		1
1	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING	
2		
3		
4		
5	HELD:	
6		
7	Tuesday, December 27, 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	CATHENE C NADDOZZI DDD GESTOTAL COURT DESCRIPT	
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

1	(Pledge of Allegiance recited and
2	moment of reflection observed.)
3	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
4	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
5	MR. MCGOFF: Here.
6	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan. Mr.
7	Loscombe.
8	MR. LOSCOMBE: Here.
9	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
10	MR. JOYCE: Here.
11	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
12	MS. EVANS: Here. Dispense with the
13	reading of the minutes.
14	MS. KRAKE: THIRD ORDER. NO
15	BUSINESS AT THIS TIME. There is also no
16	clerk's notes this evening, Mrs. Evans.
17	MS. EVANS: Thank you, Mrs. Krake.
18	Do any council members have announcements at
19	this time? Then I believe we can proceed to
20	Fourth Order.
21	MS. KRAKE: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS'
22	PARTICIPATION.
23	MS. EVANS: Our first speaker this
24	evening is Andy Sbaraglia.
25	MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia.

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Citizens of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians, let me start off and wish everybody I hope a good New Years even though I know it ain't going to be so, but anyway that it will be wished.

Now, you know the mayor has been putting out a lot of stuff saying about the budget isn't balanced. Okay. I believe probably it isn't balanced. But we are going to be borrowing a great deal of money next year so if there is a hole in the budget we are going to have borrow an extra \$5 million or whatever million, but the thing is you are able to keep the real estate down to about 5 percent instead of 29 That's the bottom line. percent. I know we are going to be pushing it off to our grandchildren most likely. It's not something I relish, but it's probably your only choice, but for him to sit and cry there is a hole in the budget knowing we are going to be borrowing a huge amount of money, so we borrow a little more and fill in that hole wherever it will, wherever it occurs I don't know, they are up to what \$11

21

22

23

24

25

million now? Saying we are going to -- next year it will be 11 million, so we are going to be borrowing what, about \$40 million probably? Well, we borrowed \$72 million in the very beginning and nobody made too much of a stink over it, but we haven't got a Like anything else, you have to sit choice. up there and make your choice. I know notice that somebody is absent. I guess he doesn't want to make that choice and be on the ballot, but I think he could have. No one likes to make a decision, but when you got to make it you got to make it whether you like it or not. It falls on you and falls on that position.

I'm very happy to see four of you here willing to make that decision, and the fifth I don't know why. I'll just hope that something -- I shouldn't say that, I just hope he has a very good reason for not attending other than the fact that he would have to cast a negative vote.

That's all. I just hope the best for you. Like I said, I have been telling you all along when you first got the

majority I was hoping the very best and that's all I can hope for it. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Mr. Sbaraglia, Happy
New Year to you, too.

MS. EVANS: Ron Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: Hello, Council.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. ELLMAN: Really briefly, I went to Mr. Bolus' dinner and I think this was such a nice event for the people of this city and I think we are so fortunate to have something like this from -- and I had a lot of people tell me to pass on a thank you to him and his staff that I delivered some food for and gave rides to.

I went to a school board meeting last week, and I can't understand how the newspaper or the city doesn't know what is going on in this schools with the students and the teacher abuse. It's ungodly. There was, you know, they was talking about it at the meeting. These students that are disruptive not only should be expelled from school, they ought to be put in jail in the

system for awhile so they are not roaming around the streets causing more problems.

And I stood up here in this very spot a couple of years ago and I said we got a gang problem because I'm out of the streets and I know what's going on and I think we should have a curfew. They got to do something to control this, and I know Mrs. Evans and Mr. McGoff probably have friends that tell them, but I never seen -- the inmates are running the asylum in that school and somebody is going to get hurt before it's all over with. It's physical abuse and they say the police are there every day. It's a bad situation.

And I'd like to say something to these young people at this Occupy Scranton bunch, they say that youth is wasted on the young, I guess that's why they make so many mistakes, and I like the idea of being against Wall Street in a way, but not the methods that these people are using all along.

But, you know, the taxpayers of this city spent a million dollars or something on

25

that, that those grounds and that building and it looked terrible. I was across the street in Mr. Powell's office a couple of times and they made a terrible mess. It's your unsightly and it was uncalled for. They are getting some bad advice. You know, they are taking one step forward and two back calling in the ACLU to sue the city which will cost a 100, 200,000 dollars and they want our support. And then of all things I listen to the Corbett telling them to take over the Court system, go sit in the courtrooms. Well, I tell you, young people, that's very poor advice. I can't believe Mr. Corbett will tell them things like that. You will be in the jail, I've been there, you don't want to go. It's one place you don't want to go with no money, I'll tell you that much. But to advise taking over the Court system is against what we just did with that American -- you know, it's just -it's just ridiculous to say take over the Court system and he kept harping on this during the week.

Well, I want to wish everybody a

happy new year and I hope you can iron out our problems. If anybody -- well, somebody was concerned about my whereabouts New Year's Eve, you don't have no problem because Mr. Jones is my designated driver, so the streets will be safe except maybe if you avoid North Scranton it might help things. You all have a good news years, hear?

(Whereupon while Mr. Ellman was speaking Mr. McGoff takes the dais and joins the meeting.)

MS. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Ellman.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Ellman, and I'll just make one quick comment, a few months ago and actually Mr. Loscombe was there with me, it was at a West Side

Neighborhood Crime Watch meeting, I spoke about how I thought it would be a good idea to have a curfew in the city and I remember correctly Chief Duffy saying that implementing a curfew causes a sprain and the police force since they have to take minors into their custody and hold them there if they get calls and he did state

1 that we don't have the manpower on the 2 police force to do so in the current state 3 that we are in right now. 4 MR. ELLMAN: Well, it's a deplorable 5 When I was in school and you situation. messed up you got paddled. And I was 6 7 paddled so many times they used to just say, 8 "Bring the usual suspects in," you know, 9 but --10 MS. EVANS: Well, thank you, 11 Mr. Ellman. 12 MR. ELLMAN: This school is out of 13 control and it's not the school's fault it's 14 the students. I don't know what the solution is, but this meeting was terrible 15 16 what they talked about. Thank you. 17 MS. EVANS: Thank you. Doug Miller. 18 MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council, 19 Doug Miller, Scranton. 20 MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening. MS. EVANS: Good evening. 21 22 MR. MILLER: I'd just like to begin 23 by pretty much reiterating a lot of the 24 statements I made from the podium the last 25 few weeks regarding the budget, and

obviously on 7-A tonight we are dealing with the override of the mayor's veto of the amended 2012 budget and I just would strongly encourage council tonight to override the veto. Your budget amendments certainly relieve the burden not only on the businesses, but the taxpayers as well by reducing taxes while at the same time generating the revenue through your many revenue enhancements that you have in your amended budget.

And I again want to commend our
Finance Chair, Frank Joyce, Councilwoman
Evans, Councilman Rogan, Councilman Loscombe
for all your work in the budget process.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

MR. MILLER: You have certainly have yet again shown how you're true champions of the people and you have continued to live to your word since you have taken office and I want to really thank you for that.

Going back to the annual Doherty surprise that we get every year, as I have stated last week I feels his actions were uncalled for. The \$5 million TAN that he

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pledged to a bank, a board of bankers that was going to be paid in cash and went around and basically went back on his word as he tends to do now in the last ten years, so it's really -- it shouldn't surprise us that much, but it's just yet again another attempt to sabotage council's budget, all the hard work and effort you put into it.

But as I said last week what really infuriated me was the fact that through all of the conversations you have had with Ryan McGowan, officials from PEL, you know, and not one time was this news ever given to you and I really -- I'm really upset by that because I feel it's unacceptable and there is no reason for that. I mean, I don't understand how you give news like that after a budget is passed and now once again you are expected, as I have said, to clean this mess up. And I truly believe it's time to let the mayor clean this one up, let PEL come in and clean it up, and Ryan McGowan because they have caused this and every year you are expected to come in with a bomb and clean this up and I just don't feel it's

fair and it's uncalled for, and as I said
last week, I think it's time for an
investigation to be done by the United
State's Attorney General, the State Attorney
General, the Governor, the Secret Service,
whoever needs to come in and hold Chris
Doherty accountable because we can no longer
continue to allow this man to get away with
these things, all right? The fiscal
mismanagement has gone on for far too long
and it's got to stop.

You know, in the past we had councils who just let this go and now that we have a council majority in here who is now exposing this we are seeing how truly what a mess the situation we are in here because nobody ever did anything about it, we constantly swept things under the rug and now, as I said, you are expected to try to come up with a plan here to try to save the day, and I think it puts you in a tough spot and I don't think it's a position you should have to be in, but unfortunately you are in the position because, you know, you are leaders of the city and I'm very confident

that you will get the job done and you will find a solution because you have done so in the past and I know what your record is and I know you who are able to overcome a lot of the obstacles that you faced over the last two and a half years, so I'm quite confident you will be able to overcome this, it's certainly not going to be easy, we all know that. But, as I said, I know you will overcome it.

And just if finally tonight, again, I want it thank you for all your hard work, I encourage you to override the veto, I think an override sends a strong message to the mayor that his fiscal mismanagement isn't going to be tolerated. We are not going to allow him to go around with a blank check and just spend recklessly like he is used to doing in the past. Those days are long over. We are going to turn this city around. It's not going to be easy and we are not going to do it overnight. It took ten years to cause the mess, I'd hate to think it's going to take that long to clean it up, but it's starting to look that way.

But, again, thank you for your hard work and I strongly recommend an override of the veto and I appreciate your time and I just like to wish everyone a happy and healthy new year. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Fay Franus.

MS. FRANUS: Fay Franus, Scranton.

MR. ROGAN: Good evening.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MS. FRANUS: I'd like to wish all of you a happy new year as well.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

thank Mr. Loscombe, Mr. Joyce, Mrs. Evans and Mr. Rogan for doing such a wonderful job on this budget. You certainly showed that you are for the people. I don't know what you are going to do tonight, but just from the way you have spoken for the last couple of weeks I hope it's for overriding the mayor's veto on behalf of all of the taxpayers and take a load off their minds knowing their homes will be saved whereas Mayor Doherty may have lost all their homes

1 and that's a big relief if that's what you 2 do tonight. 3 Mr. McGoff, I'd like to ask you a question, please. Did you know about the \$5 4 5 million TANS that Mayor Doherty before December 15, before you voted on the 6 7 amendments? 8 MR. MCGOFF: Did I know that there 9 was one? 10 MS. FRANUS: Did you know that --11 you were at that meeting, did you not hear him say he is paying cash for the \$5 million 12 13 TAN, he was not going to borrow? 14 MR. MCGOFF: I was aware of -- I was at the meeting, I was aware of what he said 15 16 if that's what you are asking. 17 MS. FRANUS: What I'm asking is did 18 you know he was going to be asking or 19 borrowing for the \$5 million or did you 20 realize he said he was paying cash? Did you 21 know yourself that he was going to have the 22 city borrow that money before December 15? 23 MR. MCGOFF: What was December 15? 24 MS. FRANUS: That was the deadline 25 for the amendment from council for the

1 budget. 2 MR. MCGOFF: I knew of it last 3 Monday. MS. FRANUS: So that's the first you 4 heard of it. 5 MR. MCGOFF: Whatever that date was. 6 7 MS. FRANUS: Then why is it that you 8 weren't quoted in the paper saying that you 9 didn't know anything about this before December 15? The paper --10 11 MR. MCGOFF: I said I knew of it at 12 the PEL meeting last Monday. I'm not sure 13 what date that was. 14 MS. FRANUS: It was after the 15. 15 MR. MCGOFF: Yes, it was. 16 MS. FRANUS: But you let on, you 17 said in the paper at one point that the officials knew. I don't know who you 18 implied by the officials, but Josh Mrozinski 19 sitting over there, I could not believe it 20 21 when I read the paper the next day after the 22 meeting where he had the headline or something, "OECD blames council for the 23 24 budget," when at this meeting the night

before he heard Attorney Hughes state

25

emphatically that Mayor Doherty lied on
December 7 saying he was paying cash for the
\$5 million in TANS yet this council knew
nothing about it until a letter from PEL
December 16 that Scott Schaffer showed on
the news, but this paper and this reporter
he would have people believing this was
council's fault and it's all lies. The
editorial in the paper on Sunday was
outrageous. Again lies.

So I hope the people get a copy of GO Lackawanna because there is the truth, the only truth in the City. The Scranton Times I'm just telling the people what you read do not believe because it's all lies. When Boyd Hughes sits here and says that Mayor Doherty said in front of 25 bankers that is paying cash for this \$5 million TAN that's the truth, and Mr. Joyce as well heard it. Then the paper doesn't say anything about it.

I just hope tonight that you do what you have always been doing, looking out for the people, and know how much we appreciate all you have done. We have no idea. I

mean, we can imagine, but we have no idea the hard work you put into this. None. But please know it's appreciated because you are the only ones that can give us hope. Thank you very much.

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

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening,

Council. Marie Schumacher, city resident -MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MS. SCHUMACHER: -- and taxpayer.

I'm probably going to bounce around a little bit and hit things just as I thought about them while preparing for Christmas and jotted them down so I wouldn't forget them, but first of all is the audit available yet for the 2010?

MR. JOYCE: The audit is not available for public review at this time and I have not received a draft copy. I have received bits and pieces of the audit, but that's about it. It's not finalized yet.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Do they have the date for the meeting?

MR. JOYCE: Not at this time.

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay, thank you.

And I would urge, it seems to me that a lot of what we are experiencing could have been changed if the Home Rule Charter had been put on the ballot and we had a new committee and the Home Rule Charter was updated. are well past the five-year window going back to Judy Gatelli's reign as president of council that was I believe unanimously voted on that updating the Home Rule Charter would be a good thing to do, but council has yet to vote on it to get it on the ballot, and I would certainly urge you to do that because I think we have enough experience now knowing where we have holes and where we need more accountability and triggers and some penalties for not doing things properly and timely. So I would urge you to get that on the ballot for the next primary.

And then it occurred to me after I left last week because the news from the solicitor was remember astounding on what the mayor had done, but, and this is what troubles me, and I guess, Frank, you get the cash flow reports and you get the

controller's reports, did it not occur to you when Mr. Doherty said he was going to pay it in cash to ask him where he was going to find it and do a follow-up question?

MR. JOYCE: I will address that during motions. I did speak with PEL about it and their advice was that we would need enough money for one last payroll if we were to avert all of our bills and pay off the TAN from what they had thought at the time and that's what I factored into the \$6.7 million in unfunded debt.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. Thank you.

And when will we learn more about the apparently scheduled June 2012 treasurer's sale? Is that --

 $$\operatorname{MR}$. \ JOYCE: \ I \ will ask NRS about it and I will find out some more information for you.$

MS. SCHUMACHER: Thank you. I'm assuming, and I want to verify whether I'm assuming correctly, whether or not the agreement we have had, the city has had with the Scranton Parking Authority is still valid, that is, we are paying for the

citation issuers and we are splitting the collections from the --

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

MS. SCHUMACHER: -- 1090.

MR. JOYCE: It is still valid, yes.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. And then again, there was an article in just two days before Christmas about a drug arrest, and I believe it doesn't matter where it was, but the paragraph says, "The city inspector condemned the property for code violations the chief said."

And I would like to know whether

LIPS is now in compliance with the

modifications to the --the notification that

people received that requires specification

of which codes have been broken? That's

been going on a long time. If it's still

going on I'm wondering if we have to wait

until we get a bunch of people who had

condemned properties take the city to Court

and waste a lot more money on the lawyers to

get it right. I think it's -- it's just -
that's just terrible having been through it

I know very well that it's not a pleasant

point to be and it's hard to pin them down and you all voted to comply with the state laws and the BOCA Code and that specifically does say that they have to site what codes have been broken and what it takes to be in compliance, so I think we need to pay attention to that.

And then another thing that gets increasingly troublesome is all of the unenforced -- may I finish this one?

MS. EVANS: Quickly, please.

MS. SCHUMACHER: They talked about the unenforcement that we can't do curfew because we don't have enough police officers and we all know there are lots and lots of laws on the books and ordinances that are not -- don't even -- there is no attempt made to enforce them and I think we need to investigate whether or not there can't be some kind of -- not a fully trained Act 120 police officer, but some kind of super traffic person. I mean, just tonight go down North Washington Avenue here and get to the corner of Linden Street and there are cars parked everywhere not just -- I mean,

where there is no parking. You can't even get in the left turn lane let alone pay attention to what the signs said and they are all over and increasingly cars and trucks parking on sidewalks and totally making the sidewalks unpassable, and there would be a whole lot of money if we started enforcing some of these traffic laws if we just had a traffic citation specialist who could go around and do those kind of things morning -- day and night. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Good evening,
Council, Bill Jackowitz, South Scranton
resident and member of the Taxpayers'
Association.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Mrs. Evans, I would like to ask Mr. McGoff a question, if I may?

MS. EVANS: Certainly.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Mr. McGoff, did you hear the question Mr. Hughes asked the mayor on the December 2011 regarding the repayment

of TANS. If so, what was the Honorable Mayor Doherty's answer?

MR. MCGOFF: I believe he said cash.

MR. JACKOWITZ: He did say cash?

MR. MCGOFF: I didn't disagree with Mr. Hughes when he --

MR. JACKOWITZ: Okay, I'm just trying to get some clarification, okay? Thank you. On the 22nd of December the Honorable Mayor Doherty was quoted in the newspaper that he told the bankers that the city would be able to repay the TANS and the TANS will be paid. That's in the quote, so that goes along with the fact that he stated that was going to pay for them in cash that like Mr. Hughes stated and Mr. McGoff stated and Mr. Joyce stated.

Okay, on the 22nd of December the
Honorable Mayor Doherty was quoted in the
newspaper saying the first priority is to
secure the \$5 million borrowing to pay back
the TANS. Now, on the 7th we had the \$5
million, on the 22nd we are trying to secure
the funds. Seems to me like there is a
contradiction there. We either had the

money or we didn't have the money. He stated on the 7tg we had the cash to pay the TANS and now on the 22nd he wants to secure the money to pay the TANS.

Now, in the same article -- on the same article and on the 7th of December the mayor said the TANS will be paid. The Honorable Mayor Doherty, which quote is truthful? I mean, we either had the 5 million on the 7th and something happened with the 5 million between the 7th and the 22nd or we never had the money on the 22nd. You guys following what I'm trying to say here?

MS. EVANS: Um-hum.

MR. JACKOWITZ: So which is true?

Now, the Times-Tribune in the same article

Josh wrote both stories. I don't understand

this. Now, it should have been clarified

before the story was made because all we did

was confuse the citizens, myself included.

We either had the money on the 7th or we

didn't have the money on the 7th. We

don't have it on the 22nd, so we need to get

that clarified and I think the mayor needs

to answer that and I think the Times needs to do a better job of reporting the story.

I'm going to hold off until the sirens go. And if he did have the 5 million we need to find out what happened to that five million.

Okay, and also in that same article on the 22nd of December the Honorable Mayor Doherty states, "Officials job is to move the city ahead.

Added, "It's not to play gotcha."

Well, I think the mayor is the one that's playing gotcha and the Times-Tribune is a playing gotcha because on the 7th he had the money, on the 22nd he didn't have the money. What happened with the money between the 7th and the 22nd? Five million dollars plus is lot of money. We need to find that out, okay?

The Honorable Mayor has not solved the problem in ten years. He has created numerous problems, which we all know, that is why Scranton remains distressed and in debt to the tune of over hundreds of millions of dollars. It's probably because

he has been playing gotcha with us, you know, and along with the Times-Tribune.

They are playing gotcha with the citizens all the time.

Mr. Ryan McGowan states he speaks with the banks every day. Mr. McGowan, have you provided the banks with current copies of the 2010 audit? For that matter, has the city council been provided with a current copy of the 2010 audit? Sounds like you haven't.

MR. JOYCE: No.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Here it is the end of December. Where is the audit?

MR. JOYCE: The audit doesn't exist yet. I actually did attend a PEL meeting today and Mr. McGowan did inform me that he provided the banks with a statement from Rossi & Rossi regarding the general fund.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Yeah, but where is the audit at? I don't want a statement. I want an audit that was due in the end of May.

MR. JOYCE: Believe me, I understand.

MR. JACKOWITZ: I don't think that's asking for too much, Mr. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: No, I don't either. I understand your frustration, belief me.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Right. Now, the
Scranton Parking Authority. Now, they are
hiring Mrs. Renda for \$25 an hour to train a
new person who is a hired to be the
financial director for the authority. I
thought that was position was eliminated
from the budget, the financial director of
the Parking Authority; am I correct on that?

MS. EVANS: It had -- council had eliminated that position, yes, in the SPA budget last year, however, Mr. Scopelliti did not adhere to the budget changes made by the city council.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Yeah, because they are going to pay her up to \$9,000 a year to train somebody for a position that's been eliminated. But not only that, it's actually going to increase the salary by \$320 a year if she gets the full \$9,000 because the salary used to be \$43,680, with the \$9,000 the salary now will be \$44,000,

you know, for Mrs. Renda to train and also the new person. Come on, man, is this the Scranton way of saving money? I mean, let's be realistic, Mr. Scopelliti and Mr. Kelly.

And also, you know, the mayor, I hate to say this but it's the truth, cannot be trusted and neither can the Scranton Times-Tribune. I mean, the mayor stated he's going to be the sixth councilman, where is he? The mayor said he created 9,000 jobs, where are they? The mayor said the audit would be produced within a week, that was five, six weeks ago. He cannot be trusted, and don't believe anything you read in the newspaper, expect the obituaries, that's because the funeral directors write those.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council.

Dave Dobrzyn.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. DOBRZYN: Dave Dobrzyn, resident of Scranton and taxpayer. Happy New Year hopefully. I have a question for John, you can maybe make it during motions, there is

an article circulating about downed fire departments, and I'd like to hear an elaboration on when does it become illegal for a fireman to report to work after so many hours because I think that the public is being lead to believe that they are just calling in sick. And after a certain point, for instance, in an industrial privatized setup after 12 hours you are no longer covered by occupational comp, so if I got half burned to death on my job as a mechanic and, you know, it would be the boss' responsibility to pay for my treatment and everything else, even possibly a loss of life.

And Mr. Jackowitz stole my thunder on the audit. And I was also wondering if when you are on the phone if you notify these people could you notify them that you are regarding their conversation so you are not being a thrown a curve ball and you could play it off right through the microphone if that be the case.

And I thought I heard something, and I did encourage it last summer, that some

help would be provided for ECTV so they get our word across as it happens and it would be helpful, I guess.

Now, on the budget, pass the budget as you see fit, the Scranton Parking
Authority they deserve nothing else other than to be privatized, but I would plead with you to reconsider on any other departments or essential services. It's cheaper for me to hop a bus than drive downtown or ride downtown than to pay the parking there for an hour. So, you know, and I'm not wearing and tearing my car in city traffic and having idling and overheating and stuff.

But trash removal, I had 51 bags of garbage in front of the apartment house that I lived in at one time and they sent the mayor and the town police came down questioning my wife about it because the people responsible said it was ours and she whipped out the payment book and everything for our trash and so, you know, like sewer and trash and stuff you can't get away from that, so I would encourage you to keep it as

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a public entity and try to get as best control over these authorities if you can.

And I seen in the Scranton Times today, never goes away, KOZ is in the state legislature from what I gather or renewal of the KOZ program with a little better accounting, but if you can get your hands on an article please do so and whatever, but they didn't encourage -- my wife's plant moved from Scranton to Scott Township in her private job and ten years almost to the day they closed and left town. They left her with stock that devalued by \$20,000, she has \$101,000 left and lu-lu's that are running the company all gave themselves a nice fat raise, of course, on top of it that \$100,000 can turn into nothing overnight some day, who knows.

And, okay, I have a special message once again for the unions, vote for whom you will, vote your conscience, but let them know the person you vote for that trade packs are killing our ability to pay taxes and needed for your very support, so when you see that job going to South Korea and

they are going to use slave labor to replace us, think about it because these people really need to be told the working class is going broke, so there is going to be no more money left to do anything with.

And I have a comment, and I'm saving the golden parrot of the year for a Democrat, but Newt was asked if he believed in marriage between a man and a woman and asked to sign it. And he said, well, yeah, yeah, but it should be between a man and a woman and his mistress.

And Romney well, when he was asked and he said being a Mormon, he said, well, it should be between a man and women, his wives.

But the golden parrot goes to Eric

Holder who has been ignoring the voter

registration acts that are passed in the

states that could deny people that were born

at home and it cost costs hundreds of

dollars to straighten it out in Court. A

lot of people are being denied without photo

ID the right to vote and shame on him

because he has had three years to address

1	it. Thank you and have a good night.
2	MS. EVANS: Thank you. Hi.
3	MR. SLEDENZSKI: Hi, Janet. Jack,
4	you handsome devil, you.
5	MR. LOSCOMBE: Chrissy.
6	MR. SLEDENZSKI: Happy New year,
7	Jack. Mr. McGoff, can I ask you a question?
8	When is the garbage this week? The garbage,
9	do you know yet? Let me know?
10	MR. LOSCOMBE: It's a date late,
11	Chris. A day behind.
12	MR. SLEDENZSKI: A day behind?
13	Okay, thank you.
14	MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you, Chrissy.
15	MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else who
16	cares to address council?
17	MS. KRAKE: FIFTH ORDER. 5-A.
18	Motions.
19	MS. EVANS: Mr. McGoff, do you have
20	any comments or motions tonight?
21	MR. MCGOFF: Please. I'll start
22	with since we are here primarily to deal
23	with the veto of the budget just a few
24	comments on that. Last week I was ridiculed
25	for saying that I didn't think that the

when I asked the question about millage, the millage and the council's budget, I was told twice that it was a 4.8 percent increase on millage, and I went back and used the numbers that were provided in the mayor's budget since we are comparing his 29 percent tax increase to the 4.8 percent increase and if you work out the -- if you take the current rate and multiply it by 1.048 and times the assessed value and times the collection rate, that amount does not come to \$13.9 million. If you use -- if you use an 87 percent collection rate you are about \$800,000 short.

numbers added up or something to that effect

If you push it to 90 percent, which has never happened, you could still come up \$300,000 short, and that's what I had asked and in order to get to 13.9 million you will have to increase -- using a 87 percent collection rate, which is what they used in the business administration office and which is really high end historically for collections. You would have to increase the millage to 11 percent in order to achieve

the 13.9 million that's in the budget, in the council budget.

And I asked the evening that it was presented, and I don't think that I received an answer. I was given -- I'm not sure whether the question was understood or what, but these numbers are what were used by the administration and I assume that we were comparing them in the same way or using those same numbers, as has been said, and it doesn't add up. It's short \$800,000, and for that I guess I was criticized. So that's one issue that I have with the budget.

The other issue I have with council budget is that I think that the extensive cuts in DPW are going to diminish the services that we now receive from DPW. I think they are too extensive and I would rather see -- I would rather have the service that we now rather than one that is going to be severely diminished.

And also in the proposal that was given to us by Mr. Joyce last week and to payback the \$5 million for the deficit, he

said one of the recommendations was to take the \$600,000 that was budgeted to reinstate 13 firefighters that to help pay off the deficit or -- yes, the deficit and so now if we follow that then we are taking the funding for public safety out of the budget, which I didn't think we wanted to do so.

And the third thing, the salary reductions I thought were absolutely and totally unnecessary and I think these range -- I think these issues bring into question council's budget and while I don't think the mayor's budget is perfect, I don't think that the council budget is perfect either, and I think through the process we should have -- we should arrived at a better solution. I know there was attempts made, at least there were some steps taken but I don't think we went far enough in reaching a compromise budget that was -- that is workable for everyone.

And I see that -- and I did receive your phone call, Mr. Joyce, I tried to call you back but I couldn't get through.

MR. JOYCE: Yes, I missed your call.

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MCGOFF: We are putting the unfunded debt back on the -- or we may put the unfunded back on the table for this evening. I think this was a -- I thought it was a good plan when it was presented and I think that it is an acceptable solution now and I just wish we had done it sooner, and that's all I have. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: And, Mr. Rogan, do you have any comments or motions tonight?

MR. ROGAN: Yes, I guess I'll make a few comments on the budget as well. I was going to wait until the vote, but I guess we'll get it out of the way. Mr. McGoff is right, there is no perfect budget. Neither council's budget nor the mayor's is perfect, but I don't think there is such a thing as a perfect budget ever, but we have a choice between council's budget which trims a lot of fat from the administration, trims some salaries, some cuts that need to be made, and there is people out there living on a fixed income and they are seeing department heads making 40, 50,000 dollars a year on their dime, at the same time the mayor wants

2

4

5 6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to increase their taxes almost 30 percent.

We need to make cuts in administration salary. If it was up to me I would have been up to 25 percent, you know, especially with some of the department heads that haven't been responsive to the people. You know, we have a stack of mail every week from certain department heads -- or from the citizens that called in and said they couldn't get any results with certain departments. Council puts the inquiry in, nothina. That's one of the most frustrating things of being on council is when we get letters and phone calls from people that say -- you know, it might be something as simple as, "I have a pothole on my street, I called the pothole hotline three times and it still hasn't been fixed."

Council sends a letter and you drive by two weeks later and it's still not fixed, and it's not just the DPW it's many of the departments head, but I don't think it's fair to put that person who is going to be pay more taxes and the top pay people in the city aren't taking a pay cut as well.

As far as the DPW cuts go, I believe, Mr. McGoff, that Mr. Joyce used your cuts for the union positions.

MR. MCGOFF: I didn't have anything in the administrative cuts.

MR. ROGAN: But the union positions.

MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

MR. ROGAN: And the union guys would be the ones that would be doing the work, not the administrators.

MR. MCGOFF: I think the administrators work as well as foremen.

MR. ROGAN: Well, as far as the majority of the labor is done on the union workers not the supervisors. I would also say that the police department runs just fine with one chief. The fire department has a chief and some deputies, you know. The fire department has a lot more to handle than the DPW, not to diminish the DPW, but the fire department is in the business of saving lives and you need a little more over site.

We have had all of these DPW deputy directors, foremen, some of them were cut

16

17

14

15

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

out of the budget that the mayor funded anyways, and yet the Department of Public Works is chaotic. It's in the newspaper Employees using public every week. equipment for private use. Employees picking up prostitutes. Not working a full day. Maybe we should have 100 foremen down there supervising maybe then the guys will work a full day and get some stuff done, but it's up to our new director and I hope that Mr. Dougher will do a good job. I'm very hopeful that, you know, he will make the reforms necessary to make that department run efficiently and to make sure the job gets done.

As far as the \$600,000 goes, I believe Mayor Doherty stated he wasn't going to reinstate the fire positions, that's why Mr. Joyce had that in his proposal.

MR. JOYCE: That's correct.

MR. ROGAN: And, you know, I think everyone of us on here would like that money to go towards public safety, but when you have a mayor who does the hiring and firing in the city if he says, no, it's not going

to happen so we don't want to leave that \$600,000 floating around where, you know, he could build another tree house or something. But at the end of the day when it comes time to vote there is a choice between two budgets, and one budget it keeps taxes relatively low and one budget that jacks them up by a third. One budget that cuts some fat from the administration, cuts some positions, eliminates some waste, and another budget that leaves them in there.

And at the end of the day each one of us has to make that decision, which budget is better for the vast majority of the people, and I think it's clear as day by looking at the two proposals that council's amendment budget is the right choice. Not only will people keep a little more money in their pockets, but we make government smaller, which is very important to me.

So I would hope that my colleagues would all vote to override the budget. I hope that it's overridden 5-0, and that is all I have. And I would like to wish everyone a Happy New Year. Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. EVANS: Thank you. And, Councilman Loscombe, do you have any commence or motions tonight?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes, thank you. too, will comment on the budget rather than when we are voting on it. Again, I agree with my colleagues that spoke prior to me that neither budget is perfect. There has been a lot of work put into both most likely. I know the work that has been put into the city council's amended budget. mayor's budget calls for a 29 percent tax increase and also laying off 29 firefighters. I had made the comment several meetings ago that I wouldn't even address the budget or consider a budget that didn't address public safety and our amended budget puts funding in for 13. And again, as Mr. Rogan said, deferring to what Mr. McGoff said about the \$600,000, I believe Mr. Joyce was referring to Mayor Doherty's comments that he wouldn't put the firefighters back with that and, you know, I find that hard to believe.

I mean, we wouldn't even be looking

at cutbacks or tax increases if the mayor followed our budget last year. Our budget was sabotaged from day one. We had revenue sources in there that were totally overlooked. We have two authorities right now that are on the hook for over \$5 million were bailing out here. I mean, those authorities were appointments by this mayor to run those authorities, and each one of them is well over \$2 million in the hole right now, and the mayor's budget wants us to give one of those authorities the parking meters to play with.

You know, we have to look at both budgets on their face. The numbers that were used for our budget Mr. Joyce received right from the administration, right from Mr. McGowan. I have every e-mail that he had sent and referred. He forwarded them to me. I happened to be there the day Mr. Courtright was speaking to Mr. Joyce with facts and figures from that office. I trust the figures that Mr. Joyce has worked on here.

I mean, how could anybody have a

3

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

perfect budget when we still have no audit?
We don't know what budget is going to -- but
I do trust -- at this point I trust the city
council's amended budget.

And to go a little further, you know, there has been a lot of anguish on my part the last couple of weeks because no one knows my heart is more into public safety, I just fear what's happening in this city right now. It's devastating, but our budget at least puts something back in there. Something is more than nothing. Is it adequate? Far from it. Do I want to see any of our employees losing their jobs this time of the year? Not with this economy. You know, it touches my heart. They have families, they have homes, they had to move into the city. You know, they have children, young children, some of them have newborns. It's a tough situation.

But again, I honestly feel that we, the majority here, didn't create this problem. This problem was created over the past ten years by reckless spending and not adhering to the budgets that were going to

benefit the public, but yet you have a newspaper like the Scranton Times that will not admit that in one sentence. And, you know what the Times has done to us up here? We have become numb to the editorials, the cartoons, the constant lashing. It doesn't phase us, we expect it. And I can't wait to read tomorrow's paper, on-line, of course, I won't buy it, but, you know, just to see what spin. I had several people after the last meeting tell me what the paper said was nothing about the meeting.

And then you have the other paper
like the GO Lackawanna which has almost
everything verbatim of what happens at the
meetings. I just don't understand it. It
only shows me that the newspaper is acting
as the protector, but they are also
continuing the problems that this city is in
rather than helping resolve them by picking
on us and trying to tell us to work together
with the mayor, it's our fault and all of
that, is only dividing us.

But to go back to give a little history of the past couple of weeks, I have

been very anguished over these budgets. I mean, it's a process. Last year wasn't half as bad. You know, I have been contacted -- I was actually contacted by the mayor himself and we had a cordial conversation last Friday, cordial but short. He asked me to consider voting for his budget and, you know, he said that we needled the tax increase and, you know, otherwise he is going to have to increase it more next year. And I just listened to him and he did say -- he said, "I give you my word we will discuss public safety."

But, you know, in the bottom -- at the end of it all there is nothing in writing. I have had several members of the fire department come to me and tell me that the mayor was going to give them a memorandum of understanding to put the men back in and I requested a copy of that memorandum of understanding, a signed copy, and to this day I still do not have one. Even as far as this day I did speak to one of the fire officials about it and it's the 13th hour. I mean, this is something that

should have been presented before.

And it appears that certain members, and understandably so, some of them whose jobs are on the line, believe that we are not doing what we can, that we have the ability to put them back in there and they are even believing that the mayor would give them a written memorandum of understanding after cutting them out of the budget, after ten years of saying he was going to bring the fire department down, bring the police department down.

Our public safety departments are at a critical stage right now and come January 1 we are lucky if we have four firehouses open, and that's with full manning. That's the truth. We are going to have a catastrophe, but what I'm asking the mayor, you know, I cannot consider that budget. I mean, we have gone on the word before and we see what happens. Even with the memorandum of understanding, he could tie that up in court for years, so what have they gained? What have we gained? We haven't gained that manpower, we have gained another court

battle. We are in court right now over the massive layoffs.

I would just hope that the members of the public safety union can understand where I stand and where my council colleagues stand. I think everyone here has fought for public safety and I believe that our budget gives us the tools and we have the commitment to provide the adequate public safety for everyone out there, not the inadequate public safety we have now, but if the money wasn't squandered over the past several years we wouldn't be in this boat.

We get surprised with a \$5 million dollar hole two years in a row. Again, no audit, we don't know what's going to surprise us yet. Revenue sources, again, untapped, let go. Authorities running rough shot. It's time, and I think it's been a hard two-year fight, but I think it's time and this year I think is the year. Given the right tools that we have in our budget that there is going to be a lot of changes for the positive. We are out here -- we are

2

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

- -

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

looking for 70,000 taxpayers we are looking for, that's who we work for, and I know in my heart and everyone's heart here that's who we represent.

Is it a great budget? Not at all. It could have been a greater budget if he listened to us last year. Again, I hope he doesn't sabotage this, but if he is comitted to discuss public safety as he said with me and if he was going to do that memorandum of understanding then show your good faith by putting the 13 firefighters back in that we have budgeted for and let us sit down together with the chiefs on the fire department, the police department, and the mayor and the chief of police and get these public safety issues worked out because that's one thing that the public deserves. They deserve to be able to sleep safely at night, sleep comfortably at night, feel safe walking down the streets, feel safe knowing that when they call for a fire truck it's not going to take ten minutes to get there and it's too late.

These are all the decisions that we

have had to make here. Are they life and death decisions? They certainly are, but I think our decisions are going to protect a lot more lives in the long run. The mayor's budget has eliminated 29 firefighters. The mayor's budget has increased taxes 29 percent. The mayor's budget had to put six police officers back in, but the ironic thing is if he had -- if he kept two police officers, if he appointed two police officers last year we would have 15 on the street today, 13 of them through COM-D, two being paid. Now we have to pay six and we only have six from that bottom number.

So, you know, we are leaving these decisions in the hands of someone that asks us to trust him, and personally, you know, I'll speak to Mayor Doherty any day, we have a gentleman's trust between us and, you know, cordiality, but we have to get on the same page but he has to listen to us, too.

And, you know, if you don't mind if
I could just address our solicitor here on
that issue of the memorandum of
understanding and our agreement from last

year that we are working on the appeal now, for your safety maybe Solicitor Hughes can explain that a little bit.

MR. HUGHES: It's ironic that you are talking about a memorandum of understanding, I'm doing the amicus brief on behalf of council to be submitted to the Commonwealth Court next Tuesday and, of course, that's on ordinances No. 57 and 58 of last year where council had a minimum staffing of the police department at 150 and a minimum of staffing of the fire department of 137, then in July the mayor laid off eight firemen and 13 police officers. There were two vacancies in the police department which brought it down to 148 and then he laid off 13 police officers.

We are putting this together now. I believe that Judge Thomson was wrong, I should say I know he was wrong. I really believe that the brief that's going to be submitted by the unions along with our amicus brief that we have an excellent chance to get the mayor -- to get the lower court reversed and then council's

legislation for minimum staffing will be valid on appeal.

I can't guarantee a result, I wish I could, but I really believe that the way that our brief is going together, it's just an amicus brief, we don't have a right to appeal, but an amicus brief is a friend of the Court that to the appellate court for them to read as to why we think that Judge Thomson should be reversed.

Secondly, it's very difficult to comment on a memorandum of understanding that, you know, we have never seen. I think Jack has asked for, we haven't seen it, I'm totally unfamiliar with such a document being used in governmental work. I have never seen one in all my years of being a solicitor for school districts, former City of Scranton assistant city for the City of Scranton, you know, for sewer authorities and everything else, negotiating the union contracts, I have never heard of such a thing.

It's used in private industry often times when businessmen get together. I have

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

used it many times in negotiating acquisitions of companies in businesses on behalf of clients or even the sale of businesses on behalf of the clients where you get together and you put a memorandum of understanding together.

You have to be very careful in private industry as to how it's phrased because it can be considered a contract and enforceable. So that I'd say most memorandums of understanding are done just that they are an agreement in principal only and there is nothing binding in it, so I think that even if the mayor did sign a memorandum of understanding with the union I don't see how it really would be enforceable, you know, that would be my opinion. I can't see how the mayor can just commit -- the mayor cannot commit the city where council is involved to have any binding commitment. I think council in it's budget right now has included 13 positions back into the fire department. The mayor could easily hire the 13 firemen that have been laid off and putting them back into the position.

I just believe I read last week where he said even if he had the grant of \$600,000 specifically for the firemen he wouldn't use it for that purpose, he would use it for something else, so it's like a chameleon. I think he takes a position depending on the color of the paper it's on. If he wants to be red, he'll be red. If he wants to be green, he'll be green. If he wants to be blue, he will be blue. But the truth is far in-between. So my opinion is that any memorandum of understanding would be unenforceable.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. HUGHES: And that's a pretty broad statement to make when you haven't even seen it, but since, you know, it's kind of like a mirage, you know, it's supposed to be there, but you don't see it.

MR. LOSCOMBE: And I would think based on past history that, you know, it could be held up in court, too, for several years, so we are no farther ahead at that point. I mean, we have to make a decision

tonight that's going to impact 70,000 taxpayers and God knows the loss of so many police and firefighters is definitely an impact. However, again, if you look at the two budgets, and ours does call at least for some manning at this point, and based on this hearing in March it could mean a lot more, but I would ask the public and those in the public safety departments to believe in us here, to have their faith in us here who have been here fighting for them the past few years and not someone who has been fighting against them the past ten years.

I mean, I find is hard to believe someone would change overnight especially when they took it out of their budget and that's what I had to gauge. I said a lot of prayers, I did a lot of speaking to people, mentors, and my gut reaction from my heart and, you know, the way I'm going to vote based on everything I have seen is that I will be voting for council's amended budget. And God bless everyone. Have a happy new year and for those families who are facing their job losses, please have faith in us.

We are here working for you. We haven't let you down, we never will, contrary to what you may have heard. We are interested in a public safety of everyone in this city, everyone's life is valuable and we will fight until we get to that point. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: And thank you,

Mr. Loscombe. Councilman Joyce, do you have
any comments or motions?

MR. JOYCE: Yes, I do. Tonight I will address all of the allegations that Mayor Doherty made in his veto message and also touch on some of Mr. McGoff's concerns as well. Mayor Doherty's first allegation was that the real estate tax increase wasn't high enough, and I know Mr. McGoff shared the same concern.

Okay, let me explain one last time here. From the cash flow report produced by Ryan McGowan on a monthly basis at the time the budget was constructed it was projected that we would receive \$13.2 million in revenue from current real estate tax.

That's a printed document and that is

available for public review.

PEL had also expressed that we should expect to see \$200,000 in additional revenue from real estate tax collections due to the transfer of the property from the Mercy Hospital to CHS, which is a for profit organization, okay? So, therefore, with this being said the total amount of revenue that the city would realize would be \$13.4 million in the current -- if we kept the current real estate tax. That's the amount of revenue that we could have expected to see but, of course, doing that wouldn't balance the budget.

The real estate tax revenue line number in the 2012 was decreased from 16183 to 1397, \$13,970,000, that is. Therefore, with all being said the amount of revenue that needs to be generated from the current real estate taxes is \$570,000 from last year. This is roughly a 4.2 percent increase in revenue. When taking into account that 87 percent of taxes are generally collected, the percentage increases 4.8 percent. 4.2 divided by .87

is equal to 4.8, and you could plug that into calculator and that's the number that you will get.

The mayors suggested that the amount that council decrease the real estate tax increase by in his budget, which was 29.1 percent, by the way, will create a \$1 million hole. This is false for the reasons that I just described. It's pretty clear now.

Furthermore, we would actually have to collect less taxes in 2012 than in 2011 for a \$1 million hole to actually occur which is absolutely preposterous since there is a tax increase of 4.8 percent.

So at this juncture I know

Mr. McGoff stated that the numbers don't add

up, so besides that I'd like to pass down a

copy of this.

MR. MCGOFF: You still haven't addressed the issue of millage. All you are talking about is revenue. Revenue and millage are two different things.

MR. JOYCE: I understand that revenue and millage are two different things

and we are talking about a 4.2 percent increase in revenue and a 4.8 percent increase in millage because --

MR. MCGOFF: No, you are not.

MR. JOYCE: -- of the .87 -- or the .87 percent. Well, the .87 collection factor. The 87 percent collection rate, but we can agree to disagree and that's fine.

Secondly, Mayor Doherty in his veto message stated that council's amendments failed to take into account the rising costs of health care and salaries which the city is required to pay by Court orders or contracts. First, let me begin my stating that this is just a flat out lie. Council's amendments only adjusted health insurance values by the amounts that Ryan McGowan, the city's BA prescribed, which was a deduction of \$14,500 for each employee that was cut and an additional \$14,500 for each employee that was added.

Furthermore, the salaries that were deducted for each position from their respective standard salary accounts, as well as the longevity accounts of their unions

members that were cut in the budget, as amended, uniform allowances were also deducted for union members accordingly as well as life and disability insurance.

In addition, \$600,000 was split proportionately due to the number of retirees and was deducted from each health insurance line item according to the savings that Ryan McGowan instructed in the -- that we would receive from the retiree prescription savings grant, which would save the city \$600,000.

The third allegation that Mayor

Doherty made in his veto message is that

council fails to budget for a \$1.6 million

guarantee that the SPA will be short on this

year. According to the SPA budget, however,

council's amendments -- or the amended

budget, sorry, not the SPA budget, council's

amendments do make this appropriation. The

appropriation made by council is added to

the contingency fund due to the fact that

the SPA has bond insurance and the SPA

should determine if their insurance is

liable to pay for the deficit before trying

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to tap into city taxpayer dollars.

With that being said, the mayor should actually pay attention to council's amendments rather than making blind accusations. Overall, the statements made by the mayor in his veto message that's what's truly preposterous.

Throughout the whole process I have contacted Ryan McGowan, our business administrator, many times as well as PEL and Gerry Cross and I have spoken for I still have not heard a word from hours. Mayor Doherty. This is what is truly unfortunate. And, you know, we sit here and we talk about cooperation week after week, I have asked Ryan -- in the past I asked Ryan McGowan to instruct Mayor Doherty to call me because I wished to speak about budget matters with him and guess what, he never I also e-mailed Mayor Doherty three different times and I still didn't her a response from him.

One would think that the mayor would be willing to speak to the Finance Chair before constructing a veto message.

However, somehow last week it's obvious that other council members are able to communicate with the mayor or the mayor may call them. Councilman McGoff knew that Mayor Doherty was not going to veto the budget on or before last Tuesday. Also, in speaking with one of my colleagues, Mr. Jack Loscombe, Mayor Doherty reached out to him and called him five times trying to get him to vote to sustain his veto. Why Mayor Doherty won't speak to the Finance Chair or the President of City Council is beyond my comprehension. It's ludicrous.

In speaking with Councilman

Loscombe, and here's an even more disturbing statement, what was truly appalling to hear was that Mayor Doherty stated on the phone to Mr. Loscombe, "I know a 29.1 percent tax increase seems like a lot, but by next year people will forget about it."

That statement alone angers me and it should anger anyone listening tonight. A 29.1 percent tax increase may not seem like a lot to him, but to the senior citizen living off social security, the new

homeowner or a single parent trying to raise their kid on one income, I bet it sure seems like a lot.

It is evident that Mayor Doherty does not have high regard for fire protection as well since he refuses to reinstate 13 firefighters that council budgeted for. However, by Mayor Doherty making the statement about the taxpayers proves to me that he doesn't have high regard for taxpayers in the City of Scranton as well, at least in my opinion since he simply thinks that people would just forget about a 29.1 percent tax increase. That's appalling, Folks.

But, you know what, be rest assured this council is going to continue to fight for you and the city's best interest. We represent everyone in this city and we will never turn our back on the residents of Scranton that make this city great.

And in all due respect, Mr. McGoff,

I know we disagree on some different

positions, but the fact that Mayor Doherty

won't put the firefighters back in that's

why I included it, and as far as the DPW cuts were concerned according to an e-mail from Ryan McGowan it was the mayor's intent to layoff 20 workers as well through -- well, end up buying out 20 workers, which would still result in 20 cuts.

And I'll tell you what, as far as the work that I have done on this budget, you know what, anyone could sit here and say that, yeah, we could have arrived at a better solution, but I'll tell you what working on the budget itself was almost -- was probably more than a full-time job over the past months, so I'd like to see someone else come up here and try to do a better job than that. I'm confident in the work that I did and I'm confident that this is the best budget for the City of Scranton. And that is all I have to say on that matter.

MS. EVANS: Thank you, Councilman

Joyce. Good evening. As anticipated, Mayor

Doherty vetoed the legislation which adopted
the 2012 operating budget, as amended, and
as explained by Finance Chair Councilman

Joyce, the mayor's veto letter contains

flawed statements and false conclusions.

Also, in the December 22, 2011, edition of the Scranton Times the mayor stated, "This is not political gamesmanship this is affecting the lives of the people of Scranton and the services we provide them and eventually would effect the value of their homes."

If Mayor Doherty is not using gamesmanship, then why did he conceal the borrowing of \$5 million from the Workers' Comp Reserve Fund until after the budget was adopted? And why did he not include the \$5 million he needs to repay the Workers' Comp Reserve Fund in his 2012 proposed budget and in his legislation to borrow \$6.7 million for unfunded debt? The mayor created his own problems when he lied to the banking community and concealed his \$5 million borrowing from Scranton City Council until December 16.

In addition, if the mayor is truly concerned about affecting the lives of the people and the services that we provide them, why did he recommend a 29 percent tax

increase while simultaneously eliminating 29 firefighters, seven police officers and closing fire stations in his budget?

The simple truth is that despite the cautionary letters sent to the administration on council by the Pennsylvania Economy League throughout 2011, the city experienced yearend cash flow problems. Please note that the same letters never mentioned the use of the Workers' Comp Reserve Fund in December 2011 to stem any 2011 financial problems.

Thus, how did this financial crisis occur when PEL forewarned the city? Well, the answer is obvious. Mayor Doherty never heeded these warnings, rather, he sabotaged the 2011 budget. First, he used a 2011 TAN to repay a 2010 TAN thereby creating an immediate \$5 million hole in January 2010 for 2011. He then refused to implement new revenue generators, in particular, the StreetSmart Parking Program, reinstated the DPW positions with benefits, and equally important gambled that HUD would never discover that he intended to pay regular

duty police officers with CDBG funds, among other actions. When warned by HUD against this type of ineligible use of CDBG funds, the mayor was then forced to pay these 13 officers from the operating budget.

Had Mayor Doherty never used the 2011 TAN to repay last year's TAN and followed the 2011 budget as amended, cash flow problems would not have occurred.

Nevertheless, even after the mayor sabotaged our current year budget city council worked continuously with the administration and PEL to develop it's 2012 amendments, used financial numbers provided by Ryan McGowan, Gerry Cross, and Tax Collector Courtright, solved all financial problems presented to it by the administration and then and only then amended and adopted the 2012 operating budget.

Shockingly the administration and PEL suddenly informed council that another \$5 million would be needed after the budget was adopted. Had the administration or PEL notified council prior to December 13 we

could have worked to address it together.

Instead, according to Home Rule Charter,
council has only one remaining authoritative
act with regard to the budget and that is
it's ability to override the mayor's veto.

Council cannot open the budget nor can it
amend the budget following it's adoption.

I agree that the budget process is not the occasion for political gamesmanship which is precisely why council set aside any doubts and differences and worked in earnest and in good faith with the administration, PEL, DCED, and the Single Tax Office.
Unfortunately, the administration, PEL and DCED did not do the same. They had the same obligation to notify city council of their planned use of Workers' Comp Reserve Funds as they had when presenting all other financial debt and issues to us.

In prior years, the administration and PEL used Workers' Comp excess funds covertly to pay bills. However, in this specific instance the use of Workers' Comp funds should never have been concealed because the administration is dipping into

the mandatory 75 percent funding level, which is far more serious than raiding excess funds and demands reimbursement as soon as possible.

The people of Scranton should not be forced by the mayor to pay 29 percent more in city taxes for significant loss of public safety services. Now, more than ever, the people can't afford the Doherty debt and Doherty gamesmanship. Three councilmen and one councilwoman are all that stands between you and huge tax increases from the Doherty administration and PEL.

Despite the pressures, threats, criticism and bullying that has been aimed at us, we won't let you down. The mayor and his supporters foolishly believe that you can afford large tax increases and that you will forget all about it by next year. I know that you're struggling to survive to keep your homes and to make ends meet. Therefore, I will be voting to override the mayor's veto this evening on behalf of the elderly, poor and working class taxpayers of Scranton, and that's it.

1	MS. KRAKE: 5-B. NO BUSINESS AT
2	THIS TIME.
3	SIXTH ORDER. NO BUSINESS AT THIS
4	TIME.
5	SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. FOR
6	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
7	FOR ADOPTION-FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 56, 2011(AS
8	AMENDED) - APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR THE
9	EXPENSES OF THE CITY GOVERNMENT FOR THE
10	PERIOD COMMENCING ON THE FIRST DAY OF
11	JANUARY, 2012 TO AND INCLUDING DECEMBER 31,
12	2012 BY THE ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL CITY
13	OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2012.
14	(OVERRIDE MAYOR'S VETO).
15	MS. EVANS: What is the
16	recommendation of the Chair for the
17	Committee on Finance?
18	MR. JOYCE: As Chairperson for the
19	Committee on Finance, I recommend City
20	Council override the mayor's veto of Item
21	7-A, as amended.
22	MR. ROGAN: Second.
23	MS. EVANS: On the question?
24	MR. ROGAN: I would just mention
25	again, I forget to bring it up, Mr. Loscombe

24

25

1

mentioned that the mayor said to him that the people will forget, and I would say the exact opposite. I strongly believe one of the reasons I'm sitting here and Mr. Joyce is sitting here is because the people didn't forget about the tax increase handed down to them by Mrs. Gatelli, Mrs. Fanucci, and the people do remember, especially when it comes to their pocketbooks. They are going to remember and it's up to us to do the right thing and to vote for council's budget to let the people in the city keep more of their money at the end of the day instead of the government taking it, and that's all I just wanted to mention.

MS. EVANS: Anyone else on the question? Roll call, please.

MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.

MR. MCGOFF: No.

MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.

MR. ROGAN: Yes.

MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.

MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans. 1 MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare 2 3 the mayor's veto of Item 7-A, File of Council No. 56, 2011, as amended, legally 4 5 and lawfully overridden: MR. JOYCE: I'd like to make a 6 7 motion to take File of Council No. 58, 2011, 8 from the table and place into Seventh Order 9 for final consideration. MR. ROGAN: Second. 10 11 MS. EVANS: On the question? A11 12 those in favor signify by saying aye. 13 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 14 MR. ROGAN: Aye. MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 15 MR. JOYCE: Aye. 16 17 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 18 have it and so moved. MS. KRAKE: 7-B. FOR CONSIDERATION 19 BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR ADOPTION -20 21 FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 58, 2011, PROVIDING FOR THE PROPER OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON 22 TO PETITION THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF 23 24 LACKAWANNA COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, FOR 25 PERMISSION TO FUND UNFUNDED DEBT IN AN

AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$6,700,000, AUTHORIZING INCIDENTAL ACTION AND REPEALING INCONSISTENT ORDINANCES.

MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to amend File of Council No. 58, 2011, 7-B, as per the following changes: Deleting the phrase, "Not to exceed \$6.7 million," wherever it appears in the ordinance and inserting there at the phrase, "Not to exceed \$9.85 million."

MR. ROGAN: Second.

MS. EVANS: On the question?

MR. JOYCE: Yes. As you know, on December 7 at a meeting at Fidelity Bank Mayor Doherty lied to a room full of bankers and stated that he wouldn't have to borrow money to pay back TAN-B from this year.

Mayor Doherty in his remarks to the Scranton Times stated that this was not a time to play gotcha, indicating that he did, in fact, say that he wouldn't be borrowing to pay back TAN-B.

Of course, as you know, on December

15 after council's amendments were passed,

Mayor Doherty said he would be reaching out

to the state to borrow \$5 million from the Workers' Compensation Trust Fund to pay off TAN-B. While Mayor Doherty does not think it's time to play gotcha, I do think it's time he is held accountable, especially by the Scranton Times-Tribune and it's editors. What I'm doing tonight is raising the amount of the unfunded borrowing so we can pay TAN-B and, therefore, clean up another mess that Mayor Doherty created.

Mayor Doherty stated that he wished to Borough \$11.5 million. The amount that I'm amending the borrowing to is \$9.85 million. The reason being is that in the original \$6.7 million in unfunded borrowing, I already accounted for \$1.25 million to be paid back to an A, B, C fund to reimburse what would be the city's last payroll, and I confirmed this with Gerry Cross. We both came to the consensus that the mayor -- we both anticipated that the mayor was lying at the meeting with the banks and that we would be \$1.25 million short.

In addition, if the mayor is refusing to put back 13 firefighters,

	··
1	council is not going to allow him to simply
2	borrow that money and use it as free will.
3	Thus, by reducing the amount to \$9.85
4	million there is not going to be an excess
5	amount of money for the mayor to simply play
6	around with, and that's all.
7	MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else on
8	the question? All those in favor of
9	amending Item 7-B signify by saying aye.
10	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
11	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
12	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
13	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
14	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
15	have it and so moved.
16	What is the recommendation of the
17	chair for the Committee on Finance?
18	MR. JOYCE: As chairperson for the
19	Committee on Finance, I recommend final
20	passage of the Item 7-B.
21	MR. ROGAN: Second.
22	MS. EVANS: As amended.
23	MR. JOYCE: As amended.
24	MR. ROGAN: Second.
25	MS. EVANS: On the question?

1	MR. ROGAN: Yes, would we allow the
2	public to address this since it wasn't on
3	the agenda?
4	MS. EVANS: I believe we can do so.
5	Is there anyone in the audience who would
6	like to address this legislation?
7	MS. SCHUMACHER: Yes. It's been
8	several weeks so could you again tell us
9	this is only for a this is ten-year
10	payback, it is specified as a ten-year note?
11	MR. JOYCE: Yes. That's correct.
12	MS. SCHUMACHER: And do you have any
13	idea what the interest rate will be?
14	MR. JOYCE: At this point we don't
15	have an interest rate because in the whole
16	process it has to be approved by the courts
17	and then we have to find a lender somewhere
18	in Lackawanna County so we don't have a firm
19	interest rate at this time.
20	MS. SCHUMACHER: Does it still
21	specify just the items that can be paid out
22	of this
23	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
24	MS. SCHUMACHER: this borrowing.
25	MR. JOYCE: Yes, and it's a maximum

1	of the amount, so if we, in fact, do not
2	have enough bills to amount up to \$9.85
3	million after the repayment of the workers'
4	Comp, the amount will actually be lower than
5	the court is petitioned for.
6	MS. SCHUMACHER: Yeah, I understand
7	that I just didn't know if that language was
8	still in there since
9	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
10	MS. SCHUMACHER: it had been
11	several weeks. Thank you.
12	MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else?
13	Do any council members have any question?
14	Roll call, please?
15	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
16	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
17	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
18	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
19	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
20	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
21	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
22	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
23	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
24	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare
25	Item 7-C, as amended, legally and lawfully

adopted.

I'd like to take this opportunity to wish everyone a very happy, healthy and prosperous new year and you can rest assured that your tax increase from the City of Scranton will not be 29.1 percent, and that city council is keeping it's eye on your tax dollars and fighting hard for you. Is there a motion to adjourn?

MR. JOYCE: Motion to adjourn.

 $\label{eq:MS.EVANS:} \textbf{MS. EVANS:} \quad \textbf{This meeting is} \\ \textbf{adjourned.} \\$

ability.

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

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER