	1
SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING	
HELD:	
Tuesday, December 6, 2011	
LOCATION:	
Council Chambers	
Scranton City Hall	
340 North Washington Avenue	
Scranton, Pennsylvania	
CATHENE S. NARDOZZI. RPR – OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER	
,	
	HELD: Tuesday, December 6, 2011 LOCATION: Council Chambers Scranton City Hall 340 North Washington Avenue

2 ||

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL:

JANET EVANS, PRESIDENT

PAT ROGAN, VICE-PRESIDENT

ROBERT MCGOFF

FRANK JOYCE

JOHN LOSCOMBE

NANCY KRAKE, CITY CLERK

KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

BOYD HUGHES, SOLICITOR

JOID HOURES, SULICITOR

1 (Pledge of Allegiance recited and 2 moment of reflection observed.) 3 MS. EVANS: Roll call, please. 4 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff. MR. MCGOFF: Here. 5 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan. 6 7 MR. ROGAN: Here. 8 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe. 9 MR. LOSCOMBE: Here. MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. 10 MR. JOYCE: Here. 11 12 MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans. 13 MR. ROGAN: Mrs. Evans called me 14 before the meeting, she said she is going to be a little bit late. Dispense with the 15 16 reading of the minutes. 17 MS. KRAKE: 3-A. AUDIT STATUS FROM 18 ROBERT ROSSI & CO. AS OF NOVEMBER 29, 2011. 19 MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments? If not, received and filed. 20 21 MS. KRAKE: 3-B. LACKAWANNA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION SUBDIVISION AND LAND 22 DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION. 23 24 MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments? 25 If not, received and filed. Are there any

1 clerk's notes tonight? 2 MS. KRAKE: We do not have any 3 clerk's notes, Mr. Rogan. 4 MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Do any 5 council members have any announcements tonight? 6 MR. JOYCE: Yes. 7 I would like to 8 make a motion to table the 2012 operating 9 budget for tonight. 10 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second. 11 MR. ROGAN: A motion has been made 12 and a second, on the question? MR. JOYCE: Yes. 13 There is still 14 some information that I would been discussing now with Ryan McGowan, PEL and 15 16 DCED today and we are still looking for some 17 clarification on some matters that relate to 18 unpaid bills as well as unfunded debt 19 borrowing and we seek to have this 20 information by next week, and also other 21 council members during this time will get into offer extended input. 22 23 MR. ROGAN: Anyone else on the 24 question? All those in favor signify by

saying aye.

25

1 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 2 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 3 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 4 MR. JOYCE: Aye. 5 MR. ROGAN: Opposed? The ayes have it and so moved and 7-A is now tabled. 6 there any other announcements? 7 MS. KRAKE: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS' 8 9 PARTICIPATION. 10 MR. ROGAN: I would also add, a 11 special meeting for tomorrow will be 12 cancelled because the amendments will not be 13 made tonight. I believe Mr. Joyce mentioned 14 on Monday. 15 MR. JOYCE: Yes, we would be looking 16 tentatively to have a scheduled meeting on 17 Monday in order to make the amendments to 18 the 2012 operating budget and have a public 19 hearing the day after on Tuesday, which is 20 our regularly scheduled meeting, where we 21 will vote on the amendments. 22 MR. LOSCOMBE: The Monday meeting 23 will be 6:30, the same time as our council 24 meeting? 25 MR. JOYCE: Yes, that's correct. Ιf

we're all in agreeance with that.

MR. ROGAN: It's agreeable to me.

MR. JOYCE: Likewise.

MR. ROGAN: Citizens' participation.

Since there is such a large amount of people here today, I would ask everybody to stay within the five-minute allotted time. Our first speaker is Reverend Kathryn Simmons.

MS. SIMMONS: Good evening, city council. My name is Reverend Kathryn Simmons, I'm a life-long resident of Scranton. I have come here these past weeks to talk about legal issues, but I'm going to give you a rest this evening, and I'm going to talk about the residents of this blessed city, and I want to give you two perfect examples of the residents who abide within the perimeter of Scranton.

Number one, a homeless gentleman stopped by my home several nights ago to see me, he is a diabetic and in need of food more than once a day. He asked me for a can of beans and some bread to take to the site where he is sleeping right now, and I said, no, I can't do that. I instead warmed him

some soup, made him a sandwich and talked to him as he ate about what I could do to be of more help to him. To make this brief, tears were shed between us both and prayers, also.

The second example happened on Friday evening. I had a single mom stop by to me see, she works. Some would consider her, I guess, lower/middle income. She had to pay her rent, her car insurance, her electric bill and her son needed sneakers for school leaving her nothing for food, so I put some bags together and sent her on her This is not the first time I have helped her, but because of her income status help was not always there and she was embarrassed to go to some places for her job was very public. I told her to come back to me and I would share with her and her children what I could for the coming Christmas season.

Though the shelter site is closed at the moment, we on the board of directors know that Father God will help us find a site, but until that site is found the need goes on, and so I'm asking anyone across

7

6

9

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

this beautiful city to help this ministry of the poor, the homeless and the needy. We are in need of food for donations of baskets for persons who have no Access card because they work and because they work they cannot get to a site which gives out food during the day, so they need to come to us in the evening hours.

We also need clothing, blankets, towels, wash clothes, soaps and shampoo for we are going to make gifts bags of these things to be given to the homeless for Christmas gifts. Financial donations of any kind will also be accepted. The phone number to contact me for further information is 570-342-4117. In this month of December of 2011, I celebrate humbly 25 years of ministry to those in need. I, and my fellow board members, will not give up nor will we leave anyone unattended even if we must go without.

There are people around this room tonight who will soon be, if not already, without jobs and they will come to look to people such as myself to extend a hand to

them to help them and we will do that and we will not make them feel as though they are less than they are, and that is a Scranton resident, proud from where they came from.

I ask on this night for anyone that can hear me, know that my Father God has showered each of us with blessings on this day by allowing us to have a roof over our head and a bed to lay in. I said to someone not too long ago who is from across the country they asked me to describe Scranton and I said, well, that's pretty difficult, but let me put it to you this way, when I walk around Scranton and I talk to my fellow residents I feel as though I'm walking around heaven and the angels have come out. Let them not forget us this evening. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Reverend Simmons, if I could just ask you?

MS. SIMMONS: Sure.

- MR. JOYCE: If you would like, we could announce this at council.
- MS. SIMMONS: You go right ahead and do it.

MR. JOYCE: If that's okay with you. 1 MS. SIMMONS: You do it. You do it. 2 3 MR. JOYCE: And donations, if they be cash, check, do they have to be a 4 5 specific thing? MS. SIMMONS: Well, if they would 6 7 call me we'll make arrangements and 8 hopefully by the time they call us we will 9 have a site that will be a drop off site, 10 so --MR. JOYCE: Wonderful. 11 MS. SIMMONS: 12 I thank you very much. 13 MR. JOYCE: You are very welcome. 14 (Whereupon while Ms. Simmons was speaking, Mrs. Evans takes the dais and 15 16 joins the meeting.) 17 MS. EVANS: Before we continue, I 18 ask that all council speakers would adhere to the five-minute time limit. 19 When the 20 bell rings at the conclusion of the five 21 minutes please finish your sentence and 22 seated. 23 I also ask that audience members 24 remain quiet and turn off cell phones 25 throughout the meeting in order that all may

be heard. Personal conversations should be 1 conducted outside council chambers. 2 3 Our next speaker is Andy Sbaraglia. MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia. 4 5 Citizen of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians, I 6 know we have to pay the debt for the Redevelopment Authority and the Parking 7 8 Authority. 9 MR. JOYCE: Correct. MR. SBARAGLIA: I think it comes 10 close to \$3 million or so? 11 12 MR. JOYCE: 3.2 to be exact. 13 MR. SBARAGLIA: How many firemen 14 could we have keep on the job for the 3.2 million, have you figured that out? 15 16 MR. JOYCE: For the \$3.2 million you 17 could reinstate all 29. 18 MR. SBARAGLIA: So we have to look 19 to the mayor for this fiasco. Many times I 20 came before council and told you them two 21 authorities are bankrupt, the people that 22 run them are bankrupt. I asked you to call 23 for their resignation. That was the most 24 prudent thing you could have done, nothing 25 else you can do because this is the mayor.

Ι

Nothing else you can blame but the mayor.

don't -- and I don't know why you haven't

done something. I know you don't appoint

the authorities, that I know definite, but

anyway, somewhere along the line we should

at least do that part to make a formal

request for council to have them authority

members resign, whether they do or not, of

course, you can't do much about it, but at

least you have done it. We are taking a

loss on all of these public employees

because of these two authorities. If you

want to let the blame, that's where it is.

Now, I looked at your parking, and I don't know how you expect to get money from the Parking Authority. They can't even pay their bonds now. How are they going to ever, ever give you money for any purpose from that legislation you planned in the past, and as you know at one time they had legislation saying that each parking garage would pay \$10, I don't know if you ever got it or not, but anyway, I believe that was on the books.

I'm not going to take a lot of time $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($

because there is no point to it at this point, but when you get everything back in order and so forth and so on I'll make my comments then. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Bob Bolus.

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

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. BOLUS: You know, the first thing we did tonight with the meeting started what do we do? We pledge allegiance to the flag. What you are looking at here are all Americans. That flag represents our freedom and to come here tonight, I just came back, I have been out of town for the last few weeks, and to pull out outside here and see what's happened to this city is an absolute embarrassment that we as Americans in this city have to face.

These are people who came here and they risked their lives. I know what it is to be a firefighter. I am one, I'm a volunteer firefighter in the Throop fire

department, I drive one of the engines. We know the risks, we know the time it takes, but to see what's happening to the men and women of this city, the police department, the fire department, the DPW, ask PEL and Chris Doherty who is going to plow streets if you hire private contractors. These are dedicated men and women. Yeah, we have some flaws in there, there are some slackers and nobody is perfect, but we pay taxes for this protection.

People have sat on their butts long enough in the city, to allow KOZ's, nonprofits to literally take advantage of us. This is our city, it's not their city, to take. The University people don't like to hear it, well, you know, I really have no sympathy for them. They are a business. They charge what they want, they could buy a \$25,000 piece of land and pay \$500,000 for it, but our firefighters and our police department protect them, and they are not paying for it other than a few crummy pennies that they throw out on the table.

I have brought up many times over

the years, and it's time this council and this administration recognize the fact, we the taxpayers are paying for those fire trucks, police cars, DPW equipment that we are letting them use for nothing basically. You run a business, you take your asset, you evaluate it, it's common business sense. You know what your cost of operation is, what your equipment costs, you charge that amount when it goes out on a service call. That's what our fire department does.

The KOZ's, nonprofits need to pay
the cost of those pieces of equipment
whether you have an automobile accident,
that's what you have insurance for. We are
not here to support them anymore. That's
why we have a problem with our men and women
here. That's why we can't pay them. That's
why we don't honor that fact and the flag
that gives us the freedom we ask for.

I had said in the past the ship is sunk, we are in life boats that has holes in them. You need now to stand united and make these changes happen. If it's the reclassification of the city, whatever it

takes. You have vacant land, sell it at auction, put the stipulation at 60 days you must start building a home on it, put it on the tax rolls, generate your cash from your assets, you have them. You have the leachate line. Eight years we have talked about it, how many millions could you have brought into this city? How many millions could the fire department and the police department brought in by charging for their services, not throwing some \$15 here or \$150,000, you can't even go to the casino anymore with what the University gives us. Let's be realistic. This is America, this is the real world.

The post office can't even afford to keep their people, yet everybody went over there. When Tobyhanna was going to lose that everybody went up and helped Tobyhanna, where are they tonight? Where are they supporting these people and they live in this city? I don't see them anywhere because they got what they wanted, and it's wrong. It's just total wrong to have to come here and see this happening in our city

and knowing that people like the University, and I brought it up again and, Mr. Loscombe, you were a victim of two teachers from the University, I know some people on this panel don't want to hear it, Mr. McGoff and others don't want to hear it, but it's the true factual reality.

I offered \$50,000 for a piece of land in this city and I haven't seen anybody do anything about making that happen. It's up to you people to do it. We are speaking. These are one voice, these people didn't come to mass in the past because they are criticized, they are union or whatever it is or they are on a free ride. That's not the case. They have a right to voice their opinion and each one should voice their opinion and not let anyone speak for them.

We've seen PEL put us in the hole where they put us in, they made hundreds of thousands of dollars. What have we gotten in return? What has Chris Doherty given us? The light show at Nay Aug Park, yeah, it's beautiful. Go to Ocean City, Maryland, and you pay to see the show. You don't drive

your car you ride in a tram and everybody is happy to pay, but not in the City of Scranton. They should have LED lights up there.

There is lot of ways we could cut costs and we are not doing it and why?

There is no excuse. It's not about political futures, it's not about who cares about this or who is going to talk about somebody, it's about what we need to do and if you don't take the bull by the horns we are all deeper and deeper in trouble. You can't borrow to get out of debt, put the meters out on a public bid nationally and see who is out there to come to plate. Go see what others states do.

We are just in here giving somebody
Monday, to borrow that money and they can't
even pay their debts now. Look at the
garbage fee we pay. You don't want to put a
fee on anybody, well, you can put a fee on
us for our garbage that we are paying taxes
for. Put a public service fee across the
board in the city, 1 percent on whatever you
come up with. A public safety figure, 1

percent of what the union makes might bring in four or five million dollars.

And those are only little suggestions. I'm sure everybody in here could come up, just like they run their household that's how you got to run the city and that's what we are doing wrong, ladies and gentlemen. We need to take and straighten our city out. You have to listen to the people once and for all in this city. You need public safety. Crime rampant, it's all over the place, you don't have to be stupid to see it, it's black and white. No matter how they salad dress it, it's black and white and you cannot take police and fire off the street. I don't care how you look at it.

And DPW, you could use those trucks to go publically out and service businesses in the city to generate income. You have the assets, but you need to use your assets wisely and intelligently, and use the people that are here. When you destroy the morale where did you think you are going? You are going down to the toilet so to speak.

1 MS. EVANS: Thank you. 2 MR. BOLUS: And one just quick 3 thing, I do have a Christmas dinner going on, Christmas Day at St. Lucy's and as 4 5 always everyone is invited. Thank you. MS. EVANS: Wonderful. 6 7 MR. ROGAN: Thank you. 8 MR. LOSCOMBE: Mr. Bolus, what was 9 the time on that? MR. BOLUS: Pardon? 10 11 MR. LOSCOMBE: The time on the 12 dinner? 13 MR. BOLUS: It starts at 12 to 6, 14 it's an all day buffet. MS. EVAN: Yes. 15 16 MS. HURCHIK: Good evening, City 17 council. My name is Eileen Hurchik, I'm 18 president of IAM Local 2462. I represent 19 the clerical union workers for the City of 20 Scranton and the Single Tax Office. I am 21 here tonight to ask city council to please 22 put back the three city hall clerical 23 positions and the eight remaining positions 24 in the Single Tax Office that were 25 eliminated as a result of the mayor's budget

and city council's budget amendments. The three city hall positions that are being eliminated are the accounts payable clerk, a housing inspector and a building inspector.

The accounts payable clerk is responsible for all payments to all vendors in the city. The accounts payable clerk keeps impeccable records of each and all transactions that are made. When any department needs to look up prior spending or has any questions regarding vendors and payments to vendors, the accounts payable clerk provides all of the information. The accounts payable clerk reconciles all of the vendor statements. The accounts payable clerk assists the business administrator with the Right-to-Know requests.

What needs to be explained is that
the functions of the remaining positions
that are in the business administration
office approve vouchers, purchase orders,
post payments, and do wires. Therefore, if
the accounts payable clerk is eliminated, it
will destroy the internal control
environment or checks and balances of the

business administrator's office. I feel it will also open up the city to a possible audit fine next year. Without this position, there are no checks that will be processed or issued.

The housing inspector and building inspector positions were vacated during the middle of 2011 when the employees vacated their positions with the city. These two positions were not put up for bid due to the city's budget constraints, however, they were supposed to be posted the beginning of 2012. Patty Fowler is one of our housing inspectors and will speak regarding the vacant inspectors positions.

The Single Tax Office positions are needed because this office will still be processing well into next year the 2011 wage tax that has been collected. Again, on behalf of myself and all of my union brothers and sisters we would appreciate anything this council could do to save these positions, and I appreciate your time.

Thank you very much.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you, and your

comments will be taken into very heavy consideration as will everyone else's.

MS. HURCHIK: I appreciate it very much. We do. Thank you. And, Patty?

MS. FOWLER: Good evening, Council.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you tonight. I'm here to explain the importance of the two inspector positions you have chosen not to fund in this year's budget.

I have been the South Side inspector now for approximately two years. In the beginning of those two years, we had two inspectors in South Side, one in the upper part of South Side, which included the East Mountain and, like, all of the -- up from South Side, South Webster up to the East Mountain. The other one had lower South Side, which is a very busy area, and Minooka, which is nice, and I was really busy, let me tell you.

So to have one inspector cover that large of an area is not only a huge tax, but at times we can only have -- we can have a few condemnations during the day working in

tandem with the police and fire. It's impossible to be in the upper side of the South Side and then called to the lower part of the South Side by another agency and be in both places at the same time. It just can't be done.

Inspector jobs are important. Many of your citizens' request refer to inspector work and without them, without enough of us, there is no way to get all of the jobs done the way they need to be done.

On another note, in not funding the building inspector position it is basically handing the taxpayers just another tax or fee. If there is no building inspector, when they are required to have a foundation inspection, a footer inspection, framing inspection, and etcetera, without the building inspector they are -- we are forcing the taxpayers to go to get a third party inspection for that particular inspection so that their project or building can further. The project or building cannot further until the third party inspection is signed off on by the building inspector and

that is approximately \$250 more that you have to pay on top of the \$150 inspection you pay for us to come up. So it can be quite pricey in a project, you know, of a huge magnitude or some kind of a building.

Not funding those positions forces
the people who are interested in all of
those projects to spend all of this extra
money that they may be able to put into
another possible project or another building
a house or whatever.

That's all I have to say and thank you for listening.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Ozzie Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Ozzie Quinn. Taxpayers' Association. Good evening.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. QUINN: Good evening. Bringing back the pride, they took that off of the website now they have progressive city. You know what, Mr. Joyce, last week there was an excerpt where you said you were backed into

the corner and, yes, you were backed into a corner since 2003 when Mayor Doherty started his spending like a sailor on leave, okay? First he sold the Gerry Park Municipal Golf Course, formerly the Muni, a favorite of a lot of people, and PEL didn't argue, okay? One-time revenue. It then started a series of bond issues, you know, we are still paying for them and we are going to be paying the debt service 2012.

We are also paying the debt service for the money that the SRA blew. For anybody thinks that the SRA and the Scranton Parking Authority is autonomous, it's a lie. The debt, we are liable for the debt, the taxpayers in the City of Scranton, as we are right now in the 2011, 2012 and future budgets for as Andy spoke before. Now, that's a lot of money and that could have saved a lot of firemen and a lot of clerical workers. I worked in city hall and I know that people are needed.

Now, the City of Scranton is 25.4 square miles, 25.2 are built up miles with about 28 individuals per square mile.

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That's a lot of people and I don't know if the response time is going to be there to save these people, you know?

And it really burns me up when I saw last week when President Obama was in town and read in the paper that there were grants available and knowing then that Mr. Doherty did not apply for those grants. Now, to me that's unethical. They all say, don't judge, you can't judge, that's falsified. You can judge anybody you want. If you don't judge you are a fool. Don't condemn a person, but you can judge them. What he did is wrong and unethical. He knew there are grants out there and he didn't care about the firemen and their families. Now, he went just right ahead and prepared his fraud budget.

Now, I'm concerned because of the fact that now we have, what, a \$20 million award in front of us because of the fact that, no, Mr. Doherty and PEL they presumed, they'll never, they can't negotiate, we're the bosses here, don't worry, okay? Now, I think the state should pay part of this.

- -

Now, I haven't seen anybody or I haven't saw anybody approach State Senator Browning about this, about getting the state to pay part of this \$20 million. They are the one that told us what to do. They should be responsible for it.

Now, it worries me because of the fact that, you know, we have all of this money going out this year's budget and next year's budget and the years to come with this debt service. Mrs. Evans, you coined it the Doherty debt, and, boy, it is a debt, you know, and people say, I have heard it, I seen it printed, I've seen on the electronic news, the Parking Authority don't count, the SRA don't care, the hell it don't count. That's our money, you know? And all of that debt if we ever get a 2010 audit, if we ever get it, did we ever get it yet?

MR. JOYCE: Not yet.

MS. EVANS: Not yet.

MR. QUINN: Well, don't be hanging.

It's unbelievable. This man should be surcharged for what he is doing on this audit. He should actually be surcharged

because of this mismanagement, but, please, please, let's try to look at ways to save these firemen, not from the fact that we are going to say let's just save them to keep them or give them a paycheck, but what I said we have 25.2 square miles and we only got -- and Mr. Gervasi said we need at least 17 more firemen, okay, to maintain at a minimum, so please listen to him. He knows more about it than Mayor Doherty does, you know?

I'm not sure Chief Davis when he was riding saddle with these people he would be one of the first ones up here, too. He would know, also. It makes me sick to see these people being laid off that are protecting my money and my taxes, my taxes. Nobody else is paying this. It's my taxes and your taxes and these jobs got to be preserved not for the fact that they are going to save a check, as I said, but to preserve the safety and welfare of the people in the City of Scranton. We can't continue.

One more thing, I looked at the

Bureau of Recreation and it says they
maintain 27 parks in the City of Scranton
and baseball fields and basketball courts,
where the hell are they? Softball fields.
I don't know where they are. 27 parks.
Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. John Judge.
MR. JUDGE: Good evening, city

council. My name is John judge.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. JUDGE: I'm the secretary for IFF Local 60, the Scranton firefighters. I'm here to represent my brothers and sisters who I work with and discuss, you know, the impact of what's going on. I found it quite odd, I guess you could say, that when I came in here tonight you guys were having a caucus and you were having a caucus with a group of people to determine impact of what their business plan and proposal is going to be on the city, but yet we blindly in this city just cut jobs left and right and we don't ask for the information from the firefighters, the people that know what's going on and what

the impact of such deep cuts that are proposed by the mayor will be.

I understand that the mayor has come out before and said no matter what happens he has the right to hire and fire, but council absolutely has the obligation to at least try to lessen that impact on the residents of the City of Scranton. It's your job. That's why I voted for the majority of you up there and I'm not afraid to say it. That's why most of my brothers and sisters voted for the majority of the people that are sitting up there because we knew that you took public safety seriously and that's what we want to continue to see.

We are hoping that over the next couple of days you will -- I see that you have made a motion tonight to table the budget amendments, I'm hoping that those budget amendments reflect that are going to be presented next Monday a real strong stance on public safety and that you guys take what you have preached for the last several years and what I have listened to by listening and watching these council

meetings, you guys were all about public safety and I hope that those amendments reflect it.

The impact of the layoffs to my brothers, obviously, that's something huge, but I'll tell you something right now they are resilient. They will get past that, we will all get past that, I'm on that list as well. Ten years I have served this city. My concern is for the safety of the members that I leave behind if I get laid off and the residents of the City of Scranton.

Make no doubt about it, and I know that last week there were comments made about, you know, that you don't want us backing council into a corner, listen, do not be threatened by us. We are here to protect the city, we will be long after this as well. I'm hoping that over the next several years that when I have to come to this podium it's for something other than screaming for the safety of the citizens.

You know, let us start to concentrate on what's truly important here.

Dave Gervasi has spent countless hours

1

fighting to keep this city safe by keeping the firefighters employed, by keeping stations open, by keeping equipment on the We need to get back away from that road. and not have to worry about it so we can start to focus and make our department more efficient, provide better services and more services for the City of Scranton and the residents of the Scranton and I'm hoping that council's amendments next week we will reflect a true stance, whether Mayor Doherty says he can going to fund them or not or listen to you or not, that you send a clear message to him that this council is all about public safety. Thank you for your time.

MS. EVANS: Bill Jackowitz. Bill Jones. Doug Miller.

MR. HUBBARD: Good evening, Council.

First, I'd like to graciously thank

Mr. Miller for allowing me to take his spot

in line, my schedule is tight and I'm

actually away from work right now and I need

to get back.

My name is Daniel Hubbard from lower

25

22

23

24

Greenridge. I was not able to see or attend the caucus this evening in regard to the Lace Works project, but I understand that when the gentleman was asked about the neighbors how they felt of the project, you guys were informed that the Bull's Head Neighborhood Association is on board. Well, I spoke to a neighbor, and my mother did briefly, that lives across the street from the Lace Works and none of the people in our neighborhood were approached about this project.

I'm not really familiar with the details of what is involved with changing, the master plan to suit this project, although, I did catch part of it at the planning meeting, but the gripe I have here is that the Bull's Head and Weston Field Neighborhood Association has gotten themselves involved in several projects that involve lower Greenridge and not their neighborhood. Flood meetings, for example, that didn't even involve the levy on their side of the project, they decided to hold it in Weston Field, obviously, because it's a

great space to have the meeting, but then the took center stage on the meetings.

This is not a Bull's Head
neighborhood project, this isn't a Weston
Field project, they are on the opposite side
of the river separated by two levies and a
river from this building. It is in lower
Greenridge and nobody in lower Greenridge
has been approached on how we feel about
this project.

I'll do my research and study up on the plan, the master plan changes that they are requesting, but I just ask council given the past situations in this city involving light and industrial and neighborhoods please step cautiously when involving any zoning that involves light industrial in a neighborhood in this city. I think that there has been -- we are all aware of past situations in this city that involve the similar type of zoning.

But I just wanted to come in and just say that the lower Greenridge neighborhood has not been approached by this and that I find it offensive that Bull's

1 Head and Weston Field continuously tries to involve themselves as the neighborhood 2 association involved in the projects on our 3 side of the river and they are not. Yes, 4 Mr. McGoff? 5 MR. MCGOFF: May I ask Mr. Hubbard a 6 7 question? 8 MS. EVANS: Um-hum. 9 MR. MCGOFF: Is there still a lower 10 Greenridge Neighborhood Association that could be contacted? 11 12 MR. HUBBARD: There is and there 13 I mean, we haven't had a meeting 14 since the flood projects went through and everything was okay with that, but the 15 16 residents still live on Albright Avenue, you 17 know, it's a very small neighborhood, so it 18 can --19 MR. MCGOFF: My point in asking was 20 if there was someone to whom we could direct 21 22 MR. HUBBARD: Direct them to me and 23 I can get a meeting together. If they want 24 to talk to the neighborhood certainly. Send 25 them to me and I will reach out to all of

25

the neighbors. I have our whole entire neighborhood list and I could put a meeting together and talk to the neighborhood about it. I'm interested in -- I want this project to go through in several ways, I want to see something done with the Lace Works, it's a fabulous building, and it's an eyesore just the way it sits now, so I'm all for something being done but I just want to make sure that we are not causing problems in the future by amending the master plan for zoning to suit one project based on the premise that this change in the master plan will facilitate other similar projects within the city, because I'm still holding my breath to see if this project gets off the ground, never mind future projects that we are changing zoning for that we are not even aware of that might, could, possibly, maybe happen in a decade. That's my only thing. I just don't want to see the master plan change to suit one project and have it adversely affect, possibly adversely affect the residents around a light industrial complex.

So if you direct them to reach out to me and I can get the neighborhood together and we can have meeting and they can go over it with us, but I just want to make sure everybody is clear, this is not the first time that Bull's Head has done this. I would they would actually stay on their side of the river. It would be nice for once to not have them involved in something on our side.

So we kind of stay -- keep our nose out of their business, I wish they would keep their nose out of our business, and so I appreciate that and if you just send them to me and just step cautiously. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: I just wanted to add quickly, time is of the essence in this matter, city council I believe has a deadline during which time a public hearing has to be conducted and a final vote taken by law, so I hope that you will be able to schedule a meeting as soon as possible.

But in addition to that, I'd like to hand over to you all of the information given to council tonight regarding the

change to the zoning --

_

MR. HUBBARD: Okay.

MO EVANO A LAL I

MS. EVANS: And the plans to the Scranton Lace project. We have another copy of that, so if you would like to take a look at that and speak to your neighbors, disseminate it through your neighborhood.

MR. HUBBARD: Certainly. I'll review this and I'll talk to my neighbors about it and then once I get a good grasp of what I have in front of me here I'll certainly return it back to you guys, so you have both copies, okay/ thank you. Have a good evening.

MS. EVANS: You, too. Doug Miller.

MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council.

Doug Miller, Scranton. Obviously the hot
topic tonight is the budget so I'm going to
address that this evening. Just to briefly
go over a few of the things that,
unfortunately, I wasn't able to attend
council's public hearing on Saturday but,
you know, obviously you took the bull by the
horn and reduced a lot of the burden. When
we look at the tax increases reducing the

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

mayor's proposed 29 percent tax increase down to 4.8, certainly relieving 1/2 of the burden on the residents of this city on the property tax and also the businesses of this city.

But, obviously, the issue that we are still dealing with and it's been addressed tonight is public safety layoffs, and I think a previous speaker said it best tonight, and I have talked about it many times since I have been coming to this podium, we need to take a look at the KOZ's and the nonprofits in this city, the ones that aren't paying their fair share. know, for years and years and years they have been given a free ride and they have taken advantage of the city while the hardworking taxpayers of this city struggle each day to meet their obligations and we are about to face a 29 percent tax increase and thankfully this council majority was able to comprehend that, the majority of the residents of this city couldn't take something like that on, and you realized that, but when we have the University of

25

Scranton and other KOZ's and nonprofits that have a free ride and aren't paying for the services that the residents of this city pay for, something is not right. It's not fair and we really need to take a close look at this and I know last summer Councilman Loscombe and Councilwoman Evans fought vigorously to get this university to pay their fair share and they didn't want to hear anything. Council was accused of wanting to make deals, the Scranton Times tried making a story out of it, trying to make council look bad, but the bottom line is that people need to realize that they need to pay their fair share. PEL has recommended to the mayor on many occasions that he needs to reach out and his lame excuse is always, well, I have issues to worry about, I have budgets to worry about, well, yeah, you're darn right you do and that's all part of it and he has failed to Why he has failed to do it, because they are all his cronies and he is not going to touch them because he has had that mentality for ten years, but I would just

2

4 5

7

6

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ask council tonight to pursue this even more.

The \$175,000 they give us ever year is a joke. It's a disgrace and it's got to We need to continue to pursue it, there is no reason why the University can't give us in excess of millions because that's what they take in each year, and we have heard they bought a property that was worth \$25,000 for a half a million. Are you kidding me? And they can only give us \$175,000 a year? I mean, it's a complete slap in the face, but while we talk about the public safety, as I have said before, this all could have been avoided eight years ago, nine years ago had the mayor been willing to sit down, but he chose not. Не once again chose it's my way or no way attitude. That's the philosophy we have had in this town and that's why we are in the position we are in today, and now we have a council majority that unfortunately has to clean up his mess because past rubber stamp councils with their arrogance and their rubber stamping they let this all go by.

Everything was swept under the rug and now, unfortunately, you have to deal with it and it's really ashame and I feel sorry for the job, but at the same time I also don't feel that this council should be pinned in a corner on this issue because you didn't cause this. The guy downstairs did with his arrogance for ten years. He is the one that needs to come forward right here, right now and explain how he intends on covering the city with less manpower, less engine companies and trucks on the road.

Council extended an invitation to the mayor, the fire chief and the BA to come forward, and again, they showed their arrogance, a slap in the face, they don't want to hear it. They don't want to come forward to the public and explain themselves. I believe the chief's excuse was he was hunting, and I'm glad to see hunting takes priority over the people's safety, I'm glad to see where he is at, he can't even put house numbers on his home. He goes and puts windows in without permits, we see where is at. He is one of Scranton's

finest.

We have a BA who hasn't come 3 forward. We have a mayor who has in his budget process, not once did he reach out to this council to ask for their input. know, Mr. McGoff has talked about the spirt 6 of cooperation. I think if I hear Mr. McGoff make that statement one more time I'm 9 going to be sick to my stomach. Did the mayor reach out to council and ask for input? No. Did this council reach out to the administration? Yes, they did. again, showing their willingness to work with the administration and the mayor just again showing his arrogance and his it's my way or no way attitude, and until we get away from that we will never turn the city around.

> The best day ahead for this city is when that man leaves office, when he walks down the steps of city hall for the last That's when we will know it's a good time. day in the city. And as I said before, it's truly remarkable what one man can do to a city in a short time, ten years, and how he

2

1

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

can leave a future so bleak for people like myself and the other young individuals in this city, the future leaders. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you, Mr. Miller.
Ron Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: Hello council. You know, about a month ago I stood here and I said it's time to clean up the Parking Authority and fire some people. Who ever heard of having someone that's losing millions and millions of dollars a \$100,000 position and keeping him, you know? This is senseless. It's time to do something. Like Mr. Hughes said, let them go broke.

Mr. Scopelliti has had several different jobs in the administration through nothing but cronyism, friendship with people. He has jumped from job to job. You know, if the mayor wasn't protecting him he wouldn't be able to clean toilets in the Parking Authorities. He doesn't know what he is doing.

You people just don't seem to put enough emphasis on how bad things are, like, the mayor should go talk -- stand in front

of Redner's or Price Rite for an hour and see how popular he is. The story of Chris Doherty is just a story of failure, you know. It's such a good city and it's got so many good people that I talked to during the week, he didn't have to go that way and the city didn't. It's just been those that oversee the city just don't seem to have what it takes to run a city. All I here is one complaint after another.

Now my taxes are going to be doubled, I don't have sidewalks, curbs, sewers. People sitting up there on Keyser Avenue haven't paid taxes in 13 years or 11 years, whatever it is, they got all of those things. They have all of the benefits from this lousy KOZ programs and my taxes are going to be doubled to help them out. Your taxes. It's just the city is just so misrun it just can't go on, you know. It's just -- I guess it's time to quit worrying about the past, like I said, and go start thinking of the future.

I just got one little -- two questions, isn't it time for some of these

KOZ's to be up already? It's been 10, 11, 12 years on some of them? And I never hear nothing being put on the tax rolls and I was talking to a fellow at lunchtime today that told me a family member of his owed a few years taxes and made a tax settlement. This doesn't seem fair to people like you and me that pay their taxes every year for a tax settlement, and I don't know how the legalities of it and how true it was.

And I saw where the school board is putting on six new people. It's time this runaway school board somebody needs to tell him the city is just broke. We can't afford a one-on-one situation like they seem to try and shove down our throats.

In leaving, I'd just to say it was so nice to see this place full of people that seem to care about our government and all of these new faces out here. I wish I was younger and could have gotten in politics years ago to instead of just standing here, and it makes me really -- I just like to see young faces out here show interest like this.

I have several things, but I guess, you know, I said once before this isn't a -- I don't mean to belittle Mr. Doherty all the time, so many people had great expectations when he took over and, look, signs all against him now, it's terrible. I just can't in my wildest imagination I can't conceive how anybody could support this administration any longer. They have just -- they have turned this wonderful city into just a nightmare.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you, Mr. Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: Well, thank you. I thank you for letting me come up here.

MR. ROGAN: Michael Vandort? Is Michael here? If not, Sam Vitris.

MR. VITRIS: Sam Vitris. I'm president of International Associate Machinist, Local 2305, representing 92 Department of Public Works Employees.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. VITRIS: First of all, I'd like to say that I'm glad and very happy that we tabled the budget tonight to give us all a chance, the members of the Department of

Public Works and the Scranton Fire

Department, the clerical union, everybody
who's jobs was put on the chopping block.

It's not a good feeling around the holidays
and it's very difficult, it happened to me
many years ago around the holidays, when you
know you might lose your job. It's a
terrific strain on people's lives and I
would just hope that city council will keep
in mind how important public employees are,
whether you are a policeman, you're a
firemen, you are a clerical worker or you
are a Department of Public Works Employee.

When the person needs you the most, whether it's a fire, a crime or you're stuck on the street with a baby in a snow storm and you are looking for a DPW truck to help ya, we need to be there and it's important that city council remembers how important we all are together. We are all one and we need to remember that and hopefully when the smoke clears the impact on the citizens of this city will be no where near as bad as what's proposed. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Sam Dockley.

MR. DOCKLEY: Good evening, Council.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. DOCKLEY: You know, I was so tickled pink when I drove up by here tonight and I saw this crowd. You know, my name is Sam Dockley, resident of Scranton all my life, retired captain from the fire department after 32 years of service. It tickled me pink to see these guys out here, Dave and I were talking, you know, this is what we needed. We need more. We need more taxpayers. They should be Washington Avenue on to Lackawanna, all the way up to Gibson Street if they are concerned.

But with that, one point I want to make. We aren't supermen, we never professed to be supermen. We are just human, hardworking firefighters that can --we can get hurt bad or we can die. We proved that with Jimmy Robeson a couple of years back. It was an accident, but it happens. I got hurt in a fire, my dad got hurt in a fire, two heart attacks I talked two weeks ago after 22 years, I beat him by ten years, I had 32.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But anyway, my point is getting across to the people and the taxpayers and the sum of the people in this room here, we aren't supermen. I wish we were so we could fly from fire to fire. Maybe we could save more lives and houses, but it's not possible.

You know, my dad retired at 54, at 54 years old, he died six years later. wish he was around a lot longer, I planned on having him, but it wasn't God's will, but the point I'm getting across, I know I wrote it down tonight, you know, the mayor worries about his budget, he put himself in this predicament by listening to idiots like DEL -- or PEL, I'm sorry, and others, I'm sorry about that mistake, but PEL. We have had them here before in the past, I used to be vice president of our local at one time, Dutchy Maros was president, we threw him out of this town. What do you know about fire fighting and police work? Go back to where the hell you came from and stay there or put on a -- we'll give you turnout gear and a helmet and a pair of boots and a Scott

Air-Pack and see what the hell you can do.

But they are making a bad example, the mayors are listening to these God darn people and getting themselves in bigger trouble by listening to them, and they won't listen. If a mayor and this cabinet can't run a city they shouldn't be mayor. Why do you have to call outside help in here and give these guys a hard time laying off 29 firefighters? They got homes. Up to 12 years they are going to get laid off. They got homes and rent to pay, bills to pay, kids to feed, where are they going to get jobs? Where are they going?

This guy has no respect or consideration and he never did, 11 years in there. 9,000 jobs, I want him to tell me to my face where he got 9,000 jobs, he won't look me in the face or Chief Davis won't either. Another thing is, I understand through the grapevine he might be closing 15, 10, 4, Engine four, Truck 4 at the beginning of the year, and maybe a rescue. My daughter-in-law was in a bad accident four weeks ago on South Main Avenue, it

wasn't in the paper or on the news. If it wasn't for Rescue 1 she could have died or -- yeah, for Rescue 1 she could have died, they had to cut her out of the car. Yep, 2:30 in the afternoon on a Saturday hit by a drunk driver head on, and this guy wants get rid of Rescue 1.

Then I heard he might get a job, land a job in Clarks Summit Hospital.

What's he going for a head job or what? He needs to go up as a patient not a worker.

Look, I have no with respect for this guy, he has no respect for consideration for us, why should we have it for him? They should be made to come here and sit down and talk to the people. Made to. Let him tell them how they are going to operate this city and protect the people.

We are going to have more lives lost with the reduction of the fire department and more homes lost, mark my words. We are going to have fires, we are always going to have fires. It's too bad -- when I used to come to work on a cold night, even Jack here, I used to pray, "Let's not have a

24

25

fire." It would be zero out, I don't want a fire, but we'd get them. We had lots of fires back in my day when I came on 1962. went through seven mayors. I wasn't afraid of them and I ain't anywhere near afraid of this buck, believe me. I got three sons. My wife and I have five children, just another minute or two, please. We had five children, three boys, two girls, they were raised here in this town here, went to school. Most of my grandchildren, 13 grandchildren I have, most of them live Where are they going when they graduate from school in this town? politicians are ruining our cities, our counties, our states and the United States of the America. Let's smarten up. Let's get with it. All the way around the world.

MS. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Dockley.

MR. DOCKLEY: One last thing, God bless Scranton, the county, the state and the United States of America. Have a happy holiday. I don't want any glory. I don't want any glory. That's off my chest.

MS. EVANS: Dave Dobrzyn.

2

3

6

5

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council.

Dave Dobrzyn, resident of Scranton.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. DOBRZYN: How did we get to this place is beyond belief, but anything that -this first statement I would like to make, anything you can do to negotiate with this mayor to preserve these public employee please do so. If you have to leave some wiggle room to revise your revisions, that's fine, but we have to have a guarantee that he just won't take the money and run after the first of the year, after the budget is sanctioned and then he can layoff anybody he wants and use the money whatever he way he wants and hire somebody for \$150,000 study of wildlife and the sewer system or something, I don't know, but it's just gone to far, but we have to have assurances no matter what that these people are not going to be laid off and don't just give him a blank check, which I'm sure you're totally interested in not doing, so that's what I have to say on that matter.

And it's come up once again about

the donations in lieu of voluntary tax service, well, I'll tell you right now, Reverend Pilarz, if you are listening I don't believe what you said last year. I don't believe a word of it and personally I think you need a little cage around that place up there. Let them build up, but not out. No further. That's it. If they actually want to smear the name of honest politicians in this city then it's too bad, we don't need their input.

And on privatizing the Parking
Authority only, I don't care what happens to them. They have been so ridiculously irresponsible over the years that personally I think the whole situation should be privatized and they should be sent packing.

We don't need them. I can park wherever I want and pay if I have to, but I have a choice. With the Sewer Authority, with DPW, I don't have a choice in the matter. I owe a bill at the end of the year or the beginning of the year and that is it and if I don't pay that bill I have liens against my house, and I don't need some corporate

degenerates telling me what I have to pay and what I have to pay is five times more than what I wind up paying right now. If I have to pay 25 bucks more that's one thing, but if I have to pay \$1,000 for a \$300 sewer bill in two years, shame.

So do what you have to do and try and wrestle -- every last ounce of your strength try to wrestle control over the authorities. Do what you need to make the city work and, by the way, do we have the audit yet?

MR. JOYCE: No, we do not.

MR. DOBRZYN: Hell no. Thank you --

MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

MR. DOBRZYN: -- Mayor Doherty, once again because we know that's your stall job. That's all it is so you can't let these people try to work out some of these problems on their own, you just want to work it out your way which doesn't work.

And everybody out in the TV land call your congressmen and irregardless of what party you vote for and who is in there right now tell them that the current

trade packs have to go and they have to bring jobs back to this country because that's what the bottom line is. We are starting to lose big time on wage taxes and so forth and 3.4 percent wage taxes and any problem to pay as compared to being jobless. There is -- it's just entirely ridiculous how I have seen this country decimated over the last 31 years. First it was robotification and the big factory jobs went down the tubes, now, we all want to outsource the rest. Shame on them.

Last week, just quickly, I'm going to end it, somebody mentioned that I never mentioned Edwards, John Edwards with his marital situation and so forth, well, John Edwards is on trial right now and he may lose a lot over it, but he kept his nose out of my marriage and I appreciate that, so if they keep their nose out of my marriage, I'll keep my nose out of them. Bawk, bawk. Have a good night.

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

1 MR. MURRAY: My name is Joel Murray, I am a resident of Scranton. 2 3 MS. EVANS: Can you repeat your name, please? 4 5 MR. MURRAY: Joel Murray. Joel 6 Murray, I'm sorry. MS. EVANS: 7 Spell the last name for 8 me? 9 MR. MURRAY: M-U-R-R-A-Y. 10 MS. EVANS: Thank you. 11 MR. MURRAY: But my brother has been 12 a firefighter and just having him getting 13 laid off, he has a kid on the way, how would 14 you feel if you had a kid? Six minutes is the response time lead to eight minutes, two 15 16 of those minutes could have saved anybody 17 that was in that house. How would you feel 18 knowing that that two minutes could have 19 been the deciding factor in someone's life? 20 Now, I have never been a public 21 speaker, but this is -- this is ridiculous. 22 Mayor Doherty is spending all this money in 23 this budget and I think that we are not 24 making budget cuts where they should be.

DPW, PennDOT, they are doing all of

25

themes renovations to the roads where they don't need to be. The Taylor bridge connecting Taylor to Old Forge, the detour on that, we just put -- what was it, directions, we painted the directions for them to make that right turn or the left turn. You can't go anywhere else. There is no bridge. You are going to have either turn left or right coming from that intersection. Like, is that where our money is going to?

And then we layoff 29 firefighters, I think that's ridiculous. I really do. It's not right. We are closing down too many fire stations and I know that I would like to have those two minutes any day of the week and save my life, and here -- and you are laughing up there. Why? I see everybody laughing over there. This is not a laughing matter. Like, I don't think it is. I'm sorry, and that's honestly all I have to say. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Bill Jackowitz,
South Scranton resident and member of the

ı

Taxpayers' Association.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. JACKOWITZ: I want to read you something that I read today and then hopefully someone on city council can tell me what it means. "The strength of a city is the combustion engineering that takes place inside of it."

Can someone please tell me what that means? "The strength of a city is the combustion engineering that takes place inside of it?"

Can anybody tell me who made that quote? It came from the Honorable Mayor Christopher A. Doherty in 2008 when he was interviewed by Mayor TV, and you can actually see it on the Scranton website, just click on the Scranton website and the Mayor TV and it's there, and I don't understand what it means, so obviously no one on city council understands what it means either.

So my opinion the strength of a city are the residents and the leadership of the elected officials that the taxpayers and

voters elected to lead. That's my opinion.

That's just my opinion and it has nothing to do with the combustion engineering that takes place, okay? Now, I didn't graduate from Holy Cross College, but, you know, that's just the way it is, you know. So hopefully maybe someone can explain that to me before the meeting is over with tonight.

Unfortunately, Scranton and
Lackawanna County we have poor leadership.
We have poor elected officials. The only
people who I have seen in the last probably
last 50 years who actually have tried to do
something for the City of Scranton have been
you four, Mr. Rogan, Mrs. Evans, Mr. Joyce
and Mr. Loscombe. You are the only four
people who have I have put any faith or
confidence in so far so don't let me down,
okay?

Now, as far as the mayor goes, the mayor has no credibility in my opinion. Mr. McGoff has no credibility in my opinion.

Mrs. Fanucci had no credibility in my opinion. Mrs. Gatelli had no credibility in my opinion, and a few others who have sat on

city council because they are the ones who voted blindly for everything that the mayor sent down. It was proven just two weeks ago when Mr. McGoff didn't even read the agenda. That tells me -- what does that tell me, he hasn't been reading the agenda for five years, okay, because he didn't even realize something was on the agenda. He was going to read his talking points from Mayor Doherty until he was corrected, and I must admit that he did stand corrected and he manned up to it, but that just tells me, again, that they didn't read what was coming down, they didn't read the budgets.

I remember when Mrs. Evans held a special budget meeting and Ms. Fanucci and Mrs. Gatelli didn't even show up because they had more pressing matters, they claimed to have family matters. One was a birthday party if I remember correctly. Again, no credibility whatsoever.

Mr. McGowan, no credibility.

Mr. Renda, no credibility. The people on the authorities, Mr. Scopelliti,

Mr. Barrett, no credibility. Chief Davis,

no credibility. Hunting is more important to Chief Davis than his firefighters. Chief Duffy, no credibility. They should be here at these meetings. Chief Duffy is more involved in making minor arrests instead of standing up and fighting for his police officers and getting new police vehicles.

Chief Davis should be getting new fire equipment. He should be getting up-to-date fire equipment for our firefighters, new fire apparatus, but, no, he is more interested in having people being laid off, not standing up for them, not coming to a meeting, and would rather go hunting than to address the citizens of Scranton.

I would like to know what Authority
Chief Davis and Mayor Doherty used to come
up with these reductions in the fire
department. I would like to know that, but
you know what, I never will because there is
no authority. They did it completely on
their own, okay? Chief Davis may have been
a good firefighter, but in my opinion he is
not a good fire chief. My opinion and my

opinion only.

Now, as far as the DPW goes, I don't want to see anybody laid off. Nobody. But you know what, they have to suffer, too, just like everybody else. The same with the clerical workers. If people need to get laid off, then they need to get laid off, but we don't need to be just laying off police officers and firefighters. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you and,
Mr. Jackowitz, in this budget there is some
money for police vehicles because that was
one of the expenditure questions that I had
in capital expenditures was a certain
allotment of money was going to be used for
and I was told that they were planning on
purchasing some new police vehicles this
year.

MR. JACKOWITZ: About time.

MISS BARCHAK: Good evening. My
name is Kayla Barchak. Me and my mother are
here this evening to not only show support
for the men and women who makeup our fire
department, but to publically express my

concern of the laying off of more firemen and the closing of more firehouses throughout the city. Just the thought of only having four or five engines being available at any given time every day greatly concerns me. I am 17 years old. I can't tell you how scared that makes me just knowing.

MS. BARCHAK: Good evening, Council.

My name is Tara Barchak, I'm a Scranton
resident, and I have to say with Kayla, my
concern is greatly heightened by this
layoff. I work very hard and contribute a
ridiculous amount of taxes as opposed to
friends of mine who live in the outskirts of
Scranton and I do so now with the fear of
not having the safety of my children if
something happens in the middle of the night
and there are no firemen there to man a
truck to get my house to save my children.
That concerns me.

I really don't -- I didn't prepare much, I apologize, I came right from work, but all I have left to say is this, I hope that if this happens and these firehouses

close and these firemen are laid off I can only hope that someone will make sure, maybe our DPW trucks can be manned with fire extinguishers so that somebody at least can be there if needed when our firemen are laid off as a thanks to them for their dedication for serving this city for so long and saving the lives of many people and businesses in this city. That would be their thanks which is quite sad, and I have to say I am very embarrassed to say that I live in this city. Unfortunately, I am, but thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: Good evening, Council.
Brian Murray.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. MURRAY: I'm a taxpayer and resident and I am number 21 of the 29 firefighters being laid off in this budget. I say that because not that I'm trying to plead for my job or any of that because in reality if you were to fund the 17 positions Mr. Gervasi has asked for in reality I wouldn't get my job back. I'm here to plead for the safety of the citizens. I took an

oath six years ago, pretty much similar to you to, to protect the citizens of this city.

And this evening Mr. Jackowitz said and Saturday that he is not concerned about the people that were in the room, he was more concerned about the people who weren't, and on that note I assembled over 100 people to visit council this evening outside. They weren't firefighters, they were firefighters' families, friends, people that we protect, people that you know, people that have gone to dinner possibly with you, that you have seen on the streets, the actual citizens of this city. Not the 137 firefighters.

I assembled them out in there in support of public safety, and Mr. Joyce had made a comment that you won't be intimidated, I understand that, I can understand where you are coming from, but in reality if you won't be intimidated by the 112 or 113 people that were outside who will get their point across?

We need public safety, the citizens

1

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of this city pay for primary services, they are paying for us to have our jobs, they are paying for the protection that you are supposed to provide, that the mayor is supposed to provide not to have some authority who can't manage to keep themselves in the black, although they have their own revenue coming in, they can't manage to keep themselves even, all right, or PEL who hasn't anything for us in 20 years or just the fact that we have within the next 18 months we will pay more in debt payments than we will for the fire department in this city, okay? That's ridiculous. Absolutely ridiculous. right?

I took an oath to protect these citizens. Whether I'm on the job or not, I will continue to protect these citizens, okay, because I let a job, a reasonably paying job, because this was a noble profession. No one can make money off of what I did, okay? That's why I took this job, all right? Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Is there

3

5

4

7

6

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

anyone else who would like to address council?

MS. WOSNEY: Good evening, Council.

My name is Katherine Wosney, Scranton
resident.

MS. EVANS: What is your last name?

MS. WOSNEY: Wosney.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MS. WOSNEY: I left work early to come support my friends and firefighters and police officers I don't know. I am resident of the city. I am originally from another I was a volunteer in that town for ten years in the fire department. It's something I grew up always wanting. I always thought it was very honorable, very noble, I always looked up to those people as well as many other people that I know, and to hear that there is 29 more being laid off along with the others that were already laid off, that's ashame. That's a disgrace to this city. The first priority of a city should be to protect it's citizens not to lay off the people who protect it.

The people that going into these

3

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

professions, I was a volunteer -- I didn't go into it for, you know, for a rush or adrenaline, I went into it because I wanted to help others, and that's what most of these ladies and gentlemen do, and to take that away from the city I don't see anybody else stepping up to the plate to do that.

The mayor certainly hasn't done When he was being reelected he promised no more cuts. He went back on his word, that's ashame, and it's sad to say I'm actually looking to move out of this city. I don't want to be a part of this city anymore because of how embarrassing it is to hear this, and I'm not a speaker, I'm a little bit nervous, but I just wanted to state my opinion, I wanted to show my support for the friends that I have and the people that I have met tonight, and if you could do something about this, I mean, this shouldn't be happening. There is -- there is just absolutely no reason for it.

These people are the ones that risk their lives for others without being selfish, without thinking twice. I don't

see the mayor doing that, I don't even say him here tonight and it's just the shame overall to see this happening.

And I have nothing else to say about it, but I just want to show my support for everybody here and hopefully this could be resolved and these men and women can have their jobs and the city can be safe, and we can go back to the way Scranton should be run. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MS. MURRAY: I'm not used to this stuff, so my name is Tracy Murray.

MS. EVANS: Murrin?

MS. MURRAY: Murray. My son is a firemen.

MS. EVANS: Oh, good evening.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MS. MURRAY: I have a couple of things. One is I don't believe these guys should be laid off. We are taxpayers, we pay you people, we want what we are supposed to get, okay, for our services. I have an example here. Behind my house, right behind my house, there is a home there that's been

condemned for ten years. There was hoarders there, living there. They brought the Hazmat team in there, they took out five 40-foot dumpsters out of there, okay? It's been boarded up. The past three years the front door has been wide open for anyone to go in there, kids, homeless people. Every single night I pray to God that that house doesn't go up because there is another house right across from it that's condemned, that it doesn't set my house and I wake up the next morning along with my family, okay?

You people and the mayor have to do something to keep these guys working. I don't care if you go to the University, there is no reason why they can't pay any money, they can't pay taxes. They would be a big help. We don't have a problem paying the tax that you are given us, but keep the guys on the job. Save them, all right, because I know if someone gets killed, if my house goes up because of that, the city doesn't want to condemn -- or take it down, I am going to hold someone responsible for it, okay? Who that might be personally I

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't know. We'll just have to see where this goes. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Marie Schumacher, city resident and taxpayer.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MS. SCHUMACHER: This is a sad night, and I'm probably going to be discombobulated because I came here thinking we are going to talk about the budget. would ask you to reconsider your Monday night meeting since that has long before advertised as the public hearing for the Scranton School Board budget meeting. think that's equally important, they actually suck up more money than you people do, although, it looks as though you're trying to compete with them, but I do think that people should not have to make a choice between the two meetings. They do have two, but for those of us who plan ahead and selected Monday that's -- it is Monday.

Now, just on one quick statement on an agenda item, which is 6-A, I heard awhile

20

21

22

23

24

25

back that that building being the Lace Company was essentially going to be torn down except for the clock tower perhaps, and I called LIPS and found out that, in fact, they were just waiting for one more piece of information that they do have permits to tear down the Lace Company building, so I'm having trouble in my brain saying how do you reuse something if you are going to tear it To me, that's starting all over, so is there -- within this legislation is there a specific percentage of the original footprint of the building that is to be reused that must be maintained or can you just keep the same footprint and call it reuse because you kept the same footprint, which I don't think is right if you are going to actually reuse a building, so I still have a lot of questions on 6-A.

And now I guess I'm really disappointed that 2012 is not going to be the first year of the Recovery Plan. I have asked for some time for a multi-year budget so that all of us can have hope, those who have to pay the taxes, those who would like

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to start businesses, those who have jobs, we should be able to look at -- I know the City of Lancaster did it, they had a five-year Recovery Plan, I don't think -- I know we can't do it in five years, but I think there are lots of options.

I think we need to stop, look and listen. It's sort of like when I went to grade school you stopped and you looked and listened. We have to stop and regather. have to look around and what others are doing. For instance, Jermyn has an auction, they auction off vacant lots once a month prior to the city council meeting. There is 350 total parcels that are attributed to the ownership to the City of Scranton. them, of course, are legitimate city buildings that are being used, some probably have been bought up for flood plane, but that whole list needs to be gone through and those that are available need to be taken, put back on the tax rolls, however it's to be done.

With regard to our public safety, I don't know what you can do with 100

firefighters. Each of those firefighters will have vacation time, Kelly days, sick days, now how far can you stretch however many there are? You are putting them at risk, you are putting our personal lives and our property at risk and I think we are owed a visit by Chief Davis to tell us how he is going to cover 26 square miles safely with obviously at any day it's going to be less than 100 firefighters. We need to know what apparatus will be retained and we need to know where it will be located, and I don't think I could be convinced that I'll be safe.

I believe Mr. Gervasi if they say -if he says we can do it with 117 and I
believe that, and that sort of begs another
issue, the Ice Box, the \$600,000. I brought
all the paperwork that shows that it looks
as though maybe some pages were mixed
together to make that deed with 198 years
that I personally believe no sane person
would have voted for, how many would that
cover. I will be back, I have a lot, and
I'm very upset by what's transpiring on this

25

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Ms. Schumacher, if you would like I could give you a copy of some of the handouts that we have on the Scranton

MS. SCHUMACHER: Yeah, I'll return them next week. Yeah, thank you, I will. I'll take it and return it next week.

> MR. JOYCE: No problem.

> MS. EVANS: Mrs. Krake?

MS. KRAKE: 5 - A .

MS. EVANS: I'm sorry, I thought everyone was finished.

MS. FRANUS: Fay Franus, Scranton. First of all, I have to say whatever I'm saying tonight is simply my opinion. Just a speech, freedom of speech. I'm all for protests and rallies and things like that. My son is at Occupy Wall Street in New York every day, so I'm all for freedom of speech, but what I can't understand is why all of these people are here tonight at council outside with the rally tonight versus this

afternoon from 8:00 in the morning to 4:00 when Mayor Doherty is at work since is he the one that took the firemen out of the budget. I don't understand why they are not there doing the day instead of tonight. I don't understand it.

Mayor Doherty last year took the firemen out, he took them out again in August, took them out this December. You put them back in last year and went to Court, the judge said the mayor has the right to take them out. You were asked last week about it, you said it's illegal for you to put them back in.

What I see here is last week Dave Gervasi said to Mr. Joyce that you, and I'm thinking he is your friend to all of city council, is culpable. City council is culpable just as much as Mr. Doherty is if the firemen don't get put back in. That's not true. You didn't do this, Mr. Doherty did it. You are not culpable at all. You are there representing the people, not just the unions of this city.

I'm a member of a union, not by

choice. I do not think any job that taxpayers pay for should have a union, there is no control. The prices just skyrocket. Between the county tax and the city tax and the school tax, there is so many senior citizens in this city I don't know how they are ever going to keep their homes.

Here is my concern, I have my home for 40 years, others have them more and some just a little bit less and we have worked all our lives to keep these homes, so the way things stand now the mayor does not want to budge, he said he would not seen any paper, he would not sign any paper saying that he will not take the firemen back out if you put them back in, so there you go.

Ryan McGowan told Mr. Joyce a couple of days ago that do not mess with our administrative budget, do not mess with it. The firemen, they are not willing to sacrifice anything. They want everything, they don't want to give anything. Sure, I don't want my house to burn down and I don't want any firemen as well, but I think you have to give and take here. The

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

administration is not willing to give, the unions aren't willing to give. Nothing.

They want everything.

Now, the firemen more than likely may get \$80,000 a piece for the arbitration, which they have coming to them. They didn't get paid, they had that coming. They start at \$61,000 a year. Not many people get that kind of pay. Here is my question to myself and I'm just wondering, I'm wondering what the odds are of all of the people in Scranton that own their homes, what are the odds that, one, they would lose their home because of high taxes in the county, the city and the school, they would lose their homes or was it a better chance if their house would burn down? I think the chances are that many more people will lose their homes versus their house catching on fire, and if we don't have -- this city is going There are going to be to be gone. foreclosures all over the world -- excuse me, the city, if the firefighters get put back and Mayor Doherty doesn't cut anything.

So, Mr. Loscombe, last week you

stated at council meeting that even though you're on the safety committee that you were not for just the unions you are for the taxpayers, you were representing the taxpayers, then Saturday you said it was criminal if they don't get put back, so here is the scenario I would like to present.

Come time for the vote, hypothetically, if you, Mr. Loscombe, and you, Mr. McGoff, vote against your own council's amendments because you came down to a 4.8 tax increase versus Mayor Doherty's 29 percent. It was great.

Now, hypothetically, if you,
Mr. Loscombe and you, Mr. McGoff, vote
against your council's amendments then it
goes to Mayor Doherty. More than likely he
would veto that. Now it comes back to you
within ten days for an override vote and if
you, Mr. Loscombe, and you, Mr. McGoff, vote
the same way and it's 3/2 you don't have
enough votes for an override, you need four
votes. That means that Mayor Doherty's
budget would, in fact, take over and that
4.8 tax increase that you implemented would

be erased, and you still wouldn't be getting
your firemen back so what did we win?
So you have to decide who you are
for, the unions or the taxpayers in the city
of Scranton.
MR. LOSCOMBE: I don't believe we
have a finished budget yet.
MS. FRANUS: Well, when you do have
it, I'm talking about when the vote comes
MR. LOSCOMBE: I'll explain in
motions. I'll let you know in motions how I
feel.
MS. FRANUS: One more thing?
MS. EVANS: Thank you.
MS. FRANUS: Nancy Krake, why did
you allow Dave Gervasi to speak for at least
15 minutes last week?
MS. KRAKE: I didn't actually ding a
lot of people. I'm assuming I can answer,
Mrs. Evans. I don't normally
MS. FRANUS: What's that?
MS. KRAKE: Is that okay? I'm
assuming I can answer?
MS. EVANS: Yes. Oh, yes.
MS. KRAKE: I'm sorry, I should have

asked Mrs. Evans first. I actually did allow a lot of the speakers to speak a lot longer.

MS. FRANUS: You work for the city, not for the unions. And the real estate transfer tax, people will not be not moving into the city because of that. That's not -- the buyers and the sellers they sometimes split that cost. The people will not be moving into this city not because of that, they will not be moving into the city because of the taxes that this mayor has imposed upon them and the county and the school district, not the real estate transfer tax. Thank you.

MR. GERVASI: Good evening, City
Council. My name is Dave Gervasi, I'm the
president of the firefighters' union. I
wasn't planning on speaking tonight because
I thought maybe we can could have some
truthful conversation in the next few days,
but I wanted to let Mrs. Franus know that
hopefully we can work this thing out.

Number one, the firefighters didn't bury the city in debt, neither did the city

council.

Number two, we have a problem right now that we want to work out and hopefully we can accomplish that.

As far as taxes are concerned, I can't speak about whatever taxes, the 4 percent that council is presenting or the 29 percent that the mayor proposed, but we did do a little research today and the cost of putting firefighters back is going to cost you, Mrs. Franus, about 93 cents a month, so I'm sorry if that burdens your budget.

You know, I just hope, I just hope that -- oh, by the way, Mrs. Krake, I'm sorry you had to be asked why -- I didn't think there was a five minute thing at the budget meeting, I was just kind of going through the budget asking my questions and making council aware of what I felt.

MS. EVANS: But actually there is a five-minute time limit for all meetings.

MR. GERVASI: You know what, I didn't know that during that public hearing. I didn't know that, I'm sorry.

MS. EVANS: Yes, that's been

established for all of the meetings.

MR. GERVASI: Okay, well, then, I would have shut up then if I went too long, but that's all. That's all I have to say.

MS. EVANS: You are not the only one.

MR. GERVASI: What's that?

 $\label{eq:MS.EVANS:} \textbf{I said you are far from}$ the only one.

MR. GERVASI: No, I'm sure. I'm sure. I have a lot to say sometimes, but just so you know, too, Mrs. Franus, that it wasn't just the mayor that didn't fund the firefighters, we got a copy of council's proposed amendments and there is no -- there wasn't one firefighter on top of the 100 that was funded so, you know, we were concerned about that, too.

So, again, I know this thing is being tabled, I'm hoping that leveler heads will prevail. I hope that the mayor will sit down with council. I hope that we can help in any way, and I just want everyone to know, too, that apparently I guess the blame game is going to be started that it's the

firefighters' fault or whatever, but if the city, the mayor and the city council took a moment to maybe ask some people for help you would have found out that we discovered whether, and it's argued, but we discovered and I'm very, very confident that that money is there, probably 1.8 to 2.3 million dollars was found in revenue that apparently no one knew on either side, but we worked a little bit hard and we found that money so there is money to put back in without raising any taxes higher. If anyone else was done on the budget deal it would have cost more of a tax increase, but the needed put the firefighters back in we believe we had covered with found revenue that was not in either the mayor's budget or city council's budget.

So all we are trying to do is just say that the money could be there, if everybody works together hopefully we can all work together and get this thing done and have a semblance of fire protection.

Thank you.

MS. ROSKY: Good evening, Council.

22

23

24

Mary Ann Rosky, taxpayer and homeowner.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MS. ROSKY: First I want to compliment council for the budget amendments. I do like the 29 percent property taxes down to 4.8 and I also like the firemen where you had it was Mr. Gervasi said 17 I believe you guys said 18, and I think there was something else I have, but we'll do that next week.

I have to reiterate week after week after week, the first thing that we pay taxes for I believe, okay, is the safety. I mean, what good are houses and people and a town without safety? If you don't have the fire department backing you up in a fire and you don't have the police backing you up when there is major catastrophes going on then what do we have? What do we have?

So I do like that Mr. Gervasi's 17 firemen additional that is needed. It's my understanding, I don't know, rumor has it, but was Mr. Doherty -- did he get a chance to sign and see the budget that you guys proposed or did he refuse and not sign it?

MS. EVANS: It's not even passed, so he is not required to sign it.

MS. ROSKY: Okay, until --

MS. EVANS: Until it's legally and lawfully adopted. First it will be amended and then there be a public hearing on those amendments.

MS. ROSKY: All right.

MS. EVANS: And then it will be legally and lawfully adopted by council, submitted to the mayor for his signature or his veto. Should he veto it, will return to council for a council override. If council does not have four votes to override the budget, then the mayor's budget stands and that would mean a 29 percent tax increase and the loss of 29 firefighters.

MS. ROSKY: I'm appalled. I just don't understand what it takes for this person -- I can't even -- oh, for Doherty to -- I can't even understand. He could be here tonight. He doesn't need an invitation. He could be here any time and listen and just voice his opinion; am I correct on that?

MS. EVANS: Yes, but he would not return phone calls to council, he has spoken to no one on council. He is not willing to city sit down with council, so --

MS. ROSKY: No, I've known that, but, I mean, I'm just -- I just I can't believe that you have a mayor and you have a city council and then it was a personality thing, according to the mayor in my opinion I thought I heard on television that there was a personality -- or, TV -- I'm sorry, the newspaper there was there a conflict of personalities, it's not you guys. You guys are fantastic. You will sit with him and reason with him. It may be his personality that is -- you know?

And I don't understand, he lives in the city. If his house burned down and his family was inside and the fire department couldn't be there would it phase him then or would he still be, like, la, la, la? What would it take for this person to understand? He doesn't get it. He gets nothing. He doesn't understand safety. We cannot afford 29 percent tax hike. That we cannot afford.

We can't even afford the garbage fee.

That's in our taxes that we pay when we own our homes. That's our taxes, so we are getting fees on top of a tax. That to me shouldn't be either.

And people who own their home they already know what's coming, renters should also be aware that with this 29 percent tax hike that landlords can raise or should probably raise their rent, and they will also be affected by it all, so it's not only the homeowners it's the renters, and then you have got insurances, which people have spoken about, homeowners' insurance, well, the less you have in safety the fire department, the homeowners' are going to go up they are going here crying and then what's going to happen then? It's too late. It's too late then.

So we have to think about it now.

We say 17 -- I'm going to according

Mr. Gervasi's number of 17, I'm not sure if
you guys said 18.

MS. EVANS: We didn't say any number, and I'm not quite sure what number

now Mr. Gervasi is up to. It's gone up from 17.

MS. ROSKY: Okay, whatever. I would say 29. Keep them all. That's my opinion.
Keep them all. We need them. We need them.
And, you know, everybody needs their jobs.
I can't care if it's DPW or clerical.
Everybody needs their job, everybody wants their job, but you cut them first. They are the ones that should be cut first, not safety. Not safety. You know, you eliminate one supervisor and I'll come back.
Thank you. Have a good night.

 ${\sf MS.}$ EVANS: Is there anyone else?

MS. KRAKE: 5-A. MOTIONS.

MS. EVANS: Mr. McGoff, do you have any comments or motions?

MR. MCGOFF: Yes, I do. First, I guess I'll address the budget since it's an emergency or priority. For the past couple of days I have and I'm sure everyone else has numerous e-mails, phone calls, whatever from the Realtor's Association concerned about the realty transfer tax. In discussion with one of the members of that

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

association, he presented both to -- I know to Mr. Rogan and to myself a proposal that would have changed the way in which it was placed in the budget. I'm told by Mr. Rogan that he was advised that this proposal was not -- we were not able to act on this proposal, however, I think that maybe over the course of the next week as we are discussing the budget maybe we can at least look into the proposal that was made and if there is any possible way that it can be implemented it seemed to be -- it was a way in which it encouraged single dwelling -the sale of single dwelling homes, but yet maintained the revenue from sale of the commercial and other properties, so something to look at over the course of the next week.

As far as the public safety issue,
I'm sorry that I was not here on Saturday,
when it was presented, but over the past
couple of days in speaking with others
concerning the proposed amendments I have
stated and I would state publically that I
am not going to vote for any budget that

does not reinstate fire and police positions. I think it's an essential, it's something that we need to do and something that I think that we are morally obligated to do in our position on council.

As far as the DPW is concerned and the cuts there, also, I think that it behooves us to search out revenue to reinstate workers so that we can ensure the continued services that we receive from DPW. I personally am pleased with the way in which DPW has operated and my refuse and recyclables are collected on a regular basis, the streets are plowed on a regular basis, and I want to see that that continues. I do not want to jeopardize that.

And as far as tax increase is concerned, I am willing to pay for those services. As a taxpayer, as a homeowner, I am willing to pay for services and for things that I feel are necessary. When we talk about tax increases, I think we really have to look at real numbers. 75 percent of all the taxpayers in the City of Scranton

1	pay \$500 or less for real estate taxes to
2	the city. \$500 or less to the city. That's
3	75 percent of the taxpayers. A good portion
4	of them obviously pay less than \$500 a year
5	to the City of Scranton.
6	When you work that out, a 20 percent
7	increase would mean or 20 percent
8	increase in taxes at this point would mean
9	\$100 a year.
10	MR. ROGAN: I hope you are not
11	trying to argue that the people of Scranton
12	are under taxed.
13	MR. MCGOFF: I'm just saying that
14	this is the case. You can argue the numbers
15	if you want.
16	MR. ROGAN: Well, you have to
17	include the wage tax as well.
18	MR. MCGOFF: I'm talking real estate
19	taxes.
20	MS. EVANS: Okay, but I think what
21	Mr. Rogan might be referring to as well is
22	it's very narrow minded of you
23	MR. MCGOFF: No, it's not narrow
24	minded.
25	MS. EVANS: To suggest

MR. MCGOFF: Excuse me, it's my 1 2 time --3 MS. EVANS: No, excuse me --4 MR. MCGOFF: -- to speak. 5 MS. EVANS: And I will allow you to do so. 6 7 MR. MCGOFF: It's my motions, let me 8 finish. 9 MS. EVANS: And as soon as I'm 10 finished --11 MR. MCGOFF: You have your 12 opportunity to speak --MS. EVANS: You will be allowed to 13 14 speak again. 15 MR. MCGOFF: Well, it's my turn to 16 speak. 17 MS. EVANS: I think that you need to 18 consider rather than considering a city tax in isolation, take a look at the entire tax 19 20 bill and tell me what the combination of the 21 city, the county and the school district is 22 and what that combination will hike up to 23 with an overall 75 percent increase. 24 Perhaps, that's affordable to 1 percent of 25 the city.

MR. MCGOFF: Mrs. Evans, may I 1 continue? 2 3 MS. EVANS: Absolutely. Be my 4 guest. 5 MR. MCGOFF: As I was saying, \$100 a year increase at 20 percent -- or at 20 6 percent, that works out to \$2 a week. As 7 8 Mr. Gervasi said, there are ways in which, 9 you know, we can implement some things that 10 are not a burden to the taxpayers. Are you 11 willing, are you willing to pay \$2 a week to ensure that we reinstate public safety 12 13 positions and DPW positions so that your 14 services are not diminished? All I'm saying is I am willing to do that and I am not sure 15 16 that there are any number of taxpayers that 17 are willing to do that. We are talking 18 about \$2 a week. Most --MS. EVANS: Please allow Councilman 19 20 McGoff to finish his motions. 21 MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. 22 MS. EVANS: The public has spoken 23 already and now it is time for the council 24 members to speak. Thank you. 25 People spend more on MR. MCGOFF:

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

lottery tickets and cable TV, probably spend more at Mohegan Sun than they do in a week than they would for insuring that these positions are reinstated and --

MS. EVANS: Mr. McGoff, just one second, please. If anyone would like to have private conversations, could you please conduct those in the hallway because I'd like everyone listening to Mr. McGoff, please.

MR. MCGOFF: All I'm saying is that I think it's imperative that we seek ways in which we can ensure that our services are provided for in this city. I think there are ways of doing that and in an attempt to make some people sick, I am not going to vote, again, for any budget that does not reflect a cooperative effort between the council and the administration. I think the only way in which we arrive at something that will be effective for 2012, something that will work, is by doing it cooperatively and I am glad that we tabled the budget for this evening so that it gives us the time in which to reflect on the amendments, time to

1

9

7

8

11

12

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

reflect on some of the things that have been discussed over the past couple of days, and hopefully implement some of knees ideas so that it's a budget that can work, and as someone said to me, maybe it's something that disagreeable to all, but often times when you cooperate and compromise you come out with things that are somewhat disagreeable, but also something that's workable.

A couple of other issues just very briefly. I noticed we have in our mail the legislation that we voted on last week approving Ms. McAndrew to the Human Resource's position. We voted on that prior to the date that we had asked her to submit In the letter that we sent to the resume. her, we asked her if she would submit the resume by December 5. She did so, but we had already voted to not approve that appointment. I hope there is something that we can do to rectify that situation and to show our approval of that appointment given the fact that her resume is rather impressive.

Also, I guess in addressing some other issues that have been ongoing, I guess if you say something often enough and loud enough people are going to think it's true, but that's not necessarily the case. have been speaking about Chief Davis over the course of the last couple of weeks. asked what the circumstances were concerning the windows that were in his house. fact, he put the windows in before a permit He went the next day, paid for was secured. a permit, and was treated as any other household owner and he paid for the permit and the two windows were that he replaced were taken care of.

Also, I was told that in his contracting business that he has never neglected to obtain permits for the work that he has done and that as a contractor his business is recognized by the city as one that does meet the standards and obtains permits in a timely fashion. I think that it's important that sometimes we get all of the facts before we start to denigrate somebody's reputation.

he has.

there's been complaints about Mr. Brazil at DPW. It's odd that the only place that I hear complaints about Mr. Brazil are here at council. In fact, in many cases Mr. Brazil has received a number of meritorious citations for his service to the city, and I doubt that there are any of you or anyone that works the number of hours that he does in service to this city. He is on call 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and over the course of his time at DPW I feel that he has done a commendable job and I would hope that the person who replaces him is as competent

As far as and the second one,

And the last thing, I don't want to be a defender of the University of Scranton and all, but we want to bring into question the University of Scranton and whether they pay their fair share or not. I'm not sure what their fair share would be, but the fact is that they are one of the -- they were one of the few tax exempt institutions that actually pays anything in lieu of taxes.

and performs the work in the manner in which

There are so many others that don't and yet we want to make an issue of the one institution that does. I find that ironic. And that's all. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: If I may just quickly before Councilman Rogan goes, I will say this, during the whole budget process I have been in contact with all department heads I've made an effort to contact. I have in constant contact with Mr. McGowan, whether it's been through phone or e-mail. I could probably open up my inbox and show you about 50 e-mails back and forth. I have also been in contact with PEL and DCED, so when we talk about cooperation, the mayor was copied on all e-mails that I ever sent out to any of these department heads.

When I called Mr. McGowan last week, I instructed him to tell the mayor that I wanted to speak with him and also I relayed my cell phone number to Mayor Doherty and the mayor never called me back. So while I do agree, yeah, there has to be cooperation, it has to be on both ends here.

And as far as DPW cuts, I know

Mr. McGoff you said you were against some of the cuts to the DPW, but all of the union cuts in the DPW were the cuts that you submitted to me, so I was wondering if you were just referring to other cuts?

MR. MCGOFF: Not all of them.

MR. JOYCE: Not all of them. Just the union cuts were the ones that you submitted to me, however, there were some other cuts through administrative workers that were made in addition to that.

MR. MCGOFF: I'm not going to argue with you.

MR. JOYCE: Right, I know, but I'm just saying that all of the union cuts that were made were essentially the cuts that you suggested. The other ones were other ones that other council members suggested.

That's all.

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

MR. ROGAN: I do now. I didn't plan on saying much tonight since most of my comments were going to be about the budget, but I guess I'll have to give my rebuttal to

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what most of Mr. McGoff said, by we'll start of with some of what we agree.

We both were in conversation with some of the realtors who are upset about the real estate transfer tax increasing, and the idea that was proposed, I believe it was the same one that proposed to both of us, was instead of decreasing the real estate transfer tax to 2.8 percent across the board was leaving it at 2.9 percent and dropping it to 2 percent for single family homes, which would make it easier for somebody going to buy a single family home or sell a single family home. I think it would be a great idea. It doesn't appear that it's legal. Over the next week I would be glad to work with you in any way we can to make that happen.

MR. JOYCE: Absolutely.

MR. ROGAN: And I think it's a win-win because the revenue actually would be according to the numbers that this person gave us would be almost identical to leaving it at 2.8 across the board because with having it at 2.9 for a business owners and

investment properties, we could get the increase income on that level, but with the single family homes it would bring it a little bit less, so it would average out to be about the same, so it would help people trying to purchase a home.

MS. EVANS: If I might suggest though, maybe you might want to research other cities and see if there is anyone, indeed, who does or follows that type of procedure because otherwise I think I can almost foresee some discrimination suits on this.

MR. ROGAN: Oh, absolutely and that's when I, you know, spoke to Mr. McGoff earlier before the meeting and it doesn't appear initially that it is legal, but if there is any way we can implement it, I think it would be a great idea.

Secondly, I'll move onto Mr. McGoff mentioned the refuse is collected efficiently or on-time actually, the question is whether it is done efficiently. You could have a thousand guys down at the DPW and if your garbage is picked up on time

every week people aren't going to realize how much money is being wasted, and that's the scenario we are in now.

We haven't had many complaints about garbage collection, it's not because they're under staffed, I believe they are over staffed. I firmly believe that if you cut DPW refuse, actually the cuts that I submitted to Mr. Joyce went much further than what was finally proposed, but it seemed that that was the consensus that everyone on the council came to as far as DPW goes.

I have to say the argument that the residents of Scranton are under taxed is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard at one of these meetings. The \$2 a week pitch sound like a bad infomercial that you would see on late night TV. That's exactly what it sounds like. It may only be -- the real estate portion of the taxes is only a small portion of what people pay. We pay the real estate tax, the wage tax, which is the one that kills working people in this city, and that's why so many people are leaving this

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

By leaving the City of Scranton, by leaving the City of Scranton to move to a community that has a 1 percent wage tax you get a 2.4 percent pay increase just by leaving the city and odds are the property taxes are lower. Odds are their garbage fee is lower. That's why people are choosing to leave Scranton, it's because of over That's the problem with the state taxation. government and the federal government. That's the problem with government in general is over taxation. Government can't manage the people's money as well as they can manage it themselves.

I firmly believe, I have always supported public safety, I always will when it can be supported. I don't believe for a second that if we put the police officers and the firefighters back in that Mayor Doherty would ultimately keep the positions there. We went through this last year.

Mayor Doherty slashed police and slashed fire. Just last year council put the positions back in, we cut some positions in the administration, what did the mayor do?

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

At the end of the year he laid off firemen, he laid off cops, but his buddies down at the DPW got to keep their job. If we go down that road with the mayor, I'm afraid that's what's going to happen again. Where we don't get the police and we don't get the fire and he keeps his cronies jobs. That's his track record.

If the mayor provided something in writing or went on TV and publically stated something then I think we can all sit down and talk to him, but until that point I don't see how that can happen. I don't trust that the mayor is going to implement this budget the way we want it implemented. If has the right, as unfortunate as it is, he has the right to hire and fire. Council can only appropriate funds. That's the bottom line. We can put in 1,000 firefighters and 1,000 cops. He doesn't have to fund them. That's what is so frustrating about this process.

You know, I do believe this budget was a cooperative effort between the administration and council. I'm not happy

1 0

with everything in it, and I don't think anyone in here is, but I think as a whole, you know, we did the best with a bad situation. The bottom line is once -- if this budget as is approved, and I'm sure there is going to be some changes and there is a lot of changes I think we would all like to see, you will still be paying less in taxes than the day myself and this council majority took office, and that's something that's very important to me.

And on one final note with the resume issue with Ms. McAndrew, I would apologize for not being more through, and I would definitely reconsider that vote. I wouldn't have a problem putting it up for a vote again and voting "yes".

And that is all I have. I will be working with my colleagues over the next week to put in my input on the budget. And I guess since everyone -- it seems to just that everyone is going put out their ultimate, I won't vote for it if this isn't in it, I won't vote for a proposal that increases taxes more than they were when we

2

3

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

took office, so that's the bottom line.

Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Councilman Loscombe, any comments or motions?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes, thank you. Again, like Mr. Rogan I was going to reserve my comments, but some questions were brought up to me this evening, so I would like to clarify my position. I was appointed by esteemed colleagues here two years ago, and I believe I was appointed based on my interview and my experience that was on my resume and then I was gratefully elected to a full term this past November. Just as you wouldn't put a plumber on a medical board, I believe that my colleagues put me in charge of the Public Safety Committee because of my experience as a retired captain on the fire department.

I have been asked by a few people and it's been brought to my attention, in this budget am I going to wear a council hat or the firemen's hat, and I have to tell you, folks, I'm wearing the husband's hat, the father's hat, the grandfather's hat, the

son's hat, and a council hat. It has nothing to do with the fact that I was a firefighter, if has to do with the fact that your safety is at risk.

Now, this council did not put your safety at risk, I happen to know. I know every member of this council has been working round the clock this past two weeks, trust me, because it's hard to get ahold of any of us because we are on the phone and going back and forth. It's not something where you can all sit together because of the Sunshine Act and stuff, but I'm glad they tabled it tonight because I still have some suggestions. You know, I think it's incumbent upon us to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public.

You know, morally and ethically I can't approve any budget that decimates our public safety, that's just a fact, and I believe we have some numbers and some ideas that would be able to, you know, I don't even know if it would be called adequately staffed that we have right now, but, you know, to not attempt to

put manning back in the budget is no excuse for us.

We did legislation last year, it was turned down by a visiting judge, but it is under appeal. There is no reason we can't budget for it and protect this money in the budget that it can only be used if manning wasn't put back in for overtime or whatever. I haven't spoken to the solicitor on that, but I do believe it's incumbent upon us not to follow suit with the mayor. I do believe he would be legally and liably responsible as much as he would. I touted from this board, from this dais week after week that I would be the first one to go into Court if we have a fatality over this situation.

If we don't do anything about it in our budget, I will be going to Court against myself in essence because I have to stand by my word. That's the hat I'm wearing. I do not think this city can be protected with 100 people.

And, you know, as far as taxes go, we are apologists for the county and the school district every time. Nobody ever

2

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

complains about the increases that they place on a property. I have an example here of a property in Scranton. This is a property where the land value is assessed at \$1,100 and the improvement is \$6,400, in the City of Scranton they assess differently on both, for a total annual tax bill of say \$1,350. The city portion of that \$229. The school board \$819 right now before any increase. County \$300 before their 38 percent increase. Yes, it is a hit, but in this particular case if the county tax increase is 38 percent that's an additional \$9.50 a month for that homeowner. If the school district, and maybe Mr. Joyce could correct me if I'm wrong, their increase is maximized at 2.1 percent unless they go to Court or something?

MR. JOYCE: Yes, I believe so.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Which would be an additional \$1.43 per month. At a maximum if our tax increase was 29 percent that's an additional \$5.50 a month for that typical homeowner, so combined you are looking at ten, 15 dollars a month. Yes, it is a big

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

chunk. It's a bug chunk, but most people spend more than that on a newspaper.

And I'm not -- believe me, I think we are overtaxed all over. I'm not looking to raise taxes I want to reduce them, and my colleagues here have been working hard to keep the taxes down and I do appreciate that, but what I'm trying to show you here is it's an insignificant amount. At what cost is a life, \$1? At 4.8 percent increase that same person is paying 92 cents a month At 10 percent they are paying 1.92. So, you know, for a buck or two a month, I think it was stated before, you do the math, a tax increase is forgotten next year. Mr. Rogan said he wouldn't want the taxes any higher than when he came in, we reduced them by 10 percent when we came last year.

Again, I don't want to see them go up. If we can reduce this 4.8 percent to zero with some found money I believe we should do it, but I still believe it is our duty to protect the people of this city, their lives. That's what their tax dollars are for.

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, Mrs. Franus, just you questioned me, I know you have a family member that lives by me, we have no fire hydrants up there, God forbid we have a fire up that area. There is nothing going to be left by the time the trucks get up to that area. And again, you know, I'm in a position again the hat I'm wearing is the hat as a caring council person, as a father, as a son of a mother who lives alone and I'm worried to death about her, and my grandchildren, and I think you know we are trying to work hard. We didn't create this We have authorities where they are hiring top dollar people who run these authorities at \$100,000 and we are getting rid of people that are saving our lives.

I know I'm preaching to the public here, but you understand this, but people have to get downstairs and let the mayor know what's going on here. You know, I stand by my colleagues here, but, you know, I can't in good conscience approve any budget that's not going to address our public safety. The administration hasn't

shown us a plan, nobody else has shown me a plan. We have a plan that we would like to work together and, you know, work on a budget with, and again, to do it without raising any taxes that would be great. But, you know, people I have spoken to feel the safety is a priority. They don't feel two or three dollars a month is a lot.

Go to your county meetings, go to your school board meetings. We are the ones that provide all your safety, your police, your fire, your garbage. What does the county provide you? A lot of people pay -- everybody pays school taxes but some of us don't have children in school. We are not the problem here, but we have been the apologists for your taxes for years, so take it to those boards and let us do what we are supposed to do and provide the public safety that you so deserve, and that's all I have to say.

MR. ROGAN: Mrs. Evans, if I could make one comment, and both Mr. McGoff and Mr. Loscombe make valid points on the issue of the property taxes, but when you look at

the taxes you have to look at the tax as a whole. When the instance that Mr. Loscombe used that resident would pay 229 for the city, 819 for the school and 300 for the county. Now, say that person makes \$30,000 a year, in wage tax they would pay \$320 into the city, \$300 to the school district, and zero to the county. Add in the garbage fee that's paid to the city, the city taxes are higher than the county taxes at the end of the day.

MS. EVANS: They are.

MR. LOSCOMBE: But we are not discussing the wage tax.

MR. ROGAN: Higher than the school board, I apologize.

MR. LOSCOMBE: We are discussing the property tax. That's what the increase is, not the wage tax.

MR. ROGAN: I understand that, but the people are also paying other taxes.

It's not just the property tax, to the county you just pay the property tax and a library fee, it's like a dollar, but to the school, the school is taking it -- the city

is taking it in in all different directions.

They are not only collecting property tax,

but also collecting an extremely oppressive

wage tax which kills the people in this

community.

MR. LOSCOMBE: There is no doubt.

MR. ROGAN: And the garbage fee.

MS. EVANS: And LST.

MR. ROGAN: They just keep piling on, but that's all, the only point I wanted to make.

MR. LOSCOMBE: The city is not a business it's a service and that's the way it should be looked at.

MR. ROGAN: It absolutely is a service, but the people can't afford it.

The people can't afford, you know, the abuse and waste that DPW and through the administration and, you know, each mayor coming in and hiring more people to take care of his friends, and it's not just Mayor Doherty, and I don't agree with Mayor Doherty, but this has been going on for decades. It's not something that was created overnight and it's not something

that's going to be solved overnight, but we need to reduce the size of government.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I'll have more comments next week.

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

MR. JOYCE: Yes, just a few.

Regarding the 2012 budget, one of the questions presented into the Scranton Times' article was the reduction of the real estate tax increase and I was speaking with Gerry Cross from over at PEL this morning and I explained to him how I got this figure and I just wanted to explain it.

PEL, Pennsylvania Economy League, suggested that we were increasing the line item by 7.5 percent. Last year in the budget it was 12998, 12.998 million, but from Ryan McGowan, our BA, in his last cash flow projection report he projects that we are going to collect \$13.15 million this year from real estate tax collections.

As per PEL's own figures, they project that we will receive an additional

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

21

\$200,000 above this year due to the acquisition of Mercy Hospital, what was formerly Mercy Hospital, a nonprofit, by Community Health Systems, a for profit So 13.15 million plus the \$200,000 company. is \$13.35 million.

\$647,600, which is the amount that council increased the real estate tax line item, is 4.8 percent higher than the \$13.35 That's where that calculation came from and I went over that with Gerry Cross this morning from the Pennsylvania Economy League.

In regards to the cuts in the DPW, while I do understand that reducing the staffing will place more of a strain on the department, every faction of city government whether it be fire, police, clerical or the administration is taking a cut in this In the words of the Mayor Doherty, budget. we will have to learn to do more with less. The DPW must adopt Mayor Doherty's philosophy and fall in line with the rest of the city. The DPW is not exempt from Mayor Doherty's philosophy.

In fact, as per Mr. McGowan, the original plan was to buyout DPW workers, and as he informed me if workers do not accept the buyout DPW employees would be laid off later in the year. He sent me that in an e-mail actually. Therefore, the staffing of the DPW if members were laid off later in the year would be near council's amendments.

In the buyout process, which I'm not very much in favor of, there are benefits such a cash payments or other benefits such as health insurance for life. I'm not in favor of benefits such as this.

To just give you a fact right here, we are paying out of our city budget seven to eight million dollars for health insurance benefits for retirees, and that's placing a huge strain on the taxpayers, especially when you account for all of the debt service that we are paying, so currently, as Mr. McGowan informed me, there is 638 retirees that we are paying health benefits for that were former employees of the city. This is nearly seven, eight million dollars, and this is the reason why

if you take a look at the budget our health insurance costs are between \$15 million a year to \$16 million a year.

Now, in the real world today you would hard pressed to find any business that offers health care for life to it's retirees in today's world.

Tonight, as I said before, I tabled the budget vote. I have some additional questions regarding unfunded prior year bills and unfunded debt. It seemed like Mr. McGowan made light of this in the newspaper, however, I will say that somehow borrowing \$6.7 million doesn't cover 2011 bills according to Mr. McGowan, but leasing the parking meters to the Parking Authority for \$6 million, which is a lesser amount, does. And that was quoted by Mayor Doherty in the November 16 Scranton Times' article.

I did attempt to contact Mr. McGowan today regarding these issues, we spoke a bit this morning about different revenue projections that I think some of the folks, I know Mr. Gervasi brought them to the podium and mentioned them, I was speaking to

Mr. McGowan about several of those things, however, Mr. McGowan has yet to provide me full concrete answers to all of my questions and I did try to call him about four times today, however, he didn't return any of my calls this afternoon, so the tabling of this budget has nothing to do with the cuts to the DPW, fire department, etcetera, but I just wanted to inform everybody else, as I stated before, I have also been working with Gerry Cross from PEL as well as Mat Domenez from DCED regarding our proposed amendments in the final preparations, and I wanted to give them both credit as they have been helpful.

And I also encourage my colleagues here on council to keep coming with suggestions and keep coming with feedback with things that they would like to see. I know Mr. Rogan brought up the realty transfer tax idea and that's very a noteworthy idea if it's something we can do and I would encourage you on correspondence, if there is any written correspondence, to copy our business administrator Ryan McGowan

as well as PEL because at the end of the day these are the people are going to set the numbers that would be put into the budget not a member from the Board of Realtors, though, I don't doubt that the Board of Realtors have incorrect projections, but we must be going by what the administration dictates to us as far as what our revenue figures are unless we have some sort of glaring info that tells us otherwise, and that's all for tonight.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Good evening. First, I would like to defer to Council Solicitor Boyd Hughes regarding the reinstatement of firefighters.

MR. HUGHES: Yes, Madam President.

I think as everyone is aware, if not we will make them aware now, last year when the mayor proposed his budget he cut a substantial number of firemen, I believe it was 28 and also 19 policemen from last year's budget. Council was very concerned about the public safety of that and as a result we drafted a manning ordinance that the fire department would have to have a

minimum staffing I believe it was 139, and that the police department would also have to have a minimum staffing I believe that was -- I don't know the exact number, but we passed that and we also put in the budget the funding for the minimum staffing that council established for the police and the fire department.

The mayor vetoed that budget, it came back to council, council overrode the mayor's veto, however, the mayor refused to implement and abide by the minimum staffing requirements as established by council. He underfunded or he undermanned both the police and the fire department, ended up laying off police and fire.

As a result, the police and fire union filed a mandamus action against the mayor, which I thought was a very good action, I really thought that they should have won that at the local court, however, Judge Thomson who was the judge, a retired judge from out of the area, decided the case and stated that the hiring, firing and discipline of police and firemen is solely

an executive decision and that the mayor did not have to abide by council's manning ordinance, and a result he was free as the executive of the City of Scranton to not fill those positions notwithstanding the fact that Scranton Council had established minimum staffing in both the police and firemen, in both and police and fire departments, and also had provided the funding of each of those positions.

As a result, there is an appeal pending before the Commonwealth Court.

Council feels very strongly about this.

They have authorized me to file an amicus curiae brief, it will due on January 3 along with the union's brief before the

Commonwealth Court. I don't know when the case -- the brief of the city will be due 20 days or 30 days after, which would be

February 2. The case will probably won't come up for argument I wouldn't think until April or May and we probably won't have a decision until sometime in the summer.

Regardless of what that decision is,

I would imagine that if the Commonwealth

10 11

9

13

12

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Court reverses Judge Thomson that the city will probably file a petition for allocatur for review by the Supreme Court. There is no automatic right of appeal to the Supreme Court. If the union losses it and if Judge Thomson's decision is affirmed I would assume that the union would file a petition for allocatur before the Supreme Court. Again, there is no guarantee, that would take time, sometimes if an appeal would be filed and say the decision came down on June 1, the petition would have to be filed for allocatur to the Supreme Court by the end of the June, and just to determine if the Supreme Court would even hear the case can sometimes take up to a year. There would be no -- and after that if they would accept it by the time the case is briefed and argued before the Supreme Court that could take another year at least.

As a result, right now what the law is that regardless of what council does in order to provide manning, to adopt another manning ordinance for the police and fire department or even without that to put

firemen and policemen back in the budget, you know, the mayor right now in accordance with the law has the right to not to abide by council's decision.

So, therefore, I mean, we know what the mayor's position is right now with the budget that he just submitted to council on November 14 was to layoff policemen and firemen, and as a result I think that the unanimous opinion of council would be to reinstate them if they could if the mayor would abide by it, but I think based on past practice and the way that the mayor has acted that no matter what council does that the mayor could use his prerogative, and also the law not to man the police and fire departments according to council's wishes.

That's where we are. That's the position, and I know that council is very disturbed over the fact that these cuts are made, and I know that Mr. Loscombe is very upset over the fact that there has been no studies of the reductions of the fire department or the police department to say that a fire department can function with the

manpower that the mayor has submitted in this year's budget.

I think any unilateral attempt by council to reintroduce a manning ordinance and to put positions back in it would be a fait accompli. I think that everybody knows what the mayor's position is that he'll say, "Council did it, but so what I don't have to abide about it because I have a Court decision."

Right now that's the law and if another mandamus action would be filed that would be cited as precedent that this is the law of case, this the law of Lackawanna County right now, and it's even though it's on appeal it is the law.

And, unfortunately, that's the situation that we are in and unless the mayor, and I think that council has tried to say that they would put the positions back in provided that the mayor would sign something in writing that he would abide by it, and he refused to do that, so as a result it's really be an exercise in futility for council on it's own to try to

do this based on the attitude of the mayor, what he has done in the budget, what he did with last year's manning ordinance, and what he has done, you know, overridden council's desire for public safety.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Next, I want to address Councilman McGoff's letter to us, his council colleagues in which he states, "Not reinstating the positions because of the belief that the mayor will not act accordingly is irresponsible on the part of city council. Council should do what is right and place the decision in the hands of the administration. Council should not act on assumptions and speculation. It should do what it knows to be the correct thing."

In the December 4 edition of the Sunday Times, Mayor Doherty made his intentions very clear, although, he never called any council member to discuss these cuts or inform them of his decision despite attempts to reach the mayor. Mr. Doherty stated he would give no guarantee in writing to relinquish his right to layoff employees should council restore funding to the

firefighter positions. He would also give
no written guarantee that he would apply for
a federal grant, though he said he intends
to do so.

Consequently, Mr. McGoff, it is you who is acting on assumption and speculation and behaving irresponsibly.

Also, the decision was already placed in the hands of the administration not once but twice. First, the decision to layoff firefighters was made by the mayor and placed in his 2012 proposed budget.

And second, he rendered his decision that he will not provide a written agreement to reinstate positions in the Scranton Times for every resident in Northeastern Pennsylvania to see.

Interestingly, last year in December 2011, this very same time, you would not vote to override the mayor's veto of the budget which fully reinstated police and fire positions, and you would not vote to approve the ordinances which set the number of police and fire for fiscal year 2011.

You said what council was doing was illegal

and you weren't going to be a party to it, 1 2 you weren't going to violate the law, and you were proved correct. The mayor not only 3 laid off the police and fire during 2011, 4 but also a Court of law decided that he has 5 6 the authority to do so. 7 MR. MCGOFF: Was that letter read 8 into the record on Saturday? 9 No, that was not. MS. EVANS: MR. MCGOFF: Okay. 10 11 MR. ROGAN: I apologize, Mr. McGoff. I know you asked me to read it, we all 12 13 donated our time to Councilman Joyce, and I 14 apologize I didn't inform you, but none of us spoke. 15 16 MR. MCGOFF: Well, then it really wasn't to be made public. I intended that 17 18 to be read into the record, if nobody spoke 19 then it wasn't supposed to be made public. 20 MS. EVANS: Well, it wasn't marked 21 MR. MCGOFF: 22 So thank you for the 23 confidentiality of that. 24 MS. EVANS: It wasn't marked not for 25 public release --

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: -- as your budget amendments were.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Let's see, so it looks
like in 2011 you were not morally obligated,
but now in 2012 you found your morals. And,
you know, in addition to that following a
Court decision you have grown bold and have
decided to violated the law. You want to
speculate and gamble to learn if the mayor
will retain firefighters in the 2012 budget
after you yourself stated at the council
meeting of November 29 in response to
Mrs. Rosky's question, and I quote, "The
mayor doesn't listen to anyone on council."

Thus, Mr. McGoff's letter to city council is nothing short of rhetorical fluff and an egregious example of grandstanding.

MR. MCGOFF: When I responded to Mrs. Rosky it was concerning whether he would attend a meeting.

MS. EVANS: No, that wasn't correct.

MR. MCGOFF: Yes, it was.

MS. EVANS: He publically chided his

colleagues last week --

MR. MCGOFF: If you are going to quote me at least make it in context.

MS. EVANS: He publically chided his colleagues last December at council meetings and in the newspaper for doing the very same thing he is doing now. This unprecedented about face doesn't pass the smell test or measure up to the standards of a logical individual.

Some council members are doing what we know is the correct thing, as suggested by Mr. McGoff, but I respectfully suggest that in this vital matter, Mr. McGoff is not one of them.

Councilman Loscombe would also like council to reinstate the fire department positions and is willing to take the risk that the mayor won't lay off firefighters again. He doesn't want to be blamed for a tragedy and term the cuts to the fire department criminal. I hope my respected and deeply concerned colleague was not accusing his fellow council members of criminal actions, and that he assigns the

blame and responsibility where it truly lies, with Mayor Doherty.

Jack Loscombe is my good friend and colleague and I ask him sincerely to consider the following questions: The mayor stated for the record that he would put city insurance out to bid in 2011, did it ever happen? The mayor signed legislation for a delinquent tax collector after Mr. Loscombe, Attorney Hughes and I worked out a new contract with that MRS, and then what did he do? Mayor Doherty substituted his own contract in place of council's lawfully adopted one for the firm signature.

This same man crossed his signature off on council legislation months after he signed it. Do you remember?

Do you recall the negotiations in 2010 in an empty Lackawanna County courtroom in which we all participated, except for Mr. McGoff, who voted against our legislation because he felt it was illegal. The mayor sued council for cutting government costs by \$700,000. Do you recall that even after council members returned to

the budget the mayor's people, as he likes to call them, the mayor abruptly called off negotiations and refused to settle the case?

Now he states that he will not provide any agreement to reinstate firefighters. This is the man you are gambling on. Do you understand the consequences if council approved of what you want to do? The firefighters would be cut from the budget while all other positions will be restored. The mayor will have the sizable extra monies from the fire department cuts to spend in any manner he desires.

The people's taxes will jump through the roof and many elderly and poor will lose their homes, and not to fire, but to banks and mortgage companies for nothing but wishful thinking, Jack. Those are also consequences which no council member would be able to live with.

Next, DPW union President Sam Vitris said the cuts to the DPW decimate public works adding that, "The appearance of this city is going to be terrible."

No division of the DPW has been decimated by council amendments because these sparse cuts were spread throughout the department. If the DPW lost 37 men, as has the fire department, then Mr. Vitris would have real cause for concern.

Further, the mayor has said we must do more with less and that government is not an employment agency. The people will get the government that they can afford, as Mr. Joyce said, and here in this I agree with the mayor.

Further, I don't know where

Mr. Vitris has been living, but the
appearance of some sections of this city
have been terrible for ten years. Ask the
taxpayers about overgrown abandoned lots,
scrub board roads, potholes, dirt, cinders,
litter and leaves citywide and trash cans
throughout into streets where garbage has
spilled on properties.

When I hear about the DPW many times it's a nightmare, from prostitutes to using city equipment for driver's tests and other personal nonwork related uses, to chronic

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

drug and alcohol problems, to failure to drug test properly. These occurrences give the DPW a black eye which is most unfair to those who work hard.

However, Mr. Vitris seems to be hinting to all of us that the DPW intends to perform less service because it lost some workers. If all of these the employees work eight hour days, however, the work will get done. On the other hand, if the worker's fail to timely collect garbage and recycling, plow snow properly this winter and repair police and fire vehicles more quickly, they may find the DPW privatized in the future. A private company will not allow much four or five hour work days and bloated overtime. People who desperately want to work will be very happy to have those jobs and work an eight-hour day.

Next, city council placed \$100,000 into it's professional services account for legal services. It is not the intention of council to use these monies, however, if Mayor Christopher Doherty ignores, alters or substitutes any legally adopted legislation

or removes his signature from council legislation, or violates the Home Rule Charter in 2012, he will find himself rapidly and frequently seated in the defendant's chair in the Lackawanna County Courthouse and that, too, however, must come with the vote of four council members.

While laboring on this budget to cut the mayor's tax hikes, I have been bullied, insulted, ignored and threatened by certain city employees, and that's fine, I'm not complaining because it comes from the position of council president whether or not such treatment is warranted. However, I will not be held hostage by Chris Doherty, his administration or any special interest groups. The mayor has his people, the unions have their responsibility to fight for their people, and I have the duty to serve all the people, and that's it.

MS. KRAKE: 5-B. APPROPRIATING FUNDS

FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE SCRANTON PARKING

AUTHORITY FOR THE PERIOD COMMENCING ON THE

FIRST DAY OF JANUARY, 2012 AND INCLUDING

DECEMBER 31, 2012 BY THE ADOPTION OF THE

SCRANTON PARKING AUTHORITY 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: Yeah.

MS. EVANS: Do we have a second? Well, then I would say --

MR. JOYCE: I'll second it.

MS. EVANS: On the question?

On the question,

I took a look at the Parking Authority budget and I'll tell you what, it's very vague at best. It looks like something that someone in a freshman accounting 101 class would put together, let alone someone who has a college education and has been very well-versed in putting together budgets, so I will be voting "no" until they submit a complete budget that also includes the salaries of all of the employees, benefits, and they have to be itemized here. They can't be in a list, say, salaries of

I want to know how much each person in this

employees, \$500,000 or whatever it may be.

authority is making, because I'll tell you what, the authorities and the authorities alone could be attributed to the layoff of fire and council's layoffs as well to DPW, some clerical worker, administration.

I'll tell you what, if they are going to say they want \$1.6 million from us, I'll tell you what, I want a heck of a lot more information from them.

So with that, I will be voting "no" and we will be requesting a revised budget from them with details and not just vague figures.

MS. EVANS: In addition to that, I know that Attorney Hughes addressed this I believe at last week's meeting, quite a number of financial documents were requested from Mr. Scopelliti, oh, probably about six weeks ago, he has never provided those, so I think it's not simply just a matter of providing a detailed budget in an appropriate manner, it's also a matter of transparency and turning over those financial documents that have been requested, and so until that happens I'm not

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going to approve this budget either nor am I going to approve -- even if for the first time in their history they provided a detailed appropriate budget, I will still not approve it until we receive the information that we have been requesting probably for the last two years.

Mr. Scopelliti will not come to a city council meeting, Mr. Scopelliti will not provide information, the Board of the Parking Authority will not appear before city council or answer questions as well, so I will be voting "no" and as far as I'm concerned that means -- oh, you know, we should add for those of you who don't recall, this budget should have been brought before council for many, many years, decades. That was never done until Solicitor Hughes found that information and for the first time last year we got their Granted, it's a -- it's not a budget. budget. I don't know what one could term It's two pages. Can you imagine if the City of Scranton presented a two-page budget?

Now, until they begin to comply there will be no budget for them and perhaps, as was discussed before, city council is going to have to start investigating what's going to happen with the Parking Authority, and as Mr. Joyce said, that \$1.6 million that they have their hand out for and not providing evidence of need for it, isn't going anywhere out of the 2012 budget. It's plugged in there, but it's not moving anywhere.

MR. ROGAN: I would also add, I was happy to let it die without a second, but since we have to talk about it now, I agree with what my colleagues said. You know, this budget it's laughable to call this a budget, I wish the people at home could see it. Its is extremely informal and it looks, like, pretty much like what --

MS. EVANS: A club would do.

MR. ROGAN: Yeah.

MS. EVANS: A high school club.

MR. ROGAN: A school club would do, right, and I think the suggestions that council members submitted to Mr. Joyce were

in better order than this and they were just suggestions, they weren't --

MR. JOYCE: True.

MR. ROGAN: -- a working document. You know, this is -- I really wish the people at home could see this, but it's basically if you had a two-page budget and one said salary \$30,000 and the next one said expenditures \$1.6 million, that's basically what this says, so I will be voting "no" as well.

MS. EVANS: Anyone else on the question?

MR. HUGHES: Madam President, I

don't if you want me to comment, but I don't

want to take up too much time, we have been

here long enough, but I did write

Mr. Scopelliti request of council's to put

\$1.6 million in the budget for the Scranton

Parking Authority because of it's proposed

deficit or anticipated deficit for the year

2012. I wrote him back, it's a two and a

half page letter, they refused and the

bonding company -- or put it this way, the

trustee, the Bank of New York, Mellon, I had

written to the trust officer in charge of the Scranton Parking Authority, I requested all types of documentation, the trust agreements, escrow agreements, requested what the balance of the funds were and various funds that they maintain. She told me that -- I wrote -- I received a letter back from her and she stated that she would not supply that information I was to get it from the Parking Authority.

As a result, Mr. Scopelliti wrote to council saying to include in this year's budget \$1.6 million for an anticipated shortfall of the Scranton Parking Authority which resulted in my letter, that was seven weeks ago. To date, I haven't even received, you know, any type of reply.

Included in that as Item No. 7, I set forth specifically what they must provide for the budget they were submitting to council, included a line item budget with comparisons to 2011 for the 2012 request, line items of managerial staff, union workers, so that the council would know exactly how many employees the Parking Authority has and what

their payments are, and to date we have received nothing. The letter was here, each council person received a copy of it back in October 27.

But, you know, just to put \$1.6 million in the budget for the Scranton Parking Authority is just like taking \$1.6 million and throwing it out on the street. You know, that's about what it would be without any documentation.

MS. EVANS: Exactly.

MR. HUGHES: That's all I have to say.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. These are people appointed by this mayor and yet this council is being asked to take the word of the mayor, just -- not even word, he didn't even give his word. Just trust it. Just trust it. And if a BA says, hey, do it, just trust it. The city is too far gone for that, ladies and gentlemen, way too far gone.

MR. HUGHES: I'll just state for the record one other thing that was set forth in the letter, there are two insurance

companies that the Scranton Parking
Authority has purchased insurance from, in
the event they do default on any of their
loans the insurance company has to pay first
and then they have other recourse that could
come. In that request for \$1.6 million they
didn't state which of the bonds issues were
in trouble being -- in trouble of being in
default. As a result, while they could be
in default, the Scranton Parking Authority
has to give notice to the bonding companies
three days before any payments are due on
interest and principal, the bonding company
will make that payment then they have

Part of the documentation I requested was copies of those insurance agreements so that we could review them to see exactly what recourse the bonding company would have in the event there is a default, and they refused to provide them.

various recourses.

MS. EVANS: Thank you very much.

Anyone else on the question? All those in favor of introduction signify by saying aye.

Opposed?

1 MR. MCGOFF: No. 2 MR. ROGAN: No. 3 MR. LOSCOMBE: No. 4 MR. JOYCE: No. MS. EVANS: No. The nos have it. 5 That isn't very often said, is it, ladies 6 7 and gentlemen? The nos have it and the 8 legislation dies. 9 MS. KRAKE: 5-C. AMENDING FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 52, 2010, AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED 10 "GENERAL CITY OPERATING BUDGET 2011" BY 11 12 TRANSFERRING \$14,300.00 FROM ACCOUNT NO. 13 01.401.13090.4299 (NON-DEPARTMENTAL 14 OPERATING EXPENSES - CONTINGENCY) \$4.000.00 TO ACCOUNT NO. 01.011.00071.4140 (POLICE 10% 15 16 EARLY RETIREMENT) AND \$10,300.00 TO ACCOUNT 17 NO. 01.011.00078.4140 (FIRE 10% EARLY 18 RETIREMENT) TO PROVIDE FUNDING TO COVER THE REMAINING COST FOR POLICE AND FIRE EARLY 19 RETIREMENT PAYMENTS THROUGH THE PERIOD 20 21 ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2011. 22 MS. EVANS: At this time I'll 23 entertain a motion that Item 5-C be 24 introduced into it's proper committee. 25 MR. ROGAN: So moved.

149
MR. JOYCE: Second.
MS. EVANS: On the question? All
those in favor of introduction signify by
saying aye.
MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
MR. ROGAN: Aye.
MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
MR. JOYCE: Aye.
MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
have it and so moved.
MS. KRAKE: 5-D. ACCEPTING A ONE
HUNDRED (100.00) DOLLAR DONATION FROM NEI
AMBULATORY SURGERY, INC. PRESENTED TO THE
CITY OF SCRANTON FIRE DEPARTMENT.
MS. EVANS: At this time I'll
entertain a motion that Item 5-D be
introduced into it's proper committee.
MR. ROGAN: So moved.
MR. JOYCE: Second.
MS. EVANS: On the question? All
those in favor of introduction signify by
saying aye.
MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
MR. ROGAN: Aye.
MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

1 MR. JOYCE: Aye. 2 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 3 have it and so moved. 4 MS. KRAKE: SIXTH ORDER. 6-A. READING BY TITLE - FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 59, 5 2011 - AN ORDINANCE- AMENDING FILE OF 6 COUNCIL NO. 74, 1993 (AS AMENDED), ENTITLED 7 8 THE ZONING ORDINANCE FOR THE CITY OF 9 SCRANTON, BY AMENDING SECTION 306 TABLE OF PERMITTED USES BY DISTRICT; SECTION 307 B.4. 10 TABLE OF LOT AND SETBACK REQUIREMENTS BY 11 12 DISTRICT: 601.A.5. MIXED-USED ADAPTIVE REUSE; TABLE 6.1 OFF STREET PARKING 13 14 REQUIREMENTS: SECTION 602.E. LOCATION OF PARKING. 15 16 MS. EVANS: You've heard reading by title of Item 6-A, what is your pleasure? 17 18 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-A 19 pass reading by title. 20 MR. JOYCE: Second. 21 MS. EVANS: On the question? All those in favor signify by saying aye. 22 23 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 24 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 25 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

1 MR. JOYCE: Aye. 2 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 3 have it and so moved. MS. KRAKE: 7-A has been tabled. 4 7-B. FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE 5 COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR ADOPTION-FILE OF 6 COUNCIL NO. 57, 2011- SALE OF TAX DELINQUENT 7 8 PROPERTY MORE COMMONLY KNOWN AS NORTH CAMERON AVENUE, TAX MAP NO. 14408-060-040, 9 SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, TO ROBERT J. 10 11 GAHWILER AND ELOISE A. GAHWILER, HIS WIFE, 12 526 NORTH CAMERON AVENUE, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, 18504, FOR THE CONSIDERATION 13 14 OF \$5,000.00. MS. EVANS: What is the 15 recommendation of the Chair for the 16 17 Committee on Finance? 18 MR. JOYCE: As Chairperson for the Committee on Finance, I recommend final 19 20 passage of Item 7-B. 21 MR. ROGAN: Second. 22 MS. EVANS: On the question? Ro11 23 call, please? 24 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff. 25 MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan. 1 2 MR. ROGAN: Yes. 3 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe. 4 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes. MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. 5 MR. JOYCE: Yes. 6 MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans. 7 8 MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare 9 Item 7-B legally and lawfully adopted. MS. KRAKE: 7-C. FOR CONSIDERATION 10 11 BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR ADOPTION-12 FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 58, 2011 - PROVIDING FOR THE PROPER OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF 13 14 SCRANTON TO PETITION THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LACKAWANNA COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, 15 FOR PERMISSION TO FUND UNFUNDED DEBT IN AN 16 17 AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED SIX MILLION SEVEN 18 HUNDRED THOUSAND (\$6,700,000.00) DOLLARS; AUTHORIZING INCIDENTAL ACTION; AND REPEALING 19 INCONSISTENT ORDINANCES. 20 21 MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to amend 22 Item 7-C as per the following, by adding a 23 new Section 6, as follows: Section 6: 24 funds in an amount up to \$6,700,000 to fund 25 the unfunded debt shall be deposited into a

1 special city account established in the 2012 2 budget to be determined to pay for the 2011 3 outstanding bills and the indebtedness as set forth in Section 2 above, and 4 5 renumbering Section 6 to 9 as Section 7 to 10. 6 7 MR. ROGAN: Second. 8 MS. EVANS: On the question? A11 9 those in favor of the motion to amend Item 10 7-C, as amended, signify by saying aye. 11 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 12 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 13 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 14 MR. JOYCE: Aye. MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? 15 The ayes 16 have it and so moved. 17 MR. JOYCE: I would like to makes a 18 motion to table Item 7-C. MR. ROGAN: 19 Second. 20 MS. EVANS: On the question? 21 MR. JOYCE: Yes. The reason I'm doing this is I would like this and the 22 23 budget to pass together, obviously this is a 24 part of the 2012 operating budget, and we 25 are talking about going with unfunded

borrowing versus the sale of the parking meters, which is currently in the 2012 operating budget, so just in case someone on council made decide that they would rather see the sale of the meters I just wanted them to both pass at the same date.

MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else on the question?

MR. MCGOFF: I think it's just that the time constraints for this that if the county started the process over a month ago and they are barely -- I think it was maybe today that it was accepted by someone, so --

MS. EVANS: They like us had a hold up because they didn't have an audit and the city doesn't have an audit, but --

MR. MCGOFF: I'm just saying that the longer that we prolong this the longer the process is going to take, and I understand Mr. Joyce's comments, but --

MR. JOYCE: Yes, I --

MS. EVANS: If I could just for one second, I spoke with Solicitor Hughes today about this very issue and he is very familiar with borrowing and bonds, etcetera,

and it is his opinion that this is not going to occur in December and the money will not be coming into the city in December, that this is something that's probably -- that's not going to be concluded until the beginning of next year and the money received until the early part of next year.

MR. ROGAN: I would add, I wouldn't even feel comfortable voting for this until after the veto vote, I'm assuming that a veto occurs. Assuming council passes an amendment, it goes down, the mayor vetoes it and it comes back to council, that veto is not overridden and the parking meters are sold then we are still --

MS. EVANS: You are right.

MR. ROGAN: -- borrowing the money.

I'm not giving the mayor a blank check for
\$6 million.

MS. EVANS: Right. Okay, I think that's a very good. Then we are table this until probably the first meeting of the new year.

MR. JOYCE: From what I understand from speaking with Mr. McGowan, it looks

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

like if we were to do this right now we would probably get the money late January, early February at best. That's kind of what we are looking at right Onow. There is a meeting tomorrow morning about loans and TANS and the various things, so --

MS. EVANS: No, I do agree with you, Mr. Rogan, that no further vote -- this will remain tabled until the override vote on the mayor's budget.

MR. HUGHES: Madam President, if I cop, I don't want to delay this meeting any longer, but that legislation was not sent to me until I think it was November 11. I was on vacation, I came bag on a Monday, came into the office on Tuesday it was there, I reviewed it. It was done as a resolution by the solicitor's office. In accordance with the Home Rule Charter, it has to be an ordinance. I redrafted it and got it onto council's agenda I believe at the next meeting, so that we have done everything within the time period. If we introduced it as it was drafted by the solicitor's office as a resolution it wouldn't have been valid,

__

because according to the Home Rule Charter to borrow money it has to be by an ordinance.

We have acted very timely on this thing, if there is any delay it's been caused by, you know, by the solicitor's office and by the administration to borrow the money.

MS. EVANS: But I also think, you know, I don't want to beat a dead horse here, but it is very important to wait until the override vote because if, in fact, it's the mayor's budget that passes then there will be no \$6.7 million borrowing and what will happen is that the parking meters will then go to the Scranton Parking Authority and the city has lost them and all of that revenue each year.

MR. ROGAN: If we voted to put this through they would have the parking meters and the mayor would have over \$6 million to build a park or something.

MS. EVANS: Right

MR. HUGHES: I would say this, that even though that would be in the budget on

the -- council could not override the mayor's veto, I do not see how the Parking Authority can borrow the \$6 million to buy the parking meters from the City of Scranton due to their financial condition without the City of Scranton guaranteeing that loan.

MS. EVANS: And the City of Scranton visa via city council I feel quite certain will not guarantee that.

MR. HUGHES: So this is one viscous circle. It's like a dog chasing his tail to put that in the budget, you know, was mere folly because it has to come back to council to approve the borrowing and guarantee the loan from the Parking Authority for the Parking Authority to get the money to buy the meters from the City of Scranton.

MS. EVANS: Exactly.

MR. HUGHES: And if they default you are going to be paying back on your own loan to sell the parking meters to the Parking Authority.

MS. EVANS: Right. Which is why council eliminated that from the mayor's proposed budget and instead put in the \$6.7

	158
1	million in borrowing, but now I don't know
2	that that's going to happen for the mayor,
3	so
4	MR. HUGHES: If that would happen,
5	it would be another \$6 million deficit
6	without council's approval.
7	MS. EVANS: That's right, but that
8	will be the mayor's budget and anyone who
9	approves it.
10	MR. HUGHES: Thank you. Good night.
11	MS. EVANS: Thank you. Roll call,
12	please. Or, no, not a roll call, we have a
13	motion. I'm sorry, motion to table. All
14	those in favor signify by saying aye.
15	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
16	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
17	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
18	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed?
19	MR. MCGOFF: No.
20	MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so
21	moved. If there is no further business,
22	I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
23	MR. JOYCE: Motion to adjourn.
24	MS. EVANS: This meeting is
25	adjourned.

.

CERTIFICATE

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER