## SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING PUBLIC HEARING IN RE: FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 56 - 2011, AS AMENDED, APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF CITY GOVERNMENT FOR THE PERIOD COMMENCING ON THE FIRST DAY OF JANUARY 2012 AND INCLUDING DECEMBER 31, 2012, BY THE ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL CITY OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2012. **HELD:** Tuesday, December 13, 2011 LOCATION: Council Chambers Scranton City Hall 340 North Washington Avenue Scranton, Pennsylvania

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

		2
1	CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL:	
2		
3	JANET EVANS, PRESIDENT	
4	(Not present)	
5	PAT ROGAN, VICE-PRESIDENT	
6		
7	ROBERT MCGOFF	
8		
9	FRANK JOYCE	
10		
11	JOHN LOSCOMBE	
12		
13	NANCY KRAKE, CITY CLERK	
14		
15	JAMIE MARCIANO, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK	
16		
17	BOYD HUGHES, SOLICITOR	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 MR. ROGAN: I'd like to call this public hearing to order. Roll call, please. 2 3 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff. MR. MCGOFF: Here. 4 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan. 5 MR. ROGAN: Here. 6 7 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe. 8 MR. LOSCOMBE: Here. 9 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. MR. JOYCE: Here. 10 MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans. 11 Evans can called 12 MR. ROGAN: Mrs. 13 me yesterday, she said she maybe a little 14 late for tonight's meeting, she isn't feeling well. 15 16 Notice is hereby given that Scranton 17 City Council will hold a public hearing on 18 Tuesday, December 13, 2011, at 6 p.m. in 19 council chambers, second floor, municipal 20 building. The purpose of said public 21 hearing is to hear testimony and discuss the 22 following: FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 56 - 2011, 23 AS AMENDED. APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR THE 24 EXPENSES OF CITY GOVERNMENT FOR THE PERIOD 25 COMMENCING ON THE FIRST DAY OF JANUARY 2012

AND INCLUDING DECEMBER 31, 2012, BY THE ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL CITY OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2012.

I would like to remind all speakers that comment during this period will just be on budgetary matters and the general meeting you can address any city business you would like. The first speaker is Reverend Kathryn Simmons.

MS. SIMMONS: I'm sorry, I didn't look at the sheet outside, that's for council.

MR. ROGAN: Okay. We'll have you first for the next meeting. Doug Miller. Bob Bolus.

MR. BOLUS: Good evening, Council.

Bob Bolus, Scranton.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. BOLUS: Yesterday we kind of discussed about the different implementations that the city can make to implement different plans and programs here before you pass the budget. You know, if you are going to do something with a budget right now, and we'll talk more I guess later

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on in the second half of this, you need to take your assets and do something with them.

As I've said in the past, if you have a boat that's sinking and you have a bucket you can try and bail it out. case for the city to stay afloat, it has to use it's assets. It has to increase the tax base, you are going to decrease tax rate. You know, in order to do that you have to use the assets that we have available that we have ignored. It's only the way we are going to bail the city out. Other than that, the city is going to continue to sink. You can't borrow to get out of debt and you can't sit here assuming that the taxpayers of this city getting hit three ways are going to be able to survive.

Most people are on a fixed income here. They are set where they are, different benefits are going up, medical, etcetera, you can't just keep doing what we are doing here and take it out on the employees of the city and the taxpayers. You have a vast number of vacant places that can be sold and generate capital. You can

22

23

24

25

make cuts, but in your planning in your budget, as I said last night, put some planning in to leave it open ended in the budget that you could utilize these assets to decrease the debt, to bring our people back to work. Have an escape route. You are not looking at. It's like closed in.

I don't agree with the real estate transfer tax, it's bad enough to try and buy a house in the city let alone keep paying more and more to transfer the tax on it. There are other avenues that you have ignored, the administration definitely has ignored, and you got to just take an open mind. But I didn't hear anybody here say; look, let's open end the budget that we could get rid of assets, we could sell the vacant land, build in 90 days or forfeit what you spend for it. That's increasing the tax base. That's only one little thing to do. You had the leachate line, you got the gas line, you got so many different things that some creative thinking would do other than just hammer the people.

Keep in mind you gave away, and this

21

22

23

24

25

council didn't do it, but it was given way over 3 1/2 dollars plus the interest on the golf course that was to be left for recreation and it was squandered. It wasn't utilized in it's best interest, it was squandered.

Now you got parks closed, kids have to stay out in the heat and couldn't swim this year. These are the things that you see being ignored on a daily basis and you have to the power right now to make this change happen. It's up to you guys to sit here and take the bull by the horn. politics to the side. This isn't about a political race, this is about the people and the businesses in this city that are being destroyed. Not everybody can live like those on a pension or their benefits are paid for, people work to get somewhere in life. Now they've gotten there and they find out that their assets are being diminished by utility companies and other expenses out there that were unforeseen 15, 20, 30. Twenty-five, 30 years ago you were told, gee, if you put this away you will

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have \$25,000 when you retire. You can't even buy a car today.

So those are the things you have to look at, the attrition that's happening to the people in this city, the morale that's gone downhill. You think one of your police officers should go out there and chase a guy and take a chance of getting a bullet when they are being discredited. Your police chief should go out or your fire chief should run into a building when he is only getting paid 40 hours? You cannot take your top management and pay them less than the subordinates. This is the morale that you are destroying in this City of Scranton. Just put yourself in their shoes, put yourself in the taxpayers' shoes and see where they are, those that are in their 60's 70's and 80's, that can't even heat their homes.

You have to open the budget, open it open ended so you could utilize the decrease in the assets that you have out here, decrease the debt and you are going to move forward. Other than that, you can talk all

night long in here you are not going anywhere because next you're going to be here, only a lot worse. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you, Mr. Bolus.

Doug Miller.

MR. MILLER: Still the hearing on the budget?

MR. ROGAN: Still the hearing.

MR. MILLER: That was for the regular meeting.

MR. ROGAN: Okay. Sam Vitris.

MR. VITRIS: Okay, Sam Vitris,

International Aerospace Machinists, president of Local Lodge 2305, deletion of positions in the 2012 budget. Jack, I know you understand this. Bob, I know you understand this. Mr. Joyce and Mr. Rogan, you eliminated snow drivers. The positions that you took out of the budget are snow drivers, so you are asking the people of the Department of Public Works, right, to do more with less, but you took our skilled people off the streets. You took them right out of the budget, what do you want us to do now? And I want some answers, you are not

just going to -- you can't just sit there and just say it's our turn to get laid off.

That is ridiculous.

MR. ROGAN: Mr. Vitris, our amendments actually laid off fewer DPW workers than the mayor's proposal.

MR. VITRIS: Pat, you are not listening. You are closed minded. You laid off snow drivers, guys who are skilled to plow snow. Can you -- you have to have a commercial driver's license. You have to be skilled to do the job. It's not just getting in your car and driving around in the snowstorm looking at the flakes falling. You got to know what you are doing or you could kill somebody. You took our snow people and our skilled people off the road.

There is nothing else I can say, but somebody has to rectify this before this vote goes through. It's terrible. All the jobs I'm hearing, "It's your turn. It's your turn to get laid off. Everybody else got laid off and lost positions."

I understand that, but you are not telling everybody the whole story. In

January we lost five bodies; am I right, Mr. Joyce?

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

MR. VITRIS: We lost five bodies.
We lost another seven in casuals, so that's
12, the nine positions with the union that's
21; correct?

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

MR. VITRIS: Right?

MR. JOYCE: Actually --

MR. VITRIS: Wait now. Wait. Now we lost -- we have 11 on workers' comp, now we are at 32 less bodies. You want us to provide the same service, and we didn't even count for one guy taking off a sick day, one guy taking off a vacation day or additional injuries because the guys are going to be out there longer and working harder.

So something needs to be done here before the people of this city explode, and it's coming, and if you are willing, because you are the policy makers, if you willing to do it and willing to go down that road and have the courage, because I lived this already back in 1991, I lived this when the

people were punished. We all still get our paychecks. We are going to get our paychecks every two weeks. You are going to get yours, but the people of this city are going to be punished because it's our turn to get laid off. This has got to -- something has to be straightened out here and I say this with all due respect to each and every one of yous.

And supervisors, is there only a Director of Public Works at DPW? Is that all there is? So you are telling me that the Director of Public Works is going to be available 365 days a year, seven days a week, 24 hours a day with no time off. What if he has a death in his family? What if he gets sick? What if he just totally exhausted because he worked all night with the snow? We are not the police and we are not the fire department where we have lieutenants, we have captains, we have shift supervisors. We are bunch of workers. That's what we do. So a huge problem.

That's why I said the department will be destroyed, and the decisions you

make today are going to be the decisions that affect 70,000 people in this city and it's going to be -- it will be bad. I seen it. I don't want to sound like I'm trying to scare anybody because I'm not. Can I finish?

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

MR. ROGAN: Sure.

MR. VITRIS: I'm just trying to tell you how I have seen this department run from '91, when it was the last time they did all of this, right, and the guys all came back to work because it was so much pressure put on them they had to come back to work.

There was no savings, overtime was way over. You think overtime is bad now, wait. I mean, I don't want to sound like I am just up here to scare you and I want you to do -- I want you to believe me and what I'm saying is true truthful.

And I said about the compensation.

You have to add, add all of those people who can't work, you have to add that into our daily work basis because our work is daily.

No matter how you cut it, it's daily, and

eliminating snow drivers, eliminating skilled drivers, the one in the parks, right, nobody knows that that's a facility maintenance, that's a skilled guy. That's a guy who if they have to pour concrete or if they have to get some carpentry done, right, we only have one now, so if he goes down or if he is off we got nobody. So, I mean, like --

MR. ROGAN: Thank you, Mr. Vitris.

MR. VITRIS: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: I just have one question though, and if you don't mind me asking, and I understand and I have a great deal of respect for the work that the DPW does. I know that every DPW worker in the budget is a skilled worker, they are very hardworking individuals, I saw the work that you and your crew did when we had the huge windstorm up on Oram Street and I have the upmost respect for the job that the DPW does, but I'm saying -- what I wanted to say is you mentioned the people being out on workers' comp, and I understand that those people aren't working, and, you know, the mayor

proposed a buyout, and there was ten people that he wanted to buyout, and I actually have an e-mail here from Ryan McGowan that there were another ten individuals with 20 to 25 years.

MR. VITRIS: Frank, I'm glad you brought it up, I really am because I actually forget about it.

MR. JOYCE: So, yeah --

MR. VITRIS: Right. I know exactly what you are going to say.

MR. JOYCE: I'm saying if the mayor were to buyout those individuals would there in your opinion, would there still be a large impact on services of the DPW with those people gone?

MR. VITRIS: I guess Josh is the only one can verify it because when he asked me that very question, well, you know, you are recommending -- I'm the kind of a guy who doesn't want to see people thrown out in the streets. I know Jack Loscombe is the same way. He is a union guy and I know it. That's the way we think, but Josh asked me the same question and I said to him that

same question, I says, "Well, yes, it could
affect services."

I wasn't going to -- whether he put it in or not is another story.

MR. JOYCE: Right.

MR. VITRIS: But he asked me that very question, what's the difference -- in other words, you are losing ten positions with layoffs, you are losing ten positions with buyouts, and I said, "Well, yeah, it could affect services."

But the bottom line is it's not ten anymore, is it?

MR. JOYCE: No, it's --

MR. VITRIS: Oh, it's not ten. It's far from ten. It's 31 or 32 less bodies.

MR. JOYCE: But I'm saying the people on workers' comp, they wouldn't be bought out, they would still be on workers' comp so with the mayor's plan those people would still be there.

MR. VITRIS: It's just like in the school district, maybe the other departments should model us. Maybe they should. It's just like in the other departments, we'll

use the school teacher profession. A school teacher takes off, what do they do?

MR. JOYCE: They have a substitute that fills their class.

MR. VITRIS: You took our subs. You took our subs and now we don't have -- now we to add the additional people who are -- no matter how you do it you got to look at the numbers. You got to look at all of the numbers, whether they are on comp, whether they are sick, whatever reason they off, sick leave, vacation, you got to look at those numbers because that's what happened in '91. Nobody listened until there was massive chaos.

And having, you know, one supervisor to do 365 days a year, now, what does that sound like to you? Does that sound -- honestly, does that sound reasonable to have one guy 365 days a year that has to be available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Does it sound reasonable to you?

MR. JOYCE: And I know that --

MR. VITRIS: And honestly. I just want an honest answer, does it sound

reasonable.

MR. JOYCE: I know that Councilman McGoff brought this up at the previous meeting, the director, the current director, Mr. Brazil, is available 365 days out of the year, 24 hours a day.

MR. VITRIS: He has help. He doesn't -- look, I'm there. He doesn't work 365 days a year, seven days a week, 24 hours a day.

MR. JOYCE: Correct. I know that's --

MR. VITRIS: Nobody could. It's impossible. Nobody could do -- unless you are, I don't know, Superman. I don't know, but you have to look at the whole picture, and if you are willing to take the blame with the people for the dismantling of this department then so be it. Then so be it. Because I lived this and I just want to prevent it. There has got to be a way that we could sit down and figure this out before it's too late. Thank you.

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

council regarding the budget?

MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia, citizen of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. SBARAGALIA: I'm concerned about the TANS. Have we got the \$5 million TAN in place at this time before you approve the budget?

MR. JOYCE: Could you repeat the question?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  SBARAGALIA: Without the TAN that budget is useless.

MR. JOYCE: Well, from what I understand we do the \$5 million TAN, it's the larger TAN that we are still in the process of obtaining. I was -- I did attend a meeting. And Mr. McGoff was there and he could attest to this, there is some things that the banking community want to see before they give us the \$9.5 million TAN. One, is the audit completed. Two, they want the budget. And essentially what the banking community wants is assurance that we are going to be able to pay them, and instead of a lump sum payment at the end of

the year, the banks will probably require that we make a monthly TAN payment instead of the current procedures with the TAN.

MR. SBARAGALIA: I knew about the 9.5, I'm more concerned with the \$5 million, has that been approved and we are going to get the \$5 million, because the \$5 million is what we are going to use in the very beginning.

MR. JOYCE: Correct.

MR. SBARAGLIA: The other 9.5 million we have maybe a couple of months before we had to get into that.

MR. JOYCE: Right.

MR. SBARAGLIA: I don't know exactly how far we are in arrears on our debt, I know 6.5 million, I don't even know if that covers all of the debt from this year actually. I don't know. I don't know if any of yous know if that's the total amount. That's the amount they told you, but not necessarily the true amount. You went through all of this before. You can't believe what they are telling you without getting them -- before you would have them

swear to it, so they can be held accountable.

I mean, you found out what happened with the last budget. They socked it right to you, and they are no different. These people are no different this time than they were the last time. I mean, if you can get somebody to come before you and actually swear that these figures are true and you can be held accountable for it, then you got something that you can really go by. As it is now, you are shooting in the dark again.

They are holding up your budget and there must be a darn good reason why. For somebody not to give you an audit got to be a darn good reason why they are holding it up, and if you usually think about it how the city works you know the reason most likely ise the debt is a lot greater than what they are saying.

I'm sorry for you, I really am. I told you that in the very beginning because I knew that all of this was coming to -- you working on a budget without the two facts, two audits, to this, to that, sweared

20

21

22

23

24

25

testimony, you are in the dark. I know you are doing the very best you can, and I certainly hope they are not holding up a heck of a lot from you, like that \$11 million from HUD or something like that might pop up or this or that, I'm not even talking about the 20 plus million because like he said before it's not going to effect this budget. It's going to effect it when he leaves office. You are going to be stuck with that and, like I said before, the debt keeps growing in that budget, this budget and the further budget, and when you start paying off the TANS in payments I hope they really give you a break on the interest that as the TANS get lower the interest gets lower. I sincerely hope, so but knowing the way this city work God only knows. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Is there anything else?

MR. UNGVARSKY: Good evening,

Council members. I'm Tom Ungvarsky. I see where over \$100,000 has been cut out of the budget for the buyouts for the Public Works

Department. I understand that whatever happens now will go through attrition; is that correct?

MR. JOYCE: We eliminated certain positions in the budget from the DPW. It was Mayor Doherty's plan to by out these individuals instead of simply cutting the jobs.

MR. UNGVARSKY: Do you know if there are buyouts for any other departments in the city?

MR. JOYCE: Currently, no.

MR. UNGVARSKY: Those were the only buyouts?

MR. JOYCE: Correct. At that time, yes. Those are the only buyout.

MR. UNGVARSKY: Okay, thank you. As far as the audit goes, I know you people tried to explain it last week, but it really doesn't make any sense. There has to be a reason why this mayor won't produce a budget and the longer he holds out the more suspicious it seems. No one seems to know the reason why he won't do it, and he has been faced -- in fact, I guess it was about

six weeks ago he told GO Lackawanna newspaper that he would have the audit by the end of that week. That was over six weeks ago. I don't know what -- the longer this goes on the worst it looks. Even if there is nothing there, it sure gives the appearance. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Bill Jackowitz,
South Scranton resident. Like I have said
several times from this podium, I really
feel sorry for you guys. You are in over
your head. Either way you go you are going
to be blamed for just about everything and
anything and that's ashame because it's
really not your fault.

Now, I said this a couple of weeks ago, that it's not the people who are here that we should be concerned about, it's the people who are not here. Jeff Brazil, I think he is still DPW director, I'm not sure, he may be with the school district now, Jeff Brazil should be sitting in that seat right there defending his DPW workers if he was really concerned about the city,

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the residents and the DPW workers.

Chief Tom Davis should be sitting in the second chair right next to Jeff Brazil as the fire chief if he is really concerned about the firefighters and the safety of the citizens of Scranton.

Chief Dan Duffy should be sitting in this chair right there if he is really concerned about his police officers and the safety of the residents in this city of Scranton.

And Mayor Doherty should be sitting over here, also, because he is the chief executive of this city and he should be concerned about the DPW workers, the firefighters, the police officers and the citizens and residents of the City of Scranton. The primary concern of any elected official is to provide for the safety and the welfare of the citizens of his community or his state or his nation, But them not being here tells me point-blank without a doubt that they are not concerned. They are more concerned about other things okay?

Now, I don't want to see anybody get laid off. I don't want to see DPW workers get laid off, I don't want to see firefighters get laid off, I don't want to see police officers get laid off, but I'm intelligent enough to realize that the City of Scranton has a financial debt that is unbelievable and it was not caused by the taxpayers of Scranton, it was caused by the

administration, by the mayor and his cabinet

members who, by the way, are not here to

defend themselves, okay?

So, you know, I believe in fairness, I understand that fairness is not always fair, but I do believe in fairness. The firefighters have been whacked and the police officers have been whacked, DPW has been whacked in the past, okay? When I say fairness I mean fairness to the citizens and to the taxpayers, the ones who are paying the bills.

We are getting whacked by a tax increase. It's either going to be 4 percent or it's going to be 29 percent, we don't really know. We'll find out when this all

comes out in the end. We don't really know what's going to happen, okay, because we know if your amendments are passed the mayor is going to veto them and you guys are going to probably override his veto and then we are going to see what happens. Last year you overrode his veto and he went ahead and did what he wanted to do anyway, so we are going to see if that happens again. But again, the people who are getting hurt all are the taxpayers and the residents and the supermajority or city council because you guys are caught in the middle of this and that's ashame.

You know, the firefighters are getting blamed for using too much overtime. For years, headlines every day in the newspaper, editorials in the newspaper about them using too much overtime. Now they are getting whacked because they don't want to work overtime. So where is the fairness there? There is none. Okay. Editorial in today's paper about the firefighters not wanting to work overtime, you know. Last year it was the firefighters working too

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

much overtime.

So, again, we have to come -- as adults we have to come to a conclusion here and it's not going to happen until council and the mayor work together. I know you have tried, I don't think the administration and the mayor has tried, but it's got to come to an end because the City of Scranton is the laughing stock of Northeastern Pennsylvania and probably the entire state, okay? With the news coverage and everything, they are like those clowns down in Scranton can't get nothing right. can't even work together, they can't decide whether they want firefighters, police officers, DPW workers, all things that are guaranteed and that's why we pay taxes, that's why we pay a garbage fee.

So good luck to you, I hope you all make the right decision and I really wish the mayor and his cabinet members would come here and express their opinion and not leave it up to the workers to do it for them.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you,

Mr. Jackowitz.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JOYCE: Um --

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening, Council. Marie Schumacher. I'll defer for a minute because I have a disagreement with some of what Bill just said. He said the taxpayers weren't at fault, I think every voter is probably a taxpayer and I would say we are at fault. Look at how many vacant seats are here tonight? Do people really I don't know. Most people who have been reelected if they have run for reelection and they have been successful and that tells me the voters/taxpayers are happy with the policies that have been set and the spending that's been set, so I say we do have a responsibility.

But now what I really want to talk about because I'm still concerned, very concerned about the fire department. I was here briefly last night because I did want to make -- I was one of, again, three people that testified last night at the public hearing at the school board. First of all, has the \$600,000 been placed into the salary line item for the fire department?

MS. SCHUMACHER: Yes or no? I mean, yeah.

MR. JOYCE: Yes, actually, more than that has been. It all comes out -- and if you could hold her time that's fine.

Actually, I have a chart and I can send that to you. I could send it to you via e-mail. It actually -- the cost is actually more than \$600,000 to add back the firefighters, however, when you subtract out their unemployment that was originally in the budget, the total comes out to \$600,000, so it may be say \$900,000 or 800 and some thousand dollars, but \$250,000 or so was already budgeted for unemployment, so those have been added to the correct line item.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, the sufficiency was the next item, I divided the \$600,000 by 13 and I know 46,000 is not enough to sustain salary and benefits, so I'll be very interested in seeing that.

Can you tell me how many stations

113 firefighters which, of course, we know
we don't have 113 on at all times, how many
fire stations will that sustain?

1	MR. LOSCOMBE: How many will it
2	save?
3	MS. SCHUMACHER: Will it sustain,
4	well, save, sustain, how you want to say it.
5	MR. LOSCOMBE: That's a loaded
6	question.
7	MS. SCHUMACHER: No, it's not
8	loaded, it's very sincere.
9	MR. LOSCOMBE: No, I don't think
10	anyone can tell you on a day-to-day basis
11	how many stations are going to be open.
12	MS. SCHUMACHER: How many without
13	rounding the number
14	MR. LOSCOMBE: There is going to be
15	more out with 100 right now.
16	MS. SCHUMACHER: Without rolling
17	brownouts how many fire stations will be
18	opened with 113 people?
19	MR. LOSCOMBE: I think you should
20	direct that question to Chief Davis.
21	MS. SCHUMACHER: Well, I would
22	assume that you folks already did that when
23	you decided on the figure of 113.
24	MR. LOSCOMBE: No, we did no study,
25	we have increased it to where we can in the

budget right now, we didn't reduce the 29. Get it straight, the mayor reduced the 29. We actually were able to find some money at this point to guarantee another 13 bodies and go for the SAFER grant, something that the mayor did not address. He cut 29. 13 more at this point is still better than 100, and is it safe? I don't believe so. Not at all. And we have to work hard to get it up to a safe position, but we have no study that was done by the administration and we have no money in our budget to do a study right now.

That's why I recommended the mayor and the chief be here at these meters to let the public know how they plan on covering the city with the reductions they have made. All we are doing is trying to do our best to put money in the budget to bring that to a little safer level, but we don't have the money at this time to fund everybody. Trust me, I think 150 is short.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Is there a guarantee of 100 percent that once that SAFER grant is applied for it's

automatically given or is this a competition? Is this \$600,000, is there a chance of it not happening.

MR. JOYCE: Well, with the SAFER grant, and this is true with any grant, there is no guarantees. What I do know is that the City of Harrisburg, for instance, they are having -- I believe they have five firefighters funded through that grant and it's for a number of years, I'm not sure of the exact term, but there is no guarantees on the grants, but it's our wish -- it's council's wish and our suggestion through the motion that I passed -- or that was passed last night, that the mayor apply for the grant and at least -- well, we can see what we are going to get.

You know, I'm saying, well,
Harrisburg has five positions funded through
it, maybe we'll have four, maybe we'll have
five, maybe we'll have more but there is no
guarantee of how many positions the grant
will actually cover.

MS. SCHUMACHER: When is the open -- when is the open period for that grant and

when the grant is awarded?

MR. JOYCE: My understanding is that the period of the grant starts in December for the SAFER grant and the money would be awarded -- I believe it's a timely process, it's a number of months. Now, I'm not sure if you are thinking of two things. One thing that I mentioned last night was the health care savings grant of \$600,000, that was to put back 13 firefighters. That will --

MS. SCHUMACHER: Well, then these are two separate grants?

MR. JOYCE: Yes, these are two separate grants.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Then the same questions I have with that grant, are they -- when is the time period, what is the chances of we'll get an award?

MR. JOYCE: Actually, the health care -- it's actually a health care prescription savings grant that applies to retirees. That's the \$600,000.

MS. SCHUMACHER: All retirees or firefighter retirees?

MR. JOYCE: All retirees. However, I'll give you the list of currently the city is covering 40 DPW retirees, 268 in fire, 237 in police, 31 in the administration and 62 in the clerical. It was our idea to use that \$600,000 in savings to reinstate 13 firefighters. The SAFER grant, which we are encouraging the mayor to apply for, would be in addition to the 13 to add more positions if the city received that grant.

MS. SCHUMACHER: So the health care and all of those other departments has been reduced and the money transferred into the firefighters --

MR. JOYCE: Yes, that's why --

 $\label{eq:MS.SCHUMACHER: -- and now I have} % \begin{center} \be$ 

MR. JOYCE: Right. That's why --

MS. SCHUMACHER: When is the grant applied for and when is it awarded?

MR. JOYCE: I will get that answer for you when the award would come in, I don't have the exact time that it would come in. However, the grant -- I will also confirm with our business administrator when

he intends to apply for it, but this is something actually that PEL said that they were bringing up for the past two years, so this is a savings that we should be seeing and should be --

MS. SCHUMACHER: So then what we are going to see is the layoffs occurring and when the grant is obtained they will be called back; right?

MR. JOYCE: That's my hope. It's my hope that the Mayor --

MS. SCHUMACHER: So we are not going to have -- -

MR. JOYCE: -- follows the motion.

MS. SCHUMACHER: That sounds fairly risky to me, but my bottom line, the rest I'll talk about in the next meeting, but the most disappointing thing is this budget does absolutely nothing, not one penny, for achieving parody with our neighbors and getting down any proposal of how we are going to work down the wage tax to the 1 percent so we can be competitive. I have some ideas on that, but I probably will bring them to the podium next year, but

that's my biggest disappointment, and the rest of my questions I will ask since I have over gone my time.

MR. JOYCE: Right, and if I may just comment for a brief moment, we would definitely like to hear your suggestions because the process for 2013 begins immediately once this process is over because -- and this is something I don't think, you know, everybody realizes, I know that you realize it because you have brought it up a few times, about state representatives and our state senator. We need the state's approval to enact many of the ideas that residents bring up to us, for instance, such as commuter taxes, payroll expense taxes and measures of that sort.

So this is something that is going to have to be a collaborative effort between counsel, the administration and our state legislature because some of these measures that we discuss here are going to be measures that would have to -- would have to obtain state approval before the city could actually enact them.

MS. SCHUMACHER: I hope you will have them sitting here at the first meeting. I don't think they do much business in January. I don't think they do much business period, but that's only one person's opinion. Thank you. Is there anyone else who MR. ROGAN: would like to address council? Hearing adjourned. 

## 

## 

## $\underline{\mathsf{C}}\ \underline{\mathsf{F}}\ \underline{\mathsf{R}}\ \underline{\mathsf{T}}\ \underline{\mathsf{I}}\ \underline{\mathsf{F}}\ \underline{\mathsf{I}}\ \underline{\mathsf{C}}\ \underline{\mathsf{A}}\ \underline{\mathsf{T}}\ \underline{\mathsf{E}}$

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER