	1
1	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
2	
3	
4	
5	HELD:
6	
7	Monday, December 12, 2011
8	
9	LOCATION:
10	Council Chambers
11	Scranton City Hall
12	340 North Washington Avenue
13	Scranton, Pennsylvania
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	CATUENE C NADDOZZI DDD AFFICIAL COURT DEDORTED
24	CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR – OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
25	

## CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL:

JANET EVANS, PRESIDENT

PAT ROGAN, VICE-PRESIDENT

ROBERT MCGOFF

FRANK JOYCE

JOHN LOSCOMBE

NANCY KRAKE, CITY CLERK

JAMIE MARCIANO, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

BOYD HUGHES, SOLICITOR

(Pledge of Allegiance recited and 1 moment of reflection observed.) 2 3 MS. EVANS: Roll call, please. MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff. 4 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 11 MR. JOYCE: Here. 12 MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans. 13 MS. EVANS: Here. Dispense with the 14 reading of the minutes. MS. KRAKE: THIRD ORDER. NO BUSINESS 15 16 AT THIS TIME. And also, no clerk's notes. 17 MS. EVANS: Thank you, Mrs. Krake. 18 I ask that all council speakers would adhere to the five-minute time limit and confine 19 20 their remarks to the budget amendments. 21 When the bell rings at the conclusion of 22 five minutes, please finish your sentence 23 and be seated. Also, I ask that audience 24 members turn off cell phones and remain 25 quiet throughout the meeting in order that

all may be heard. Personal conversations should be conducted outside council chambers.

Tonight's special meeting of
Scranton City Council is conducted for the
purpose of amending the mayor's 2012
proposed budget. Council will hold a public
hearing tomorrow at 6:00 p.m. regarding it's
amendments in compliance with the Home Rule
Charter. The regularly scheduled meeting
will follow at 6:30 p.m. during which city
council will cast it's final vote in Seventh
Order to legally and lawfully adopt the 2012
city operating budget as amended.

At this time, I ask Finance Chairman Frank Joyce to present council's final amendments to the mayor's proposed budget.
Citizens' participation will be conducted thereafter, followed by motions and the formal amending of the budget. Councilman Joyce, please begin.

MR. JOYCE: Okay, everybody. I'm going to start the 2012 budget amendments.

As you know, Saturday previous to this week I presented some amendments that would be

made and there have been some changes since that time, so I'm going to just go over a quick recap of where we were last time and I'm going to go over those changes. So, let's recap where we were, and I see part of the screen is cut off there if I could have one moment.

As everyone knows, on November 15
the administration submitted a budget to
council. The budget submitted proposed a 29
percent real estate tax increase, a 33
percent business BP and mercantile tax
increase, a 16 percent real estate transfer
tax increase, increased permit fees and
layoff of two positions. All members of
council didn't agree with the budget
submitted.

So, you know, what I did was I asked people to suggest amendments. All of my colleagues, I listened to all of the proposals that were offered up here, through speakers, and this is a combination of everything from the beginning process, the beginning point on November 15 until now.

Just to recap where we were, people

can't afford the budget that was sent to council. People already have high real estate taxes. Residents can't afford a high increase of this type. The real estate transfer tax under Mayor Doherty's proposal as the realtor's board had informed us would be the second highest real estate transfer tax in the state making it more difficult for people to buy and sell homes and high business privilege and mercantile taxes makes Scranton's small businesses suffer more.

So this year how did we get to where we are? The city will incur extra expenses this year in opposition from last year.

There is some major reasons as I highlighted last time: One, a default on the loan taken out by the SRA, Scranton Redevelopment

Authority, that will cost the city \$1.6 million. Luckily, this is a one-time expense. A projected deficit by the SPA, the Scranton Authority, that will cost the city \$1.6 million, an increased workers' compensation cost that will amount to nearly \$1.5 million.

So though there is other increased expenses, the major ones alone that I just mentioned amount to \$4.6 million, so the mission of these amendments, just to recap, was to soften the blow of the proposed tax increases and provide Scranton residents with the government that they can afford.

So the amendment highlights, the real estate tax increase will be decreased from 29.1 to 4.8. The realty transfer tax will be decreased from 2.9 to 2.8, and the business privilege and mercantile tax will be decreased -- the increase will be decreased from 33.to 16.7. There will be no changes to these measures and these amendments.

So how is this all possible? We did this in a number of ways. Administration positions, reduction non-DPW there were two. Administrative positions reductions in the DPW there were four. The elimination of DPW casual workers and some union positions reductions, 18 of those.

There are decreases in departmental expenditures. There is a new revenue

source, the parking tax, which is also part of PEL's Recovery Plan, that will be a tax on parking garages, and there is some other new revenue and savings opportunities that came into play over the course of the past week and a half.

The first I want to talk about is the nonresident tax, 888 funds. For those of you who don't know, individuals working in Scranton that live in the community that do not pay a wage tax are subject to a 1 percent tax on their pay. This was originally budgeted at \$100,000. As per business administration Ryan McGowan, he informed that this could be projected at \$500,000. This has also been confirmed by tax collector Bill Courtright.

There is also some issues that we didn't quite consider everything with, more nonresident tax may be realized due to the efforts of Burkheimer tax administrator who will be collecting taxes for us, the wage tax in 2011, since the amount is difficult to project no additional funds were added to this projection. Therefore, city council is

acting conservatively in this measure, so we may actually have more than \$500,000 coming in 888 funds, however, since this is the first time that we will be using Burkheimer to collect taxes, we couldn't make an accurate assessment between speaking with Mr. McGowan or anyone from the tax office as to how much Burkheimer will be able to bring in for us, but \$500,000 was the amount confirmed by Mr. McGowan and our tax collector.

A tax sale. Northeast Revenue Services will be collecting delinquent real estate taxes, and there will be a delinquent tax sale. NRS, they boast a collection of rate of over 80 percent, and they have informed us that we can expect to realize over \$200,000 in revenue from this tax sale, through Scranton may realize over \$200,000 they stated that it could be as high as \$300,000, an additional \$200,000 was budgeted just to be conservative. We don't want to go or put in a number that is too high and then end up falling short at the end of the year.

Refinancing earlier. I had the opportunity to meet with the banks as well as Councilman McGoff, Mayor Doherty and Business Administrator Ryan McGowan were present at this meeting, it was in regards to the TAN payment, and at that meeting with various bankers, Mayor Doherty confirmed that Scranton can save \$1.4 million by refinancing early. In the budget, it's pegged right now at \$5 million. By refinancing early, we would abate our April debt service payment, thus, this is the reason why we will save the \$1.4 million from the early refinancing of debt.

I also spoke to Gerry Cross from the Pennsylvania Economy League and he did state that the \$1.4 million figure was accurate.

Salary reductions, and this is primarily spearheaded by Councilman Rogan, salaries of all department heads outside of OECD, since they are federally funded, law, police and fire will be reduced by 10 percent, including council's office, from the 2011 budget.

Salaries of the fire and police

chief were based on system, 4 percent higher than the highest subordinate based on a 40-hour work week. The savings of this measure is projected to be approximately \$51,000 when you work out all the numbers.

Some additional savings, business administrator Ryan McGowan has informed that the city will apply for a retiree health care prescription savings grant. PEL also informed me that this was a savings that they had suggested two years ago. The city currently covers health care costs of 638 retirees, primarily most of these retirees are in the public safety sector from police and fire, I would say probably somewhere in the high four hundreds. Savings are projected to be \$600,000 as per Ryan McGowan, our business administrator.

So what is changed since the previous presentation. I have it titled, "Bills, bills, bills."

Currently in our general fund, as per Ryan McGowan, we have roughly \$3 million after our last payroll. From his cash flow projections he projects that we will realize

an extra \$3.3 million in revenue from the single tax office before the end of the year. When I spoke to him last week, he stated that we haven't received anything from the tax office in December thus far, and that in order to make an accurate assessment the only thing that we would be getting in right now is revenue from the tax office and it's roughly \$3.3 million when you analyze this cash flow report.

And I wanted to mention that Mayor Doherty stated at the meeting with the banks that both Councilman McGoff and I attended that the TAN would be paid by 12-31 in order to secure TANS for next year. The banks are also looking for other measures to secure TANS, such as a completed audit and a budget. Currently we owe \$6.55 million on our 2011 TAN.

So right now we need \$1 million to make our last payroll and \$6.55 million to pay our TAN and we only have \$6.3 million, so at this point the city will need to temporary dip into an additional fund and then pay it back in 2012. This is something

that has been done in the past and it's been done with the Workers' Compensation Trust in the past, however, it hasn't been revealed what fund may be dipped into, but the pay back of 2011 expenses must be accounted for in the 2012 budget. These are prior year obligations. It amounts to roughly \$1.2 million.

Mr. McGowan also projects the city will receive nearly \$1 million worth of bills in 2011 that we haven't received yet. In addition, the city is currently holding back on \$2.3 million worth of bills.

Mr. McGowan has also informed that we have received a \$500,000 bill from Municipal Energy Managers, our previous street light maintenance contractor. We may have to pay back HUD \$120,000 for previous possibly misuse of CDBG funds, which also is a prior year expense of 2012. And in 2011, the Scranton Redevelopment Authority defaulted on a loan to Pennstar Bank, which is a 2011 expense according to council solicitor, who I consulted with on this matter. I wanted to see DCED's view on

whether the default of the loan from HUD -or, sorry, the default of the loan interest
the SRA was, in fact, a 2011 expense and
they said that it would be best to consult
with your council solicitor, they didn't say
that it wasn't, and in looking through
everything instead of being a budget line
item we are going to include this in the
outstanding obligations rather than have it
as it's own separate line item in the
budget.

And, in fact, after speaking with Solicitor Hughes and looking back through my own paperwork, we received the notice of default on this loan which was taken out in December of 2007 all the way back in May, so it is, in fact, an expense, an unexpected expense from this year. All prior year obligations mentioned amount to approximately \$6.7 million, which is the amount of the unfunded debt proposed. The amount in the budget submitted by the administration was \$3.4 million with the Pennstar Bank being a separate line item, but we are taking that and putting it into

the prior year obligations rather than having it's own separate line item for it.

Extra savings measures and revenue enhancements will be used to pay the bills that were not in the administration's original budget.

The \$600,000 of money to be saved from the retiree health care grant fund will be used to fund 13 firefighters which will bring the compliment in the department to 115. Council has restored the funding for the fire positions in our amendments, however, the mayor must reinstate them. It is now up to him to make that decision, and that is the end.

MS. EVANS: Thank you very much, Councilman Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: You're welcome. Before I do leave, I do want to mention that there was one other reinstatement that I did not mention and that was of the accounts payable clerk in the business administration's office, as well as the reinstatement of tax office employees responsible for collecting the wage tax. They will be funded for the

3

5

6

7

4

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

first five months of the year.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: And that's all.

MS. EVANS: Mrs. Krake.

MS. KRAKE: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION.

MS. EVANS: Our first speaker tonight is Mary Ann Hayes. Mary Ann Hayes. Evidently, she is not in attendance so we can move onto Mr. Bob Bolus.

MR. BOLUS: Good evening, Council. Bob Bolus, Scranton. It's very impressive, Mr. Joyce, as to the time and energy you are putting into this budget. You know, some of the things that I find a little unsettling is that we have many, many opportunities to move forward in a lot of different areas to generate the keynote here is called revenue. Can't pay our bills without money and we have the assets, but it's how do we determine to use them wisely, whether you are a small business or a large business you still pay to the piper one way or the other, and, you know, you still have to have staff, people, utilities, and so on and so forth

and the same as the city.

You know, if people paid attention to the Sunday Times there is an article about the leachate gas going from the landfill that's being sold up in Archbald. That's a private operation. We should be collecting as a host community, because it is landfill related, a fee for that gas.

And what I would ask tonight some of the things I'm bringing out as you may your final determination and your budget, and maybe from other people here, is to put in amendments to your budget that you in the future can make changes to it if some of the issues or some of the profitable things that are out there are put in to help reduce the budget in the future as we go. If we get a million dollars somewhere, we take it back out of the budget, we could do certain things with it, pay other bills and do other advancements, so that was one of the issues is the gas line.

The second one is the leachate line that I have been speaking about for eight years. There were agreements in the past, I

don't where they disappeared to, but I think we need to make amendments to it as a host community. The Sewer Authority gets paid to service it, but we should get paid if allow it to run through our city as a pipe. There are millions of dollars sitting there and we need to do that. If we have to change classifications in the city, whatever we need to do now as we all saw tonight we have a serious financial problem in this city.

The next thing is, again, charge for your fire department and your police department, not a token amount of money.

Take your departments, categorize them independently as they were separate businesses and then turn around and charge the appropriate rate that a fire truck, a ladder truck, an engine or a bumper should charge and that's where you are going to go your revenue from. We are entitled to that. Why should we give KOZ's and nonprofits or somebody in an accident basically a free ride at our expense? We bought the fire trucks, we pay the people, we should be reimbursed for it so more than any other

business that would fix or repair a vehicle or tear a house down and repair it, so those are things that need to be in there.

I'd like to see, and I thought it was interesting in here with the tax changes for a tax sale, think about putting all of the vacant land up in the city, vacant land, abandoned buildings that the city owns, selling them at a public auction, with the stipulation that you must build within 60 days or start construction. If you don't, you forfeit what you paid for it to the city. You will generate hundreds of thousands of dollars and you will put property back on the tax roll. You don't need to a tax sale, you need creativity, and that's one of the ways to go ahead and look at it.

I don't think we should ever have a garbage fee increase in this city when we see the landfill making millions of dollars off the city in other areas, and I -- question, I don't know if I'm correct, but I don't know if the street lighting organization is a DeNaples' subsidiary or

has something to do with it, I'm not sure, I just heard rumors, and I would ask council to look into that, so before we start handing more out let's start looking at what we should be getting back in from the people that are actually making a heck of a profit here. We don't need to raise a garbage fee if we can't put a fee against every KOZ and nonprofit in this city, because that's basically taxation without representation.

I disagree with one of the things, if you have executives you don't pay them less than the subordinates underneath. I don't think that's fair. I don't think they should have to be held accountable or responsible for the subordinates that are making more money than them, and I disagree with that. I don't do it in my organizations and I know a lot of others that don't. I think Chief Duffy, quite frankly, has done one heck of a job.

There is a lot of other things, but
I would ask Mr. McGoff even tonight if he
would champion putting in a fee against the
University and everywhere else to make this

part of our future agenda to get our money. I heard Mr. McGoff's comments the other day that, you know, people spend money on McDonald's, this and that, and he has no problem with raising taxes. My question would be we don't get pensions and we don't get our benefits paid for it, and maybe in the financial position you are we have people on fixed incomes, and I think they have suffered enough in the city. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Bolus. Doug Miller.

MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council.

Doug Miller, Scranton. I will be fairly brief tonight, I just wanted to just take the time to come up here and take a few moments to personally thank our Finance Chair, Councilman Frank Joyce, for all of the time and effort that you did put into this budget making process. You know, besides Councilwoman Evans when she was Finance Chair, I can't recall any other Finance Chairman or Chairwomen that really put their time and effort into this in

putting a budget together and I want to commend you and your colleagues for doing so, the presentation tonight. Just once again showing your openness and your transparency that we really haven't seen around here in a long time, and I just want to thank you coming from one Scrantonian.

You know, but it unfortunate that we can't say the same about the mayor and his administration. You know, we take a look at a lot of the questions that we are still waiting for answers to that you have asked questions, you know, going months back, even years back, and we are still waiting for the 2010 audit and, obviously, I'm sure you had a tough time putting this budget together without that audit because there is a lot of question marks, and it's truly just discouraging that there can't be more cooperation from the mayor and his administration.

You know, if you take a look the real estate tax the mayor wanted to put us, you know, with a 29 percent tax increase, you know, you understood that in these tough

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

economic times that the residents can't take something like that on, as I've said. The business privilege tax, 33 percent down to 16.7. You know, you realize that, and you certainly took one heck of a burden off the businesses and the residents of this city and I want to commend you for that as well.

You know, DPW, Mr. Rogan, I know this has been one of your main issues and I agree we had to cut some fat in that Obviously, I'm sure that you department. would admit, you know, there is obviously a lot more we wish we could do here, but we are a dealing with difficult circumstances, obviously, and not having that audit causes a lot of problems. You know, public safety, 13 firemen right now that's in the mayor's hands. As I have said, he has had the resources for years with these SAFER grants and all of the other grants out there. avoid all of this, as I have said, so now it's in his hands. You know, as I said last week, that wasn't a situation where council should have been pinned in a corner because you had nothing to with this. As I have

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

said, we could have avoided this ten years ago had he be willing to sit down at that table and negotiate.

And at this point in time I'll reserve most of my comments, the remainder of them, for tomorrow evening's meeting, but I did want to just briefly respond to just one of comments that were made were last week by Mr. McGoff, and it was in reference to the taxes, and I just truly have to say that I was truly appalled by the statement I heard last week from that audience. Ιn fact, I actually had asked myself if I was even hearing what I was actually hearing from these speakers here, and that was that basically you were implying, Mr. McGoff that the residents were under taxed, and I just truly was puzzled by a statement by that and your analogy of 75 percent of the residents in this city only paying \$500,000 a year and it would only be an additional \$100 or \$2 a week and the residents spend more on lottery tickets and I believe you said cable TV, and I just was insulted by that statement, and I know a lot of the residents in this city

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

were insulted by that statement.

MR. MCGOFF: Were the numbers wrong?

MR. MILLER: Excuse me, and a lot of the residents were insulted by that statement and I just feel that you mislead the public last week, and I think you owe the residents of this city an apology because, you know, it's the smoke and mirrors and the misleading that we have had in this town for ten years, and when you leave out the wage tax, the city, the county, you know, Mrs. Evans, like you've said, maybe 1 percent of the population in this city could take something like that on, but I don't know what town you think you are living in, Mr. McGoff, but we are in a town that's in poverty. I mean, you say that to a senior living on a fixed income.

You know, say that to the family with a mom and dad working two or three jobs just to get by, struggle to put food on their table for their kids at night. You know, tell that to the young adult coming out of college with student loans and can't find employment. You know, it was totally

uncalled for, it was misleading, misrepresentation, and I truly believe you owe all of the residents in this city an apology for that, and I thank you and I'll reserve the rest of my comments for tomorrow evening's meeting. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

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

MR. JACKOWITZ: Bill Jackowitz,
South Scranton resident. First question I
know the answer but I'm going to ask the
question anyway, have we received the 2010
audit yet?

MS. EVANS: No.

MR. JOYCE: No. I will say this much, at the meeting with the banks the administration did inform that the audit is close to being completed, so hopefully it will completed sooner than later.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Does anybody have a logical explanation as to why they have not received the audit? The mayor promised us the audit what, a month, month and a half ago? It's due on the 31st of May, so has

anyone received a logical answer or solution as to why we do not have the 2010 audit?

MR. MCGOFF: All of the information was unavailable -- was not available.

MR. JACKOWITZ: How can it not be available? He has had an entire year.

MR. JOYCE: I know that was some --

MR. JACKOWITZ: Don't we have a bookkeeping system within the city?

MR. MCGOFF: Some of the information was unavailable to the city.

MR. JACKOWITZ: I don't buy that,
Mr. McGoff. That's up to you, if you want
to buy that explanation go right ahead and
buy it. I'm not buying it.

MR. JOYCE: There was some information that was unavailable. There was some info from NCC that we were waiting for, however, that wasn't the only thing that we were waiting for. There has been some information that wasn't submitted before the due date as specified by Rossi & Rossi, however, the statement that Mr. McGoff made it is correct in a sense that we were waiting on information from NCC, however, we

2

4

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

were also waiting on other information throughout the duration, and it's my understanding that that information is now submitted, however, we are still waiting for the final audit.

MS. EVANS: But you can track through the reports submitted to city council to the mayor, well, possibly the business administrator by Rossi & Company that the same requests were made over and over and over again beginning back in April of 2011, and for whatever reasons there were a myriad of categories that were held up until very, very recently, and I think now that maybe the banks, the banking community has informed the administration that they want an audit in order to award TANS, maybe now the administration will take it seriously. They did not take Rossi seriously, they did not take council seriously and, unfortunately, the Home Rule Charter has no consequences within it for failure to meet the deadline for the audit for the administration.

MR. JACKOWITZ: I understand that

23

24

25

and I don't know, maybe I'll silly, but I actually believe that people should obey the law and abide by the law and the law is very specific that the audit should be submitted by the end of -- you know the end of May of every year, and I also feel that if they could not have submitted that audit on time then council and the citizens or residents should have been kept updated as to the reason why. You know, I still don't know the reasons why the audit has not been submitted by 31 May. No one has given me a logical explanation except that some of the information is not available. Basically if it's not available then we need to really get on the backs of our business administrator and our section heads and make sure that the audit is done. If they are not capable of doing their job then they shouldn't be doing the job anymore, they should be fired, and we should hire people that are capable of doing the job.

I don't buy -- I work in an areas where audits are required and I tell you what, if we don't have our audit in on time

we are in big trouble. Big trouble. And now we have an audit that's affecting the entire -- all of the residents of Scranton and we are being told that all of the information isn't in. I'm not buying that. I'm not buying that at all. It needs to be done and it needs to be done properly, otherwise, get rid of the people who are in those positions and hire people who are capable of doing their jobs and abiding by the law. I mean, that's the main thing, the law is being violated and broken.

But anyway, did I understand correctly that in your amendments you guys are proposing, and I know you can't do this, but you are proposing that you put 15 firefighters back on the job? Did I understand that correctly?

MR. JOYCE: It was 13.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Thirteen, excuse me.

MR. JOYCE: We added the funding back into the budget, we added the correct amount of salaries and uniform allowances, health insurance deductions and whatnot into the correct accounts, it's now up to the

1 mayor to honor that request by us and put those firefighters back into the city. 2 3 MR. JACKOWITZ: So, in other words, city council has done everything that they 4 5 can possibly do and now the ball is in the mayor's court, is that --6 7 MR. JOYCE: Correct. 8 MR. JACKOWITZ: Am I understanding 9 that correctly? MS. EVANS: 10 Yes. MR. JOYCE: 11 Yes. 12 MR. JACKOWITZ: And, you know, 13 basically the supermajority of the council 14 has managed to find themselves right in the middle of everything again. I really -- you 15 16 know, I don't know what to say. You guys 17 are caught in the middle and I hope you do 18 the -- you know, I know you will, you are 19 doing the best that you can possibly do and 20 I know the majority of the citizens 21 appreciate that. 22 As far as Scranton residents being 23 under taxed, that's the biggest hogwash I 24 have ever heard in a long time. People 25 should go out to the farm and feed the hogs

with that information because that's nothing but BS, you know? I mean, you know, my wage tax is over \$3,000 a year. That's just my wage tax, so I really wish that people would take that into consideration. You know, school tax, wage tax, county tax, everything, it's ridiculous that we are under taxed. I mean, as far as people going to Mohegan Sun and buying lottery tickets, if they go to work and they earn their money if they want to go to Mohegan Sun, if they want to buy lottery tickets, let them go to Mohegan Sun and by lottery tickets, but don't -- the government shouldn't take their money from them.

I mean, some people go to Ireland in the summer on summer vacation. They can afford to go to Ireland. Maybe they shouldn't go to Ireland if people can't buy lottery tickets and go to Mohegan Sun. I don't know, just my opinion and my opinion only. Scranton residents are not under taxed. We have the highest unemployment rate, we have the lowest median salary, we have the highest wage tax in the area for a

city this size and we are being reprimanded saying that we are under taxed.

Unbelievable.

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

MS. KRAKE: FIFTH ORDER. 5-B.

MOTIONS.

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

MR. MCGOFF: Please, just very quickly. As far as under taxed, I don't believe that I ever used that word. That was something that my colleagues used. I never said anything about anyone being under taxed.

Secondly, as far as anyone being appalled, the numbers that I presented were correct. If anyone wishes to argue the numbers then they're wrong. What I said was absolutely correct in terms of numbers, so there is absolutely no reason for anyone to be appalled. The numbers are correct, and I never said anything -- I never used the word under taxed.

As far as the budget amendments that

were presented, I'll perhaps just hold comments until they are actually presented for a vote. Thank you.

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

MR. ROGAN: Yes, very briefly. I will also hold the majority of my comments on the amendments for the vote, but as Mr. McGoff said the numbers he presented regarding the property tax are correct, but what Mr. McGoff did do was omit the wage tax, the garbage tax, the county tax, the school tax, and the right to work tax, so by just singling out one tax you don't really get the full picture of the tax burden that's on the average Scrantonian, and that was the point I was trying to make.

And I will hold the rest of my comments for the vote. Thank you.

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

MR. LOSCOMBE: Well, the only comments I have are basically, again, I commend my colleagues for all of their hard

25

1

work on this budget, I know it's been time consuming, you can see all of the work Mr. Joyce has put into it and I, too, think I discussed some property taxes last week and the reason I was discussing the taxes was not to say we could pay more or we should pay more or anything like that, I was -- the only reason I discussed the property taxes was to try to show that we have to go after the county and we have to go after the school district. They are the ones that are raising the taxes on a regular basis and we are providing public services, so if anyone thought I was looking to discuss increasing any taxes that's incorrect. I think I stated it then, but that wasn't the case, I was just trying to show a comparison that the city is a smaller piece of the pie as far as property taxes go, and, you know, I would hope that these other bodies would tighten up and start to, you know, give the public a shot and reduce their taxes, but it's up to us as the public to go to them and discuss those issues with them.

And I will have -- I'll probably wait until tomorrow evening to discuss under comments my feelings on the budget and for the sake of the brevity that's all I have tonight. Thank you.

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

MR. JOYCE: Yes, I am going to actually be brief tonight because I did most of my speaking earlier, one thing I wanted to mention is it was an idea of Wayne Evans, vice-president of the Board of Realtors, and I know we proposed, Mr. Rogan and Mr. McGoff mentioned having a realty transfer tax for single family homes at 2 percent and having it at 2.9 percent for commercial transfers.

Now, I know from speaking to

Mr. Rogan, I reached out to Mr. Rogan and

Mr. McGoff and I know that in speaking with

them it was discovered that there were some

discrimination issues with doing that

though, I do thank Mr. Evans for his idea

and it would have been a very good idea if

it was something that we could do. The only

1 thing that we were able to do within our 2 limits in order to keep taxes down was lower 3 the realty transfer tax by a bit. Other than that. I have two motions 4 5 I am going to make tonight and the first is 6 I hereby make a motion to encouraging Mayor 7 Doherty to reinstate fire positions as per 8 the 2012 operating budget as amended, if 9 passed, whereas funding has been restored to 10 the proper expense accounts in the Scranton 11 Fire Department for the restoration of 13 firefighters. 12 13 MS. EVANS: We have a motion on the 14 floor, do we have a second? MR. LOSCOMBE: Second. 15 16 MS. EVANS: On the question? A11 17 those in favor signify by saying aye. 18 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 19 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 20 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 21 MR. JOYCE: Aye. 22 MS. EVANS: Ave. Opposed? The ayes 23 have it and so moved. 24 MR. JOYCE: And the second motion 25 that I am making tonight, I make a motion

that it is council's desire for the administration to apply for a SAFER grant to fund any additional fire salaries above the 13 budgeted for and that any grant money received be applied to restore fire positions as per Exhibit A, and if my colleagues would like to turn the page, there is an analysis of the 29 firefighters that were laid off in the 2012 budget that was sent down, and you could see a breakdown of the cost that the city would incur to add all of those positions back based on their salaries, health insurance payments, life and disability insurance payments, uniform allowance, longevity pay and, of course, the amount deducted that was budgeted for unemployment which is 16.48 percent as per our business administrator, Ryan McGowan. That's all.

MR. ROGAN: Second.

MS. EVANS: On the question? A11 those in favor signify by saying aye.

> MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

MR. ROGAN: Aye.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.

23

20

21

22

24

25

•

MR. JOYCE: Aye.

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

 $\label{eq:MR.JOYCE: And that's all I have} % \begin{center} \begin{center} MR. JOYCE: And that's all I have for tonight. \end{center}$ 

MS. EVANS: Thank you, Councilman
Joyce. Good evening. Mayor Doherty handed
this council a devastating budget containing
a 29 percent tax increase, the sale of the
parking meters to a struggling Scranton
Parking Authority, the elimination of 29
firefighters and his four major financial
messes, a 2011 \$6.7 million deficit, an OECD
debt for ineligible funding, an SRA debt to
Pennstar Bank for uncollected delinquent
taxes, and SPA bond payments to prevent it's
financial collapse, all four of which amount
to approximately \$10 million.

Further, the mayor's budget failed to include an additional \$3.4 million in 2011 unpaid debt. In response, city council lowered the tax increase from 29.1 percent to 4.8 percent and eliminated the sale or lease of city-owned parking meters to the SPA by including \$6.7 million in borrowing

for 2011 unfunded debt.

In addition, city council takes the people's public safety and welfare very seriously. As a result, council included \$600,000 in the budget from a prescription health care savings grant for which Mayor Doherty intends to apply in order to fund the reinstatement of 13 firefighters.

However, council did not include the positions in it's amendments. It will be the mayor's decision to reinstate these 13 positions because council cannot violate law, it can only provide the funding.

City council also cleaned up each of the four Doherty messes by agreeing to borrow \$6.7 for 2011 unfunded debt, included \$120,000 in the budget to repay OECD's debt to the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development or HUD. Hire Northeast Revenue Service to collect tax delinquencies and retained \$1.6 million in the 2012 budget for the SRA's debt and placed \$1.6 million into the contingency account for the Scranton Parking Authority for use only if undisputably necessary and with council's

approval.

Further, 2011 unpaid bills such as those for the \$500,000 service of MEM are funded in council's amendments.

Councilman Joyce conferred frequently with the business administrator and PEL and DCED representatives and contacted department heads while I spoke with the tax collector and Northeast Revenue Services in the development of financial projections for debt refinancing, 888 collections, delinquent tax, health care and unpaid 2011 bills, among others.

Additionally, city council lowered administrative salaries and within the DPW it eliminated four administrators, that would be two foremen, a parks and recreation specialist, and the deputy director of the DPW, nine union positions and seven casual workers. Mayor Doherty intended to eliminate ten union positions through buyouts. Council cut the buyouts.

It is noteworthy that when the mayor announced that the DPW cuts -- or, excuse me, that when the mayor announced the DPW

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

cuts and buyouts, the DPW never made statements that garbage collections, plowing and pothole repair would suffer, the only statements were made by DPW president Sam Vitris who commented in the newspaper that if cuts were going to be made he hoped there who be retirement incentives.

Now that council eliminated the incentives or buyouts, suddenly the DPW states on two local news stations that it won't get its work done. It should also be noted that in the last ten years while the police, fire and clerical unions sustained numerous job cuts, the DPW remained In fact, if 2011 the mayor untouched. reinstated four DPW supervisors to the budget claiming the city would suffer without those positions, however, two of those supervisory positions were already eliminated by the mayor in the second half of 2012, and the DPW appears to have successfully survived.

Our city is in a financial crisis, and as the mayor said, we must do more with less. Throughout this budget process it has

1	become increasingly clear that Scranton City
2	Council is the responsible branch of the
3	city government. We have done all that is
4	financially realistic, prudent, and possible
5	within our legal scope of authority to help
6	taxpayers and businesses and to chart a more
7	sound financial course for fiscal year 2012,
8	and that's it.
9	MS. KRAKE: 5-B. NO BUSINESS AT
10	THIS TIME. SIXTH ORDER. NO BUSINESS AT
11	THIS TIME.
12	MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to amend
13	Item 7-A as per the following amendments:
14	Reducing the following
15	expenditures
16	MS. KRAKE: Mrs. Evans, may I
17	interrupt for a moment
18	MR. MCGOFF: He has to take it off
19	the table.
20	MS. EVANS: Yes. You have to take
21	the motion off the table first.
22	MR. JOYCE: You have to make a
23	motion to take it off the table.
24	MS. EVANS: Yes.
25	MR. JOYCE: Okay, I make a motion to

take File of Council No. 56, 2011, from the 1 2 table and place it into Seventh Order. 3 MR. ROGAN: Second. MS. EVANS: On the question? All 4 5 those in favor signify by saying aye. MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 6 7 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 8 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 9 MR. JOYCE: Aye. 10 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and so moved. 11 12 MS. KRAKE: SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. FOR 13 CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE -14 FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 56-2011, PREVIOUSLY TABLED, APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR 15 THE EXPENSES OF CITY GOVERNMENT FOR THE 16 17 PERIOD COMMENCING ON THE 1ST DAY OF JANUARY 18 2012, TO AND INCLUDING DECEMBER 31, 2011, BY THE ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL CITY OPERATING 19 BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2012. 20 21 MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to amend 22 Item 7-A as per the following amendments, 23 and please bear with me, this will take a 24 little while. Reducing the following 25 expenditures:

1	Account No. 01.010.00000.4270, Dues
2	and Subscriptions, \$200.00.
3	01.010.00000.4420, Travel and
4	Lodging, \$225.86.00.
5	01.020.00000.4070, Longevity Salary,
6	\$1,578.00.
7	01.040.00000.4010, Standard Salary,
8	\$37,740.00.
9	01.040.00000.4116, Health insurance
10	Clerical Union, minus \$116,307.28.
11	01.040.00000.4117, Health Insurance
12	Non-union, minus \$87,153.64.
13	01.040.00000.4190, Umemployment
14	Insurance, minus \$275,604.57.
15	01.040.00040.4270, Dues and
16	Subscriptions, minus \$20,000.00.
17	01.040.00041.4010, Standard Salary,
18	minus \$4,00.00.
19	01.040.00041.4201, Profession
20	Services, minus \$20,000.00.
21	01.040.00042.4010, Standard Salary,
22	minus \$4,400.00.
23	01.040.00042.4440, Telephone,
24	\$27,000.00.
25	01.040.00043.4010, Standard Salary,

	<b> </b>
1	\$3,840.00.
2	01.051.00051.4010, Standard Salary,
3	minus \$77,392,00.
4	01.051.00051.4070, Longevity Pay,
5	minus \$3,156.00.
6	01.051.00051.4101, Uniform
7	Allowance, \$666.67.
8	01.051.00082.4201, Professional
9	Services, \$60,000.00.
10	01.051.00082.4320, Building Repair
11	Supply, \$27,000.00.
12	01.060.00000.4010, Standard Salary,
13	minus \$13,500.00.
14	01.060.00000.4040, Other Salary,
15	\$701.20.
16	01.060.00000.4201, Professional
17	Services, minus \$15,000.00.
18	01.060.00000.4270, Dues and
19	Subscriptions, minus \$1,300.00.
20	01.060.00000.4420, Travel and
21	Lodging, \$500.00.
22	01.011.00071.4010, Standard Salary,
23	\$3,211.13.
24	01.011.00071.4112, Health Insurance,
25	minus \$222,884.28.

1	01.011.00071.4013, Health Insurance,
2	minus \$63,537.92.
3	01.080.00080.4010, Standard Salary,
4	minus \$44,875.00.
5	01.080.00070.4118, Health Insurance,
6	DPW, \$168,117.60.
7	01.080.00080.4420, Travel and
8	Lodging, minus \$250.00.
9	01.080.00080.6020, DPW Buyout
10	Incentive, minus \$100,000.00.
11	01.080.00081.4550, Capital
12	Expenditures, minus \$175,000.00.
13	01.080.00083.4010, Standard Salary,
14	minus \$154,140.88.
15	01.080.00083.4040, Other Salary,
16	minus \$40,000.00.
17	01.080.00083.4070, Longevity Salary,
18	minus \$4,734.00.
19	01.080.00083.4101, Uniform
20	Allowance, minus \$1,185.00.
21	01.080.00084.4010, Standard Salary,
22	minus \$152,437.05.
23	01.080.00084.4070, Longevity Salary,
24	minus \$4,734.00.
25	01.080.00084.4101, Uniform

1	Allowance, minus \$1,185.00.
2	01.080.00085.4010, Standard Salary,
3	minus \$40,469.45.
4	01.080.00085.4070, Longevity salary,
5	minus \$1,578.00.
6	01.080.00085.4101, Uniform
7	Allowance, minus \$357,50.
8	01.100.00000.4010, Standard Salary,
9	minus \$111,864.16.
10	01.100.00000.4040, Other Salary,
11	minus \$145,493.50.
12	01.100.00000.4070, Longevity Salary,
13	\$3,156.00.
14	01.100.00000.4101, Uniform
15	Allowance, minus \$790.00.
16	01.401.15318.4299, Debt Service, SRA
17	Pennstar, \$1,600,000.00.
18	01.401.15319.4299, Debt Service,
19	Parking Authority, minus \$400,000.00.
20	01.401.15322.4299, Debt Service,
21	Issue, Cost of Meters minus \$175,000.00.
22	01.401.15321.4299, Debt Service,
23	Refinance Saving, minus \$1,400,00.00.
24	Increasing the following
25	expenditures:

1	01.020.00000.4010, Standard Salary,
2	\$9,937.22.
3	01.020.00000.4201, Professional
4	Services, \$100,000.00.
5	01.040.00040.6002, SPA Citation
6	Issuers, \$562,234.80.
7	01.011.00071.4010, Standard Salary -
8	Fire, \$809,424.44.
9	01.011.00071.4070, Longevity Salary,
10	\$65,000.00.
11	01.011.00071.4101, Uniform
12	Allowance, \$9,396.32.
13	01.011.00071.4120, Life/Disability
14	Insurance, \$18,862.74.
15	01.090.00000.4010, Standard Salary,
16	\$191,562.10.
17	01.090.00000.4119, Health Insurance
18	- Single Tax Office, \$143,788.33.
19	Account No. TBD - Debt Service -
20	2011 Unfunded Debt Loan - \$721,538.00.
21	01.401.13090.4299, contingency,
22	\$1,200,000.00.
23	01.401.16090.4299, Accrual -
24	Outstanding Prior Year - \$3,363,013.09.
25	Reducing the following revenues:

1	01.301.30100, Current Real Estate
2	Tax, minus \$2,212,986.00.
3	01.310.31100, Real Estate Transfer
4	Tax, minus \$155,173.00.
5	01.310.31160, Mercantile Tax, minus
6	\$157,723.50.
7	01.310.31290, Business Privilege
8	Tax, minus \$76,625.00.
9	01.380.38040, Sale of Meters,
10	\$6,000,000.00.
11	01.301.30120, Delinquent Real Estate
12	Tax actually, this is an increase now in
13	everything I read or to the following
14	revenues.
15	Delinquent Real Estate Tax,
16	\$200,000.00.
17	Account No. TBD, Non-Resident Tax
18	(888 Funds), \$400,000.00.
19	Account No. TBD, Parking Tax,
20	\$500,000.00.
21	01.320.23430, Housing Rental
22	Licenses, \$60,000.00.
23	01.331.33118, Parking Tickets -
24	Yellow, \$700,000.00.
25	01.331.33145, Parking Meter Permits,

1 \$25,000.00. 2 01.360.36010, Parking Meters, 3 \$1,400,000.00. 4 Account No. TBD, Unfunded Debt Loan (2011 Bills, \$6,700,000.00. 5 And that's all. 6 MS. EVANS: A motion has been made 7 8 to amend Item 7-A, is there a second? 9 MR. ROGAN: Second. 10 MS. EVANS: On the question? 11 MR. JOYCE: I'll just say for the 12 record that all of the amendments and account numbers that I just read off 13 14 basically reflect everything that I presented in the Power Point presentation 15 16 earlier tonight and the other Saturday. 17 MR. LOSCOMBE: Makes you want to say 18 0h, oh. 19 MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else on the motion? All those in favor of the 20 21 motion to amend Item 7-A signify by saying 22 aye. 23 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 24 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 25 MR. JOYCE: Aye.

1	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
2	have it and so moved.
3	(Mr. McGoff was not at the dais for
4	the vote.)
5	MR. JOYCE: I would like to make a
6	motion to Table Item 7-A, as amended.
7	MR. ROGAN: Second.
8	MS. EVANS: On the question? Again,
9	this is being tabled this evening in
10	compliance with the city's Home Rule
11	Charter. We must conduct a public hearing
12	within 72 hours of the formal amendment to
13	the budget and that will be held tomorrow
14	evening at 6:00 p.m. in city council
15	chambers. All those in favor of signify by
16	saying aye.
17	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
18	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
19	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
20	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
21	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
22	have it and so moved.
23	If there is no further business,
24	I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
25	MR. JOYCE: Motion to adjourn.

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

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