the first one has to do with what was brought up by Mr. Gervasi, and that has to do with governance. What the decision said was that the Collective Bargaining Act supersedes the Distressed Cities Act basically and that any actions taken by an elected official under the Distressed Cities Act are null and void, which means that everything was reversed to the arbitration decisions.

If I were a member of a labor union negotiating with any municipality I would never negotiate a contract. I would wait until it went to arbitration because history says that arbitrators favor unions, especially in the State of Pennsylvania. We now have arbitrators that are determining

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

how municipalities are going to operate. I think this diminishes the authority of all elected officials.

Now, in this case, you know, it may be the mayor, it may be -- in other situations it may be councils, it may be commissions, but it takes the power away from the elected officials and puts it in the hands of somebody who was never elected. I have never voted for an arbitrator. don't think anyone here has, so why are we having arbitrators, you know, basically making decisions. I think that this turns democracy around. I think it puts all municipalities in a difficult situation where you may be powerless to negotiate contracts that are in the best interest of the municipality.

While it may be viewed in this instance as a success for the unions, and it is. You know, I'm not going to deny that, but I think into the future it sets a bad precedent and that concerns me.

The monetary -- the second part, the monetary part, obviously, this decision

exacerbates, you know, what's a dire situation. We need to pay these awards and my question, you know, who is going to profit from it? Certainly the members of the unions who are working, you know, when these awards were made certainly will benefit, but the end result is that we are looking at tax increases, layoffs, increased debt, all of these are going to be products of this decision.

I don't want to see anybody lose their job. I don't want to see my taxes go up. I don't want to see, you know, any of these possibilities, but it's likely to happen. Right now tax revenues pay for about 90 percent of the employees' wages in the City of Scranton, okay, and the other 10 percent has to come from somewhere else. With the salary increases that will occur over the next few years, that's probably going to fall to somewhere maybe 70 percent, 60 percent of what tax revenues will provide, where did you make up the difference?

Estimates are that, and I'm sure
I'll be corrected, but I'm told that
estimates are that the starting pay for a
firemen by in 2015 will be somewhere around
\$70,000 per year.

MR. GERVASI: I wish.

MR. MCGOFF: Our current tax structure can't pay for that. Something is going to have to change, and how we do that, how we account for that, I'm not sure. While you can look at the decision as being, you know, a victory for, you know, those who suffered under, you know, the eight, ten year, whatever it was of this Court decision or before this Court decision fine, it's a victory, but in the long-run it may be a victory for some and certainly it's going to have an effect on the City of Scranton and especially the taxpayers in the City of Scranton.

Solution? I agree with Mr. Judge, Mr. Gervasi, Mr. Martin, and I have been saying it all along. I think the only solution to any of these problems is in communication, dialogue, compromise,

discourse, whatever you want to call it, and I'm saying this to, you know, and I will say this to the mayor, in talking with Mr. Judge before the meeting I will go to him and I think it's an absolute necessity that that be done if we are going to have any type of resolution that will be of benefit to the entire city.

Do I think we are going to hurt?

Yes. But if we can diminish this hurt then
I think it is incumbent upon us to do that.
I think it's the duty of all elected

officials to do that. And again, I will

convey that message to the mayor.

Again, when it comes down to it, despite the fact that I sit here I am but a single citizen when it comes down to it and maybe what's needed is some type of, you know, message sent that this is what -- this is what the citizens of the City of Scranton want is for cooperation and some type of agreement on how this is going to take place.

On another note, the parking meter proposal that -- the lease proposal that was

made last week, I just had a couple of questions that I would like to pose before we actually get into dealing with it. You know, one of them, and I did ask Attorney Hughes after the meeting is what effect will this have on the Scranton Parking Authority? And while I know it's not our -- necessarily our business to take care of Scranton Parking Authority, this does play an integral part in this proposal, at least from my perspective.

I think that removing the revenue,
the meter revenue from the Parking Authority
will effectively bankrupt the Scranton
Parking Authority and --

UNKNOWN CITIZEN: Good.

(Citizens applaud.)

MR. MCGOFF: And while you may see that as something that's desirous, it does have some negative effects. First of all, the Parking Authority is \$50 million in debt, all of that is secured --

MR. JACKOWITZ: Whose fault is that?

MS. EVANS: Let's --

MR. MCGOFF: Excuse me. All of that

is -- that's fine. All of that is secured by the City of Scranton. They go bankrupt, that \$50 million debt becomes part of what we need to pay.

UNKNOWN CITIZEN: Big deal. We're already paying it.

MR. MCGOFF: Excuse me.

MS. EVANS: I'm sorry.

MR. MCGOFF: You had your time.

MS. EVANS: I'd like the audience members to remain quiet, please. This is Mr. McGoff's portion of the meeting, his motions and comments, and just as council listens respectfully to the speakers, I ask that the speakers are respectful of the council members and listen to what each has to say, please.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. I appreciate that. My only question is can the estimated excess revenue that Attorney Hughes demonstrated we might receive or have from this proposal, is it enough to cover the cost of the increased debt service that we would get from the Scranton Parking Authority? If it is, then maybe it's not a

2

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

bad deal. But if it isn't, then maybe we need to reconsider. It just -- it's a question that I had. And I think it's one that need to be addressed.

Secondly, in looking at the numbers it's my understanding that in order to receive the 16 point -- or, yeah, sorry, \$6.5 million revenue bond that it would probably be necessary to pledge more than that amount in order to -- you might have to pledge 125 percent of, you know, or whatever number in order to receive that. If that is in fact true, if that is in fact what a bank would ask for, then I think that we need to take a look at that and revise the numbers that were presented, and I'm not disagreeing with the proposal, I think it needs more discussion, but I would like to, you know, I think these are two questions that may need to be considered before we move forward with that proposal.

Third thing, rental registration.

We did not have an opportunity to meet again with Attorney Kelly, obviously other issues arose that became a little more important

and we did not have an opportunity to go back and meet again, but just to answer some of the questions that were perhaps brought up, there has been no amelioration of, you know, the strictures against blight in the new proposal. In fact, when we sat down and talked about it some of the wording was actually enhanced so that it would be more that inspectors and all would have more power to deal with blighted properties and unacceptable rental properties, so if that was a concern, I think that that's one that's unfounded given what we have tried to do.

And as far as making it a revenue source, I think it always was a revenue source. I think what's needed that by proper implementation of it and operation of it revenue will naturally flow from it. We are not doing it to -- the changes weren't necessarily to make the fees, you know, prohibitive. Yes, they were increased a bit, but they are still within -- I thought and I think we all agree that they were still within the parameters that were, you

know, quite acceptable, but the big thing was to implement the program so that all rental properties were, you know, paying what they should and by doing that the revenue would increase and hopefully in, you know, the next week or two week we do need to get together again and, you know, further fine tune this so that we can bring a proposal and so that we can bring acceptable legislation to council for approval. And I guess that's all I have for the evening.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. I know

Mr. Joyce wants to comment as Finance Chair,

but just a few things I wanted to mention in

response to the SPA and the proposed sale of

the parking meters versus the proposal

presented by city council and Attorney

Hughes to the banks and to the public.

First of all, the Scranton Parking

Authority hasn't had a balanced budget

without borrowing since the \$35 million was

borrowed when was that, 2007 or 2008? Each

year their budget is in the red and they

approach a bank for a letter of credit for

borrowing which brings us to the most recent

example of that where the SPA pulled a fast deal, if you will, by borrowing \$3.9 million through the Landmark Bank, and connect the dots here to the proposed \$14 million that this council is supposed to approve.

Now, only six of that \$14 million would go towards the purchase of those meters. The remainder is going to be used for their debt, one of which is the \$3.9 million fast deal that was just pulled off maybe two to three months ago. All of this is interrelated.

And in addition to that, if you sell the meters then the city has a gapping budgetary hole annually and how would you propose to fill that hole? Now, the fact of the matter remains, there is an operating agreement between the City of Scranton and the Scranton Parking Authority which gives the city the right to terminate that agreement on 60 days notice in terms of parking meter revenue, tickets, permits, etcetera.

And I believe it's in the best interest of the city to pursue the proposal

that was presented by Attorney Hughes because, as we said last week, it maintains a city asset, it provides a continuous source of revenue for the City of Scranton and the Scranton Parking Authority who know suggests that the city is going to have to assume it's shortfall perhaps next year, well, folks, that's not news as I told you. The news has been they had a shortfall every single year and they have gone out and borrowed.

Council found out last year, because this was another secret for I don't know maybe 20 years plus, that the Parking Authority budget has to be approved by this city council and last year for the very first time council took that action and council made changes to that budget which the Scranton Parking Authority ignored. They continue to employ the same number of administrators at the same inflated salaries and they chose instead to move around the worker bees so that the highly paid administrators continued to receive those hefty pays, so I think the Parking Authority

needs to look to itself and clean up it's own house and we'll worry about the City of Scranton.

MR. LOSCOMBE: And by doing so reducing ticket income, also, by taking the ticket writers off the street and putting them in as ticket processors, which they removed and kept the administrative people there, like Mr. Evans said. The worker bees are the once that generate the income and work on the street and they are the ones that could have kept this Parking Authority afloat, but they failed to follow our budget, they ignored our budget, and they still keep coming back to the trough for more help.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. I just want to comment on the whole presentation and maybe this will help clear some things up. In Boyd's presentation last week based on Mr. McGowan's numbers, he stated that the city is on course to receive about \$1.148 million or so in parking meter revenue. By that agreement, as far as what we pay the Parking Authority, we pay for their workers

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and we pay for the maintenance, etcetera, etcetera, tokens, associated fees and we give them a 10 percent service fee for that, so essentially we give them 100 -- and, well, in this case 10 percent of hundred or \$1,144,051 would be \$114,845. presentation that Mr. Hughes gave, Mr. Hughes, actually that money that we give to the Parking Authority is still included in the SPA citation issuers line, that wasn't deducted, so the \$548,000 of revenue that the city would be expected to receive every year would actually be a little bit more, so the loss to the Parking Authority would be about hundred and -- about a \$110,000 approximately, and it would

Now, I don't know based on the financial status of the Parking Authority if something to be could worked out if that agreement were -- if this plan were to eventually be adopted, and I had one question for you. You were stating that the taxes pay for about 90 percent of the city's workforce and that would down to perhaps 60

actually be about \$659,000 to the city.

or 70 by 2015 or so, I actually would like to look into it myself to find out what that would be in upcoming years, but when you said the city's taxes, were you referring to all taxes or just that --

MR. MCGOFF: All taxes.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. That's all I have to say.

MR. MCGOFF: I'd just like to go back, the only two things that I brought up that I think need to be considered, can the city absorb \$50 million worth of debt if, in fact, the Parking Authority is bankrupt?

And second, do we need to pledge more than \$6.5 million in order to receive \$6.5 million. Those were the only two things I asked.

MR. JOYCE: And I think that

Mr. Rogan made a very valid and good motion

just a few weeks ago to put these things out

to bid to see what the value is for the

parking garages because perhaps, you know,

maybe it won't be -- maybe someone won't be

willing to offer what the debt would be that

we currently owe on the parking garages.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

However, if Mayor Doherty follows through with the suggestions that Mr. Rogan made, and I believe that was two weeks ago you stated that, then we would at least know whether there is someone willing to pay for those parking garages at the rate -- or to offset the amount that we currently owe on it.

MS. EVANS: And it was my understanding at the time of that the \$35 million for the Parking Authority was approved that the garages were to be appraised at the time and they never were, but I think the point of an appraisal is that you are looking to sell or lease and for some reason that all just fell by the wayside where it got swept under the rug and I think the answer lies in exactly what both of these gentlemen were saying and this council has been saying, the administration should be facilitating an appraisal ASAP and looking, you know, contacting national companies for requests for proposals and this type of insatiable monkey needs to be removed from the back of the taxpayer not

fed further.

MR. JOYCE: And if I could just add, it's not very difficult to find companies that buy or agree to lease parking garages. I did a simple Goggle search about -- I don't know, this was months ago, and you could find probably about five to ten companies that specialize in that sort of thing. I have done the same sort -- have been involved in the same sort of procedure in Chicago, New York City, and other cities across. One example is ProPark, I believe.

MS. EVANS: Well, thank you all.

And, I'm sorry, Councilman Rogan, do you have any motions or comments this evening?

MR. ROGAN: Yes. I guess I'll start off just by making a few comments with the general discussion, first about the taxes paying 90 percent of the salaries. If that number is, in fact, correct, you know, you don't have to increase the taxes to 100 percent, you can decrease the salaries.

Secondly, the rental registration, you know, I agree with what Mr. Schumacher said to a point where we don't want it to be

The Vacant Property Review

a tax on people who own rental properties.

We do want them to pay the fee to the city so the inspectors can go out and inspect. I think that's, you know, a home run in both ends if the money come in they can pay for the inspection and the blight is reduced in the city. The only thing I fear about a rental registration program is that the city brings in money and never inspects the houses. That's my fear. If that's the case, that's a tax, it's not a fee.

A few other comments about CDBG and which Mrs. Schumacher brought up, I guess I'll address those now, and the first is about the neighborhood police patrols while it was kept in. Multiple reasons. The first one being that the money can always be transferred through legislation. I believe we transferred a few hundred thousand through legislation to increase our allocation for paving a few months ago.

Secondly, when I asked all my colleagues for suggestions, not one person wanted the money removed.

Committee, it was increased by \$25,000. I wish there was more money to put there as well, but we also did increase demolition of hazardous structures by 90 percent as well, so the money probably would have come from there if we were going to do that.

And I agree that there should be more elected official control of the paving program. You know, we are out in the neighborhoods, we talk to the residents all the time, we know the roads are bad and we hear the same -- we get the same letter from the same two people for the same tow years about, you know, certain roads in the city and nothing has been done.

I will comment a little more on the CDBG amendments and also the emergency certificate for the refinancing of the Section 108 loan as well.

MR. MCGOFF: Could I just ask a question?

MR. ROGAN: Sure.

MR. MCGOFF: And just something as you talked about the money for the police patrols. It's my understanding that in the

award of the Supreme Court decision that at least for the police there were minimum manning -- there was a minimum manning clause reinstated and would that minimum manning clause then put the numbers back at the level at which we could then have the neighborhood -- the number, what was it 130 and therefore we weren't eligible for the funding? With the minimum manning would that put that number back at 130 and then again make us eligible? I don't know the answer to that.

MR. ROGAN: I'm not sure either. It's something we can see.

MR. MCGOFF: But it would give credibility to leaving the money in there and --

MR. ROGAN: And, you know, leaving it in there, like I said, it can always be transferred and we all agreed that the neighborhood police patrols is something that's very important and we hope that we will have them.

MR. MCGOFF: I'm sorry to interrupt.

MR. ROGAN: No problem. I guess a

few comments about the hot issue of the week, the judgment that came down against the city. It's not a surprise that this judgment came down, you know, it's what the mayor has to say in the news and the newspapers and the mayor's solutions are make cuts, raise taxes. I'm all fine with making cuts, but let's make cuts in the areas that haven't been gutted over the last ten years.

Under Mayor Doherty, police and fire
-- every time cuts are made it's related to
the police and fire. Every single time. We
need cops. We need firemen. You know, this
started years ago. When all of this started
not one of these people, not one of my
colleagues or myself were sitting on this
board. I was sitting in a classroom in West
High when all of this started and now we
have to pay. We have to pay.

We have representatives from the police union and the fire union here today said they are willing to sit down with the mayor and the mayor refuses to sit down with them. That's very unfortunate, I hope the

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

mayor reconsiders that and sits down with
the unions and works out a longer term
payment plan maybe over five or ten -- ten
years is very ambitious, maybe over five
years where you could spread the burden out,
we don't have to make as deep of cuts, and
the taxes absolutely cannot go up.

The idea of a 100 percent tax increase is absolutely ludicrous. raise the taxes 1 percent. The people of this city are broke. All across the country they are overtaxed, you know, and I would remember gut the rest of the budget outside of the public safety than increase. have to cut into the absolutely bare bones and keep our cops on the streets, keep our firemen in the firehouses and keep taxes low because in the long run the more taxes go up the more people that are going to move outside of the city. People -- if you make \$50,000 a year in this city you are doing pretty well, but if you move from Scranton to Dunmore or Taylor you are getting an instant pay raise because you are paying less in property taxes and much less in wage

tax, so to break it down to a number that's very easy to understand.

For instance, you have a city with 100 people and it cost \$100 to run that city. They increase taxes to \$2, so 100 people paying \$2, the city is bringing in \$200. Half of those people leave, which I know that half of the population of Scranton has left over the last few decades because in part of the high taxation, the city is still running on that same amount of money so the remaining people have to pay even more, so it's a snowball effect.

You raise taxes you get the bump in revenue initially, then people leave and revenue continues to decline. It does not work long-term to just keep increasing taxes. People aren't bound to live in the City of Scranton. We saw this with the smoking ban that was done by the city. People left the bars in Scranton and went to the bars outside of the area to go out and drink and smoke. It's the same thing with taxes. If taxes are increased in the city people are going to look to move to Old

Forge or Taylor, somewhere right outside the city where they can still come here, enjoy the services of the city, work in the city, because we don't have a commuter tax, and have the protection when you are in the city that are you not paying for now because you live outside of here, you are paying much less in taxes.

Tax increases are absolutely not the answer. When council amended the budget last year it was the first step in a long time towards reducing the taxes the people in this city pay. It was step in the right direction. Unfortunately, the budget wasn't implemented properly. I don't want to beat a dead horse, it's been brought up every week all of the problems that the administration has had administering the budget.

But like I said before, if we have to gut the budget outside public safety to avoid a tax increase, I'm willing to do it. If we have to privatize the DPW, sell the Sewer Authority, whatever we have to do, we can't increase taxes. And that's all I have

. 2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for now. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Councilman Loscombe, do you have any comments or motions?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes. Thank you. don't want to belabor it and don't want to speak lengthy on it because we have all heard a lot this evening, but I do want to address a couple of issues. Ladies and gentlemen, as we all know for the past ten years numerous people have approached this podium regarding our public safety contracts, the arbitrations and the appeal process just as they have this evening. This administration can twist and turn this and slice and dice it all they want and blaming the unions and city council for our financial problems, but the fact is the ultimate blame lies on the shoulders of the three stooges, the mayor, PEL, and DCED as they sit back laughing while this whole process was going on.

You know, they have continually appealed arbitration after arbitration.

Last year myself and Mrs. Evans met with the

those health care arbitration awards. We had a very amicable meeting. We told him that at that time because the language was so strong by the arbitrator that if he didn't appeal those, he resolved those it would open the lines of communications with the bargaining units and perhaps they could work something out.

mayor personally and asked him not to appeal

Again, as usual, two days later we read in the newspaper that it was appealed. He didn't even have the nerve to call us. But, you know, the mayor -- PEL and DCED sat here at this table in a caucus several months ago and we had questions back before that we were going over the budget and one of the questions we had asked them is do they have a contingency plan in case the award goes to the unions? And their response was, no. They had a lot of confidence, but any businessman should have a contingency plan, but our mayor downstairs and his two coconspirators do not. Now they are going to dump everything on your lap.

It's not your fault, it's not our

1 fault, it's not the union's fault. As we heard here tonight, in 2008 the police union 2 3 basically it would have been 50 percent of this award that they agreed to, and the 4 5 mayor walked away from it. In 2009, the fire union said that it was pennies on the 6 7 dollars they would have agreed to and the 8 mayor walked away. And I would like to ask, 9 Mr. McGoff, you were a union person, 10 correct? 11 MR. MCGOFF: Are talking to me? 12 MR. LOSCOMBE: You belonged to a 13 union. 14 MR. MCGOFF: At one time. MR. LOSCOMBE: Did your union have 15 16 the ability to strike or did you ever 17 strike? 18 MR. MCGOFF: I was on strike for a 19 month and ultimately lost my job because of 20 it. 21 MR. LOSCOMBE: Well, the police and 22 fire unions throughout Act 111 arbitration 23 which was setup years ago it took away the 24 right of police and firefighters to go on 25 strike and force them into arbitration if

they didn't reach an agreement, and the arbitrators were decided. Each union would pick their arbitrator, the city would pick their arbitrator, and mutually they would pick a neutral arbitrator and that's how it goes. They hear the case, they rule on the case. It's neutral. There is a neutral person there.

And then Act 11 binding arbitration they shouldn't even have been appealed and you said, your comment was, that if that's the case the way the ruling came down that with that Act 47 that it behooves the police and fire to push for arbitration.

MR. MCGOFF: Absolutely.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Well, in this case if it went the other way it behooves the administration of these cities to use Act 47 so they can't negotiate. In other words -- I lost my train of thought there. Basically they have gone back to the days prior to the mine bosses here when there were no rights for workers. That's all Act 47 was trying to pull and we had a panel of judges that saw it for what it was and ruled fairly.

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And as far as, you know, taking it out of the hands of the elected officials, which ones of us voted for DCED? Which ones of us voted for the attorneys that the administration would use? Which one of us voted for the PEL to represent the city?

None of us.

MR. MCGOFF: If you voted for the Recovery Plan you did.

MR. LOSCOMBE: That's another thing, well, I'll get to that in a little bit. But, you know, it really galls me because in this last week, first of all, the mayor has been touting heavy duty layoffs, big tax increases, well, in this last week just this past Sunday in the City of Scranton there were three fire stations open. West Scranton, Engine 7, for as massive as it is with no water on West Mountain or the Fawnwood area did not have a company, Engine 7 was closed. Engine 8 in North Scranton was closed and the engine was relocated to North Main Avenue. Rescue 1, God forbid we had any kind of major accidents or rescue situations, was closed.

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is all being done with no plans, no policies, just a whim, and this the kind of stuff that's going on, and it's only going to get worse. If he is going to cut more where are we going to go? We might have one station open one day. We have to get up and we have to -- I don't know. I just don't know. The frustration level from a lot of the speakers and myself is rising.

But again, as I stated before if something happens to anybody in this city I'll be the first to go to Court for them because of the lack of a study, fore manpower and the usage of our system here. We are going to have dire consequences. me, just reading and seeing the news media and reading the paper, it's all vindictiveness, vindictiveness to the unions that won the awards, and they are not They didn't act like winners. winners. They came here tonight and asked to work with us because they taxpayers, too. are residents of this city, too. They want to work with us for you, yet they went to the mayor through his business

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

administrator, I believe, and asked if they could work with him.

Now, PEL to their credit, DCED to their credit agreed to, but apparently from what we heard this evening the mayor does not want to hear it, all he wants to do is put a massive tax increase out there and cut your services even more and I think that's I mean, like the mayor claims that the voters approved the Recovery Plan, but guess what? The voters also approved the supermajority to help them and I am willing, as I'm sure most of my colleagues are, to sit down with the unions and work out and discuss the Supreme Court ruling in order to soften the blow to the taxpayers, and I believe they will have some reasonable ideas and we can work this out for all of us.

But last but not least, if this mayor sends us a budget, as he stated he wanted to, with massive cuts, massive increases in taxes, it's going to impact the health, safety and welfare of this city so bad that I would like to call at that time a public hearing with the mayor, the business

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

administrator, and the police and fire chiefs to explain to you, the taxpayers, how they are going to protect you and how they are going to man their stations with firefighters and man their police cars with their plan, with all of their massive cutbacks. I want to see the plan that they have in place or a plan that they have had, but for them to just throw that on our lap and not answer to you and explain to you how they plan on doing more with less as the mantra is, they have to face you. The mayor says he is a strong mayor, he is your mayor, we are all willing to work together with him, ut, it's about time to face the piper and discuss his reasons to you, the taxpayers, why he is trying to do the things he is doing.

And I'm sorry for my frustration, but, you know, I'm worried about my family where we live and this is impacting everybody in this city. Don't think because your station is open or there is a patrol car driving by your house that you protected, because in the minute they could

be on the other side of town working on another situation and you are left uncovered.

But it's about time everybody in this city got mad. We are going to be paying a lot more for a lot less and there is no reason for it. Sit down and negotiate. They had the opportunity and they blew it and now they are crying about it. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Councilman Joyce, do you have any comments or motions tonight?

MR. JOYCE: Yes. I thought you forgot my name there for a second.

MS. EVANS: No, I was just taking a breath.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. As everyone knows the State Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Scranton police and fire department over an ongoing suite. Business administrator Ryan McGowan acknowledged in today's Scranton Times' article, it will cost the city between 6 and 10 million dollars. Though the Scranton Times likes to paint me

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

as an advocate for the unions, this is not true. I'm an advocate for the taxpayers and residents of Scranton, Pennsylvania. In fact, I have never even been in a union in my entire life as opposed to many other people that have been on council in the past.

What happened in the Supreme Court ruling when looking back at all of the events leading up to this point, you know what? They were predictable. On numerous accounts Bob Martin, president of the police union, and Dave Gervasi, president of the fire union, appeared before council to encourage the mayor to reach a settlement with them. Last year I also spoke about the pendulum theory where government works best when neither the unions have excessive power nor the administration has excessive power. The administration had excessive power with the police and fire unions for a long time, but guess what, now in the Court case that pendulum has swung right to the opposite end.

Obviously, Mayor Doherty didn't

agree with that theory. Mayor Doherty often alludes to the fire and police union as being paid more than the clerical and DPW union workers. One, this has been -- that is true for the most part, however, it's always been true; and second of all, the gap between what fire and police are paid as opposed to what a DPW or clerical union worker could have been much less if the mayor decided to negotiate with the police and fire union. Never happened.

Mayor Doherty's recent failure to negotiate with the public safety unions have again imposed a cost to the city. From what I have been informed, Mayor Doherty had the opportunity to settle with the recent Supreme Court case ruling for about a third of what it will -- or what it will cost the city now. Bob Martin, president of the FOP, stated that at one point -- at another point it was a half, so if Mr. McGowan's projection of the award is accurate, Mr. Doherty's failure to negotiate is going to cost the city between \$4 million when all is said and done, if a third is the amount,

and if it's a half it's going to be three to five million dollars.

Mayor Doherty's answer on how to solve this increase -- or rather this Court decision, increase taxes and layoff more firefighters and police officers. That's what he says. So who are Mayor Doherty's failures going to hurt? The senior citizens who can barely pay their taxes because they are living off social security checks, the people of Scranton that struggle from paycheck to paycheck just to make ends meet, or how about those even less fortunate people in Scranton that work two jobs just to make enough money to consider themselves broke.

What Mayor Doherty should have been doing is trying to negotiate a plan with the police and fire unions to -- or what he should do now is it negotiate a plan to spread the payments out over "X" number of years or possibly at lest cost than the settlement that the Court ruled in favor of instead of threatening tax increases and layoffs and scaring taxpayers and citizens

of this city.

Mr. Doherty likes to cry to the newspaper that the Court doesn't realize the financial situation of the city and that the ruling of the judges wasn't fair. Well, as Mr. Doherty always proclaims, Scranton has a strong mayor form of government. Well, why doesn't our strong mayor finally act like one instead of acting like a cowardly mayor and finally sit down with the unions and negotiate a fair deal for the city rather than taking everything -- or appealing and taking everything to the Supreme Court and losing on a consistent basis. It's now starting to become a trend.

On other notes, you know what, should we have expected Mayor Doherty to negotiate with the unions when he still can't appear before a city council to discuss plans to reduce a deficit that he created? I think that Mayor Doherty needs to be held accountable for his actions. He needs to appear before this council to discuss our plan on how to resolve the current deficit for this year. He states

that no one has reached out to him to discuss this plan, however, there were multiple council members who have worked on this plan along with the city solicitor.

With this in mind, no more than two council members can sit in his office to discuss the plan with him because it's a violation of the Sunshine Act. Basically here it is, this forum is the most effective way to discuss city business and not private meetings. Mr. Doherty needs to come to a council meeting and discuss our plan and the plan that he proposed with all five council members, not just one council member in a coffee shop.

On other matters, Mayor Doherty continues to lie to the newspaper. He claims that the cost of the tax cuts city council imposed in 2011 reduced revenue by \$3 million, that's a -- that's just a flat out inaccurate statement. It's \$1.7 or \$1.8 million. So far it's cost \$1.5 million to the city. I have the documentation of what it's cost the city so far from our tax collector to prove it.

Also, Mayor Doherty is now blaming council for the city's credit rating. When the city's credit rating was originally reduced in 2009 before the city council even took office and when Mayor Doherty had a city council that was favorable to his agenda. You can see that bond rating decreased by reading the 2009 audit.

Speaking of the audit, Mrs. Krake, has Mr. McGowan given us an update on any of the outstanding items that we addressed?

MS. KRAKE: No, he has not.

MR. JOYCE: I believe he does have a two-week timeline though, correct, provided? Okay. Well, the solution is clear, Mayor Doherty finally needs to come to city council to discuss solutions. Contrary to what the newspapers view is, being the Scranton Times, not GO Lackawanna, Mayor Doherty wouldn't be coming to Council for a bashing session. This is about solutions. This is about moving the city forward.

Unfortunately, Mayor Doherty always claims that he is moving Scranton forward in every campaign he has run in, but you know

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what, is this really true? By failing to negotiate with the unions and discuss fiscal solutions with the five member council he is really doing nothing but moving the city It's time for Mayor Doherty to backwards. discuss the solutions and I ideas with us.

Finally, I do have some questions for Mr. McGowan and Mayor Doherty and, Mrs. Krake, please contact both asking the following questions:

In light of the recent Supreme Court decision, are you willing to sit down with the police and fire unions and work on a solution? Originally I was going to request that it -- the answer was, no, but if you can send a statement to him that it was council's request, well, two of my colleagues aren't here, but with the agreement of the majority of my colleagues I would like this request sent on council's behalf.

> MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. JOYCE: The second thing I wanted to address, the upcoming budget. Please ask how many police and fire

personnel does he plan to eliminate. In the upcoming budget, how many other positions does he plan to eliminate, and please specify these positions.

Number four, what percentage of each laid off employee's salary will be budgeted for unemployment payments?

Number five, what will be the average cost per employee used for budget calculations in regard to health insurance for fire, police, DPW, clerical unions and the administrative employees.

And number six, what is the opt out benefit for employees choosing to decline city health insurance in all unions as well as the administration?

Seven, Mayor Doherty has said to media sources that he plans on raises taxes in 2012. Please ask which taxes he plans on raising and by how much, and I'd rather have the amount in writing than just go by hearsay and rumors.

And also, what is the cost of lifeguards and other pool personnel projected to be in 2012. I think that's an

important thing that we need to know when we are looking at other salary accounts in the DPW.

You would think that Mayor Doherty would want to discuss fiscal issues with council as we all want the city to move forward. You know, Scranton has been distressed for nearly 20 years which is nearly 2/3 of my life. It's time that we all move in the new direction which involves the mayor actually discussing fiscal matters with the city council in public.

It's apparent that Mayor Doherty doesn't want to move in this direction, however, he still insists in speaking behind closed doors or in some cases in coffee shops. He has yet to implement any idea that council has proposed to him. Two weeks ago, Councilman Rogan made motions for the mayor to put out RFP's for privatization various authorities, and I'm still waiting to see that happen. I wonder if the mayor is just going to use that motion as a piece of scrap paper in his office.

Also, I made many other revenue

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

generating suggestions for 2012 including a payroll expense tax on businesses, a commuter tax, an amusement tax, advertising on city street sweepers and refuse trucks, asking for pauper status to avoid court costs and filing fees and also lien fees in civil suits, a stronger rental registration program, which I give Councilman Loscombe and McGoff credit and also Attorney Kelly. This is the one thing that's been worked on to this point. Selling or leasing the parking garages if feasible. And another thing, we have to find out if it's feasible first. We have to put out the request as Mr. Rogan made that motion, and also implementing StreetSmart, which has been successful in just about every other city that it's been implemented in.

Also, here is another thing, if we are granted pauper status, I would also like to make the recommendation that we charge a service fee to insurance companies for police and fire responses to accidents.

This is an action that's been done in the past, however, the municipalities failed to

collect payments from insurance companies because of having to sue them. The cost of suing them was equivalent to the cost of the payment that they would have received. If we receive pauper status, that would remove many of the costs associated with going after insurance companies who wouldn't want to pay this fee.

Also, in closing, I just want to say I reviewed Mr. McGowan's latest cash flow report. The projected deficit for the end of year is now \$5.4 million, it's down from the last report. With this in mind, Attorney Hughes, if you could please revise the plan that council put together to reflect \$6 million of borrowing rather than 6.5.

Also, I have a number of citizens' request, however, for the sake of brevity, I am not going to address them publically, but please be assured if you have contacted me over the past week I will be addressing your concerns with the appropriate officials throughout the city, and that's all.

MS. EVANS: Thank you, Councilman

Joyce. Good evening. The recent Supreme
Court decision against the City of Scranton
came as no surprise and the Pennsylvania
Economy League and the Doherty
administration's failure to financially
prepare for this Court decision was also a
known fact.

In fact, some council members had been very concerned about the potential for this tremendous financial impact. As a result, Councilman Loscombe and I visited the mayor long ago to urge him against pursuing litigation and toward negotiation of a fair settlement in the best interest of the taxpayers of our city.

In addition, during the negotiation session between council and the mayor ordered by Judge Mazzoni during the mayor's 2010 lawsuit against city council for cutting government costs, I warned Mayor Doherty of the future consequences of his incessant legal actions and appeals which would harm the people of Scranton. Despite our best efforts, the mayor refused to listen to us.

It would be all too easy and inaccurate to simply blame Mayor Doherty for this catastrophe because he had powerful partners on a path of destruction to the Supreme Court. The Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development, or DCED, and the Pennsylvania Economy League are equally culpable because both selected Scranton from among 25 distressed municipalities and used our city as their guinea pig for a test case in a legal battle to prove the supremacy of Act 47 throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In fact, it was not the city labor attorney, Dick Goldburg, but it was the DCED lawyer, Attorney Clifford Levine, who presented the City of Scranton's case before the Supreme Court. It is clear, that DCED and the PEL actively urged and enabled the Doherty administration to pursue a ten-year battle in the Court system that culminated in a Supreme Court decision that is extremely injurious to the people of Scranton.

Therefore, the State Department of

Economic and Community Development should share the financial burden of the Supreme Court decision and take responsibility for it's actions. Don't hand our taxpayers a bag of bills and walk away. People of Scranton did not ask for labor unrest, a decade of Court battles, and a double digit million dollar Supreme Court decision. They are the victims of the state and the Doherty administration.

Late last week I had the opportunity to discuss these critical issues at length with state representative Kevin Murphy with particular emphasis and the roles played by the state DCED and PEL. Representative Murphy offered to help our city and it's people in any way he can do so in his role as a state official. We are grateful for his interest in and concern for our city and it's people and for any and all assistant he can provide.

. Throughout my years as a seated councilwoman, I have often questioned and discussed the failed leadership of the Pennsylvania Economy League that spans

nearly 20 years. As a result of his assistant and oversight, Scranton is in worse financial straights in October 2011 than it was in January 2002, the day Mayor Doherty first took office, and in 1992 when our city was declared distressed.

The Pennsylvania Economy League has failed the people of Scranton and has enabled the Doherty administration to amass monumental debt, engage in financial shell games and coverups, and openly defy the terms of the Recovery Plan by enlarging administrative numbers, salaries and benefits, creating and maintaining unnecessary political jobs, hiring consultants and numerous law firms, and engaging in overall unbridled spending among other acts.

Also, the minutes of regular meetings between the city administration and the representatives of PEL and DCED are not taken, and no meeting agenda was provided to participants for these meetings until lately, very recently.

Equally important, although PEL was

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

an active participant in countless Court battles since 2002o, it made no provisions for payments of Court awards and currently it has no plan to address the Supreme Court decision. As a result, I direct Mrs. Krake to send a letter to the Honorable Thomas Corbett, Governor of Pennsylvania, and to the State Department of Economic and Community Development on behalf of Scranton City Council requesting the replacement of the Pennsylvania Economy League and the local DCED representative Matthew Dominez, as Act 47 coordinators for the purpose of financial oversight of the City of Scranton based on 20 years of demonstrated failed leadership and unproductive, unsound collusion and bias toward the Doherty administration that have resulted in historical debt and significant and sizable Court awards for which Scranton residents are financially responsible.

In addition, Scranton City Council offers for your consideration a portion of the Act of the October 19, 2011, written opinion of Mr. Justice Saylor, in which he

cites a previous ruling, "Scranton quickly became the biggest client of the Pennsylvania Economy League. PEL was billing hundreds of thousands of dollars in fees for advice that no one was following and that was producing absolutely no discernable progress. The state was little better, with the exception of one transparently political effort to compel the city's compliance with the Recovery Plan, the state wrote lots of memos, but did nothing to substantively achieve the goals of Act 47."

Mr. Justice Atkins concurring opinion of October 19, 2011, states: "I join the salient analysis of my colleague, Justice Saylor. During argument of this case, council candidly acknowledged that of approximately 25 cities that have been entered Act 47 and it's protections, only a handful have recovered to the point of leaving the protection of Act 47. The remaining cities have apparently found a home there. Scranton has been there nearly 20 years."

2

3

5

6

7

9

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Do I have the agreement of my colleagues to send this letter?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.

MS. EVANS: Well, we have three of four and your opinion is duly noted.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: And thank you,

Mrs. Krake, please forward gentlemen. copies of this letter to State Senator John Blake, and State Representatives Kevin Murphy and Ken Smith. In addition, I would like a letter sent to Senator Blake and Representatives Murphy and Smith on behalf of Scranton City Council requesting their assistance in obtaining state funds to mitigate the costs of the recent Supreme Court decision, specifically in light of the active leadership role taken by the State Department of Community and Economic Development and the continuance of labor unrest and unrelenting legal appeals to the financial detriment of the people of Scranton. Do I have the agreement of my

1 II

colleagues?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

10

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.

MR. ROGAN: Um-hum.

MR. MCGOFF: That's fine.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Also,

Mrs. Krake, please send a letter to the State Department of Economic and Community Development on behalf of Scranton City Council requesting funding for the City of Scranton, which has suffered a serious financial blow as a result of the recent Supreme Court decision that Scranton must pay interest arbitration awards to city police and firefighters. Since DCED played a significant role in this city's current dire financial straights through it's use of the City of Scranton as a statewide test case for the supremacy of Act 47 over Act 11, it's adamant argument to the Supreme Court, and it's steadfast promotion of legal appeals and related litigation, DCED should accept it's financial responsibility to the City of Scranton and share in it's financial burden. Scranton City Council requests your immediate attention and assistance on behalf

-

of the taxpayers of our city and is available to discuss potential resolutions to this matter. Do I have my colleagues' agreement?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.

MR. ROGAN: Yes.

MR. MCGOFF: I'm opposed.

MS. EVANS: We have three council members in favor and Mr. McGoff is opposed, and so please send the letter.

Now we must turn the city's financial responsibility in this matter.

According to Mayor Doherty, he will cut your services drastically while simultaneously raising your taxes. In other words,

Scrantonians will pay much higher taxes for far less public services. Since the mayor is also on record as stating that he will not cut any DPW employees, taxpayers can only assume that the mayor's next manpower possible will once again target the police and fire departments. These are predictable and easy answers to his self-inflicted crisis.

In response to Mayor Doherty's

question included in the Sunday Times,
"Where else am I going to get the money?"

I'd like to offer multiple better solutions to address the city's financial ills. First, as has been said many times this evening, the mayor should immediately begin negotiations with the FOP and the IAFF unions to less the financial impact of the Supreme Court decision and provide an agreement that is both fair to the people of Scranton and their public safety employees. He owes it to Scranton taxpayers to extend an olive branch to the police and fire personnel and to discuss lower payments, perhaps settling other cases, dropping other cases, and a multi-year payment schedule.

Second, city debt should be refinanced.

Third, borrowing or a bond issue should be pursued.

Fourth, the StreetSmart Technologies
Park Program and an aggressive rental
registration program should be included in
the mayor's 2012 proposed budget and
implemented.

Fifth, appraisals of the city
parking garages and lots and the Scranton
Sewer Authority should occur as soon as
possible and national companies should be
contacted to request proposal for the sale
or lease of parking garages and the
management and operation of the Scranton
Sewer Authority.

Six, include an amusement tax in the 2012 proposed budget and aggressively pursue a change in the city's classification in order to implement a commuter and a payroll tax to be included in the 2013 budget.

Seven, cut city departments which were not previously targeted in August 2011.

Eight, eliminate health insurance for management positions or increase all copays which are currently lower than payments made by union employees.

Nine, eliminate payments to employees who opt out of city provided health care.

Ten, limit DPW overtime to emergency declarations for snow removal, flooding situations, cave-ins and other natural

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

disasters.

Eleven, institute a wage freeze where possible and/or shorten the workweek or work hours for city hall employees.

Twelve, eliminate nonessential budgetary expenditures including the funding of organizations.

Thirteen, pursue buyouts of workers' comp cases and early retirements.

Fourteen, aggressively pursue large city nonprofits for payments in lieu of The mayors of Reading and taxes. Pittsburgh, for example, have been successful in these ventures and the same Pennsylvania Economy League that oversees Scranton recommended recently this action to Harrisburg's mayor. Interestingly, however, it seems that, and it was a very wise individual who discussed this with me just today, that quite a number of the city's former administrator's, whether that be a business administrator, a human resources director, my goodness, there are so many it's hard to recall of them now, they have left their city positions to take new

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

positions at our local colleges and universities. Coincidentally, the very entities that the mayor should be seeking PILOT payments from. Perhaps, we received our PILOT payments in terms of new jobs for city administrators who now work -- I believe the chief of police works at Marywood University. We have the business administrator who is now employed by Keystone College. We have the human resources director who is trotting over to the Sewer Authority, and I know I'm missing more than that, but it's very apparent that the nonprofits and the municipality authorities are the depository for former City of Scranton employees. If their pay is going to be cut or their job might be eliminated, off they go.

Now, 15, pursue collection of the \$600,000 owed for the property which formally housed the DPW garages.

Sixteen, bring city towing of vehicles in-house by using city-owned property for storage or tow yards and eliminate the unnecessary use of vehicles by

city employees such as the IT Department head, among numerous other solutions.

The bottom line is that city council has numerous suggestions, but the mayor must agree and then implement or enforce these measures and programs. The decision is his to either cut your services and increase your taxes or to work with city council to address our city's financial problems in ways which are less painful and burdensome for the people of Scranton.

As I said earlier, council can bring the horse to water, but we can't make him drink. Mrs. Krake, please forward this list of the revenue generators and budgetary cuts to Mr. Doherty and to Mr. Cross.

Next, if the mayor intends to obtain 2012 tax anticipation notes or borrowing to cover the deficit and/or debt refinancing, he must produce and submit the 2010 independent audit of the City of Scranton and his proposed 2012 budget to the local banks as soon as possible. Although Councilman Joyce and I have been calling for the city audit from the Doherty

administration for the past five months, the heads of the local banks have recently joined that call. The mayor would do well to respond to the request of the banking community immediately. It is unacceptable to postpone an audit to year's end or into 2012, as occurred in the case of the prior audit.

The lengthy list of the financial documents requested by the auditors since last April must be submitted immediately. It is not sufficient to local banks and city council for Christopher Doherty to merely proclaim that he will cut personnel, raise taxes and then just exit the room. Everyone wants to see the financial documents demonstrating where we are, what we owe, and how we intend to pay. His vision will no longer suffice.

Next, Mrs. Krake, please send a letter to Mr. Brazil, city controller Roseann Novembrino, and Lisa Moran unless, of course, she has already exited, in that case I believe it's Attorney McAndrew who will be replacing her, on behalf of Scranton

City Council requesting the following information:

What is the name of the DPW employee who serves currently as the mechanic for any and all city fire vehicles. Provide copies of invoices and vouchers for Sandone and any and all other businesses who performed the duties of a mechanic by servicing fire department and city vehicles from June 2011 up to and including October 26, 2011.

Council requests this information on or before November 4, 2011.

Finally, I have citizens' requests for the week, which will be submitted to our office and forwarded to the appropriate city departments, and that's it.

MS. KRAKE: 5-B. AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS FOR THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO A LEASE WITH AIRLINE PETROLEUM COMPANY OF DUNMORE TO PROVIDE SPACE FOR THE SCRANTON POLICE DEPARTMENT OT OPERATE A SUBSTATION.

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

	148
1	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
2	MR. JOYCE: Second.
3	MS. EVANS: On the question? All
4	those in favor of introduction signify by
5	saying aye.
6	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
7	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
8	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
9	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
10	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
11	have it and so moved.
12	MS. KRAKE: 5-C. ACCEPTING THE
13	RECOMMENDATION OF THE HISTORICAL
14	ARCHITECTURE REVIEW BOARD ("HARB") AND
15	APPROVING THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
16	FOR HEMMLER + CAMAYD ARCHITECTS, 409
17	LACKAWANNA AVENUE, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA
18	FOR REMOVAL OF DETERIORATED, SINGLE-PANE
19	WOOD WINDOWS; REPLACEMENT WITH NEW,
20	ENERGY-EFFICIENT, ALUMINUM CLAD,
21	MAINTENANCE-FREE WOOD WINDOWS; REMOVAL OF
22	OVERHEAD DOORS AND REPLACEMENT WITH NEW,
23	ENERGY-EFFICIENT OVERHEAD DOORS AT THE
24	CENTRAL FIRE STATION, 518 MULBERRY STREET,
25	SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA.

MS. EVANS: At this time I'll 1 2 entertain a motion that Item 5-C be 3 introduced into it's proper committee. 4 MR. ROGAN: So moved. MR. JOYCE: 5 Second. MS. EVANS: On the question? 6 7 those in favor of introduction signify by 8 saying aye. 9 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 10 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 11 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 12 MR. JOYCE: Aye. 13 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 14 have it and so moved. MR. ROGAN: I make a motion pursuant 15 16 to the emergency certificate to place on the 17 agenda Resolution No. 49, 2011, entitled, 18 "AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 686 OF 2000, ENTITLED: AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER 19 APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF 20 21 SCRANTON TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO 22 PROMISSORY NOTES B99MC420014 SERIES, AND ALL 23 OTHER NECESSARY LOAN DOCUMENTS IN THE AMOUNT 24 OF \$3 MILLION FOR THE HOTEL AND CONFERENCE 25 CENTER PROJECT IN ORDER TO REFINANCE THE

CURRENT OUTSTANDING BALANCE OF THE AFORESAID LOAN WHICH WILL RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL SAVINGS AND INTEREST."

> MR. JOYCE: Second.

MS. EVANS: On the question?

MR. ROGAN: Yes, on the question, I did speak with Mrs. Evans and Ms. Aebli and her staff today, what this basically amounts to because the interest rates right now are at historic lows, by refinancing the Section 108 loan the city is going to save a vast sum of money, I think it will be -- when I talked to Ms. Aebli earlier I think it would be around \$9,000 extra dollars per year will have to use in our CDBG allotments going forward because of the savings doing this, so it really is a no-brainer. It saves the city taxpayers money and we'll have extra money to put towards programs.

MS. EVANS: Anyone else on the question? All those in favor of said resolution signify by saying aye.

MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

MR. ROGAN: Aye.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

23

20

21

22

24

25

1 MR. JOYCE: Aye. 2 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 3 have it and so moved. 4 MS. KRAKE: "AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 686 OF 2000, ENTITLED: AUTHORIZING THE 5 MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS 6 7 OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO EXECUTE AND ENTER 8 INTO PROMISSORY NOTES B99MC420014 SERIES, 9 AND ALL OTHER NECESSARY LOAN DOCUMENTS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$3 MILLION FOR THE HOTEL AND 10 CONFERENCE CENTER PROJECT IN ORDER TO 11 REFINANCE THE CURRENT OUTSTANDING BALANCE OF 12 THE AFORESAID LOAN WHICH WILL RESULT IN 13 14 SUBSTANTIAL SAVINGS AND INTEREST." MS. EVANS: We have a resolution --15 16 pardon? 17 MR. MCGOFF: It's a motion. 18 MS. EVANS: Actually -- we are 19 amending the resolution. Oh, okay. At this 20 time I will entertain a motion, thank you, 21 that Item 5-D be introduced into it's proper 22 committee. 23 MR. ROGAN: So moved. 24 MR. JOYCE: Second. 25 MS. EVANS: On the questions? A11

	152
1	those in favor of introduction signify by
2	saying aye.
3	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
4	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
5	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
6	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
7	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
8	have it and so moved.
9	MR. ROGAN: I make a motion to
10	suspend the rules and move Item 5-D to
11	Seventh Order to be considered for final
12	passage based on the attached emergency
13	certificate.
14	MR. JOYCE: Second.
15	MS. EVANS: On the question?
16	MR. ROGAN: Yes, and I would also
17	hope that since we are moving it through one
18	night we could also give the public an
19	opportunity to talk on it.
20	MS. EVANS: All those in favor of
21	said resolution signify by saying aye.
22	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
23	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
24	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
25	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
	ll

1	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
2	have it and so moved.
3	MS. KRAKE: Sixth order. 6-A.
4	READING BY TITLE - FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 55,
5	2011 - AN ORDINANCE - AUTHORIZING THE
6	EXTINGUISHMENT OF THE PERMANENT EASEMENT FOR
7	INGRESS AND EGRESS AT THE CORNER OF MARION
8	STREET AND NEW ROSS AVENUE AND TO ANNEX SAID
9	LANDS TO BE CONVEYED BY THE CITY OF SCRANTON
10	TO RONALD F. KITLAS AND MARY ANN KITLAS.
11	MS. EVANS: You've heard reading by
12	title of Item 6-A, what is your pleasure?
13	MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-A
14	pass reading by title.
15	MR. JOYCE: Second.
16	MS. EVANS: On the question? All
17	those in favor signify by saying aye.
18	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
19	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
20	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
21	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
22	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
23	have it and so moved.
24	MS. KRAKE: SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. FOR
25	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY

DEVELOPMENT FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF COUNCIL

NO. 53, 2011 - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND

OTHER APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF

SCRANTON TO TAKE ALL NECESSARY ACTIONS TO

IMPLEMENT THE CONSOLIDATED SUBMISSION FOR

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

TO BE FUNDED UNDER THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) PROGRAM, HOME INVESTMENT

PARTNERSHIP (HOME) PROGRAM AND EMERGENCY

SOLUTIONS GRANT (ESG) PROGRAM.

MR. ROGAN: I make a motion to amend Item 7-A as per the following:

Increasing the funding of the Deutsch Institute \$5,000 for a total of \$20.000.

Increasing the funding for the Catherine McCauley Center by \$5,000 for a total of \$10,000.

Increasing the funding for Licensing and Inspections Demolition of Hazardous Structures by \$90,000 for a grand total of \$300,000.

Increasing the United Neighborhoods
Bellevue Youth Program at \$2,500 for a total
of \$10,000.

Eliminating the funding for the 1 2 United Neighborhood Centers SCOLA program 3 reducing it from \$5,000 to zero. Increasing funding for the Downtown 4 5 Senior Paving Program by \$3,500. Increasing the Scranton Police 6 7 Department police vehicles by \$26,500. 8 Increasing the Dress for Success by 9 \$20,000. 10 Decreasing OECD administration by 11 \$58,000. 12 Decreasing Friends of the Poor, 13 Summer Historical Program by \$10,000. 14 Increasing Lackawanna Neighborhood 15 Home Rehab \$85,000. 16 Increasing North Scranton Little 17 League playground project by \$20,000. 18 Increasing the Vacant Property 19 Review Committee Blight Removal by \$25,000. 20 Increasing First Friday busing for 21 seniors by \$1,500. Decreasing the Scranton Parks and 22 23 Rec, Lincoln Jackson Park, by \$350,000. 24 Decreasing Weston Field Residents 25 roof repairs by \$25,000.

1 Increasing Scranton Forestry Tree Removal by \$50,000. 2 3 Decreasing Broadway Theatre tickets by \$10,000. 4 5 Decreasing Scranton DPW pool and bathhouse rehab by \$175,000. 6 7 Decreasing First Night Scranton, 8 tickets and transportation, by \$20,000. 9 Decreasing Scranton Public Theatre 10 Jazzfest by \$10,000. Decreasing Scranton Public Theatre 11 12 Cultural Program by \$9,000. 13 And increasing Scranton DPW paving 14 program by \$338,000. MS. EVANS: We have a motion to 15 16 amend Item 7-A on the table, do we have a 17 second? 18 MR. JOYCE: Second. 19 MS. EVANS: On the question? 20 MR. ROGAN: Yes, very briefly on the 21 question, while going through these, as I 22 said before, it is taxpayer money and all of 23 us when we looked through them we are in 24 agreement on I would say 95 percent of what's in here. Each one of us there is 25

something that we wanted more money for or less money for, but on the whole we put most of the money for street paving, blight removal, and making your life better, and when I ran for council, and I know my colleagues ran for council, that was the platform and we came through with this through federal funds, and we didn't waste it on tickets for theatre programs. We didn't waste it on, you know, some of the other programs in here that really would be a waste of taxpayer dollars, and at the end the day these will make -- these allocations will make everyone's lives a little better than the previous allocations.

MR. MCGOFF: Might I also thank
Councilman Rogan for allowing the
opportunity for input from all council
members in these allocations and also
affording the opportunity to the public for
responding to these allocations.

MS. EVANS: The only thing I would add to that is that I know perhaps I think it was last year's allocations, all council members were able to and did provide

question? All those in favor of the motion 2 3 to amend Item 7-A, signify by saying aye. MR. MCGOFF: 4 Aye. 5 MR. ROGAN: Aye. MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 6 7 MR. JOYCE: Aye. 8 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 9 have it and so moved. What is the recommendation of the chair for the 10 11 Committee on Community Development. 12 MR. ROGAN: As Chairperson for the 13 Committee on Community Development, I 14 recommend final passage of Item 7-A, as amended. 15 MR. JOYCE: 16 Second. 17 MS. EVANS: On the question? 18 before we take a vote this evening on the 19 changes that were made this evening to the 20 CDBG allocations, is there anyone member of 21 the audience who wishes to address city 22 council? 23 MS. SCHUMACHER: Yes, if I may do it 24 from here, would you repeat -- I think you 25 flip flopped on the administration from what

recommendations. Anyone else on the

1

1 you reported last week. MR. ROGAN: No, it's still a 2 3 deduction. It's the same as reported last It was a reduction of \$58,000 to a 4 week. 5 total of \$592,000. MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. Thank you. 6 7 MR. ROGAN: You are welcome. 8 MS. EVANS: Roll call, please? 9 MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff. MR. MCGOFF: Yes. 10 11 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan. 12 MR. ROGAN: Yes. 13 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe. 14 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes. MS. CARRERA: Mr. Joyce. 15 MR. JOYCE: Yes. 16 17 MS. CARRERA: Mrs. Evans. 18 MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare 19 Item 7-A, as amended, legally and lawfully 20 adopted. Is there anyone who wishes to address council on Item 7-B, that would be 21 22 the emergency certificate Section 108 loan 23 agreement for the hotel and conference 24 center project in order to refinance the 25 current outstanding balance of the aforesaid

	100
1	loan, which will result in substantial
2	savings in interest and that has been moved
3	to Seventh Order this evening?
4	What is the recommendation of the
5	Chair for the Committee on
6	MR. MCGOFF: It has to be read.
7	MS. EVANS: Pardon? Oh, yes, Mrs.
8	Krake.
9	MS. KRAKE: 7-B, FORMERLY 5-D, FOR
10	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY
11	DEVELOPMENT - FOR ADOPTION.
12	MS. EVANS: What is the
13	recommendation of the Chair for the
14	Committee on Community development?
15	MR. ROGAN: As Chairperson for the
16	Committee on Community Development, I
17	recommend that Item 7-B, formerly 5-D, is
18	approved for final passage.
19	MR. JOYCE: Second.
20	MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
21	call, please?
22	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
23	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
24	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
25	MR. ROGAN: Yes.

_	
	161
1	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe.
2	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
3	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Joyce.
4	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
5	MS. CARRERA: Mrs. Evans.
6	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare
7	Item 7-B, as amended, legally and lawfully
8	adopted. If there is no further business,
9	I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
10	MR. JOYCE: Motion to adjourn.
11	MS. EVANS: This meeting is
12	adjourned.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER