		1
1	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING	
2		
3		
4		
5	HELD:	
6		
7	Thursday, March 1, 2012	
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	<u> </u>	
24	CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER	
25		

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL:

JANET EVANS, PRESIDENT (Not present)

FRANK JOYCE, VICE-PRESIDENT

ROBERT MCGOFF

PAT ROGAN

JOHN LOSCOMBE (Not present)

NANCY KRAKE, CITY CLERK

KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

BOYD HUGHES, SOLICITOR

(Pledge of Allegiance recited and moment of reflection 1 2 observed.) 3 MR. JOYCE: Roll call, please. MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff. 4 MR. MCGOFF: Here. 5 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan. 6 7 MR. ROGAN: Here. 8 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe. Mr. 9 Joyce. MR. JOYCE: Here. 10 11 MS. CARRERA: Mrs. Evans. MR. JOYCE: Council President Janet 12 Evans as well as Councilman Jack Loscombe 13 14 will not be in attendance at tonight's meeting, both are still recovering from 15 16 illness. Dispense with the reading of the 17 minutes. 18 MS. KRAKE: THIRD ORDER. 3 - A . MINUTES OF THE NON-UNIFORM MUNICIPAL PENSION 19 20 MEETING HELD JANUARY 25, 2012. 21 MR. JOYCE: Are there any comments? 22 If not, received and filed. MS. KRAKE: 3-B. AGENDA FOR THE 23 24 NON-UNIFORM MUNICIPAL PENSION FUND HELD 25 FEBRUARY 22, 2012.

1 MR. JOYCE: Are there any comments? If not, received and filed. 2 MS. KRAKE: 3-C. DEPOSIT MADE BY THE 3 SCRANTON SINGLE TAX OFFICE IN THE AMOUNT OF 4 5 \$1,018,281.44 TO FIDELITY BANK FOR 2012 TAN DEBT. 6 7 MR. JOYCE: Are there any comments? 8 If not, received and filed. 9 MS. KRAKE: 3-D. MINUTES OF THE FIREMEN'S PENSION COMMISSION MEETING HELD 10 JANUARY 25, 2012. 11 12 MR. JOYCE: Are there any comments? 13 If not, received and filed. Clerk's notes? 14 MS. KRAKE: We don't have any this 15 evening, Mr. Joyce. 16 MR. JOYCE: Do any council members 17 have any announcements? There will be a 18 benefit spaghetti dinner for Nancy Reuther, 19 who has been diagnosed with multiple 20 sclerosis, on Saturday, March 3, 2012, from 21 2 to 6 p.m. at the Fraternal Order of 22 Eagle's Club and that's located on 493 23 Meridian Avenue in West Scranton. The cost 24 is \$8. 25 MS. KRAKE: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZEN'S PARTICIPATION.

MR. JOYCE: Our first speaker tonight is Frank Galdieri.

MR. GALDIERI: Good evening. My name is Frank Galdieri. I'm a resident of the City of Scranton and reside on Steel Avenue which is located in a very small area off the Morgan Highway. The only access that we have to our small community is through a road called Pike Street. Pike Street is approximately one-half of a mile distance from the Morgan Highway and runs north and south intersecting with Steel Avenue overstreet.

The roadway is deplorable. The road has not been resurfaced in 24 years. I have been trying unsuccessful for 18 of those 24 years to try and have this road resurfaced. The only thing holding it together is the patch material from the potholes. I addressed this to Councilman Loscombe months ago. Mr. Loscombe went up and took pictures of the roadway and agreed it is beyond repair. It needs to be resurfaced. It's not only bad condition, it's dangerous.

As a retired police officer with the City of Scranton and an accident reconstructionist, I can tell you somebody is going to get hurt or killed and I don't want it to be me. I drive a motorcycle on that road and constantly I'm getting swerved at by people that are trying to avoid the potholes and come at you on a blind curve. I could tell you that my life has flashed before my eyes on many occasions.

On two occasions my wife was actually run off the road into a ditch because somebody coming down the road was trying to avoid the holes or the bad terrain of the roadway, came at her head on and she ended up in a ditch. Something needs to be done about this roadway. Councilman Loscombe had promised me unequivocally that that roadway would be paved this year.

Several days ago, the Scranton Times came out with a paving list for the City of Scranton, again, we are not on it and I would like to know why. The roadways that are listed on the Scranton Times' paving list I'd like to know how many times they

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have been resurfaced in the past 24 years.

MR. ROGAN: Mr. Galdieri, I just want to mention, the list that was published in the Times is only the paving for OECD, which is federal money that can only be used in low to moderate income areas. The road, Pike Street I believe would have to be paved through city funds.

MR. GALDIERI: The only time that that road has been paved it was actually designed in the 1970's, early 70's. When the old traffic circle, which was before your time, was recreated for the North Scranton Expressway only once has that road been resurfaced and that was in 1988, that was because at that time Director Pizano and I had gotten together and after a few years of begging and pleading realized that the road needed to be resurfaced. The way that they did it was a test program through the city. When he had refurbished the paving machine for the City of Scranton and had DPW workers actually the roadway. The road has never been professional or properly resurfaced. It is beyond repair, we are

driving on dirt and holes that are just your unimaginable.

Please don't take my word for it, please take a ride up there and you will see what we are dealing with on daily basis going up and down that roadway. My neighbor, Mr. Steven Patrick, and I every day we have to traverse that road it's just deplorable. We really need something done about it.

MR. MCGOFF: What is the length of the --

MR. GALDIERI: It's a little over half a mile.

MR. ROGAN: One suggestion I have and, you know, this depends on how the rest of the winter goes, obviously, with the very light winter we have had I would assume that DPW's costs for overtime for plowing, salts, things of that nature should be well under budget.

MR. GALDIERI: We agreed. That was one of our issues that we were going to suggest.

MR. ROGAN: If it continues to go

this way now, who knows March we may be hit with a ten blizzards and the money will be used up, if it's not I would support transferring the money if Council could to or ask the director to transfer for paving. There is few other roads that -- I believe Hamm Court is of one of them as well and, you know, roads that some of them cannot be paved through the money from OECD which is where the city has to step in and everybody has a right to drive to their house on smooth roads.

MR. GALDIERI: I could understand if it was ten years, 15 years, 24 years. 24 years is long time. As a matter of fact, one of our neighbors allegedly put a sign up at the intersection of Pike Street and Morgan Highway and it says, "Chris, restore the pride, pave this road it's been 22 years."

The sign has been there for two years.

MR. ROGAN: Well, 24 years is -- -

MR. GALDIERI: So it's ignorance and apathy they we constantly are dealing with

every time we call. We have been told personally there is not enough votes up there to get it done. That's not right. We are paying taxes every year just like everybody else and we deserve to have the same opportunities that everybody else has in this city.

MR. ROGAN: Absolutely. 24 years is unacceptable. I'm 24 years old so that means the road hasn't been paved in my lifetime.

MR. GALDIERI: Yeah.

MR. JOYCE: And you were told that there is not enough votes?

MR. PATRICK: That's correct.

MS. JOYCE: I find that odd because that's not something we would particularly vote on.

MR. ROGAN: I think what they are saying is that the mayor said there is not enough votes to vote for the mayor.

MR. GALDIERI: Yeah.

MR. PATRICK: That's exactly right.

That was done when I was at DPW when Jeff

Brazil was in charge of the DPW and I asked

him several years, please pave it. And again, nothing. Not enough votes.

MR. GALDIERI: I have been writing letters to the city for the past 18 years through DPW. Every year the letter goes unanswered and I have sometimes several times a year have sent letters and I have yet to get a phone call or a response back.

I would also like to address the drainage issues that are a serious problem up along that roadway. The westerly side of the street, we are getting huge amounts of runoff. A simple rainstorm turns that roadway into a raging river. When there is serious rainstorms we basically cannot cross that roadway. The water so deep.

MR. PATRICK: There is two to three inches of water falling right across.

MR. GALDIERI: Gentlemen, I hope you take it in all seriousness and really try to help us out. Twenty-four years is more than enough. I have copies of the letter I just sent to council, if you would like a copy I can provide you with one.

MS. JOYCE: I have actually received

a copy. Our office makes a copy of all of the letters that are sent to each one of us, but we will try our best for you.

MR. GALDIERI: Thank you for your time.

MR. JOYCE: Our next speaker is Andy Sbaraglia.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia, citizen of Scranton, fellow Scrantonians. I saw that you got a little notation in here that for that SRA loan for them to negotiate it. I was under the assumption that that loan wouldn't be even borrowed on until after June, after the TAN was paid off; am I right in that assumption? We can't get any money until after that TAN is paid off?

MR. JOYCE: Until the TAN is paid off our real estate taxes are essentially in the lockbox, but the city is free to do what they wish with the other revenue that comes in.

MR. SBARAGLIA: I was under the impression that that 9.5 million wouldn't be acted on until after the TAN was paid off.

It is being acted on now? Is it the same

with the 40 million or 30 million; is that being done now?

MR. JOYCE: I have to research that a little bit more.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Well, the paper -the article in the paper stated that we
would get no money at all on the 9.5 until
after the TAN was paid. Now, whether they
just quoted it and miss this and miss that,
I don't know. All I know is I saw the big
article saying that when we would payoff
that SRA default, and I just wondered
because all it says here for them to
negotiate it, and I don't know when they
negotiate it.

The same with our firemen and police pension. That interest is being compounded I was told at 6 percent, is that right or wrong?

MR. JOYCE: I'm not 100 percent sure what the percentage rate is right now, but I will find that out for you.

MR. SBARAGLIA: I mean, we are talking about for \$30 million that's a lot of interest, and you have to get after the

administration to start getting that bond out because obviously we are going to have to take a bond.

MR. HUGHES: If I could just make a quick comment. Any judgment in Pennsylvania it's simple interest interest, there is no compounding of any judgment, so the 6 percent would be the legal limit, on any judgment is 6 percent per year. Simple interest, not compounded.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Okay. That's a little better, but it still doesn't really, you know, address the problem that we have.

MR. JOYCE: Correct.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Because eventually we have to borrow the money and then, unfortunately, that's going to be interest, too. I don't know, I hope it's better than 6 percent if that's what he said and that's the law then I hope we can borrow a bond less than 6 percent and get it done because this is a dangerous situation. I mean, really dangerous. Our finances -- well, you know that, they are in the tank. We are just on the knife point whether we should go

bankrupt or not go bankrupt. We don't know exactly what's going to happen and you don't know how it's going to effect the people.

You don't know if a lot of people are going to move because you know and I know that money has to come from somewhere and the only place it can come from is yours, mine and everybody's else's city pocket. That's where it's going to come from. We ain't going to have no one unless we hit the lottery. Have you talked to the mayor about getting some Powerball tickets? That may be our only chance to get out of this?

But other than that we are in trouble. I mean, I read the little notation in there that they are talking about an '06 TAN. How could that money have been left in a '06 TAN? When you have a TAN that's a fixed deal. You have interest on that TAN that you have to pay and the certain time to pay it. How could there have been money left over in that TAN? I don't quite understand it unless the bank was very good and said, "Well, you don't have to pay the interest just pay the principal."

But somewhere along the line money is being stored, and I'm not even talking about the \$3 million because everyone talked about it already, I am talking about all of those little things that come up like money from the SRA that all of a sudden is found and this money and that money. Now, we got a little music.

MR. JOYCE: If I could please ask everyone to just put their cell phones on vibrate or turn them off just to be respectful to the speakers. Thanks.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Well, I'm not going to go into it too deep because there is no way. There is no way I can go. I don't want to go back 10 years. I'm afraid that's where you have to go back and I don't want to do that. I'm trying to see where we are now and how we get for it, but you can't forget the past. You definitely -- because we have to pay for it. If we are able to say, you know, if you declare bankruptcy and say, well, you don't have to worry about the past anymore only the future if they let you do it then you can say that, but in our

position we got to go back to the past as well as the present and the future because the viability of the city in this question unless you can come up with some way to shake money from our nonprofits that's our only solution really. I mean, all of these other things that come through here isn't going to make a darn.

Somewhere along the -- I told them in the very beginning break it down to services. Break down the police protection service, firemen service, this service and that service into a breakdown and then you can enforce the people from the nonprofits to pay for service. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you. Our next speaker is Doug Miller.

MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council.

Doug Miller, Scranton.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. MILLER: I would like to begin tonight just by reiterating some of my thoughts on the whole MEM issue that we have had going on here the last few weeks. You know, we have heard that they allege that we

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

owe them nearly \$600,000 for maintenance they did on our streetlights going back quite a few years, and recently we learned going back two weeks ago that the mayor received thousands of dollars in campaign contributions from MEM from individuals associated with them and it just once again goes to show the pay-to-play politics we have had to deal with, as I said.

And I just want to state once again that I feel strongly that we shouldn't be giving this MEM a dime. They did a pathetic job on the maintenance, you know, I don't understand, you know, where we are going here with this. You know, we understand they are in some litigation outside of the city and so for that reason I feel we shouldn't give them a dime and I'm hopeful that, you know, we will continue looking into this matter and make the right move on this because, you know. These are just games we played where we awarded contracts left and right and this mayor has awarded contracts left and right to people who weren't qualified and give campaign

contributions and then we wonder why we are in the shape we are in because of this.

Moving onto another issue, I'd like to know tonight if we have a status on the investigation of the Scranton police officer that we learned of an investigation last week? Do we have a status on that?

MR. JOYCE: I have not been made aware of any updates on that investigation.

MR. MILLER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: We only know what's in the newspaper and the media as well.

MR. MILLER: I appreciate that. You know, I do think this is something that council should be given information on this, I feel you should be given follow-ups on this and I'm hopeful that the proper officials will keep you up-to-date on what's going on because this is city business, this is something, you know, that affects the every delay operations of the city and certainly we don't want to see another black mark because, obviously, we know we have quite a few of them as it is.

Another issue tonight, this is going

back two months now, where I came up here and I made a Right-to-Know request requesting an electric bill regarding the cost to operate the 2010 Nay Aug Park light As you know, we had an issue with the light show this year where lights were on at all hours of the day. This was cause for concern because, obviously, as you know, 3:00, 4:00 in the afternoon you don't need Christmas lights on. It's a waste of money and certainly we are paying for it, regardless of what others want to say, and to this date I have yet to receive that electric or any type of response and, you know, I'm just quite baffled that it takes two months to locate an electric.

I'm not requesting an audit of the city. It's a simple electric bill and yet again we are playing games, lack of cooperation. It's a simple request. You know, it's like pulling teeth around here to get an answer and I don't think it should take two months to locate an electric bill. Within a week I should have had it in my mailbox and had a response, and I haven't to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this date, so I'm hopeful that I'll get one and I don't plan on getting one any time soon because it's been this long, but, you know, perhaps if I write out a \$1,500 check and give it to the mayor maybe then I'll have more luck. I think that's kind of how we have to do business around here.

And finally tonight, I'd like to talk about the impact fee. We have had a lot of discussion on that in recent weeks. Two weeks ago Mrs. Evans shared some helpful information dealing with institutions throughout the state and outside of the state that contribute to the municipality that they are located in. I do believe we should contact our local representatives and senators and get them onboard and try to get support statewide for an impact fee, not for the city, but for other municipalities who have to deal with, you know, the free rides. The KOZs and the nonprofits who, you know, unfortunately, we have to carry the load because they don't pay their fair share.

And I feel very strongly about this, I'm passionate when it comes to this

because, you know, when you have institutions such as the University of Scranton, and I understand people think that, you know, we solely pick on the University, but, you know, they are the greatest example we can use, and millions and millions of dollars that University takes in each year and what do we get? A whopping \$175,000. That's the biggest slap in the face this city can take.

And yet what are we doing about it? We talk about it, but why aren't we taking action? It's easy to sit around and talk, but it's time to do something about it. And I know this council will and I understand these things take time and we are doing research, but the time to do it is now. We need to be really, you know, quick with this because this is lot of revenue that we are missing out on and I feel strongly that these institutions, KOZs and nonprofits need to start paying their fair share. They see the situation that the city is in, we are basically bankrupt and yet they are trying to attract students to a community that's

that? And I would certainly think that an institution such as the University would want to attract students into a viable city, a city that has jobs, a city that you are proud to live in. We don't have that, so it's time to put pressure on this and get it done because it's time -- it's not fair that the residents of this city continue to carry the burden for those that don't want to pay their fair share. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you. Our next speaker is Ron Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: Hello, council. I'm sorry to see some people still not feeling good. I'd like to make a statement or two on our disgraceful school board. I have talked to several people and I guess people are just very disappointed. Like that old saying if it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck, these people have just taken bribes, that's it, and to make a statement that it didn't influence them is -- for a learned man to make a statement like that, you know, like we are naive and don't

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I would like to mention

believe it and then following it up with a statement he ought to be congratulated for telling the truth on all of this I just -it's inconceivable. It's shameful. The whole board has knowledge of this and ought to be resigned.

The people who are cut and all we see is hiring everywhere. They have already shoved one school down the taxpayers' throats and months ago they made plans for another school. You know, the reason they get away with this is I guess is because they rely on the fact that 70 percent, 75 percent of the people of this city don't vote they just complain and then they get their tax increase every year, but this area has been known for a hundred years or more for graft and corruption and they seem to be just bringing it right up just like what went on down in Wilkes-Barre. I hope it --I hope it's terminated as quick as can be and as each one comes up for reelection we need somebody else to hold their feet to the fire I suppose.

something about I read last week or so that United Way was wondering where their next meal is coming from. Maybe if they quit buying \$200,000 houses for ARC and letting them go off our tax rolls they might have some money, and there should be a thorough of investigation of ARC and their finances. They are just getting away with murder for a nonprofit organization.

I just didn't want to take too much time. I bought these at an auction and I thought somebody from the city might want them. They are bonds from the City of Scranton from 1886 and they are in very good shape and, you know, I have no use for them. If somebody would like them and donate them or something, you know, I would give them to you.

MR. JOYCE: Yes, you could.

MR. ELLMAN: They are very interesting. They have a council, signed by a council then.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

MR. ELLMAN: See if somebody wants them. I have no use for them. I kept one

1 of them. Thank you. MR. JOYCE: Thank you. 2 I'd like to suggest 3 MR. **HUGHES:** give them to the historical society or keep 4 5 them here in city hall, one or the other. MR. ROGAN: I think that's a good 6 7 suggestion. 8 MR. HUGHES: Maybe frame them and 9 put them in council's office, that would be 10 another thought. 11 MR. JOYCE: Our next speaker is Les 12 Spindler. MR. SPINDLER: 13 Good evening, 14 council. Les Spindler, city resident and homeowner and taxpayer. 15 16 MR. JOYCE: Good evening. 17 MR. SPINDLER: I want to speak about 18 a few articles that have been in the Doherty newsletter the last few weeks. 19 The first 20 one is about the SRA not being able to 21 condemn two business in the 500 block of the 22 Lackawanna Avenue, one being Buona Pizza. 23 spoke against this since day one that the 24 Redevelopment shouldn't be doing this. 25 Buona Pizza if not the longest standing

business in the city it's one of the longest standing businesses and they were treated terribly, and so I hope this is the end of this. The only people that made out on this is Chris Doherty's attorneys. They got their pockets stuffed for years and years now and, Attorney Hughes, I know you were involved in this, is this the end of the case or could the city still keep appealing this?

MR. HUGHES: There is no automatic right of appeal to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

MR. SPINDLER: Thank you. I hope this is the end of it. The next thing, a few weeks ago the people were talking about MEM execs contributing to Chris Doherty's campaign, well, I brought this up last year, council might remember, during the Cordaro and Munchak trial, PJ McLaine and the person from Highland Associates, I can't think of his name, both received immunity to testify against Cordaro and Munhack and said back then they contributed to Chris Doherty's campaign and there should have been an

investigation back then and I still say
there should be an investigation because
good people don't hang around with these
kind of people and Chris Doherty is not a
good person.

The next thing, Councilman Rogan, a few weeks ago you spoke about the synthetic marijuana being back in the market and a few weeks earlier I heard on the news that bath salts are also on the market now under a different name, and I forget what the name was, I wanted to write it down, so maybe we can look into doing away with that again, too.

MR. ROGAN: Yeah, and it seems every time, it's not just the city, every time the city, the state or the federal government makes a law to ban certain substances they find another substance with a different chemical makeup that does the same thing.

MR. SPINDLER: It's terrible and it could just use these things and just change the name and just keep using these things.

MR. ROGAN: From a lot of the studies that I have read about they are

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

worse than the actual drug.

MR. SPINDLER: It's not right. Another thing, the other day in the paper the council has to pay a \$1.5 million that the Redevelopment Authority defaulted on. have said it for years, these authorities have to go. They serve no purpose. A11 they are doing is costing us money. Like I said, with the case on Lackawanna Avenue it cost us money, and now with this where are we going to get \$1.5 million? This city is almost in bankruptcy and we've got to foot this bill? Plus the bill for, like I said, for the businesses in Lackawanna Avenue. This just isn't right. I don't know where the money is going to come from. Maybe in motions, Mr. Joyce, you can get into that.

MR. JOYCE: I could state quickly that the money for the SRA is in the operating budget.

MR. SPINDLER: It is?

MR. JOYCE: Yeah, that was something that was put in there because it was a default and the city would be liable to -- or to pay that back.

MR. SPINDLER: Okay. It's a darn shame because we could have done a lot more things with that money --

MR. JOYCE: Agree.

MR. SPINDLER: -- than throw it out on something stupid that the Redevelopment did. It's ridiculous. About this rental registration legislation, what buildings does that include? Like, I own a double, I live on one side, am I exempted on that?

MR. ROGAN: You would be exempt.

MR. JOYCE: Yes, you would be exempt.

MR. SPINDLER: Thank you. The next thing, in the paper the other day on the Linden Street bridge they said it's going to be fixed soon, they said they are going to solicit bids in July. Why are they waiting until July? It's just another example of PennDOT dragging their feet. Why wait this long, and they said it might be done by the end of the year. Back in the 80's when they had the earthquake in San Francisco I think the Golden Gate Bridge was fixed faster than the Linden Street Bridge, and that's a lot

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

bigger. This is just politics at it's best.

It's unbelievable and people's safety is at harm.

Lastly, another article in the Doherty newsletter about another satellite police station opening in South Side. are opening all these satellite police stations, too bad we don't have any police officers to put in them. Keep laying off police officers pretty soon we will have a police station for every police officer on their force, they will have their own home. I think this is just a waste and the money it took to open these places could have been used for somebody something better like put more police officers on the force. just more examples of this city being mismanaged for the last ten years and I don't know when it's going to end. I guess that's it. Thank you for your time.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Our next speaker is Steve Patrick. Our next speaker is Ozzie Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Ozzie Quinn, taxpayer's

Association. Good evening. Mr. Joyce?

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ QUINN: The 9.85 million that was awarded by the Court.

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

MR. QUINN: Is that legislation -- where is that legislation to go ahead and seek RFPs?

MR. JOYCE: Currently the city is under negotiations to find a lender for the money and once that is completed then we will receive legislation from what I have been informed.

MR. QUINN: I see. Okay. The other thing I want to ask is this here, you know, the Redevelopment Authority, Mrs. Evans hit it right on the head when she said the purpose for the authority is not for what it's been doing under Mayor Doherty, the reason for the Redevelopment Authority is as the Urban Redevelopment law under the Federal 1949 Housing Act started renewal and it was to remove blight, okay? And after the Redevelopment Authority, after all the debts were paid off and all the bonds were

3

4 5

6 7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gone, that all the staff were gone they kept the board just in case of condemnations or oppositions or whatever.

However, Mr. Doherty is using that as his little gadget and that shouldn't be. The Redevelopment Authority -- the purpose of the Redevelopment is not for putting lights up the Nay Aug or trying to sell delinquent properties, you know. And you should amend whatever he is trying to do and add to that because nobody has ever done anything about that until Mr. Doherty and hopefully nobody ever will, but you can never tell. The bad thing and it's got to be stopped right away because of the fact that that Redevelopment Authority should just -- the use of the Vacant Property Review Committee, and very seldom do I ever see a piece of land coming up here for sale. When do they meet? And something is wrong some place. Somebody is holding the cards here and they are just there for the purpose of whatever Mr. Doherty wants to do.

I saw part of the independent audit,
Mr. Rogan, and this should pertain to 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

and the fact was I think there was 11 findings in the audit on OECD and, you know they still have an outstanding audit by HUD/Office of Inspector General of \$11.7 million, you know, so something is wrong. Something is amiss over there.

MR. ROGAN: I plan on calling Linda Aebli tomorrow actually about a few issues and that's one of them. The other one is the transfer that is under the agenda on Fifth Order, so I will be addressing that with her tomorrow as well.

MR. QUINN: Okay. Thank you. know, I know you guys are between a rock and a hard place where Mr. Doherty put you and I know darn well that you are going to have to figure out about that \$9.85 million and borrow it and put it out there, and we, the taxpayers, are going to have to pay it back and I don't know, it's going to be tough to do so I really don't know, so I hope you can have a good PR setup before that happens because people are going to be really angry about it. Thank you very much.

> MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

1 MR. HUGHES: Mr. Chairman, if I 2 could? 3 MR. JOYCE: Yes. 4 MR. HUGHES: Mr. Quinn? MR. QUINN: 5 Yeah. MR. HUGHES: I believe you were on 6 7 the Redevelopment Authority when council 8 adopted the requirement of HUD that was the 9 called the phaseout agreement. MR. QUINN: 10 Yeah. 11 MR. HUGHES: Where the Redevelopment 12 Authority had to dispense of all of it's 13 staff, had to line everything up and turn 14 over all it's assets to the city and the only function of the Redevelopment Authority 15 16 would be condemn properties where there was 17 an Urban Redevelopment Plan adopted by the 18 city. 19 MR. QUINN: Yes. 20 MR. HUGHES: I think you were on the authority at the time and the chairman. 21 22 MR. QUINN: I was the chairman. 23 MR. HUGHES: I think you were. 24 Maybe council would appreciate if -- I know 25 there was a closeout resolution, I believe

3

2

4

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that Mayor Doherty's father was on council at the time that pushed for the Redevelopment Authority be phased out and closed out, and it was to be kept only as a board for condemnation, not for the things it's doing like you are saying.

MR. QUINN: Yes.

MR. HUGHES: I don't know if you have some time maybe to talk to Mrs. Krake, you know, what that resolution was and find Actually it wasn't a resolution, I that. think it was an ordinance, and I think there was a deed later on where all -- that all of the Redevelopment Authority's properties would be transferred to the city. I don't know if it was ever done, but if you are --I'll just ask you, you know, since you have an interest in it to maybe discuss that with Mrs. Krake and maybe she could find that phaseout ordinance because I don't believe-and to see if it was ever amended so that the Redevelopment Authority could be doing the things that it is doing, which I don't think it can. I appreciate your help on that.

MR. QUINN: Thank you. I will. I will get in touch with Mrs. Krake.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you. Our next speaker is Peter Lamandre.

MR. LAMANDRE: Good evening,

Council. My name is Peter Lamandre, I'm the

Greater Scranton Board of Realtors 2012

president, and I'm here before you this

evening to talk about the rental

registration ordinance that's on the agenda

this evening.

First and foremost, I would like to say that we support the concept. We feel that it is important that properties be registered, that the city have power to know who is the responsible party for a particular property if it's tenant occupied. You need to have to some teeth to be able to get rid of blight, so we definitely support the concepts.

We have some concerns concerning the current way in which the ordinance is being enforced and some of that language is a carry over and is in the proposed ordinance that I had the opportunity to review, so I

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would like to bring a few things to your attention.

Just to give you some background for myself, I am a licensed broker and a property manager and I operate within the city limits as well as throughout the county, so I have some experience from that perspective as far as how the ordinance is being currently enforced and how some it can actually be better.

So one of the first things I would like to address is the concept of the registered agent. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to be a property manager, to be someone who is responsible for another person's properties, enforce leases, collect rents, those sort of things, you have to be a licensee. The current ordinance as it's written is silent to that effect and we feel that what it does is it creates an opportunity for the unlicensed practice of real estate and if the goal is to have a responsible party who better than someone who is licensed, trained and is under the supervision of the Department of State than

that that person to be the responsible agent, as opposed to just a handyman, an uncle, whoever it may be. So I think that needs to be looked at.

Access to the reports is actually a concern. When an incident happens on the properties we have a three-strike rule essentially. One of the concern is we can't get access to the reports, it becomes a privacy issue, and if there is a problem at a property how is a landlord, how is a property manager supposed to enforce the lease and get rid of the tenant if they can't get access to the actual report?

Now, we have been told by the police department that it is basically unless the landlord or the property manager is named in the report they don't have the right to get access. It would be very helpful if in the ordinance there was some mandate that if it is a tenant occupied property that the property manager, the registered agent or the landlord be named in the police report so that they can obtain access to that particular police report and, thus, enforce

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the lease and potentially get rid of the tenant.

Also, it would be proper notice to the agent. In practice, the agents aren't being notified. What's happening is the owners are being notified. If the owner is separate from the property, living 3,000 miles away, and they have hired someone to take care of the property that person should get notice that there is problem. They are the person who is close. They are the reason why you have this ordinance. If they don't know what's going on in the property they can't solve the problem. Often times the landlord, if they are noticed, isn't noticed until the second or third instance. They are not noticed during the first instance. So if they are not given the opportunity to know there is problem they can't react and they can't rid of the problem.

Also like to bring to your attention in terms of enforcement. It takes time to evict a tenant, it's not an instantaneous process. It can sometimes take up to two or

three months to actually evict a tenant based on the current statutes in the State of Pennsylvania. I would like to see -- we would like to see some consideration in the ordinance if the property owner or the property agent is in the process of evicting the tenant with respect to enforcement concerning the three strike rule because if they are already taking steps necessary to remove the tenant and you are going to hold them responsible for continued disturbance as at the property it seems as if it's punitive.

Let's see here, a couple of other things. Also, I'd like to see code enforcement, understand it may be a staffing issue, but they there a lot of properties that just aren't registered. Basically right now you have to volunteer and say, "I have a property, here is my money, here is my registration, I have this."

It would be helpful if it was more proactive. I understand that that may be a staffing issue, you may not have the ability and resources to be able to have someone

sending out correspondence saying, "We know your property --" if they live in New Jersey, it's a rental property. If they live in New York, it's a rental property. I mean, you can check that from the tax records. So there is a way at least to capture some of them. We understand that you can't capture all of them, but there needs to be some corrective side from the city as opposed to just someone reporting.

And very importantly, again, is that when there is an instance at the property, let's say code enforcement goes out, the agent should be contacted. Often times if something is going on in the property if code enforcement is there they can call, I'm sure they can radio city all, find out who the registered agent is and find out what's going on with that property and let them know. Very often they can address that concern within 24 hours if they are notified.

Just in closing, again, we support the concept. We just feel that it needs a little bit of help. We hope that you will

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

take into consideration some of the things we brought forth. We are happy to work with council and work with the city, however we can to try to benefit it. Thank you very much for your time.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you. Our next speaker is Lee Morgan.

MR. MORGAN: Good evening, council.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. MORGAN: I have missed the last couple of meetings, but this 8-A did get my attention today, this last gentleman spoke about some of that. I have a lot of problems with that. I mean, I would like to really have the ability to come here tomorrow and actually read it and understand exactly everything that's in this legislation you want to pass, but I do have a lot of problems with this just from the article I have read in the Scranton Times at this point. Okay, we are going to have one inspector, we are going to charge a \$15 per unit fee. We are going to have a \$50 permit fee per site, and one of the real major problems I have is all of the people that

3

4

5

7

8

6

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are enforcing this alleged ordinance. mean, I can understand some people coming out here, but zoning and all of this other stuff. I mean, if this is a legal rental unit why would the zoning officer come out I mean, I have had my own this site? situations with this city where as the Scranton Times put it that my -- the condemnations of my properties were all political, and I really don't care what political people do to me because it doesn't really matter. I just think politics is extremely corrupt and the politicians will do whatever they can to do whatever they have to do, but I'm just really troubled that, you know, you are going to -- in my opinion I think what we are doing here with these ordinances is we're blaming the people that have rental properties for the city's problems. I mean, you know, you take a look at Mr. Pocius when he put the renter's ordinance through.

I mean, you know, you have a problem with the tenant and you are worried about how many times the police were called?

Well, if the tenant broke the law arrest him and take him out. I think there is lot of other issues we have to worry about. We have to worry about landlords that have tenants who do massive damage to their property and can't collect the money and damage from their property, all right?

I think we have to worry about this law being misapplied considering all of the homes that we are condemning in this city and tearing down. I think we have to be concerned that when your one inspector goes into these units he understands that the work that was done in that house is grandfathered in at the time the work was done instead of holding the property to today's standard.

I think there is an awful lot of problems with this legislation and I think that before we move forward and cause more harm to people who own property in this city, look it, the last gentlemen talked about people living in New Jersey or wherever they lived. Well, these are people that are investors, they are investing in

this city and, you know, that's a really difficult thing, but if you live in this city and you walk around this city, I mean, the city just walks up and if the property has been empty for a certain period of time just condemns it. They have never even been in the property.

I mean, when you deal with what's going on in this city as far as rent are concerned people don't even want to buy them. I don't know if this realtor agrees with that, but, you know, the one thing that we don't seem to realize is we rent as we rip these rental properties down, not only do we have holes all over this city and not only have we created blight all over this city by condemning all these homes, but all of these renters that aren't here, they aren't paying the wage tax.

And when we come and we use the money that Senator Casey brings here for ripping all of these properties down there is no benefit to the residents of this city because we have no money to pay our bills, so what we are doing is we are roving

through a city, we are allowing an inspector to go in and condemn a property, I don't know, is it right? I can't tell you that, but I know of people who have had properties and they were trying to hold it to today's code. These people didn't understand how long they had to go to the building appeals board, all right, and then it became a matter of fact because you have so many days to do it.

And what about all of these people that bought these condemned properties and tried to bring them up to code and have invested money in them and then we determined it can't be a six unit anymore, it can't even be a four unit, but maybe we'll let it be a three unit. It's just not the way a city should do business. I mean, we are wondering why the city is in a perpetual downward spiral?

I think what we really need to do is we need to create an atmosphere, like I said here once before, and change the contractor's list for the people who can do work in this city so that when you send your

inspector out they have got a very large array of contractors they can call to do work on their property. What will that do? It will bring down the price of bringing that property back into code if they have to do that. We can keep wasting our time and wasting our money, but this city isn't going up, it's going down.

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

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, council.

Dave Dobrzyn.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. DOBRZYN: Resident of Scranton and taxpayer within the city. On MEM, finally the administration came to their senses and apparently they are going to make them go to Court and prove what they owe.

And also, might I add there was an article in the paper a few days ago or maybe a week or two about a man that did contracts, subcontracting work for them and they tried to twist his arm and to turn in phony receipts for work done and he refused

3

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and they refused to pay him, so if they can prove that we owe anymore money perhaps they should be forced to pay these people that they owe money to and have refused to pay them their rightful fees for their service.

I have a question on Wyoming Avenue. I don't have the exact address, but it's the old Roth Furniture building and it's in-between the Ritz Theatre and I think it's a Episcopalian church or something like that and Andy verified that it was most likely a This man raised his rents whatever KOZ now. way he felt like and nearly drove a local musical concern out of business and it remains to be seen if the guy can even stay in business with the damage he did, and it's really ashame I hope -- and I have a question, I'll get the address, but I'd like to know if any COM-D money went into that place, too. Like I said, I don't have the exact address, but it's really shameful how much money that man's rent went up despite the fact that he had a lease. I don't know There was some clause in it that allowed him to raise the rent at that point.

But, you know, I tried to deal with local people and throw them the business. I buy my clothes at Tucks and different things, jeans, and things like that, and I get personal service out of them.

Say like in Galucci's case I had a guitar reworked that's worth a considerable at of money because it has -- it was built before Brazilian rosewood was banned for importation and it could cost thousands of dollars for a couple of Popsicle sticks of this wood and the guitar started to become poorly playable and was hurting my fingers so I submitted it there for a lousy \$85 I got it fixed, so it really bugs me that this was done to that man and it's ashame.

And I would hope that if somebody is given COM-D money and KOZ money that they pass it along, spread the cheer a little bit as we would say.

And I see finally the audit, so I'll be listening in for any developments on that, form an opinion later. That's what I try to do in life.

I just read a really interesting

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 0 |

book, "Free Lunch." How the wealthy stick the government with the bill and get you to pay the taxes on it, and I'm going to give it back to the library pretty soon so I'd recommend anybody that is interested in that book, and you should be, race down there and get a lottery going if you have to get that book fast. I hope it's available in paperback so I could buy one because it's really ashame. The author is David K. Johnston.

And, okay, I'll keep it short tonight. The golden parrot goes to Florida. They lowered -- they are looking to lower -- the wage -- they lowered their waitresses from -- by \$3.05 an hour to \$4.20 an hour and they are looking to lower it about \$2 more so hopefully the restaurants down there will start giving the golden parrot or golden cockroach out with every meal. Thank you and have a good night. Bawk, bawk.

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

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening,

Council. Marie Schumacher, city resident and taxpayer.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MS. SCHUMACHER: First, I noticed two days ago in the paper there was an article on Dunmore hiring an investment firm for their refinancing and they don't expect to -- even though they got somebody hired already, they don't expect to see anything until at least April or May, and I'm really disappointed that our refinancing legislation is not on tonight's agenda.

First, agenda items. 5-G. Since 12 plus million dollars in property taxes will be unavailable to pay bills until July 1, do we have the funds to both pay this SRA bill as well as meet payroll through June 30? You can answer during motions, but I'm very interested in that.

7-A. Last week -- or two weeks ago now, Mr. Joyce said, "Currently there was a clerk in the Treasurer's Office collecting current refuse fees and it's our intention that, and NRS's intention, that this clerk will still be responsible for collecting

this fees."

Mrs. Evans broke into state, "They will handle the delinquencies. That individual has been successfully performing those duties and responsibilities for quite a number of years and I think we don't want to take -- well, I think the saying goes, if it ain't broke don't fix it."

If 7-A passes this evening that
means we will be paying Northeast Revenue
Services, LLC, to collect both current and
delinquent trash fees. That means the city
employee will be doing the work and
Northeast will be collecting the fee. This
is wrong.

MR. ROGAN: It's going to amended.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. And, also, I still want to know how many years delinquent the \$178 refuse fee must be before the additional 400 plus additional fees are assessed to the property owner.

7-B. A few questions regarding the rental registration program, which I still think should be outsourced to someone in the city to perform. First, have all of the

rental properties who currently pay the fee, which is a small minority, been inspected?

Next, if all currently unregistered rental properties are successfully registered this year do we have adequate city inspectors to inspect all of these properties in year? I suspect the answer is "no" and if I'm not correct I would like to know how the order of inspections will be determined as I suspect this to be a fertile area for abuse.

I recommend 7-B be amended to require a monthly random selection occur publically, perhaps during city council meetings, to determine the number of the properties the inspectors will be able to handle the following month.

Now switching to other items. In early June of 2010, city council held a special caucus to address blight legislation that could be proposed by Scranton's two representatives despite the fact that a piece of the legislation addressing blight, HB-900, was already working its way through the legislature. I never heard of any

blight legislation either of these
legislators introduced, but the in-process
legislation became law in October of that
year. That law allows municipalities to
file Court actions against the owners of the
properties with serious code violations with
judgments against the owner's assets, not
just liens against the buildings.

It provides for extradition of out-of-state owners of deteriorated property from prosecution. It allows municipalities to deny applications for certain municipal permits and approvals if the applicant is delinquent on taxes or other municipal charges or if the applicant owns property that is in serious violation of codes and has taken no substantial action to bring the property into code compliance.

It encourages education and training programs for judges related to blight in the abandoned properties and it authorizes the establishment of housing acts. My question is how many times the City of Scranton has used this statute to address our cities ever growing blight? I asked this question as

the regular reader of court notes where I have noticed a significant number of the properties being sold to limited liability corporations and I am concerned this may be a tactic to shield the owner's assets which would render one of the big sticks of this legislation, judgments against the owner's assets, null and void.

Am I correct in assuming that a judgment against a LLC property owner would be limited to the equity in that property? If so, we best start using the power of HB-900 before all properties are converted to LLCs. We need to use the tools we have been provided, and the rest I'll finish next week I guess since I'm out of time. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you. Are there any other speakers?

MR. SLEDENZSKI: Frankie.

MR. JOYCE: Hey, Chrissy.

MR. SLEDENZSKI: Hi, Frank. Hi,

Pat.

MR. ROGAN: Hey, Chrissy.

MR. SLEDENZSKI: Hi. Claire. Thank

you.

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

MS. KRAKE: 5-A. MOTIONS.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. A couple of things. First, on a personal -- somewhat personal note, a congratulations and good luck to the Holy Cross boys basketball team as they will play Saturday for the Class AA District Championship, personal because my grandson happens to be the captain of the team and they have been playing well and hopefully will continue to.

Secondly, the documents that

Mr. Ellman provided I will take those to the
Lackawanna County Historical Society, and as
Attorney Hughes suggested, I'm sure that
they will be happy to have them. I know I
have taken things there before and they are
happy to get things that are associated with
the City of Scranton and Lackawanna County
for display and for research as well, so
that will be done as soon as I can get
there.

Third, there was some mention,

Mr. Sbaraglia and also Ms. Schumacher mentioned some things about the unfunded debt and the refinancing. I know Mr. Joyce answered some of it so this may be a little bit of a repeat. The banks that were involved in providing the TAN for 2012 were the ones that said they said that they would not entertain unfunded debt or the refinancing until TAN was paid, which would have been May or June.

MR. JOYCE: Yes, June 30.

MR. MCGOFF: And since that was -that would have prolonged the process, the
city went and started to look for additional
or other financing for those two items and
currently they are negotiating with other
financial institutions for the unfunded debt
and the refinancing and you are -- and it
was correct in stating that the refinancing
is late and we will lose some of the
benefits from the -- what was suggested or
what was proposed in the refinancing, but it
is proceeding, and as Mr. Joyce said,
nothing can be done until we find a

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

financial institution that is willing to entertain the unfunded debt and the refinancing, so when that is done, when there is assurances then legislation will be provided and it will move forward.

Hopefully that will take place in the near future. Hopefully.

And finally, a lot has been said about the rental registration, so I'll comment on it now rather than waiting until it comes for a vote. A number of things First of all, the rental that were said. registration ordinance that is on the agenda there are very few changes from what he originally had, most of it was in language and trying to strengthen the position of the city where in some of it said the city may do something, some of the wording was changed to shall do something, so that it gave a little bit more force as to what the city could do as far as inspections and dealing with some of the rental properties.

To answer maybe the one concern that was mentioned, one of the primary ideas for doing this, maybe the first thing that we

wanted to do was to get a more adequate database from which to work on the rental registration to update the number of rental properties that exist in the city.

As was mentioned, you know, unless you basically volunteered to send the money many times we don't even know that these rental properties exist and hopefully though the work of the housing inspectors and rental registration personnel hopefully we can improve on that, on the database that we have, and in that way increase revenue to the city.

I probably misspoke about couple of weeks ago when I said part of this was for the increase of revenue. Actually the fee structure there are some changes, but it's not a major change to the fee structure, what I actually should have said was we are looking for a more efficient enforcement of the rental registration fees and in that way we would increase revenue to the city. Make it a self-sustaining program. I think maybe Mr. Rogan mentioned that the week I wasn't here, and in that way it would increase

revenue.

Also, we received a letter from the Single Tax Office from Mr. Courtright in stating that once we identify any new properties that are rental registration -- that come under the rental registration they are also subject to the business privilege tax, which many of them are probably not paying since we haven't identified them as, you know, revenue making properties.

So there are a number of ways in which revenue should increase and it's not necessarily by placing a greater burden on the landlord. Yes, there are some changes to the fee structure, but they are not exorbitant and it doesn't place a great burden on the landlord or shouldn't on the tenants either.

Other things that that were brought up, the enforcement officers. Mr. Morgan brought up why the zoning officer. Well, there are many provisions in the ordinance dealing with zoning and, therefore, having a zoning officer as one of the people that can enforce the rental registration is I think

appropriate and it states, I won't have to quote it, but it's also on -- from the direction of their supervisor that they would go and perform these duties, so it's not just, you know, five different people running around the city trying to enforce something, it will be enforced through the LIPS Department and at the direction of the Director of Licensing and Inspections.

So, you know, I think that the people that are designated there are important and need to be in there so we can have proper enforcement of this when it is finally passed.

Also, the claim that we are trying to blame the landlords for everything I think is superfluous. I think that we included protections for the landlord as well in here. There are a number of sections, the one section, the duty of the occupants, and we have tried to place more -- some more accountability-- some more -- more accountability on the occupants of these properties and give the landlords a little bit more power to remove

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

an occupant if, in fact, there is a problem.

Under some of the old ordinance it was, again, the wording was, well, we may do this, we may do that, this gives the landlord, you know, a little bit more force in order to deal with unruly tenants, and so I think that there are -- is it perfect? No. There are some changes that probably could be and should be made, but I think in it's entirety it takes a step forward in trying to deal with what I think everybody sees as a common problem throughout the city, not to all rental properties, but to some, and what we are trying to do was to make this a more equitable situation to try and deal with landlords who -- and tenants who, you know, just simply refuse to abide by the law and that are abusing, you know, the privilege of being a resident of the City of Scranton and hopefully through this ordinance we can, you know, take care of some of those problems.

With that all said, we are going
to -- because of some conflicts in some
wording issues we are going to -- I am going

to propose that we table this for this evening, but it will be put back on the agenda when those things are worked out and I believe that this is a positive good for the city and once it is enacted we can get to work on trying to deal with, you know, the problems associated with rental properties in the city, and that's it. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you, and I also would like to wish you much success with your grandson's basketball team. I hope they are successful in their venture.

Mr. Rogan, do you have any questions or comments?

MR. ROGAN: Yes. I guess I'll start off on the rental registration fee as well and I am glad it's going to be tabled this week. There were a lot of good points brought up at tonight's meeting. I certainly appreciate the input of realtors. I agree with most of what was said that the problem is -- the problem right now isn't the person who is doing it right, it's the person who is doing it the wrong way and we

wouldn't want to see a landlord who, you know, happens to rent, and I'm sure the landlord is going to have met most of the people they rent to, but it happens. You get a bad apple no matter how hard you search for good tenants. They shouldn't be punished for one bad tenant.

Now, on the other hand, when we have most -- it's mostly out-of-town landlords that don't live in the area and they are just getting those checks sent to them every month they don't live in our community and a lot of them don't care. Now, some of them are good businessmen just trying to make an honest dollar, but a lot of them are just looking for that check every month, so we definitely have to crack down on the absentee landlords and I think while a rental registration program can do that, the key is the inspection.

The fee I'm fine with as long as there is an inspection. If there is a fee without an inspection it's not a fee, it's a tax. You know, if you are paying for the service of an inspection I'm perfectly fine

with that. There is no inspection it's simply a tax on landlords.

There are many things that were brought up and I'm glad we are tabling it to give everything worked out and there is a lot of good ideas floating around with this and hopefully it will work out, and like I said a few weeks ago and Mr. McGoff just mentioned, the goal is that it will be a self-sustaining program.

You know, I would love to see the amount of fees that we brought in was enough to pay for the inspectors to go out and do the inspections and crack down on the blight in the neighborhoods and that's the purpose of the program. It's not supposed to be a cash cow for the city.

Moving on, MEM was brought up once again, and for once I agree with the administration and I agree with the few of the speakers, we shouldn't give them a dime. It's been reported in the newspaper by a former MEM executive it was a Ponzi scheme, so I certainly think before we send them any money we have to make sure we actually owe

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

them for a service that was provided.

Moving on to a few other matters I would like to address. I received a letter from Linda Aebli regarding 13 properties, the bids came in for the demolition. properties are 416 13th Avenue, 1125 Rear Luzerne Street, 1908 Luzerne Street, 1144 Luzerne Street, 905 Archbald Street, 1507 North Main Avenue, 1228 Meadow Avenue, 419 and 427 East Market Street, 442 New Street. 1413 Dickinson Avenue, 1218 South Webster and 1502 South Irving. I'm very happy to see these on the list. Many of these were properties that we have received calls on, I'm sure not only myself, many of us have seen these properties and they are an eyesore to say the least.

The bids do vary pretty widely by price. The lowest bid is \$121,275. The highest bid is \$418,000, so quite a wide range in the bids. I hope Linda and the attorneys at OECD will do a good job sifting these over and see this project completed to get some more blight out of the neighborhoods.

Next, we received a letter and regarding property at 519 Grace Street in Scranton. I'll read it, it's very brief. It says, "We are writing to make sure you are aware we are very concerned about and strongly opposed making of a parking lot on the property formerly known as 519 Grace Street. The property was attained by the city under a flood-related project and should be under a restricted deed."

Now, it was addressed to the mayor, city council and the zoning board. I have the agenda for the zoning meeting on March 14 and there is nothing regarding this on the agenda. I'm not sure what's proposed, who is, you know, proposing to put a parking lot in there. There is about 50 signatures on here.

Mrs. Krake, could we please send a letter to the zoning board and the proper authorities to see -- just to get to the bottom of this just to see what is proposed, and I know if it was a FEMA buyout I know the property is very restricted. I think it's supposed to remain green land, I don't

4

1

6

7

5

8

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

think you can do anything on it, so I think if a parking lot was put on there that would actually be in violation if it was a flood buyout. Again, I'm not sure, just something that was sent to us that we can look into it.

Next, Mrs. Krake, could we also please send Mr. Galdieri's letter to council to DPW asking that this road be at least in the mean time repaired and placed on a paving list. I'm going to take a ride up there this week to check it out. I have to admit I have never been on the street myself, but I will go up there and check that out. 24 years without being paved is quite a bit of time and, you know, I hope that this will be extra money in the DPW budget from the light winter that we have had can possibly fund other activities, one of them being the flooding on the Cameron Avenue that we had a caucus with a few of the residents from there. I believe it was Mr. Brazil at the time was here and maybe a few more officials, I don't remember everyone that was in attendance, but again,

we had a caucus, it seemed the DPW was willing to help the residents in that neighborhood and then it stalled out.

So now maybe with Mr. Dougher at the helm down there maybe something will get done, so could we please send a follow-up to Mr. Dougher regarding that as well.

Also, Mrs. Krake, could we please send a letter to the IT Department asking that the names of the zoning members be updated on the city's website. Currently the members -- there is three of them that are on there that are correct and two that aren't.

Finally, Mrs. Krake, would you also please a letter to the business administrator asking if Blue Cross was paid its premium for health care. I heard from a resident that there was a check that was supposed to be made today and if it wasn't that city employees could be in a lapse of health care. I don't know if there is any truth to it, but just something that you can look into as well.

And finally, I should have announced

21

22

23

24

25

this earlier, but I just noticed it in my mail, West Scranton High School will be presenting the rock and roll hit musical Grease on Friday, March 30, Saturday, March 31, and Sunday, April 1. As a West Scranton alumni myself I remember going to the plays through the years, they do a great job, you know, they go out of their way and do a great job and they are selling -- if for any business owners or anyone run for office this year that would like to place an ad in the brochure, the contact people or Judy Kilmer, who can be reached at Judith.Kilmer@ CSRSD.org. Or Mary Ann Hazzouri at MaryAnn.Hazzouri@CSRSd.org, and definitely it will be a great presentation judging by the track record at West Scranton High School and I think that is all I have for now. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Rogan.

Tonight I just wanted to begin by commenting on what Mr. McGoff said in regard to the refinancing of the debt and unfunded debt.

Currently the city is in negotiations with various lending institutions regarding the

unfunded debt as well as the refinancing of debt, and once a lender is found that will be placed on the agenda. I do recall a few of our speakers saying that it wouldn't be entertained until the TAN was paid off.

Currently it was the position of the banks involved with the TAN that they didn't want to engage in the unfunded debt or the refinancing until the TAN was paid off, but there are other banks that are interested and that the city is currently in negotiations with.

Also tonight I'm going to provide everyone with a detailed summary as brief as I could be of the 2010 audit by Rossi & Rossi, which we have received and is completed, and if anyone wishes to receive an electronic copy of this I suggest that they e-mail or contact our office and we'll see what we could do as far as getting that copy to you.

But as one knows in 2011 when the majority members of this city council took office there was an attempt to open the 2010 operating budget to save costs, and after

Court hearings with the administration in 2010 it was ruled that we didn't have the power, however, city council was wise in trying to reduce expenditures in the 2010 budget though it was defeated in Court.

As per our 2010 audit by Rossi & Rossi, the city was short \$4,471,439 in revenue in other financing sources in 2010. As far as expenditures were concerned, the city spent \$67,145 more than budgeted. Therefore, overall in 2010 the amount of money budgeted for revenue and expenditures obviously were both \$77,865,746, as the budget has to be balanced on both sides. The city in actuality only realized \$73,394,307, while it spent \$77,932,891 leaving a hole of \$4,538,584 in the administration's budget.

To provide a detailed breakdown of how the city accumulated this hole in the 2010 I'll begin by discussing revenue.

First, let's begin with the Act 511 taxes.

Act 511 taxes are established and permitted under the LTEA, Local Tax Enabling Act, which permits certain type of taxes that

cities of various classes are able to levy. The Act 511 taxes that the City of Scranton levies consists of wage tax, real estate transfer tax, mercantile, the business privilege tax, the local service tax, and all of their delinquencies. The total amount of Act 511 taxes that the city was able to collect in 2010 was \$28,421,074. The actual amount that the city collected was \$27,227,468. Therefore, for all Act 511 taxes, both current and delinquent, the city came up \$1,193,606 short.

Secondly, besides Act 511 taxes, the city also levies the real estate tax and receives revenue from delinquent real estate taxes, public utilities as well as penalties and interest. The total amount of money that was budgeted for these revenue sources along with the Act 511 taxes was \$43,011,633. The city collected \$42,307,622 meaning that for tax revenue overall the city came up short by \$704,011.

In addition to taxes, the city also receives other sources of revenue. One type of source of revenue that the city receives

are in the governmental earnings.

Intergovernmental earnings consist of supplemental state pension aid as well as proceeds from the OECD reimbursement from their demolition program. For intergovernmental earnings the administration budgeted \$2,910,000. In 2011, the actual amount that the city realized was \$2,788,434, which meant that overall as far as intergovernmental earnings were concerned the city was \$121,566 short.

Along with intergovernmental earnings and taxes, the city also receives revenue from departmental earnings which include parking meters, fines and forfeits, pave cuts, copies of police and fire reports, alarm fees and zoning board fees.

Over all, the administration budgeted \$2,961,362 for these revenue sources. The actual amount realized was \$2,296,790 meaning that the city was \$664,572 short.

Another source of revenue that the city received is classified in the budget as other revenues. These revenues consist of refuse disposal fees, license and permits,

cable TV franchise revenue from Comcast, payments in lieu of taxes or known as PILOTS, interest income, user fees, donations and rents and concessions. The total amount that the administration budgeted for these revenue sources in 2010 was \$9,400,932, the actual amount the city realized was \$7,952,577 meaning that the city was \$1,052,355 short.

In regard to other financing sources, the city also took out \$14.5 million in tax anticipation notes in 2010, budgeted \$2 million for the advance sale of delinquent real estate taxes as well as budgeted for transfers from liquid fuels and other funds. The total amount that the administration budgeted for other financing sources was \$19,977,819. The actual amount that the city realized was \$18,048,884 meaning that the city was \$1,928,935 short.

As far as expenditures were concerned in 2010 the administration budgeted for various expenses. To educate, expenditures generally consist of items such as salaries and benefits, workers'

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

compensation claims, professional services, utilities, Court awards, etcetera. amount of money that the city pays to fund the SPA citation issuers is also another expense, and supplies such as salt, paving material, contingency funds and debt service payments are also examples of the various expenses that the city has. Overall the administration budgeted \$77,865,746 in The city ended up spending expenditures. \$77,932,891, meaning that the city spent \$67,145 over budget regarding expenditures. That would not be a large problem if revenue projections by the administration in 2010 were not off by over \$4.4 million.

Again, with all being said, in 2010 the administration created a \$4,538,584 budget hole. And a few weeks ago there were questions as to whether or not the Scranton Parking Authority could consider parcels of land that they own as tax exempt. We had asked our Solicitor Boyd Hughes to look into this and I would like to ask Mr. Hughes, do you have any updates?

MR. HUGHES: Yes, Mr. President, or

22

23

24

25

I guess vice-chairman, Mr. Joyce. It was reported in the Scranton Times that Mr. Tunis, a board member, stated that all of the properties of the Scranton Parking Authority are tax exempt and it does not have to pay any real estate taxes on any of That statement is not its properties. accurate based on accordance with the law, a Supreme Court decision involving the Pittsburgh Parking Authority which has been in effect for over 50 years. Its been cited in many cases both in Pennsylvania Courts and in Federal Courts of the US District Courts for the Eastern District, the Western District and also the Middle District of Pennsylvania, that any property of the Parking Authority that is leased commercially can be assessed and taxed.

Currently the Assessor's Office is taxing the Parking Authority on properties that they do have commercially leased such as restaurants, I mean, just look around you see that the -- I know on the main -- on the original Scranton Parking authority garage at the corner of Washington and Linden they

are being taxed on the commercial properties there. They would also be taxed on any commercial property that they have on any of their other garages, so that statement is not in accordance with the law. They can be taxed and they will be taxed by the city and by the Assessor's Office. They currently are being taxed by the Assessor's Office.

I believe that from what I understand, I haven't seen any of the leases, but I believe that the leases that the Parking Authority has with the commercial tenants and all of the buildings require them to pay the real estate taxes that are assessed, so to make a statement that the Parking Authority could collect the real estate taxes that would be assessed on that share of the tenant's property, leasehold property, that they could keep the money and not pay it to the taxing agencies is totally incorrect.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you for your opinion. And that is all I have for tonight.

MS. KRAKE: 5-B. AMENDING FILE OF

1 COUNCIL NO. 40, 2010, ENTITLED, "AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER 2 APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF 3 4 SCRANTON TO TAKE ALL NECESSARY ACTIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE CONSOLIDATED SUBMISSION FOR 5 COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS 6 TO BE FUNDED UNDER THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT 7 8 BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) PROGRAM, HOME INVESTMENT 9 PARTNERSHIP (HOME) PROGRAM AND EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANT (ESG) PROGRAM, BY TRANSFERRING 10 11 \$39,800.00 FROM PROJECT NUMBER 08-120 12 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TO PROJECT NUMBER 11-229.1 UNITED NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS OF 13 14 NORTHEASTERN PA - CONDEMNATION PROGRAM. MR. JOYCE: At this time I'll 15 16 entertain a motion that Item 5-B be 17 introduced into its proper committee. 18 MR. ROGAN: So moved. MR. MCGOFF: Second. 19 20 MS. JOYCE: On the question? All 21 those in favor signify by saying aye. MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 22 23 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 24 MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 25 have it and so moved.

1	MS. KRAKE: 5-C. AUTHORIZING THE
2	MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS
3	TO ACCEPT AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE
4	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF
5	COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES (COPS)
6	FOR THE 2011 COPS HIRING PROGRAM GRANT.
7	MR. JOYCE: At this time I'll
8	entertain a motion that Item 5-C be
9	introduced into its proper committee.
10	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
11	MR. MCGOFF: Second.
12	MS. JOYCE: On the question? All
13	those in favor signify by saying aye.
14	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
15	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
16	MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
17	have it and so moved.
18	MS. KRAKE: 5-D. CREATING AND
19	ESTABLISHING SPECIAL CITY ACCOUNT NO.
20	02.229604 ENTITLED "2011 COPS HIRING
21	PROGRAM" FOR THE RECEIPT AND DISBURSEMENT OF
22	GRANT FUNDS BY THE SCRANTON POLICE
23	DEPARTMENT FOR PAYMENT OF SERVICES
24	FOR A POLICE OFFICER.
25	MR. JOYCE: At this time I'll

	92
1	entertain a motion that Item 5-D be
2	introduced into its proper committee.
3	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
4	MR. MCGOFF: Second.
5	MS. JOYCE: On the question? All
6	those in favor signify by saying aye.
7	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
8	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
9	MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
10	have it and so moved.
11	MS. KRAKE: 5-E.APPOINTMENT OF JACK
12	EMILIANI, 946 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE,
13	SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, 18504, AS A MEMBER
14	OF THE BOARD OF THE SCRANTON REDEVELOPMENT
15	AUTHORITY FOR AN ADDITIONAL FIVE (5) YEAR
16	TERM. MR. EMILIANI'S CURRENT TERM EXPIRES ON
17	FEBRUARY 14, 2012 AND HIS NEW TERM WILL
18	EXPIRE ON FEBRUARY 14, 2017.
19	MR. JOYCE: At this time I'll
20	entertain a motion that Item 5-E be
21	introduced into its proper committee.
22	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
23	MR. MCGOFF: Second.
24	MS. JOYCE: On the question?
25	MR. ROGAN: Yes. Mrs. Krake, did we

	03
1	receive a resume or did we send a request
2	yet?
3	MS. KRAKE: We have not sent a
4	request. It should be in your backup
5	everything that came down to us. We will
6	double check for that though.
7	MR. ROGAN: If we didn't receive one
8	would you please send out a request?
9	MS. KRAKE: Yes.
10	MR. ROGAN: Thank you.
11	MR. JOYCE: All those in favor of
12	introduction signify by saying aye.
13	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
14	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
15	MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
16	have it and so moved.
17	MS. KRAKE: 5-F. ACCEPTING THE
18	RECOMMENDATION OF THE HISTORICAL
19	ARCHITECTURE REVIEW BOARD ("HARB") AND
20	APPROVING THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
21	FOR SCRANTON CONNELL, LP, 595 E. LANCASTER
22	AVENUE, ST. DAVIDS, PENNSYLVANIA FOR
23	INSTALLATION OF A SIGNAGE BAND AND
24	SIX (6) INDIVIDUAL AWNINGS AT THE CONNELL
25	BUILDING, 121–133 NORTH WASHINGTON AVENUE,

SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA. 1 2 MR. JOYCE: At this time I'll 3 entertain a motion that Item 5-F be 4 introduced into its proper committee. MR. ROGAN: So moved. 5 MR. MCGOFF: Second. 6 MS. JOYCE: On the question? All 7 those in favor signify by saying aye. 8 9 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. MR. ROGAN: Aye. 10 11 MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 12 have it and so moved. MS. KRAKE: 5-G. AUTHORIZING THE 13 14 MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO A SETTLEMENT 15 AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF 16 SCRANTON ("THE CITY"), THE REDEVELOPMENT 17 18 AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON (THE "SRA") AND PENNSTAR BANK ("PENNSTAR") 19 20 TO SETTLE LITIGATION FILED AGAINST THE CITY 21 AND SRA BY PENNSTAR BANK CONCERNING AN AGREEMENT OF SALE AND PURCHASE OF TAX CLAIMS 22 FOR WHICH PENNSTAR PROVIDED FINANCING. 23 24 MR. JOYCE: At this time I'll 25 entertain a motion that Item 5-G be

introduced into its proper committee. 1 2 MR. ROGAN: So moved. 3 MR. MCGOFF: Second. 4 MS. JOYCE: On the question? A11 5 those in favor signify by saying aye. MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 6 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 7 8 MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 9 have it and so moved. MS. KRAKE: 5-H. RATIFYING AND 10 APPROVING OF THE EXECUTION AND SUBMISSION OF 11 12 THE GRANT APPLICATION BY THE CITY OF SCRANTON. ON BEHALF OF UNITED NEIGHBORHOOD 13 14 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (UNCDC), TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA ("THE 15 16 COMMONWEALTH") ACTING THROUGH THE 17 COMMONWEALTH FINANCING AUTHORITY (THE 18 "GRANTOR") FOR A LOCAL SHARE ACCOUNT GRANT, PURSUANT TO THE PA RACE HORSE DEVELOPMENT 19 AND GAMING ACT, FOR A PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AT 20 21 "CEDAR 500" LOCATED IN SCRANTON PA, AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE 22 CITY OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO 23 24 EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO A LOCAL SHARE ACCOUNT

GRANT CONTRACT #C000052035 AND COMMITMENT

25

LETTER WITH THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA 1 COMMONWEALTH FINANCING TO ACCEPT AND UTILIZE 2 3 THE GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$435,200.00 4 AWARDED BY THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA ACTING THROUGH THE COMMONWEALTH FINANCING 5 AUTHORITY FOR SUCH PROJECT. 6 MR. JOYCE: At this time I'll 7 8 entertain a motion that Item 5-H be 9 introduced into its proper committee. MR. ROGAN: So moved. 10 MR. MCGOFF: Second. 11 12 MS. JOYCE: On the question? A11 13 those in favor signify by saying aye. 14 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. MR. ROGAN: Aye. 15 16 MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 17 have it and so moved. 18 MS. KRAKE: SIXTH ORDER. 6-A. READING BY TITLE - FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 18, 19 2012 - AN ORDINANCE - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR 20 21 AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO ACCEPT AND DISBURSE 22 GRANT FUNDS FROM THE WALMART FOUNDATION IN 23 24 THE AMOUNT OF \$2,000.00 TO PURCHASE TOYS AND COATS FROM THE SCRANTON POLICE DEPARTMENT'S 25

ANNUAL TOY/COAT DRIVE. 1 MR. JOYCE: You've heard reading by 2 3 title of Item 6-A, what is your pleasure? 4 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-A 5 pass reading by title. MR. MCGOFF: Second. 6 7 MR. JOYCE: On the question? All those in favor signify by saying aye. 8 9 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 10 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 11 MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 12 have it and so moved. MS. KRAKE: 6-B. READING BY TITLE -13 14 FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 19, 2012 - AN ORDINANCE - CREATING AND ESTABLISHING SPECIAL CITY 15 ACCOUNT NO. 02.229602 ENTITLED "SCRANTON 16 17 POLICE HOLIDAY TOY & COAT DRIVE" FOR THE 18 RECEIPT AND DISBURSEMENT OF DONATIONS RECEIVED BY THE POLICE DEPARTMENT TO 19 PURCHASE TOYS AND COATS DURING THE HOLIDAY 20 21 SEASON FOR AREA FAMILIES. 22 MR. JOYCE: You've heard reading by 23 title of Item 6-B, what is your pleasure? 24 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-B 25 pass reading by title.

1 MR. MCGOFF: Second. 2 MR. JOYCE: On the question? All 3 those in favor signify by saying aye. 4 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 5 MR. ROGAN: Aye. MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 6 7 have it and so moved. MS. KRAKE: 6-C.READING BY TITLE -8 9 FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 20, 2012 - AN ORDINANCE - TRANSFERRING FUNDS FROM FUND 01 CITY OF 10 SCRANTON 2006 SERIES A TAN ACCOUNT WHICH 11 FUNDS AND ACCOUNT ARE NO LONGER NEEDED FOR 12 THE CONDUCT OF CITY BUSINESS, AND ABOLISHING 13 14 AND CLOSING SAID ACCOUNT AND TRANSFERRING THE FUNDS REMAINING IN SAID ACCOUNT TO THE 15 PNC GENERAL FUNDING CHECKING ACCOUNT LISTED 16 17 BELOW. 18 MR. JOYCE: You've heard reading by title of Item 6-C, what is your pleasure? 19 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-C 20 21 pass reading by title. MR. MCGOFF: Second. 22 23 MR. JOYCE: On the question? 24 MR. ROGAN: Yes, on the question, 25 did anyone ever receive a reply to the

1	letter we sent regarding other monies that
2	may still be sitting in these accounts?
3	MS. KRAKE: I don't believe that we
4	have, but I will check into that, Councilman
5	Rogan .
6	MR. ROGAN: I don't see anything.
7	MR. JOYCE: I didn't see any.
8	MR. ROGAN: All right. That's all.
9	MR. JOYCE: All those in favor
10	signify by saying aye.
11	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
12	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
13	MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
14	have it and so moved.
15	MS. KRAKE: SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. FOR
16	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
17	FOR ADOPTION-FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 16, 2012 -
18	AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE
19	OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO EXECUTE
20	AND ENTER INTO AN ADDENDUM TO THE
21	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH
22	NORTHEAST REVENUE SERVICES LLC FOR
23	THE COLLECTION OF DELINQUENT TAXES TO EXPAND
24	THE COLLECTION SERVICES PERFORMED BY
25	NORTHEAST REVENUE SERVICES TO INCLUDE THE
	II

COLLECTION OF CURRENT AND DELINQUENT REFUSE 1 FEES. 2 3 MR. ROGAN: I make a motion to amend 7-A per the following five changes: 4 5 One, in the summary title delete "current and." 6 7 Two, in the whereas clause delete 8 "current and." 9 Three, in the now, therefore, clause, delete "current and". 10 Four, revise addendum Exhibit A as 11 follows: In the third whereas clause delete 12 13 "current and", and in the, now, therefore 14 clause, Article I, delete "current and". Also, in the now, therefore, clause 15 16 Article II, delete Subarticle 2-A and 17 reletter 2-B as 2-A to read as follows: 18 "The fee for the collection of the 19 delinquent refuse fees shall be 15 percent 20 of the delinquent refuse fees and interest collected by Northeast Revenue and paid to 21 22 the treasurer. Northeast Revenue shall also 23 collect the penalties, interest and fees 24 authorized by the City of Scranton." 25 MR. JOYCE: Second. On the

1 question? All those in favor of the motion 2 to amend number 7-A? 3 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 4 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 5 MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and it is so moved. 6 My 7 recommendation as Chairperson for the 8 Committee on Finance, I recommend final 9 passage of Item 7-A, as amended. 10 MR. ROGAN: Second. 11 MR. JOYCE: On the question? 12 MR. ROGAN: Yes, just to explain the 13 amendment and the entire process, by deleting "current and" the city will 14 continue to collect the current so instead 15 16 of having to pay the fee on current and 17 delinquent it would just be on the 18 delinquent so it does save the taxpayers 19 some money. 20 MR. JOYCE: Anybody else? Ro11 21 call, please. 22 MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff. 23 MR. MCGOFF: Yes. 24 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan. 25 MR. ROGAN: Yes.

1 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Joyce. 2 MR. JOYCE: Yes. I hereby declare 3 Item 7-A, as amended, legally and lawfully 4 adopted. MS. KRAKE: 7-B. FOR CONSIDERATION 5 BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES FOR ADOPTION-FILE 6 OF COUNCIL NO. 17, 2012 - ESTABLISHING A 7 8 REGISTRATION PROGRAM FOR RESIDENTIAL RENTAL 9 PROPERTIES: REQUIRING ALL OWNERS OF 10 RESIDENTIAL RENTAL PROPERTIES TO DESIGNATE 11 AN AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS; AND 12 PRESCRIBING DUTIES OF OWNERS, AGENTS AND 13 OCCUPANTS; DIRECTING THE DESIGNATION OF 14 AGENTS: ESTABLISHING FEES FOR THE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE REGISTRATION OF RENTAL 15 16 PROPERTY; AND PRESCRIBING PENALTIES FOR 17 VIOLATIONS. 18 MR. MCGOFF: I'd like to make a motion to table Item 7-B. 19 20 MR. ROGAN: Second. MR. JOYCE: There is a motion on the 21 22 floor to table Item 7-B and a second. 0n23 the question? All those in favor signify by 24 saying aye. 25 MR. MCGOFF: Aye.

	93
1	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
2	MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
3	have it and so moved. Item 7-B is now
4	tabled.
5	If there is no further business,
6	I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
7	MR. ROGAN: Motion to adjourn.
8	MR. JOYCE: This meeting is
9	adjourned.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER