	1
1	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
2	
3	
4	
5	HELD:
6	
7	Thursday, May 17, 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	CATUENE C. NADDOZZI DDD. CESICIAL COURT DESCRITE
24	CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR – OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
25	

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL:

JANET EVANS, PRESIDENT (Not present)

FRANK JOYCE, VICE-PRESIDENT

ROBERT MCGOFF

PAT ROGAN

JOHN LOSCOMBE

NANCY KRAKE, CITY CLERK

KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

BOYD HUGHES, SOLICITOR

1	(Pledge of Allegiance recited and
2	moment of reflection observed.)
3	MS. JOYCE: Roll call, please.
4	MS. KRAKE: Mr. McGoff. Mr. Rogan.
5	MR. ROGAN: Here.
6	MS. KRAKE: Mr. Loscombe.
7	MR. LOSCOMBE: Here.
8	MS. KRAKE: Mr. Joyce.
9	MR. JOYCE: Here.
10	MS. CARRERA: Mrs. Evans.
11	MR. JOYCE: Dispense with the
12	reading of the minutes.
13	MS. KRAKE: THIRD ORDER. 3-A.
14	SINGLE TAX OFFICE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR
15	THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2010.
16	MR. JOYCE: Are there any comments?
17	If not, received and filed.
18	MS. KRAKE: 3-B. TAX ASSESSOR'S
19	REPORT APPEAL HEARINGS FOR MAY 30, 2012.
20	MR. JOYCE: Are there any comments?
21	If not, received and filed.
22	MS. KRAKE: 3-C. APPLICATIONS ALONG
23	WITH THE DECISIONS RENDERED BY THE ZONING
24	HEARING BOARD ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 2012.
25	MR. JOYCE: Are there any comments?

If not, received and filed.

MS. KRAKE:

have announcements?

MS. KRAKE: 3-D. AGENDA FOR THE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD MAY 16,
2012.

MR. JOYCE: Are there any comments?

If not, received and filed. Clerk's notes?

MR. JOYCE: Do any council members

No, Mr. Joyce.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes, I guess I could do this now during announcements. I just wanted everyone to know for the Armed Forces parade this week, this Saturday, ECTV will be videotaping the parade and they will be rebroadcasting it several times on Channel 19.

And on that note, I would like to wish Mark Migliore's grandmother, who runs ECTV, Irene Migliore, a happy 80th birthday. Three months ago she was hospitalized with heart surgery and she will be coming home tomorrow actually, so I would like to wish her a happy 80th birthday, and hope she is not upset I told everyone how old she is. Thank you.

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JOYCE: Councilwoman Evans is not feeling well and will not be in attendance in tonight's meeting.

Also, we did receive this in our mailbox, I'll get it out, and I just wanted to congratulate the West Side Hyde Park Neighborhood Watch, we received a letter from the National Sheriff's Association addressed to them and on behalf of the National Sheriff's Association and their president, Sheriff Paul H. Fitzgerald, they would like to inform everyone that the West Side Hyde Park Neighborhood Watch has been selected by the National Neighborhood Watch Advisory Board, and they are also a field experts as a winner of the 2012 award for excellence in neighborhood watch. So I think that's something that's very noteworthy and I think that's something that they should be congratulated for.

MS. KRAKE: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION.

MR. JOYCE: Our first speaker tonight is Martina Scoggin.

MS. SCOGGIN: Good evening, Council

24

25

members. I'm here on behalf of the Scranton Public Library to talk about a great event that we are having next Friday, May 25, from 5 to 8 p.m. It's our annual fundraiser for "Swinging on Vine", and it's going to be held at 5 p.m., like I said, right in front of the library rain or shine. We are hoping for great weather so everybody can be outside, but we have food donations coming in from local businesses as well as we have raffle donations so right now we have about 15 raffle baskets and by end of next week we expect to have close to 20, so it's a great event and we just hope that everyone will It's \$15 in advance, \$20 come out for it. at the gate that evening, where there is also going to be cocktails, you have to be 21 or older to attend, but once you get inside everything is included except for just paying extra for the raffle baskets, which we have got some great baskets all totaling \$50 or more a piece. So it will be good if somebody winning that.

So just we want to thank everyone for listening and please come out for the

great event.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Scott Thomas. Our next speaker is Bill Jackowitz.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Good evening,
Scranton City Council. Bill Jackowitz,
South Scranton resident and member of the
Taxpayers' Association, founder of the
Legion of Doom, and very proud of that, and
also a cosponser of the "Kids Swim Free" for
the last five years at Nay Aug Park, proud
of that, also.

I've got some facts and figures
here. 20.3 years ago, 10 January 1992,
7,433 days ago, 1,061 weeks ago Scranton was
declared a distressed city, according with
Act 47. Do you know that there have been
six leap years since Scranton has been
declared a distressed city? Six. And they
only come about every four years.

Legion of Doom has spoken on this matter many times. We have always been ignored. Citizens have been arrested, cameras have been removed, Doomers have been

searched, Doomers have been denied access to city council meetings, Doomers have been threatened, they have been threatened with the lost of their jobs in some cases. We have been ruled out of order for expressing our opinion, but you know what, we kept coming back and as everything -- as the outcome has shown in the past 7,433 the people who have come to this meeting and the Doomers, the Legion of Doomers, have been right about just about everything.

The city council members in the past have been wrong. Our mayor has been wrong for 12 years -- well, 11 years really, but no one -- and to this day we are still not listened to, we are ignored. We are -- we come up here with suggestions and ideas and really no one really cares about it. Again, I mean, we have got 1,061 weeks, weeks of being a distressed city in Act 47. Now we are talking about a new Recovery Plan? The first Recovery Plan didn't work.

You know, why don't we just pack our bags and pack it in and say, hey, there is no way out. There really isn't. The

citizens can no longer afford this. We are talking about raising taxes for the next ten years, any tax increase cannot be afforded. It's as simple as that. We need to tell this mayor and his city administrators, I don't see anybody here again. Where are they? Where is our city council at? Don't you have any power or any authority to get anybody here? You are elected officials, they are elected officials, you should be working together.

I'm appalled that week after week after, I stayed away for five weeks from this meeting myself because I come here and I don't get paid, but yet we can't get an administrator here or we can't get anybody from an Authority here and we have been distressed for 7,433 days and nobody cares except the Legion of Doom and the citizens who came here and asked for your help, and when I say your help I'm talking about city council, our elected information, past, present and future if there is a future for the City of Scranton.

Come on, people, get these people

here. Get this mayor. If you got to go sit down at his office and sit on his front porch then sit on his front porch. If you have to sit on Mr. McGowan's front porch, sit on Mr. McGowan's front porch.

But I, for one, am tired of it. I'm tired of being laughed at because I live in Scranton, a distressed city. I'm tired of it, and I hope other citizens are tired and I hope more people start coming to these meetings and express their opinion because it's out of control. We are talking about more tax increases, you know what? Tax increases don't solve problems they create problems, and this city has enough problems.

We have Lackawanna County, for example, our county commissioners, the only thing they are worried about is a baseball field, a baseball stadium. We have the highest unemployment in the state. We have the lowest wages in the state but yet we are worried about a baseball stadium. People can't afford to go to that baseball stadium. Our county commissioners hold meetings at 10:00 in the morning on a Wednesday, the

middle of the week, nobody can go to those meetings. If they really cared about the citizens of this city and this county they would hold their meetings at 7:00 at night and invite the public here.

Our school board, they don't even abide by their own ethics policies. They do whatever the hell they want, pardon my language.

I'm tired of it. And I hope more people in this city get tired of it. Our swimming pools, they are not even going to open. We will be lucky to get two swimming pools open this year. Swimming -- the cost to swim at Nay Aug Park went up to \$4. \$4 a day to use the pool and the slide and we are supposed to be happy about it?

Doug Miller has been trying to get an answer about the lights, the light show, the cost. I have been trying to get an answer about how much money has been collected from Nay Aug Park on the pools for swimming at \$4 a person. No answers. Why?

These people are appointed to serve the people of the City of Scranton and they

don't do it, and I'm giving you forewarning right now city council, get some people in this meeting. It's about damn time. We, the citizens and the residents and taxpayers of this city, this county, get answers.

And, county commissioners, hold your meetings at night so we can attend the meeting. I still work full-time. I can't get off at 10:00 in the morning to go to a county commissioner's meeting.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you. Our next speaker is Andy Sbaraglia.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia, citizen of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians, your 26, was it, or 28 million you want to borrow, has it as unfunded debt. What unfunded debt are we referring to?

MR. JOYCE: The unfunded debt is the \$9.85 million.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Okay. And that's the unfunded debt, so the only other thing is you are taking part of that, how are you going to do that? You are selling bonds out, but you have a -- your little notation there where you are charging a surcharge for

ten years at 10 percent or whatever onto unfunded debt. Now, how are you going to differentiate that from the bonds? Are you going to have one bond specifically saying 110.8 million?

You know, of course, any time you get a bond this, that or it cost us or whatever, but it usually doubles, I don't care what anyone says, when you like at the charts and so forth, amortization chart, it usually doubles. How are going to differentiate that or are you going to differentiate it?

MR. HUGHES: It's differentiated in the series of bonds. The Series A bond is going to be \$9.85.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Oh, okay.

MR. HUGHES: Then there is the Series B, C and D, one of which is taxable is going to depend on then and they are going to be floated for different things depending on the interest on the 2003 bonds and the -- the 2003 bonds or 2011 and 2012, a portion of that will be broken out into what's going to be a taxable bond, some of

them have to be taxable. However, it's possible that by the year end if they are not sold they can then repackage it for next year and they will be tax free at probably a lower interest rate.

MR. SBARAGLIA: But there will be 9 point whatever eight million or whatever it cost, 12 or 13 million, whatever them bonds come out to be, to separated from the other bonds.

MR. HUGHES: That's a separate series; correct.

MR. SBARAGLIA: So we now, I was wondered just how you were doing this being this is Court -- you know, what it says here. Of course this isn't worked out yet.

There is lot of things happening within the city besides this. We are actually -- we know we are in trouble. I know you didn't bring up the Parking Authority, I have been doing it for so many years I'm trying of bringing it up, but I'm waiting for you members of council to say to the board members of the Redevelopment Authority and the Parking Authority to

24

25

request their resignations. When you bankrupt anything you should be out of there. Take a lesson from the bank. You saw what they did, the people that were in charge of them bonds, they are no longer They lost their \$2 billion it's We didn't lose \$2 billion, but we lost what is two some million. But I haven't seen anybody get up there and say Just because they are Democrats or appointed that's not the way to do it. When you actually do damage to the city you should be asked to resign, there is no question about that. If you were in private business they would have already been out of there, but you not a private business, you became a charity, and that's not what you were elected to be. You are not there to bail out the Parking Authority or Redevelopment Authority, plus you didn't even see what's going to happen when they have to pay for the pizza place and the hot That's still on the books. dog place. don't know where they are getting that money from, probably from our out of our pocket.

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

This has got to stop. You got to get rid of them people that are incompetent. If the mayor did what he said to you, I

would have sent him a letter asking him to Have gumption. You got to have

The city is teetering, actually it's over the edge. Like I told Janet many

times over, you should have went with

Chapter 11. I know there was some thoughts that the employees, the pension and so forth

and so on, but the judges in this county are

all Democrats, most of them anyway, and they

probably wouldn't do anything for the

pensions that were there, the medical and so

forth and so on, they probably wouldn't even

bother that, but we need to redeem them to

pay our debt and possibly a lot more revenue

sources.

gumption.

Carbondale finally listened to me and broke out the police from their budget and charged them all for police reduction. I told you should have done that with police and fire, you got to get the nonprofits and the only way you are going to ever get money out of the nonprofits is put a gun to their

head and offer them say a choice they can't refuse, that's the only way. To sit there and say give it to us, forget it, and it doesn't work, it never will work. Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Our next speaker is Doug Miller.

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

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. MILLER: I'd like to begin on a topic that we've obviously been discussing here the last few weeks and that's our financial situation. You know, it just truly frustrates me to once again stand here tonight and talk about this. You know, last week we discussed the legislation on the agenda, 6-A and 7-A, dealing with the unfunded debt and the up to possibly \$26 million of borrowing to once again bail this mayor out.

And I just have to say tonight, and
I see this is in Seventh Order, before we
even consider giving this mayor another dime

we tonight need to demand that he come forward right here in this chamber once and for all and come forward publically and explain himself and hold himself accountable, but the games, the bailouts the nonsense, it's got to stop now.

You know, we have sat here and talked and talked, we have tried to reach out to the mayor, we have to tried to build a working relationship, he doesn't want it, okay? He can't be trusted, he has proven it for ten years, he needs to come forward and hold himself accountable up to the people.

But most of all, more people need to start packing this chamber. You know, I have been coming here for a long time, and so has a lot of other people here, and I think Mr. Jackowitz summed it up pretty well tonight in his five-minute comment, people need to come forward. We have been coming forward ten years and fighting for everyone else in this city and yet they want to sit back and they don't want to help themselves. You know, they're concerned, oh, what time is Dancing with the Stars on, and all that

other nonsense, but they need to come forward and they need to demand accountability. This is your town, too. You know, you want to sit back and you want to complain, but you don't want to do anything to help yourself. We had a mentality in this town far too long that we want other people to solve our problems and we don't want to help ourselves. Well, that needs to stop now.

We're over \$313 million in long-term debt and that's not even including these authorities, which I don't even to get into that it's just unbelievable. Now we have a Parking Authority coming forward looking for another handout, now it's \$1.4 with Bob Scopelliti and his nonsense. I mean, you got to be kidding me. These guys they just don't want to hold themselves accountable.

And while we are on that subject, I know last week we sent a request to have Mr. Scopelliti and Mr. McGowan come forward in a caucus, did we hear anything back? I doubt it?

MR. JOYCE: I'll address that during

motions. No, we didn't hear anything back from Mr. Scopelliti yet.

MR. MILLER: That's a big shock.

Again, another example of not handing another dime to an authority until they come forward. How many requests have we sent to the Authority with questions? Take a look at the budget they sent us down. I wouldn't even call it a budget. I think a third grade from probably Francis Willard could probably come up with something better, don't you think? Mr. Hughes sent a letter back in October, November, still hasn't received a response. You got to be kidding me. I mean, where are we going here?

You know, I think Pat, you said it best last week, I agree with you, let the authority fail and let's take these matters into our own hands. It's my opinion that Bob Scopelliti should be fired. He has no business being in the position he is in. He shows the way he runs that Authority he is incompetent. I mean, it's just truly frustrating. I come up here every week and I know I sound pretty repetitive, but, you

know, to be honest with you we are dealing with the same issues consistently and we don't seem to be resolving anything. You know, it's just it's amazing how one man can single-handily destroy the future of this city in a ten-year period.

You know, I have talked to many young individuals my age bracket recently and they tell me they have no intention of staying here, and I can't tell you how much that upsets me to hear that because obviously, as you know, for coming here this long I do care about this city. I do have a passion for the community I live in and I want to see us move forward.

But, unfortunately, when we see some things like that and had we have fiscal mismanagement in the city, you know, it makes you ask yourself are we really going to turn this thing around? And sometimes I doubt it, but until we get people to come forward and demand that Chris Doherty and the authorities and everybody else that we have sent numerous requests to come forward right here publically we probably won't

۷,

solve any of our problems. You have, the mayor and all of these authorities need to remember one thing, they work for us. We are their boss, not the other way around.

And, you know, I have been talking about an issue with the electric bill up at Nay Aug that I have made numerous requests on, just another example of falling on deaf ears. I did file my appeal with the state, I don't know where that's going to take me, but I'm going to do what I can to get an answer on that because I'm not going to back down from it, when I make a request I expect to get an answer and when the city council makes a request I certainly hope to get an answer, but, unfortunately, that's not happening.

So, like I said, until we get the mayor to come forward and everybody else involved I wouldn't hand this man another dime. Let's not jeopardize the future of this city. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Our next speaker is

Ozzie Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Ozzie Quinn, Taxpayers' Association, resident of Scranton.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. QUINN: Good evening. I want to announce that the Scranton/Lackawanna County Taxpayers will meet Tuesday night here in city council chambers and the guest speaker will be a resident of the county who was initiating a start of a referendum in the county to change the Home Rule Charter in the county so that when there is a tax increase it would have to go for a referendum, okay? So it should be interesting.

Last Monday there was an editorial in the Times about the -- the commuter tax about SAPA and Mrs. Evans and Mr. Loscombe saying that the only time you go there is when, you know, you need them and so on. You know, I know I pay county taxes, you know, and I think that money goes to a lot of these boroughs, you know, for work that's being done in the boroughs, and I know I pay federal taxes and I know they have Community

okay? So, you know, I have to disagree on one thing, in fact, that I think there should be some kind of a fee if you come in here and work in the city and using our services. But, you know, I want to follow-up with what these gentlemen were saying about the fact that, you know, Mr. Doherty is not here and, you know, you see these editorials, but you have never seen the Scranton Times' editorialize that Mr. Doherty should be at these meetings. For ten years you have seen the Scranton Times cover up for Mr. Doherty. Cover up and cover up. No investigations. spend, spend, never question, and I didn't

Development Block Grant money and a lot of

that money goes to the boroughs to help them

with the boroughs, you know, so I think it's

a give and take situation, there is no doubt

about it. We are paying taxes on that money

and we don't really get anything from the

county and the city. It's mostly boroughs,

see any stories this week at all about this

meeting tonight about the \$6 million bond

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

issue and the tax increase and so on, you know?

And I think that should have been out front and people should know what's going on because of the fact that Mr. Doherty is to blame for all of this. You people aren't to blame. These people aren't to blame, it's Mr. Doherty. Mr. Doherty and his cronies and, you know, it's ashame, and it's really ashame because we were talking before the meeting and I agree that you people have a tough job because of the fact that rubber stamping councils before us and the way that the Scranton Times has been able to hide Mr. Doherty from the public coming here before the city council and to defend him in any way whatsoever, protect him, put a spin on things and whatnot and let him spend our money is a grand total over \$300 million in long-term debt, we are looking at a \$26 million bond issue, a tax raise, maybe two tax raises in January, and yet he don't show and either does any of his, what's it, his cronies, Mr. Scopelliti and Mr. McGowan.

It's ashame and maybe it's time to start subpoenaing some of these people to get them in here, okay? Thank you very much.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you. Our next speaker is Gary Lewis.

MR. LEWIS: Good evening.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. LEWIS: My name is Gary Lewis.

I am a resident downtown I'm also a consultant specializing in distressed debt and distressed finances. I'm here tonight to talk to you about the city's financial situation. In a follow-up to the letter that I distributed to every member of council as well as the mayor last week.

Scranton is broke, completely and utterly broke. The city has a \$10 million structural deficit. We have a pension fund that's been deemed severely distressed by the state. We have over \$215 million in governmental liabilities, not including the \$26 million new bond issuance or any Court awards, workers' compensation claims, all of these other things that total the \$300 million number that was quoted earlier. I

expect the 2011 audit of Scranton to show
net assets of zero, if not negative amounts.
The city cannot continue down it's current
path.

The way out of this, in my opinion, is Chapter 9 bankrupt. Chapter 9 does three major things. The first one is that it temporarily suspends any ongoing litigation; the second one is it allows the city to refinance its debt, and thus reduce its debt service payments; and the third thing is that it allows the city to renegotiate its union contraction.

These final two points, refinancing debt and renegotiating contracts, are absolutely critical. Currently, employee compensation and debt service account for more than \$50 million of annual expenditures. This amount is in excess of all taxes received by the city. It's more than -- it's almost 100 percent of real estate taxes. That means you need to double your real estate tax collection to balance the budget based on how we currently are.

Additionally, 10 percent of that

employee compensation, more than \$45 million, goes to 255 union employees and retirees from the police and fire unions.

These contracts are unconscionable and they are raping this city financially.

A Chapter 9 reorganization will help the city's expenditures get under control and allow the city to finally balance the budget with minimal, if any, tax increases. We have a spending problem, not a revenue problem. You cannot increase the revenue and expect that just because you put a 10 percent tax increase on paper that you will see a concurrent increase in tax revenue.

Every conversation I have seen has revolved around raising taxes. No one is taking into consideration this concept of a default currently. We are at a critical point in the tax base in the city where if you raise taxes I honestly think you will see people just completely defaulting, and as you increase taxes the default rate increases and you see a negative rate of return, so at some point you hit this tipping point where raising taxes doesn't

solve the problem. I think we are there and I think the answer to this is to look at the expense side of the equation.

As representatives of the city, I urge you to pursue all possible alternatives before raising the cities taxes again.

Thank you.

(While the speaker was at the podium Mr. McGoff takes the dais and joins the meeting.)

MR. JOYCE: Our next speaker is Lee Morgan.

MR. MORGAN: Good evening, Council.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. MORGAN: You know, the last speaker probably is echoing what a lot of people at this podium have said about bankruptcy for a long time. I'm just glad to see another person come here today and talk about some figures that evidently he pulled out of the budget, and it's really amazing that we have elected numerous councils who haven't used their power of subpoena for all this time, decades, as this city has gone downhill.

And, you know, a lot of speakers have talked about the mayor creating this problem, we were distressed in '92 before the mayor became the mayor, so I'm not going to try to defend anybody on what their performance was, but there isn't a doubt in my mind from walking this city that people are fleeing, and I just think that if we increase taxes we are going to lose more residents, and we can't sell houses that are already vacant.

And, you know, a speaker got up and spoke about maybe we should make people resign in government. If we did that, I'm not sure we'd have any elected officials because we have either been sending them to prison or they are been acknowledging that they have committed crime and making plea agreements, and that's Democrats and Republicans, and we probably have the worst political -- just the worst -- we are out there trying to free other people in other countries from tyrants and we are electing our own who don't even care what we think because they are just going to do whatever

_ .

they want and tell us that's the way we are going to proceed. It's really a very troubling thing.

I'm totally against the borrowing for the \$26 million. I think we need to table that and just move away from it because borrowing money isn't going to solve our problems. We have been doing that for decades, and it hasn't brought one iota of prosperity in this city, not one bit.

The gentleman here was speaking before, I believe, that we have got \$40 million in the pension fund and we are spending a million a month, that's another problem that's in front of us, and all of these employees came to work in good faith and the city government made promises to everybody. I don't know what the elected officials are going to do about that, but I guess that since they made promises to all of us when they get elected and then we see what happens I think they break every promise they have ever made just to sit in seats of power to abuse the electors.

I honestly believe that there should

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be no commuter tax. The residents of this city by not voting, by not being involved, but not wanting somebody else to carry their water. You see them, they are not here. Evidently they weren't concerned. They thought that this was a comedy show and they have enjoying it. Believe me, at a lot of doors they though council meetings were funny. Well, it's time to start laughing now.

And as far as SAPA, SAPA was the way SAPA had a lot of promise for the out. city, it was going to do great things. Mr. Loscombe was at the debates, President Evans talked about maybe we should present that at the debate, I brought the issue up. It was like crickets were in the room. There was nothing. That's the way for this city to turn around. SAPA needs to be reintroduced and it needs to be voted in, and the other thing is this, this city needs to maintain it's Class 2A status, because if SAPA is voted in then that could be a catalyst for economic development, all right, because the legislature will pass

legislation because it is will only affect the city and maybe we can stimulate this economy to create economic growth through help of the Commonwealth, okay?

I mean, we seem to think that we are going to run this city like a business. Government isn't a business, government is supposed to provide service to the people who pay taxes, and that's not what's going on in this whole country. Every layer of this country's government is broke from the federal government, who is massively overextended, all the way down to the city, the county, and the truth of the matter is they have all lost sight of reality. They all sitting down with special interests and making deals and it's all costing the people something.

When I was a kid everything was made here, and you know something, businesses don't create wealth. You might think they do, but they don't. People, workers create wealth, and the people that own the means of manufacturing collect that wealth and redistribute it and try to package some

illusion that they are working in the best interest of the people, but the people who work every day they pay their taxes every week out of their check and the people who own businesses they pay theirs at end of the year after they can get every tax deduction they can find that the legislatures and government produce for them to avoid their obligations to support the society that we are all part of.

We are sitting in the city where there's a lack of adequate, fire, police, Department of Public Works and, yes, even clerical employees. Why? Because this city has been mismanaged for decades, and you know, you have to take a look at an article the Scranton Times wrote about playground programs that was recently in the paper. You know, at one time I would say that 98 percent of woman stayed home and raised the family. But you know something, they created a playground program so kids would be safe and have a safe place to hang out together during the summer. We have got overwhelming drug problems and no citywide

playground program. We have a lack of safe places for children to swim, and I think politics need to end and I think the Democrat and Republican party are responsible for where we are. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you. Our next speaker is Les Spindler.

MR. SPINDLER: Good evening,

Council. Les Spindler, city resident and
homeowner and taxpayer.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. SPINDLER: What that Mr. Lewis said was spot on. We need more people to come here like him and speak their peace, and a lot of other speakers responded, too, and I agree with what they have to say. I think it's time for this council to get some backbone. I know you have met with Mr. Doherty lately, tell him he is not going to receive a penny until he gets his butt here and listens to the people of this city. I know for a fact that Mayor Layton in Wilkes-Barre attends every council meeting he can and he gets along with their city council, and Chris Doherty has come here two

times in 11 years, once was to ask for money and once was to put Mr. McGoff where he is now. So tell him to his face he doesn't get a penny unless he gets in here. It's time to bow your backs and tell him to his face to get in here.

And this 10 percent tax hike for ten years, I said it last year, you can't do this to the people of this city. Like I said, there is people like myself that have to work two jobs just to make ends meet. We can't afford a 10 percent tax increase for ten years. I know at least two of you, possibly three of you were up for reelection next year, if you raise taxes for 10 years you are not going to be reelected, I can guarantee that.

And I have supported this super majority from day one, I have supported Mrs. Evans since she was been sitting up there, if I get hit with a 10 percent tax hike for ten years I can't support anybody that does that to me. I hope you think about that when it comes time to vote tonight.

Next thing, I want to talk about the pit bulls again. Last Saturday night on Channel 16 there was a story about two people in Pottsville, they had two pit bulls, the pit bulls were fighting, the people want to break them up, their own pit bulls attacked them. These people had to be flown to the hospitals, and I said I don't know how many examples I have come here with about these viscous animals, and it's past city council and this city council it just falls on deaf ears. We need a dangerous dog legislation.

The past council solicitor, Minora, said we can't be breed specific. Yes, we can. They are in Pottsville. Last time I checked that's in Pennsylvania. "Pottsville does have an aggressive dog ordinance which went into effect last year after numerous incidents of pit bull attacks. Owners will be fined if a dog attacked. After a dog attacks a third time it must be put to sleep."

Time for this council to make an ordinance like this, maybe the streets will

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you for your time.

be safer for people to walk. Like I said, a long time ago when I got my dog he was attacked by two pit bulls. Thank God is anything okay. Nothing was done to those people and the people have since moved, thank God, because I know they were selling drugs in that house.

The next thing, this commuter tax, does council have any plan how they are going to enforce this because I know when it was -- when they instituted it under Mayor Connors they couldn't enforce it. people paid and some people didn't. are going to have this tax you have to have a way for every single person is going to I know people who work for business they could have -- the business could have it taken out of their checks. A doctor, a lawyer works for themselves, you can't enforce them, so unless council comes up with a plan to enforce it on every single person then I don't think you should do it to anybody.

That's all I have to say this week.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you. Our next speaker is Gerard Hetman.

MR. HETMAN: Good evening, Council.

Gerard Hetman from the Lackawanna County

Department of Community Relations. First,
just let me say to follow-up on some of the
comments made by some of your earlier
speakers, our department is here in
existence and I'm hear at council meetings
and other municipal meetings that I'm
assigned to do work with city residents and
county residents to find answers to their
questions and solutions to their problems,
their issues, and the issues that present
themselves to these municipalities that are
with county government.

And I want to remind everyone here
I'm here for the whole meeting every meeting
and my colleagues at every meeting for the
whole meeting through the end of the meeting
and we are here to work with residents to
find answers to those questions so if there
are issues or questions regarding the
breakdowns on county spending or county
responsibilities with some things that

residents may have questions for we are here to answer them for or if we can help them find answers.

For some things, for example, sometimes service is provided by the City of Scranton, when it comes to our smaller municipalities in the county there may be county offices or county departments that help provide those services to those smaller municipalities, things such as the Community Development Block Grants. I believe Scranton and Carbondale have their own economic development departments which I believe handle those requests every year and those issues every year. Sometimes it is then provided at the county level for some municipalities.

But we are here to answer those questions when it comes to things like the county budget, county ordinances, and also our baseball document archive. I remind everyone that archives are available on the county website at www.LackawannaCounty.org, and some of them go back with baseball all the way to the start of Triple-A baseball in

Northeastern, Pennsylvania, and the ordinances I believe goes back to the early 1980's, if not longer. So there is some history there and those tools are there, but when residents need help we are here to help them.

And again, I'm here until the end of the meeting and you can talk to me and access me whenever they need to at these meetings to discuss that. Of course, keeping in cooperation with your ordinances on speaking here and your rules on speaking, so that' why I said until the end of the meeting, please.

With that said, we would like to remind of the 2012 Armed Forces Day parade is taking place this Saturday, May 19, in downtown Scranton, and the parade steps off sharply at 11 a.m. It's 1100 hours I believe or 1100 hours from the Gino Merli Veteran's Center on Penn Avenue, and again, this is an initiative that has been in existence now for a little over a decade, and it has the full support of the Lackawanna County Commissioners and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Lackawanna County government. program that we see here in downtown Scranton and it's something we hope to continue to build on. Our department has only been on the job for just over two months, so we haven't been able to do as much for this year's parade as we would like, but for the future and going forward we hope to see this development and hope to work with city council, with the school board, with everyone in Lackawanna County to build this into a positive event that will show respect and pay tribute to the services of our veterans, and our current military personnel and other groups, police, firefighters that participate in the parade from all of our municipalities.

So with that in mind, again,
Saturday, May 19, this Saturday, at 11:00
a.m. stepping off from the Gino Merli
Veteran's Center and wrapping up on the
courthouse square in downtown Scranton.
I'll be there, as well as some of my family,
and many of my colleagues and we hope to see
lots of you out there as well. That's all I

have for this evening. Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you. Our next speaker is Dave Dobrzyn.

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. DOBRZYN: Dave Dobrzyn, resident of Scranton and taxes paid. Why did we vote for who we did, not vote for tax bills and foreign vote so many times, what can you say.

I don't know what to say about the borrowing, if we want to go home with hefty paychecks and whatever that's the way it's going to be, but, well, I'm not going to commit myself to voting for somebody else because my often than not you get worse the second time around anyway.

But in retrospect I think it's time that we look into the feasibility, and I have heard from the leader of the Hill Section Committee that it's okay or legal to box in nonprofits, and we have been stooped for years with people from SAPA or whoever dumping their nonprofits in this town and

they get the benefit, we get the tax bill, so box in all nonprofits now, no further expansion whatsoever, don't bother applying for a grant, don't bother applying for a loan, don't bother anything, property tax on all land and structure if feasible within the constitution and it's time to do it now because we can't take this. That's where our problem is coming in.

and we are stuck holding the bill for the whole Lackawanna County, we have a politicians from Up Valley complaining and people complaining about having to pay a commuter tax, well, okay, yeah, they are the one person that's stuck paying the bill out of how many that don't work in Scranton, but do benefit from the hospitals and the colleges and so forth.

And we still haven't changed our character in this town. I was on the school board meeting where they voted to close Audubon, well, it's six or seven million dollars to fix Audubon and, you know, they cried poor and we can't afford it and this

1

5

4

7

8

6

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and that, going back and forth, well, I can add and subtract because as soon as they voted to close Audubon they said maybe we can build a nice new school some day for \$17 million and you know that will double by the time they get around to it, so I can add and subtract, unfortunately, I learned my lessons in school somewhat.

And another food for thought, we get all of these promises out of these mega corporations and we all are going to school and fly off and become rocket scientists and soar to greater heights, and I remember a lot of promises during the Clinton administration over NAPTHA and the Chinese trade packs, when wage tax goes down so the do the taxes that get paid, so if you want somebody to carry it the only way you are going to do it is to tax somebody that's making 25, 30, 40 percent less on the job that they got after they lost their job. It's just ridiculous. It's a small world after all. I mean, you know, things that happen outside of this city, this isn't a microcosm or an island of economic

development or economic events.

And, okay, the golden parrot,
Eduardo Severin denounced his citizenship to
avoid paying taxes for Facebook profits.

Now, I'm not on Facebook, I heard somebody
Up Valley was robbed because they announced
that they were on Facebook going on
vacation, so that the thieves came right in
and busted in their house and robbed
everything. His family asked for asylum
from Brazil, he was educated in the US, and
kudos to Schumer and Casey because they want
to deny his return if he does.

And then there is a Vandsloot of Iowa he blames lost business on customers and media despite his donations against his customer's interest. Well, guess what, I don't drink Coke, I don't drink Pepsi because they donated money to ALEC and I'm not eating at Wendy's and I'm not eating at McDonald's anymore. Take a hike, gang.

And in Florida, this is why we have a stand our ground law, a lady was sentenced for firing a handgun into the ceiling into the air to ward off her abusive husband who

was reported two times prior, and this is the third incident of abuse, you know, so I thought we had a stand your ground law. I mean, do we have to get to beaten up for 20 years? Excuse me, Florida, I think we got too much Alzheimer's down there. Have a good night and bawk, bawk.

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

Council. Marie Schumacher, city taxpayer.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening,

MS. SCHUMACHER: You know, awhile back I asked that the prayer include the taxpayers, and I think we should start that again because we need all of the help we can get.

First question on 7-A tonight, two weeks ago I asked what the deficit was going to be at the end of 2012 and, Mr. Joyce, you told me \$4 million; correct?

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Why was that not included with this -- with the current borrowing in 7-A? I mean, it seems to me if

we are paying of somewhere between a quarter and a half-million dollars to get this bond issue going we are going to have to pay the second time it would seem to be me at the end of the year if there is another unfunded debt. I don't know how else we are going to pay it, so why was it not included in this one since we already know that we are going to be \$4 million short?

MR. JOYCE: There have been talks about how to address that actually in the Recovery Plan as far as how to address the \$4 million that's expected to be short at the end of the year and it's not through borrowing.

MS. SCHUMACHER: What is the funding source then?

MR. JOYCE: Well, I'm not obliged to release any information at this point.

MS. SCHUMACHER: About?

MR. JOYCE: About the \$4 million or about the source just because it was marked not for public release.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. Thank you.

That brings me to my next point, which is

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

transparency. I attended a lot of rallies and I heard a lot about transparency and sadly I believed those things, but we are suffering from lack of transparency. Ι think the latest issue of the revised Recovery plan should be posted on the city's website. If the mayor won't do it then on the council's website. It's a very, very sobering document, and I have to agree with anybody else, I don't know how we dig our way out of this one. It's just -- I just don't know, and I definitely think that it should be posted and give people who have computers at least an opportunity to read about it and talk to their friends and family about the really, really sad shape that this city is in.

And then the next item on transparency, I had come to Mr. Loscombe on the police investigation that the chief said was going to take probably two weeks and we have heard nary a word. We still don't know what the misconduct charge was, we don't know if that person is still working on the force and I think that's sad --

MR. LOSCOMBE: I can answer that

MS. SCHUMACHER: Pardon?

MR. LOSCOMBE: I can answer that

now.

now.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Well, you can do it in Fifth Order, that's okay, but I'll hear it tonight because, you know, where there is smoke there is fire, the state police wouldn't have investigated it and they wouldn't have handed it back to the police chief if something hadn't gone on, and I think while Old Forge is certainly in sad shape with respect to their uniformed personnel at least they know what's going on. We know nothing and I think that's sad.

And then I would next like to ask, in the Treasurer's sale there doesn't seem to be -- I think there was one property for the City of Scranton, and I think there is something like 350 roughly, if you just count how many per page, properties that are listed as the owner is City of Scranton and they may not be delinquent in taxes because they don't pay it, but I'm certain that a

lot of those properties should be put into a sale for somebody to get them back on the tax rolls. Certainly we are not using all 350 of those properties, so I think that list needs to be gone over and I was upset by the offering because I think it is essentially an upset sale, so everybody has to do their own research to see how much you are really going to pay and their website did not have a lot of information. I had to physically call to make sure that you weren't going to own the property free and clear so I think that left something to be desire. too.

One final pitch, I just hope people just because ECTV is going to show the Armed Services Day parade at a later date I hope that doesn't deter anyone from coming out in person and showing their support to our armed services. Thank you. The rest I'll bring next week.

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

MR. ANCHERANI: Good evening,

22

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Council. Nelson Ancherani, resident and taxpayer, exercising my First Amendment Rights.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. ANCHERANI: Last week I sat in the audience when Council President Evans brought up the emergency certificate of funding sent to council, there was the \$1.4 emergency fund certificate for the Scranton Parking Authority, so they wouldn't default. I find it very interesting that the Scranton Parking Authority is looking for \$1.4 million when a couple of years ago the Scranton Parking Authority got a \$35 million loan basically for the Connell building parking and whatever else they were going to use it for. 35 million. A lot of money.

What I have been saying since the Scranton Parking Authority got that loan is that the interest on that loan is \$59 million. 59 million interest along with the 35 million for a total pay back of 94 million. I believe they also got approximately 1.5 million more after that 35 million. I can't remember what was that

1	for, but it was approximately 1.5 million I
2	believe. But \$59 million interest, \$59
3	million interest. \$94 million payback.
4	What is outrageous is the \$59 million
5	interest.
6	So if StreetSmart was implemented
7	maybe we wouldn't be in this situation, but
8	it was council's idea so we didn't expect it
9	to go anywhere. What's the saying,
10	pennywise, dollar foolish? 59 million
11	interest, that's ridiculous and foolish.
12	Thank you.
13	MR. SLEDENZSKI: Jackie.
14	MR. LOSCOMBE: Chrissy.
15	MR. SLEDENZSKI: Hi, Frankie.
16	MR. JOYCE: Hi, Chrissy.
17	MR. SLEDENZSKI: Up a little bit or
18	stand back. Right here?
19	MR. LOSCOMBE: You are good,
20	Chrissy.
21	MR. SLEDENZSKI: Jack, I told you
22	about that, my next door neighbor,
23	(unintelligible) somebody hit that, would
24	you take care of that for me?
25	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yeah, we'll take care

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of it.

MR. SLEDENZSKI: All right. Thanks,

MR. JOYCE: Is there anyone else who would care to address council?

MS. KRAKE: 5-A. MOTIONS.

MR. JOYCE: Mr. McGoff, do you have any motions or comments?

MR. MCGOFF: Yes, thank you. sorry I wasn't here earlier. I would like to just make one announcement again for the Scranton Celtic Festival, which will be held this weekend at Sno Cove, Sno Mountain, Sno Cove on Saturdays, it's from noon to the 9:00 p.m. and Sunday from 11 a.m. to 6:00 Music, vendors, family activities, food, drink, it's a great attempt to do something for the community. I hope that everyone will come out and support it, especially any of us from Celtic heritage to go and support what I think is a worthy venture on the part of the committee that is putting this on. That's Saturday and Sunday, noon to nine on Saturday, and 11 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Sunday.

Secondly, I have been talking about people responding to requests from council, I made a phone call and spoke with Mr. Dougher at the DPW and had a meeting with him to discuss some of the issues that have been sent to DPW. What we did was he had a stack of letters, I'll say from council, and what he does with them is the letters are received, they are sent to the various departments that would deal with them and appropriate action is taken on each request.

It's basically the same process, I don't know if it was a year or two years ago when I met with Mr. Brazil when he was director of DPW and pretty much did the same thing. I went through the list of responses that he -- or through the list of letters, took a look at some of the items that were there that have been brought up at council. Some of the items have been completed, the work at Rockwell Park -- or, excuse me, at Pinebrook, I actually took a ride by the softball field the grass has been cut, you know, appropriate actions have been taken.

Actually, it looks in better shape than it has in a number of years, at least back to when I was umpiring softball games.

Potholes requests they are starting, they have just received hot patch, the company that supplies it has just kind of opened for business now that there is warmer weather. They are meeting those demands as they can.

Paving, their list of things that or lists of place that can be paved by the city, also, a list of places that are or streets that will be paved through OECD that that we have funding there.

Other things, as I said, Rockwell
Park I did ask about Nay Aug Zoo and I know somebody had asked about how and why the metal was removed from there, they said it was done maybe over a year ago and they asked for any dealers, that they wanted all of that removed for some reason, and someone came and removed it for the city. It was at the city's request. I asked if there were any plans for the building at this time, they said -- Mr. Dougher said that there is

not any concrete plan for the actual building, it didn't seem as though there was anything that was -- there may have been actually some indication that they would like to remove the building because it apparently has no use at this time.

But anyhow, all of these things or many of the things that have been requested are in the process of being done, and I think that when we criticize, you know, or do not responding to letters perhaps the response is in the actions that are taken. Perhaps we should go out and, you know, if we make a request go out and see if some of these things are actually being taken care of rather than just relying on a letter being returned.

I did want to speak about the

Recovery Plan a little bit. At one point in

time I was pretty optimistic that we would

have a Recovery Plan in place that was

mutually agreed upon and that would be

functional for the next however many years.

That optimism is very quickly turning to

pessimism. It seems that every time we talk

about the Recovery Plan council seems to have one more impediment and every time one of these impediments is brought up and agreed to there is another one and another one and another one and another one. Just today we received, you know, an e-mail with council requests or I don't think it was actually requests, but revisions, these were not suggestions, it seems as though were demands. It said, "Required revisions."

We are not in the process of even negotiating these anymore. Now it's come to demands that need to be met if we are going to have a Recovery Plan. It seems that council is intent upon creating a crisis with this Recovery Plan, an economic crisis that I don't know if we are going to get out of it.

We need to -- we need to sit down and I agree there needs to be a little bit more openness about what we are doing with this Recovery Plan. These things cannot be conducted in secret. Let's put out there what it is that we are looking to do with this Recovery Plan. Let's put out there

will, you know, kind of acquiesce to the request that was on there to not make them public, although, other council members have not treated me in the same way in the past, but we need to make these more open. We need to get these -- we need to get these things into the public eye, we need to discuss them now, we need to come to an agreement on them, not as demands, but as negotiations and we need to come to a Recovery Plan that is acceptable to everyone so that we can move along.

what the suggestions are. What I received I

We are not going to get out of this crisis until there is a plan in place, and I know that we have been, you know, taking things secondhand, at least I have, in dealing with some of the responses from the banking community and others. I made a few phone calls, spoke to a number of people that have been involved, a number of people in the banking community that have been involved with the unfunded debt, with the TAN, with other things that are going on in the city and to a person they said they are

not moving on anything until there is a Recovery Plan in place and one that will work. They are not looking for some idealistic plan with fabricated numbers. They want something that they see will provide economic stability in the future.

Right now we are looking at an unfunded debt, we are going to vote on something tonight that really unless there is a Recovery Plan in place is a meaningless vote. The reluctant partner that we now have for the unfunded debt is not going to move until there is a Recovery Plan in place.

MR. SPINDLER: Vote it down.

MR. MCGOFF: We -- excuse me. Thank you. And there is no -- if there was an indication from anyone that there may be other banks out there who are willing to deal with the unfunded debt I was told point-blank there is no banking solution available at this time. There not one person that I spoke to, any of the banks that is willing to involve themselves, their bank, in this unfunded debt.

4

1

5

8

9

7

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And they said over the past couple of weeks, couple of months that things that have been said, the criticisms that have been made of the bank willing community and especially things that were said about defaulting on loans have made the banks extremely reluctant to be involved. That they are not, they are -- they said if the city in any way defaults on a loan, even one that they are only guarantors for that they will be in Court and the minute they go to Court there is not one bank that will do any business with the city and that jeopardizes everything that's in the budget that relies upon the banking community.

We need to move forward. We need to open up discussions. We need to get things done. We can't sit back and criticize. We can't sit back and blame. We need to be proactive. It may be too late to be proactive, but I think that we need to really get out and stop with the impediments, stop with the obstructionist views and move forward and until we do we are in -- we are going to create more and

more crisis for the city and at some point in time, as it was said to me, at some point in time the banks are just going to stop and say, "We've had enough."

And when that happens then maybe we are looking at bankruptcy, and personally I'm not in favor of the city going bankrupt. I don't know think that that's an alternative, I don't think that the state sees it as an alternative for us, we need to work out our own problems. We as council persons, we as an administration, we need to solve our own problems. We can't go looking for anyone to do it for us.

And as far as the thing that have been mentioned about the Recovery Plan and about things, I agree with some of the things that have been said. I'm not sure that a commuter tax is the panacea for, you know, our problems. We have talked here on numerous occasions it's been mentioned about turning businesses away from the city.

If we implement a commuter tax what new businesses are going to move to the city if they know that they are -- you know,

possibly many of their employees would, you know, be subject to this commuter tax? I think it's an impediment to new businesses. I don't think that new businesses will move out because of it, but I think we have just put another impediment in the way of businesses moving to the say.

I'm not saying that maybe the commuter tax is a bad thing, I'm just saying I think it needs to be looked at and investigated and, you know, more than just saying it's a demand that we must have this in place if we are going to have a Recovery Plan.

I just think there are a lot of things that need to be discussed and I think that in the coming weeks we need to do that more openly and more efficiently until we come to a mutually agreeable plan for the future, and that's all. Thank you.

MR. HUGHES: If I could briefly respond, Mr. Chairman, on two issues. First of all, the fact that -- I don't know who sold the cages, but in accordance with the Home Rule Charter no city asset can be sold

without the permission of the council. It has to be by appropriate legislation. If they thought it was scrap, it had to come by law to council to be approved. It was sold illegal in contravention of the Home Rule Charter, number one.

Number two, I gave an opinion on this when the Recreation Authority attempted to lease Nay Aug to Lackawanna College for 100 years, that could only be done with legislation approved by council, so that any asset that's sold, I don't care if it was the cages, I don't know what that scrap was worth, anybody that made that decision legislation should have been approved and should have came to council to determine did they want to destroy that and just have the shell of a building there without the cages.

Secondly, the banks, if they have the best interest of the city at their heart they should be putting the pressure on the Scranton Parking Authority. The Scranton Parking Authority is the one that gives us legislation that they want \$1.4 million without any identification as to where it's

going to go, what bond payment is coming up for payment, what their funds are in their sinking funds. I wrote that letter seven months ago. Seven months ago. Haven't even had a one-word reply that any of the items we requested.

As I said at the last meeting, they gave us a Mickey Mouse budget, it was rejected by council and what have they done for the last five months? They have done nothing but thumbed their nose at us, and I believe that this council would act inappropriately, and I would recommend against any ordinance that with approve any money to the Parking Authority without a specific designation as to what bond fund is going to be in default, was the insurance company given notice as it required in the bond fund, what the balances are in the sinking funds in order to make that payment.

They just -- it's just like a panhandler sitting on the corner and you want to give them a \$10 bill and he said, "Don't give me any money, give me your check. Just sign the check so I can fill it

in."

And to this day I don't know if I would recommend that council not even put legislation on for the Parking Authority until my letter is answered and until Scopelliti comes before this council and answers those questions and we have a budget that we know is a legitimate budget and not something that's just drawn up on the back of a piece of paper.

And that's where -- that's where these banks should be putting the pressure on the Parking Authority. If they are going to go in default and they don't have the money, now, the banks don't have it, it's only the bond -- it's only the bonding trustee, they can put that pressure on them.

I even requested seven months ago when they were crying that they are going to go in default, and they wanted council to put it in the budget, I said, "Have you given notice to the insurance companies that are insuring those bonds?"

They could have written back in accordance with question five of your

letter, "No." Or "Yes."

I mean, they are just playing to council for their own benefit, and it's the banks that should be putting the pressure on the Parking Authority and not on council.

I think as they say in the movies, it's a rogue agency. It's out there on its own doing what they want to do.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you for your response to what I said and, once again, we get involved in criticism of the banking community and we are reliant on them for, you, know moving forward with a lot of things and I think the more criticism we level at the banking community the more difficult it is going to be to do business with them. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Mr. Rogan, do you have any motions or comments?

MR. ROGAN: Yes. I guess I'll start also with the Parking Authority. I agree with what Attorney Hughes said last week and this week and Mr. McGowan did send out an e-mail to all of council and I want to read a little bit of what was included in this

e-mail. First I'll start with the section that was in bold and specifically addresses the Scranton Parking Authority. It states, "The contingency funds for the Scranton Parking Authority were set aside in the 2012 budget as by city council. The transfer must be completed or the Scranton Parking Authority will default on their June 1, 2012, debt service payment."

First of all, as business administrator I think Mr. McGowan should know this, money in a contingency fund is not earmarked for any specific purpose. That money is not earmarked to pay the Scranton Parking authority. When the mayor issued and sent his budget to council there was I believe it was \$1.4 million earmarked for the Parking Authority. Council took it up because we knew by passing a budget with money earmarked for an authority it would be signed away. We would have no recourse. There would not be a vote on whether to give the money to the authority if that was placed as a line item in the budget. budget would have been the final vote and

they would have got the money.

Instead, council placed it into contingency, which gave us control over those funds to withdraw the money out of the fund from council.

Mr. McGowan goes on stressing how important it is that we protect the authority, and obviously it's not up to Mr. McGowan or his boss, who has almost single-handily bankrupted the city, we are broke. We do not have the \$4 million to give to an authority, and especially we are not going to give money to an authority when we can't get the head of the authority to come in and at least make a case of why they need the funds.

Additionally, the budget they submitted was worse than a high school class president's budget. It was three pages.

Something that could have been drafted in ten minutes. I wish I had a copy of it here to show to everyone. It was a joke.

In the same e-mail from Mr. McGowan he speaks about Blue Cross and health care and the amount that's owed. He goes onto

say, "From numerous discussions that have taken place in the past few months each of you are fully aware we must become current with Blue Cross in the near future or we risk having no health care for 1,300 individuals. This is a risk that I am not willing to take."

I agree with Mr. McGowan. I'm not willing to take that risk either. Let's use the funds in the contingency fund to pay for health care for our employees instead of bailing out the Parking Authority. He states, "The city currently has \$574,000 in the general fund and a balance of approximately \$3.5 million in accounts payable."

He goes onto talk about these funds and where they should be used -- or he goes on, you know, saying that we need the unfunded debt for this while we have money sitting in contingency. Now, I think the reason for a contingency fund is for an emergency. City employees losing health care certainly is an emergency, so maybe that's something that should be considered

by the mayor and Mr. McGowan, if we are on the brink of losing this health care coverage.

Moving on, I was reading the
Wilkes-Barre city's Citizens' Voice who was
also having issues with parking, and it says
were there is a value on Wilkes-Barre
parking assets. "Wilkes-Barre Parking
Authority will discover today whether it's
\$20 million prospect for a 30-year lease of
parking garages, lots and meters is
realistic and that the discovery could have
a big impact on whether or not the lease
moves forward. Parking Consultant
Associates released the value of 30 to 50
year leases this afternoon."

This is something that members of council have been saying over and over again, that we could lease the parking garages as a way to bring in revenue for the Parking Authority. Approximately \$20 million is the estimate on the lease. And the best part about a lease is when the lease is over you still own it. Our mayor wanted to sell our parking meters for \$6

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

million to the Authority. Six million dollars in our pocket and then they are gone. We never receive another dime for them.

I don't support leasing the meters, but I do support leasing the garages, but you are not bringing in money, just another thing that the authority should be looking into.

And I find it very arrogant for Mr. Scopelliti and Mr. McGowan to come to council requesting \$1.4 million, more money than most of us here will ever see in our lifetime, and won't even come to city council and explain what it's needed for. Won't come here and explain why his salary, I believe it's around \$80,000, more than almost everyone in this city makes, why his salary is set where it is, what he has been doing to try to tighten the budget and take control of his own house, because the most frustrating part about an authority for all of us up here we don't have any oversight. We don't make the appointments to the authority, the mayor does, and we don't have

any control. The mayor appoints his people to the authority and it is his right to appoint those people and then they do what the mayor wants them to do and that's why we are in the shape we are in.

Moving onto some of the comments that Mr. McGoff made. I was just wondering did the flooding on Cameron Avenue come up at all in your conversations with Mr. Dougher?

MR. MCGOFF: I did not ask him.

MR. ROGAN: How about Pike Street?

MR. MCGOFF: He said that -- he said that they are making some repairs to Pike Street and that they are trying to determine how best to make more permanent repairs to Pike Street.

MR. ROGAN: That's good news. And I also reached out to PennDOT concerning drainage issues on Keyser Avenue that is state owned and PennDOT will be addressing that, so at least that part of it is moving in the right direction.

The potholes that are forming above the golf course lot, those letters were sent

might have been last summer.

MR. MCGOFF: I did not get into specific --

MR. ROGAN: Okay.

MR. MCGOFF: -- spots as far as potholes were concerned. What he did say was that they have a list of requests, that they are moving on those requests as they can.

MR. ROGAN: Mrs. Krake, I will e-mail these to you tomorrow so we could submit these again.

Next, I guess I'll speak on some of the comments Mr. McGoff had on the Recovery Plan, some that I strongly agree with, some that I disagree with. As far as the conversation being open and public, I could not agree more. When we initially went to put our suggestions in for the Recovery Plan we were all asked to submit them in writing and council president would distribute them to everyone, which I did, I submitted mine in writing, and I was hopeful, and I think many of us were hopeful, that council as a whole, the mayor, PEL, DCED and all the

parties involved would sit down and talk.

That has not happened. Because of the

Sunshine Law, three of us cannot meet during
the day. We could have a caucus right here
before a council meeting. We could schedule
a special meeting to have everyone here and
discuss. Personally, I would like it to be
televised and open to a public. If that's a
sticking point, that the meeting is not
going to happen because of it, just open it
up to the public and have a meeting.

MR. MCGOFF: May I just --

MR. ROGAN: Sure.

MR. MCGOFF: PEL had requested to come here for a caucus and they have been denied.

MR. ROGAN: Well, I'll say that no one ever asked me whether I supported it or denied it.

MR. MCGOFF: I know.

MR. ROGAN: I do support having them come in. I think PEL has been doing a terrible job over the past years, but I'm willing to sit down with them and listen to what they have to say and I think it's part

of our jobs, we all have to.

Again, with the mayor, I don't agree with the mayor's philosophy on a lot of things, but I'm willing to sit down and talk if we can get an agreement. That hasn't happened.

You know, I know it was reported in the paper that Mrs. Evans and the mayor have been working together, that's great, but there is five people on council not one.

Moving on to another issue is the agenda items. I am going to make a motion to table Item 7-A. Before I do that I do want to speak a little bit on the reasoning. In the past, Mayor Doherty did come to council to give a pitch for borrowing and that was when he had more favorable council he was still willing to come and give the pitch. I think that we are not doing a service to the community unless we are waiting -- unless we have the people come in here and if we have to wait another week to get them in, fine, but we need to know what the mayor's plan is in moving forward.

One of my biggest problems with the

21

22

23

24

25

it's borrowing and a tax increase, which I staunchly oppose, but that it's not the end of the line. This does not address -- this doesn't even touch the union awards. don't even have a dollar amount yet of how much we owe. This decision was rendered half a year ago, maybe even longer, and we still don't have a dollar amount on how much This borrowing isn't going to do we owe. anything to save the city, you know, and I know people say, well, if we don't get it the city is going to shut down, this is going to happen and this is going to happen, but we pass this we are going to be in the same situation six months, a year from now when the union -- with the money that's owed to the unions. If we are going to borrow to address

two agenda items tonight, one in Sixth Order

and one in Seventh Order, not only that's

If we are going to borrow to address a hole you do it all at once and never do it again. You dig your way out. You don't dig out of a hole by keep digging. That's part of the problem with the federal government, state, local, we see it everywhere. We

can't afford to keep borrowing.

Additionally, in the past councils have been accused of being rubber stamp councils. I tend to agree with that sentiment that was made, but if this council who ran against rubber stamping of borrowing, tax increases, more debt for the people, if we voted without the mayor even coming in here or speaking to us, we are actually worse than the people we replaced.

That being said, I will make a motion -- I would like to make a motion to table Item 7-A until Mayor Doherty is willing to come in and speak to the residents and council.

MR. LOSCOMBE: May I address our solicitor?

MR. JOYCE: Yes, you may.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Attorney Hughes --

MR. ROGAN: A motion has been made.

Can we deal with that first?

MR. JOYCE: A motion has been made, all in favor --

MR. HUGHES: There has to be a second.

MR. JOYCE: Oh, sorry. Is there a second for the motion to table Item 7-A?

 $\label{eq:mr.mcgoff:} \text{MR. MCGOFF:} \quad \text{I'll second it so we} \\ \text{can discuss it.}$

MR. JOYCE: On the question?

MR. LOSCOMBE: On the question, what I had addressed Attorney Hughes about was what impact would this have in the immediate, and also, as Mr. McGoff stated that he had spoken to some bankers that said this is a moot point until we have a Recovery Plan anyway, would that be the case?

MR. HUGHES: First of all, whatever the banker's say is strictly hearsay in a Court of law. I take it with a grain of salt, number one.

Number two, in my reading of the ordinance it says that the city will have -- I don't have the exact words, I don't have the ordinance with me, it says that the city will have a Recovery Plan. There is nothing in the ordinance that requires the adoption of a new Recovery Plan. The city right now has a Recovery Plan in place so,

therefore, in my opinion, it meets the requirements -- the ordinance as set forth and what the city has in place on the Recovery Plan meets the requirements of the ordinance which is the condition of M & T for funding.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. HUGHES: I don't have it me, I wish I had the exact language because I went over it, there is nothing in there that says the city must adopt a new Recovery Plan, must adopt amendments to the Recovery Plan, it just says the city will have a Recovery Plan in place. Mrs. Krake just handed it to me, if you give me a second I'll find it.

MR. MCGOFF: While Attorney
Hughes -- if you don't mind while Attorney
Hughes is looking for that, I don't believe
that we should table this. I believe it's
something that we need to do to move
forward. Is it a final solution? No.
Obviously, it's not. But it is a step
toward the solution. If we don't take the
step then, again, all we are doing is being
stagnant and we need to keep moving forward

2

3

5

6 7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with addressing this problem.

As far as the Court awards for the unions, no, there is no figure as of yet. It was the unions that were compiling that number and presenting it to the city and I think when the city receives that number they are going to do their due diligence in auditing those numbers to determine whether it is acceptable, you know, I don't think that we are just going to -- I don't think that the city should just take whatever number the union gives them and says, okay, this is what the award is, I think there is probably a bit more to the process of determining what those numbers will be before we actually arrive at a final number, so I don't think that you can address something for which you don't have a final number and I don't think that should -- I don't think that should hinder you from taking action on issues.

Will there be a necessity for some action when that final number is achieved?

Yes. But again, that's something to look at in the future, and I think that we need to

deal with the unfunded debt now.

MR. ROGAN: I would just reply, and I do appreciate a second so we could discuss, I don't believe borrowing any amount of money that doesn't address the need that is there currently is a step forward. It's a step backwards. We are going to be increasing our debt, which will make us even less attractive to a bank in the future. You can use credit -- you can only run the credit card through the machine so many times.

Additionally, and I agree that the union shouldn't be taken at its word when given a dollar amount to the administration, I guess it's what you owe, but I think it would be the job of the business administrator to calculate the figure, not the union. The union won the award. It was the city's wrongdoing. The union shouldn't be forced to calculate it.

MR. MCGOFF: They are not being forced to, they have volunteered to. It's their award, they said this is what is going to be owed to us.

MR. ROGAN: If they are willing to help with calculating the figure that's great, but ultimately it's the administration that should be calculating the award --

MR. LOSCOMBE: Or at least concurring.

MR. MCGOFF: Either way it works it's going to be a process to arrive at a final number. Neither side is going to accept what is presented. I think they are trying to do that to get to a final number, it's just not going to be something that is done tomorrow.

MR. ROGAN: Well, it's been over six months, and if my understanding is correct we are paying interest each day it goes by, so the dollar amount gets higher and higher. By borrowing this money, more interest, more fees and to boot we didn't -- I didn't want to bring this up yet because this is another item on the agenda, it's paid for by a 10 percent tax increase over ten years. It's a very long period of time. You know, we are asking a lot out of the residents.

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And another concern I have with the tax increase, and I don't know if anyone can answer this, would it be a separate line item on the budget or would it be included with the real estate taxes?

MR. JOYCE: I believe it would be included with the real estate taxes and then it would be separately sorted out by the Treasurer's Office.

MR. ROGAN: And again, and this is another piece of legislation, but the two of them are tied in together, you don't have the tax increase without the borrowing, my fear is if it's passed, and I'm hoping it doesn't, if council passes a 10 percent tax increase for ten years it doesn't automatically go away on their own here, and we know government has a habit of initiating one time taxes and keeping them. federal government, the state government, local governments, they have all done it, so I don't even believe that the tax increase would only be ten years because then whoever is on council and the mayor ten years from now would have to rescind that tax. Ιt

doesn't automatically expire until the debt is paid off, so there may be a tax of 100 years because there is no end date. If the tax increase is specifically to pay for the borrowing it should expire the date the parking is paid.

Getting back to the motion, and I apologize I did get a little bit off track, I do believe that council should not vote on any borrowing until we all meet. The business administrator, the mayor, all five members of council, and other interested parties, the public, should certainly be invited to attend and I would like to hear the mayor's thoughts on why this is the only way, why there is no other way to address the financial problems in the city. I am not willing to accept that increased borrowing and increased taxes is the only way.

MR. JOYCE: Regarding the question,
I just wanted to ask our council solicitor
one question regarding the -- I know it came
up with the Supreme Court award, in a
typical situation such as this, I know that

you've worked with -- and I'm sure you have worked with settlements and what not and decisions, is it typical in a union versus municipality situation such as this where the unions won an award that they would come up with a figure and the city would then audit those figures?

MR. HUGHES: I don't know what's typical, but I don't think anything in this city between the city and the unions is typical, so I don't know why the union is figuring it, I could see where they would figure it and the city would also figure it, the administration, and if they come to different figures then they would have to compromise. I don't see why it's taken six months, you know.

And just relying on the union to calculate it, I think the administration should be calculating it and come up with a figure and then they meet with union if the union have a different figure, I mean, but this is what the figure is.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I agree with

2

3

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Solicitor Hughes, especially if there is interest building up every day. You think the city would be interested in getting this behind them.

MR. HUGHES: I mean, to me it's -well, it really isn't rocket science, it's really computer science. I mean, somebody sits down, you have a calculation, you have a program, you throw it through a computer, I don't know what's taking six months. mean, there is a lot of variables. haven't seen the award. I have no idea what it is, but certainly, you know, you have actuaries, you have people that they can program this, put all the variables in, these people are in for so long, they get this much, they're retired, this guy died, he is out, boom, boom, he would have got this. I mean, all of these variables can be calculated in a formula. You run it through a computer.

And I really think that, you know, as Pat says that what's that unfunded liability? Why are we voting on debt until we know what the full thing is, but, I mean,

that's my opinion. But, I mean, I really think that by now, you know, somebody should have had -- somebody should have calculated from the administration standpoint and the union should certainly have something by now, I don't see why it's taken six months. That's my opinion, but I don't think it's typical.

MR. ROGAN: Getting back to the motion to table, I would just ask that my colleagues would consider in tabling this borrowing and next week if the borrowing is tabled the tax increase as well until we meet with the mayor, hear him out and look the every other option that may be available.

MR. MCGOFF: I think that that was the purpose of having a caucus with the business administrator and the bond counselor and the financial advisor. We had them in here for over an hour and half.

MR. ROGAN: In that caucus we only talked about the specifics of the bond issues because there were so many different complexities.

MR. MCGOFF: That's what we talked about was the unfunded debt and how we can move forward with it. You are asking for us to redo what we have already done.

MR. ROGAN: I'm not asking to redo as far as, you know, they came in and explained their proposal, you know, it was very confusing and I give Attorney Hughes a lot of credit for helping explain it, but why does it have to be borrowing? Why can't we sell a city asset like the Sewer Authority? It could be valued at tens of millions of dollars that I have been bringing up for the two years I have been on council. Why does council have to be forced to bail out the mayor?

MR. MCGOFF: We are going to go back and forth and we can go back and forth on this forever, but all of the things that you are mentioning, you know, sale of the sewer catch basins and so on, things have been suggested for the Recovery Plan.

MR. ROGAN: I suggested that.

MR. MCGOFF: The unfunded debt is something that we included in the 2012

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

budget. We have already voted to do this.

Now all we are doing is approving the process. You know, as far as I'm concerned we are looking to -- you are looking to undo something that we already voted -- that you already voted for.

MR. ROGAN: When you have a budget, when you have two options, one that raises taxes, I don't know remember what it was, I think it was 25 percent of the mayor's budget --

MR. JOYCE: It was 29 percent.

MR. ROGAN: One that raises taxes 29 percent, one that raises it 5 percent, it's a pretty clear decision to make. Did I like everything in the budget? No. I have stated, I believe it was a few weeks ago, that in the future amendments should be voted on item by item. It will make for a very long meeting, but I think each council should be able to have a say on each individual thing and we have already against -- I'm not sure there were many things in there that you did support that you could have voiced our support because it's one

vote on a block of a set of amendments instead of line item. I have said my peace. Let's vote on the motion to table, unless anyone else has a question?

MR. JOYCE: Does anyone else have any comments to add? All in favor of the motion to table Item 7-A signify by saying aye.

MR. ROGAN: Aye.

MR. JOYCE: Opposed?

MR. MCGOFF: No.

MR. LOSCOMBE: No.

MR. JOYCE: No. The nos have it and Item 7-A is not tabled.

MR. HUGHES: I have looked through the ordinance, Mr. Chairman, it's not in the ordinance, it's in the placement memorandum. It's a document to be delivered in closing to be certified by the city clerk as true and correct. I believe it's in the document. Mrs. Krake was going to go get the case memorandum, I believe it's article -- it's like Article 12-G, it might be 12-G-10 document, something like that. I was just going from memory from a couple of

weeks ago, but it's not in the ordinance, it's in the placement memorandum about the copy of the Recovery Plan, which there's a Recovery Plan in place, so it's my opinion it qualifies.

MR. ROGAN: I guess I had a few other things I wanted to mention tonight, I don't want to hold up the whole meeting for other issues that could wait until next week, so there are a few things, I will save them until next week, and I will hold the remainder of my comments for when we vote.

MR. JOYCE: Mr. Loscombe, do you have any motions or comments?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Just a few comments.

I agree with lot of what you said,

Mr. Rogan. This is probably one of the most difficult votes that we have had to make as council persons. We did have the caucus here where a lot of this was explained. As far as selling an asset, I mean, that's still on the table. Perhaps we can do something like that and get rid of this debt at that point. What I'm afraid of right now is the payless paydays, the health insurance

default and the stuff like that. You know, I don't want to pay more taxes no more than anyone else, but I think our back is against the wall.

As Mr. McGoff stated earlier, the city is in dire straights. We are in dire straights. The problem is -- and also, you know, about pushing for a Recovery Plan and he suggested that we had demands in there, well, the problem is we are in dire straights, our back is against the wall, but we have been here a little over two years. We didn't create the mess that has accumulated over 12 years. I can't imagine if we didn't tighten the purse strings two years ago where we would be at this point. It's very frustrating.

But the demands that -- if you want to call them demands, our requests that we put into this Recovery Plan, were basically to protect the taxpayers. We have a history of PEL and the Recovery Plan and this administration with the Recovery Plan and it's not a pretty history. That's why we are here. That's why we are at this point.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I mean, you can call those last few Recovery Plans mock Recovery Plans because they didn't abide them, only certain parts, and that's what we are afraid of. If we are going to make this city fiscally sound, you could call them demands or whatever they are, but they are in -- PEL is in this city working for us. And, yes, we are demanding that they start paying attention to the taxpayers of this city. That's what they are and if you want to call them demands, fine. They are requests to protect the public and the taxpayers so that the stuff that's been going on doesn't continue to happen and bury us deeper, that's what they are.

I mean, I'm as frustrated as many of the taxpayers that spoke here tonight and our regular speakers. Mr. Jackowitz, you know, if I was on the other side of the podium I would be just like him. I get frustrated here and I think people see it sometimes.

Mr. Sbaraglia, I have to agree with you, anyone that has been on these

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

authorities and boards that have put them at a point where they are bankrupt or overlooking opportunities to help themselves out they don't belong there and I would ask for them to leave or resign definitely.

That's a no brainer. Any company, like you said, that has a board of trustees or whatever if that company is going downhill they are out the door. We have to get people in there that are going to protect your interests and that my response on that to Mr. Sbaraglia.

Mr. Miller, I do agree the mayor should be here and he has got to come here. We have to get together and he has to be just like he came once before for large borrowing, the problem is we are at the 11th hour now and we can't jeopardize this, but he has to come here and answer to us and the taxpayers. He is the head of this city. Не has to answer where we are going in the He has to do his state of Scranton future. address to the public, the taxpayers, not an invited group, and we have said that many times here, but you could see he continues

to be the same ole', same ole'.

We have got directors of the different departments that are unresponsive. Mr. McGoff said he spoke to Mr. Dougher. But, you know, we did ask Mr. Dougher to respond to us for a caucus, did he mention he would be here for a caucus or anything?

MR. MCGOFF: That request was for when, I'm not sure?

MR. LOSCOMBE: At his availability before a meeting.

MR. ROGAN: About the flooding on Keyser Avenue.

MR. LOSCOMBE: There is several issues, yeah.

 $\label{eq:mr.mcgoff:} \text{MR. MCGOFF:} \quad \text{I did not ask him about}$ that.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Okay. And the
Recreation Authority, as Mr. Hughes
expressed before, first of all, before I get
into some of this stuff about the Recreation
Authority I do want -- can we initiate some
kind of investigation, I think a legal
investigation or a police investigation on a
removal of that equipment? Would that be

done through our police department or requested through the District Attorney's Office? Do you have any opinion on that? That's theft of city property.

MR. HUGHES: First let me look into it. I know the section of the Home Rule Charter that says before any city asset is sold it must be approved by council. Let me find that.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Okay.

MR. HUGHES: Then the thing is that who made the decision? I mean, somebody had to be there with the acetylene torches. I was on the zoological society for many years, I'm very familiar with the zoo. I loved the zoo when we had lions, tigers, elephants --

MR. MCGOFF: And bears.

MR. HUGHES: -- everything, but I was on it during that period, had many fund raises for it and we raised more money out of Luzerne County than we did Lackawanna County to keep the zoo open, but let me take a look at it because I don't know how they could dismantle it and what happened to it

2

4

5 6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

but just before we go off and do anything

let me come up with an opinion on it, okay,

please?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Okay. I definitely think it should be investigated, it is city property, no one was notified and someone profited from it definitely, and I did notice in the legal ads on May 11 requests for sealed quotes, Scranton Municipal Recreation Authority for professional services, and I'm just curious to what this In the lower body it says, "The Nay is for. Aug Park improvements, 1900 Mulberry Street, Scranton, Pennsylvania, 18510. The quote must be divided into three consecutive phases that provide all required professional services from planning to final inspection at project completion. This will include preliminary park planning, construction documents, construction support services. Anthony Maranucci, President."

Now, I'm just curious that they're seeking bids for park improvements? I thought the park was improved over the past few years. We have many parks out there

right now that are falling apart.

Obviously, this is dichotomous because it's the Rec Authority and they handle Nay Aug, but at the same time they are charging -- they have money to spend for studies like this and consultants, yet, they are charging children to swim up there.

MR. MCGOFF: May I respond to part of that?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.

MR. MCGOFF: I believe that either the city or the authority received I think it's a \$50,000 grant that's project specific that was written through the Parks and Recreation and that is where the funding is for the project that is out on proposal.

MR. LOSCOMBE: So it probably cost more than that 50 for a consultant. I would think they would just take that grant and dump some piles like they did originally that cost us \$700,000 and placed some grass on it. I'll consult them for \$5.

MR. MCGOFF: I would suggest that if you are that concerned that you go and find the RFP which should explain what work is

going to be done.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I just happened to see this in the paper, they are supposed to send stuff to us, aren't they? We have asked them to respond here to meetings, they haven't yet.

At the same token, since we are discussing the Rec Authority, they are an authority and they run Nay Aug, on that insurance policy are we are actually carrying property at Nay Aug, too. That should be something that they paid the insurance on, and speaking of that, have we ever received a response from the Library Authority or Knowels Associates regarding the insurance questions that we sent them on overpayments of buildings that are not insured by the city that are owned by the authorities? We haven't received anything on that, have we, Mrs. Krake?

MS. KRAKE: No, we have not.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Well, I would like to have those questions answered, too. And they have a 50,000 grant for Nay Aug, maybe they could use it for swimmers.

MR. MCGOFF: It's project specific.

MR. LOSCOMBE: It's specific you said to a certain program?

MR. MCGOFF: I believe it was a project specific grant.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Well, then whatever project it's specific to they can do it without a consultant, I believe, or I think that, you know, the board of director members may have some experience in the parks. That's my opinion only, excuse me. But, you know, money is going everywhere but where it should go.

We discussed the Parking Authority and Mr. Scopelliti before, and I have to agree with our solicitor and Mr. Rogan's comments on that. They have been given every opportunity for the past couple of years to help themselves out. They have been given advice from council, they have been given opportunities to generate revenue, and they thumb their nose at us. They have provided us with bogus budgets and now their back is against the wall again. If they are autonomous, and this isn't

guaranteed, I would say it's time to show them a lesson, and let this be a lesson to the other authorities that continue to run rough shot. We are all the same taxpaying body. We have to get things under control at this point.

Another issue, Perry Avenue where they wanted to make a park at one time. It's a city-owned property. Well, the grass is up over the knees right now so I'm glad they didn't transform it into a park or they wouldn't be able to play in there as it is, but that is a city park, and I will get Mrs. Krake to request that the city maintain it. It is a city property.

The other day we had several flooding issues. We have had heavy rains, but it seems, you know, we spent a lot of money on flooding programs in the city, the river flooding and the stream flooding, yet, we continue to ignore the storm water flooding from the heavy rains. The same neighborhoods, the same people are getting inundated time after time after time and some of them -- some of the problems have

simple solutions. As a laymen, I could see that. Some of them are much more complicated and may cost us some money, but I believe at this point these people that are living under these conditions have to see some resolution, and I think it's going to take a meeting with the Sewer Authority, our Department of Public Works, our city engineer, PennDOT, and any of us that are interested in being involved and resolving this resolution once and for all.

I mean, my phone rings off the hook every time it rains. I'm usually out on the road checking those areas anyway. I have probably 120 pictures in my camera from the same areas that constantly flood. And again, like I said, probably 30 to 40 percent of those we could alleviate the problem very simply, very cost effectively. Some of the problems are going to take some engineering and some other solutions, but that's what we are here for. That's what our departments are supposed to be doing.

But I'm going to try and setup a meeting with all of these officials that I

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

had mentioned and try and resolve this and if any possible way I would like to have it public so those that are affected could come here and voice their concerns and I will be working on that.

Paving issues, those are regular issues.

Lastly, Mrs. Schumacher, regarding the police issue, it's not the same thing as Old Forge because Old Forge has been -- the District Attorney and the state police have become involved and they have opened up. With the city situation, they determined there were no criminal charges relegating it back it our police chief to do his own internal investigation and determine what his decision would be, and since it's an internal investigation and it is a human -under personnel issue I am legally not liable to mention any names, because there have been no criminal complaints or no Pardon me? criminal charges.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Next week.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Well, I am only telling you -- I'm not the police chief, I'm

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not the mayor, I'm only a city councilman handling the public safety. I don't get paid for it like the chief does, I don't get paid for it like the mayor does. I can only do what I can legally do in my position. am not at liberty to mention any names, all I can tell you is that police officer was brought back to the rank of patrolman and that's all I can tell you. I apologize. would like to stand here and scream it out myself, but I'm not going to take -- get myself involved in a Court case for something that I have no control over. it's a personnel issue and it's not criminal issue, it's out of my hands and that's actually the result of it.

But, you know, if you have any further questions you can go see Chief Duffy the mayor and see if he will provide you with anymore information, but that's all I have at this point. I probably have a lot more, but --

MR. HUGHES: If I could,

Mr. Chairman, it's not in the ordinance,

it's in the placement agreement, and the

first one is under Article 8-C, "At the time of closing, the Act 47 plan shall be approved by the city and shall be in full force and effect and shall not have been amended, modified or supplemented."

Now, there is a Recovery Plan in place. Then they go to, that's 8-C, you go to 8-G-3, "The most recent Act 47 plan certified to be an appropriate -- certified by an appropriate officer of the city as having been duly approved and adopted by the city council and the mayor."

There is one in effect, so there is nothing in here about any type of amendment, so the city has met all of the conditions of the placement agreement and of the ordinance because this is a document that has to done, so anybody that's trying to say there has to be a new Recovery Plan, there is no contractual commitment on behalf of the city that that's true.

However, there is one thing in here, and it's article 8-G-11, this is a condition of the closing, "A copy of the rating letter from Standard and Poors Corporation

assigning the city an underlying rating of BB minus or higher," well, BB minus is a junk bond that's not investment grade, cannot be put in any trust agreement in Pennsylvania by any fiduciary so that would be the status of the city's bond. It would be a junk bond in financial parlance. I have nothing further.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I just failed, and I did want to thank -- last week I was critical of an employee of the DPW, but I do want to thank them through all this rainstorm they were out there, the DPW workers and the Sewer authority, trying to do what they could with the situation that we had at hand, and there was a mudslide up on West Mountain on the road, that was actually removed the next day, so I want to thank them for that, also.

You know, often we're critical about different situations, but I do want to thank them when they are due a thank you. That's all. Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: First of all tonight, I just want to say I'm really flabbergasted by

the Parking Authority and their Director
Mr. Scopelliti. I have been asked in an
e-mail through Ryan McGowan whether
legislation was going on the agenda for the
\$1.4 million to be withdrawn from the
contingency.

First of all, the business administrator should know that I don't have the authority to place legislation on the agenda and to not place legislation on the agenda. That's something only the council president can do. But let me just say this, you are looking for \$1.4 million out of the contingency fund, and this is the letter that went to Mr. Scopelliti.

"Dear Mr. Scopelliti, Scranton City
Council requests your attendance a public
caucus to be held in council chambers prior
to it's weekly meeting. Before the caucus
can be scheduled, you must fully respond to
Attorney Hughes' letter to you of October
27, 2011, which is months ago, which was
nearly seven months ago, to which these have
never been responded.

You must produce all documents

requested and submitted in accordance with the budget set forth in Item 7, the letter, except that for the budget use actual figures to December 31, 2011. All copies of the documents and figures requested to date must be updated to the date of your response. Before any meeting is scheduled with could council, all of the documentation requested in the budget must be submitted to council at least one week prior to scheduling a public caucus.

Since the Scranton Parking Authority is currently operating without an approved budget, the budget must be properly and adequately prepared for the supporting financial documentation it can be placed on the council's agenda for adoption.

Council must adopt the Scranton

Parking Authority budget for 2012 before it

will consider an ordinance to provide

funding to the Parking Authority."

Now, let me ask you this, if you sitting out there and, you know, you are wondering, you are the executive director of the Parking Authority, you get this letter,

you have a \$1.4 million obligation to pay, I think that the first thing you would want to do is get this done. I don't understand why Mr. Scopelliti, and maybe I'm mistaken, has Mr. Scopelliti provided any correspondence to this office?

MS. KRAKE: No.

MR. JOYCE: I don't understand how they could be suggesting that we just hand them a check for \$1.4 million when they won't even appear to say exactly what it's going for. And correct me if I'm wrong, does anyone know exactly what this is -- what the \$1.4 million is going to pay?

MR. HUGHES: No. It was just the ordinance came down with \$1.4 million. It's giving money to a drunken sailor. It's like, you know, it's falling into a black hole in space over in the corner of Washington and Linden Street.

MR. JOYCE: And, you know, after reading this letter that was sent out from the office I can understand why legislation hasn't been placed on the agenda. Though I have no authority to say what goes on the

agenda and what does not go on the agenda, I wouldn't place it on the agenda unless I had the required information either. I think I think it's mandatory that they submit the budget and they tell us exactly what they are going to pay with the \$1.4 million.

Now, over the past meeting or two there has been a good deal of dialogue regarding unfunded debt borrowing as well as refinancing over the past three meetings.

Now, I'm going to try to take this time and clear this the air and shed some light on the few things regarding the legislation on the agenda tonight, Item 6-A and Item 7-A.

First, regarding the unfunded borrowing, it was not council's original idea to engage in unfunded borrowing. This was advised by PEL and the administration confirmed as well. Council in 2011 unknowingly -- or into 2011 unknowingly that the 2010 was not yet paid. This was not included as a part of the 2011 budget submitted by the administration, therefore, we started the year with a hole.

Eventually, that hole became what it

was and then council was placed to a legislation that was approved by all council members for the city to petition the Court of Common Pleas -- or Commonwealth Court rather to borrow \$9.85 million because at this time council had no other choice. Our original plan was to borrow against parking meters because one of the suggestions that the administration had was to sell the parking meters for \$6 million, which we didn't approve of.

Now, the city was granted permission for the unfunded borrowing and by the Court and at the same time the Court order that there must be a Court mandated millage increase to cover the cost of the unfunded borrowing, which is the piece of the legislation that you see in 6-A.

Subsequently, and correct me if I'm wrong, Attorney Hughes, if council doesn't approve this millage increase since it was mandated by the Court is it true that we wouldn't be able to engage in the unfunded borrowing?

MR. HUGHES: That's a condition of

2

4

5

6

7

9

10

. .

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the approval of the unfunded borrowing is that there be specific -- that there would be a raising of the taxes or at least a specific amount of the taxes to pay that bond issue for each of the ten years, so even if you approve the borrowing you have to approve the ordinance in accordance with the Court to raise the taxes in accordance with the Court order.

MR. JOYCE: Right.

MR. HUGHES: The two not only go hand in hand, but if they are not approved there is an issue is the city in violation of the Court order. So, I mean, the city went in in order to get approval to borrow, to have this mechanism determined whether the taxes are going to go into an escrow account, and I don't know -- I don't want to state to what you said before, Mr. Chairman might not be correct, but I would believe that since an escrow fund is being established to pay these bonds that that would be a separate line item in the budget. I believe it would be because those monies are not going to be commingled with other

city monies that tax revenue, they are going to be segregated by the tax collector and put into an escrow account to pay those bonds, so I think that would be a separate line item.

But you can't approve the borrowing without approving the raising of the taxes, and as I said last week, it's going to be a question of where that it doesn't mean that the millage is automatically going to go up 10 percent because there were other cuts made in the budget, it's just that that amount to pay these bonds is going to come from the real estate tax revenue.

MR. JOYCE: Right.

MR. HUGHES: And that will be determined later, so that assuming that there is extra revenue that's coming in from other items in the budget and that there is cuts made, it's conceivable that there might not be a tax increase, but that the amount of the real estate taxes that are necessary to pay these bonds is going to be set aside and is going to be escrowed. That's what the legislation is saying.

MR. JOYCE: Right. So you are saying that technically the legislation is saying that it's not a 10 percent increase in taxes, it's a 10 percent separation of taxes for it's --

MR. HUGHES: It might be less from the standpoint that once the bonds are floated and you have an exact figure as to what those payments, principal and interest are going to be, it might be 9 percent, but whatever will be put into escrow, if it is 10 percent, then it would be a surplus in that fund. That's the way that I see it. It will be a surplus in that fund so that the next year, depending on what it is, you would have a carryover and you might not need as much.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

MR. HUGHES: I'm being very optimistic.

MR. JOYCE: Unfortunately, if we are not able to engage in unfunded borrowing the city won't be able to pay it's overdue bills, including employee health care. And costs to run day-to-day operations.

Now, regarding the refinancing of the debt, though the mayor states that this is in their budget, it was in his budget submitted to council on November 15 of last year as well. The refinancing of debt is in the budget for this year, and it's a planned part of the original Recovery Plan sent from PEL for next year as well.

Mayor Doherty stated at the meeting at Fidelity Bank last year that if we refinanced early enough we would be able to save \$6.4 million, which is the amount that the -- the amount of savings that was -- that the budget was amended to. This was also confirmed by PEL.

If refinancing was not a part of the budget for this year, the city would have needed to levy an enormous tax increase on it's residents to make up the difference.

You are looking at \$5 million, that would have been -- that could have been nearly a 50 percent tax increase in one year.

Now, as far as getting the refinancing done early enough, the city was not able to find a lender quick enough to

realize the full savings that could have been part of the refinancing. In fact, it was told to me that banks did not even really want to touch the city, by business administrator Ryan McGowan, and that's why we have this bond issue. We don't just have some regular loan because right now the City of Scranton is in a lot of trouble. We are in a crisis. It's safe to say that and right now this is the only way -- or this is the only lending that we could get.

Now, regarding the Recovery Plan recently I did send various requirements of council to Business administrator Ryan McGowan. I received an e-mail back regarding various issues and he advised me you to alter his spreadsheets that he put together in regard to what the administration already had in regard to the Recovery Plan. There have been a number of meetings that have occurred on the Recovery Plan between primarily myself, Councilwoman Evans, the mayor, and business administrator.

Now, let me make this quite clear,

as a part-time legislator it's not my job to alter spreadsheets. As the business administrator, this is his job to alter any spreadsheets with any suggestions or requirements that we come up with. With the situation that the city is facing, if the administration wants the Recovery Plan revised I suggest they get working fast with council suggestions.

Now, Mrs. Krake, with this in mind can you please contact Mr. McGowan and ask him to alter any spreadsheets with the requirements for the Recovery Plan that I originally sent over.

And that's all and I'll save my other comments for the vote.

MR. HUGHES: Mr. Chairman, if I could and what I said before, and I don't want to take too much time, but in my letter seven months ago to Mr. Scopelliti, and it was very specific, that Item No. 2, "The balances of all funds, included, but not limited to, the debt service account, the sinking fund, the debt service reserve account, the bond redemption improvement

fund, any applicable bond escrow funds for redemption of any bonds held by the trustee, Bank of New York Trust Company, NA, successive trustee of JP Morgan Trust Company, for all of the trust indentures," so that every bond issue they have we would have knowledge and we would have the actual information what the trustee, which is Bank of New York -- or, I'm sorry, the New York Trust Company, has in all of these debt services accounts, the balances.

They can tap these debt services accounts, because that's what they are there for, to make the payments. Now, there is a requirement that if they are going to be in default that they have to give -- there is two bonding companies that are involved in these bonds, Radiant Asset Assurance.

"No. 5, a copy of all documents to Radiant Asset Assurance, Inc., by the SPA or the Bank of New York as required by for supplemental trust indenture between the SPA and Bank of New York at any time since January 6, 2009, to date.

(6) A copy of all documents

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

submitted to Financial Guarantee Insurance Company by the SPA or Bank of New York as required by the third supplemental trust indenture between the SPA and Bank of New York any time since January 1, 2009, to date."

They are the insurance, they are the ones that have given the insurance so those bonds can never be in default. Have they given then notice? So they are saying that they need money on June 1 to make bond payments, right? They have never answered this, so how could you even look at legislation. They could have millions of dollars, well, hundreds -- millions, in these various -- in these various supplemental accounts that are required by the trust indenture that if you are going to be in default they can take out then they've got to replenish it, just like an escrow fund. That's what they are.

Have they given the insurance companies, the two insurance companies, you know, Radiant and Financial Guarantee notice that they are going to be in default. If

they have, you would think they would have sent over the legislation we need \$1.4 million. That's what I said last week, it's like, you know, they are running around Chicken Little, you know, the sky is falling. "We are going to be in default, we are going to be in default."

There is no evidence that they have given us that they are in default, so the only conclusion I can come to they ignore the letter for seven months, they are not going to be in default, they want \$1.4 million for the city for some purpose.

That's Boyd Hughes' opinion.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ JOYCE: And that's all I have for tonight.

MS. KRAKE: Mr. Joyce, before I continue with the rest of the agenda, we have a student here from Scranton Prep which brought it to my mind, would you be so kind as you recall, be able to ask permission to remove our suit coats, since there is no air conditioning working at this time, would it be all right wit the president of council to alter the dress code a little if need be?

	122
1	MR. JOYCE: Yeah. That's fine by
2	me.
3	MS. KRAKE: I'm sure you recall
4	having to do that in class at the meeting?
5	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
6	MS. KRAKE: Thank you very much for
7	that.
8	MR. JOYCE: That's fine.
9	MS. KRAKE: 5-B. ESTABLISHING A NO
10	PARKING ZONE IN THE 900 BLOCK OF NORTH
11	WASHINGTON AVENUE (S.R. 3023) ON THE WESTERN
12	MOST SIDE OF SAID STREET PURSUANT TO THE
13	HIGHWAY OCCUPANCY PERMIT APPLICATION OF THE
14	COMMONWEALTH MEDICAL COLLEGE FROM SR 3023
15	SEGMENT 0090 OFFSET 1000 TO SR 3023 SEGMENT
16	0090 OFFSET 1219 FOR A DISTANCE OF TWO
17	HUNDRED NINETEEN (219) FEET.
18	MR. JOYCE: At this time I'll
19	entertain a motion that Item 5-B be
20	introduced into its proper committee.
21	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
22	MR. MCGOFF: Second.
23	MS. JOYCE: On the question? All
24	those in favor of introduction signify by
25	saying aye.

	123
1	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
2	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
3	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
4	MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
5	have it and so moved.
6	MS. KRAKE: 5-C. AUTHORIZING THE
7	MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS
8	TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO ON BEHALF OF
9	THE CITY OF SCRANTON A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
10	WITH LWA ASSOCIATES LP. RELATED TO THE LAND
11	DEVELOPMENT KNOWN AS LAUREL WOODS WITHIN THE
12	CITY.
13	MR. JOYCE: At this time I'll
14	entertain a motion that Item 5-C be
15	introduced into its proper committee.
16	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
17	MR. MCGOFF: Second.
18	MS. JOYCE: On the question? All
19	those in favor of introduction signify by
20	saying aye.
21	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
22	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
23	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
24	MR. JOYCE: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
25	have it and so moved.

MS. KRAKE: 6-A. READING BY TITLE -1 FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 32, 2012 - AN ORDINANCE 2 - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER 3 APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO LEVY A REAL 4 ESTATE TAX MILLAGE INCREASE FOR A PERIOD OF 5 (10) YEARS DEDICATED TO RETIRING THE 6 UNFUNDED DEBT INCURRED IN CALENDAR YEAR 2012 7 8 IN THE AMOUNT OF NINE MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED 9 FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$9,850,000.00) AND DIRECTING THE CITY TREASURER TO SEPARATE THE 10 PROPER PORTION OF THE REAL ESTATE TAXES 11 12 RECEIVED FROM THE SINGLE TAX OFFICE DURING 13 SUCH TEN (10) YEAR PERIOD AND FORWARD SAME 14 TO A SEPARATE ACCOUNT TO SERVICE AND RETIRE THE UNFUNDED DEBT. 15 16 MR. JOYCE: You've heard reading by 17 title of Item 6-A, what is your pleasure? 18 MR. MCGOFF: I move that Item 6-A 19 pass reading by title. 20 MR. LOSCOMBE: Second. 21 MR. JOYCE: On the question? A11 22 those in favor signify by saying aye. 23 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 24 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 25 MR. JOYCE: Aye.

1 MR. JOYCE: Opposed? 2 MR. ROGAN: No. 3 MR. JOYCE: The ayes have it and so moved. 4 MR. HUGHES: 7-A. FOR CONSIDERATION 5 BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR ADOPTION 6 -FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 31, 2012 - AN ORDINANCE 7 8 OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON, LACKAWANNA COUNTY, 9 PENNSYLVANIA, SETTING FORTH ITS INTENT TO ISSUE ONE OR MORE SERIES OF FEDERALLY 10 TAXABLE AND/OR TAX EXEMPT GENERAL OBLIGATION 11 BONDS OR NOTES OF THE CITY IN AN AGGREGATE 12 PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED TWENTY-SIX 13 14 MILLION SIX HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$26,600,000) (COLLECTIVELY, THE "BONDS") 15 PURSUANT TO THE ACT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY 16 17 OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, PA.C.S. 18 53, CHAPTERS 80-82, AS AMENDED, KNOWN AS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNIT DEBT ACT (THE "ACT"); 19 FINDING THAT A PRIVATE SALE BY NEGOTIATION 20 IS IN THE BEST FINANCIAL INTERESTS OF THE 21 22 CITY: DETERMINING THAT SUCH BONDS SHALL 23 EVIDENCE NONELECTORAL DEBT OF THE CITY: 24 SPECIFYING THAT SUCH INDEBTEDNESS TO BE

INCURRED TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR A CERTAIN

25

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROJECT OF THE CITY CONSISTING OF ALL OR ANY OF THE FOLLOWING: (1) FUNDING UNFUNDED DEBT OF THE CITY; (2) REFUNDING A PORTION OF THE CITY'S OUTSTANDING GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS. SERIES A OF 2003; (3) REFUNDING A PORTION OF THE CITY'S OUTSTANDING GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, SERIES B OF 2003; (4) REFUNDING A PORTION OF THE CITY'S OUTSTANDING FEDERALLY TAXABLE GENERAL OBLIGATION PENSION FUNDING BONDS, SERIES C OF 2003; (5) REFUNDING A PORTION OF THE CITY'S OUTSTANDING FEDERALLY TAXABLE GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS. SERIES D OF 2003; AND (6) FUNDING NECESSARY RESERVES AND PAYING THE COSTS AND EXPENSES OF ISSUANCE OF THE BONDS: SETTING FORTH THE REASONABLE ESTIMATED USEFUL LIVES OF THE CAPITAL PROJECTS THAT ARE TO BE FINANCED AND REFINANCED BY THE BONDS; ACCEPTING A PROPOSAL FOR THE PURCHASE OR ARRANGEMENT OF THE PRIVATE PLACEMENT OF SUCH BONDS AT PRIVATE SALE BY NEGOTIATION TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS. QUALIFIED INSTITUTIONAL BUYERS AND/OR ACCREDITED INVESTORS; PROVIDING THAT SUCH BONDS, WHEN ISSUED, SHALL CONSTITUTE A GENERAL OBLIGATION OF THE CITY; FIXING THE

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DENOMINATIONS, SERIES DESIGNATIONS, DATED

DATE, INTEREST PAYMENT DATES, MATURITY

DATES, INTEREST RATES, REDEMPTION

PROVISIONS, OPTIONAL AND MANDATORY

REDEMPTION PROVISIONS (IF APPLICABLE) AND

PLACE OF PAYMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL OF AND

INTEREST ON SUCH BONDS; AUTHORIZING

SPECIFIED OFFICERS OF THE CITY TO CONTRACT

WITH THE PAYING AGENT FOR ITS SERVICES

IN CONNECTION WITH THE BONDS; SETTING FORTH

THE SUBSTANTIAL FORM OF THE BONDS EVIDENCING

THE DEBT; AUTHORIZING EXECUTION AND

ATTESTATION OF SUCH BONDS; PROVIDING

COVENANTS RELATED TO DEBT SERVICE APPLICABLE

TO SUCH BONDS TO THE EXTENT REQUIRED BY THE

ACT AND PLEDGING THE FULL FAITH, CREDIT AND

TAXING POWER OF THE CITY IN SUPPORT THEREOF;

CREATING A SINKING FUND FOR EACH SERIES

OF BONDS IN CONNECTION WITH SUCH SERIES OF

BONDS, TO THE EXTENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT;

DESIGNATING THE PAYING AGENT TO BE THE

SINKING FUND DEPOSITARY; PROVIDING A

COVENANT TO INSURE PROMPT AND FULL PAYMENT

FOR SUCH BONDS WHEN DUE; SETTING FORTH

REGISTRATION AND TRANSFER PROVISIONS WITH

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESPECT TO SUCH BONDS; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF ONE OR MORE INVESTMENT AGREEMENTS BY SPECIFIED OFFICERS OF THE CITY (IF APPLICABLE) AND THE PURCHASE OF CERTAIN U.S. TREASURY OBLIGATIONS OR ANY OTHER SECURITIES OR INVESTMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROJECT AND THE REFUNDING OF THE PRIOR BONDS; AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING SPECIFIED OFFICERS OF THE CITY TO DO, TO TAKE AND TO PERFORM CERTAIN SPECIFIED, REQUIRED. NECESSARY OR APPROPRIATE ACTS TO EFFECT THE ISSUANCE OF THE BONDS, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, THE PREPARATION OF A DEBT STATEMENT AND BORROWING BASE CERTIFICATE. AND THE FILING OF SPECIFIED DOCUMENTS WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, ALL AS REQUIRED BY THE ACT; DECLARING THAT THE DEBT TO BE EVIDENCED BY SUCH BONDS, TOGETHER WITH ALL OTHER INDEBTEDNESS OF THE CITY, WILL NOT BE IN EXCESS OF ANY APPLICABLE LIMITATION IMPOSED BY THE ACT: AUTHORIZING PROPER OFFICERS OF THE CITY TO DELIVER THE BONDS UPON THE APPROVAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: IF

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

APPLICABLE, SETTING FORTH CERTAIN COVENANTS PRECLUDING THE CITY FROM TAKING ACTIONS WHICH WOULD CAUSE THE BONDS TO BECOME "ARBITRAGE BONDS" OR "PRIVATE ACTIVITY BONDS, " AS THOSE TERMS ARE USED IN THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986, AS AMENDED (THE "CODE"), AND APPLICABLE REGULATIONS PROMULGATED THEREUNDER; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE AND COVENANTING TO COMPLY WITH THE PROVISIONS THEREOF, IF APPLICABLE; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF ONE OR MORE ESCROW AGREEMENTS BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY AND THE ESCROW AGENT NAMED THEREIN IN CONNECTION WITH THE REFUNDING OF THE PRIOR BONDS; APPROVING THE FORM OF AND RATIFYING THE PREPARATION, USE AND DISTRIBUTION OF A PRELIMINARY PLACEMENT MEMORANDUM AND A PLACEMENT MEMORANDUM BY THE PURCHASER OR PLACEMENT AGENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE MARKETING OF THE BONDS; AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE PREPARATION. EXECUTION AND DELIVERY OF ALL OTHER REQUIRED DOCUMENTS AND THE TAKING OF ALL OTHER REQUIRED ACTION: PROVIDING WHEN THIS ORDINANCE SHALL BECOME

EFFECTIVE; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY OF PROVISIONS; AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES OR PARTS OF ORDINANCES INSOFAR AS THE SAME SHALL BE INCONSISTENT HEREWITH.

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

MR. MCGOFF: Second.

MR. JOYCE: On the question?

MR. ROGAN: Yes. I guess I'll say a little bit more, I said most of what I wanted to say in regard to this item and the tax increase during motions. You know you are being sold snake oil when it takes ten minutes just for the legislation to be read.

When I ran for council both the first time and I was unsuccessful, and the second time with Mr. Joyce and Mrs. Evans successfully, I stated I was committed to fiscal responsibility, fighting against tax increases, fighting against the increased borrowing, and I made a pledge to the voters that I wouldn't do those items unless every other option was explored, and I truly believe that, that that's how business

should be conducted.

Now, I agree with my colleagues when it comes to the Parking Authority. They want -- we all want Mr. Scopelliti to come in, explain his case, why should the City give them \$1.4 million. Well, why don't we ask at the same time for the mayor and the business administrator and PEL to come in and explain why borrowing is the only option left? There have been numerous attempts by this council to address our financial woes. Some of them very small, some of them very large.

The StreetSmart program that

Councilman Loscombe brought up, would have generated more money to the city, we wouldn't be in as big of a hole as we are in. The sale of some city assets, such as the Sewer authority, I have been banging my head against the wall for two years just trying to get the mayor to put out proposals to see what it's valued at, just see what it's valued at then move forward. If that was done two years ago we would know the valuation of the Sewer Authority.

My personal belief it's in excess of the money we are borrowing right here, so by selling that we would avoid having to borrow money and increase taxes on the residents until the year 2023. Try to comprehend that. It's 2012. 2023. Not only would we be passing a tax increase for 10 years, there is no actual end date.

Now, I know that Attorney Hughes mentioned that it may be separate, Mr. Joyce said it may be together, we'll get that sorted out, we still have another week on that piece of the puzzle, but I look at these two items, the unfunded borrowing and the tax increase as one, because they really are. You know, if you are voting "yes" on one you have to vote "yes" on both because you need the tax increase to pay for the borrowing.

There is no set end date for the legislation for the tax increase, and that's been another thing that concerns me. As I said before, Mayor Doherty came to council in the past to lobby for borrowing. Even when he had friendly councils, and many more

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

speakers who were opposed came to council back in those days, he still came here.

It infuriates me that this is going to be rubber stamped by this council. I am not going to be one of them, but it infuriates me this is going to be passed through without the mayor even coming in here, and when we took office -- thank you.

When we took office two years ago the media dubbed the term supermajority, which I thought at the time was fitting. As months go on, and especially after last week's meeting and this week's meeting, I really feel like I'm a minority of one sitting on council as the only person standing up against these tax increases and borrowing. I will be voting "no". I will stand behind my vote. Don't fall for the scare tactics the administration is going to try to sell you that the city is going to fall off a cliff if we don't borrow tens of millions of dollars and raise taxes. He has been selling the same snake oil for a decade. And that is all I have to say. I'm voting "no".

1 MR. JOYCE: Anyone else on the question? 2 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes. Just, you know, 3 it would be easy to sit here and say, "I'm 4 5 not voting for it." MR. ROGAN: No, it's not an easy 6 7 decision to say you are not voting for it. 8 It's easy to say approve it like everyone 9 has been doing in the past. I'm the only 10 one standing up saying, "Let's try something else." 11 12 It's getting frustrating. 13 MR. LOSCOMBE: The problem is, the 14 problem is we have been asking to try something else for two years now and we are 15 16 getting no response. 17 MR. ROGAN: So why give in? We are 18 elected officials --19 MR. LOSCOMBE: We are not just 20 effecting ourselves, we are effecting 21 everyone's lives out here whether you want 22 to believe it or not. If everything goes in 23 default next week then what's --24 MR. JACKOWITZ: Then so be it. It's 25 not our fault.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Of course it's not 1 2 your fault and it's not ours either. 3 MR. JACKOWITZ: So be it. MR. LOSCOMBE: We have been here two 4 5 years trying to make up for the mess that's occurred over ten years. 6 7 MR. JACKOWITZ: Talk to the people 8 who were here four, five or six years ago on 9 council who voted in favor of all of this. 10 Talk to them. 11 MR. LOSCOMBE: It's our job here to 12 try and rank this ship and I think that's 13 what we are been doing. We could have 14 passed a 29 percent tax increase at the 15 beginning of the year and let the budget 16 fly, but we didn't. 17 MR. JACKOWITZ: Then do it. Do it. 18 MR. LOSCOMBE: I'm talking 10 19 percent now. 20 MR. JOYCE: Excuse me, if I may. 21 MR. LOSCOMBE: Not 29 percent. MR. JOYCE: Citizens' participation 22 23 is over for this meeting. I ask that 24 Mr. Loscombe be able to say his peace. 25 MR. LOSCOMBE: I'm not just -- trust

me, I don't want to pay another dollar taxes. My mother can't afford to pay another dollar in taxes.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Then vote "no".

MR. LOSCOMBE: The problem is at this point we have no choice. We have no choice. It's easy to sit there and say, "Do this, do that, do this."

We have been trying. We have been trying to get people to respond to us and answer us. It's easy to stand at that podium and tell us what to do, but until a better idea comes up I have to listen to my solicitor and the condition we are in right now. I put my faith and trust in my solicitor and our financial chairman here. That's their expertise. I have to listen to what their advice is and what they feel. I have to protect this city. That's why I am here, and it's not an easy issue. It's not an easy vote.

But, you know, I had to look at the whole picture and, you know, I'll probably be unpopular, but at this point I think it's our only option right now. For further

to pay awards and stuff like that. I do
demand the business administrator and the
mayor to come here and tell us how, and we
have had PEL here for years that, you know,
have not guided us in the proper direction.
I still don't feel comfortable no matter
what Recovery Plan is in there as long as
it's under their stewardship, but as for the
immediate moment you know, I don't want us
to fall off this cliff.

We didn't create it, I think we have gone on the best advice that we have.

Again, and I agree a lot with what Mr. Rogan said, trust me. He is right on the money with most of it, but I just can't walk away and wash my hands and, you know, not worry about what's going to happen tomorrow.

MR. ROGAN: We are not washing our hands with it, and you mentioned and I agree with you, like you said, I agree with a what of what you said, also. You said you demand the mayor and the business administrator to come in. By voting "yes" and appeasing Chris Doherty he is going to continue the

behavior of thumbing his nose at council and not coming in. By voting "yes" it's giving him -- it's exactly what he wants. So why demand him come in when you are going to vote against my motion to table it until he comes in, which was the first option, then vote against -- and then vote for the legislation. We could have stopped him today. It could have been stopped today, put on hold for a week until the mayor came in.

Mr. McGoff, even though we disagree, seconded the motion so we could discuss, and not one person agreed that the mayor should come in. If you agreed the mayor should come in you would have voted for the motion to table.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I agree the mayor should come in, but I think it's beyond the point. We did have a caucus here with the people who are involved as our solicitor stated.

MR. ROGAN: The caucus just went over the specifics of the bond issue, nothing else was discussed during the caucus

except the bond issue with the attorneys.

We didn't discuss any other options with the mayor at that caucus, and the mayor wasn't present. And the business administrator didn't do most of the talking, it was mostly the attorneys doing the talking trying to make the legal language so everyone up here can understand it so the public could understand it.

MR. MCGOFF: I would like to call for a vote, Mr. President.

MR. JOYCE: I would just like to say one thing, you know, this is a tough vote.

6-A was a tough vote, and one thing about being a council member sometimes, a lot of times there is tough decisions to make and you have to make those decisions with what you feel is in the best interest of the city and that's the best interest of all of the people. And I'm sitting here tonight and I'm looking at unfunded borrowing and borrowing in order to refinance debt. This is something that was done in the 2012 operating budget. This was something that was passed for one with Mr. McGoff being the

only dissenting vote. The mayor vetoed that budget. Then it was overridden 4-1 with Mr. McGoff being the only dissenting vote, and Mr. Rogan did vote for the 2012 operating budget.

Now, what do you suggest that we should do? What are the other options? If you say you want to privatize the Sewer Authority, who is going to do it? Are we going to say, "Mayor Doherty, you have to privatize the Sewer Authority."

Yeah, you know what? Sure, that's easy, I would love to say that, but you know what he is going to do, he is going to say, "Goo pound sand."

And plus you have to have a board that agrees to do it. It's not as easy as it seems. I think we have come to a point where we have exhausted a lot of options, and this was an option that we all voted for, like Mr. McGoff did state before during motions, in the 2012 budget and now the process is coming up where in a way we are by voting "no" trying to unravel that process.

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROGAN: I would just state, as I stated to Mr. McGoff, when it came to vote for a budget there were two options on the Obviously, the budget that mostly table. you and Mrs. Evans put together, the amendment, was far superior to the budget that Mayor Doherty and Ryan McGowan put together. And as I also stated before, I don't think there is one person up here that agreed with every line item in the budget. It was voted on as a package. It was a take it or leave it vote. You didn't have the option of saying, "Well, I like items one through ten and I don't like number 11 and 12," you have to weigh the good with the bad and I felt on a whole avoiding a massive tax increase for the residents, making some cuts that needed to be made, obviously, and I have stated it before, I wanted more to be made in some departments, avoiding the mayor's budget going into effect outweighed the negatives of the parts that I didn't like in both budgets.

And again, that's why I advocate in the future, and I think we should vote line

item by line item, and even a lot of them maybe 4-1 on one, one way another some of them will still wind up passing. Council will know where each member stood on each vote.

Going back to the unfunded debt, if I recall there was a special council meeting --

MR. JOYCE: I believe so.

MR. ROGAN: -- regarding the unfunded debt that was called on very short notice.

I was out of town. I was unable to attend that meeting. Had I been at that meeting I would have voted "no" then as well.

And as far as what Mr. Joyce said, you know, we have our ideas and the mayor has told us to pound sand in the past, he is right he has, and that's the problem, and the way to deal with it isn't to just give in and say, "Well, you know, we are council, we are just going to let the mayor run the city. We will give him the reigns."

That's not what you do. You fight back and you fight for what you believe in.

You don't give into the mayor or whoever it

may be. I believe in fighting for what I believe for and I'm going to continue to do that and I think we all should. It seems in this situation that council is appeasing the mayor by not even asking him to come into explain his case and not even allowing council to offer a counter proposal on anything in the process.

MR. JOYCE: So let me ask you this --

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Joyce, I think we have talked this back and forth, I think it's time to vote.

MR. JOYCE: It's still on the question. I think we have been for a long time, I think we can stay for another few minutes, but let me ask you this, you are saying to me that you voted for the budget and to override the veto, which had unfunded would borrowing it, and which had the refinancing in it, but if you were at that meeting, which was around the same time of the budget, you would have voted against what was in the budget?

MR. ROGAN: There were two options

when it came to budget time. There were two options, and when it came to overriding the veto, you either -- if I voted to override the veto the amended budget became law. If I voted to sustain the veto or I missed that meeting or whatever if I -- if it wasn't a 4-1 vote the mayor's budget was to raise 30 percent, and it didn't cut any of the fat out of the budget, it would have taken effect.

Weighing that with some of the negatives that were in the budget I felt that there was -- the positives outweighed the negatives. Do I agree with everything that was in it? No. But you pick your battles. At that time I was concerned about keeping taxes low. I was concerned about cutting waste in government, and we did a lot of that. There was a lot of good in the budget done by council. I can't deny that.

MR. JOYCE: So then what is your alternative if we don't vote for this tonight? How would we makeup that \$9.85 million hole?

MR. ROGAN: Well, at this point it's

either an up or down vote because nobody is willing to vote with me to have the mayor come in and reconsider other options, so right now it's a take it or leave it proposition whether it comes to the administration. The mayor if he really was in the spirit of cooperating with council before it even got to this point he would have met with all of this and said, "What's your ideas, Councilman Joyce? What's yours, Councilman Loscombe? What's yours, Councilman McGoff," and for all of us and we all would have discussed it. He didn't.

I was under the assumption when we took over the majority of this council the days of rubber stamping the mayor's agenda were over. Apparently I'm wrong.

MR. JOYCE: And apparently that's not the case. It's not rubber stamping.

MR. ROGAN: What you have done to check up on it? Has the mayor come in --

MR. JOYCE: Let me ask you this, if you wanted a budget that didn't have refinancing and didn't have unfunded borrowing it, why didn't you create one?

MR. ROGAN: If I created a budget the vote would have went down three for council's budget we did pass, one for my own and one for Mayor Doherty's. The mayor's budget would have become law. I was the deciding vote on the budget. If I did not vote with yourself and Mr. Loscombe and Mrs. Evans, Mayor Doherty's budget would have became law. I had two options. That was it.

You need four votes to override a veto. Without four votes, it doesn't matter, I could have proposed anything I wanted with one vote it would have went anywhere, so I went with the better of the two plans that were in front of me and if I could go back and do it again I would have done the same thing because we avoided the massive tax increase and we are able to cut the size of government. It was the right thing to do at the time and I defend that vote. I don't agree with all of it, but on core principal it was a good piece of legislation. There was some things that I didn't agree with.

2 3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LOSCOMBE:

Now we have another vote in front of us that addresses some of the items that I disagreed with it, so now I have the opportunity to vote "no" on the items I didn't agree with.

MR. JOYCE: And let me make this clear, if -- one, do I want to raise taxes on the residents of this city? Absolutely That's not one thing I want to do. It's not one thing that I have ever thought of doing, but this is the thing, we have a budget, it has unfunded debt borrowing, it has refinancing in it. The Court mandated this tax increase. If we don't vote for it, we don't get the borrowing. If we don't get the borrowing, employees don't get paid, health care gets shut off, city services get shut down. So with that I'll be voting "ves". Roll call, please.

MS. KRAKE: Mr. McGoff.

MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

MS. KRAKE: Mr. Rogan.

MR. ROGAN: No.

MS. KRAKE: Mr. Loscombe.

Yes.

_	
	148
1	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Joyce.
2	MR. JOYCE: Yes. I hereby declare
3	Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted. If
4	there is no further business, I'll entertain
5	a motion to adjourn.
6	MR. MCGOFF: Motion to adjourn.
7	MR. JOYCE: This meeting is
8	adjourned.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER