	1
1	
2	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
3	
4	
5	
6	HELD:
7	
8	Tuesday, November 22, 2011
9	
10	LOCATION:
11	Council Chambers
12	Scranton City Hall
13	340 North Washington Avenue
14	Scranton, Pennsylvania
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
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 moment of reflection observed.) 2 3 MS. EVANS: Roll call, please. 4 MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff. MR. MCGOFF: Here. 5 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan. 6 7 MR. ROGAN: Here. 8 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe. 9 MR. LOSCOMBE: Here. 10 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Joyce. 11 MR. JOYCE: Here. 12 MS. CARRERA: Mrs. Evans. 13 MR. ROGAN: Ms. Evans will be 14 joining us later on today. She is attending the meeting regarding the proposed closing 15 16 post offices in the Scranton area. Please dispense with the reading of the minutes. 17 18 MR. KRAKE: THIRD ORDER. 3-A. TAX ASSESSOR'S REPORT, SCHEDULED HEARINGS TO BE 19 HELD DECEMBER 7, 2011. 20 21 MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments? 22 If not, received and filed. 23 MS. KRAKE: 3-B. TAX ASSESSOR'S 24 REPORT, APPEAL RESULTS FROM OCTOBER 12, 25 2011.

1	MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?
2	If not, received and filed.
3	MS. KRAKE: 3-C. AUDIT STATUS FROM
4	ROBERT ROSSI & CO. AS OF NOVEMBER 15, 2011.
5	MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?
6	If not, received and filed.
7	MS. KRAKE: 3-D. MINUTES OF THE
8	MUNICIPAL PENSION FUND MEETING HELD OCTOBER
9	26, 2011.
10	MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?
11	If not, received and filed.
12	MS. KRAKE: 3-E. APPLICATIONS ALONG
13	WITH DECISIONS RENDERED BY THE ZONING
14	HEARING BOARD ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 9,
15	2011.
16	MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?
17	If not, received and filed.
18	MS. KRAKE: 3-F. AGENDA FOR THE
19	MUNICIPAL PENSION FUND MEETING HELD NOVEMBER
20	16, 2011.
21	MR. ROGAN: Ms. Krake, do we have
22	clerk's notes tonight?
23	MS. KRAKE: We do not have any
24	clerk's notes, Mr. Rogan.
25	MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Do any

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

council members have announcements to make?

If not, we'll move onto fourth order. The first speaker on the sign-in sheet is Andy Sbaraglia.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia. Citizen of Scranton, fellow Scrantonians. picked up the paper and read PEL's report. Well, as you know, PEL has been saying we should raise our taxes for the last three, four, five years. Every time they came up they came up with a different plan. Now, we are in a good plan they want to raise it 47 percent. Well, from PEL's standpoint economics it does make sense. I'm not saying that it doesn't make sense, it's just that we can't afford it. The businesses can't afford it. The city cannot afford it, so there we stand. I don't know if we are going to end up paying the bonds off from Scranton Parking Authority, the two points on a million, I know we have to pay I think it's 1.3 or 1.4 million from the SRA, okay, but yous people don't realize we are also paying a lot of 108 loans for other people that's piled onto our debt. I wish somebody

would finally get out there and really go through everything and put on a good report where we actually are. I know there is no word for worse other than worse, worse, worse, and we are finally at that position, and I don't envy you, I really don't, but I told you that in the very beginning, I don't envy you at all because I knew what was going to happen. That sword that was hanging over our head by a thread has broken and has fallen into the heart of the taxpayers.

You can hear people talking, businessmen talking, they are not going to be able to afford the taxes between the county, the city, and I guess the school board I guess they are fixed at 2.1 or something like that, but every penny adds up. For a long time you have been coming before you and trying to avoid this day over and over and over again, we have been saying this is going to happen and it will happen.

One and one does make two, it does not make one and that's what they were doing. They were looking at their figures,

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

101112

14 15

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

this figure, that figure, and they didn't make sense. There is so many other things that's happening, yous people don't realize how many people went out and got their taxes reduced, okay? Every person that got their tax reduced raised your taxes. People don't go out there and check it. They have to get down there to that county office and really get on their backs.

When you don't have any paperwork or paper trail to say why you got that reduction there is something definitely wrong down there, and I wish yous make that request. I know you don't have anybody down there, I know Bill gives you sort of some paperwork about it, but he even don't know the reason why they got that reduction, so is it fair? No, I doubt it. And even if they had that assessment they keep saying they are going to run down and get more reduction. Something is wrong down there. There is definitely something wrong. least they should have a paper trail. you give somebody a reduction in taxes they should have a reason why that reduction was

2

4

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

made and the backup for that reduction, they don't have it, and I know why they don't have it because they don't want you to know why it was done.

That's the sad part about this city, this county, they don't really have an open policy on everything. You have to go around there and dig. You have to be a miner. Lucky we are all coal miners up here because you really have to be a miner to dig out the facts, and I'm sorry, like I said before, I feel sorry for you because you can get the blame for this fiasco. The mayor is going to try to say council did it because they have a supermajority so they are responsible. He is not going back to when he took office. Why we had to buy the streetlights is beyond me, but he had to buy Why he had to do all of that construction he did at that time and put the 72 million, he didn't have to at that time, but he did and he kept adding to it, adding to it and adding to it to where we are now. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Doug Miller.

MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council.

Doug Miller, Scranton. I'd like to begin
this evening by presenting council and the
public with some very disheartening
information that I received over the past
few days. Earlier last week I was made
aware that a member of our Scranton zoning
board witnessed the installation of new
windows at the home of not only our fire
chief, Mr. Tom Davis, but unfortunately we
can't stand here tonight and say that this
was a normal construction project.

This zoning officer noticed work
being done without the proper permits needed
to proceed with any construction. The
officer at this point proceeded to contact
the LIPS office to clarify if any permits
were pulled at that time and that individual
was told that at that time no permits were
pulled, so therefore, right off the bat it
violates city ordinances, laws and
everything else to allow an individual to
perform work on their home without permits.

This is our fire chief. This is an individual who is a licensed contractor in

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the City of Scranton. This is someone who knows the laws and knows the permit procedures and went around it trying to take advantage of it. This is also a man to under the mayor's proposal finds that this individual is worth a \$17,000. Does this sound like someone that deserves a \$17,000 raise? I don't think. This is someone to tried to take advantage of the taxpayers in this city, he is full aware of the situation we are in. We are a financially distressed city, we are struggling to take in revenue, and he can't even go and get a lousy permit to do the windows? Is this the politics and games that we want to play in this city?

And I have pictures here to prove it. I'm going to present them to council.

As you can fully see here, brand new windows in Mr. Davis' home with the old windows on the porch, and you can see in this photo here we have more windows here, he is leaning up against the garage, what's believed to be a garage at Mr. Davis' residence.

What I find truly appalling is that,

as I said, this individual went and did this without the permit. I found out today that after the issue being persistent by the zoning board that Chief Davis finally went to the licensing office and pulled a permit after the fact, after he went around, disobeyed the law and installed windows. I believe he should be fined to the fullest maximum expense. What he did was wrong. He violated the law. Not only do I believe he should be find, but I also believe as contractors license should be pulled and this story gets even more comical.

According to the information I was also given, Chief Davis also had failed to put house numbers on his home. A little research takes us back to File of Council No. 13, 2001, an ordinance passed to require numbering of houses on homes and other buildings throughout the city. We take a look at Section 6, penalties, "Any person violating this ordinance shall upon conviction be fined no less than \$100."

Section B here, if the evidence shows that a person died from fire, disease

or other reason due to at least in part an inability to locate an address on the structure that the fine shall be \$300.

Let's go to Section 7, enforcement, this is where it gets really good here.

"The following officials and city employees are hereby authorized to enforce this ordinance: All police officers, the superintendent of fire and his deputy, the fire prevention officer," which from what I understand we no longer have, and fire inspectors in the department, in the Scranton Fire Department.

So here we have a fire chief who in this ordinance File of Council No. 13, 2001, is required by law to enforce it and he doesn't have it on his home. This is some example he is setting I'll tell you. Yet again the politics and games that we allow to go on this city. And you know what's ironic? Guess who was on council when this passed? Guess who spearheaded this? Our Honorable mayor, Christopher A. Doherty. And isn't it funny now how it's the other way around and he is letting one of his

cronies get away with this. It's time to start holding these people accountable. We have let this nonsense go on for far too long. We have seen it with what the mayor is trying to do in the budget, and I have about had it, I'm truly disgusted. I have been involved in this city for ten years and I have never seen it like this, and all I have to say is that it's truly disheartening to the future that one man can leave for my generation. He has completely ruined it.

But I'm not going anywhere. I'm going to continue to come up here and fight for what I believe in and fight for my generation and I'm not going to stand by and let this man continue to tear this city apart. I was notified today that Engine 7 was shut down. That's the closest engine company to my house. God forbid anything were to happen there. I'm not only holding our mayor accountable, but I'll hold Tom Davis and Ryan McGowan responsible.

And I'd like to piggyback on what Councilman Loscombe said, I agree with him 1,000 percent, Chris Doherty, Tom Davis and

24

25

Ryan McGowan need to come forward right here at this table and explain how they intend on covering this city with 29 less firemen and less engine companies, and you want to talk about response times, we have individuals like Mr. Loscombe said sitting behind a desk with a pen and paper who have absolutely no clue what they are doing, they are not qualified to make these decisions determining what engine companies they are going to shut down, how many more firemen they are going to take off the street, and they continue to jeopardize the health, safety and well-being of the residents of this city, and what's truly sad about this the bottom line they don't care. actions have proven it time and time again, and as I have said, I've about had it. disgusted and I want these three individuals to come forward and come forward now and I hope council will continue to pursue that, and I thank you for your time. And I'd like to leave you with these pictures if I could.

MR. ROGAN: Absolutely.

MR. MILLER: Thank 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

MR. ROGAN: Thank you, Mr. Miller.
Bob Bolus.

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

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. BOLUS: I'd like to kind of start off, I was coming down Mulberry Street last night and the way it's lit up there with the crosswalks with the kids from the University, they don't pay attention to anybody. I mean, for kids going to school they are pretty stupid. They just come walking right out, they see the crosswalks, you can't even sit them dressed in dark clothing and they just literally walk right out in front of you. We almost hit one of them last night while we are driving up Mulberry Street, and I think the "U" has to be notified here to either wear some type of reflective clothing if they are walking or they light up the intersections a lot better, but these kids just think because they see a crosswalk and it's a state law they forgot about the thing they learned when they were kids, stop, look and listen,

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'd like to see you get a letter about it,
but it's dangerous. Somebody is going to
get hurt or worse.

The last thing is last week I had

so I think something has to be done here and

brought in the signs of Mr. Loscombe, well, so everybody is aware I filed criminal complaints against Dr. Oakes and Slotterback, professors from the "U", that did this. You got the pictures, they are on video, we submitted it to the district attorney and we have been waiting now for the DA to make up their mind what they want Now, I don't want to see a procrastination with them that because of the influence of the University that they think this is going to get swept under the rug, it's not. So you know, we don't want to see something that happened like Penn State where everything just sits on the burner and nothing comes out where it's supposed to be because of the clout University has over the citizens of this city.

The issue isn't going to die, and I

can assure you, Jack, I'm going to take it all the way to the end until we get a resolution because people like this that have been taking a free ride from us in the city should have more respect for our legislators and the people in the city and for property that doesn't belong to them.

The other part is that we have here -- we had the Hartman issue that I brought here and, you know, you kind of get sick and tired of coming here and talking about it, there is 16 1/2 foot, he built this house on it, it's deeded, I produced the deeds, Paul Kelly came in and wrote an opinion letter that the city doesn't deed or own it. Well, what I think Paul Kelly needs to do is put a deed where his mouth is and show the city does not own it. Our title search by a very credible and reputable company proved that the City of Scranton owns this property.

I put a \$50,000 bid on it. This city is broke and they are turning their back on 50 plus thousand dollars that could come into the coffers, yet it's being

ignored. I would like council to send a letter to Paul Kelly to put his deed where his mouth is to show that the city, in fact, had deeded this property out to Hartman, it's not owned by the city, and that's the end of it. He has not done that and it's time that we start bringing him to task.

And I'd really like to know what
Paul Kelly really does. He is a full-time
solicitor in the city? I seen him in
courthouse yesterday and, really, I don't
know if he is doing private business or city
business, but we are paying him to do that.
He is the solicitor for the authorities. I
mean, enough is enough yet we are in trouble
because of ignorance in this city or
protection of the cronyism.

The other thing is with PEL, I think they're the biggest first class joke that we ever had in this city. You know, business is business, common sense is common sense.

Now they want to see us pay more than we are already getting hammered on in the county, we didn't get the school district's hammer yet, and PEL wants us to pay more money.

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

. .

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Like, what kind of stupidity did they possess over all of the years we paid them, God knows how many thousands of dollars to direct this city and look where the heck we We are sunk. We are not sinking, we We are in dire need of have sunk. direction. You have KOZ's, you have nonprofits, you have everybody on a free You've got the gas line that's going through this city that you should be getting something on, you got the leachate line from Dunmore because you are afraid to take on the landfill, yet these idiots from PEL want us to pay a higher garbage fee than we are already paying, and we pay taxes to have our garbage picked up and we have to pay a fee. Actually, the fee that was put on is illegal because it's taxation without representation, it doesn't go across everybody.

And if people start looking at it they will see more and more what we need to do in this city. We got vacant land all of the over city. My house got a condemnation on it and I live in it. What about the

houses that the rats are living in, windows are knocked out, that have never been knocked down. That's why I came to this council. It's time now that council starts standing up for us.

People like Paul Kelly, Grazianos, the zoning board, need to be held accountable to the people in this city. I've put up with their nonsense, their embarrassments, thousands of dollars in money got out in lawsuits, now it's go to cost the city a lot more because now their depositions are going to be taken in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, so now the cost is going to come to bear on the city.

I went to Doherty four different times and asked him to intervene and we put this to bed. This is the guy who still wants to see the recreation is taken care of in his whole budget deal, yet he is the one that pulled 3 1/2 dollars of the golf course money that was put for recreation and he won't be in here asking for it, he blew it, he spent it and he put the screws to everybody in this city and it's time the

rubber stamping that went on in the past
with PEL and everybody else comes to an end
and we get a firm decision and the people
start speaking out and we will change
Scranton around, and that's where we need to
go. Thank you and, incidentally, have a
good Thanksgiving.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you, Mr. Bolus.
You, too.

MR. HALL: Bob Hall. Occupy

Scranton. I'm not going to use all my four minutes, but we have been talking since the very beginning that we want to become more involved in local issues and it just happens that this budget came up. It's seemed like a perfect opportunity for us to speak on it. The standard of living in the city is so low to begin with we cannot afford to put 29 percent tax increase on the backs of the lower class, the working class.

It seems very strange to me that when we start talking about how to deal with this debt crisis it all lies on the backs of the working class and for some reason the firefighters. This is a fairly large city

the population may be declining somewhat, but square mileage-wise the city is not shrinking. If we close firehouses people are going to -- the firemen aren't going to be there on time to save the lives that they need to save. It's strikes me as very odd that those would be the first ones to come up to save the debt crisis that was caused by a lot of the city's waste in the first place. If you ask anybody in the city, they know there is waste and there are solutions to it, the firemen ain't one of them. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Bill Jackowitz.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Bill Jackowitz,
South Scranton resident. First of all, a
couple of weeks ago, a few weeks ago, it was
brought to our attention that director Jeff
Brazil authorized people to utilize a
flatbed truck, a city-owned flatbed truck to
go up to the Dunmore barracks and take
civilian driver's license tests. Now we
find out that, and I just found this out now
from Doug Miller listening to him speak,

that our fires chief, Tom Davis, is having work done on his house without the proper permits. Again, is this not the same fire chief that has a 93 percent no confidence vote? Why is he still the fire chief? Is this the same fire chief that's in the proposed budget for a \$17,000 pay increase? Again, why is he the fire chief?

I hope this is not swept under the rug. I hope it's investigated and checked into, and if Chief Davis did put those windows in without the proper permits then he needs to be fined, he needs to be cited just like anyone else in this city is, and I'm counting on city council not to let this slip under the rug and go by the wayside.

Also, I want to know what happened with Jeff Brazil. Has anything been done with this? His authorization to use a government owned, a city-owned truck, to have a civilian driver's license test taken by a civilian. He is not even a city employee, he is a civilian. Again, I hope it's not being swept under the rug. Here's another director, a cabinet member of this

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

city.

Okay, now, we have got the proposed budget, \$84 million budget. Last year's budget was 75 million. Why do we have a \$9 million proposal increase? I don't understand this. I thought the city was distressed. I thought we didn't have any more money. How could we be spending \$9 million more in 2012 than we are spending in 2011? We are having a reduction in the fire department. They are talking about reduction in the DPW. They are talking about raising taxes anywhere from 29 percent to 70 percent depending upon who you want to believe, PEL or the mayor. I don't believe any one of them because I think they both lie.

But, anyway, again, what's going on?

How can our budget, proposed budget, be \$9

million higher? It doesn't make sense to

me. Maybe someone, maybe Mr. Joyce can

explain it to me in motions, but again, this

budgets needs to be looked at, cuts need to

be made, especially if we have cabinet

members, Chief Davis and Jeff Brazil just

doing whatever they want to do because they were appointed, and I'm going to use that word appointed. That means they brown nosed their way into the position. That's how they got their job. Qualifications don't matter. Our past president Judy Gatelli of city council stated that. Qualifications do not matter and you know what? I think the City of Scranton follows that advice because qualifications do not matter.

Again, I'm going back to the budget, you know, where is the audit? Has anybody received the audit yet? Has anyone looked at the audit yet?

MR. JOYCE: No.

MR. JACKOWITZ: How can we possibly have a discussion on a budget when we don't even have the audit? The mayor promised us that the audit would be here. By law the audit should be here by the end of May. We are in the end of November for God's sake and we still don't have the audit but yet we are going to have a budget and we are going to have tax increases? How does he justify tax increases if we don't even know anything

_ (

about the audit or what money has been sent and where the money has gone? Come on, people.

And again, I'm counting on Scranton city council to hold this man's feet to the fire. I'm counting on you to hold Jeff Brazil's feet to the fire, and I'm counting on you to hold Chief Tom Davis' feet to the fire. Just because they are appointed cabinet members ask not give them the right to do whatever they want to do. They must follow the rules and regulations just like everyone else in this city. And again, I hope you hold their feet to the fire.

You have know, we talk about people

-- the city not having money, but yet we got
a fire chief that is too cheap to purchase
the permits and he is going to get a \$17,000
raise and he got a raise two years ago and
he has a 93 percent no confidence vote?
Let's be for real, people, and I hope
something is done about this.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you,

Mr. Jackowitz. Ron Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: Hello. Council.

2

4

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. ELLMAN: This morning about 5:30, quarter to six, I was at the junk yard and there was a fellow waiting for it to open and we started talking for a couple of seconds, he told me he had owned his house 22 or 23 years and he had three or four more years on his mortgage and he has lost it. Twenty-some years of paying house loans and he has lost it. This is just such a great sadness. He didn't pay taxes this year, he said there is no way in the world he could go on and he -- I said to phone Ozzie Quinn about some of these institutions he knows about it he said he has tried, he has tried He said it's gone. to sell it.

I think we can thank all of these colleges that took a third of our tax base off. This just shouldn't happen in this city and this country. This is just so sad that somebody pays on a house, you know. You know, I saw the article this weekend in the paper that the University of Scranton opened the dormitories \$41 million. \$41 million and you know they are going to have

a nice income coming in, they are living off the tax base. You've got to put a cap on it like they did in California. Something has got to be done. Half the people in town are supporting the other half. Maybe they need a zone. If they want to buy outside of that zone let them pay the taxes. Keep them in the zone. It's just can't go on. Let them buy and take over everything.

Two or three days ago -- I think it's today's paper, Blue Cross is going to give the medical school \$54 million. They promised them \$54 million over the next five years. What did they promise us? They promised to take five acres of taxable property around them off the payroll the next five years. That's why everybody is talking about their house taxes doubling in one year because of these obscene people that are overseeing these -- these are financial institutions, they are money making businesses.

I saw some jerk at PNC Bank gave the Lackawanna College a \$2,500 check. Does anybody know what it was for? The paper

taken that one building that they turned into the dormitory probably was \$10,000 it had businesses in it and, you know, they are getting -- it just doesn't make sense.

Somebody is giving them money while the city is broke, the people are losing their houses, 400 houses coming up in January. Have you seen that big sheet with the foreclosures? It's huge. Next year think what it's going to look like with the taxes doubled.

said for tax donations. Here they have

I don't know, people won't be able to pay rent, you know, they will be gone. The tax base is just leaving town. This guy told me this morning his wife got on the list for apartments in Scranton Housing. I mean, it's over with for him and then I see Paul Mansour's name in the paper for selling a house \$177,000, he has had it for years, hasn't paid taxes, he got a completely 100 percent bogus nonprofit organization, nothing has been done. All you have to do is check on it. He doesn't qualify for anything and he is in a real estate business

at our expense. I complained two years ago about it, he sold a house, and I forgotten, like four or five months later, it's still the people that bought it had never put it on the tax rolls. I've forgotten where it is and now it's like a year ago and this is going on everywhere.

Here Austin Burke is supposed to support the city and he is paying next to nothing for building permits, never caught up with him. Every time you turn around somebody -- a position is just stepping on the little man of this city.

I'd like to say that Mr. Miller's talk was very good. I seen him all fired up and it made me happy, you know, but you people have got to help the little people of this city or they will be gone. You know, where are you going to go with taxes doubled? I don't know where they get \$88, they are doubled. No matter if you have a 500 house or -- I'm talking about your taxes or a 1,000, 2000, they are going to double at 30 percent, 40 percent, then the school board. You got to complete runaway school

board talking about building another school.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you, Mr. Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: You're going to have a ghost town here if something isn't done to stop these colleges. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Les Spindler.

MR. HUGHES: Excuse me,

Mr. Chairman, if I could, in response to Mr. Ellman's statement, the University of Scranton is in an institutional district which -- whose northerly boundary is Mulberry Street. Where the new dormitories are built they are not built in the institutional district where these dormitories are permitted. As a result of that, they wanted to have the alley between the two parcels where the dormitories are constructed they wanted that vacated and they wanted the air rights over it.

We met with them, the condition was and we got excused of extortion by the Scranton Times that we would convey the air rights for a certain amount of money. They expanded over there because they went before

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the zoning board and they obtained a variance. Right now any expansion by the University of Scranton beyond the northerly side of Mulberry Street, I believe it would be the easterly side of the Clay Avenue, they are outside of the institutional district. They can only expand by getting a variance from the zoning board, so that anybody that -- it's up to the zoning board to deny the variances. If they do, that will stop the expansion of the University of Scranton outside of the institutional district then they would have to come to council and they would have to request, at least we might be able to negotiate and say that if you do want to expand we could at least go to a zoning board and say that you are going to pay the tax on the real estate that you are taking which is now exempt.

That would be a way that the University of Scranton and any other institution that keeps buying properties to expand outside of the their district and they have to get variances, the way to stop it is to through the zoning board.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROGAN: Thank you, Attorney Hughes.

MR. SPINDLER: Good evening, Council. Les Spindler, city resident and homeowner and taxpayer. First of all, I want to echo what Doug Miller and Bill Jackowitz said. If these allegations against Chief Davis are true, he has got to be held accountable. He is no better than any other citizen in this city. Everybody, myself and anybody else in here, we have to get permits to have work done. If he got his permit after the work was done, that is wrong. He should be fined and he should have his license taken away, but this is the height of politics again in this city. Chris Doherty make sure nothing happens to him. I hope council holds his feet to the fire, something should be done, and also with Jeff Brazil.

I woke up this morning and saw the headline in the paper. You know, it wasn't funny, but I had to laugh. It's really sad. They want to raise taxes 42 percent. Where do they think the people of this city are

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going to come up with money like that? mean, there is mainly elderly in this city on a fixed income, we are getting whacked 38 percent by the county, 42 percent by the city, these people have to go. We have been distressed for 19 years. PEL has been here for 19 years and we are in worse shape now than when they first started. All they're doing is stuffing their pockets, making millions on this city, and Mr. McGoff doesn't think they should go. He didn't want to a letter sent to the governor asking him to be replaced. These people have to I have said it in the past, they are just stuffing their pockets with our money and not doing a darn thing. It's a shame. It's really ashame.

I wish council would get Mr. Cross in this room here and ask him why we have to raise taxes 42 percent. What's been going on or what they have done in 19 years? I'd like to ask that question.

Last week I mentioned about a good revenue source, which I think putting cameras in each intersection, the next day

22

23

24

25

on WILK talk radio there was a different host on there, Lane Toroler, and he just brought it up at the end of the show, he said -- I forget the name of the city, it was a city in Ohio that put them in and in the first 20 days of use they gave out 10,000 tickets. In the first 20 days. So multiply that by a year and it's an unbelievable revenue source. I think we should really look into cameras at every intersection where there is traffic lights, and not only for people running red lights for any traffic violation, as I said last week, people making wrong turns, turns on red.

Lastly, what Doug said about Engine 7, my wife went out before for a hoagie, in the shop a woman came up to her really upset that she said Luzerne Street fire station was closed today. When is this going to end? This guy just doesn't care about the people of this city. Mr. Loscombe, do you know if that was just a brownout or is that permanent?

MR. LOSCOMBE: No, it's a brownout,

but it's been closed quite frequently in the last couple of weeks. I mean, look at today, I believe, there is three engines and one truck company in service and that's with the existing manpower, I don't know what's going to happen --

MR. SPINDLER: That's just ridiculous. That's to cover 27 square miles.

MR. LOSCOMBE: That's why the administration has to be here to answer these questions.

MR. SPINDLER: It's covering 27 square miles of this city, and with all due respect to Doug --

MR. LOSCOMBE: Without any water either. Without hydrants, without water. I mean, that's a pretty significant coverage area that Engine 7 protects, they even respond into the Newton-Ransom area there, too.

MR. SPINDLER: And they would cover what Engine 9 was going to cover, also. I don't know what's going to happen with this city. With all due respect to Doug, we are

12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |

never going to get Chris Doherty in these chambers. He will never come here, he just hides in his office downstairs. He will never come face to face with the citizens of this city and it's a darn shame. Something has got to be done and we need more people coming here calling his office, I have called his office before telling him my dissatisfaction with what he is doing, but we need a lot more people calling.

Something has got to be done.

As one of the people that spoke here last week on three out of the four days there were only three fire stations open.

That's unacceptable. They can't cover the whole city. You don't have to be expert to figure that out and something has got to be done. Thank you for your time. I hope you follow through with this complaint about Chief Davis.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you, Mr. Spindler.

Dave Dobrzyn.

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council.

Dave Dobrzyn, resident of Scranton and
taxpayer.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. DOBRZYN: First, each week
Scranton City Council meeting can be found
from now on at WFTE.org, audio only, thanks
to help from Mark from ECTV. WFTE FM is a
nonprofit community radio at 105.7 Scranton.
There is quite a bit of interesting stuff on
there so if you want to hear something
different from a different perspective tune
in.

Now, last week I went over some ideas that I thought PEL devised a suggested donation list for all nonprofits. I mean, every year I see this in the paper, oh, we should approach nonprofits and ask them for a donation. They are the ones suggesting it, why they don't come with the suggested nonprofit and nonprofits call it block zoning or whatever you want to call it, but they should be zoned in and it's time that if the "U" wants to expand they just have to start paying taxes, and that's it. If they want to build up that's fine, but if they build out it's time to start paying taxes, I'm not that impressed with their standards

at all.

And on trash fees, we must begin to enforce standards for citizens on method of disposal and a required recycle. It's just ungodly what I see in the courts and stuff when I take a walk through.

We need to review grants and health insurance under Affordable Care act for the fire department and police, and require the administration to cooperate with union advisors. I have heard quite a few things over the last couple of months where money was available and wasn't applied for by the administration. It's time to bury the hatchet when it's -- it's always over our heads instead.

And no raises for department heads and safety chiefs. That's crazy. That is nuts. \$17,0000 a year. Some people if you work in a convenient store, and they make sure you don't go over 40 hours a week, you will not make \$17,000 a year. Shame.

Inspect utility work on road repairs. This hasn't been done and basically they stink. They come in, they

dig up the street, do what they want and leave what they want, and it's a -- you can start -- mine coal in some of them.

And finally, advocating lobbying state officials and the fed officials to make changes to ensure that we don't lose following their directives especially for PEL. And it's just ashame the way they lead the mayor around for years and we not going to have to pay this and then went on and look where we are at now in addition to a couple of million dollars probably worth of lobbying or legal fees.

And finally I'll make it quick, the golden parrot goes to Newt Gingrich he accepted in excess of \$25 million in lobbying fees and he claims it's only for history lessons, so last week I criticized Jan Brewer under the golden parrot for firing the chairman of their redistricting committee, which was established in Arizona by a referendum by the citizens to prevent gerrymandering, well guess what? This week she is being recalled. Thank you, there might be a God. Have a good laugh on the

way down, Jan. Bawk, bawk. Have a good night.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to address council?

MR. MOODY: Good evening, Council.

My name is Carl Moody, I'm a member of

Bethel AME Church, but I want to make this

very clear, I am not a representative of

Bethel AME Church. I cannot be a

representative of that church unless my

pastor appoints me as a representative of

that church, so I'm speaking purely as a

citizen, and I'm just letting you know I'm a

member of the Bethel AME Church.

At your last council meeting, I caught it on tape on a public service channel, and I was shocked, shocked, that a woman, Kathryn Simmons, calls herself Reverend Kathryn Simmons, was allowed to stand in this chamber before this dock and simply make a statement that the new minister was sent here to Scranton by the Bishop to remove, one, the white minister, and two, to close down the shelter. And no

one in this panel challenged her.
Challenged her.

I find that personally extremely offensive, and once again, I am not a representative of Bethel AME Church, I'm just a member of the church. I would like to ask has any of -- do any of you gentlemen know any parishioners of Bethel AME Church personally? Do you know somebody who knows somebody? Has anyone ever went over and spoke to the new minister or any previous ministers? Talked about this shelter project? Has anyone done that?

Okay then, if you haven't learned this information for yourself, what you were told last week, a lot of that was false. It was false. And I like I said, I find it most offensive that it was left hanging in the air that our bishop would send a minister in here to tell a white parishioner of our church, "Get rid of the white woman."

We don't do that in my church, and I would invite you to come and join us for fellowship and you will see what kind of

church we are. Come join us, but that statement should not have been allowed to hang in the air and linger like that. She should have been challenged on that.

The fact of the matter is this, as a parishioner, what I know, am not speaking for the church, previous ministers have told Reverend Simmons, well, Kathryn Simmons, because I'm not certain she is a minister.

I am not certain. I would encourage you to check her degrees on that, you might be surprised. A previous minister had told Kathryn Simmons, "You are not a representative of Bethel AME Church."

She was told a number of times that, and the situation was thusly that the minister had to bring it to the congregation to make it plain and simple and clear to everyone, you are not a representative of that church unless I say so. The minister is in charge. He reports to the bishop, but as our church is set up the minister is the one that calls the shots. That previous minister didn't want federal funds brought into our church. We did not -- he did not

Find out who signed that contract.
Find out which minister signed that

want the federal entanglements and he played it plain and clear, so who was it that signed this contract? Who was it? Whose name is on that contract? As I understand it, the contract can't be found.

You need to do a little deeper research. I think all of you gentlemen are smarter than this. Smarter than this. To allow this woman to leave that statement hanging in the air and walk away. It doesn't past the smell test, gentlemen, and it shouldn't past the hearing test. It should fall on a tin ear. It doesn't sound right. It doesn't sound right.

Nobody, a previous minister had made it plain and clear we do not want the federal entanglements. You take federal money, you have to follow their rules. What church wants to do that? Federal government is really not in-line with most churches. Churches do the right thing. They go out and assist the community. The federal government is not involved in religion.

contract. The current minister we have, wonderful woman, intelligent woman, strong black woman. I would encourage you to sit down with that woman for five minutes and I will assure you, I assure you, you will be surprised. You will come away with a whole different appreciation of that woman. You need to do your duty. You need to get up, go down to that church and talk to somebody.

Kathryn Simmons came up here and sold you a bill of goods. That's my say. That what I'm saying. You need to do further investigation. What that woman was allowed to do in coming here was a slander on our church, and to finish with -- and for her to finish with, "I was a member of the church for 42 years and I don't want to hurt my church."

Well, didn't she just throw her church under the bus? It doesn't smell right, doesn't sound right. It sounds to me it wasn't -- sounds like to me, "It wasn't me, it was them."

Kathryn Simmons was intricately involved, deeply involved with seeking those

2

3

4

5

6

8

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

federal dollars, but did Kathryn Simmons approach the bishop about this entire thing?

Do your due diligence. Check it out.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. I just do want to mention, Reverend Simmons, just like everyone else in the public, is allowed to come to the podium and state their position and, you know, it wouldn't be right for us to gavel her or, you know, rule her out of order for stating her position just as it would be wrong for us to do the same with you.

MR. MOORE: Exactly, but, sir, I would proffer to you, all of you gentlemen, it I were to walk in here and say something like, "Well, the bishop fired me because the new bishop in here because he wanted to get rid of the black priest and the shelter," you would laugh me out of here. It would shock your senses, wouldn't it? It doesn't make sense. That's why I'm asking you please, gentlemen, take a walk down the street and have a conversation with somebody other than Kathryn Simmons. This woman chose when the bishop is visiting on a

1 dinner to welcome the new minister, she 2 chose that time not to speak with the 3 bishop, she chose to try to picket the bishop with people who weren't even a member 4 of our church. It's ridiculous. 5 MR. ROGAN: Thank you. We will. 6 MR. MOORE: 7 Please do your due 8 diligence, sir. 9 MR. ROGAN: Thank you. 10 MR. MOORE: But, as I said, as a 11 member I take that as a slander upon my 12 church, and my mother, Julia Moody, who 13 worked for the City of Scranton for a number 14 of years, she was one of those same women that helped pick Kathryn Simmons up, dust 15 16 her off, and turned her around. 17 MR. ROGAN: Thank you. 18 MR. MOORE: Okay? Thank you very 19 much, gentlemen. 20 MR. ROGAN: Thank you very much. 21 there anyone else who would like to address 22 council? 23 MR. SLEDENZSKI: Hello, Jack. 24 MR. LOSCOMBE: Chrissy. 25 MR. SLEDENZSKI: Frankie.

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JOYCE: Chrissy.

MR. SLEDENZSKI: Well, Jack, Engine
7, keep it open. We need it, Jack, for West
Side. We need it. We need it bad. Jack,
you are my man downstairs. Remember that.
I love you, Jack. Take care, buddy.

MR. ROGAN: Thanks, Chrissy. Is there anyone else who would like to address council?

MR. ANCHERANI: Good evening. Nelson Ancherani, resident and taxpayer, recording secretary of the FOP, First Amendment Rights, at least I think we have Last week you were presented with the city's budget for 2012. This budget is the second highest budget in the history of the First was three or four years ago city. when an \$84 million plus budget was presented to council, but that one was adopted without being amended. Council, you have a monstrous challenge ahead of you to come up with a budget the city could live with that doesn't punish the taxpayers and business owners of the city.

If I were sitting up there, I would

be tempted to let the budget go as it is and when it doesn't work council won't get the blame, the blame will go where it is rightly deserved. You face an uphill battle because the city has an ally in the Scranton slimes and you can't win an argument when the ally buys ink by the barrel. The slimes will support this administration as long as it's not the Connors' administration.

Now, who woke PEL up? They now come here with their revised Recovery Plan that has a 71 percent tax increase going into the year 2014. Wasn't it four years ago that they were here looking for a 75 percent tax increase that was divided up in three 25 percent increases? They only got one, a 26 percent increase, and were shot down for the other two.

Weren't they also looking for a \$44 loan at the same time? You have to admire their persistence. They're now back for the rest and more. How do you trust their reliability when this is the 20th year that they have been the Recovery Plan coordinator? Their record is dismal in

accomplishments. What they are good at is being able to remain as plan coordinator for 20 years and to keep their do nothing jobs. How many millions did they get paid for nothing, in my opinion. Trump would have fired them 19 years ago, and I should have bet Mr. McGoff about the tax increase, the second record budget, and the 15.1 million that PEL proposes to borrow. We can't forget, also, that they want 22 more dollars on the tip fee, garbage tax, and then another 42 coming up after that. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Is there anyone else who cares to address council?

MR. GERVASI: Good evening, city council. My name is Dave Gervasi, I'm a firefighter in the City of Scranton, president of the firefighters' union.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. GERVASI: I don't even know where to begin tonight there is so much stuff happened this week. Let me start with just a few things. The budget came out with a 29 percent tax increase, and correct me if I'm wrong, I read the budget, there is

nothing in the budget that has to do with the award, the Supreme Court award, the fire and police won; am I correct?

MR. ROGAN: Correct.

MR. GERVASI: So they want to raise your taxes 29 percent and that's not even factored in, that's the mayor's budget. The Recovery Plan comes out, the new Recovery Plan comes out Monday morning, yesterday morning, and they want to raise your taxes 42 percent next year, this year coming, then 5 and 7 percent each year for the next four years, and correct me if I'm wrong, but there is nothing in the Recovery Plan that reflects the Supreme Court decision on the police and firemen; is that correct?

MR. MCGOFF: That is correct.

MR. GERVASI: That is correct.

Thank you, Mr. McGoff. As a matter of fact,

the Recovery Plan even states, and I'll read it to you, "The cost impact of the October 19, 2011, Pennsylvania Supreme Court decision that remanded for reinstatement prior City of Scranton fire and police arbitration interest awards was not

available when this 2011 revised Recovery

Plan was prepared. Therefore, any potential revenue and expenditure impact that may be associated with the Supreme Court decision is not included in the revenue and expenditure projections that follow."

Now, if you read the papers and you listen to the mayor on TV, it makes it sound like he had to raise your taxes 29 percent and the Pennsylvania Economy League wants to raise your taxes 42 percent because of the police and firemen award when it is specifically not even a part of the budget or the Recovery Plan.

It's only going to get worse and in the mean time while they are raising your taxes, you know, I hate to beat a dead horse, but when I started coming here I told everybody that the experience that I learned from other municipalities that were under Act 47 is the end result is you will pay much more for much less services. That is the result of Act 47. The Pennsylvania Economy League was her for 19 years, we started to recover, as a matter of fact, we

"I think it is a working document."

ran a surplus since 1999 and then they did nothing. They stood by with the full consent and knowledge of DCED, the state, and allowing the mayor to run us to \$300 million in debt, and at the same time they said, "Don't worry about it, we are going to beat the cops and firemen."

Something that really made me appalled when I read the paper this morning was a statement by Mayor Doherty, and the people need to listen to this very, very carefully, maybe even the Scranton Times should listen to this very, very carefully. It said because of the 70.7 percent cumulative tax increase that PEL is calling for in the Recovery Plan, the mayor said, "Obviously, it's very high and we believe that's very unfair," even thought the mayor was touting two weeks ago that he was going to raise taxes 100 percent over the next five years.

But he did express this one statement, which baffles my mind, "I think it is a working document."

2

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I take that to mean it's a work in progress. The proper thing to say is it's a fluid document, that's the proper terminology I believe.

The reasons why the police and firefighters were at war in Court for the last nine years is because Mayor Doherty, the last Recovery Plan, wouldn't change one Not one word. If you go back word in it. about six years from now you can read the transcript of what I said from this podium, and I said what a shame it was that the Recovery Plan, even though the citizens voted for it, because frankly no one read it, it had violations of the heart and lung act, it had violations of the labor law in it, it had many, many numerous Tammany Hall-type management rights that had nothing to do with the impact or recovery -financial impact or the recovery of the city.

They perverted the intent of Act 47 and they drove it down everyone's throat with a threat of a tax increase and, yes, 70 percent of people, but we weren't going to

sit back and have a Recovery Plan and have
Chris Doherty take our rights away, so we
fought and the city was extremely aware that
Recovery Plans could be amended.

When we said this article in the Recovery Plan violates the state Heart and Lung Act. We are never going to give you that because it's our right, it's everyone, every police and firefighter, state trooper and correction officer in the State of Pennsylvania has that right, and for good reason, and we said we are not going to give that up, so why don't you just drop that from the Recovery Plan, and few other things, and you know what, the rest of the stuff we are going to have to eat and they wouldn't change one word. Not one word in the Recovery Plan.

And as a matter of fact, during arbitration we had Charlie Waters from DCED, and I forget who was from PEL testifying, and we asked him specifically, "Can Recovery Plans be amended or changed after they are adopted?"

And they said of course they could.

It's been done twice in Scranton, it's been down in Johnstown, it's been done in Chester, it's been -- recently it's been done in Pittsburgh and they said the mayor and DCED this time said not one word is going to be changed, and that's why we are in Court for nine years and that's why the mayor spent \$3 million on legal fees to drag this thing out for so long, and that's why the city is going to pay this court award now because they wouldn't change a word.

But today he wants to have an epiphany, "I think it's a working document. We can work with it."

All of a sudden. Isn't that a shame. Thank you.

(Whereupon while Mr. Gervasi was speaking Ms. Evans takes the dais and joins the meeting.)

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

MR. DOCKLEY: You have to excuse me. Good evening, Council.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. DOCKLEY: My name is Sam

Dockley, life-long resident of Scranton. I love Scranton, this is my city. First, I want to congratulate brother firefighter Jack Loscombe on his victory and Mr. McGoff, I'm a little choked up.

I'd like to tell you a little story about my dad. He was a firefighter, also, in Scranton 22 years. He went to work one day working night shift, Truck 1, a hook and ladder they call it, they called the back seat driver the filler man. He had two drivers on the truck, on the back. He wasn't feeling good. He said to a couple of his men, he said, "I don't feel so good, I'm going to lay down for a little while."

At that time they had bunk rooms, a kitchen, washroom, lockers, so one of the men decided to go up and check on him and he was gasping for air, he was having a heart attack. He was in his 21st year so they rushed him to State Hospital, he recovered. Thank God. So my mom and I took him to Dr. Cross, at the time he was a heart specialist, he came around about six months, the doctor gave him the okay to go work.

Down the road about another six months he had another heart attack, took him back to Dr. Cross, he said, "Sam," we both had the same name, I'm not a junior, he said, "Sam, if you want to live, you got to quit fighting fires."

At that time my dad retired, he went on disability. I myself am a retired firefighter of 32 years. Retired captain of the Scranton Fire Department. I got hurt on the job. I was 54 years old fighting a fire in South Side, three herniated discs. My point is getting across we had a compliment of men, we had in 1961 when I come on we had 248 firefighters, and we had men getting hurt then. It's a stressful job, a lot of pressure.

And with this reduction now my point is how many more men are you going to have out on workers' compensation with this reduction? It's bad enough now. I know the job. 32 years I was on the job, I know. I also was a filler man, they broke me in filler man in Truck 1. We had two in the city at that time. We also at that time we

had 15 fire stations, 18 companies, we are down to eight and ten now, eight stations and ten companies.

What is going to be before this man, I won't even call him the mayor, I don't respect him, like I said, this is my city and yours. Is it going to take somebody to die? A firefighter get killed or a resident of this town get killed? A child, a sister, brother, mother, father, grandmother, grandfather, uncle, aunt?

This man has no respect for the people. Where is the money our department alone gave back? The position firefighters, the fire stations closed. I want a full investigation of city hall. There is corruption going on. The judges in Luzerne County thought they were God they couldn't get caught, where are they? In jail. Where is Cordaro and Munchak going? To jail. They thought they were God.

This guy thinks he is God, he can't be touched. Him and his henchmen up there. I know politics, I have been around it for years I know how is operates. I was

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

vice-president of our local for six years back in the 60's. We sat down and negotiated with council across the board cost of living raise. You are not getting nothing.

This guy's father was a councilman. I don't disrespect anybody, I'm a nice guy, but you back somebody into a corner and they are going to fight. They are going to come out fighting whether they want to or not. His father was the same way, him and Melnick, Hansel. Mr. Geritty was a councilman. There is a man that I respect that stood up for us. He even went to fires. He wanted to see how it was operated, the manpower we had, the operation. He come out at three in the morning to a fire, I seen him. We had many fires.

This man has no respect for this city. I could read something here to you if I have another minute. It's called a city hall's recent flip flops. This man back May 6th of '09, Mr. Renda, said about the Recovery Plan, it will allow the city to go

ahead with Mr. Doherty's plan to layoff almost 40 firefighters. That was May 6th of '09.

Public safety director Ray Hayes says, "Restructuring the department part of the Recovery Plan is a major transition and complex enough without consolidating companies."

Public safety director Hayes stated, "Scranton is seriously exploring plans to shut down two fire engine companies."

My point is these people are hollering, crying about their taxes, where the hell when they kept this guy in office? He is ruining this town. We all know it. You know what impeach means? I have it here. Impeach means to bring an accusation against a public official before a compliment with a misconduct in office."

In other words, he doesn't no responsibility to public safety. They bring PEL in here and this other concern company what the hell they know about fighting fires? When does this guy now? What does any of his henchman know up there in city

20

21

22

23

24

25

hall about fighting fires or doing police He gave a man, Tom Davis, a chief's job, let him run the department. You gave the superintendent of police his job, let him run the police department? No, they are yes men. That's all they ever were, always will be. And it's ashame, Tommy Davis was a good firefighter, I'll stand up for him that I heard this young man, I rushed down here about Tom Davis with his house and stuff, he is right, the young guy. Не should abide by the laws and the rules of the city with a permit. Anybody else would have been fined. He is wrong. I know I would have been wrong, Jack would have been wrong, any one of us, but he is a good firefighter, I'll stand up for him for that, I worked for him.

But getting back to this man has got to go. He has got another year in there, what he is going to do? Why do you think we are in the spot we are in? All the men asked for was a cost of living raise. You wouldn't be in this predicament today.

That's all we ever asked for. We didn't

want to rob the city, 3 percent or whatever 1 the cost of living raise, you wouldn't be in 2 3 this mess today. He thinks he is God, he can't be touched. He thinks he can do 4 5 whatever he the hell he wants and get away with it, him and rest of his henchmen, I'll 6 7 say it again, and I don't care I'm not 8 afraid of anybody, I never was and never 9 will be. 10 I'm a nice guy, but don't get me Jack will confirm that and Dave 11 mad. Gervasi will attest to that. 12 13 MS. EVANS: Thank you very much for 14 all of those comments. MR. DOCKLEY: I'm glad I got my 15 16 point across. 17 MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you. 18 MR. DOCKLEY: I want to congratulate 19 you people. Happy Thanksgiving. 20 MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else who 21 cares to address council? Mrs. Krake? 22 MS. KRAKE: FIFTH ORDER. 5-A. 23 MOTIONS. 24 MS. EVANS: Mr. McGoff, do you have 25 any comments or motions this evening?

MR. MCGOFF: Please. First thing 1 2 I'd like to talk about was once again is the 3 2011 deficit. I believe that this is the first and initial problem that we need to 4 5 deal with. The mayor had sent proposals to us, they have not been put on the agenda. I 6 7 would ask that they be put on the agenda or 8 something or some proposal in order to deal 9 with the deficit that we have. I would like 10 see the mayor --MS. EVANS: Mr. McGoff, I'm sorry to 11 12 interrupt, it's on tonight's agenda. 13 MR. MCGOFF: It is? 14 MR. JOYCE: Yes. it is. MS. EVANS: Yes. 15 16 MR. MCGOFF: I didn't even notice 17 it. 18 MS. EVANS: It's under 5-A. 19 MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. Is that the 20 updated proposal that he has made? 21 MS. EVANS: I'm going to address it 22 under motions and I am going to have 23 Solicitor Hughes comment on the entire 24 situation and I'm certain that then you will 25 better understand the situation, but I can

1 tell you now that it is not tied into the 2 sale or the lease of the parking meters. 3 MR. MCGOFF: Thankfully. 4 MS. EVANS: I apologize for 5 interrupting. MR. MCGOFF: Oh, no, thank you for 6 7 interrupting. I did not see that when I 8 looked, my apologies. I'm glad that it is 9 placed on the agenda. 10 The second thing that I did want to 11 speak about was the rental registration 12 I would ask permission to take ordinance. 13 that to Attorney Kelly and have him write 14 that so that -- and hopefully it can be placed on next week's agenda. 15 16 MS. EVANS: Do you have the 17 recommendations from --18 MR. MCGOFF: Yes. 19 MS. EVANS: -- Councilman Loscombe, too? 20 21 MR. MCGOFF: Yes, and the things 22 that it seems as though the recommendations 23 primarily dealt more with the rental 24 registration coordinator or director and 25 would be more appropriately included in any

RFP that was, you know, placed for that. I think there may have been one of the recommendations that actually applied to the ordinance itself. I would like to see the ordinance put on the agenda and then we can deal with the RFP, you know, at a later date, you know, for the coordinator, but I think it's imperative that we get that done as soon as possible.

MS. EVANS: I agree.

MR. MCGOFF: I have your permission?

MS. EVANS: Yes, please.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. The third thing, obviously, the major concern is the budget and the Recovery Plan. We had a look at the mayor's budget, a short look at the proposed Recovery Plan. I think -- I don't think that either one is a workable plan. I think that both would need revision and I know I'm probably saying something that we all know, but I think that the answer and the revisions that's needed is one that would come through cooperation and compromise with all three parties involved in this. While we may not like what, you

know, the fact that PEL is here, they are at this point in time the Recovery Plan coordinator or whatever title they have, and we are at some point in time going to be looking at adopting a revised Recovery Plan.

I think it would be in the best interest of all, if three parties, the administration, council and PEL were to work together to produce not only a budget for 2012, but also to produce a workable and acceptable Recovery Plan and I hope that takes place within the next few weeks and before the final vote on a budget, which I know is coming very quickly.

The other thing that I did want to mention that is talk about the audit, it was mentioned at a PEL meeting yesterday that the administration and NCC are meeting with Rossi & Rossi to try a resolve the remaining items. I realize that this is long after the fact, but they are meeting and hopefully that they will be resolved and that we can receive an audit prior to the end of the calendar year.

And last thing, I was asked a number

4

5

1

6

7

9

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of weeks ago to look into the -- and it's been mentioned tonight, the situation with Mr. Brazil. I spoke with the mayor, he was aware of the situation and I was told that it was dealt with administratively and that Mr. Brazil had come to the mayor, that they were aware, and the mayor had been aware of the problem, and it was dealt with within the administration, and that's all. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. McGoff. And before I call on Councilman Rogan I just wanted to comment on one of your statements. I agree that cooperation is necessary, cooperation is a two-way street and I don't know if you are aware or not but council has been highly cooperative with the administration. I know that Councilman Joyce, for example, has been in regular contact by e-mail with the business administrator. There is borrowing placed on tonight's agenda in order to save the administration for their decisions in 2011 and fill this 2011 deficit against many of our better wishes.

So I think what's important is that, as I said, the administration must cooperate. City council has been cooperating. The administration, on the other hand, when asked for information by us has replied, "Send a Right-to-Know request."

That's not the proper answer.

That's certainly not reflective of cooperation, so I believe if we want to discuss cooperation week after week after week, you are not doing it in the proper venue because, like I said, you need to get the other side of the street to begin to cooperate with us, please.

And, Councilman Rogan --

MR. JOYCE: I had a question if you don't mind me asking? I have been doing a lot of work researching over budgetary items and sending out e-mails and trying to contact Mr. McGowan and various department heads and they have been adequately responding to some of the requests I have, but I was looking over my notes from last year and for Councilman McGoff I had a question because I remember at one point you

governing business taxes so that --

MR. MCGOFF: I will try.

MS. EVANS: So that we can, in fact, learn what the truth of the situation is and if your source is correct then I would believe that it's the duty of the administration to make that correction in the mayor's proposed budget and resubmit is budget to city council reflecting those changes.

MR. ROGAN: I would also add that PEL, I believe it was Mr. Cross when he was here, said the same thing. And, obviously, PEL doesn't have a problem with the mayor's budget or objection.

MR. JOYCE: Actually, in the Recovery Plan I do look over some of it and they actually recommended raising the business privilege and mercantile to 1 mill, however, their have ben questions in the past as to whether this violates state law or not, so I think it's mandatory that we actually know if it's against state law or not.

MS. EVANS: Yes, and that's an

excellent point made by Councilman Rogan, for PEL to state publically that an increase cannot occur and then to include it in it's plan and to give it's blessing to apparently the current budget that contains that item is certainly highly questionable.

MR. ROGAN: We have to look back at the minutes, but I remember pretty clearly looking at a graph presented to us from PEL and Mr. Cross mentioned how in the 90's where the mercantile tax was reduced by Mayor Connors he mentioned that that can't be increased to that level again because it was cut, which I think is a good thing, but we'll see what the law is.

MS. EVANS: Thank you very much. Please continue.

MR. ROGAN: I'll be pretty brief tonight, just a few comments on the Recovery Plan and few comments on the budget. I obviously haven't had a chance to read the entire Recovery Plan yet, but from the highlights in it, and again, I disagree with the mayor, I think the best part of the Recovery Plan is the 50 percent decrease in

parks and recreation spending. We have spent far too much money in the parks in the city. It's something nice to have when times are good, but when times are tough we need the basics.

spending. I would like to see a little, but 5 percent is a start. Decreases in work force. Three police officers, three firefighters, one clerical, one public works and one administration. Now, obviously, Mayor Doherty wants to cut far in excess of three firefighters, three police officers. Our police officers and firefighters are stressed to the max with the limited amount of manpower that they have.

On the other hand, I firmly believe you could cut a lot more than one employee in the Public Works Department. I believe that we can collect garbage in the city in four days with the amount of people we have and I definitely think cuts need to be made in public works.

Clerical employees, 5 percent reduction in their base salary.

Administration employees, 15 percent reduction in base salary on an hourly wage either on January 2011 or January 2012.

Public Works Department 15 percent reduction in base salary. Police department 15 percent reduction in base salary. Fire Department 20 percent reduction in base salary.

And, obviously, these cuts even though they are not the same percentage across the board are a little more fair than what has been pursued in the past when our public safety unions has been almost exclusively targeted by the administration.

All city employee health care monetary contributions will be based on a percentage of base salary or hourly wage and the -- again, the sale of the city's parking meters to the Scranton Parking Authority. I don't know why the mayor and PEL keep bringing up the sale of the parking meters. It's the one asset we have left in this city. It's the last thing we should be selling. Now, if they came to us and said, okay, well, here is \$100 million, it's going

to take up 50 years to recoup the money before we make a profit, then I'm sure all of us would consider it. You know, that sum of money could solve a lot of money in the city, but when we are selling them for six, seven, eight, nine, ten million dollars it's not worth it.

If I had the kind of credit where I could go to a bank and get \$15 million I would buy the parking meters. Do you see how much money they bring in? Selling the parking meters to the Parking Authority is simply a bailout for the Parking Authority. That's all it is. It's not going to address any of the city's financial problems, it's only going to put us deeper in the whole.

15.1 million in new borrowing consisting of unfunded borrowing of \$6.1 million to pay outstanding bills in 2011, and that's what I have a question with the agenda items, when the administration is requesting \$6.7 where it conflicts with what's in PEL's report. I don't know who is right, but there is about a six or eight thousand --

MS. EVANS: What we will be doing this evening, Councilman, is requesting from the administration a list of all of the 2011 expenses that will be paid by the 2011 borrowing and it must be restricted solely to those issues. Should it ever reach beyond that limit, it will require council approval. And I'm recommending tonight before we would take a final vote on this borrowing that not occur until we receive that information from the administration. They have to give us item by item what will be paid using that \$6.7 million.

MR. ROGAN: I couldn't agree more and, you know, if there is a \$600,000 difference we definitely don't want to give the mayor free reign on how to spend that money. We will have another tree house up at Nay Aug if that's the case.

70.7 cumulative increase in the tax dollars for real estate over four years. A new \$22 refuse collection fee in 2012 increasing by \$72 for January 1, 2014. I think that could be avoided by privatizing the DPW or by making drastic cutbacks in

public works. And finally, a new 15 percent parking tax in 2012. Again, I'm only reading you the bullet points. It's a pretty thick document, I didn't get a chance to read the whole thing yet. How they plan on levying that tax I'm not 100 percent sure, I'm sure once I read through the whole document I will have a little more information on that, but for the most part it seems PEL is just giving us more of the same as they have been for 20 years. Up taxes, cut public safety and the people pay.

It's easy for somebody to come from out of town or from some organization to tell us how to run the city, but they are not the ones that have to see the people of the city when they go different places and hear their stories, a senior citizen who can barely afford to pay their property tax because their husband passed away and she is on a fixed income, and a family that wants to move to Scranton and live here. People aren't going to come to Scranton when they see this.

Scranton has been getting such a bad

reputation in the media not only because of PEL, because of the mayor, because of the previous council increasing taxes and reducing services why would anyone come to a town like that? You are paying more and getting less. We definitely need to look to allocate money in new ways in this city.

And few brief notes on the budget.

As I mentioned to Mr. Joyce before the meeting, I know he requested input, but I need another day or two I'll have some recommendations for you for the budget, mainly consisting of a lot of the cuts that I would like to see made, and I definitely think that council as a whole needs to get together and discuss what our priorities are, whether it be restoring positions or reducing the tax increase, because I want to see the firefighters put back in the budget more than anyone.

My greatest fear is that council would make cuts in other areas, put the police and fire positions back in that should be in the budget, and then the mayor goes and eliminates those positions anyways.

I would hate to see that happen. The tax increase, again, that's hurting everyone, the cuts in public safety, so I definitely think all of five of us need to get together and, you know, making the cuts is the easy part, at least for me, it's figuring out where we want to put that money is where if becomes a challenge.

And finally, I would just hope that once everyone does submit their suggestions to Mr. Joyce, and I know you did a great presentation last time, I just hope we all get the final document a couple of days in advance so everyone can read it over and, you know, if we work together we can make this not hurt as much for the people in the city.

And as far as PEL goes I agree with what many of the speakers have said and what many council members have said they are useless. We should throw them out of the city. They haven't done anything for us. We are in much worse shape now than we were when they got here, and that's all I have for tonight.

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

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes, just a couple of things. I have been stopped by a few people on the street that said I appeared quite agitated last week in the meeting regarding the fire department cuts and my response to them was they haven't seen anything yet if we have a fatality in this city. I wasn't even near agitated. Trust me.

Just like I said last week, those that are responsible will be held accountable, but I would like to apologize to all the taxpayers for the condition of our city right now, and I'm not apologizing on behalf of us sitting up here, I'm apologizing for the last ten years. The reason why we are in this position, you know, and we have heard speakers at the podium, we have had other reports, and part of the big problem has been over the last ten years has been abuse of power, misconduct and also the abuse of power of the printed press. They have sort have been

an accomplice to what's going on here in the last 10 years, more specifically, the Scranton Times. They have covered every issue that has been presented to them that would be negative to this administration, so they are just as accountable as anyone for the condition of this city.

You know, we have been -- this council this year has been handed a daunting task with this budget. We have been here two years, the mayor has been here for ten, never anything put aside for contingencies. I'd like to know where all of the spending has gone because the fire and police budgets for ten years up until this ruling have been flat lined. There has about been no increase on their end.

Something is wrong here and someone called for an investigation before, I hear that from everyone, and I would certainly hope that there is an investigation going on. I mean, the Court system here is being investigated, the Court system in Luzerne County while things are going on blatantly right here in city hall on a daily basis,

and I'm not afraid to say that because everybody is aware of what's going on, and they don't seem to give a damn. I would definitely hope anyone that has any evidence, as I stated before, anybody that has done anything, used their abuse of power or favors to certain people we have had, in fact, that DPW incident I got it from a good source it wasn't one time, it was three times that truck was taken to Dunmore. But, you know, apparently, we didn't get a slap on the hand on that either.

Now I understand that the fire chief is, you know, going without permits. And again, like Mr. Dockley said before, I worked with Chief Davis on the fire department, he was a good firefighter, a very good firefighter, but, you know, to stand idly by and let your department get decimated like this I don't know. I don't know what they are thinking.

But, you know, not only have we had abuse of power and misconducts, we also have the authorities that are out of control, they become employment agencies and, you

know, and the pay scale has been pretty high at those departments, too. They have been used to bank roll this administration whenever they needed a loan for something. All this debt is not even included in the debt we are being shown in the budget, and again, without an audit we still don't know where we are at.

Two years ago, our first year as the supermajority, we tried to amend the budget, save over \$700,000. That was thrown out by Judge Mazzoni as stating that it would effect the health, safety and welfare of the people of this city. Again, I ask how would that effect the health, safety and welfare of the people of this city and not the police and fire cuts? I would certainly hope that that's looked into a little bit deeper.

We have provided revenue initiatives for the last budget year, and again, the administration ignored every revenue initiative that we put in that budget. Our budget was sabotaged from day one. We have a man sitting downstairs that's the head of

this city watching us spiral down and the only thing he can do, his only excuse is to blame the unions and to blame city council. Blame the unions, blame city council. He hasn't taken one ounce of ownership for the conditions we are in, and that's the most frustrating part.

And as Mrs. Evans said, we have been open to discuss things with the mayor, but we are not going to do it in a back room because that's not the way we operate. We operate in the light and if he wants to come here and sit down with us the door is always open. Instead of driving down to Wilkes-Barre, he just has to come up one flight of steps and we'll meet with him at any time, but it's going to be open and it's going to be in the light because we have nothing to hide. Obviously, they must. We don't have an audit yet and they will not meet with us.

Again, Mrs. Evans stated that we have a lot of reasons why we are in these problems, but you never read about it. I mean, we have the nonprofits who in the

prior plan the mayor was told to go aggressively after the nonprofits. That's not written in this new plan, and because he didn't do it Ms. Evans and myself started the ball rolling and the rest of our council people had gone to different institutions and what do we get for it? Just about nothing.

I understand one of the colleges now is going to be employing one of our other people that's leaving the Sewer Authority, so now I think every college in the city is covered with former city employees or board of director members or whatever they have, board of directors on them that have contacts, you know? I mean, is this done purposely so they are not approached?

We have to go after them more aggressively. We have to ask him to give their fair share. I don't know how they can market their schools in a city that's this distressed. They have to help. A lot of these schools have for profit businesses right in them. You have an apartment house next door to one of their dorms, you are

paying the taxes on those apartments and they are not.

Let's get with it. Fair is fair.

We are not going to sit here and read the paper and hear on the news week after week it's council's faults, it's the union's fault, and we keep saying I have heard, well, don't use the blame game. Ladies and gentlemen, all we have done was try to cut the fat, try to keep your safety. That's your first priority. You deserve it with your taxes that are you paying. Now do you think you deserve to pay a lot more taxes for less services? There is no reason we should be in this position.

Again, this didn't happen in the last two years, it happened over ten years and I don't think if we didn't take the purse strings over the last few years how much deeper we would be in right now. We don't get active responses when we ask questions. We have to request Right-to-Know and we still don't get the responses. Now, let's be open. Mr. McGoff touted we have to work together and the administration keeps

pulling this stuff.

Now, I know a lot of people don't watch this, but those who do pass it onto your friends and neighbors what the reality is here. I think we have take over city hall. That group that was here before they should occupy city hall. Maybe then somebody would wake up. I mean, it's just crazy, but we have a public hearing next week I believe it's on the budget?

MS. EVANS: Yeah, I'll announce that under motions.

MR. LOSCOMBE: But what I would like to do personally is request that the mayor, the business administrator and the fire chief, attend that public hearing and explain to us and the public how they plan on protecting their safety with the cutbacks. They were put in those positions, those positions have a lot of authority, they have to respond to the people they represent.

I mean, even like when we spoke about nonprofits, the University, they couldn't -- they gave us a measly increase.

23

24

25

At the same time there was a house right up the street from them on the court that was only purchased, it was purchased in 2006, \$27,000, not another penny put into it, you know what the university purchased it for in \$505,000. Now does that seem right? In a court yet. I wish I could get that kind of profit on my real estate, but they are willing to buy up taxable properties and they don't care what they are spending on it, that's off the tax rolls now. They gave them 500 and some thousand dollars and we can't get \$150,000. I'm sorry, \$185,000, our increase was what, \$60,000. That's just one example.

But I would certainly hope that there isn't an investigation going on in this city. If not, I will have no faith in the legal system whatsoever.

Another thing that we had requested from the beginning of last year was an RFP for our insurance coverages. Come January 1 this city is going to be totally uninsured because we issued a letter to Mrs. Novembrino last year not to pay it,

apparently it was paid for the full year, we only authorized it for six months, but as far as I know that's still stands and if it doesn't I would ask that my fellow council people amend that or agree with it that that would still stand or send a letter to Mrs. Novembrino, but we need an RFP on our insurance companies. They have had plenty of opportunity to know about it, they have had plenty of requests, and we still don't have an RFP for our insurance coverages.

And lastly, I would like to make a motion authorizing the council solicitor to take an appeal of Arbitrator McNeal's decision in a matter of grievance filed by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Local Lodge 2462, regarding the unilateral elimination of bargaining unit positions.

MS. EVANS: A motion has been made for the council solicitor TO take an appeal of Arbitrator McNeal's decision in the matter of a grievance filed by the IAM Local 2462 regarding the elimination of bargaining unit positions. Is there a second?

MR. JOYCE: Second. 1 MS. EVANS: 2 On the question? 3 MR. MCGOFF: Could someone please explain? 4 5 MR. LOSCOMBE: Well, on the question, basically an arbitrator has ruled 6 7 that the city can remove our executive 8 assistant, Ms. Carrera, from our office, and 9 our confidential secretary, Jamie, and this 10 was done unilaterally. City council was not 11 a party to this arbitration. 12 MR. MCGOFF: Who filed the 13 grievance? 14 MR. LOSCOMBE: I don't have a copy of the grievance, I just have the decision. 15 16 MR. HUGHES: The grievance was filed 17 by the union against the City of Scranton. 18 MS. EVANS: And I think, as 19 Mr. Loscombe was saying, Scranton City 20 Council was not a party to the proceeding, 21 which is wrong, and if anyone were to check 22 in the Home Rule Charter as well as the 23 Administrative Code, council is given the 24 Authority to hire and fire it's employees. 25 Further, there is also a Court case,

4

5

3

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this situation went to Court years ago Judge Harhut ruled on just this type of situation in favor of city council and it's ability to hire and fire, and so I am asking or I had asked our council solicitor to pursue legal action against the union so that city council can remain and retain it's rights.

MR. ROGAN: I would just say this, I agree with the motion. I don't like voting for things that I see for the first time the day we are voting on it, but I do agree that council staff should be at will positions by council. We were lucky enough to have Ms. Carrera and Ms. Marciano come in and they do a great job and, you know, they came in as union positions, they were retained by council, I think there is not one of up here that can say that our whole staff they do a great job. And, you know, I think the union is just trying to handle power, but I know the Times try to paint council as pro-unions, but it's not always the case. It's just what right is right and this time the union is wrong.

MS. EVANS: And I should probably

23

24

25

1

add this, Councilman Rogan, city council was never informed about this arbitration. were never asked to be present at the hearing, I believe the only individual who represented the city at this hearing would have been Business Administrator Ryan McGowan, who certainly does not speak for Scranton City Council. I am appalled by the fact that all of this could transpire without our knowledge, without having been informed by the IAM Local 2462 until after the decision arrived, and because the clock is ticking on this issue I had asked our attorney to look into it and to respond accordingly.

MR. MCGOFF: So just so -- these are the two positions that were removed from the bargaining unit --

MS. EVANS: Um-hum.

MR. MCGOFF: -- two years ago?

MS. EVANS: A year ago.

MR. MCGOFF: A year ago. When was the grievance filed?

MS. EVANS: I don't even know. I have never even received.

MR. HUGHES: That's the question. 1 No one knows when it was filed, no one knows 2 3 who was served. It was never submitted to council. Council did not have any knowledge 4 of it until after the arbitrator's decision. 5 Not only that, but the solicitor's office 6 did not defend it, the president of the IAM 7 8 works for Mr. McGowan's office, Mr. McGowan 9 is not an attorney and he appeared solely at 10 the arbitration proceeding, and as a result 11 nobody knows what happened. The appeal will 12 be filed tomorrow by noon. 13 MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else. 14 MR. HUGHES: If I'm authorized. MR. DOCKLEY: Is it possible I have 15 16 a little --17 MS. EVANS: I'm sorry, no, we can't. 18 MR. DOCKLEY: Next week? MS. EVANS: Next week. Is there 19 20 anyone else on the question? All those in 21 favor signify by saying aye. 22 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 23 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 24 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 25 MR. JOYCE: Aye.

MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and so moved. 2 3 MR. LOSCOMBE: And that's all I have 4 this evening. 5 MS. EVANS: Thank you, Councilman Loscombe. So, Solicitor Hughes, you are 6 7 indeed authorized to file that petition 8 first thing tomorrow morning in Lackawanna 9 County Court. 10 MR. HUGHES: It will be filed by 11 noon, not first thing in the morning. 12 MS. EVANS: Very good. As long as it is done tomorrow. 13 14 MR. HUGHES: If I don't sleep 15 tonight maybe I could do it first thing in 16 the morning. 17 MS. EVANS: Councilman Joyce, do you 18 have any comments or motions tonight? MR. JOYCE: Yes, I do. 19 In the 2012 20 operating budget there has been a great deal 21 of focus placed on raises and police and 22 fire unions as being the rationale for the 23 layoffs and tax increases. While members of 24 the police and fire unions are receiving 25 raises as mandated by the Supreme Court,

1

other unions are also receiving raises, not just the police and fire, such as the Department of Public Works. While there are raises for very various union members, there are also additional costs that the city is obligated to pay. A great deal of these costs stem from the Scranton Parking Authority and the Redevelopment Authority.

Now, just to provide everyone with a quick background on the authorities, municipal authorities are separate government entities whose board members are appointed by the mayor. Authorities generally only handle a specific function. For instance, the Scranton Sewer Authority handles sewer operations. Though the authorities do not have the power to tax residents per se, they do have the power to increase rates as they see appropriate.

Though municipal authorities operate independently of the municipality, the city is obligated to guarantee their debt obligations.

In regard to the Redevelopment

Authority, before this council was even in

place he city sold delinquent taxes to the SRA, which is the Scranton Redevelopment Authority who in turn took out a loan on these delinquent taxes. Unfortunately, the loan was essentially taken out assuming that the delinquent taxes sold would be realized at over a 90 percent collection rate.

As you may or may not know, this was not the case and the Redevelopment Authority defaulted on the loan that was taken out.

The amount of money that the city owes on this loan is \$1.6 million, which is an additional expenditure in the 2012 budget since the city is obligated to pay for it the authority's poor judgment.

In addition to this, after receipt of the Scranton Parking Authority's budget, it's also evident that they will have a deficit that will hold us back. City council received a budget from the Scranton Parking Authority that projects a realized \$3.1 million in revenue from parking garage and other operations. Unfortunately, for debt service payments on loans that they took out to fund the construction of the

parking garages as well as other structures in the past is nearly \$3.7 million for 2012.

With this being said, the Parking

Authority is projected to be \$600,000 in the whole before even paying it's employees.

When adding the cost of the employee expenditures associated with operating the Parking Authority, the estimate is about a million dollars as indicated by the SPA's budget.

With this being said, the Parking Authority is projected to have a \$1.6 million deficit in 2012 that the city will also be obligated to pay.

When one adds the cost of the default of the loan from the SRA with the projected deficit of the Parking Authority, the total amount that the city will be obligated to pay is \$3.2 million. The \$3.2 million amount is roughly equivalent to the amount of Mayor Doherty's projected tax increase.

With this in mind, it's evident that the board members that Mayor Doherty put in place in the Parking Authority and the SRA

have not made fiscally sound decisions. To compensate for his appointments, which lead to the city having shouldered \$3.2 million in additional costs in 2012, he wishes to shoulder the burden on the taxpayers by increasing real estate taxes as well as other taxes and permit fees.

Regarding other budgetary matter, I have reached out to business administrator McGowan as well as the mayor and other department heads regarding the various departmental expenditures. I have received responses to many of my questions and there are also questions where I requested some supporting documents to backup expenditure projections mostly for big bucket items. On all e-mails that I sent all council members are copied.

With this in mind, I encourage my colleagues to ask further questions about expenditures if they have any. Before any council member make a suggestion to cut any expenditure, I think it's important that they know what exactly they are cutting.

Last week I asked council members to

provide suggestions that they had in regard to the budget, I realize that there is some questions that I had followed up on and in particular in regard to health insurance, I am asking all council members to provide me with their suggestions next week.

And to conclude tonight, council is still in the process of reviewing the budget line item by line item, questioning expenditures when appropriate, and working to soften the blow that the Doherty tax increase will impose on taxpayers.

For the sake of the brevity, I have a couple of citizens' requests that I am not going to read aloud tonight, however, please be assured if you e-mailed me or sent me a request about an issue in your neighborhood or any other matter that I would be handling that with the appropriate party, and that's all.

MS. EVANS: Thank you, Councilman

Joyce. Good evening. I apologize for my

late arrival to tonight's meeting. I was

attending the public hearing regarding the

closing of the Stafford Avenue Mail

Processing and Distribution Center. It is our hope that Scranton would not lose yet another business and source of tax revenue, employees would not lose their jobs and Scrantonians would not incur decreased and delayed services from the US Postal Service.

As all are aware, the mayor's proposed budget includes a 29 percent tax increase, the elimination of 29 fire department positions, and the lease of the parking meters to the Scranton Parking Authority for 15 years for an upfront payment to cover the 2011 Doherty deficit, among numerous other items.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me assure you that city council is working hard to reduce the mayor's 29 percent tax increase. His significant increase was revealed almost immediately after a 38 percent increase was unveiled by the county and it could be followed by Scranton School District tax hike.

I do understand the financial hardships inflicted on Scranton taxpayers.

Unlike other county residents, Scrantonians

have received a one-two punch and a knockout could soon arrive from the school district. I know that more than half of you cannot survive these tax increases because your incomes simply did not provide enough dollars. Therefore, city council will make every effort to lessen the blow and decrease a burdensome 29 percent city property tax.

Unfortunately, although, it has received numerous requests from residents to save jobs, city council's hands are tied concerning the elimination of the 29 fire department positions because the Court ruled in 2011 that the mayor has the right to cut them. Even if city council were able to restore some of the positions in the budget, there is nothing to prevent the mayor from cutting them once again in January. This decision lies with the mayor.

If you are opposed to losing 29 firefighters, 70 percent of your fire protection, and more than half of your neighborhood fire stations, you need to call the mayor, visit his office, send an e-mail or a write him a letter. Also, if you are

opposed to the mayor's 29 percent tax hike, you should voice your opposition in these same ways.

In addition, Scranton City Council will not approve the sale of parking meters nor will it approve the lease of parking meters to the Scranton Parking Authority for 15 years. City council presented a plan to the lenders and the public to borrow \$6 million and use annual parking meter and ticket revenue to repay that borrowing.

Since the city administration did not complete and submit the 2010 audit and various other significant financials requested by the banking community, the administration has been unable to attract bids for 2012 tax anticipation notes and to arrange borrowing to fill the 2011 deficit.

As a result, I discussed unfunded debt borrowing with Solicitor Hughes recently, and he drafted an ordinance for placement on tonight's agenda for introduction. At this time I will defer to Solicitor Hughes for his comments.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Madam

President. I received a fax -- my office received a fax last week when I was on vacation regarding a proposed ordinance to borrow unfunded debt in the amount of \$6.7 million. When I got back into my office on the 11th I saw it, I reviewed it, I discussed it with you. And, first of all, the manner in which was done was done by a resolution. In accordance with Article 302-7 of the Home Rule Charter it must be by ordinance, so the legislation as submitted was not properly drafted.

We reviewed it and I redrafted it as an ordinance and I put in a new section two because there is nothing in the cover letter that came up from Ryan McGowan, actually it went to President Evans with a copy to me, there was nothing in there as to how the funds were be distributed and how they were going to be used. We stated a long time ago that the \$6.7 million dollars comes from two areas, one is the fact that the city right now cannot pay Fidelity the \$5 tax anticipation note that's due the end of the year because the \$5 million was really a

deficit last year which was camouflaged by not paying that at the end of the year when it was due and taking \$5 million of this year's tax anticipation note and in early January paying back Fidelity with the funds -- with the TAN funds for last year's TAN. That automatically put the city in a \$5 million whole this year.

In order to use this year's tax anticipation notes to pay off last year's tax anticipation note, it's a violation of the Unit Debt Act, it was a violation of the ordinance passed by council, it was an unauthorized act, it was totally unwarranted and it was used to cover up last year's \$5 million deficit which put us the city in a \$5 million deficit this year.

What I would propose is that this year with any -- assuming the city gets the TAN, that the legislation be forwarded to Mrs. Novembrino so that she will know that any tax anticipation note for this year that is not paid cannot be used to be paid with next year's funds with the 2012 budget.

The next area that the \$6.1 million

23

24

25

comes from is the fact that council for the first time in I believe it was June I was notified by Attorney Mike Winfield of Signon and Rhoades in Harrisburg about the fact that the city was in default -- or actually, the Redevelopment Authority was in default of a loan on the sale -- on what was termed the sale and was structured to look like a sale of the 2004, five and six delinquent real estate taxes by the city to the Redevelopment Authority using those delinquent real estate taxes which had gone to approximately \$2.1 million, using them to borrow from Pennstar Bank. Pennstar Bank used -- lent the Redevelopment Authority 90 percent of the delinquent real estate taxes for the years 2004, five and six, which is an absurdly high amount to loan on delinquent real estate taxes, but to complicate matters they ended up also increasing the loan. There were about \$186,000 of fees involved with the Redevelopment Authority to various agencies in underwriting that loan, which amounted to about 98 percent financings.

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This was a default from the day that the documents were signed. There was no way it could be paid. It was due to be paid his year by December 15. It was not put in last year's budget and as a result the money is not available. Litigation has been instituted by Pennstar Bank against the city and there is no way to pay that. There is an amount outstanding of about \$1.6 million.

It would appear that the \$6.7 million loan which the city would -- the council would authorize the borrowing by this ordinance, would be used to pay those However, there is nothing in the two items. use of the funds in any of the cover letters sent by Mr. McGowan or in the legislation. As a result, I drafted a new paragraph two in the -- that's been placed into the ordinance and it states that the funds, which is the \$6.7 million, shall only be used by the city to pay for 2011 operating expenses and payments required to be made on the city's outstanding indebtedness as set forth in the city's 2011 budget, and the funds cannot be used for any other purpose

without additional legislation approved by council.

In addition to that, in order to try to get this thing a little bit tighter, I wrote to Attorney Kelly on November 21, I submitted to him the ordinance, I told him that I welcome his comments, that we would place this on the agenda tonight and that it would have it's first reading, that it is possible that council could suspend the rules next week in order to adopt it in two sessions, however, I stated that, "As you are undoubtedly aware, the 2000 --"

No, I said that, "I must request in order for council to suspend the rules to have the ordinance adopted at it's November 29, 2011, meeting that Ryan McGowan, the business administrator, submit a detailed list of the names and amounts of how the funds of \$6.7 million would be dispersed to pay for current operating expenses and outstanding indebtedness."

In the event that's not received next week, it would be my recommendation that council does not suspend the rules. It

2

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

should be received the week after so that before council adopts the legislation that you know exactly what the use of the funds are going to be. In the event they are used to pay the Fidelity loans then at least the money that would be available would then be used to pay unpaid bills for this year.

I also stated, "As you are undoubtedly aware, the 2010 audit for the City of Scranton, which was to be completed prior to May 31, 2011, and to be published in a local newspaper by May 31 of each year pursuant Section 313 of the Home Rule Charter, Robert Rossi & Company has been able to complete the 2010 audit which is now six months past due even though he has made repetitive requests for the over the last 10 months to various department heads for required information necessary to complete the audit. I do not see how the Court of Common Pleas can approve the petition for permission to fund unfunded debt without an audit being completed. Even if the petition is approved, I do not see how any lending institution would lend the city up to \$6.7

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

million to fund unfunded debt without the 2010 audit being completed."

As a result, with this and knowing that at least to get it on the agenda it would be my recommendation that the ordinance, I think it's "G" tonight, 5-G, that that would be passed and have it's first reading tonight, and that hopefully by next week Mr. McGowan will submit how these funds are exacted to be used and what bills are be to paid, and in the event it's not received by next week it would be my recommendation that the rules not be suspended and that hopefully two weeks tonight that the use of the funds will be submitted to council so that we will have an idea as to exactly how this money, if the Court approves the borrowing, and then secondly, if they can even borrow from a lending institution without the audit or hopefully the audit will be completed by then, that how those funds will be spent so it's just not a cart blanch check for \$6.7 million.

MS. EVANS: And thank you very much,

Solicitor Hughes. First, I wanted to make clear one thing though, when the legislation was faxed to Attorney Hughes' office during that period of time in which he was on vacation, I understand because to this moment I have never seen this legislation, that the cover letter was addressed to me. Well, that letter and the legislation was never sent to me nor was it ever sent to the Office of Scranton City Council. It was for whatever reason faxed to Attorney Hughes and that was unbeknownst to myself or to any member of the city council.

In summary, council's solicitor corrected the legislation sent to him by the administration and inserted language so that the proceeds of the borrowing shall only be used to pay for the 2011 TAN series and other 2011 expenses. It will not, and I repeat, it will not be used for the lease of parking meters.

Further, Scranton City Council requests a written list of any and all 2011 expenses to be paid with the proceeds of the \$6.7 million borrowing for unfunded debt on

or before November 28, 2011, in order to proceed with the final vote on the legislation on November 29, 2011.

Mrs. Krake, please hand deliver this request to the mayor and the BA tomorrow morning.

Also, Mr. Scopelliti, executive director of the Scranton Parking Authority failed to respond to a request for financial information on or before November 15, 2011, and submitted to him on October 27, 2011, by Council Solicitor Boyd Hughes. Because Mr. Scopelliti never responded and refused to provide financial documents, city council will be forced to make decisions regarding the SPA budget regardless.

Further, city council never received a responses from business administrator Ryan McGowan and Mr. Scopelliti regarding the monies paid by the CMC Hospital for bagged parking meters and parking permits is that owed to the City of Scranton, but may have been paid instead to the Scranton Parking Authority.

The SPA's total lack of transparency

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 apparent confiscation of monies due to the City of Scranton are yet further justification for the city to retain it's own meters and revenue and to proceed with an appraisal and request for proposal for the sale or lease of parking garages.

Also, in early 2011 Mayor Doherty stated for the record more than once in the Scranton Times that he would place the city's insurances for a broker of record out for bid at the end of the 2011. And, Councilman Loscombe, I think our minds are certainly thinking alike lately. The clock is winding down and the mayor has not addressed this important issue and has sent no legislation to council. This issue must be taken care of immediately. Council will not entertain legislation for the status quo again in 2012 particularly since some city insurance coverages are incorrect. mayor must keep his word or the city will be without insurance in 2012.

Next, according to documents provided by HUD, Scranton spending of federal money that is deemed ineligible

requires repayment by the city. The annual city CDBG allotment is not reduced in order to make repayment.

Therefore, Mrs. Krake, city council wishes to send a letter to Mayor Doherty and Business Administrator McGowan asking if the mayor's proposed to 2012 budget contains funding for repayment of ineligible use of HUD monies in the Office of Economic and Community Development. If so, provide the account number, line item and page number of the 2012 proposed budget for this appropriation. If no funding has been appropriated, please send a revised budget to city council which includes these necessary changes.

Much work is ongoing and will continue until the 2012 operating budget of the City of Scranton is legally and lawfully adopted by council. Mayor Doherty has chosen to address the Supreme Court decision through additional borrowing in 2012 and has not included this matter in his budget.

Mayor Doherty has cut 29 firefighters and closed neighborhood fire stations. Mayor

Doherty wants a 29 percent property tax increase, among other tax increases.

As a part-time legislative body, city council is making every effort within it's scope of authority to help you, the taxpayers. A public hearing regarding the mayor's proposed budget will be conducted next Tuesday, November 29, 2011, at 5:30 p.m., in city council chambers.

In addition, a public hearing on the \$6.7 million in 2011 borrowing will be scheduled in the near future. Please check the newspaper's legal advertisement for the starting time and date.

Scranton City Council will hear from people of the Scranton and thereafter make it's final amendments to the mayor's budget.

Now, I'd like to just weigh in since I understand even throughout my absence this evening that the Recovery Plan or the revised Recovery Plan has been a topic of discussion as tonight's meeting, and I do have a few comments regarding the Recovery Plan. The arrival of the plan came as a surprise shortly after the announcements of

the Supreme Court decision regarding Act 111 and Act 47. Mr. Cross of the Pennsylvania Economy league went on record in the Scranton Times stating that because of this Supreme Court decision PEL would not complete and submit it's plan until sometime in 2012. Arriving on heals of the mayor's 2012 budget, places this plan in an increasingly questionable light particularly since it's proposed 42 percent tax hike seems to make the mayor's 29 percent appear more reasonable than it is.

I received the 110 page plan just as I walked in this evening and I will need significant time to read and carefully exam all 110 pages of it's provisions before I can reach any conclusions.

City council is engaged obviously in more pressing and critical matters such as the 2012 operating budget and 2011 borrowing at this time and will not deliberate on the Recovery Plan until sometime in the new year. We will address one issue one crises at a time.

Now, PEL has amassed a nearly

20-year record of the failed leadership.

Together with DCED, it has lead Scranton down a path to the deepest level of distress and destruction in it's history. Some of it's recommendations throughout the years have been faulty and it has allowed the mayor to violate the plan in numerous instances.

Further, this plan is not legally adopted. As a result, it's merely supplementary material at this point in time. PEL will have to revisit it's newly presented revisions in 2012 following the adoption of the 2012 budget and the financial resolution to the Supreme Court awards to police and fire and only then will council consider PEL's Recovery Plan.

Most of all, I am amazed by the arrogance of PEL and DCED. As I said earlier, they lead Scranton down the path to financial destruction in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania and what is their solution now? They're handing the taxpayers of Scranton a bag of bills they actively helped to create to the tune of a 42 percent tax

hike today and overall a 70 percent tax increase. This is unacceptable, and just as PEL and DCED say they won't share these costs, as president of Scranton City Council I am saying that the people of Scranton will not share in these devastating taxes increases.

I will never give my approval to this plan as it stands. My advice to PEL is to go back to the drawing board and create a plan that truly addresses the needs of our city, not a piecemeal plan that has been thrown together very rapidly using portions of other distressed city's plans. I see much of Harrisburg as I peruse this tonight. Some of the I think numbers included in there with regard to perhaps it was to even our fire department are not correct for our fire department, they apply to the Harrisburg fire department.

Now, each city is unique and one size doesn't fit all. Get to work and use independent CPA's to develop the financials instead of accepting the convoluted numbers submitted by this administration.

Finally, I would like to wish everyone a very blessed and happy
Thanksgiving, and that's it.

MR. HUGHES: Madam President, if I could just on the Scranton Parking Authority?

MS. EVANS: Yes, please.

MR. HUGHES: I wrote a letter to
Mr. Scopelliti on October 27, it was
probably about three pages long requesting
detailed information regarding the bond
issues, the reason I wrote that was in
anticipation of the budget coming up, but
also we received documentation that they
were demanding it was going to \$1.6 million
shortfall and that would be put in the
budget this year, I mean, for the city's
budget next year.

Prior to that I had done, it took me a long time to trace down the trustee which was Bank of the New York Mellon, the Philadelphia office, finally went through various people, I did talk to, I forget the lady's name right now who is in charge of the Scranton -- the Scranton Parking

Authority. I told her what I requested, she told me to put it in writing. I put it in writing and the documentation I wanted was all the trust agreements that were used to float the public bond issues of the Scranton Parking Authority, I requested every one of them. A few days after that I got a reply from her stating that they would not submit them to me even though I stated that they were public documents.

After I received that letter I wrote to Mr. Scopelliti and I submitted to council, I believe it was with your correspondence, a copy of that letter. In my October 27 letter to Mr. Scopelliti I demanded that he submit a budget to council on a line item by line item basis, for his request for 2012 in comparison to 2010 and to this day almost four weeks later Mr. Scopelliti has not replied to my letter and there is information in there which is necessary for council to receive to make informed decisions about funding the Parking Authority or to provide any funding in issue to the Parking Authority.

And secondly, is that the budget that was submitted three weeks after my letter, you know, this diatribe I would call it, is woefully inadequate to provide information to council as to the operations of the Scranton Parking Authority. As you are aware, I discovered that in the prospectuses to float the bond issues over the last several years, I'd say the last ten years, there is a requirement in there that the Parking Authority must submit to council it's budget for council's approval. year was probably the first time ever that the Parking Authority after the demand of council did submit a budget to council for it's review.

I think this is woefully inadequate. I wouldn't even consider it a -- it's not anywhere near the responses to what was requested in my October 27 letter and I certainly had almost three weeks to put something together that would have complied with that, give council information regarding the true finances and the financial status of the Scranton Parking

Authority instead of just what we lawyers call a balled conclusion. You go from A to Z without any supporting documentation to say, hey, we are going to have a deficit of \$1.6 million. Yeah, I believe in the Easter bunny, too.

MR. LOSCOMBE: If I may add, they didn't abide by the budget either.

MS. EVANS: No.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Position-wise last year just like the administration. It seems they all work together.

MS. EVANS: Well, clearly because all of the boards are appointed by the mayor.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Is it possible to have a board appear at a caucus here?

MS. EVANS: We have requested in the past for that the representatives of the SRA, that Mr. Scopelliti of the Scranton Parking Authority would come before council for a public caucus, they have refused to do so time and time again, and this again points back to my remarks earlier about the blatant lack of transparency at the Scranton

5

6 7

8

10

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Parking Authority.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I was just wondering if we could get the board members themselves here and find out, you know, how they are letting things go the way they are.

MS. EVANS: Well, you can certainly ask.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I mean, that \$1.5 million if it's explained the way Mr. -- or Attorney Hughes explained it, I would think they should be liable to some point under their directors and officer's policies. mean, if it was as blatant at that and something that we can look into. But I would like them to, you know, explain why the Parking Authority is missing their budget every year.

MS. EVANS: And perhaps at this time we would be able to find out where the CMC parking meter revenue is.

MR. HUGHES: I don't want to take up anymore time, but I had a trial in Wilkes-Barre this week, I parked in the Wilkes-Barre parking garage, I came out and the lady, I give her my ticket and she

looked at me and she said, "Three dollars," and I said, "Three dollars?"

And she looked at me and she says, "Yeah."

I said, "Well, how much is it to park here?"

She says, "A dollar an hour."

I said, "It's \$3 for the first hour in the Scranton Parking Authority Garage."

I said I believe that the city should hire the Wilkes-Barre parking Authority to come up and manage the Scranton Parking Authority, but that's the rate in Wilkes-Barre, it's a dollar an hour, I think here in Scranton it's \$2.65 for the first hour, it's \$3.50 and it keeps going up, but the rates in Scranton are significantly higher than the rates in Wilkes-Barre. I think council should know that and so should the public.

MS. EVANS: And it's never enough to balance the budget annually at the Parking Authority who has had to borrow every year since they received that \$35 million bond issue.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Not just to belabor it, but I understand they are doing extremely well down there with the StreetSmart parking system and the meters. Another missed opportunity for Scranton.

MS. EVANS: Mrs. Krake.

MS. KRAKE: 5-B. APPROPRIATING FUNDS

FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE CITY GOVERNMENT FOR

THE PERIOD COMMENCING ON THE FIRST DAY OF

JANUARY, 2012 TO AND INCLUDING DECEMBER 31,

2012 BY THE ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL CITY

OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2012.MS.

EVANS: At this time I'll entertain a motion

that Item 5-B be introduced into it's proper

committee.

MR. MCGOFF: So moved.

MR. JOYCE: Second.

MS. EVANS: On the question? I think it's very clear that council must vote "yes" to the introduction of this document in order that council will then have the ability to amend it. You can be assured that the document will not stand in it's current state.

MR. ROGAN: I would just add,

although we all know council will be amending it, I will be voting "no" just as a matter of conscience on this vote.

MS. EVANS: Well, I thank you for that, I wish we could all do the same.

MR. ROGAN: I agree.

MS. EVANS: And I feel very strongly that I should be able to say "no", Mr. Loscombe, Mr. Joyce, Mr. McGoff if he would like to, but in so doing we then stop the budget process.

MR. ROGAN: And council could chose their own budget at that point.

MS. EVANS: Basically, according to the Home Rule Charter, the mayor must present his budget, it has to be put before council for it's approval, council has the right to amend that budget. That budget, including the council amendments is then passed and the mayor has ten days in which to veto. Should he veto, then council has the opportunity to override the veto.

MR. ROGAN: I understand it's just a procedural vote basically.

MS. EVANS: Right. Right. It's a

procedural vote. It is ugly, but necessary. 1 2 All those in favor signify by saying aye. 3 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 4 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. MR. JOYCE: Aye. 5 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? 6 MR. ROGAN: 7 No. 8 MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so 9 moved. MS. KRAKE: 5-C. ESTABLISHING A "NO 10 PARKING" ZONE ALONG THE WESTERLY SIDE OF THE 11 1300 BLOCK OF NORTH WASHINGTON AVENUE FROM 12 THE VEHICLE ENTRANCE OF THE LACKAWANNA 13 14 COUNTY PRISON TO THE VEHICLE EXIT FROM THE LACKAWANNA COUNTY PRISON TO ALLOW FOR SIGHT 15 DISTANCE FOR VEHICULAR TRAFFIC ENTERING ONTO 16 17 THE 1300 BLOCK OF NORTH WASHINGTON AVENUE 18 FROM THE LACKAWANNA COUNTY PRISON. MS. EVANS: At this time I'll 19 entertain a motion that Item 5-C be 20 21 introduced into it's proper committee. 22 MR. MCGOFF: So moved. 23 MR. JOYCE: Second. 24 MS. EVANS: On the question? 25 MR. ROGAN: Yes, on the question. Ι

don't know if people out there recall or my colleagues recall about a year ago I was contacted by residents of Cottage Avenue and council sent multiple requests to the administration asking for a "No Parking" on one side of that road because the residents on that road were fearful that in the event of a fire a fire truck wouldn't be able to move down that road. We received no response from the administration.

I believe, again, as a matter of principal why would the administration choose to do the "No Parking" on one side of the road for the prison, but not for the residents of Cottage Avenue? There were multiple letters sent, I talked to members of the fire department, it would be challenging to get a truck down that road and, you know, I explained that at the time and it was a very simple solution to make it no parking on one side because the people on that side of the road all had driveways. The people on the other side of the road no one had a driveway. People without driveways would be able to park on the

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

street. People in the driveways would park in their driveway. Again, the mayor completely ignored council's request, so I'm going to ignore the mayor's request and vote "no".

MS. EVANS: What I would like to add to that just quickly is that quite a number of years ago I had made many requests regarding two spaces at the corner of North Washington Avenue and New York Street because as one is traveling up New York street to North Washington Avenue if you -whether you are going to turn left, right or proceed straight, the line of vision there is almost nonexistent because cars are parked right to the corner on both sides, so you are literally taking your life in your own hands trying to pull out on New York Street either across from North Washington to turn either way. To this day, that request remains unanswered. And, as I said, that was for merely two parking spaces.

Now I'm seeing that because I did pass the county prison, even though this legislation comes to us tonight, those "No

Parking" signs are already up. 1 Yes. MR. ROGAN: 2 3 MS. EVANS: They have been up for quiet a while. 4 5 MR. ROGAN: That's what it says in the chief's letter. 6 7 MS. EVANS: And they extend, I'm not 8 sure if it's the entire block or from the 9 drive-in for visitor parking, all the way 10 down to nearly the end of the block, but this -- I mean, Mrs. Krake, did we receive 11 any requests or petitions from any city 12 13 residents requesting --14 MS. KRAKE: No. MS. EVANS: -- this legislation? 15 16 MR. LOSCOMBE: Mrs. Evans, I think I 17 can clear this up a little bit more. 18 Earlier I spoke about abuse of power, I'm 19 going to go out and a limb here and I 20 received it from a very reliable source that 21 the mayor was over at the prison visiting 22 one of his friends who was a correction's officer over there and he almost had an 23 24 accident pulling out of the driveway, so 25 therefore, the signs were put up the next

day, and it just goes to show you what's going on here. You now, those parking spots are for the prison guards and for the visitors there. The other side of the street is all permit parking, so they have no place to park. I could see them taking one car, like, for clearance, but leave the rest for parking. I mean, if that's the case then every street should have half a block of no parking, but this is just another example of I am who I am. And that's all I have to say.

MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else on the question? All those in favor of introduction signify by saying aye.

MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

MR. JOYCE: Aye.

MS. EVANS: Opposed? No.

MR. ROGAN: No.

MR. LOSCOMBE: No.

MS. EVANS: The nos have it and the legislation dies. And, Mrs. Krake, I would advise you to please send a letter to the DPW notifying them that the legislation was not passed and that the signs must be

1 removed. 2 MR. ROGAN: And also any residents 3 who are watching the meeting if they were 4 cited at those spots to challenge them 5 because they are not lawfully put up. MS. EVANS: Correct. Thank you. 6 MS. KRAKE: 5-D. SALE OF TAX 7 8 DELINQUENT PROPERTY MORE COMMONLY KNOWN 9 AS NORTH CAMERON AVENUE, TAX MAP NO. 14408-060-040, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, TO 10 11 ROBERT J. GAHWILER AND ELOISE A. GAHWILER, 12 HIS WIFE, 526 NORTH CAMERON AVENUE, 13 SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, 18504, FOR THE 14 CONSIDERATION OF \$5,000.00. MS. EVANS: At this time I'll 15 16 entertain a motion that Item 5-D be introduced into it's proper committee. 17 18 MR. ROGAN: So moved. MR. JOYCE: 19 Second. 20 A11 MS. EVANS: On the question? 21 those in favor of introduction signify by 22 saying aye. 23 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 24 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 25 Aye. MR. LOSCOMBE:

	132
1	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
2	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
3	have it and so moved.
4	MS. KRAKE: 5-E. ACCEPTING A ONE
5	HUNDRED FIFTY (\$150.00) DOLLAR CONTRIBUTION
6	FROM THE NEPA MINERS FOOTBALL ORGANIZATION
7	PRESENTED TO THE CITY OF SCRANTON FIRE
8	DEPARTMENT.
9	MS. EVANS: At this time I'll
10	entertain a motion that Item 5-E be
11	introduced into it's proper committee.
12	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
13	MR. JOYCE: Second.
14	MS. EVANS: On the question? All
15	those in favor of introduction signify by
16	saying aye.
17	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
18	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
19	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
20	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
21	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
22	have it and so moved.
23	MS. KRAKE: 5-F. APPOINTMENT OF GINA
24	E. MCANDREW, ESQUIRE, 1144 AMHERST STREET,
25	SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, 18504 AS HUMAN

	133
1	RESOURCE DIRECTOR EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 1,
2	2011. MRS. MCANDREW WILL BE REPLACING LISA
3	MORAN, WHO RESIGNED.
4	MS. EVANS: At this time I'll
5	entertain a motion that Item 5-F be
6	introduced into it's proper committee.
7	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
8	MR. JOYCE: Second.
9	MS. EVANS: On the question?
10	MR. ROGAN: Yes, as with all
11	appointments did anyone receive a resume?
12	MS. EVANS: No.
13	MR. ROGAN: So if we don't receive
14	one by next week everyone knows the
15	protocol.
16	MS. EVANS: Thank you. All those in
17	favor of introduction 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: And, Mrs. Krake, if you
25	would just send a reminder to Ms. McAndrew

1 that a resume is required by council for it's approval for appointments. 2 3 MS. KRAKE: 5-G. PROVIDING FOR THE 4 PROPER OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO PETITION THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF 5 LACKAWANNA COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, FOR 6 PERMISSION TO FUND UNFUNDED DEBT IN AN 7 8 AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED SIX MILLION SEVEN 9 HUNDRED THOUSAND (\$6,700,000.00) DOLLARS; AUTHORIZING INCIDENTAL ACTION; AND REPEALING 10 11 INCONSISTENT RESOLUTIONS. 12 MS. EVANS: At this time I'll 13 entertain a motion that Item 5-G be 14 introduced into it's proper committee. MR. ROGAN: So moved. 15 MR. JOYCE: 16 Second. 17 MS. EVANS: On the question? 18 MR. MCGOFF: Yes. Once again I 19 would like to apologize for not seeing that 20 on there trying to making a fool of myself. 21 MS. EVANS: All is forgiven. I 22 think it's important that this moves along 23 and this is certainly contingent on the 24 administration's cooperation in this matter. 25 MR. ROGAN: Absolutely.

approval, for our approval to be given to this we must receive the requested information from the business administrator. As our very learned solicitor stated, if we should receive it prior to next week's meeting we can suspend the rules and move it into Seventh Order. Should we not, it will continue into the following meeting, and beyond that, however, if there is no

response given to this council then council

MS. EVANS: In order for it's

MR. MCGOFF: I agree.

will not vote to approve the borrowing.

MR. HUGHES: Madam president, I know I shouldn't comment, but my letter was solely to Attorney Kelly, he had the letter to Ryan McGowan wrote to you was to the received in council chambers, had about four or five, I think 6 cc's on it, I would suggest that my letter to Attorney Kelly that it be hand delivered to Mr. McGowan tomorrow.

MS. EVANS: Yes, that's an excellent idea.

MR. HUGHES: So that he will have

	100
1	it. I did not send it to him, I thought
2	that would be Attorney Kelly's function to
3	send it to Ryan.
4	MS. EVANS: Absolutely. Absolutely
5	and perhaps I think with a copy to the
6	mayor.
7	MR. HUGHES: Yes, he was copied by
8	Ryan McGowan, also, and PEL was, I think
9	there was six or seven people copied, but
10	anyway.
11	MS. EVANS: Thank you.
12	MR. MCGOFF: Five.
13	MS. EVANS: Anyone else on the
14	question? All those in favor of
15	introduction signify by saying aye.
16	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
17	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
18	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
19	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
20	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
21	have it and so moved.
22	MS. KRAKE: SIXTH ORDER. NO
23	BUSINESS AT THIS TIME.
24	SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. FOR
25	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
	II

	13/
1	FOR ADOPTION-RESOLUTION NO. 52, 2011-
2	ACCEPTING A ONE THOUSAND (\$1,000.00) DOLLAR
3	CONTRIBUTION FROM SANOFI PASTEUR PRESENTED
4	TO THE CITY OF SCRANTON FIRE DEPARTMENT.
5	MS. EVANS: What is the
6	recommendation of the Chair for the
7	Committee on Finance?
8	MR. JOYCE: As Chairperson for the
9	Committee on Finance, I recommend final
10	passage of Item 7-A.
11	MR. ROGAN: Second.
12	MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
13	call, please?
14	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
15	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
16	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
17	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
18	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe.
19	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
20	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Joyce.
21	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
22	MS. CARRERA: Mrs. Evans.
23	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare
24	Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted.
25	If there is no further business,
	ll

_		
		138
1	I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.	
2	MR. JOYCE: Motion to adjourn.	
3	MS. EVANS: This meeting is	
4	adjourned.	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

ability.

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER