	1
1	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
2	
3	
4	
5	HELD:
6	
7	Thursday, April 26, 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	CATHENE & NADDOZZI DDD OFFICIAL COURT DEDORTED
24	CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR – OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
25	

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL:

, II

•

JANET EVANS, PRESIDENT

FRANK JOYCE, VICE-PRESIDENT

ROBERT MCGOFF

PAT ROGAN

JOHN LOSCOMBE

NANCY KRAKE, CITY CLERK

KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

BOYD HUGHES, SOLICITOR

1	(Pledge of Allegiance recited and moment of reflection
2	observed.)
3	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
4	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
5	MR. MCGOFF: Here.
6	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
7	MR. ROGAN: Here.
8	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe.
9	MR. LOSCOMBE: Here.
10	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Joyce.
11	MR. JOYCE: Here.
12	MS. CARRERA: Mrs. Evans.
13	MS. EVANS: Here. Dispense with the
14	reading of the minutes, please.
15	MS. KRAKE: THIRD ORDER. 3-A.
16	MINUTES OF THE COMPOSITE PENSION MEETING
17	HELD MARCH 28, 2012.
18	MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?
19	If not, received and filed.
20	MS. KRAKE: 3-B. LACKAWANNA COUNTY
21	PLANNING COMMISSION SUBDIVISION AND LAND
22	DEVELOPMENT EVALUATIONS RETURNED APRIL 12,
23	2012.
24	MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?
25	If not, received and filed.

1	MS. KRAKE: 3-C. APPLICATIONS ALONG
2	WITH DECISIONS RENDERED BY THE ZONING
3	HEARING BOARD ON APRIL 11, 2012.
4	MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?
5	If not, received and filed.
6	MS. KRAKE: 3-D. TAX ASSESSOR'S
7	REPORT, RESULTS FROM APRIL 4, 2012 APPEAL
8	HEARINGS.
9	MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?
10	If not, received and filed.
11	MS. KRAKE: 3-E. AGENDA FOR THE CITY
12	PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD APRIL 18,
13	2012.
14	MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?
15	If not, received and filed.
16	MS. KRAKE: 3-F. ADDENDUM FOR THE
17	CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD APRIL
18	18, 2012.
19	MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?
20	If not, received and filed.
21	MS. KRAKE: 3-G. TAX ASSESSOR'S
22	REPORT FROM HEARING DATE MAY 9, 2012.
23	MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?
24	If not, received and filed.
25	MS. KRAKE: 3-H. DEPOSIT MADE BY THE

SCRANTON SINGLE TAX OFFICE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,014,408.14 TO FIDELITY BANK FOR THE 2012 TAN DEBT.

MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?

If not, received and filed. Do we have any clerk's notes, Mrs. Krake?

MS. KRAKE: No, Mrs. Evans.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Do any council members have announcements at this time? The Friends of the Scranton Knights will conduct their annual Night at the Races this Saturday, April 28, from 7 to 11 p.m. at St. Anthony's Center, 1013 Wood Street in Scranton. Tickets are \$10, are available at the door, and include light fare, beer, soda, water, music and fun. You must be 21 years old to attend. All proceeds benefit the Scranton Knights football team.

Astronomy Day is sponsored by the Lackawanna Astronomical Society, will be held on Saturday, May 5, 2012, at 7:00 p.m. at the Thomas G. Cupillary Observatory. Sunday spot, solar prominences, Mars and Saturn's rings can be viewed through

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

observatory telescopes. Admission to the program is free. Don't miss this annual educational and entertaining event. And that's it.

MS. KRAKE: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS'
PARTICIPATION.

MS. EVANS: Our first speaker tonight is Ozzie Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Ozzie Quinn, Taxpayers' Association. Good evening. This morning I saw in the newspaper about the Rockwell Avenue Bridge falling apart and I got concerned with that because the last couple of readings of the change order was to do with the engineer who did the -- for \$70,000, you know, for Rockwell Avenue, and then I looked on the mayor's -- the city's website and he has taken a -- for the accomplishment of \$1 million infrastructure improvement for the Rockwell Avenue bridge, and I called Mrs. Evans and I got in touch with Mr. Evans today because I thought it seemed a little undeserving, you know, that he is saying that the Rockwell Avenue bridge the infrastructure is already done and it's

falling apart and it's in the creek and will you find out the answer for that,

Mrs. Evans?

MS. EVANS: Yes. You are correct about the legislation, it is Resolution No. 16 of 2012 that was finally passed March 22, I believe, and there is a supplemental engineering agreement with Buckhart and Horn in the amount of \$71,004.03 for the Rockwell Avenue bridge project. I have already asked our office to send these concerns to the city engineering, to the mayor, and all appropriate parties for their responses.

MR. QUINN: Thank you. It's ironic, you know, when you see this meeting tonight and for anybody who has been looking at what's been going on in the city since the Doherty administration took over in 2003 that, you know, we were coined the Legion Doom, anybody that come up here that made any type of complaint or recommendation or what against the Doherty administration and, you know, so now we get to a point now that we are broke and we are talking about bailing him out with \$26 million, you know?

I mean, we just can't afford this here. We can't even -- we don't have two nickles to rub together, how can we be talking about \$26 million. Mr. Hughes, it was very good of you to look over that and find that where we are at with that \$26 million because, you know, when I see addendums or when I see amendments that scares me. That really scarce me, okay. And, please, do not vote for that \$26 million.

Mr. Loscombe was right on the money when he brought up about the safety award, what about that, duh, you know? We got to pay for that you know? You are talking about 50 some million dollars. And, you know, Mr. Doherty is going to be gone, you know? Now, we all know that there has been a lot of spending put on while Mr. Doherty has done in the last 10 years. For instance, Mr. Doherty or the city administration to tear down ten blighted properties. Well, that should have read Mr. Doherty is going to put ten properties

back on the tax rolls by rehabilitation, you know? See, we have been listening to that spin. He has been doing it and every time it's been going on, it's been going down and down and down and down and we got to a point where we kept on refinancing and refinancing and Mrs. Evans called it the Doherty debt and it is the Doherty debt.

Now, if somebody wants to cosign leave the publishers of the Times cosign that \$26 million bill. If they feel so pleased with what Mr. Doherty has done in the last ten years and drive us into the ground where even the bridges are falling into the creek, the lampposts are falling down, sidewalks are caving in, houses are Market value of the houses are abandoned. declining, let them cosign, you know? Ιf there they have so forthright, you know, that they could tell us, you know, sign to that get that \$26 million there for Mr. Doherty so we could get going. We all know the guy is a mismanagement incompetent for finances. My gosh, you know, and so, please, forget about the whole thing, will

24

25

you? Go back to square one and try to find out what we can do to just get out -- even the judge said \$8.9 million, I don't know why you are even talking 12 million, 26 million. I don't understand that.

But the fact is, you know, we have been here going -- coming up here, Legion of Doom and the ironic thing we were right all the time and the Times was wrong and now they want to support, you know, this here absolutely insane idea. Oh, my God, Mr. Hughes hit it right on the head \$26 million he is muttering and moaning, went around when the bottom line was, he said, yeah, it could go to \$26 million and that's the truth, okay?

I do want to say one other thing, too, in regards to Mr. Hughes' salary, okay, for overtime, you know, I saw in the past where Mr. Greco, you know, with overtime on his contract, you know, okay, and so what he did is the city says they won't pay it so what he did he took it to Court and the city didn't oppose it so, therefore, he got the award, you know? So, I mean, that's

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

circumventing what, you know,

Mrs. Novembrino has said, okay? So does he have to do that? Well, if you do, I hope he does it. Good luck. Thank you very much.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. HUGHES: Ozzie, thank you, but I
I'm sure they wouldn't give me a default
judgment.

MS. EVANS: Andy Sbaraglia.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia, citizen of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians, them 203 bonds that were issued, is that the ones we took the insurance out on? If vou remember -- well, you weren't there, you wouldn't even know, but way back when the mayor touted we had a AAA rating on early bonds and I think they are the 203 bonds because we bought our insurance. We had the foresight to buy insurance, and if they want -- if we have an insurance on it why would you want to refinance? I mean, if we can't pay the insurance, the bonding company will take up the payments until we are able to pay, but if you in turn refinance them bonds and then a bonding company sold the

money in reserve to pay for those bonds, which they probably are, you are bailing out the bond company and that's not the whole idea. The reason you buy insurance is to provide the insurance. Now, I don't know if the 203 bonds work because, like I say, this is all -- I didn't get to read this as he -- as is pointed out, this is all in his head for the time being or draft to you people, I didn't have time, now I could check my records and see what the 203 bonds were and see if you they were the ones that insured.

That was way back when. We borrowed 72 million for various things, for the DPW site, and the police building there and we also borrowed the money for -- to buy the light fixtures back then. This was the first one the mayor had his cart blanch buying that he had for the council and he borrowed like crazy and now we are in a bind and can't pay for what he borrowed, and the worst part about it you want to borrow more money, I didn't say you, the administration wants to borrow money that we can't afford to pay anyway.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, I mean, if them bonds, the 203 bonds, are the ones that are insured I'd let the insurance company take the brunt. wouldn't let them go for the whole thing, but they would pay the people who bought the bonds until we are able to pay. It's a whole idea of insurance. Why bail out the insurance companies if them are the bonds that are insured. That was way back, as I said before, that's the first bonds he came in when he started really borrowing. Somewhere in my records I might have them, but that's a long time ago, but I didn't forget that we took out an insurance because he touted that we had a AAA bonding rating. Sure we did. We had insurance on that debt, now unfunded debt that we keep seeing rise, and rise and rise, well, the debt on the bonds is unfunded because they had no intention of paying them this year, so it became unfunded.

But also there is lot of other unfunded things. His library that he sold and touted I believe he took out some options for a Penn Security, that building

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there, I remember somewhere along that an option might have been taken off on that building. Penn Security is now building a new bank and that bank now will be, I don't know whether they will keep it open or it will be vacant, but I remember an option for 100,000 way back when. So that's another thing that you can check if that became unfunded.

Everything that he has contracts out that he get paid verbal or so forth that he is able to do that he didn't pay becomes unfunded, so there is lot of unfunded debt that you may not even know about. don't know, like I said before, when you first came in I told you to triple that man's salary, you should have, should have put it right in the budget. I told you that because I knew what was going to happen. You are going to go loggerhead with the mayor and where the mayor is now the city, I told you before, the most liable -- the best thing we can do for the city is file for Chapter 11 really. Not bankruptcy, Chapter 11, and setup the funding for anything to

get it straightened out because as it is now it's not going to work. You can't keep borrowing to get out of debt somewhere along the line or you are break the back of the taxpayers. I mean, how many of them nooses could you put around their neck?

I'm getting calls about people with your legislation on the apartments. I don't know how it effects them, I don't have any, but they were quite upset about them. I didn't get it from the parking yet, but I'm sure they will be telling me about the parking. I didn't hear about having people who work out of town come in and pay the money to the city, too. So you have -- I'm going to quit because there is no such getting into it because I could go for hours and hours on this debt. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Our next speaker is Les Spindler.

MR. SPINDLER: Good evening,

Council. Les Spindler, city resident and
homeowner and taxpayer. I was happy to read

in the Doherty newsletter this morning that the handicap accessible are finally fixed. I have been coming to these meeting for almost 11 years and I think for a majority of those years those doors haven't been fixed. I can't believe how long it's been taking to repair those. It's totally unacceptable how long it took. We can't even get handicap people in and out of this building. It's ridiculous. Its just continues to show the incompetence of this whole administration.

On that note, I got a letter in the mail last week from Department of Public Safety, I have an old garage, it's in disrepair and it said if I didn't get new hinges on the doors that I'm going to be cited in 30 days. We have handicap doors that aren't accessible for eight, ten years and I'm getting threatened? They should take care of their own house before they harass taxpayers. Let's get the things working in here. They said it's a public safety hazard, my garage. It's not a public safety hazard, not letting the handicap

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

people in and out of this building is a safety hazard.

Okay, I want to also talk about this \$26 million. I don't understand how we can even talk about \$26 million when all the Court authorized the mayor to borrow is \$9.85 million so why are we even considering \$26 million? It's ridiculous. What does he plan on doing with the rest of this money, put it in his pocket like he has done for years? I wouldn't give this man a penny extra because nobody knows what he is going to do with it. He could say what he is going to do with it, but he has been lying I wouldn't trust the man as far for vears. as I could throw him. I wouldn't give him any more than the 8.5 million that the Court authorized.

Moving on, last Sunday the big headline in the paper, "What went wrong?"

Talking about this city. I'll tell you what went wrong, the city has been electing the wrong mayor for almost 11 years now. We have a man that knows nothing about running a city, we have been mismanaged for almost

11 years. He has done nothing but put us deeper and deeper in debt for almost 11 years now and that's what's wrong. I hopes the Times-Tribune prints that in the paper and God help us if he is reelected again next year. I just hope we get somebody better to run next year or we are going to be in the same boat.

And another thing, PEL, they have to go and Mrs. Evans isn't here, I don't know if anybody knows the answer to this, but didn't Mrs. Evans ask for a letter to be sent to the governor about trying to get rid of PEL?

MR. JOYCE: Yes, that is correct.

MR. SPINDLER: Did we get any response about that letter?

MR. JOYCE: Mrs. Krake, did we ever get a response to that letter?

MS. KRAKE: Not that I'm aware of.
I could verify that. It's been awhile.

MR. SPINDLER: Because I said for years and years they have been in charge of this city for 20 years now, we are worse off now than we were 20 years ago. PEL hasn't

done a darn thing but line their pockets and collected millions of dollars from this city and they are put part of the problem, so one of the best -- two of the best things we can do is get rid of PEL and get rid of this mayor. That's all I have tonight. Thank you for your time.

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

MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council,
Doug Miller, Scranton.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. MILLER: I'd just like to begin on a positive note as Mr. Spindler just alluded to moments ago, we took a big step forward in this city for once. I walked in here this evening and saw for the first time in years or since I have been coming here we finally have handicap accessible doors, so we can do something right in the city and I'm glad to see we finally got it down, it's something that should have been done a long time ago, but it's done and we have proven that we can get something accomplished for a change.

But I do want to begin on a serious note here, you know, I sat here tonight at the caucus and I listened to the discussion on the administration's proposed plan to seek \$26 million. We don't exactly know what the figure is 18, 20, 26, there is all kinds of numbers floating around, but the bottom line is it's not good. Many thoughts did go through my head throughout that caucus, none of them were positive.

I listened to the presentation, we had documentation, draft ordinances that really frustrated me to listen to some of the things that were said and how this draft was proposed. Councilman Loscombe brought up a good point the fact that they still have Leonard Kreshefski listed as the business administrator just tells me how much time and effort they have been putting into this, and other council members listed as president and other things, other issues that, you know, just baffles me, but I have been coming here for the last ten years and I have listened to all of the business administrators and all of the bond advisors

come forward and spew all of their rhetoric and their plans as to what they feel we should borrow and how they feel we should run our city, and each year we have had the mayor come forward looking for councils to bail them out and, yet again, he is doing it with this plan that he has here.

We had past councils go ahead without any hesitation and approve millions of dollars in borrowing and they did it without any sympathy whatsoever and they are the ones that we could also point the finger at because they have an awful lot to do with the situation we are in as well. This isn't just the mayor. This is also his minions, as we like to say, who were a part of this.

And, of course, due if all of this we find yourselves in a situation where, you know, it's painful to say at this point after all of these of coming here that, quite frankly, we are on the verge of bankruptcy and I do hate to say that, but we need to start telling the truth. You know, I truly can't begin to express how disgusted I am with this administration and the way

they have handled our finances and to think how they destroyed, single handedly destroyed the future of my generation as well as the future generation after mine.

As I said, it's truly amazing what one man can do in ten years and how he can cause such a mess and now we are in a situation we now we have to find solutions to solve these problems and it's not easy, and I have said many times from this podium I'm truly sorry that this council has to deal with this, that you have been left with the situation that, quite frankly, I just don't even know where you begin and borrowing is not the solution, you have seen where that's taken us.

I truthfully believe that giving the mayor whether it's 26 million or 18 million, whatever it is, it's like giving an arsonists a box of matches and a gallon of gasoline. Nothing good is going to come out of that. We are \$313 million in long-term debt. What does this man not understand about that? Now, he wants to add an additional \$26 million on top of that. When

is it going to stop? When is he going to finally realize that borrowing is not the solution to getting out of our financial situation? You know, I truly don't understand what goes through this man's mind.

But I do encourage council to continue standing up for the little guy as you have done for the last two and a half to three years and send a message loud and clear to this mayor that you will not allow the borrowing and spending to continue, that those days are over and we are not going continue that trend. Send a message to this mayor that you are not going to continue to allow him to increase our debt and we can no longer afford to add financial burdens on the residents of this city and the future generations.

Moving on, I would like to briefly discuss the Rockwell Avenue bridge.
Unfortunately, we were all informed that due to safety issues that the bridge had to be shut down, obviously, this has been a concern for years now. Residents have

22

23

24

25

brought issues forward as to concerns of the safety and they have sought out relief. You know, we had past elected officials make tons of promises that they were going to go in and restructure the bridge and do renovations and other things to improve it, that was never done. Those promises were never fulfilled. To think of all of the millions of dollars that we have squandered over the last ten years on projects, you know, the parks and everything else this mayor has squandered money on, maybe if we invested in our roads and our bridges we wouldn't be in this situation where we have to now inconvenience residents in that section of town and limit their access to that bridge. Now it will be a detour, just another headache for the residents in this section of town that they have to deal with.

And finally tonight, just a quick question, last week I had requested that we send a letter to Mark Dougher regarding the operation of swimming pools this summer and I'm just asking if we received any response at this point?

23

24

25

MS. EVANS: No, we didn't. The letter was sent through.

MR. ROGAN: I'll be addressing that in Fifth Order. I actually have additional concerns regarding the pools.

MR. MILLER: I appreciate that. Once again, this is an issue we have had many times with getting responses and quite frankly it's appalling, it should not take seven days to answer a simple question. question was what pools will be open this We have had months to discuss this. summer. The summer months are approaching very quickly. It's not like all of a sudden we are realizing that pools are opening up, it's inexcusable and, you know, again, just add to the frustration in this town that we can't even get answers to simple questions as to what pools will be in operation this summer. It's just disgusting. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Ron Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: Hello, Council.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. ELLMAN: It looks like 20 years of PEL is just a complete miserable failure

to people. I don't know. You know, the people want cuts. You go out here and talk to them they just want cuts for God sake. They want some relief. Everybody you talk to they got abandoned houses and foreclosed houses all around them and empty apartments they can't rent. The way we are going, you know, people -- you keep talking about building new apartments, we got 3,000 less people paying taxes in 10 years. We don't need no more apartments. You know, these developers are just using all this tax money and these loopholes and everything and they are taking us for a ride.

And the neighborhoods, any neighborhood you go down you can see it's declining. You know, I have been complaining, I don't have sewers or sidewalks, I got hundred year old sidewalks to walk around on, no curbs. The cars park on the sidewalks so you can't use them, nothing -- you know, nothing is being accomplished around here. The money that should have been going for our streets and sidewalks in North Scranton Doherty tore

down that three-story apartment building next to the Taurus Club in the city parking lot, and what do we have? We got a little empty lot and we got a great big dumpster sitting on the city parking lot for two car places. Some of accomplishment there. I don't know how much taxes that thing paid, but it was a three-story apartment building. It had to do more than an empty lot, and they are not even using the empty lot for nothing. It's not paved. You can't put a car there. They don't even put the dumpster there.

That's the kind of plan, you know, that Doherty has done for the city. I think he is getting delusional talking about downtown is so good. I was at the mall over the weekend, it's empty. Honestly, I don't want to see everybody-- it's full of empty stores, you walk around downtown there is empty stores, there is parking places. This city never had you could pull up someplace and park, it was never like that. I used to go around the block over and over looking for parking places. They have killed

downtown. I don't know, you know, what you can do about it.

What happened about the parking plan with those -- that the company was going to put the temporary deal in? You had that in your budget, didn't you?

MS. EVANS: The previous year budget.

MR. ELLMAN: Well, that's ashame. I don't want to see anything fall through. I wasn't too much in favor of it. You know, when you mess with people's money it makes you most irritable and this administration is just -- they just don't know what they are doing. Last week when I complained about -- I just use this for an example, the intervention center which gets seven, eight, nine-hundred thousand dollars of tax money using tax money to buy houses that they go take off the tax rolls and then they got to improve the property with tax money. It just a never ending deal. Whoever heard of something like that?

Anthony Rinaldi couldn't get rid of that property because of the turndown for

what he had in it, so he gets his dream of a deal with the intervention center. Now, why would they need four particular pieces of property that he has? If this isn't a crooked deal I don't know what is and somebody ought to be investigating it. It's as bad as our school board.

You know, I got a little thing I saw in the paper yesterday, Philadelphia -- I don't know if anyone saw it, Philadelphia closed 40 schools. It's right there in yesterday's paper under the state, Tuesday's paper. They closed 40 schools and they are laying off hundreds of staff members. What are we doing, building schools? You know, that's our school board, hiring people and taking bribes, I forgot about that. They are good at that. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Lee Morgan.

MR. MORGAN: Good evening, Council.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. MORGAN: I have a copy of the 2010 audit that was in your office and I'm having an auditor look at that for myself,

well, more than one auditor, but from outside of the city that have audited banks and fortune 500 companies and I'm trying to just get an understanding of that document a lot better than I have the ability myself, but what I'd like to know does council have a copy of the Parking Authority and the Scranton Sewer Authority's audits in your office? Do have you have copy of those?

MS. EVANS: Mrs. Krake, do we have those in our office?

MS. KRAKE: We may. I would have to verify that.

MR. MORGAN: Maybe I'll call tomorrow.

Mr. Sbaraglia talked a little bit about the new ordinance for establishing a registration program and I see that all five council members voted for this, and I would like to ask, I don't see anything in this document as far as an appeals board in the city, so does this go in front of the building appeals board?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes, it does.

MR. MORGAN: Could that be included

23

24

25

in this legislation so that -- and could it also be -- could council modify this so that whenever you act on a property this person knows to immediately take an appeal to the building appeals board because the window to appeal is so sort that -- I have had an opportunity to have a lot of conversations with people in the city who have had their properties condemned or have had actions taken against them by the city, I've seen documents signed by the city solicitor, okay, that has given them back their properties and their right to rent because as long as they don't speak to the newspaper or the television, because evidently their rights were violated, and I have read these documents myself because people have called my cell phone and there is lot of people that are very angry over this legislation.

And I just can't understand really, I mean, when you read this document and you talk about BOCA and the city code and all these things, you know, I really have to say that I think we are chasing the wrong people here. I think that the reason these

properties and this city is in the shape it's in isn't the property owner's fault, it may seem that way because they own the property, but what do you say to somebody who takes a tenant to the magistrate and has \$5,000 worth of the damage and can't recoup ten cents? Where is the legislation to give the mechanism to collect?

And how about the people who have rental properties in the city who are forced, as you say, to pay unpaid sewer bills on their property because council passed that legislation long ago holding the property owners responsible for unpaid sewer bills? And where is the legislation in this document that's going to give these people the ability to recoup those costs when tenants refuse to pay the sewer bill and they abandon the property?

I have to be really honest and tell you that I think in this city for a very long time and, like I said, I'm not singling out this council, this city has been very seriously mismanaged and there has been flight out of this city for an extremely

long period of time. There is blight in every single part of this city, and I just think you have singled out one group of people who have come here to make an investment who have been very seriously abused for an extremely long period of time. I mean, have any of the people on council here ever read the condemnation book before you made this legislation to figure out why properties were being condemned?

And who is to determine, okay, I mean, we have so many people making a determination on what a violation is, okay, but did anybody on council look at the grandfathering of properties at the time the work was done? Has anybody done that? mean, you have created a document here that's created a law, but my point is the five members of council who signed this, did you research any of this yourself? Did you look at the sewer bill situation and the inability to collect? Did you look at the inability of landlords to recoup damages on their property? I mean, how much real research went into this document because,

you know, a lot of people who have bought these rental units that was their investment, okay, and they are stuck here.

Like Ozzie Quinn said when he was here, realtors don't want to come here and show properties. It is the fault of the owners that this has taken place or is it the fault of the system and you have created a document and all five of you have signed it and it's very flawed. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Gerard Hetman.

MR. HETMAN: Good evening, council.

Gerard Hetman from the Lackawanna County

Department of Community Relations.

MS. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. HETMAN: I'm here tonight to talk about certainly the hot button issue in the county which is baseball. Very briefly, when I made my last appearance at our last meeting of council I said that we were still waiting for a date for the public hearing for the proposed sale of the local baseball franchise. As it turns out, the meeting and the sale were to be completed before this

evening's meeting, so there was nothing we could do in terms of meeting here with council to offer anything to add the Scranton City Council meeting as things proceeded.

But to give you a brief overview,
last evening the public meeting was held at
the Scranton Cultural Center involving
members of the Lackawanna County
Multi-Purpose Stadium Authority as well as
alternate members of the Lackawanna County
Board of Commissioners, the architects and
construction managers that were involved in
the stadium reconstruction project as well
as attorneys and members of the negotiating
team were involved in negotiations.

The hearing lasted approximately three hours. We had approximately 100 local residents in attendance at the meeting we had approximately 20 speakers come forward to express their concerns, opinions, questions to everyone present to answer them.

A wide variety of questions and concerns and topics were discussed at the

21

22

23

24

25

meeting, so I won't go into elaborate detail here, but just to give you and all of our residents in attendance who are watching TV a very brief overview. I have a document on Triple-A baseball for an economic engine for Northeastern Pennsylvania prepared by Mr. Dan Lispe, president of TRL Consulting and Development, and I will just give you a few very brief key points just to keep you updated as to a couple of the particulars and a couple of what we believe are very positive aspects to the baseball sale that went on today, actually this morning, at the Lackawanna County Multi-Purpose Stadium Authority, a vote approved by a four to one vote the ability to -- the right to sell the team to Scranton/Wilkes-Barre Yankees, LLC.

So to give you a very brief overview, the present Triple-A baseball infuses \$6.6 into the regional economy. It has an estimated economic impact of \$32.8 million. After completion of the stadium project, Triple-A baseball will infuse \$9.4 million into the regional economy and have an estimated annual economic impact of \$47

million on the local economy.

That figure of \$47 million is obtained from what's called a multiplier effect, where as one dollar spent from the consumer to the provider that's serves as a dollar to that provider to then use to spend as a consumer with another provider in some other capacity.

Typically the multipliers are used by a formula of five where there is a chain of five purchases or five transactions for every dollar that originates as part of that process. So again, we are looking an estimated annual impact of 47 million annually as a result from this sale.

I'll very briefly go through a couple of parts of this. Construction job creation facts: This project, the stadium renovation that will come from this sale, will support 350 construction jobs in our community that will pay approximately \$17.5 million in salary and benefits for the local construction employees.

The construction economic impact on the whole community for suppliers, all of

the supplies that can be obtained locally will be obtained through local suppliers, that will total \$6 million spent with local construction supplier.

Ten more permanent jobs with the local franchise will be created, that will bring the permanent wages paid total to over \$2,750,000.

Annual spending on goods and services by the team will total \$4,458,00 estimated.

Taxes, fees and other revenues to the various branches of government will come to \$1,789,000.

Ancillary revenue, for example, revenue spent in restaurants, hotels, a number of which are sometimes in the City of Scranton for visitors, visiting teams, officials, etcetera, etcetera, is estimated at \$405,000. These are all annual estimates, but the big thing that we believe with Lackawanna County and the Lackawanna County Commissioners believe make this deal much different than the way the franchise operated in the past or the stadium operated

in the past and much different than other previous tentative deals that were looked at over the years to secure the situation is that there is a financial commitment on the part of Scranton Yankees, LLC to be vested in the stadium in a very positive way.

To explain that, the receipt of \$22 million in state assistance and Scranton Wilkes-Barre Yankees, LLC's commitment to fund all construction project overruns, local taxpayers were spared construction expenses associated with the stadium project.

In addition, Scranton Wilkes-Barre
Yankees, LLC has invested at least \$30
million into the stadium project over the
next 30 years. Furthermore, SWB Yankees,
LLC is also paying all future capital
maintenance expense over \$15 million.
Project architects on the whole have
estimated future capital expenses to come to
\$30 million over the next 30 years.

If I could just finish up very briefly? By limiting it's exposure to future capital expenses of \$15 million,

local government has mitigated it's long-term capital expenditure risk.

In addition, the decision by the local government to cover the \$15 million in future expenses and or the bond issuance paid through existing funds has eliminated the need for new local tax dollars to support Triple-A baseball.

Sorry, if I ran out of time. There are just a few key points here. The Yankees are responsible for cost overruns that will come -- if they come in the construction process all cost overruns, after that \$15 million from county funds it's estimated that the Yankees, LLC will be responsible for all costs in the remaining 30 years over the cost over those 30 years. So they have a vested interest in the deal and I think that makes this different from previous deals.

If any member of council or anyone here tonight has any questions I will be here and will try to answer them. If I don't have an answer immediately, we will get an answer for council or for the audience and will be happy to make sure all

1 questions are answered. 2 Mrs. Evans, may I just MR. ROGAN: 3 ask --MS. EVANS: Certainly. 4 MR. ROGAN: -- for clarification 5 purposes, there is nothing in that agreement 6 7 that guarantees that Mandalay will keep the 8 franchise in Scranton, is there? 9 MR. HETMAN: There are provisions, 10 we believe. Again --MR. MCGOFF: You believe. They are 11 economic ones, but there is no guarantee. 12 13 MR. HETMAN: If I can get back to 14 you, Mr. McGoff, we will get the exact legislation in there and I will contact you 15 16 to clarify that for you. 17 MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. 18 MR. HETMAN: No problem. 19 MS. EVANS: I just had one or two 20 quick questions that perhaps you can look 21 into? 22 MR. HETMAN: Sure. 23 MS. EVANS: If the renovations 24 include a project labor agreement, and will 25 local labor union tradesmen be used on that

project.

MR. HETMAN: I believe the answer to both of those is, yes, but again, we will look up the exact legislation in the agreement and get the answers to all three of those questions for you very briefly.

Not tonight, but over the course of tomorrow and this week, but I believe the answer to both of your questions is yes. Several representatives from local labor unions and local labor were present last night and expressed their support for the project, so we will get back to you ASAP on those questions.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Dave Dobrzyn.

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council.

Dave Dobrzyn. I don't know what all of this talk about money is about, I pay my trash collection fee and bought a dog license today you should have all of the money you need. Anyway, I paid it for a year, by the way, so I don't forget and wind up with a late fee, which I did in the past.

Okay, on this arbitration award I would suggest that we ask for a bottom line. It's way past time from the administration and if not maybe the unions would come to a caucus and answer that for them because we hear 20 million, 30 million, I mean, are we going to start billing the kitchen sink, you know, along with the labor settlement or what, you know? There is always lots of fudge area when some of these estimates that we get out of the administration along with what we heard tonight. I didn't hear everything tonight so I'm going to watch and form an opinion next week.

And it came to my attention from
listening to the national news reports,
profitable nonprofits. Charter schools
where the administrators are driving to
school in Mercedes and Cadillac Escalades
and so forth and they are nonprofit, they
are listed as a nonprofit. The kids don't
have books, but they are a nonprofit, and
these people are making a hellacious amount
of salary drawing salaries from nonprofits,
so it might be an interesting avenue to

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pursue and find out who is making money on the nonprofits and are they very profitable nonprofit then they shouldn't be a nonprofit because they are too profitable.

Graffiti, my house was hit with graffiti down on the wall and I would just like to warn some kids out there and some parents and this isn't anything that I would even think of, but we do have a stand your ground law in Pennsylvania and it's only a matter of time until some nut case goes down there and maybe goes after a kid with a gun or something over some graffiti. Now, I'm going to clean it up, but it hasn't been I have had two attempts already. easy. It's soaked into concrete wall, but they are lucky that my wife has rose bushes because I was thinking of a couple of 300 pound boulders that could accidently become dislodged.

And last, I think it was yesterday,

Jack, do you remember our friend Jerry from

Orchard Street, he was out there cleaning up

somebody's garbage again and it's entirely

ridiculous the pile there, so I'll get in

21

22

23

24

25

touch with you in the future here and I fell asleep before the meeting so there is a lot of things I didn't get done I had planned. I had an early doctor's appointment, almost missed the meeting. But, I mean, there must have been nine bags there. No recycling being done. Nothing, you know. A person approached me at the supermarket, they were very nice about and they said, "Well, gee, some of these people can't get their recycling done because they are too old, but the one place I drove by they always put it at the back fence and the back fence is approximately 400 percent longer of a walk to the back fence to throw their recycling away as trash than it would be to put it out on the front, you know. So, I mean, there's excuses and there's excuses and it's just ashame.

Don't forget out in TV land tun into 105.7 WFTE and get to hear the other side of the story. Fox news is the -- they already had a ruling where the truth isn't necessarily the news so. Okay, on the golden parrot we have ALEC, they are also a

non profit, by the way, a lobbyist nonprofit, I mean, give me a break, that's what I mean about profitable nonprofits, and apparently people have been turning in tax deductions for their donations to this company, American Legislative Exchange Counsel, they are responsible for our photo IDs and everything I have been hearing on the phone, I'm doing some work for -- political work for people and I'm hearing about old ladies that it takes 30, 40 hours to get them into an ID and stuff and they laxed it a little become bit, but it's still not cutting it.

So anyway, Jack Ambramoff had a center for American Policy Research and he wound up in prison because he was double dealing his -- he outlawed or helped outlaw gambling in Texas at the behest of a Louisiana tribe and he is taking millions of dollars from the Texas tribe to relegalize gambling, so he gets four years instead of 40 and now ALEC decided to drop this because they lost 13 funders already and guess who is taking up the photo ID? The Center for

1 American Policy Research, Jack Ambramossil organizations, so that's what I mean. 2 3 Profitable nonprofits, bawk, bawk, bawk. Have a good night. 4 5 MS. EVANS: Thank you. Jerry Ferrario. 6 MR. FERRARIO: 7 Council, good 8 evening. Jerry Ferrario, Dunmore resident 9 and Scranton employee, worker, property 10 owner. 11 MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening. MS. EVANS: Good evening. 12 MR. FERRARIO: 13 I'm trying to get 14 some clarification on your proposed ordinance for the imposition of the 15 15 16 percent parking tax. I have been trying for 17 a couple of weeks and I'm looking for 18 somebody to tell me who it's going to 19 effect. For example, does it effect 20 somebody that parks in the lot that is a 21 tenant in the building? 22 If only effects if you MR. ROGAN: 23 own a lot or you have a lot where you're 24 charging a fee. 25 MR. FERRARIO: I'm sorry?

MR. ROGAN: It would only effect you if you are charging a fee.

MR. FERRARIO: I have a tenant who it's a tenant of my building who parks in my parking lot, they pay rent, do I -- is there anywhere that I have got to pay 15 percent for this parking fee?

MR. ROGAN: Attorney Hughes, do you know if that would be covered?

MR. HUGHES: I believe the way the ordinance is structured, the way it came down from the solicitor's office and the way we reviewed it, it would have to be a charge by the landlord on that specific lot. If you had -- if they're a tenant in your office building and you say -- you have a parking lot and you charge them say \$100 a month to park extra in addition to the rent that would then be taxable.

MR. FERRARIO: So if I just charge them the rent then they are not taxable?

MR. HUGHES: That's going to be up to the solicitor's office, but the thing that -- what this was aimed at is that -- this was aimed at is that where there is a

charge for that parking spot by the owner of the parking lot and it's being charged and there is being an amount paid.

MR. FERRARIO: So if I charge \$5 an hour I'm responsible for a 15 percent tax which would be 75 cents, I understand.

MR. HUGHES: Or if you say --

MR. FERRARIO: If I charge \$100 a month for a monthly spot then I would be responsible for --

MR. HUGHES: \$15.

MR. FERRARIO: \$15, okay.

MR. HUGHES: But you would have to charge for it.

MR. FERRARIO: I would have to charge, right. I would have to charge for it.

MR. HUGHES: And somebody that had an apartment building and just -- or, you know, an office building, and my office isn't in Scranton, but, you know, like my office building there is parking spaces all over, so everybody pays, you know, free.

When I was in downtown Scranton where I had my office they charge us for the parking, so

1 we had to provide our secretaries, and 2 ourself, would have to lease a eight parking 3 spots, so now that wasn't included in our rent. 4 MR. FERRARIO: So if I include it in 5 the rent --6 MR. HUGHES: Well, I don't know. 7 8 MR. FERRARIO: Okay, just it's 9 Mr. Kelly that's going to be the -- who makes that determination. That's what I'm 10 11 trying to understand. MR. HUGHES: It would be I believe 12 13 up in LIPS, Licensing, Inspections and 14 Permits. They are the ones that enforcing the ordinance. 15 16 MR. FERRARIO: Who wrote the 17 ordinance though, is it --18 MR. HUGHES: It came down from the solicitor's office. 19 20 MR. FERRARIO: From Mr. Kelly. 21 MR. HUGHES: From Mr. Kelly; 22 What this was aimed to do is to correct. 23 get where somebody is leasing that space, 24 and it's not like you have -- they could 25 have an apartment building and say, okay,

1 here, that's not included in your rent so 2 now you have to pay extra. 3 MR. FERRARIO: And that I understand. What I'm trying to --4 5 MR. HUGHES: I can't tell you 6 whether -- what you charge if you provide 7 free parking it's included in there and that's included in your office and you are 8 9 saying, "Here, the office is \$10 a square 10 foot per year and it includes two parking 11 spaces." 12 I mean, to me that's the parking 13 spaces because you have them, they are going 14 with the office but you are not charging individually for those parking spaces. If 15 16 you say, "Here, I also have a parking lot 17 and if you want parking spaces -- " 18 MR. FERRARIO: 100 a month. MR. HUGHES: "-- then it's extra." 19 20 I can't -- that's about it. 21 MR. FERRARIO: Well, then you not 22 the one that -- this was written from the 23 city's --24 MR. HUGHES: Correct. 25 MR. FERRARIO: Okay. Because the --

what the city told me was that every time this proposed ordinance comes back to them it's changed, so he couldn't give me an interpretation of -- I'm just as confused as you are, he couldn't give me an interpretation of who has to -- you know, who is paying for it. Is somebody that's a tenant in a building responsible for their spot and if so how you can separate that amount?

The ordinance, I mean, the ordinance itself I could not get it from the city. I called your office and Mrs. Krake said I could come down and read it, is its normal procedure that I can't get a copy of a proposed ordinance or is it just --

MS. EVANS: We can provide you with that.

MR. FERRARIO: No, well, I had to go down and read it and write it and retype it, that's what I did, but I'm just trying to understand the normal procedures. I know tonight is the third reading, will it actually be voted on tonight?

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. ROGAN: Yes. I'm going to recommend that we table it actually because another thing I just thought of was and, Attorney Hughes, maybe you can answer this, I didn't think of it, one area we are trying to get with this tax is the University of the Scranton and other institutions that charge a fee to the students to park, can't they just now if it, you know, as we are speaking part of the rent include that the rent of the dorm and get around the tax? I didn't even think of that.

MR. HUGHES: I have no idea what the University of the Scranton does. It's my understanding, and you even said it that when you went there they had parking lot and they charge you to park per month. I have no idea what they do, that there is supposed to be a policy there where only seniors can have cars. Now, that's what I understand. I don't know how true that is.

MR. ROGAN: Well, I was looking into it today --

MR. HUGHES: But everybody has cars from freshman on up. They park on the

streets and, you know, or where the University of Scranton has parking garages and lots and they lease those spaces that would be applicable. We are not charging a tax on the land itself, but it's on the revenue that's being produced on the parking.

MR. ROGAN: The current -- the way the system is currently setup at the University of Scranton when I went there it would apply. You pay for the permit, but if they looped it in with rent for those who are getting a dormitory would it then not apply?

MR. FERRARIO: The imbalance is that at the University I believe it's \$100 or \$150 a semester or even a year so at \$100 they are paying \$15 for the semester if it's a semester. The employees downtown that pay me \$85 a month are going to have to pay \$12 additional tax to park downtown, so these are the people that are working downtown, they are paying taxes downtown and now I have to pay an additional \$12, okay? The person that sits next to them in their

office who may park at the Parking Authority for \$112.50, \$25 more a month, now doesn't have to pay that \$12 because the Parking Authority is exempt from this ordinance.

MR. HUGHES: That's a decision out of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

MR. FERRARIO: And, Mr. Hughes, I understand that, but the --

MR. HUGHES: We tried to have -- we originally when we received the ordinance I reviewed it, I sent it back, and I thought that the Parking Authority should be taxed, also. However, I then did some research and I found the cases and where it came out of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania that the City of Pittsburgh taxed the parking Authorities and it was held they couldn't tax them on the revenue and on the 15 percent tax.

MR. FERRARIO: And I understand that, and I understand that, you know, I mean, you could either drive the top line and get more money or you can cut the bottom line and spend less money and you have to do one of them, and I understand that, I just

1

9

10

8

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't think it's fair to be isolated in that the people that are parking in the Parking Authority -- I mean, I have to compete with the Parking Authority. I have to pay taxes, they don't have to pay taxes. If I now have to pay another 15 percent, if I have a lot with 200 spots they are -- those spots are now part of the city.

MR. HUGHES: I totally agree with you with that, unfortunately, that's a Supreme Court of Pennsylvania case.

MR. FERRARIO: And that I understand. I understand that, but let me just -- what Mr. Rogan is saying I think is the best solution and that is to table it. Part of the definition of the operator here is a governmental body and governmental subdivision, a municipal cooperation and then I understand it says that the Scranton Parking Authority is exempt, but technically a governmental body would be the federal government; correct? Okay. The federal courthouse is owned by us, but it's operated by the GSA, by General Services. GSA then takes a portion of that and takes the

21 22

23

24

25

expenses for a portion of that for the federal judges and for the FBI and each of those people in essence pay rent to the GSA. So technically if there is a FBI agent parking in a parking garage beneath the federal courthouse that's a parking spot, so 5 percent of some number has to be apportioned to that. It just -- I think if you can table it and if you can do a little bit more research and it and maybe go back to the city it would be or -- go back to the city and rewrite it, it would be a better ordinance and a better law and I understand taxes have to be paid, I understand I'm going have pay more taxes, but if you look at the lots, the parking lots downtown, the people with ten cars or four cars or six cars that charge people are not going to be subject to this because it's going to be too hard to enforce it and other people are going to pay the brunt of it.

So I would ask that you consider tabling it and maybe doing a little bit more research before you make any decisions.

Appreciate your time.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else?

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening.

Marie Schumacher, citizen and taxpayer.

Just a couple of quick things, on 3-D is anybody keeping a running log on the impact on the city's property taxes of the appeal hearing results? No?

MS. EVANS: I don't believe so.

MS. SCHUMACHER: I think that might be advisable. For Mr. Rogan, there was a line in the paper again on Rejuvenessence and I know a couple of years back they borrowed a quarter of a million dollars so I would like to know whether or not -- what their current balance is on that loan and if they are current on their payments and if not how long they have been delinquent.

MR. ROGAN: Sure thing.

MS. SCHUMACHER: As a matter of fact, I would like to see that for all OECD loans that have not been paid off.

Three, again, following up its now been about five weeks since the police chief said he thought it would takes two weeks for

1 the investigation of the police officer, do 2 we have a conclusion to that, Mr. Loscombe? 3 MR. LOSCOMBE: He has not responded back to me since I spoke to him. He was 4 5 supposed to update me when he made his decision. 6 MS. SCHUMACHER: Would you follow-up 7 8 with him? 9 MR. LOSCOMBE: Sure. MS. SCHUMACHER: He estimated two 10 weeks and it's been five now, so that's a 11 12 little bad. And then again, I'm sorry, 13 Mr. Rogan, also on that EPA award did you 14 ever get --MR. ROGAN: We didn't receive 15 16 anything in return. 17 MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. 18 MR. ROGAN: And I apologize, I should have asked Mr. McGowan when he was 19 20 here, but, you know, we were on another 21 subject. 22 MS. SCHUMACHER: And 5-C tonight, 23 where is the location of that building, is 24 it in the backup? 25 MS. EVANS: Yes. I believe it's at

the corner of Keyser Avenue and Oakwood Drive.

MR. ROGAN: Yes.

MS. SCHUMACHER: And again, will this be a nonprofit? So this will be another nonprofit --

MS. EVANS: Yes, I'm going to address it under motions.

MS. SCHUMACHER: And that's it for tonight. Next week I will hopefully speak on -- well, I guess, maybe I do have another question, how close are we on the Revised Recovery plan?

MS. EVANS: Well, the mayor is hoping to make or to present recommendations to PEL on Monday, but I have been reading through provisions of the Act 47 and it appears that there can be or there should be a lengthy process involved, in other words, the plan. And I forgive me, I don't have the act with me, but just based on recall here that PEL has to publicize, you know, that it has a plan and has to be available for public review and comment, written -- there has to be a designated time period for

written comments to be submitted and in addition PEL has to conduct a public hearing on the plan and all of that I believe may have to occur before council would even entertain the legislation.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Well, has council inputted their recommended changes to what I'll call the baseline budget, PEL's baseline budget?

MS. EVANS: Some have, and that's something else I'll address under motions.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Then that did remind me of another thing, too, I know someone earlier spoke about it, but we are only dealing with 10 years worth of employees, I don't know that the turnover has been that great and I don't know why we don't have any exact figure save for the interest payments on the effect of the Supreme Court awards to the fire and police. What is the hold up? It seems all you have to do is take every employee and apply the percentages; right? I mean, what am I missing here? That was last October, ten years worth of employment, what am I

1 missing? 2 MS. EVANS: Well, I think it 3 involves more than salary. There is health 4 care, there is longevity, there is retirees involved and --5 MS. SCHUMACHER: But again, we are 6 7 talking ten years. How many people have 8 retired in ten years? 9 MR. LOSCOMBE: Quite a bit. Quite a few. 10 MS. SCHUMACHER: Yeah, but how many 11 12 months has it been? It's been six months. 13 MR. LOSCOMBE: There is deaths. 14 there is retirements, there is a whole ball of whacks there. 15 16 MS. EVANS: Even those who have left 17 the city's service that were employed during 18 those years they would be entitled to --MR. LOSCOMBE: That's correct. 19 20 MS. SCHUMACHER: I'm sorry, who 21 would be entitled? 22 MS. EVANS: Even those employees who 23 may have left the city service since but 24 were an employee of the city during these 25 years that are covered by the Supreme Court

award they are entitled to --

MS. SCHUMACHER: I understand that. But again, how many? I would think you got payroll records and you know who the money was going out to I just -- I just don't understand the lag here and I presume again that we are paying interest, that the interest is applying every day on these awards since last October? Is that true or false?

MR. LOSCOMBE: I'm not sure.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Maybe your solicitor would know.

MR. HUGHES: I have no idea.

MS. SCHUMACHER: I can't ask him.

MR. HUGHES: I have no idea, I've never seen the awards, I think these are questions that have to be addressed to the mayor, to the administration. I mean, council is not involved in this from the standpoint of making that determination.

This is purely an administrative function.

This is the mayor -- these are the questions that have to be addressed to him. We can only act on legislation that comes down.

Council has no power to do this. They could ask questions and see if there is answers, but this is not an issue of the council. I mean, right now it's not. I think your questions are -- council doesn't make these determinations. This is up to the mayor and the administration.

MS. SCHUMACHER: I would think they would be beating the door down particularly if interest applies, you know, expeditious -- hire somebody to do is, something. It's got to be -- we got to know.

MR. HUGHES: Council can't do that.

Council has no power to do that.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Well, they are citizens. They can knock on the mayor's door the same as I can; right? But, okay, I take your point.

MR. HUGHES: Sure we can knock on the door, that doesn't mean it's going to be opened.

MS. SCHUMACHER: They can't make it better, okay. And that's it for tonight.

Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else?

MR. MARTIN: Bob Martin, 420 Adams

Avenue. Since I made a shout out to the police and firemen, I want to make a shout out to the DPW workers, my cousin worked for them for 35 years and I thought I would give a shout out to them because I know they early sometimes. Sometimes there are criticisms that they leave early and everything like that, but there is -- I just wanted to give a shout out to them because it's not an easy job, you know what I mean? When you go through the garbage bag you never know when you are going to hit a needle or something like that.

But, Mr. Rogan, I want to ask you a question, I don't know how to ask it. Some people -- I know you have criticism against the DPW sometimes or some people, I talked to somebody and the person, I'm not going to mention their names, it's like they are criticizing you because it seems like they don't like you. I don't know why, you know what I mean? But as far as I know I have seen you talk, you know, about the way things are going with the firing people that

they shouldn't have hired back or --

MR. ROGAN: You know, I try to watch, and I think we all do, try to watch every dollar that's spent in the city and whether it's the DPW or another department no matter what department it is if they are wasting money I'm going to call them out on it. It's not just the DPW, it's mainly the refuse division that I have criticized, not the highway's division or the other divisions, but if, you know, I see something I think is wrong I'm going to mention it.

MR. MARTIN: I know this person I talked to, I'm not even going to mention his name, he used to work for DPW and it just seems likes he's mentioned bad about you.

MR. ROGAN: I'm sure I'm not the most popular person in the DPW.

MR. MARTIN: No, I know, but I think the -- I don't know, I have nothing against anybody up there and trying to save the people money and stuff and, you know, and there is another question about where I live, you know, people out there were the city has a chance to recycling and where I

live at 420 Adams I asked them, "Are you recycling?"

And they said, "No."

And I said, "Why?"

Because they tried it and it ain't working. Well, they are not trying hard enough as far as I'm concerned. All they got to do is put a recyclable can downstairs and let them drop it in. I mean, basically a lot of people or older there, but I love recycling.

Another thing I want to close on, I'm critical of ECTV. Part of the reason why I'm critical is because they do not put the schedule on the TV, like, along the screen. I don't see nothing there. They always advertise about the web. I look on the web and they see --Scranton Today always had it on, okay? They always had it on.

And then you say like put this message on ECTV, there ain't no messages on there. I mean, I don't see. They see in the top of the screen it says ECTV and that's it.

There is nothing there. They don't show it.

But. I

mean, I don't understand why can't they put the schedule on for each day, not for a whole week, but for each day, you know what I mean? I mean, you know, it's on the web, but, I mean, on the computer, but I think they should put it on the TV.

They show the weather and stuff.

I loved Scranton Today, I always did, and I think they did a better job, but, I mean, I'm pleading out to ECTV right now to try and put the schedule on for each day to let the people know what's going on so they can just see for that day and also start putting messages on. Scranton Today used to say, "Well, if you had a video or something you want to put on, you know what I mean, we will have it on, put it on."

I mean, there is certain times and certain things they cannot put on if it's controversial, but I'm pleading to ECTV please put the schedule on and put messages on, like, you know, public service announcements, and that's all.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Mrs. Krake, maybe we could send a letter to Mr. Migliori

and also the board of the directors of ECTV requesting that programming, daily programming is run on the station, a programming schedule. Thank you. Is there anyone else?

MR. ANCHERANI: Good evening.

MS. EVANS: Good evening. Nelson
Ancherani, resident and taxpayer, recording
secretary of the FOP, exercising by belief
and opinion by exercising my First Amendment
rights. On November 7, 2011, I was placed
on administrative leave, discharged,
terminated, fired from my job with the city
because of my age. Whatever word is used,
administrative leave, terminated, fired,
discharged, I was forced out of my job
because of my age.

It is my belief and my opinion that age was used as an excuse by the city to retaliate against me for coming to council and voicing my opinion for the last ten years, by exercising my First Amendment Rights. The result of me being forced out of my job has forced me into retirement under protest. I just want you to know that

I will continue to come to council and continue to voice my opinion. For the last ten years I have spoken about frivolous spending, 300 million long-term debt, dirt at Nay Aug along with a green and black fish pond. These are just a few of the issues that I have spoken on. Record budget, rubber stamp councils and names have been called to persons who come to council and speak because they love this city.

We will not be intimidated. Joe Clifford, Jack is Back, and his last name escapes me, Dick Lasky, along with MaryAnn Wardell, Les Spindler, Chris Lugick, Doug Miller, Lee Morgan, the Hubbards, Marie Schumacher, Ozzie Quinn, Andy Sbaraglia, Dave Dobrzyn, Ron Ellman and many, many others. We're not intimidated and will not be intimidated. We love this city and will continue to come here and fight for it and there will be more issues to follow in the future. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

 $\mbox{MR. LOSCOMBE:} \quad \mbox{I believe it was} \\ \mbox{Jack Fossett.} \\$

1	MR. ANCHERANI: That's it.
2	MS. EVANS: And, Mr. Ancherani, I am
3	ashamed of the city's actions toward you and
4	what was done to you.
5	MR. ANCHERANI: I forgot to add, I
6	must love the job because it's been 41 years
7	since I became a reserve. Thank you.
8	MS. EVANS: Thank you very much.
9	MR. LOSCOMBE: And you were
10	dedicated, too.
11	MS. EVANS: Yes.
12	MR. SLEDENZSKI: The last one.
13	Jackie.
14	MR. LOSCOMBE: Chrissy.
15	MR. SLEDENZSKI: Jack, back here or
16	up a little more? A little bit up.
17	MS. EVANS: Talk right in.
18	MR. SLEDENZSKI: I am. Hey, Vince,
19	happy birthday 76-year-old man. Happy
20	birthday.
21	MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else who
22	cares to address council?
23	MS. KRAKE: 5-A. MOTIONS.
24	MS. EVANS: Councilman McGoff, do
25	you have any comments or motions?

MR. MCGOFF: Yes. Thank you.

First, I almost forgot, thank you for mentioning happy birthday, I was not thinking of it, today is my father's 91st birthday.

MS. EVANS: Congratulations and happy.

MR. MCGOFF: Happy birthday to dad, he watches regularly, although, he does complain that he can't hear some of it, but that's probably a good thing.

Just a couple of items that have been discussed tonight and I guess I will comment on them. Obviously, the major question of the night has dealing with the progress of the unfunded debt. Mrs. Evans did mention that, you know, this is something that is part of the 2001 budget, the unfunded debt, the refinancing is something that we can't walk away from this. We decided on this back in December that this is what we are going to do, and while we may not like the plan that's being presented we need to act on something or else the budget is going to be just 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

disaster. There will be no financing because if we don't get the unfunded debt, if we don't look through the refinancing then we are likely to lose our line of credit, we are likely to not meet payrolls, we are likely to go through all types of economic distress so --

MS. EVANS: We won't make bond payments.

MR. MCGOFF: We won't make bond payments, this is something that we need to act upon. I know, again, people may not like the plan, but if there is a better plan I am sure that we would all be more than welcome to listen. So far this is the best, at least from what I can see, this is the best opportunity that we have had to secure this unfunded debt, to secure the refinancing, yes, you know, maybe it needs to be refined, and I thank Attorney Hughes for working on that to help refine the ordinance that was sent to us, but I think that we do need to move on this and move quickly so that we can hopefully, you know, get back to some financial stability. I'm

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not saying it's recovery, but at least stability for the 2012 year.

And I wasn't present when the -- I missed the meeting when the question of the money to Attorney Hughes came about since I did mention the work that he has done, I would just like to comment on that issue. In the past there have been other instances where legislation or whatever has come to us for additional funding for solicitors for authorities, for -- you know, whatever and I always held to three criteria for, you know, judging it. Number one, was the work necessary? Number two, was the work requested by the supervising body? And number three, was the work completed? Ιf those three things held then I always said that the person deserved to be paid.

In this case I think all those three criteria have been met by Attorney Hughes and, you know, I think that something should be done to see that, you know, the compensation is taken care of.

The recovery plan, I hope that we'll speak of it somewhat tonight, you know, it

was a little bit of an update, I know that I have not, you know, sent anything to you as far as recommendations or all, I have attended, you know, PEL meetings now for, you know, any number of months and have at least offered some I don't want to say suggestions, but at least commented on what I thought was appropriate about what they submitted to us and what I thought was acceptable and unacceptable.

Again, maybe we are under the gun, maybe we are being forced again, tonight it came up, you know, somebody something for us to adopt a Recovery Plan or a revised Recovery Plan I'm hoping that we can accomplish this again in the near future. This is something that I think a lot of what we are dealing with is contingent upon this Recovery Plan being adopted. I know right now we are probably not going to meet the April 30 deadline that was set forth by the consortium that provided the TAN, that could put us in default, although, I believe that the balance on the payment for the TAN -- or the balance is relatively low and may even

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be paid off by the --

MS. EVANS: Middle of May.

MR. MCGOFF: Well, there was some hope that it might even be by April 30 and thus make that whole idea of default But I think that we need to irrelevant. move -- again, we need to move on the TAN -or not on the TAN, on the Recovery Plan. Ι think we need to speak with PEL. they have been requesting to come to council, I think we need to bring them in and I think that we need to speak to them directly about the Recovery Plan and about when we propose and what's acceptable and what's unacceptable about the revisions that they have made. And again, hopefully we can do that in the near future.

And then just one last thing, I know it's not city business, but it was brought up about the baseball agreement and the nature of that whole situation is something that has upset me for a number of years. I was -- I bought a ticket, a season ticket, before there was a team, before there was a stadium. When John McGee first put those

24

25

out for sale I bought one and held onto it, actually went up to four. We had four season tickets at one time. The group that has purchased the franchise or purchased the team forced me to leave the stadium. think they have mismanaged it and I, along with many other people, feel that they have mismanaged it with the intent of making it so financially irresponsible that they would move the franchise, and that's one of the conditions on which the league would allow them to move the franchise.

And the question I asked I knew the answer to, while they may have made a financial commitment, there is nothing in the agreement that says that the Triple-A franchise will stay in Lackawanna County and that's something that upsets me. you know, back 20 whatever years ago that this was a great situation for the City of Scranton, for Lackawanna County, to have a major league -- a minor league -- Triple-A minor league team here, and I really fear that we are going to -- that it may be lost and I'm sorry that I confronted you with

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that, but just again, it's not city business it's just vent a little bit at the end this evening, and thank you.

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

MR. ROGAN: Yes. Thank you. guess I'll speak about the caucus a little bit more. I'm glad we had it, it's cleared up much of, you know, the misconceptions that many of us had the previous week that additional money was being borrowed on top of the unfunded debt and the refinancing. The reason why I questioned about the refinancing was when the budget -- I always assume the refinancing would be done the traditional way, going to a banking institution, getting a loan at a fixed rate. That's why I brought that up and it seemed strange to refinance with a bond instead of going to a bank and, obviously, Mr. McGowan made it very clear that no banks will lend to us which is why it's being done this way.

And I think it's a decision that -the borrowing is going to be a decision we
all have to think about long and hard. I

am -- I don't like the idea of not knowing the exact amount when I vote on it, that really bothers me, but it is something that I think we'll all be considering and talking about.

Mr. McGoff mentioned having PEL into council, this is something that I think is a great idea if we had a caucus with them, maybe we can schedule it for 4:00 or 3:00 or on a weekend judging by how long the caucuses have been running, you know, we all have a whole lot to say, but --

MR. MCGOFF: Just could we -- is it possible, and I know, you know, I don't want to overburden anyone, is it possible to have a caucus, just a caucus, you know, so that we have the time to discuss with PEL all -- and there is not the, you know, then the burden of having a meeting afterward.

MS. EVANS: I think we can do that but since all five members would be in attendance then the caucus has to be advertised according to the Sunshine Law.

MR. ROGAN: Maybe we can do that on say a Tuesday. We used to meet on Tuesdays

every week, one week and even if we have to do it on a Saturday you, know, if we all got together and had a nice long discussion with PEL in person I think that would be beneficial.

MR. MCGOFF: I'm sorry.

MR. ROGAN: It's okay. No, I think that would be a great idea and I submitted my recommendations. There was recommendations or -- you know, some talks that came from the meeting and nothing is firm yet, so there is no reason to discuss, you know, proposals until we actually have them, you know, to discuss and I think we have all put our ideas out there and what we think would be good and wouldn't be good for a Revised Recovery Plan.

Next, regarding Item 7-A, I walked in here tonight planning on voting "yes" and not even thinking about what would happen in the situation what was brought up to us tonight. It seems that we don't know the answer. If that is a legal loophole and I think the situation that was brought up to us doesn't seem -- Mr. Ferrario wasn't

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

trying to get around the law, but some of the others will try to get around the rule. I don't believe for a second that if a landlord is renting to a business and everything is in one bundle that they should have to pay for a spot on top of that. think it's part of what happens when you sign the lease. If there is a parking lot there and you get use of the lot, I don't think you should have to pay the additional tax if it's bundled, but I worry with that being brought up that an institution like the University of Scranton or Lackawanna College or another institution that charges for parking would use this loophole to get around the tax.

For instance, instead of charging the 100 or 200 dollars per semester fee to park they could make the parking lot open to students who have a students ID and tack it onto the tuition, which am I right, Attorney Hughes, would that be -- would they be getting around the law doing that?

MR. HUGHES: Well, I think they could, but then how about all of the kids

that don't have cars that are paying for parking? You know, then they would be paying because it would be put on -- it would have to be charged. I can't see how they could do that.

MR. ROGAN: They could just --

MR. HUGHES: Charge every student, you know, for a parking fee and put it in tuition and then kids that don't have cars are going to be paying for parking spots in their tuition and they don't have them, and I believe that tuition is just based it's so much per credit.

MR. ROGAN: Yes and no.

MR. HUGHES: Well, I have no idea, it's been a long time since I have been in college.

MR. ROGAN: Yes and no. If you take more than I believe 12 credits per semester it's a lump sum rate, and there are other fees that are added on, an activities' fee and I could see them coming up with a maintenance fee, which would cover everything, and only students could go into that parking lot but it's free for students,

which is how they get around the law.

To me, and I'm not an attorney, but I definitely think before voting we should know exactly what would happen in the situation that was brought up to us tonight when a landlord rents to a tenant who part of the deal is the parking spots and --

MS. EVANS: I think they can probably -- I believe the payments are going to be made to the City Treasurer and they can probably handle individual cases like that just as in, you know, the refuse fee collection when you have an empty apartment and, you know, providing proof of that so --

MR. ROGAN: Before voting I think we should know exactly what the ramifications of the vote are. I don't think anyone up here can say for certain what would happen in that situation, and I didn't think of it until 15 minutes ago when the speaker brought it up at the podium.

That being said, I would like to make a motion to table Item 7-A.

MS. EVANS: We have a motion on the floor, do we have a second?

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(No council member responds.)

MR. ROGAN: I guess it fails then.

Again, I just I'm a little concerned about

not knowing exactly how the law would effect

everyone.

Moving on to the pools, I know Mr. Miller brought it up again this week and the Department of Justice and the ADA, American Disabilities Act, there is a new requirement for public pools this year. They are required to a have a handicap lift. None of our pools in Scranton have it that I'm aware of. Without these lifts, we can't legally open our pools. I don't know if the city has -- I mean, any arrangement to try to make them handicap accessible. I don't believe so, but the date was extended a few months, it was I think May, I think they extended it to June. I'm going to look into this a little bit further, but if the city opens our pools the way they are now we would be in violation of the federal law.

So, Mrs. Krake, could we please send a letter to the law department as well as the DPW asking if any arrangements have been

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

made to make our pools ADA compliant? And I will send that to you, I'll send you an e-mail with the backup information regarding the law.

And finally, just because it was brought up tonight and a few people have actually brought it up to me over the last week, is the baseball stadium. I think we all fully support having a minor league baseball team in the area. I would love to see it in downtown Scranton or somewhere in the actual City of Scranton because, as was mentioned, the money that comes and having it is great. If you look at the Montage Mountain area and go back to when we had the Red Barons when they first started up there you had a baseball stadium and skiing. think that was it. Now when you go up there we have Cinemark and we have the Shoppes at Montage, we have ice cream stores, and the economic development in that area has been I think it's in large part because of the minor league baseball bringing people up there.

We'll see what happens. I hope

things work out and we do continue to have a minor league team in the area. I would leave to see them in the City of Scranton, but that is all for tonight. Thank you.

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

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes. Thank you.

Just briefly, I didn't plan on saying anything this evening, but after a couple of speakers brought up some issues I decided to touch on this. Mr. Morgan discussed the rental ordinance and Mr. Ferrario, I believe it was, on the parking, and Mr. Rogan also mentioned that.

Everyone saw we had a caucus earlier here today about borrowing millions of dollars. This council had to look at different ways to generate revenue in the city or we could have passed a 30 percent tax increase across everybody. Some of the ideas that we have put forward are starting to come into place and although they are not perfect ordinances we have the ability to amend them as we find problems down the

road.

The renter's ordinance, as I stated earlier, wasn't meant to be government intrusive, and I know all of my colleagues, we have gone around the neighborhoods on different issues, potholes and stuff like that, one of the biggest complaints that we found were multi-family rental units, and a majority of them are out-of-town landlords, but to be fair we can't discriminate between local landlords or out-of-town landlords.

We saw the neighborhoods declining because of a lot of these problems with multi-family rental units, so that taxes the police department, the fire department, our License and Inspection Departments continually responding to these areas.

There are some protections in there for the landlord.

Mr. Morgan was asking about the destruction of a property by a tenant, well, that's what the magisterial system is for, with a strong contract that should be in the landlord's contract. I know there is lot of -- it is tough, a lot of good landowners,

4

3

5 6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

landlords, take care of their properties and they do run into problem tenants, but that's what the legal system is for. Our ordinance is to protect those that live in those properties and to make sure that they are up to code.

And Mr. Morgan mentioned grandfathering, I don't believe that the inspection's department should go into a place that's been okay and updated over the years and make them update it to today's code as long as it was -- you know, it was current when they were in there. We are looking at life safety issues, that should be the key. Egress and access. escapes, fire alarms. You know, safe window screens, issues like that. Kept up properties where you don't have roof shingles falling on the neighbors or porches falling apart. Those are obvious.

You know, the only ones that should worry about this rental ordinance are those that don't care about their properties.

Those that keep them up have no problems whatsoever. I think it's a good start to

bring back our neighborhoods, and again,
it's not perfect, but we can make amendments
as it goes to bring things up-to-date.

And the same goes with the parking issue, I think we could pass it and if we find a little chink in the armor there we can -- you know, we can make an amendment.

I believe if you own a building and you have ten parking spots and maybe have a four-unit building your tenants are included in that building, the four tenants, but if one of those spots is rented to someone else those spots are taxable. Again, this has to be laid out. But the same thing with the University, they go out and they ticket the vehicles in their parking, so as long as there is enforcement there they are showing that there is payment there, too, so that's another issue that we could look at to make sure it's enforced and they won't be able to.

MR. ROGAN: I agree with what you are saying, and as I stated before, I agree completely that if somebody is renting a building and there happens to be a parking

lot attached they shouldn't have to pay the fee.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Right.

MR. ROGAN: But the question is do they have to pay the fee, and I'm not comfortable. That's why I have --

MR. LOSCOMBE: I believe it was laid out at this point to delineate a payment.

In other words, if you had to pay to park in that spot specifically if it wasn't included -- if you had to pay to park in that spot if your rent is \$200 a month for the apartment and you had to pay another \$50 for that parking spot then that's --

MR. ROGAN: Up until, you know, a half hour ago I was under that assumption as well, but when we had a business owner come in who said that he tried contacting the law department, he couldn't get an answer, I don't like to vote for not knowing. If it is the way I thought it was and we all thought it was over the last two weeks when I voted yes both times I wouldn't have a problem with it, but if that person is going to be charged a tax I don't think that's

2

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

right, number one, and not knowing the answer I don't feel comfortable voting for it.

And we have tabled countless pieces of legislation, many of them I objected to tabling to check and make sure everything was done right. That's why I made the motion to table and it didn't carry and --

MR. LOSCOMBE: I understand that and I think it's just that my minor issue that we could update or whatever, but again, you know, he we starved for cash in this city and the sooner we start to doing things that are going to generate revenue, we should are done this years ago. It's taken us two years now to get this two and a half years to start getting some of this stuff into the budget. We shouldn't be here, you know, having caucuses over multi-millions to be borrowed, this stuff should have been looked at years ago that were revenue items that were presented and keep getting pushed by the wayside and we just keep getting deeper and deeper and, you know, we have to start somewhere.

But this is not a tax on everyone, so I think that's a benefit, too, and there is some other things that will come up down the road.

And Mrs. Schumacher before had a discussion with Mr. Hughes about requests and stuff like that and I -- you know, two and a half years I'm here, I know some of you have been here many more, but I'm frustrated at the responses that we don't get, and we send repeat letters and we don't receive answers. We send Right-To-Know letters, we don't receive answers. It's embarrassing here as a councilman when I'm out on the street and people ask me the same questions and I cannot get an answer for them.

I don't know what the answer is. Do we bring the department heads in here again that are responsible or, you know, I mean, I have heard subpoena before, but, you know Right-To-Knows aren't working, letters aren't working, paperwork is piling up and we get the same questions over and over and that's what caused frustration years ago. I

used to see people come to these meetings and it was frustrating because they are asking the same thing that should be simple answers and they are not getting the response, and what's more embarrassing is we are not getting a response and we are getting it out on the street.

You know, and I just hope we can come up with a solution to at least have this body get some responses. If anyone has some discussions I would be happy, but that's all I have. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. And, Councilman Joyce?

MR. JOYCE: Yes. I have a few comments tonight. First, I want to discuss the 2012 TAN a little bit. To reports, as was specified in 3-H earlier our tax collector on April 23, our tax collector, Bill Courtright, has submitted a deposit into the 2012 TAN lockbox which is being held at Fidelity Bank. The deposit was made in the amount of \$1,014,408.14.

Just to remind everyone with the TAN, as one may or may not know, this year

there is a special agreement with the tax anticipation note, commonly referred to as the TAN. As part of the special agreement, all real estate tax revenue is required by our TAN lender to be placed in the lockbox for final repayment by June 30 or until all of the balance is paid, whichever comes first.

Now, I do want to add that there is a stipulation with the Recovery Plan in there but hopefully the TAN payment will be paid sooner rather than later. At this point there is approximately \$1.3 million left to pay on the TAN after the last deposit.

Secondly, Scranton City Council had received a report on the usage of overtime through February of 2010 -- or not 2010, sorry, 2012. To report, as of this time period a total of \$171,457.49 had been spent on overtime. The total for the period of February was \$59,090.41. The bulk of the overtime expenditures came from the largest parts of the budget, being police, fire and DPW.

To report, overtime usage in the fire department this year so far is very low, it's only \$4,455.47 that was spent after February, and overtime in the DPW was also lower this year due to the warm winter.

I do have a few citizen's requests, and this is a recurring request and I'm not sure if we received an answer, however, residents in North Scranton have informed me that the condition of both Greenbush and Reese Streets are subpar. There are many cracks in the road and various potholes.

Mrs. Krake, with this in mind, can you please inform Director Dougher of the situation and ask him to handle it accordingly. Residents in this area have informed me that both streets have not been paved in roughly 25 years and they would like to see these streets paved if possible.

MR. LOSCOMBE: That's another request for the 100th time; right?

MR. JOYCE: Also, the 500 and 600 blocks of Crossing Court if you could add that to the list to contact Director Dougher about residents have reported that they are

in rough shape. Also, the 300 block of South Fourth Street and the 300 block of Emmett Street are also in rough shape as various residents have reported to me.

Also, various residents have informed me that there is a large pothole on Main Avenue where Main Avenue and Oram Street intersect and this is making traveling conditions very difficult in this area of Main Avenue.

So, Mrs. Krake, since this section of Main Avenue is a state route can we please contact PennDOT and ask them to have this hole repaired as soon as possible as many travelers are getting quite frustrated, and that is all for tonight.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Good evening. During last week's council meeting I stated that the Revised Recovery Plan submitted by the Pennsylvania Economy League failed to include the complete Supreme Court award to Scranton police and fire employees and provision for the payment. As a result, I could not support a plan that would lead our city back into the Court system.

I spoke with Mayor Doherty regarding this issue early this week noting that Act 47 language requires the inclusion of all awards in the Recovery Plan. He responded that he would speak with Pennsylvania Economy League and encourage them to include the full award as well as provisions for it's payments.

In addition, I submitted information related to the Revised Recovery Plan to council members on April 19 and I would ask that all recommendations, additions, deletions are forwarded to Councilman Joyce or to me by e-mail tomorrow since Mayor Doherty intends to submit recommendations to PEL on Monday, April 30.

Included in tonight's agenda for introduction is legislation to approve a Pennsylvania Gaming Act grant in the amount of \$350,000 for the Community Life Support new building project located at the corner of Oakwood Drive and Keyser Avenue. The new building will consist of 5,000 square foot of office space and an attached garage that will house up to 14 ambulance and emergency

services vehicles. Community Life Support or CLS is a nonprofit whereby a 501-C-3 designation is pending. It was established in 2005 by a group of volunteers and former staff of Community Medical Center ambulance service. This is a worthy project, however, as a nonprofit CLS is removing taxable property interest the tax rolls.

Further, the Recovery Plan calls for increased payments in lieu of taxes to assist the city in meeting its current and future financial obligations. Therefore, I would like to ask Solicitor Hughes for his advice as to how city council might proceed to seek a PILOT from nonprofits engaging in new projects within the City of Scranton as we go forward amid trouble financial straights?

MR. HUGHES: I certainly think after the legislation is adopted you could probably request it. I don't think we can ask before legislation and link it to the legislation. I do not know how big this parcel is, I generally know where it is over on Keyser Avenue, and I don't know who owns

the land, but certainly, you know, the project -- this project is a total of \$2.2 million, there is a \$350,000 grant from the Harness Racing Commission or whatever commission it is on horse racing. I believe \$17,500 goes to the city for administration and legal expenses. There is a mortgage, as I remember, of about \$1.75 million, so it's a substantial project, but they are a nonprofit and certainly it's going to take a piece of property off the tax rolls back there.

What economic effect it would have

it and I don't know what the taxes are on

on the city, I don't know, but probably every nonprofit will say the same thing, we already have enough problems just raising money, we can't contribute to the city, but I certainly think that if it is passed and if it is built or when it is built, well, this is the second stage of it because it's already been approved to put the grant in and now this is for the grant funding for the allocation for the receipt of the money by the city, that this is a substantial

project, and again, something should be done where they could certainly request for them to make a substantial payment to the city.

MS. EVANS: So I think what you are saying to us is if we chose to approve the project thereafter we would send a letter perhaps to CLS requesting an annual PILOT for the City of Scranton?

MR. HUGHES: Yes. I think under the Recovery Plan though I think that's the mayor's responsibility. He is the one that is supposed to be going out and bending the arms of the nonprofits and raising the money and it seems like council is doing it to try to get the money in and I don't think that there is that much money that the mayor is really getting from the nonprofits.

But, you know, we can't really link it, you know, the two of them together, but I certainly think that with this and with what the city is doing for administering the grant and putting in the grant application and obtaining the money that that they certainly should make a payment, you know, to the city every year in lieu of taxes.

1 2 3

And maybe the thing would be is that find out exactly where this parcel is and what the real estate taxes are, you know, and tell them, "Here, you are taking it off the tax rolls, you are getting a \$350,000 grant through the city, we appreciate a payment in lieu of taxes."

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. HUGHES: I'll try to find that out at the Assessor's Office by the next meeting as to where the parcel is and what the taxes are. Obviously I don't think it has to be subdivided, so I think it's an independent parcel.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: I'll speak to Ms. Abeli as well and, Mr. Loscombe, if there is a public safety aspect, you know, it was mentioned that ambulances would be housed there, we'll check on that as well.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Definitely.

MS. EVANS: And that's it.

MR. HUGHES: I do believe from reading the legislation that they do charge but they provide I think it was 25 percent

1 of their services are voluntarily given. 2 MS. EVANS: Yes, if you cannot pay 3 you won't be turned away. 4 MR. HUGHES: Right. 5 MS. EVANS: Thank you. MR. KRAKE: 5-B. APPOINTMENT OF LEE 6 7 BORTHWICK, PE, 616 DEPOT STREET, SCRANTON, 8 PENNSYLVANIA, 18509, AS A MEMBER OF THE 9 HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURE REVIEW BOARD TO 10 SERVE THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF DAVID G. SMITH, 11 PE PLS THROUGH OCTOBER 11, 2015. 12 MS. EVANS: At this time I'll 13 entertain a motion that Item 5-B be 14 introduced into its proper committee. MR. ROGAN: So moved. 15 16 MR. JOYCE: Second. 17 MS. EVANS: On the question? 18 MR. ROGAN: I would like to thank 19 Mr. Borthwick for sending in his resume 20 before even being asked. 21 MS. EVANS: Indeed. 22 MR. JOYCE: Likewise. 23 MS. EVANS: Anyone else? All those 24 in favor of introduction signify by saying 25 aye.

1 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. MR. ROGAN: Aye. 2 3 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 4 MR. JOYCE: Aye. 5 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and so moved. 6 MS. KRAKE: 5-C. RATIFYING AND 7 8 APPROVING OF THE EXECUTION AND SUBMISSION OF 9 THE GRANT APPLICATION BY THE CITY OF SCRANTON, ON BEHALF OF COMMUNITY LIFE 10 SUPPORT (CLS), TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF 11 12 PENNSYLVANIA ACTING THROUGH THE COMMONWEALTH FINANCING AUTHORITY FOR A LOCAL SHARE 13 14 ACCOUNT GRANT, PURSUANT TO THE PA RACE HORSE DEVELOPMENT AND GAMING ACT. FOR THE 15 PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS COMMUNITY LIFE 16 17 SUPPORT NEW BUILDING PROJECT LOCATED IN SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA AND AUTHORIZING THE 18 MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS 19 OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO EXECUTE AND 20 21 ENTER INTO A LOCAL SHARE ACCOUNT GRANT CONTRACT AND COMMITMENT LETTER WITH THE 22 23 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA TO ACCEPT AND 24 UTILIZE THE GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF 25 \$350,000.00 AWARDED BY THE COMMONWEALTH

OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR SUCH PROJECT. 1 2 MS. EVANS: At this time I'll 3 entertain a motion that Item 5-C be 4 introduced into its proper committee. MR. ROGAN: 5 So moved. MR. JOYCE: Second. 6 7 MS. EVANS: On the question? A11 8 those in favor of introduction signify by 9 saying aye. MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 10 11 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 12 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 13 MR. JOYCE: Aye. 14 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and so moved. 15 MS. KRAKE: SIXTH ORDER. 16 NO. 17 BUSINESS AT THIS TIME. 18 SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE 19 FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 30, 2012 20 21 - AN ORDINANCE IMPOSING A TAX FOR GENERAL REVENUE PURPOSES ON OPERATORS OF PARKING 22 23 SPACES AT THE RATE OF FIFTEEN PERCENT (15%) 24 UPON EACH PARKING TRANSACTION AND 25 ESTABLISHING ANNUAL LICENSE PROCEDURES AND

FEES AND PROMULGATING THE RECORD KEEPING AND REPORTING RULES AND REGULATIONS ON PARKING TRANSACTIONS PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL TAX ENABLING ACT 53 PA. C.S.A. 6901 ET SEQ.

MS. EVANS: What is the recommendation of the Chair for the Committee on Finance?

MR. JOYCE: As Chairperson for the Committee on Finance, I recommend final passage of Item 7-A.

MR. ROGAN: Second.

MS. EVANS: On the question?

MR. ROGAN: Yes, I would just make my objections clear one last time, I didn't have a problem with the ordinance the way I thought it would take effect. We have a business owner come, we couldn't answer his questions. I don't want to pass it to find out what's in it. I think it was about a month ago Ms. Schumacher brought up some concerns about a piece of legislation in Seventh Order. We made a motion to table it, we tabled it. The next week we had a caucus and all of the questions were answered and it passed unanimously.

I don't see what the rush is on one more week to find out exactly how it's going to impact every resident and every business owner, so because of that I will be voting "no".

MR. MCGOFF: I know we did -- what you are suggesting we do with the rental registration ordinance.

MR. ROGAN: And the South Side project as well.

MR. MCGOFF: And we kept pushing it and trying to perfect it and I don't think that it will -- it ever reached a point where it was going to be perfect. I know I requested it at that time and council went along. I don't know that we can ever perfect this parking ordinance to the point where everyone is going to be satisfied. I think that at this point in time implementing it and allowing it to work through for eight months of this year and see what problems there are and revise it as it goes along --

MR. ROGAN: I would just say I'm not asking for a change, I'm just asking how it

1 will effect that situation. MR. MCGOFF: And I don't know that 2 3 we can ever get that answer. MR. ROGAN: Well, I think the law 4 5 department should have it. MR. MCGOFF: Well, I think what you 6 7 brought up are hypotheticals. Are there 8 going to be --9 MR. ROGAN: Not the resident that 10 was here. That wasn't a hypothetical. He 11 is a business owner in the city who came to 12 us with a question. MR. MCGOFF: Right. 13 14 MR. ROGAN: We didn't answer his question, so how can we vote on this 15 16 legislation without knowing the answer to a 17 resident's question -- or a business owner's 18 question? That's what I'm --MS. EVANS: Well, I think we can 19 20 still vote on the legislation, obtain the 21 answer and if problems arise, as I think 22 Councilman Loscombe indicated, whether it is 23 this piece of legislation, the rental 24 registration legislation, we have the 25 ability to amend it in the future if

1 necessary. 2 MR. ROGAN: I understand that, but I would like to have all of the information 3 4 before voting. That's all. Roll call, please. 5 MS. EVANS: 6 MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff. 7 MR. MCGOFF: Yes. 8 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan. 9 MR. ROGAN: No. MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe. 10 11 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes. 12 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Joyce. MR. JOYCE: Yes. 13 14 MS. CARRERA: Mrs. Evans. MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare 15 Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted. 16 there is no further business, I'll entertain 17 18 a motion to adjourn. 19 MR. JOYCE: Motion to adjourn. MS. EVANS: This meeting is 20 21 adjourned. 22 23 24 25

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER