		1
1	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING	
2		
3	HELD:	
4		
5	THURSDAY, AUGUST 23, 2012	
6		
7	LOCATION:	
8	Council Chambers	
9	Scranton City Hall	
10	340 North Washington Avenue	
11	Scranton, Pennsylvania	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	AMELIA NICOL, RPR	
22	REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTER	
23		
24		
25		

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

(Pledge of Allegiance)

MS. EVANS: Please remain standing for a moment of reflection for our servicemen and women throughout the world and for all those who have died in the last week, particularly Barbara A. Czyzyk, beloved wife of our good friend Tom, mother, grandmother, great grandmother, sister and aunt; Alice F. Sporer, devoted wife, mother, grandmother, great grandmother, aunt and retired Scranton School District employee and their dear family and friends who suffer their loss.

MR. LOSCOMBE: If I may add.

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I forgot to
mention this last week but two retired
firefighters have passe away, Joe
Matyjevich and Louis Genovese if we
can remember them and their families
in our prayers and Gary Marinchak
whose brother, Mike, is a city
employee and his brother, Gary, is a

1	retired firefighter also and Mrs.
2	Florence Rossi, mother of Rich Rossi,
3	a former city councilman. Thank you.
4	(Moment of Silent Reflection)
5	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
6	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
7	MR. MCGOFF: Here.
8	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
9	MR. ROGAN: Here.
10	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
11	MR. LOSCOMBE: Here.
12	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
13	(No response.)
14	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
15	MS. EVANS: Here. Dispense with
16	the reading of the minutes, please.
17	MS. KRAKE: 3-A. CONTROLLER'S
18	REPORT FOR THE MONTH ENDING JULY
19	31, 2012.
20	MS. EVANS: Are there any
21	comments? If not, received and filed.
22	MS. KRAKE: 3-B. MINUTES OF THE
23	COMPOSITE PENSION BOARD MEETING
24	HELD JULY 25, 2012.
25	MS. EVANS: Are there any

1	comments? If not, received and filed.
2	MS. KRAKE: 3-C. CITY OF
3	SCRANTON'S PROPOSED CAPITAL
4	INVESTMENT PLAN OF 2013 PURSUANT TO
5	SECTION 904 OF THE CITY'S HOME RULE
6	CHARTER.
7	MS. EVANS: Are there any
8	comments? If not, received and filed.
9	MS. KRAKE: 3-D. APPLICATIONS
10	ALONG WITH DECISIONS RENDERED BY
11	THE ZONING HEARING BOARD ON WEDNESDAY,
12	AUGUST 15, 2012.
13	MS. EVANS: Are there any
14	comments? If not, received and filed.
15	MS. KRAKE: 3-E. AGENDA FOR THE
16	CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
17	HELD AUGUST 22, 2012.
18	MS. EVANS: Are there any
19	comments? If not, received and filed.
20	Do we have any clerk's notes this
21	evening, Mrs. Krake?
22	MS. KRAKE: No, Mrs. Evans.
23	MS. EVANS: Thank you. Do any
24	council members announcements at this
25	time.

MS. LOSCOMBE: I have one. There will be a fundraiser for the West Side Falcons, an All you can eat pancake and sausage breakfast at Applebee's in the Viewmont Mall on this Sunday, August 26th from 8 a.m. till 10 a.m. The tickets are \$7 and are available at fieldhouse or at the door. Please help support the West Side Falcons Youth Organization. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else? (No response.)

MS. EVANS: Before I call up the first speaker, I would like to announce that the City of Scranton has obtained funding from Amalgamated Bank in the form of a tax anticipation note, Series B, in the amount of 6.2 million dollars. In addition, city council has received emergency legislation for acceptance of the 2.25 million dollar combined loan and grant from the State Department of Community and Economic Development. Both pieces of legislation accepting

these financial agreements will be 1 2 placed on council's agenda this 3 evening and moved through Fifth, Sixth 4 and Seventh Orders. In addition, the 5 revised recovery plan has been 6 approved by the Pennsylvania Economy 7 League and the State Department of 8 Community and Economic Development. 9 Mrs. Krake? 10 MS. KRAKE: Fourth order, 11 citizens' participation. 12 MS. EVANS: Our first speaker 13 this evening is Katie Hawley. 14 MS. HAWLEY: Good evening, councilmen and women. 15 16 MS. EVANS: Good evening. 17 MS. HAWLEY: My name is Katie 18 Hawley. Last time I stood before you, 19 you requested that I compile some 20 information of the ordinance I'm 21 requesting. So I am going to provide 22 that with you now so that you may look 23 through it as I speak. 24 (Councilman Joyce arrives and is 25 seated at bench.)

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. HAWLEY: So basically I know a lot is going on with layoffs and budget cuts and my deepest sympathies to those that are affected. However. those citizens can come here and voice their frustrations. I'm here to speak for those that don't have a voice. The longer our city goes without a Spay and neuter ordinance the more sick unhealthy dogs and cats are brought into our streets and brought into our shelter. I don't have to tell you that not every dog and cat brought to a shelter has a happy ending. I speak as a former employed of Griffin Pond Animal Shelter and a current local animal rights activist. I also run my own low cost spay and neuter program. I see firsthand every day the repercussions of irresponsible breeding and it needs to stop. Proper breeding requires extensive vet records of both maternal and paternal bloodlines. There are people in our city who will breed their dog simply

24

25

because one has a female and the other has a male. Most of these people which are known as backyard breeder have no vet records, no experience, they have unhealthy conditions and most of the time a lack of finances dollars to insure a healthy pregnancy and birth. A little statistic to share with you. One unspayed female dog can actually produce 67,000 puppies within six years and when you know that every litter born in this county is a litter euthanized, that's 67,000 lives lost because of one dog. And when it comes to cats, three unspayed female cat can produce one million kittens within six years. Same goes for that. A million kittens lives lost because of three unspaded cats. And right now in America an animal is euthanized every eight The more that are born, the seconds. more die. We need to give the thousands of dogs and cats that pass through our local shelter a chance at

24

25

adoption a chance at a new happy life which I believe every animal deserves. It was man that domesticated the dog 15,000 years ago and it is man that continues to improperly and irresponsibly breed and therefore overpopulate man's best friend. So I believe it is up to us to start to protect our innocent furry brethren. If we had this ordinance passed not only would it get backyard breeders off the streets which would prevent pumping out genetically poisoned bloodlines, unhealthy dogs to just continue the -- I'm losing my chain of though. It just keeps going basically. The people get these dogs, they keep breeding them and the unhealthy bloodlines just keep going. It would also prevent accidental litters. So for the people that say, Oh, we didn't mean to do it, it was an accident, therefore, they can no longer say that because it would by law for them to have them spayed or

23

24

25

neutered. The low cost options are out there. I mean, I personally run the spay and neutered program and Griffin Pond offers the low cost vouchers so there's definitely I think the options are out there but perhaps not the education. I do believe, too, that it would bring in a lot of revenue for this city because we can fine these people that are irresponsibly breeding and not following the ordinance. Also, the people that would be allowed to responsibly breed would have to pay a certain amount of money per year, per month, whatever the ordinance would require and they would have provide a AKC certification. Therefore, they are the breeders that are doing it responsibly and doing it for the love of the breed and not just to make money. A lot of times you see, too, with pit bulls, I specialized in a rescue with pit bulls and a lot of times when these people are breeding

pit bulls, that's just the surface, you know. So if I can get at some of these people that are putting these -- could be wonderful dogs in these terrible situations, like I believe that the pit bull is a wonderful dog, however, with no ordinance to control who breeds them, they end up in the wrong hands and for the wrong reasons. So what I've provided you with was basically a majority of the cities that have passed it, and there's a lot of information in there and hopefully we can get this passed.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MS. HAWLEY: Thank you very much.

MS. EVANS: Ron Ellman. Andy Sbaraglia. Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. ELLMAN: I'm sorry. I'm talking as usual. I ran into my dear friend, Johnny superstar today. I was one of the first people to sign his petition running for mayor. He told me he already bought 3,000 votes and knows there's a few more that can be

bought.

2345

6

1

7 8 9

13

12

10

11

15

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, I'll tell you, is this the best council could do? This is just a blow to the people of this city that they can't overcome, I'll tell you. This is a contemptible wish list. It's an impossibility to live with. Where are you going with something like that. It just -- it's just wishy-washy. It's not factual. know, shame on you people. You don't -- you just don't get out there and talk to the man on the street, the people that are heart of this city. You might run into someone at the grocery store or something but you don't know what people are going through in this city. This nonsense is a \$36,000 average, that's bull. You know, the people of this city are hurting financially, not all of them, probably a quarter of the people are just in the poverty level and they're retired and senior citizens that are hanging onto these houses that this

24

25

will take away, this will be death, There's no sense revisiting you know. Doherty incompetence in all this. We've just gone over and over and over that. A 100 people have gone over it. You know, you just refuse to address the problem is the nonprofits. I don't know why you're so fearful to tackle them but something has got to be done. Right here in this very paper you're asking for 80 percent raise. There's a church in Brooklyn, New York right here bought \$175,000 piece of property for investment. That's what is wrong with this city. There's no tax base. You know, it's like I said, the speech coming into office last month at Lackawanna County College we're growing to grow 40 percent. I don't know how many houses that is, how many pieces of property but it's plenty. Then you've got the medical school. They want five acres around them at our expense. It's just got to stop. The rule of

24

25

the nonprofits has got to be terminated somehow. But this plan is counterproductive, you know. You make a ghost town out of this place. neighborhood is just gone downhill in 20 years. You can't imagine what it was like and what it's like now. got that zone up there that has just infested the neighborhood with a bunch of druggies and undesirables. They're right out on the street everyday, nothing being done about it. I don't have no curbs, no sidewalks. People come and park their cars all along the 2000-2100 block. You can't use sidewalks. Those people haves garages and driveways park on the sidewalks anyway. There's no curbs to keep you off, you know. Then Doherty tore up a good sidewalk on the 17, 1800 block. It's such mismanagement. You know, if you took all the meters out of downtown like I said once before and had a small surcharge on the businesses to cover the loss of the

23

24

25

meters, you would bring people downtown. I know you've been told. Just gobs of people don't come downtown anymore because the meters -it's asinine, fifty cents for an hour and then the parking lots, you know, it's out of hand and nothing being done about the SPA, nothing being done about these 50 friends that Doherty -his high school friends that he's just elevated all along with him. The city wants cuts. You go there and talk to them. They want cuts. There's 50 people you can. You know, you've got a voice and you've got the ability to contest things and you don't. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Andy Sbaraglia.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia, citizen of Scranton, Fellow
Scrantonians. I've been asked many questions. What was the cost of the lawyers for the cop and firemen cases?
What was the total cost that we have

1 to pay the lawyers? MR. JOYCE: I do not know offhand 2 3 but I will find out for you. 4 MR. SBARAGLIA: Well. it's odd 5 that you should have found that out 6 there. What is the cost per man for 7 this 50 point some million that we 8 have to give the police and firemen? 9 MR. JOYCE: It will equate to 10 probably about \$40,000 plus per 11 employee. 12 MR. SBARAGLIA: I think you're 13 closer to 60,000 plus but that's okay. 14 That's somewhere along the line if not 15 more because it's probably a formula 16 that they have to use for some 17 policeman that retired and so forth 18 and so on. I'm not going to get into 19 that. MR. JOYCE: Right. 20 21 MR. SBARAGLIA: Now, let's get 22 back to the millage. When you give 23 out the millage figures, you have to 24 say whether it's on land or 25 improvements so we know. And I'd like

23

24

25

you to use a \$100 figure when you calculate it so that it would easy for everybody to figure. In other words, \$100, you're going to pay the \$110 the first year and if you get 15 percent on top of that 110, you know, that would be like 130 or 140 and then a bigger one on top of that may bring it up to 180. Then all the person has to do is he is paying \$600 now, he knows what it would be for a 100 because people have -- when you give out figures, it's nice if -- if I had a calculator, I had the figures in front of me, I would have no trouble figuring out what that would be but people weren't happy when they saw 81 percent. They weren't happy at all and they've been pretty well angry with that. And the worst part about it now you probably do need a 81 percent tax hike. I won't deny it. You probably need a 100 percent tax hike because there's so many things that we owe that are not paid for.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

mean, when you talk about the health insurance and the pension, that's just for the employees, not even all the people we owe for the insurances and your medical and so forth and so on. We're in deep, deep trouble. Everyone up there should know it. But you try to simplify it. The people of They Scranton want to know the facts. don't want a lot of jumble mumble numbers. They want facts, simple facts that could be brought out so everything understands and comprehend Everybody don't have calculator them. or not familiar with percentages and this and that, whatever. But I don't know. I really don't know what's going on with the city, I really don't, because like I say, I don't know how much tax we have to go to get them people up there when the final figures but you don't even know them. If you don't know them, then you don't know what the percentage is going to Plus the fact you have too many be.

24

25

variables, too. I mean, nobody knows if there will a commuter or a sales Them factors are not known. They're wished upon but they're not a So somewhere along the done deal. line you've got to simplify everything and tell the truth as bad as it may be. It got to go out and you say this is where, this is what we owe and this is what we're stuck with. It's the only way. And people, of course, will make a decision. I hate to be where you are. I told you that before a long time ago. You're going to get blamed for a lot of stuff and I'm sorry for you. You're going be the council that gave the greatest tax rise in probably the history of Scranton and you're going to get blamed and there's no way out of it even though the council before you were the problem. You're stuck. Just like -- I guess just like the president. He's stuck for what happened before and everything is

being put say on him and it's going to be with you, too. Well, I wish you luck. Thank you.

> MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Thank, Mr. Sbaraglia. I do have to comment. I agree that we are stuck and during motions I will breakdown what the impact of this tax increase would be to the average taxpayer listening.

MS. EVANS: And I just want to add that the tax increase is 31 percent and compounded over three years it is 39 percent. The newspaper likes to sensationalize with an 81 percent tax increase which is the worst case scenario. And actually that isn't the worst case scenario. The worst case scenario is the State of Pennsylvania coming in here and taking over the City of Scranton and appointing a receiver because the taxes will go through the roof and city services will be cut dramatically, and we have only to look

25

23

24

25

to Harrisburg to get a vision of what our city would become and what our taxpayers would have to endure.

Our next speaker is Ozzie Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Ozzie Quinn, Scranton, good evening.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. QUINN: Two things. First of all, I want to congratulate council for getting a bank and for the recovery plan getting it passed. know, people forget too soon. Well, I remember the last eight years. Evans, all those years you were here and you kept on saying, the Doherty debt, the Doherty debt, the Doherty debt. Everybody knew their day of reckoning was coming. You knew it, the Scranton Times knew it, but nobody did anything about it. And now it's left hanging around you people. Andy said, it's a shame, you know. It's like a stigma to say that, well, you know, we had to go out of town and someplace, we had a hard time getting

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

money, we had to borrow someplace else. But, you know, you are to be commended. If people do not forget, if they remember what happened for the last eight years, Mr. Doherty spent, spend and spent. You are to be congratulated. I would not congratulate Mr. Doherty because he's the problem. He was the problem. the Scranton Times publishers now they're selling their papers by sensationalizing headlines everyday on the City the Scranton and twisting things to make it seem that you people don't know what you're doing. Well, you know, there's still are a lot of people out there that thank you and I am one of them.

Secondly, two nights ago we had a taxpayers' meeting and Mr. Gary Lewis, s he's a financial analyst -- private financial analyst and he deals with -- specializes in municipalities in debt. And it was live and feedback, it will be on ECTV. If you go to ECTV

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

schedule, if you goggle that, you'll find out when it's on but a lot of comments, a lot of good comments on the meeting because of the fact the way he presented the budget, the recovery plan and whatnot, you know. And the taxpayers unanimously agreed that we have a town hall meeting here in city hall which I asked the clerk already -- the City Clerk's Office already for Tuesday, September 4th, and we're inviting the city council to come, each and everyone of you. letting the mayor, Roseanne Novembrino and Mrs McGovern and the decorum will be of the highest standard. You can believe me. There will be a facilitator and will not be any denigrating remarks or whatever. here are a lot of people that are concerned and they are concerned about sales tax. And a lot of people are concerned about commuter tax, you know. I mean, we just have to have what's the name, maybe sit down and

1 talk about it, you know. And Mr. Gary Lewis will be here, okay, and he will 2 3 make the presentation on his budget 4 get and I hope that we can benefit a 5 lot from it and come a lot closer 6 together in the City of Scranton. 7 We've got to forget about the last ten 8 years. We've good to forget about it. 9 We've got to dig ourselves out and I 10 have a lot of faith in you four people 11 out there to dig us out. Thank you 12 very much. 13 MS. EVANS: Thank you. 14 MR. LOSCOMBE: Mr. Quinn. what 15 time was that meeting on September 4th? 16 17 MR. QUINN: It's 6 p.m. September 18 4th, the day after Labor Day right 19 here and it will be televised on ECTV. 20 Thank you. 21 MS. EVANS: Our next speaker is 22 Gary Lewis. 23 MR. LEWIS: When I look at 24 council's approached to a revised 25 recovery plan, I can't help but be

25

reminded of Mazlo's hammer. You should probably recognize this concept when all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. Apparently when you're a member of city council, every probably looks like a revenue shortfall. The truth is that Scranton has a very serious spending problem, not a revenue problem. The point I've been trying -- this is a point that I've been trying to convey since April of this year. Just to recap. I stood here in May at this very podium and I predicted the city would be insolvent in 2012. I thought it would happen in October. I was wrong. It happened earlier this summer. In June I stood here and I told you that the city and the Parking Authority had failed to comply with the disclosure requirements and were towing the line on a technical default. That are very same evening you released a letter from Bank of New York Mellon repeating

23

24

25

exactly what I stated. When you released your revised recovery plan, I was here three weeks ago to warn that your tax hikes didn't add up, that your revenues were overstated and your expenses were understated. I warned you that you had no support for the various new revenues you were predicting. Four days after I said that and four days after I sent that same analysis to PEL and the DCED, PEL responded to your plan citing my very same issues. Putting numbers on paper simply doesn't work. We've had two decades of broken budgets that prove that but here we are again looking at unsupported numbers, numbers you are apparently shopping around in the hopes of securing additional funding to cover the financial malfeasance of the last decade. The issues with your recovery plan are easy to spot. They've been pointed out by PEL. revenues are overstated. The debt services is not accurately reflected

24

25

and new revenues are unsupported and I believe the refunding of borrowing to the Workers' Comp trust is not accurate in your budget. It's time to radically alter our approach and look at the expenditure side of the equation. I don't expect you to do that, though. I don't even expect you to attend the September 4th hearing but this city deserves to know the truth and they deserve to hear other options. They deserve to know that your plan is inaccurate and politically motivated. You plan to borrow from hedge funds is not only unwise, it a blatant attempt to secure financial windfall for Paul Kelly and Boyd Hughes in the form of billings related to the private placement of the debt. You should ashamed of this. You should be ashamed of the recovery plan, of the cash grab by the attorneys and of your political motivations. One in nine homeowners cannot pay their current tax bill and

25

you want to reach deeper into their pockets. What are you going to do when that number hits one and five. What kind of a recovery plan leads to the city forcibly taking 20 percent of privately owned property for delinquent taxes. You need to address the expenditures but you won't. have. I've prepared a budget that's based on our actual collections, a budget that is based on reality. I've discussed this budget on Tuesday with the Taxpayer's Association and I've provided the same document earlier today to DCED and PEL and I'm going to bring it to tomorrow's hearing. Unlike you I've made my budget public and all of my support easily accessible and available. You may not show up on September 4th but I will be here and I'll be encouraging every single resident of this city to think long and hard about the two approaches. Do we continue to throw good money after bad hoping and

1 praying that some day reality will 2 catch up with our budgets or do we 3 make the rational choices and manage a 4 budget to the revenue we've actually 5 collected. I'm a proponent of the 6 reasonable choice. As I said, three 7 weeks ago I believe that your plan is 8 theoretically arrogant, financially 9 reckless and negligent. It's time to 10 accept the reality of the situation 11 and address the expenditure side of the equation. We need -- we need to 12 13 actually build a budget that's 14 sustained by the revenues we've collected and will collect. We can't 15 16 continue to chase people out of this 17 city and continue to raise the taxes 18 to a point where they can lose their 19 homes. We're ruining people's lives. 20 Thank you. 21 MR. JOYCE: Mr. Lewis, I just had 22 a couple of questions. 23 MS. EVANS: No. You may be

seated.

24

25

MR. LEWIS: So I'm not allowed to

respond.

MS. EVANS: If you want to pose questions.

MR. JOYCE: I just wanted to ask a few questions. You said that the city has a spending problem. Where exactly do you suggest that we cut from?

MR. LEWIS: I've said in the past that I believe we need to address expenses related to salary and debt service and I've put forth a new proposal to restructure our debt and I've recommended cuts to salary and benefits.

MR. JOYCE: To salary and benefits. Now, what about union contracts, how does that apply? Will this drag the city in a long court battle because obviously you can't cut salaries of the fire and the police and the DPW workers and the clerical union workers and there's not that many management personnel and we've already cut their salaries.

25

MR. LEWIS: Well, actually we just gave a big raise to the police and the firemen, right, in the newly negotiated contract?

MR. JOYCE: That was court ordered.

MS. EVANS: Actually that was decided by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania so it cannot be altered.

MR. LEWIS: Right. But as I've said in the past bankruptcy allows us to reject collective bargaining agreements, it allows us to restructure debt, it gives us a stay of current litigation and, you know, I've made this point on Tuesday that the bankruptcy judge does not come in an unilaterally raise taxes. The bankruptcy judge is there to implement the plan that's put together by the city and their creditors. It's possible for the city to operate on a 54 million dollar budget but we need to protection provided by bankruptcy. And I know the governor needs to

approve it, the mayor needs to sign it but if we have a reasonable, workable plan and we sit down like rational reasonable people, I don't see why everyone couldn't come to the table and if they won't make -- file for bankruptcy, they won't allow that, maybe we can actually negotiate new contracts and work with our bond holders. I mean, I don't think we've ever tried these steps.

MS. EVANS: Well, I do know that as soon as the council of Harrisburg declared bankruptcy the state under the current governor took immediate action and passed legislation in record speed to take over the City of Harrisburg. It is very clear that the Republican leadership of the state opposes municipal bankruptcy.

MR. LEWIS: Harrisburg didn't have a plan like I've built for this city. I have months sunk into this.

This is my job. This is what I do for a living.

1 MS. EVANS: That's exactly right. 2 Bankruptcy is your job so, of 3 course --4 MR. LEWIS: No. Saving failing 5 organizations isn't my job. I work 6 with failed banks --7 MS. EVANS: Well, through 8 bankruptcy. 9 MR. LEWIS: No. My clients do no 10 declare bankruptcy. The government 11 comes in, shuts down a bank. I work 12 with that failed bank to make them a 13 solvent stable institution. I've done 14 it with 23 banks. I don't use 15 bankruptcy. Banks cannot file 16 bankruptcy. 17 MS. EVANS: Well, you obviously as part of your job duties deal in 18 19 bankruptcy. MR. LEWIS: No, I don't do 20 21 anything. I don't do anything. I'm 22 not a lawyer. I don't deal with 23 bankruptcy courts. I've done research 24 on Chapter 9, research on municipal 25 bankruptcy. I do not work with

1	bankruptcy as part of my job. I work
2	with failing institutions and I help
3	them become solvent and stable and
4	work on the revenues they actually
5	have.
6	MS. EVANS: And have ou formed a
7	pact?
8	MR. LEWIS: I have.
9	MS. EVANS: And are you asking
10	for contributions?
11	MR. LEWIS: I am because I want
12	to publicize my plan. I want people
13	to know that what you're saying is not
14	the only course of action.
15	MS. EVANS: And what are the
16	contributions you've requested?
17	You've suggested
18	MR. LEWIS: Are you talking
19	about I suggested that people make
20	contributions of \$100 or more.
21	MS. EVANS: Up to \$5,000.
22	MR. LEWIS: That's the federally
23	required cut off. You can't take more
24	than \$5,000.
25	MS. EVANS: Correct. And so

1 MR. LEWIS: And do you know how 2 many I've received? Twenty-five 3 dollars of my own money. 4 MS. EVANS: Well --5 MR. LEWIS: So if you're trying 6 to make a point like, oh, I'm going to 7 go back to people and I'm going to, 8 you know, work with well heeled 9 lawyers and accountants and I'm going 10 to work with all this money that 11 Doherty's worked with over the last 12 ten years, that's not what I'm doing. 13 I'm taking my plan to the people 14 through out of my pocket. 15 MS. EVANS: Well, yes, your \$25 16 and you'd like everyone else to make 17 their contributions between like what 500 and 5,000 and --18 19 MR. LEWIS: This is it. All you 20 can do is sit there and attack me. 21 You can't talk about the issue. Can't 22 we talk about the issue. The issue is 23 the spending and the issue is the 24 revenue. 25 MR. LOSCOMBE: Relax.

MS. EVANS: Excuse me, excuse me.
You're out of order. I think
something else that should be
indicated is that the website also
proposes the backing of Republican
candidates for office. So before Mr.
Lewis accuses anyone of political
pandering or political decisions, I
suggest he look to himself.

And our next speaker is Doug Miller.

MR. MILLER: Good evening,
council, Doug Miller, Scranton. You
know, what took place here just now is
totally uncalled for. And just
nothing more than grandstanding that
we've had to deal with in this
chamber. You know, I've had to sit
back and listen to Mr. Lewis for
months now in all his rhetoric and
telling us how we should run the city
and bankruptcy is the solution. I
think the best thing for Mr. Lewis at
this time is if he's going to remain
political, then we all due respect I

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

suggest he stay away from this chamber. We're here to conduct business and if he can't conduct himself in a professional manner, then he doesn't belong here.

Moving on though I'd like to begin with some pressing matters, obviously the announcement made by council earlier this evening that we will receiving a TAN -- a TAN-B series in the amount of 6.2 million dollars from an outside bank and I think it's a credit to from my understanding Attorney Hughes was quite instrumental in securing this financing. I just would like this time, I know he's not here this evening, but I wold like to take this time to personally thank him for all his hard work, his tireless o hard work and effort, not just with this issue but on many other issues he's taken on. He's certainly taken on many matters that most city council solicitors in the past years never did and I think it's a credit to this

24

25

council in their selection of Attorney Hughes and he's yet shown his commitment to not only the council but the taxpayers of this city and it's certainly a relief to hear that we're receiving this funding as well as the 2.5 from DCED. This will give us a total of eight million dollars to work with and I say that this is just the beginning of the victory for the taxpayers of this city. We certainly didn't get ourselves totally out of the hole but we've definitely come a long way to the last five months and it's a credit to the council and the mayor coming together on a revised recovery plan and you should be commended for that, that, you know, political differences were put aside and leadership was put forth and we get to this position we're in tonight that we're going to pass the recovery plan that met PEL and DCED approval and I want to commend all sides for coming together. You know, to have

24

25

the mayor here last week was certainly a good step forward and a credit to council as well as many speakers that have come forward requesting that the mayor come forward in a public setting and we were able to see that take place. But, you know, throughout this process I can't say that everything has gone smoothly. As you know, I've been a critic of a lot of the grandstanders, I like to call them, who have come forward and have had objections to the recovery plan. I guess you could say that's the easy way out. I think we can all say no, no, no, no every week but no, no, no, no doesn't get us anywhere. Ιt doesn't solve our issues. And, you know, it's unfortunate Mr. Rogan left the room because I do want to address him this evening. You know, as I've sat back in recent weeks, I should say months, you know, I've listened to a lot of the statements made by Mr. Rogan and I sat back and I didn't say

25

anything, I let him continue. felt tonight as we're in the position we're in tonight with this plan as we take it into final passage, I felt it was important for me to respond to some of the statement made by Mr. You know, as we all know, Rogan. we're quite aware he has been a critic of this recovery plan and he's objected to it and he's stated quite boldly that he's voting no. But what I find kind of amusing throughout this whole process is while he's consistently claiming that he's voting no, he hasn't offered any alternative. You know, like I said, it's easy to be objective but when you don't have a solution yourself, I kind of find it hypercritical to, you know, make statements such as no. You know, my question to Mr. Rogan tonight and like I said it's a shame he walked out of the room but, you know, my question to him tonight is simply where is he supposed we come up with an estimated

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

32 million dollars because that's what the hole would be in our recovery plan if we were do away with the sales tax, the commuter tax and the amusement tax. Where does he suppose we come up with 32 million dollars without raising taxes. I'm curious to hear his plan on that.

My second question for him is he talks about how the Scranton Parking Authority, we need to dissolve, we to dissolve, we need to sell off the parking garages. Believe me I'd love to see it take place but I think what Mr. Rogan fairs to realize is that any money we recoup from the sale or lease of parking garages is going directly to pay off the bond debt. The city is not going to reap any of those benefits and if we do, there won't be much, if anything, left. He's back And I going to ask these questions again now that he's in here. But not to talk behind your back, you know, Mr. Rogan, I did have a few

I'm

1

questions for you tonight.

2

MR. ROGAN: Sure. I apologize.

3

I had to use the restroom.

4

5 basically going to be repetitive and

•

repeat a lot of what I just said. But

MR. MILLER: That's fine.

6 7

I stated moments ago, you know, I've

8

been sitting back and I've been

9

listening to a lot of statements made

10

by speakers and, you know, even

11

council members with this recovery

12

plan. And, you know, I've kind of bit

13

my tongue with a lot of your

14

statements and, you know, this is not

15

meant to be disrespectful but, you

16

know, it's obviously well known that

17

you've objected to this recovery plan  $\,$ 

18

and you stated you'll be voting no.

19

But I just have to ask tonight while

20

we intend on voting no, I'd like to

21

ask you, where do you intend on coming

22

up with 32 million dollars in revenue

23

that will be needed to fill a hole in

24

your proposal to do away with the

25

sales tax, the commuter tax and the

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

amusement tax because from listening to your statements, it's my understanding you're opposed to those so where do you feel you can up with 32 million with not raising taxes.

MR. ROGAN: Not all. opposed to the sales tax. I have stated that repeatedly. The commuter tax I remain open minded on. To be honest with you if there was a vote to implement the commuter tax today, I don't know how I would vote. amusement tax, I don't have a problem with. I did question whether Montage was in Scranton or, I'm sorry, the amusement tax. I did question whether Montage was, in fact, located in Scranton or not. Attorney Hughes state that it was. I don't have a problem with that. I also support that nonprofits should increase contributions to the city but I don't believe that they actually will judging by their track record. not saying that there's a possibility

1 to create a plan that doesn't increase 2 taxes. I've never said that. 3 when you have only a few million 4 dollars in spending cuts compared to tens of millions of dollars in tax 5 6 increases, I oppose that. 7 MR. MILLER: Well, let me ask you 8 this question because you're not the 9 only one that stated this and this is 10 sort of something that I find amusing 11 is we hear constantly we need millions 12 of dollars in cuts in the budget, 13 where do you suppose we make all these 14 cuts without cutting essential 15 services such as public safety. 16 MR. ROGAN: I believe -- on that 17 point I believe public safety is the 18 only essential service. I am fine 19 with gutting the budget outside of 20 public safety. 21 MR. MILLER: You don't believe 22 Public Works is an essential service 23 to taxpayers? 24 MR. ROGAN: It can be done 25 outside of government. The public

safety cannot be done outside of government, other services can be.

MR. MILLER: All right. Now, another question. You've also talked about the Parking Authority, selling or leasing the parking garages. And believe me nobody wants to see that done more than I do but at the same time you do realize that any revenue from any sale or lease will have to go to pay off that debt.

MR. ROGAN: Absolutely. And the reason why I support that is it wouldn't affect the city budget -- say if the Parking Authority sold three garages for 30 million garages tomorrow. They city wouldn't get a dime out of that money. The money should be used to pay down debt. If the Parking Authority sold and I'm just saying -- I'm not saying this is an exact number. If they sold assets say for 30 million dollars, by paying down debt early, that would say additional 30 million dollars.

Because as was mentioned by Attorney
Hughes the principal debt is
approximately 50 million dollars.
Through the course of making minimum
payments just like if you run a credit
card bill and you're making minimum
payments, the 50 million dollars by
making minimum payments comes to be
100 million dollars. By liquidating
some of those assets in paying off in
a lump sum, we're paying far less in
interest which at the end of the day
saves the taxpayers a lot of money.

MR. MILLER: You know, I just -as a stated, you know, I find the
whole thing just to be -- well, I'm
disappointed, I should say that
because I just think, you know, in
recent weeks we've had nothing more
than grandstanding and, you know, I
just don't feel you've offered any
alternative. As I said, it's easy to
say no. I can come up here. We can
all say no. No doesn't solve
anything. So what I'm asking tonight

is we've constantly heard, you know, 1 2 the mayor needs to come forward and 3 I've been a proponent of that and 4 council has pushed to get him here. 5 We finally had him here last week and 6 I know you wanted him here bad, too, 7 but, you know, I was kind of 8 disappointed that, you know, I didn't 9 hear any suggestions or solution posed 10 to the mayor from you. MR. ROGAN: Well, I wasn't 11 12 actually four of the five members on 13 council weren't given an opportunity 14 to question the mayor. 15 MR. MILLER: Okay. Does that 16 mean you weren't entitled to submit a 17 letter of -- or a list of proposals to 18 the mayor? 19 MR. ROGAN: I submitted a list of 20 suggestions to city council when the 21 recovery plan process started. 22 But that wasn't my MR. MILLER: 23 question. My question was, did you 24 submit anything to the mayor? 25 MR. ROGAN: It was submitted to

all five members of council. 1 2 MR. MILLER: So you didn't submit 3 anything to the mayor? 4 MR. ROGAN: Well. last week the 5 plan was already set in stone. 6 here to present that. 7 MR. MILLER: That's not my point. 8 The point is if you're going to be a 9 critic of something and you're not 10 willing to -- you know, you've talked 11 about having the mayor come here and 12 we wanted to develop a relationship 13 with the mayor and come up with a plan 14 together, you're telling me you didn't offer any suggestions to the mayor. 15 didn't ask --16 17 MR. ROGAN: Because that's not --18 Mr. Miller, that's not how the meeting 19 was structured and I don't want to get 20 in to a --21 MR. MILLER: I'm not concerned 22 about what meetings are structured. 23 My point you're a councilman, you're a 24 elected leader of the city, you have 25 an obligation to watch out for the

1	taxpayers of this city. What prevents
2	you please. What prevents you from
3	submitting a list to the mayor of your
4	suggestions to the recovery plan.
5	MR. ROGAN: Can I respond now?
6	MR. MILLER: Please.
7	MR. ROGAN: Thank you. First of
8	all I will say, if I knew Mayor
9	Doherty was coming to council, I would
10	have had something prepared.
11	MR. MILLER: You have had ample
12	time. You've had months to come up
13	with a plan
14	MR. ROGAN: Mr. Miller, am I
15	going to be allowed to reply?
16	MR. MILLER: You've had ample
17	time, though.
18	MR. ROGAN: No. To you.
19	MR. MILLER: It doesn't make any
20	sense, though.
21	MR. ROGAN: Without being cutoff,
22	let me reply
23	MR. MILLER: You make no sense to
24	me, though, if you had more and ou
25	didn't know the mayor was coming.

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You've known about his recovery plan for months. You've had ample time to come up with a plan so I don't buy your excuse.

MR. ROGAN: I've stated from day one when the whole debated started before any proposal came down, that all five members of council and the mayor need to meet to discuss a plan, not for the mayor and I'm not knocking the mayor for coming here, I'm glad he did, but I think if he came here two months ago and sat in that chair and we sat here and we talked about -- Mr. McGoff would say, Well, I support I would say, I support that, this. down the line, all five of us and come up with a plan created by five members of counsel and the mayor in public like in front of the citizens, we would have had a much better outcome than we have now.

MR. MILLER: But you knew at that time, you knew darn well at that time he wasn't coming forward with a

1 majority present and council, any 2 meeting with the majority needs to be 3 held in public. So you knew he wasn't 4 coming forward at that time. 5 again, still you didn't answer my 6 question. You're giving me the run 7 around, you know. 8 MR. ROGAN: No. I am answering 9 your question. 10 MR. MILLER: You didn't answer my 11 question because I asked you why you 12 didn't submit anything to the mayor 13 and your response was, Oh, I didn't 14 know he was coming. MR. ROGAN: I didn't. 15 16 MR. MILLER: What does that have 17 to do with submitting suggestions to 18 the mayor. 19 MR. ROGAN: So you expected me to 20 know that Mayor Doherty would be here 21 today, to come here with suggestions 22 and hand it to him when I didn't even 23 know he was going to be here. 24 MR. MILLER: No. What I'm 25 expecting as a city councilman if I'm

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Your excuses are --9 MR. ROGAN: Mr. Miller, it's not 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 MR. ROGAN: 21 Evans. 22 23 MS. EVANS: Mr. 24 25 end the debate.

concerned about a recovery plan is I would compile a list together and I would send it to Mayor's Office whether or not he's coming to a meeting or not. Nothing prevents you from walking into the mayor's office and saying, Mr. Mayor, here's my plan.

an excuse. If it said all along and you can look at it, I probably said it 20 times at this meeting, said it in the Scranton Times, said it WBRE and WNEP, I wanted a meeting of all five, members of council and the mayor to discuss the plan. That was my position and that's still my position.

MR. MILLER: What's your plan, Mr. Rogan? Do you have a plan?

There shouldn't be -you're running the meeting, Mrs.

Miller, thank you very much and I think we need to

1 MR. MILLER: No. I appreciate 2 that but it's just a ton of 3 grandstanding. You know, we like to 4 play to the camera, you know, we like to be show boats and that's all it is. 5 6 MS. EVANS: Thank you. Gerald Hefman. 7 MR. MILLER: Thank you. 8 9 MR. HEFMAN: Good evening, 10 council. Gerald Hefman --11 MS. EVANS: Good evening. 12 MR. HEFMAN: -- from the 13 Lackawanna County Department of 14 Community Relations. First, if I may, 15 would just like to announce a little 16 bit of an adjustment to our 17 schedule -- my schedule with regards 18 to attendance at Scranton City Council 19 meetings. Effective after this 20 evening's meeting in the future 21 starting with the month of September, 22 I will attend the first meeting, the 23 first schedule meeting and then the 24 third scheduled meeting each month of 25 Scranton City Council here in council

24

25

chambers. The first meeting of the month I will make a comprehensive list of announcements that we have regarding announcements that I have made, ongoing programs, activities, any other announcements as the commissioners and our partners dictate in our office. And then the third week, the second meeting of the month that I attend, I'll provide any updates on those original announcements and any new announcements that develop in the meantime and I do have some updates due to our previous announcements. This is a result of after several months of operation as with any new type of operation, our office has had a chance to evaluate how we can best work with all of our communities, all of our partners in the community in the City of Scranton and Lackawanna County in it's attempt to streamline and make more efficient our operations with regard to serving everyone that

22

23

24

25

we need to with the time and resources allotted to us. And, of course, I will always be available by phone or e-mail or in person whatever a member of council or a resident of Scranton should need to speak to your office regarding any relevant issue. So we will see you definitely next month and we will continue to provide the quality service to Scranton City Council and, again, the taxpayers and the residents of Scranton and Lackawanna County going forward.

With that said, we do have an update regarding an event I announced last week which our Department of Community Relations is spearheading and undertaking the planing for, that is Lackawanna County Senior Health During the course of this week and also early next week our department is working with Lackawanna County coordinate the Transportation Department and also all of our senior centers scattered around the county to

25

provide free transportation for senior residents of Lackawanna County to attend the Senior Fair which again will be held Tuesday, September 11th from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. at the Lackawanna County Trolley Museum on the grounds of Steamtown National Historic site. For more information on transportation senior residents can contact any of their local senior centers throughout the county. And I know we do have a number within the city and they can contact my colleague, Michelle Newberry, at 570-963-6743. extension 1872. That's 470-963-6743, extension 1872. On that same token my coworker, John McGurl is actively working with a number community partners and agencies and vendors as we call them in our office to attend the Senior Fair. There will been a number of services offered. Last week I mentioned the free flu There will be additional shots. things. We're working to get blood

20

21

22

23

24

25

pressure screenings for free, possibly hearing screenings and a lot of these things are still in the process but we're working very active to have a very fun event, interactive and have a wide variety of services available to our senior residents. So if anyone is from a business or from an agency that wishes to partner with our department to produce this event and to provide again a quality event for seniors, they can contact John McGurl at 570-963-6743, extension 1875. That's 570-963-6743, extension 1875. And our department looks forward to welcoming many of our senior residents of Scranton and Lackawanna County to our events and we hope it's going to be a great success and move forward to working with all of you to spread the word and make sure it turns out to be a very good day.

Last but not least another event that our department is planning and I do have to admit that this is kind of

25

my baby and my supervisor, Rod Ray as well, we're working with a number again of community organizations and particular public safety agencies to plan Hero's Day which will be held at the Lackawanna County 911 Center on Valley View Drive in Jessup on Saturday, September 22nd from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. This is an event that's a celebration and an exposition of public safety: Police, Fire Department, emergency medical services and other community entities that provide public safety and public works operations. It's a very fun event. There will be free food, giveaways, music and we're working with in addition to the emergency services, we're working with a number of other community agencies, Penn State Extension, Colts, and also Operation Lifesaver which is a national group that promotes railway safety for drivers, pedestrians, bicyclists and sadly there's been a number of

1	railroad related accidents in the news
2	over the last few days both locally
3	and nationally. Operation Lifesaver
4	works to educate the public on how to
5	be safe when doing business near
6	railway apparatuses. So that's all we
7	have and we look forward to seeing you
8	next time and thank you for your time
9	as always.
10	MS. EVANS: Thank you.
11	MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.
12	MS. EVANS: Marie Schumacher.
13	MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening,
14	Marie Schumacher, city resident and
15	taxpayer.
16	MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.
17	MR. ROGAN: Good evening.
18	MS. EVANS: Good evening.
19	MS. SCHUMACHER: First, a bit of
20	housekeeping on some open requests and
21	a couple of new questions.
22	First, Mr. Loscombe, would you
23	please explain the difference between
24	Mr. and Miss X and I believe it's Mr.
25	Alexander who regarding revealing

22

23

24

25

the offense. One was in the paper and the other we're still wondering and what's the difference between those two.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Well, the difference between those two is that the paper published the name of the one and didn't publish the name of the other. The newspaper has more legal attitude than I have. Neither one of those persons have been charged or convicted at this point so I can't mention either name. You know, I go from personal experience. people who were accused of certain things and were not guilty and I'm going to ruin anyone's reputation until it's adjudicated legally and if you would like to request any information, please put it in writing and I'll bring it to the police chief.

 $\label{eq:MS.SCHUMACHER: I'll do that.} % \begin{center} \begin{$ 

Mr. Rogan, do you have anything on the 408 Cedar LLC status to share

1 during Fifth Order. 2 MR. ROGAN: No. I actually sent 3 you a message yesterday. Sorry. And 4 actually I lost some of my notes from 5 the meeting. I had request and I ask 6 for it again. But you can just either 7 reply to my message or I will jot it 8 down now. 9 MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. I'll do 10 that. 11 MR. ROGAN: Sorry about that. 12 MS. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Joyce, the 13 rest are for you. Do you have the 14 list of the establishments that were 15 billed for the parking tax available 16 tonight? 17 MR. JOYCE: I don't. Mrs. Krake, 18 we haven't received that list, have 19 we? Just so I'm sure --MS. KRAKE: I'm not sure what 20 21 Miss Schumacher is asking. It's not 22 clear to me. I apologize. 23 MR. JOYCE: A few weeks Mrs. 24 Shumacher asked for a list of all of 25 the recipients of the parking tax

1 bills and we had sent that request out 2 twice. Have we receive the reply on 3 that? 4 MS. KRAKE: Thank you. Now I 5 understand. No, we have not received a reply, however, I did hear a remark 6 7 from our business administrator 8 concerning a different question that 9 we have received some money and there 10 was some question about some people 11 maybe not questioning the tax itself 12 and then, you know, how we were going 13 to go forward with it. So apparently 14 it has been completed. I just -- he has not forwarded to us who he sent it 15 16 to. 17 MR. JOYCE: Could we please 18 reforward that request to him. 19 MS. KRAKE: This will be our 20 third request. 21 MR. JOYCE: Yes. 22 MS. SCHUMACHER: I was going to 23 say if they're stiff arming you, it 24 sort belies the new cooperation 25 between council and the administration

if they're still not providing 1 2 answers. 3 MR. JOYCE: I agree. 4 MS. SCHUMACHER: Do you have a 5 copy of the letter requesting the 6 reimbursement for the added cost incurred as a result of Vice President 7 8 Biden's visit on the 3rd of July? I 9 believe you asked for that as well. 10 MR. JOYCE: I don't have a copy 11 of that on hand. 12 MR. ROGAN: I think that was me 13 that asked for that. We didn't get a 14 reply from the Mayor's Office 15 regarding the visit. I know he did 16 mention to -- I believe it was the 17 Scranton Times that he also did 18 support that the Obama campaign should 19 be reimbursing the city for the visit 20 but I haven't seen a receipt for reimbursement yet for reimbursement 21 22 yet from the Obama campaign. 23 MS. SCHUMACHER: But did the 24 letter go out specifying how much that 25 would cost to cover? Do we have a

1 copy of that letter? 2 MR. ROGAN: The administration 3 hasn't replied to our request. 4 MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. Chalk up 5 another one for cooperation. Did you 6 research during the past week what 7 became of the case laws that I 8 provided on the contractors operating 9 a government-owned facility and the 10 fact that they are, in fact -- should 11 paying property taxes and in the case 12 of General Dynamics that would be 13 about a half a million dollars a year? 14 MR. JOYCE: I have started to 15 look into it but I have been busy with 16 the recovery plan but I will continue 17 to research that. 18 MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. And then 19 the two new ones tonight. The 20 interest rate on the TAN-B? 21 MR. JOYCE: Five percent. 22 MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. And do we 23 have a status on when we will get 24 coverage for the unfunded debt that 25 the Court approved and for paying for

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the police and firefighters?

MR. JOYCE: At this time Ryan McGowan is negotiating the terms with various financial institutions to try to get us the best deal that we could get as far as the 9.85 million dollars and it my assumption that once we get the TAN-B and the state money, the 2.25 million dollars, \$250,000 and a grant and one million dollars in a loan that has to be paid back this year and one million dollars and the loan that has to be paid back over ten years, that the firefighters and police officers would be paid their back pay from the minimum wage pay week.

MS. SCHUMACHER: But that's not all of the back pay. That's just the seven and a quarter an hour, right?

That's not all of their back pay from the Supreme Court ruling. That's what I'm --

MR. JOYCE: Oh, no, no. Okay.
That's still --

1 MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. Because 2 previously it was stated that that 3 would be covered by a bond. 4 MR. JOYCE: Yes. That still is 5 in the works as far as negotiating 6 with the banks. 7 MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. Now to 8 the biggie, 7B on tonight's agenda. 9 No. 1, affordability of additional tax 10 hikes. Perhaps now would be a good 11 time to express my disappointment that 12 dispute all of the comments about the 13 Scranton Sewer Authority rates not one 14 councilman had the time or interest to 15 attend the public hearing on their CSO 16 long term controlled plan draft and 17 the impact on the ratepayers. Section 18 8.3.3 of that document which is 19 available at the Scranton Sewer 20 Authority website provides -- may I 21 finish? 22 MR. JOYCE: Yes. 23 MS. SCHUMACHER: Since others 24 were granted. Provides a 2011 25 financial capability assessment update

24

25

that I would ask you to review and it's got an appendix that's also posted that tells how that was calculated. I personally calculated for each of the 11 municipalities having a common border with the Scranton. The percent of the total of municipal property tax, wage tax, school tax and county tax is both a median family income and the median home value and guess what, Scranton is tied for second highest as a percent of the household income and third as a percent of home value and this was at the current rate. How much more do you believe you can squeeze out of the taxpayers before they flee for affordability. Second is the dubious revenue sources impact on the millage. I noticed in yesterday's Times Tribune that the mayor of Mayfield is lining up other municipalities to go to the court hearing to oppose the commuter tax that is a part of your recovery plan unless we hear a change tonight

and there a question regarding other dubius revenue sources that must be backed up by yet more increases in millage. Then there are the several unresolved one time expenses that could impact the budget which includes payments to MEM for streetlights and correction the drainage issue at the Village of Tripp Park. Maybe Mr. McGoff could find out if the developer actually fixed that or if we're still on the hook because the judge put us as No. 2.

Now, finally though I understand the other communities are unable to currently retaliate with a commuter tax of their own, the unintended consequences consequence on Scranton business may hurt more than you think and our business privilege and wage taxes may take a hit. All of which leaves me to my recommendation which is all parties need to come together to prepare a plan as though we were bankrupt. Without incurring the added

Thank

Deb

1 cost of attorney fees and actually 2 filing for bankruptcy we need to move 3 from the current cash accounting 4 system to an accrual system. you for your consideration of this 5 6 request. 7 MS. EVANS: Thank you. 8 MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you. 9 MS. EVANS: Deb Niehaus. 10 MS. NIEHAUUS: Good evening. Niehaus, West Scranton. I want to 11 12 thank the young lady that spoke 13 earlier about the animal law 14 ordinance. I'm not sure what it -- I 15 couldn't hear actually but I'm glad to 16 see somebody finally speaking up on 17 behalf of animals in the City of 18 Scranton. And beyond that I just want 19 to clarify something. Council 20 President Evans, you stated earlier, I 21 think your opening remarks you said 22 something about the actual proposed 23 tax rate over three years. Was that 24 39 percent you said or 34?

MS. EVANS: It is 35 percent but

25

1 when compounded over three years it is 2 39 percent. 3 MS. NIEHAUUS: Okay, 39. So the 4 81 percent figure we've been seeing in 5 the paper is --6 MS. EVANS: Well, actually that 7 is for the worst case scenario meaning 8 that the mandates would fail but I 9 believe that council and the mayor are 10 going to be working very hard to bring 11 them to successful fruition and in 12 addition we need the city, county and 13 the state to work together to achieve 14 all of the goals of the revised 15 recovery plan throughout the next 16 three years. 17 MS. NIEHAUSS: Thank you. 18 MS. EVANS: As well as the 19 nonprofits. I'm sorry. 20 MS. NIEHAUSS: Well, on that note 21 I hope all of the people that were 22 earlier mentioned, I think by Mr, 23 Quinn, could start entertaining the 24 idea of all taking a seat at an actual 25 roundtable and discussing these ideas

20

21

22

23

24

25

openly and calmly and truthfully and airing everybody's worse case scenarios and worse fears and I think once we start communicating and realizing that we're all in this together, maybe we would, you know, I guess relax a little bit and start brainstorming as a true community as opposed to individual entities of government. So I think coming from my background when I worked in advertising and marketing in Philadelphia one of the practice that we used to do was to brainstorm ideas and they can be very, very helpful to just generate ways and solutions out of really dire situations which I think we're looking at now.

But to continue, I think regardless of whether we end up raising taxes or eventually filing bankruptcy, I think the time is ripe in the city for what we, the citizens are looking for. We and judging from the comments that came from past

25

speakers and recent past meetings, I think the lady with the petitions was constantly saying the comments from Scranton citizens were they're upset and frustrated with the ongoing --I'll say less than ethical practices both in government and in business around here. I think its time if we're going to start overhauling budgets and so forth, it's also time to start seriously considering ways that we can put reforms in place that will guarantee or at least hope to guarantee the citizens of this city good -- and I know it's redundant but I will say it again -- good, honest, open, accountable, transparent, ethical government. Once and for all let's get something on paper, incorporate it into the city code or the charter so that we no longer have to have this nagging feeling that we're operating behind some, you know, dark forces of corruption and graft. I don't want to see any more pay to

24

25

play. I don't want to cronyism anymore in my city. I don't want to see even favoritism which I find this is the oddest of them all based on one's ancestry. I mean, it's just -you know, we're all Scrantonians, we are all Pennsylvanians and we're all American citizens and I think we have to start really thinking of ourselves that way, that we're all Scrantonians, regardless of where our ancestors came We would have less of a from. resistance to discussing problems. I would like to say no more nepotism, I'd like to say good government now, and I think that's the citizens' plank of this recovery plan and I would ask that perhaps council could consider at some point soon convening a task force or a committee on the subject of good government practices and good business practices and start again brainstorming. I have -- I know I've done some research. I have at least two files full of what other cities

21

22

23

24

25

have done, ethics codes, what works, what doesn't work. I mean, let's -we don't have to reinvent the wheel. We can just start incorporating these things and holding, you know, our government officials, our local officials as well as people who do business with the city accountable. That's all. I think when we don't do that, it has a way of segwaying into actual physical problems as well. And I would like to just ask one guick question if it's appropriate to pole council. I know we had the issue of the initial vote to fund and cover the Parking Authority's bond payment and initially it did not pass, and I'm just wondering because I am somewhat confused. I get mixed signals from the Scranton Times. Does each council member, do you regret voting no on that initially and, if so, why for those who did vote no. Could I ask each one of you how you feel about it Was that a mistake to vote no on now?

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Parking Authority bond and then going back.

MS. EVANS: I'll begin. No, that was not a mistake. I certainly do not regret that because that put the wheels in motion. If the city had simply stepped in and provided the money, today you would have the same trustee, you would have the same solicitor who demonstrated a clearcut conflict of interest, you would have the same salaries and you would have the same mismanagement that has been ongoing over the past several years and so by taking that vote it gained the attention of the bond insurers and the bond issuers then became convinced that the trustee was not performing its due diligence, a new trustee had to be appointed and the ball has been rolling since than. And I know it doesn't move as quickly as everyone would hope but it is moving along. And now, of course, there is a receiver that has been appointed and

22

23

24

25

he will need the time to get up to speed basically with the policies, practices and budgets and -- or lack thereof and financials of the Scranton Parking Authority prior to making his decision as to professional management and that is certainly the goal of Scranton City Council to seek professional management so that the Parking Authority will become either self sufficient in the future or if that is not a possibility because perhaps too many garages have been constructed, then there should be a sale of garages to drive down the bond payments, you know, what the proceeds from that sale will be used to repay the bonds and then the city ultimately will be responsible only for the remainder of that debt and, of course, you'll save a tremendous amount of interest as well.

MS. NIEHAUSS: I agree. I think it was a wise move but you can't always tell that. I don't if

23

24

25

everybody else wants to vote on that.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I would echo Mrs. Evans totally.

MS. NIEHAUSS: That definitely answered or speaks probable for almost all --

MR. ROGAN: I would say the first vote that you asked about whether, you know, people regret voting against giving them the money. I personally feel the first vote was the correct vote not give them the money. know, we later found out that there was extra money in a reserve fund. Later legislation was passed asking for the money back from the reserve fund and all we have gotten from the new solicitor and from still Mr. Scopelliti as, you know, side step, well, you know, talk about accelerated payments and I know Attorney Hughes mentioned last week he didn't see that in there but, you know, he doubted that it would be. He's not here tonight to talk about it but I voted e

1	against giving them the money six
2	times and I was happy you know, I
3	thought it was the right choice every
4	time.
5	MR. MCGOFF: I'll be very quick.
6	I was the only yes vote and it was my
7	belief that we would eventually have
8	to pay that debt which we did and it
9	was also my belief that it would
10	create a negative perception to the
11	banking community and to others which
12	I believe it did.
13	MR. JOYCE: I voted no and I do
14	not regret my decision.
15	MS. NIEHAUSS: Thank you very
16	much, council.
17	MS. EVANS: Thank you.
18	MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.
19	MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else
20	who cares to address council?
21	MR. MORGAN: Good evening,
22	council.
23	MS. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.
24	MS. EVANS: Good evening.
25	MR. MORGAN: The first thing I

24

25

have is, you know, I'd just like to say publicly that I think it's time for the Court of Common Pleas and for the county commissioners to come up with a contract for the guardian ad litem in the Lackawanna County court system and it's also time to expand the program and bring three or four newly graduated attorneys in to act in court for minor children in the guardian program that have never practiced law here. And I'd just like to say that publicly and I just hope that the county commissioners and judges are listening because I think that the program is very valuable.

And now I'd like to go to the city's position here. Is the city going to vote tonight three times on the recovery plan to fast track it through council tonight?

MR. LOSCOMBE: This is actually the third vote on the recovery plan.

MR. JOYCE: This would be the third vote on the recovery plan.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, I man, I'm MR. MORGAN: looking at a revised copy of the ed recovery act, okay, it's dated as of tomorrow so this is a new copy of the recovery plan and I'm not sure that people understand that there's a new version and there's been changes made to it but I think it would be important for the residents of this city to understand that in my opinion politics is moving full steam ahead and this recovery plan has nothing, absolutely nothing to offer the residents of this city except for a massive tax increase. And I have to applaud the people outside the city. They're going to fight against the commuter tax and a sales tax increase because to quite blunt, it isn't only this council that's made mistakes by cutting taxes and just speaking as if really you had some idea what was going on and yet it turned out where you just didn't. The supermajority turned out to be a nightmare for this

24

25

city. And that may go contrary to what the other people believe and torpedoing the Parking Authority. Look it, Mr. Scopelliti didn't allow that borrowing to take place, councilmen did. Okay? And the running of the Parking Authority, well, look it, they knew they couldn't pass those bonds when they passed that legislation through council and now what we're going to do is we're going offer up Parking Authority alleged property that council seems that's a great idea bu the market is so suppressed that we're never get what the value of the property is. with the tax increases coming in, oh, that lady that was in paper today, she's absolutely right about the 81 percent. And, Mr. Rogan, I'd like to applaud you because, you know, you are We've had one rubber stamped riaht. council after another and I don't see much difference between this council and previous councils even though

24

25

you're a supermajority, okay, because what's going on here is the pain and the hardship that's going to come to the residents of this city is just mind boggling. Okay? And to act as if this recovery plan is going to turn the city around, I don't know, I don't think it is. I don't think I've heard anybody on council talk about all the money owed to the pension plans but I guess that money is just going to fall out of the sky for us, okay, and I haven't seen any of the council members speak about a multitude of other issues that are very important to the residents of this city. I mean, it's easy to grandstand on certain issues but the truth of the matter is this city is very sick, okay, and this -- look it if the state is going to come forward and give you some money and we're going to allegedly find a bank now that is going to give us some money, I think there's a lot of arm twisting going on

1 but is it really in the best interest 2 of the residents. And my other 3 question is if there's a public 4 hearing -- if there's going to be a 5 public hearing which may not take 6 place or may take place, council will 7 determine that, but if the residents 8 of this city come here and say they're 9 opposed to this plan, what will the 10 council do then? Or does it not 11 really matter -- Janet talked about a 12 public hearing, Mr. Loscombe, if 13 you're not aware of that. She talked 14 about a public hearing --I believe we had a 15 MR. LOSCOMBE: 16 public hearing already on it. 17 MR. MORGAN: Okay. But now we 18 have a new recovery plan, we have a 19 revised one. Or maybe we don't 20 deserve another hearing. But one 21 point is really simply --22 MR. LOSCOMBE: We're at a 23 deadline, sir, and that was fluid 24 until right before our meeting 25 tonight. We're at a deadline. If we

want to --

MR. MORGAN: You're at the deadline? What about the residents that can't pay their taxes? What about their deadline?

MR. LOSCOMBE: I'll explain that in a little bit. But if we want to lose two and a half million dollars tomorrow --

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Loscombe, let me say this to you. All the things you explained to the residents of this city aren't going to do a thing for the condemnations that taking place and the amount of people --

MR. LOSCOMBE: That's only your opinion --

MR. MORGAN: And many people in this city losing their homes because they can't pay their taxes and the most relevant thing that could have been done for this city is to find some relief somewhere. And look it, we can all talk about how much this recovery plan is going to present,

1 39 percent, whatever, if none of these 2 revenues come forward, it's still 3 81 percent. And when the pension plan 4 need to be funded how many percent 5 will it be then. And if you can't 6 understand what former residents are 7 saying in the newspaper and out in 8 public about abandoning this city over taxation, you know what, I feel sorry 9 10 for you. MR. LOSCOMBE: Well, I have to 11 12 represent 77,000 people and I have to 13 go with what the majority of people 14 tell me. I haven't --15 MR. MORGAN: 16 MR. LOSCOMBE: Pardon? 17 MR. MORGAN: Let's see what they 18 feel. 19 MR. LOSCOMBE: They voted me in. 20 MR. MORGAN: No, you're right, 21 they did. They did vote you in. But 22 you know something, this should have 23 been placed on a ballot and the 24 residents, the 77,000 people you say 25 you represent should have had a vote

1	in this because you know something,
2	this council and this administration
3	are going to pick their pockets, all
4	right. And as far as good and ethical
5	government, if it hasn't happened at
6	this point, I don't know why you think
7	it's going to happen tomorrow. But I
8	appreciate your time, sir.
9	MR. LOSCOMBE: Sir, I can account
10	for us but we didn't create this mess.
11	We're only trying to straighten it
12	out. I live in this city, too. We
13	have all have to share the pain.
14	MR. JOYCE: Is there anyone else
15	who would like to address, council.
16	Hi, Chrissy.
17	MR. SLEDNESZSKI: Can I ask you a
18	question. Just to you, Mr. Rogan. I
19	asked you a question. No one else.
20	MR. ROGAN: Okay, Chrissy.
21	MR. SLEDNESZSKI: Up on on the
22	second court. (Unintelligiable.)
23	MR. ROGAN: Okay, Chrissy.
24	MR. SLEDNESZSKI: Thanks, Pat.
25	MR. ROGAN: Okay. You're

welcome.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Take it easy.

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

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening council, Dave Dobrzyn, resident of Scranton, taxes paid. I'll pay what extra I have to pay, I guess. That's the way it is.

On the spay and neuter at Griffin Pond, I just figured I'd get this out of way quick, it's \$60 for shots, spay and neuter. It usually typically cost about 200 at a vet so it's something out there for people in TV land to consider before they let that animal get pregnant.

And, okay, support. As painful as the tax increase is, I have a question for the people out there in TV land. Do people deserve to pay for the policies they support it. We're up against the wall here. It can't go any further. You can't keep letting people go home with empty pockets and

minimum wage and there's no more money so we have to plan in the future to never have this happen again but I don't see any way out for you people other than to increase the taxes. And if you voted for some of the rubber stampers and so forth, you have nobody but yourself to blame. Or if you didn't show up on Election Day and didn't care. That's the way it is.

And I have a message for public employees. Carful whom you vote for, I it may cost you your job some day. Anymore increases might be out of my cold dead hands. And as far as the state takeover, that's the last thing I'd ever want to see, ever want to see the state takeover. They pulled the carpet on us, they locate their nonprofits here and tell us to go play. So they can go play. In the future I'd just love to see a limit set on anymore tax exempts, period.

No more. I don't care who they are, I don't care what they're doing or what

1

9

7

8

12 13

11

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

their purpose is, find a place up in Spring Brook with the 230 acres you've purchased for our friends up on the hill here, the university, and some of these other places. Lackawanna County Junior College gets about \$6,000 per student for a few months from the Unemployment Office. So it's not like they can't afford to throw us a few.

And furthermore on fees, I wonder -- you know, I might get 20 bucks or 30 bucks back from my property taxes from the City of Scranton or maybe 50, wouldn't it be cheaper if we just charged fees for city maintenance. I often wondered. Then the people that are getting the free ride would have to pay. like the trash fee. If you want to use the trash, you have to pay the Irregardless of whether you're fee. tax exempt or not. So add 35 percent to that and start picking up all the garbage because I think a lot of this dumping that I mentioned along the

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sides of East Mountain and so forth are landlords and it gets stuck with a bunch of old couches or mattresses and then they sneak back there with their pickup truck and, you know, the country side suffers.

And furthermore with the current state administration and legislator are making you guys be the bad guys. And that's all I have to say on that. They've got everything their way. They want to -- they didn't tax Marcellus Shale, the tri-axles beat up on the roads. What's Governor Corbett's solution? Fines and fees. O in other words I'm going to have a policeman follow me around and will make sure I'm using my turn signal and pay for the broken roads and pay a higher license fee for my car and whatever and, you know, I'm paying to put money in somebody else's pocket so that's what we got out of them and very little else. All we have here is a loan. We don't have anything else.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And somebody noted that up at Nay Aug, this is a petty thing but the Job Johnnies are not gender oriented so men and women both use them. While a lady slug a door open and there was a guy standing there with his panties down. And she got herself a free show. And the street sweeper on East Mountain comes up after the trash -or before the trash removal. So a guy stopped me at the supermarket. And, okay, I'm going to keep harping on this voting thing because with the golden parrot. If your name or nickname is Frank, Pat, Bob or Jack, you better make sure that you're properly registered to vote. Do you hear that, Mr. McGoff? If you're registered to vote as Bob and your name is actually Robert, you better correct that this fall. And the 501C4's are being run and they're actually political organizations and they're listed as public interest or public benefactors and they write some

1 of these nasty ads up and make lots of 2 money. So Mr. Corbett and 501C4's, 3 have a good night, balk, balk, balk. 4 MR. JOYCE: Thank you. 5 MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you. 6 MR. JOYCE: Is there anyone else 7 who cares to address council? 8 MR. JACKOWITZ: Good evening, 9 council. Bill Jackowitz, South 10 Scranton resident, member of the Taxpayers' Association and founder of 11 12 the Legion of Doom. 13 MR. JOYCE: Good evening. 14 MR. JACKOWITZ: First of all. I'd 15 like to make an announcement. As Vice 16 President of the Taxpayers' 17 Association and I was conference with 18 Mr. Quinn, the President of the 19 Taxpayers' Association, we're still 20 going to have our town hall meeting on 21 the 4th of September but right now 22 we're going to table Mr. Lewis' 23 opinion because we as officers were 24 not aware of the website and we want 25 to investigate that before we find

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

out. But we will still be inviting city council, they mayor and other elected officials of Scranton and we're also going to be inviting mayors of surrounding communities also to come in and we hope the citizens of the city and the county come to the meeting on the 4th of September right here at the city council's meeting and ask our elected official questions and we hope the elected officials come prepared with answers. But first of all, we hope they show up. That's the most important thing.

Okay. Now, in reference to what Mr. Miller's comments were attacking Mr. Rogan, at last week's meeting or I should say at last week's dog and pony show which was declared -- which was a caucus we were under a time limit. We had an hour. Mrs. Evans made that perfectly clear. As a matter of fact, I was the last speaker. So Mr. Rogan would not have had time to ask Mr. Doherty questions during last week's

caucus because it's obvious that Mayor Doherty was here for one hour and one hour only because it was the first time I attended a caucus where we were rushed and had to be over right at 6:30. Meetings have started late many times because of a caucus. So in defense of Mr. Rogan he would not have had time to ask questions.

Furthermore, as far as grandstanding, Mr. Rogan is an elected official. has -- he was elected by the people. He can go vote anyway he wants to It's up to him. And for him to be ridiculed -- he was ridiculed for a vote a couple weeks ago when he made his vote because he did not agree with the supermajority. So that was grandstanding. Bringing a pacifier to a city council meeting is grandstanding. Moving a chair up to the front is grandstanding. resent the fact that an elected official is accused of grandstanding

when he makes his vote. That's what

24

25

he's there for. Just because he doesn't agree with you. I don't agree with a lot of votes that go on but that's not grandstanding. Bring a pacifier to a meeting is grandstanding. I've been around a lot longer than Mr. Miller. I've lived in different cities. I know what goes on in government. Mr. Miller is young, plus he's going to be running for office again. I'm pretty sure. Ιf I'm wrong about him running for office, I will apologize to him. But I think he's the one who is grandstanding and that's all I'm going to say on that. That needs to stop right now.

Okay. You know, I appreciate what council does, okay, I really do. I appreciate what council does. I appreciate the hard work. I understand you guys are working hard but you know something, that's what you were elected to. If you think I'm going to thank you for doing your job,

24

25

I'm not going to because that's why I voted for you. I vote -- you know, we've been distressed for 7,531 days now, 238 months. I elected you two and a half years ago to work for the people. Just like I elected the mayor and everybody else whether I voted for you or not. I voted for four of you up there. Mr. McGoff, sorry, Bob, I never voted for you. But anyway -and I haven't voted for the mayor the last two times either. But that's what we elected you for. That's your job. I'm not going to sit here and pat you on the back. I appreciate what you do. But I'm not going to pat you. You know what I'm going to pat you on the back, when city council and the mayor holds a joint news conference to say, guess what, we are no longer a distressed city. We no longer owe a half a billion dollars in loans and bond payment. Then I will definitely -- as a matter of fact, I'll even take you out and buy you a

24

25

McDonald's Big Mac because I will appreciate. But up until then, I'm not going to play passy to you guys, I'm a realistic. As far as okav. being accused of being negative, I'm not negative. I tell the truth. the truth of the matter is we are a distressed city and very serious financial problems. And in order for us to get out of these financial problems, we have to get money. And how we get the money, I don't really care as long as we get it, you know. And as far as the police and firefighter go, I support the police and the firefighters. I think they should be the highest paid employees in the City of Scranton. But can e afford 78,000 -- 90,000 police and firefighters, right now I say no. minimum wage in the -- not the minimum The median family income is \$36,000. The average median family income in the United States is \$57,000. We're \$21,000 behind that.

23

24

25

We can't afford anymore tax raise. want to know exactly how much is the tax going to be raised. What is it? Mr. Joyce, I think you're brilliant. I think you deserve that 4.0 grade average and that master's degree that you have but, please, talk in plain English because most people do not understand anything you're saying. Okay? And that's where the confusion comes in. Talk in plain simply English so the people out there can understand. They really want to know because they're the ones who have to pay the taxes. They're the ones who are on the hook. City council is not on the hook. The mayor is not on the hook. The residents and the taxpayers are on the hook. Okay? So let's get it out. Let's not have anymore -let's get everything out. It has to be out in the open.

And, again, I invite everybody to come to city council chambers on September 4th, Tuesday. We're still

1 going to have our public meeting, our 2 town hall meeting. We hope the 3 elected officials show up. I hope you 4 answer questions, I hope the citizens 5 show up and I hope mayors from 6 surrounding communities show up because I'm dead set against the 7 8 commuter tax, I'm dead set against the 9 one percent sales tax. We made this 10 mess, the residents of Scranton, so 11 we're the ones who need to pay for it. 12 As far as our bridges go because we 13 have a speaker who talks about people 14 using our bridges -- I believe 15 everyone of our bridges is under 16 construction and they're detoured. So 17 is that what we're asking the 18 communities to pay for, to drive on 19 detoured bridges. Thank you. 20 MR. JOYCE: Thank you. 21 MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you. 22 MR. JOYCE: Is there anyone else 23 who cares to address council? 24 there no one else? 25 (No response.)

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

MR. MCGOFF: Yes. Thank you. I was on vacation last week. I did, however, send a substitute. I hope you were pleased with his appearance. Sorry.

A couple of things that have been brought up tonight. First of all, the tax increase in the recovery plan. I hope I'm not stealing anything from Mr. Joyce but I really do think it's time to start stop talking in hyperbole and to take a look at some real numbers. We can throw a round percentages all we want, but when we get down to talking about the real numbers that are here, it's a little bit different. The average -- well, let's put it this way.

Seventy-five percent of all taxpayers in the city, real estate tax pay less

in the city, real estate tax pay less \$250 or less in city real estate taxes. Okay? Seventy-five percent of the taxpayers in the city pay \$250 or

20

21

22

23

24

25

less in city real estate taxes. tax percentage is somewhere around 20 percent of the total tax bill. County, I think, is 26 or 36 and then the school district is like 54. we are the lowest taxing body. If you were you -- if you take a look at -if we were to apply the tax increases that are in the revised recovery plan, not the contingency but the tax increases, in the third year of those tax increases, the 39 percent cumulative that that Mrs. Evans spoke about, that would amount to less than \$2 a week for a taxpayer, less than \$2 a week. If we went to the contingency which, yes, it seems like an exorbitant and as a taxpayer I'm not looking to pay that but in total that would be less than \$4 a week in the third year of the plan if, in fact, all of those contingency were applied. So when you look at real numbers, it's not as exorbitant -- yes, it's \$4 a week a bit of money to pay, yes, but

it's not the exorbitant amounts that people want you to believe. I think that we have the newspaper and others that glorified what this tax increase would mean to the taxpayer. I think that if some of the mandates are met and we can look at reasonable tax increases, even at the 39 percent, as a said, that's less than \$2 a week in the third year for the taxpayer and I think that's that manageable if we expect to provide the services that all the taxpayers in this city want.

The second thing that was brought up was the TAN-B, just a couple of notes on that. The interest rate is at five percent. What was the TAN-A interest? Does anybody remember?

MS. EVANS: It was higher. It was remember.

MR. JOYCE: It was higher, yes.

MR. MCGOFF: It was higher than
five. It was seven or eight, wasn't
it?

MR. JOYCE: Yes, I believe so.

1	MS. EVANS: And in addition to
2	that, as you know, all of the real
3	estate revenue was well, for lack
4	of a better word, confiscated for
5	repayment.
6	MR. MCGOFF: Well, I was looking
7	at TAN and I believe that the
8	repayment on it is very similar to
9	what TAN-A was if I'm not mistaken.
10	It says that from September 1st to
11	December 15th the is it the earned
12	income tax would designate any
13	earned income tax would be designated
14	to repayment.
15	MS. EVANS: Well, actually
16	60 percent.
17	MR. ROGAN: Sixty percent.
18	MR. MCGOFF: Sixty percent. I'm
19	sorry.
20	MS. EVANS: And the city will
21	retain 40 percent.
22	MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. And also
23	the DCED loan would be a direct
24	payment to Amalgamated Bank?
25	MS. EVANS: Yes.

1 MR. MCGOFF: For repayment of 2 that. So I guess what I -- my 3 question on the TAN-B would be that 4 would leave a balance of somewhere 5 around four million dollars repayment 6 between now and the end of year, and I didn't have the cash flow analysis or 7 8 the -- anything. Is that an expected 9 amount that we can --10 MS. EVANS: Yes, it is. 11 MR. ROGAN: Yes, it is. 12 MS. EVANS: In fact, I believe that Mr. McGowan, Mr. Joyce and 13 14 Attorney Hughes provided the 15 historical data to Amalgamated Bank. 16 They received all of the city 17 financials and they approved TAN-B 18 yesterday at a meeting of their board. 19 MR. MCGOFF: Thank you very much. 20 Just some questions I had about it. 21 And, again, very thankful for the 22 TAN-B that we can meet some of our 23 expenses and payroll for the, you 24 know, coming months. 25 Last thing I'd like to just bring

up as we move through one crisis or one situation. I would like to know if council would reconsider or reintroduce SAPA for 2013. I realize that when it was voted town there were some, you know, objections to it. But I think as we move forward, it may provide -- it may provide some incentive for business in the Scranton area or in the City of Scranton and it might be worth looking at for 2013. And that's all. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Actually I can respond to that. The SAPA plan is included in the revised recovery plan and it is the mayor's, I believe, responsibility to meet with the member communities and discuss the issues. The initiative -- the burden of the initiative has been placed with the Mayor's Office.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you.

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

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROGAN: Yes. Thank you.

I'll save most of my comments on the recovery plan for the voting portion of the meeting.

I do just want to address one point about the tax increase where people were mentioning and they said they want to hear in plain English whether it's, you know, 35 percent, 39, 68, 81. It depends on how you look at it. The tax increase in this plan would be 39 percent if you believe that the City of Scranton will have a commuter tax, a sales tax, increased payments from nonprofits and the amusement tax. Those items have to be realized for the tax increase to be at that level. If you do not believe that the City of Scranton will have a sales tax, a commuter tax, increased payments from nonprofits, then it will closer to the 81 percent mark. So I guess, you know, can it be 35 percent, yes. Can it be 81 percent, yes. It depends on whether

you believe those items are realistic and they are going to be achieved. So that's, you know, my way of summing it up in plain English. If, you know, there's any questions, you know, feel free to talk to me afterwards.

Just one question and Mr. McGoff actually pointed this out to me. I saw that I am happy to see that we are getting a second TAN and the money from DCED as well at the zero percent interest. Now, that would come right off of the principal on the second TAN; is that correct?

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

MR. ROGAN: Okay. Because I do
like how that's structured. Is we're
actually not borrowing over six
million at, you know, an interest rate
because you're paying off a nice
portion of it right off the get go
with zero percent interest. You know,
long term borrowing, I think everyone
knows I'm opposed to. Short term
borrowing in this forum, you know, to

get through payroll and, you know, pay our bills, I don't think is bad. And the interest rate, I think is fair. I think five percent is more than a fair interest rate. So on those two items I will be voting yes.

Just a couple other things that I want to mentioned. Some residents contacted me and when streetlights go out, we send the request in. The responsibility of placing new streetlights on, for instance, a block that's completely black, would that rest with the DPW or does that rest -- does anyone know?

MR. LOSCOMBE: I believe that's Metlatch now, right?

MS. KRAKE: Would you like me to respond as far as know. We actually were contacted by someone in our office so I don't know if that was the same person, Mr. Rogan.

MR. ROGAN: It may have been.

MS. KRAKE: We told them the process as per the laws of the city.

1 They have to -- we gave them the 2 paperwork and so forth and it has to 3 come before council because it is an 4 additional expense then. We do pay 5 for the electricity. So if they have 6 more questions, they can certainly call us and we'll try to help them. 7 8 MR. ROGAN: Okay. Great. Ι 9 wasn't sure if it was something that, 10 you know, was done through, you know, 11 if the administrators of the 12 government, for instance, the DPW can say, well, I think this street 13 14 needs -- you know, I didn't know that 15 there was a formal process up, so. 16 It's very likely that's the same 17 person that contacted both of us. 18 MR. LOSCOMBE: I'm sorry, Mr. 19 Rogan. I misunderstood. I thought 20 you meant if the lights were out. 21 MR. ROGAN: No, no. I mean, the 22 actual installation of a new fixture, 23 SO. 24 MR. LOSCOMBE: Yeah. Mrs. Krake 25 is correct.

1 MR. ROGAN: Thank you. And two 2 other concerns and one was brought up 3 to me and I don't want to mention the 4 names but I think people know, how 5 will lawsuits that have been -- I'm 6 trying to say it without saying it, 7 you know, saying that the lawsuit out 8 front. For instance, if the city owes 9 a judgement to somebody outside of the 10 union awards, how will that be paid if 11 it's still -- will that be through contingency. Has there been any 12 discussion on that? 13 14 MS. EVANS: Normally within the 15 budget there is line item for court 16 awards and settlements, et cetera. 17 MR. ROGAN: So they're just not 18 being paid now because of the cash 19 crisis, I would assume. 20 MS. EVANS: Yes. 21 MR. JOYCE: Correct. 22 MR. ROGAN: So hopefully those 23 obligations will be fulfilled as well. 24 And finally just one request. 25 am happy and disappointed. I've

mentioned the 3000 block of Division for about two months now and there was DPW truck up there that fixed part of it, the multiple potholes on a school route which, as we all know, school will be back and very soon. I do know it was repaired around the manhole but the actual potholes weren't repaired. So, Mrs. Krake, if we can please ask that the street is fully repaired.

And I will comment on the other agenda items as they come up for a vote. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Can I mention one thing. Just for information sake. We long have been asking for the pavement of Hamp Court where the Linde Corporation had operated. The three and the 400 blocks of Hamp Court have been paved.

MS. EVANS: Hallelujah.

MR. ROGAN: Very good news.

MS. EVANS: I'm sure all of those who reside on Hamp Court are at long last satisfied. Thank you so much.

And, Counsel Loscombe, do you have any comments or motions this evening?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes. Thank you.

I have a few. First of all I would
like to apologize for leaving early
last week. I was a little under the
weather. I thought I'd be able to
hold out but, you know, I was able to
catch a replay so I saw most of what
happened.

I'm happy to say and Mr. McGoff is involved in this, the rental registration is up and running and Dom McKean is handling that. He requested that I announce the phone number if anyone is a landlord out there and would like to call for some information and we'll be getting together, me and Mr. McGoff to see if we can get this on the website and stuff, too. But the phone number to call would be 348-4193, extension 4517. And that's for anybody that has any questions on the rental

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

registration and it will be strictly enforced so I hope everyone that is a landlord, you know, will comply before there's any adverse actions taken down the road.

I guess I will, you know, discuss the recovery plan at this point rather than belabor it on the vote. This has been a tough process. It's been a long process. We worked separately, we worked together. I really have to say I don't think anyone has worked harder than our president and Mr. Joyce along with Mr. McGowan and Mayor Doherty on the final outcomes. I know that because I've been in interrupted on calls many times with Mrs. Evans, receiving calls from the mayor or vice versa and the same with Mr. Joyce receiving calls from Mr. McGowan. So I real have to applaud them because it took a lot of time and effort and it's been discussed many times. No plan is going to be perfect. There's going to be hardship for everyone to bear. You

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

know, we have to make decisions here, you know. We make enemies, we make friends. It's a tough situation here. But I have to look at the whole piece of pie myself. I know each one in their own individual vote will be basing their vote on what they feel is in the best interest of everyone. But, you know, there's been talk of bankruptcy, a lot of other issues, there's a lot of good ideas out there. Unfortunately if this -- if some of these ideas came to fruition two and a half years ago, we would be in a little better position. But I think we are on the right path at this point, at least in this asset. But we're not going to please everyone no matter what a do. If we go bankrupt, there's going to be people upset. Ιf we provide a recovery plan with borrowing and tax increases, people are going to be upset. And I use this quite often when people ask me, you know, sometimes how do you put up with

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

up there. I said it's -- if you walk down the street and give everyone a \$100 bill, there's going to be a couple people complaining because their's has a winkle in it. that's exactly how we have to look at it as far as the mental aspect. But we finally come to a point where we've been working with the administration to develop a plan that's going to be the blueprint for the next three years for everyone in this city, and it is very serious. It's a very serious issue and it's a lot of hard work. And, again, I commend Mr. Joyce and Mrs. Evans for the hard work they've done on it and their constant contact with Ryan McGowan and the mayor. we to -- if we do approve this plan the way it stands, it's incumbent upon us to be vigilant because we're going to own it along with the mayor. We have to continue to work on this. And I think with all the time invested and the effort if this plan goes the way

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it is, we are going to be vigilant.

You know, it's taken us two and a half years to get to this point, and if anyone wants to think that everybody sat back here and did nothing in two and a half years, that's how long it's taken us to get to this point. That's why there's all this exposure where the finances are and everything.

That's why the Parking Authority was exposed. That's why they're putting a bid out for street meters. If we sat back and did nothing, we would be in same old mode that we were before and we would be looking at higher debt. We're trying to come up with ideas that won't come out of your tax dollars, out of your pockets, but yet we get chastised for that. And that I can accept. The newspaper is printing high in the sky ideas and doom's day. I find it ironic. For months they harp on us for not getting along with the administration and all of a sudden

the past few weeks, there's doom and

345

6 7

8

10

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gloom about us working the administration and they're tripping over themselves t write articles everyday scaring the people in this city to death. I can't understand it. Is it perhaps because this plan includes a tax that they may have to pay? I'd say that's probably a big part of it. But I do have to say in looking -- I did buy the paper today. Usually I don't. But I bought the paper today and I happened to see this and since I'm not going to be -- I'm only using this woman in her article because she's on the front page, her name and address are mentioned. But I think Mr. McGoff tried to explain it and I think Mr. Joyce said he's going to explain a little. I don't want to bore you but I want to give you an example from the doom and gloom percentage increases that have been professed in the newspaper for Scranton City taxpayers. And I'm going to give it to you in black and

24

25

This woman's property, Ann white. Smith, if I'm correct, 304 William Street, Scranton, PA, and I'm going to be fair. I'm going to give you my breakdown also. Her total assessed value, land value, 1,200; improvement value, 7,300. The city splits it. The total value is \$8,500. What that means is right now her cumulative tax bill -- well, first of all, her tax bill, her city portion, 2012, \$269.56; the county portion, \$467.50; the school portion, \$946.56, the city being the smallest part. Now, her cumulative taxes combining those three entities would be \$1,683.62 a year. If we used our proposed tax increases that we've proposed -- I'll give you the best case and the worst case. first year and I believe I'm using our latest numbers but the first year at 11.91 percent increase for 2013 would increase her city taxes \$32.10 a year, a year. The next year, 9.63 percent for to 2014 and this is compounding

24

25

interest, not using flat as the Times pointed out so pointedly. This is using the compound interest. Her tax increase for 2014 would be an additional \$35.93 a year; 2015 with the 14.34 percent tax increase, the increased would be \$40.20 per year. Add those three years of the tax increases together, three years cumulatively amount to \$108.24 a year or \$9.02 a month after three years. That's our scenario. That's the tax increase that the city council put in In order to get the plan approved through DCED if those other things don't come to fruition, the county taxes or any of those, the worst case scenario, the worst case scenario would be, again, this person is paying \$269.56 on her city taxes now. first year of the higher increase or I should PEL increase would be 12 percent or an additional \$32.43. Where this plan takes the big hit on tax increase is the second year.

24

25

That's a 44.32 percent increase under the mandate PEL plan or an additional \$133.84 and the third year they would increase it 12.24 percent or an additional \$53.35 for a cumulative after the three years, the increase would be \$219.62 or \$18.30 a month. That's the worst case scenario, \$9.02 a month to \$18.30 a month for this particular property that was in the newspaper and they're worried about the taxes affecting a sale or whatever. And, again, I know these times are tight. My mother is on a fixed income. Every dollar counts but, you know, your cable bills go up every year, this is still probably cheaper than your weekly newspaper. And to be fair I'm at a little higher end of the tax structure and this is what I'm going to have to pay. Right now my annual tax bill for school district is \$2,081.76; for the county, 1,028.17 and for the city, \$445.66. My cumulative tax bill right now in

24

25

2012 is \$3,555.59. Now, using the same breakdown and not prolong it or over, you know, each one, but the first year my taxes would under our plan would increase \$53.80; second year, \$48.03; and the final year, \$78.40. My additional monthly payment for the city would be \$14.96 a month. The worst case scenario, it would jump to \$30.24 a month. Now, I'm a realist. I think giving it real numbers it doesn't give you the shock value that it does when they tell you 80 percent, 90 percent and we're wrong from 35 percent to 60 percent. are the facts. This is what is in the recovery plan. The majority of people and I think Mr. McGoff stated before, paid below a certain level, they would be in the lower end. Under our plan Under the worst case \$9 a month. scenario \$18 a month. People that are at the higher end of the taxes, anywhere from \$15 to \$30 a month. you know, I don't know if that helps.

24

25

I don't know if it hurts, but I think for logical people it's a little easier than seeing percentage numbers that are thrown in as scared tactics of front pages, and that's the truth. When you read back further in the article, then you see, the realtors here or realists. It's not just here, it's all over the country what is going on with home sales and stuff like that. But the problem is, you know, I'm not a person that is looking to raise taxes or anything like that and it was said here before, we pass this plan, we'll go down in history as the council probably to raise the highest taxes. That's daunting. That's not something we want on our record. And I think it takes a lot of guts for my colleagues here that may be running for reelection to take that stand if they approve this plan because we've been apologizist for years for county and for the school district. People come to this podium,

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

they complain about our taxes which would amount to a \$9 a month impact. But yet the biggest pieces of the pie, the school district, how many people go complain when they put people on. I just saw a nice contract in the paper with a 90 percent pension. You know, I mean, I don't understand it, maybe because we're more accessible. We are transparent. We're on live TV here. We tell it the way we feel it and the way it is and we take a lot and maybe we give a lot. But, you know, I go day-to-day, I have people stop me, wondering how you put up with it and all that. I love it. I love my city. I'm at a great sacrifice personally right now. A lot of people know that and I'm doing my best to get out of it. And, you know, I could easily go and file bankruptcy, too. That's the easy way out. they're my debts. I'm responsible for them. So I'm going to try and work something out because I own them and I

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

think it's incumbent upon us even though these aren't our debts, they're the city debts, to work something out without going to that option of bankruptcy because in the long run I think bankruptcy is going to burn us a lot more than a small tax increase. And I notice people laughing saying, ha-ha, small tax increase, but in the realm of the whole picture it's a small tax increase. And I never believed that would be saying that but I know exactly where it was and what it is. If we weren't apologizist for the county and the school district all these years and raised the percent here or two percent there, I think we would be in a lot better position but I think this -- my colleagues here who are going to vote for this plan are showing a lot of bravery. It's easy to say, no, I never voted to raise your taxes, but they're showing the bravery to stand up and say, you know, I might be running for reelection but

24

25

I love my city and I don't want it to go in the dumps tomorrow. We didn't create this mess but we're going to work and put our hearts and soles on the line for you. And that's the way I feel. That's where I'm coming from and no one out there can understand the work that colleagues here, Mrs. Evans and Mr. Joyce have put in and labored over because I've been in many conversations with both of them and I was just in conversations with them back and forth. As I stated, there were interruptions on those conversations from administrative personnel, DCED people, the lines of communications were back and forth. We have to do in our heart what we feel is best for the city and for you. I have children and grandchildren and I want them to be a part of Scranton and the decision is not easy, it hasn't been easy and I think all and all, back and forth, this was a fluid document until right before the

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

meeting to be honest with you. were still things that were being worked on. That's how hard they've been working on it continuously and I believe it's up to like 68 pages or something at this point and I really want to show my appreciation for the work that you've done on it and I don't know if I would have had the wherewithal. I would have been exhausted by now so I imagine you guys will sleep good once this whole process is over. But, you know, we're elected in this position, we have to do our due diligence which I believe we've all done and we're all going to vote based on what we feel is the best decision for the majority of people here. You know, we can't fault anybody for their votes. They're voting the way they believe for certain reasons. But I've studied this, I've looked at other issues and, you know, I think we have to save our city. We have to take the bull by the

24

25

And we've had two and a half horn. years. To some people that seems like a long time. To us it's pretty short. You know, we did accomplish some things. There's a lot of nitpicking things out there that are still bothering and I apologize to those who, you know, are still waiting for their issues to be resolved but we did have some big issues here. We will be able to get back on those other issues that are important to all the taxpayers once this is resolved. I think it's going to be, you know, fiscally responsible and, again, like I said before it's incumbent upon all of us to be vigilant with the administration and with these parts of program and on top of that do our homework and research and look at other projects down the road and programs that will benefit the city and help us financially and Miss Neihauus was here before. mentioned community involvement and

24

25

stuff like that. That's something, I believe, we all welcome. You know, there's a lot of expertise in this community and it's just the gentleman that was at the podium and walked out before. He brings some good ideas. He brings some wisdom and we're trying to have a little discourse but, you know, some people don't want to hear what they want to hear and at this point for myself I know bankruptcy is a last resort. I think we can work this through. Unfortunately, you know, the bull wasn't taken by horn several years ago but right now it is. And I for one and I know my colleagues are showing their dedication to get this plan through. We'll work very hard to make it succeed. And I believe that's all I have at this point. Thank you.

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

MR. JOYCE: Yes, I do. I just to

-- before I even begin what I was going to say tonight, Mr. Loscombe said that Mrs. Evans and Mr. Joyce, being myself, will probably sleep well tonight because of all the work that we've done on the recovery plan but I'm not going to sleep well tonight because --

MR. LOSCOMBE: If I could just interrupt, Frank. I don't know where you're going but you jogged my memory. I did -- I mean, first of all, I want to thank our solicitor, Boyd Hughes, and Nancy and our office staff because they've been working nonstop. As a new change came in, they had to revise it and the conversations were back and forth. But I'm sorry I didn't want to miss all of them.

MR. JOYCE: That's okay. But I'm not going to sleep well tonight because right now we're trapped in a way. One, it's not my goal to raise taxes. I don't want to. But we're faced with the situation in the city

24

25

where we have to. If we don't raise taxes tonight this TAN that we're going to get is basically -- it's basically garbage. It won't happen. The state loans that we're going to get, the state grant that we're going to get, it won't happen. What would that mean? It would mean that the city would fall further into the hole, the deficit would grow larger, services could be shut off, police, fire, DPW, clerical, management, basically all workers in the city would see payless paydays as well. essentially this recovery plan is like a lose/lose situation because, one, yes, taxes will be increased but, two, if we don't do it, then the city basically false into an abyss. what do we need to do. That's the reason why I'm voting for the recovery But to begin tonight I'm going to address the recovery plan and questions that I have and questions that the public may have and I'm also

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going to go over some comments that were -- you know, some questions that were asked of me over the past week. Some them were questions that I elaborated on last week and I'll quickly elaborate on them again. first question that I received is were there anymore financial changes to the recovery plan over the past week. to begin, there were some changes financially to the recovery plan that occurred over the past week. In 2014 PEL's base line projection for operating revenues that city will realize changes from \$60,986,457 to \$61,236,457 for an increase of \$250,000. In 2015 PEL also adjusted the amount of operating revenue that city is projected to receive from \$61,132,824 to \$61,573,258 for an increase of \$440,434. In addition to this PEL removed the \$750,000 grant that the city was projected from DCED and changed it back to 250,000. reasoning for this is due to the fact

2

3

5

6

7

9

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that we only have a \$250,000 grant commitment DCED at the current time. Though the mayor and business administrator both expressed that they are going to lobby to have the grant increased to \$750,000.

A second question that I received is what does the tax increase do to my tax bill? As Mr. McGoff and Mr. Loscombe elaborated, currently the city taxes are the lowest taxes out of the taxing bodies, being the city, the county and the school district. So when they say taxes are going to go up by a certain percentage, obviously your whole tax bill isn't going to go up by a certain percentage. It's just the city portion. First, if the tri-countywide sales tax or sales and use tax that Senator John Blake is proposing comes to fruition based on median city tax bill which was reported in the Times is \$343. 2013 there will be a 12 percent increase which is associated with the

24

25

unfunded borrowing, court mandated tax increase of 2011. This would result in a \$41.16 raise in one's property Therefore, the medium taxes. Scrantonian would be paying \$384.16, In 2014 there would instead of \$343. be a 9.7 percent tax increase. would result in a raise of one's property taxes of \$37.26. Therefore, the median Scrantonian would pay \$421.42 rather than the 380.16 that he or she would pay in 2013 and the \$343 that he or she pays currently. 2015 there would be a 13.3 percent tax increase. This would result in a raise in one's property taxes of \$56.05. Therefore, the median Scrantonian would pay \$477, \$487 rather than 421 that he or she would pay in 2013 and \$343 that he or she pays currently. Overall there would tax increases of 12 -- 9.7 and 13.3 percent. The total of these numbers if you add up these percentages as 35 percent. However,

the median Scrantonian would end up paying 477.47 after three years because the taxes are compounded and do not all take place at once. The total raise in property taxes after the three years would be 134.37. This would result in a cumulative tax increase of 39.2 percent over a three-year span. This is for city taxes only, of course.

Secondly, if and only if the tri-county sales tax being proposed by Senator Blake which is a part of the recovery plan even though it was purported by the newspaper that this may not be -- they may not come to fruition or it may be part of the plan. If this is not approved which is the worst case scenario based on the median city tax bill which is \$343, in 2013 there will be a 12 percent tax increase which is associated with the unfunded borrowing court mandated tax increase in 2011, this would result in a \$41.16 raise in

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

one's property taxes, therefore, the median Scrantonian would pay \$384.16, rather than \$343. In 2013 there would be a 44.7 percent tax increase. This would result in a raise of one's property taxes, the median Scrantonian Therefore, the median of \$171.57. Scrantonian would pay \$555.73 rather than the 384.16 that he or she would pay in 2013. In 2015 there would be a 10.6 percent tax increase. This would result in a raise of one's property taxes of \$58.91. Therefore, the median Scrantonian would pay \$614.64 rather than the \$553.73 that he or she would pay in 2014 and the \$343 that he or she pays currently. Overall there would be tax increases of 12 percent, 44.7 percent and 10.6 percent. total of these numbers is 67.3. However, the median Scrantonian would end up paying \$614.64 if and only if the sales taxes is not enacted after three years because the taxes are compounded and do not all take place

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

at onces. The total raise in property taxes after three years would be \$271.64. This would result in a cumulative tax increase of 79.2 percent over a three-year span. This is the worst case scenario.

A third question that I received over the past week is what is so different about the recovery plan now as opposed to the mayor's recovery plan that was sent down in May since the tax increases are similar. First, the tax increases are not exactly similar. If sales and the use tax is approved by the state legislature, the city property owners are looking at a 39.2 percent cumulative tax increase that will occur over three years. addition to this, there are additional expenses that were not included in the recovery plan that was sent down by the Mayor's Office such as the requested MMO of 5.1 million dollars per year. The MMO is the minimum municipal obligation that we must

23

24

25

contribute to our pension funds, and I know that Mr. Morgan had mentioned what is the plan for funding the Right now if we don't pensions. contribute this 5.1 million dollars per year which was determined through a study by Tom Andersen, we would have to pay full pensions out of our budgets to the retirees which would be about 14 million -- 13 to 14 million dollars in a three years' time because the pension fund would be depleted. Also the mayor's recovery plan accounted for 5.4 million dollars in revenue that could not be realized since it called for the sale of an asset being the stormwater conveyance system that the city doesn't own. Ιf mayor's recovery plan was adopted and then later revised to reflect the increase to the MMO as is, the taxpayers in Scranton would most likely be looking at a tax increase over 115 percent.

A fourth question that I received

23

24

25

Why does the city need a tax was: increase in the first place, especially since the city is not increasing services? There are several reasons why a tax increase is needed to cover expense. To begin, first, we have a 17 million dollar Supreme Court award to pay to the firefighters and police officers which was caused by Mayor Doherty taking the advice of DCED and fighting against the police and fire unions for years. The debt service that this will cost the city is outstanding. To note, if it were not for the efforts of some city council members and the administration to negotiate with the unions recently, this award could have been in the range of 30 to 35 million dollars respectively. Secondly, in addition to this, the MMO, our minimum municipal obligation that the must pay towards the police, fire and non uniform pension plans for city employees will increasing by 5.1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

million dollars for years, 2013, 2014 and 2015 as per a study conducted by Thomas Andersen. This 5.1 million dollar per year expense is a large hit to the city. Third, salaries are rising. As one knows, prior to court decisions, the fire and police force in Scranton didn't receive a raise in ten years. After court decisions, the fire and police force in Scranton were awarded raises which were retroactive. Therefore, the cost of our fire and police force is higher than in year's past and it will continue to rise in 2013, 2014 and 2015. Other unionized workers such as DPW and clerical unions will also receive raises in 2013, 2014 and 2015. Fourth, health insurance costs are rising. Though the fire and police unions will be contributing to their health care as well as the DPW and clerical unions along with management as they have been, the cost of health care is rising at a rate of somewhere in the

Fifth, the Scranton Parking Authority according to their operating agreement will continue to need funding assistance of the city as per the operating agreement in which the city guarantees their full faith and credit by their taxing powers to cover -- or to cover the Scranton Parking Authority debt. Because of reckless

range of nine percent per year.

Authority that has caused the
Authority to borrow more than they can
pay, the city is on the hook for
approximately two million dollars per
year.

borrowing by the Scranton Parking

Sixth, beginning in mid 2014 the city will be required to pay the salaries of firefighters being paid by the Safer Grant at the current time. It is expected to cost the city \$700,000 in 2014 and 1.5 million dollars in 2015 to keep our Fire Department staffed at the same level its currently staffed at.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A fifth question that I received over the past week was: Is just better for the city to go bankrupt already? The short answer to this is Though some have discussed that the city going bankrupt is only way out. It's really not. If city were to g bankrupt, a receiver would be appointed. At that point the decision making powers of the administration and Scranton City Council would be a Basically the moot point. administration and Scranton City Council would lose its say in what happened with the city. An appointed receiver would be given discretion to dictate the future of the city which means that a receiver could simply increase your taxes at will. Subsequently, if a municipal receiver was pointed, one could easily expect a tax increase of over a 150 percent. municipal bankruptcy is not the answer to getting rid of the municipal debt that Scranton has. Unlike a personal

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

bankruptcy, in a municipal bankruptcy the debt does not simply go away. fact, after researching further into municipal bankruptcies, there have not been one case where municipal bankruptcy had forgiveness on its debt. This was also quoted by Senator John Blake in a recent meeting that I participated in him. In addition to this, municipal bankruptcy would destroy the city's credit rating and jeopardize the city's borrowing power for future necessary tax anticipation notes which are used on a year by year basis to keep the city afloat until tax revenues are realized in the beginning of the year for each year.

A sixth question that I received over the past week again was: Why can't the city privatize refuse collection and eliminate the garbage fee? Which is \$178 per year. The first reason that we cannot do this immediately is due to the fact that the DPW contract doesn't expire until

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the end of 2013. Meaning, that we couldn't privatize it until 2014. Ιn addition to this, I've researched other surrounding communities. other communities where refuse is privatized, fees to pick up garbage is much higher on an annual basis. some communities the cost to pick up garbage is three dollars per bag. Therefore, if one were to take the average family -- let's look at the average family who has two bags of garbage per week, on average, the cost to pick up garbage would be six bucks per week. Six bucks per week multiplied by 52 weeks in the year equates to \$312. With this being said and this scenario the average family would end up paying more than the garbage fee every year even if they only had two bags of garbage per week. If a family had three bags of garbage per week at three dollars per bag, this would equate to nine dollars per When multiplying this by 52 week.

weeks, this would equate to a \$460 per year fee. Both scenarios would equate to an average family or the person for that matter or average person actually paying more for garbage pick up than the current city fee, plus there would be restrictions as to what could actually be picked up. Our current DPW staff is fairly liberal when it comes down to taking items such as old furniture and whatnot.

A seventh question that was asked is why can't we privatize the Scranton Sewer Authority? The answer to this is very complex. First of all, many requirements would have to be agreed upon for this to happen. For instance, the mayor would have to approve to privatize the authority which we current don't have. In addition to this, the board of the Scranton Sewer Authority would have to agree to dissolve the authority and sell themselves which we currently don't have either. Third, we would

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

need to get the agreement of Dunmore to dissolve the authority which would be unknown as to whether or not we would get it. We would have to get the agreement of Dunmore because the Scranton Sewer Authority is actually a joint authority between Scranton and Dunmore. Fourth, there are many mandates that need to be made under the Chesapeake Bay federal mandates that the Scranton Sewer Authority is currently making. The cost of these mandates is extremely high which is the reason that the sewer rates have been on the rise by the Authority. the Sewer Authority were to be sold, the sewer rates could rise by an even greater amount. Fifth, the sale of the Scranton Sewer Authority would not bring in a windfall of cash that would be needed to cover all expenses. Ιn the past when the Sewer Authority was sold, the city only received five million dollars in upfront money which would only put a dent into 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

projected three-year deficit before mandates of over 41 million dollars.

And eighth question that was asked is why can't we just sell the parking garages to cover the projected deficits? The answer to this is quite elementary. One, if parking garages were to be sold, the proceeds would be used to pay down the long term debt of the Parking Authority which is currently around 50 million dollars in principal and 50 million dollars in interest, plus the Landmark Bank loan of 2.9 million dollars. This money would not go to the city coffers. Also selling off the parking garages would be the decision of the Parking Authority board and its receiver, Mike Washo. We don't know if we would have this approve and it is likely that we would not have this approval judging by the past record of the Scranton Parking Authority.

A ninth question that was asked Why can't we just make cuts in was:

20

21

22

23

24

25

the revised recovery plan? To begin, there are already cuts in the recovery plan as revised. The savings from cuts are projected to be \$500,000 in 2013, 1.2 million dollars in 2014 and 1.6 million dollars in 2015. For a total of 3.3 million dollars in cuts. In meetings with the mayor, department heads will be given the direction to make appropriate cuts to their departmental budgets to equate to these amounts. It was discussed if the amounts of cuts could be more. And after speaking with the mayor and business administrator, the simple answer was no. Currently the city is operating with a small account of employees that it has operating with in years. In addition to this, if the city were to cut anymore than what is in the revised recovery plan, one would be looking at cutting into equipment and supplies by a drastic amount. Since the largest departments in the city are the Fire Department,

23

24

25

Police Department and Department of Public Works, additional cuts other than what is being proposed would be mean that we would be cutting into vehicles, such as fire trucks, police cars, refuse collection trunks and trucks used for paving and snow removal, thus there would be a drastic reduction in services as a result. addition to taking the fire trucks off the street, police cars off the street, sacrificing refuse collection and sacrificing paving, if we were to make any additional cuts than what is already i the revised recovery plan, we would facing cutting necessary city building repairs, Workers' Compensation insurance that is currently the city's requirement to pay for amongst other matters. departmental budgets of the other departments besides the DPW, the Fire Department and the Police Department are small. There's not enough to cut you in there to lower the tax increase

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

by a significant amount and the department heads of those small departments will be asked to trim those departments.

A tenth questions that was asked is why does the city need the recovery plan in the first place. In response to this question the city needs a recovery plan in place because lending institutions are now requiring it to provide financing to the city such h as Amalgamated Bank which is agreeing to issue us a tax anticipation note. In meetings that I have attended with local institutions in the past PEL has been present. In these meetings PEL has stressed the importance of a revised recovery plan as being a method of assurance that the city could pay them back. Because of PEL's persuasion a revised recovery plan is being required by the lending institutions. At this point in time without a revised recovery plan the city would not be able to secure

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

budgeted financing. This would mean that the city would fall into an abyss again. Employees would not be paid, debt service obligations would not be paid and we would go into default on city debts and the city most likely would not be able to secure any financing that it would need in the future and that's all I have for tonight.

MS. EVANS: And thank you. Good evening. On tonight's agenda are two pieces of emergency legislation sent to city council by the administration. One allows the city to accept 2.25 million dollars in a grant and from the State Department of Community and Economic Development. The other provides a tax anticipation note or TAN-B. One of the terms of TAN-B pledges 60 percent of earned income tax revenue received by the city for the remainder of 2012 as repayment. The city will retain 40 percent of the earned income taxes which will be used

24

25

for 2012 operating expenses. Because the city is in immediate need of the 2.25 million from DCED and an additional tax anticipation Note B for payroll and to comply with an agreement to provide the remainder of wages owed to city employees from the minimum wage pay period among other pressing financial obligations. legislation requires immediate consideration within one meeting rather than the typical three week progression from Fifth through Seventh TAN-B will be issued by Order. Amalgamated Bank located in Washington D.C. and New York. This TAN was secured through the work of city council's solicitor, Boyd Hughes, the architect of this financial agreement, Mr. Michael Judge of Casecon and Mr. John Judge, local IAFF President. Contrary to articles published in the Scranton Times regarding hedge funds the city is working with a Amalgamated Bank and another reputable financial

24

25

firm to secure the funding that is needed to solve its short term financial cries. Further, as has been said before, in order for necessary funding to be secured, specifically the 2.25 million from DCED as well as the TAN-B, the city must adopt the revised recovery plan. Although the plan was previously rejected it has now received the approval of the Pennsylvania Economy League and the State Department of Community and Economic Development. If the city fails to do so, it be unable to obtain funding from any sources, meet payrolls and pay outstanding debts hereby driving the city into bankruptcy or takeover by the State of Pennsylvania. In that event taxes will rise by enormous percentages far greater than what is contained in the revised recovery plan while services unfortunately will be cut drastically. A state appointed receiver would determine the tax increases as well as

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the cuts to all city services. And as I said very early this evening, we only to look to the rise in taxation and crime in Harrisburg during the state's recent takeover and we can see Scranton's future if this plan were to be rejected.

Next I received a troubling e-mail from South Side residents which merits investigation. Residents request a report from Ms. Aebli, OECD Director, regarding 408 Cedar Avenue owned by A.H. Noonan. Residents report that HUD monies were appropriated to a sacramental wine distribution center but a private nightclub was established. addition a garage sale has been on going this week and neighbors question if the items being sold were purchased with HUD monies. Mrs. Krake, please send a letter to Ms. Aebli requesting an update on the \$250,000 loan provided to the owner of 406 Cedar Avenue, when was the last payment

made, what is the balance of the loan and who is responsible for payment currently.

Also, I don't believe that Ms.

Aebli has been submitting monthly reports regarding any and all OECD loans to city council. In the same correspondence please remind Ms. Aebli that council continues to require monthly reports.

And finally I'd like to read a copy of a letter I received from the neighbors of the Yesu Development in East Mountain in which they expressed their gratitude to police officers for a job well done. "Dear Chief Graziano: The neighbors of the Yesu Development on the top of East Mountain wish to express our sincere thanks to police officers Jamie Toban and John Burgett. For the past several months there has been ongoing situation which had escalated very quickly in the last few days. The officers were caring, compassionate,

professional and maintained a positive attitude despite being put into a precarious situation. Please extend the thanks from the neighbors for a job well done. The department is fortunate to have these capable police officers as part of Scranton's finest. Again, our thanks, the neighbors."

This is an example -- albeit a small one but it's an example of the services our taxes pay for, services we can't afford to risk losing. And that's it.

MR. JOYCE: I make a motion
pursuant to the Emergency Certificate
to place on the agenda file of Council
52 of 2012 entitled "AUTHORIZING THE
MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY
OFFICIALS OF THE CITY SCRANTON TO
RECEIVE AN INTEREST FREE LOAN IN THE
AMOUNT OF TWO MILLION DOLLARS FROM THE
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT AND TO A GRANT OF \$250,000
FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

1	DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC
2	DEVELOPMENT PURSUANT TO THE
3	MUNICIPALITIES FINANCIAL RECOVERY ACT,
4	ACT 47 OF 1987, AS AMENDED.
5	MR. ROGAN: Second.
6	MS. EVANS: On the question?
7	(No response.)
8	MS. EVANS: All those in favor of
9	said ordinance signify by saying aye.
10	MS. EVANS: Aye.
11	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
12	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
13	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
14	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
15	MS. EVANS: Opposed?
16	(No response.)
17	MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and
18	so moved.
19	MS. KRAKE: 5-B. EMERGENCY
20	CERTIFICATE - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR
21	AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS
22	OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO RECEIVE AN
23	INTEREST FREE LOAN IN THE AMOUNT OF
24	TWO MILLION DOLLARS FROM THE
25	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

1	DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC
2	DEVELOPMENT AND TO RECEIVE A GRANT OF
3	\$250,000 FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF
4	PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY
5	AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT THE
6	MUNICIPALITIES FINANCIAL RECOVERY ACT,
7	ACT 47 OF 1987, AS AMENDED."
8	MS. EVANS: At this time I'll
9	entertain a motion that Item 5-B be
10	introduced into its proper committee.
11	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
12	MR. JOYCE: Second.
13	MS. EVANS: On the question?
14	(No response.)
15	MS. EVANS: All those in favor of
16	introduction signify by saying aye.
17	MS. EVANS: Aye.
18	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
19	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
20	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
21	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
22	MS. EVANS: Opposed?
23	(No response.)
24	MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and
25	so moved.

1	MR. JOYCE: I make a motion
2	pursuant to the Emergency Certificate
3	to place on the agenda File of Council
4	No. 53 of 2102 entitled "AUTHORIZING
5	THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF A SIX MILLION
6	TWO HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLAR
7	PRINCIPAL AMOUNT, TAX ANTICIPATION OF
8	THE CITY OF SCRANTON KNOWN AS TAN
9	SERIES B-2012 AWARDED TO AMALGAMATED
10	BANK; DETERMINING THE FORM AND TERM OF
11	SAID NOTE; AWARDING SAID NOTE;
12	AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE FILING
13	OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS; AND DIRECTING
14	THE PROPER OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF
15	SCRANTON TO TAKE AND ALL OTHER ACTIONS
16	AS MAY BE REQUIRED IN CONNECTION WITH
17	THE ISSUANCE OF SAID NOTE."
18	MR. ROGAN: Second.
19	MS. EVANS: On the question?
20	(No response.)
21	MS. EVANS: All those in favor of
22	said ordinance signify by saying aye.
23	MS. EVANS: Aye.
24	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
25	MR. ROGAN: Aye.

1 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 2 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 3 MS. EVANS: Opposed? 4 (No response.) 5 MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and 6 so moved. 7 MS. KRAKE: 5-C. EMERGENCY 8 CERTIFICATE, AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE 9 AND SALE OF A SIX MILLION TWO HUNDRED 10 FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS PRINCIPAL 11 AMOUNT, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON KNOWN AS TAN SERIES 12 B-2012 AWARDED TO AMALGAMATED BANK; 13 14 DETERMINING THE FORM AND TERM OF SAID NOTE; AWARDING SAID NOTE; AUTHORIZING 15 AND DIRECTING THE FILING OF CERTAIN 16 17 DOCUMENTS; AND DIRECTING THE PROPER OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO 18 19 TAKE ANY AND ALL OTHER ACTIONS AS MAY 20 BE REQUIRED IN CONNECTION WITH THE 21 ISSUANCE OF SAID NOTE. 22 MS. EVANS: At this time I'll e 23 entertain a motion that Item 5-C be 24 introduced into its proper committee. 25 MR. ROGAN: So moved.

MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)  MS. EVANS: All those in favor of introduction signify by saying aye.  MS. EVANS: Aye.  MS. EVANS: Aye.  MR. JOYCE: Aye.  MR. ROGAN: Aye.  MR. MCGOFF: Aye.  MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.  MS. EVANS: Opposed?  (No response.)  MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so moved.  MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	1	MR. JOYCE: Second.
MS. EVANS: All those in favor of introduction signify by saying aye.  MS. EVANS: Aye.  MR. JOYCE: Aye.  MR. ROGAN: Aye.  MR. MCGOFF: Aye.  MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.  MS. EVANS: Opposed?  (No response.)  MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so moved.  MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	2	MS. EVANS: On the question?
introduction signify by saying aye.  MS. EVANS: Aye.  MR. JOYCE: Aye.  MR. ROGAN: Aye.  MR. MCGOFF: Aye.  MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.  MS. EVANS: Opposed?  (No response.)  MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so moved.  MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	3	(No response.)
MS. EVANS: Aye.  MR. JOYCE: Aye.  MR. ROGAN: Aye.  MR. MCGOFF: Aye.  MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.  MS. EVANS: Opposed?  (No response.)  MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so moved.  MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	4	MS. EVANS: All those in favor of
MR. JOYCE: Aye.  MR. ROGAN: Aye.  MR. MCGOFF: Aye.  MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.  MS. EVANS: Opposed?  (No response.)  MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so moved.  MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	5	introduction signify by saying aye.
MR. ROGAN: Aye.  MR. MCGOFF: Aye.  MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.  MS. EVANS: Opposed?  (No response.)  MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so moved.  MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	6	MS. EVANS: Aye.
MR. MCGOFF: Aye.  MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.  MS. EVANS: Opposed?  (No response.)  MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so moved.  MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	7	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.  MS. EVANS: Opposed?  (No response.)  MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so moved.  MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	8	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
MS. EVANS: Opposed?  (No response.)  MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so moved.  MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	9	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
(No response.)  MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so moved.  MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	10	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and so moved.  MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	11	MS. EVANS: Opposed?
14 so moved.  15 MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to 16 suspend the rules to move Items 5-B 17 and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be 18 considered for final passaged based on 19 the attached emergency certificate. 20 MR. ROGAN: Second. 21 MS. EVANS: On the question? 22 (No response.)	12	(No response.)
MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question? (No response.)	13	MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and
suspend the rules to move Items 5-B and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question? (No response.)	14	so moved.
and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be  considered for final passaged based on  the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	15	MR. JOYCE: I make a motion to
considered for final passaged based on the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question? (No response.)	16	suspend the rules to move Items 5-B
the attached emergency certificate.  MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	17	and 5-C to 6th and 7th order to be
MR. ROGAN: Second.  MS. EVANS: On the question?  (No response.)	18	considered for final passaged based on
MS. EVANS: On the question? (No response.)	19	the attached emergency certificate.
(No response.)	20	MR. ROGAN: Second.
,	21	MS. EVANS: On the question?
	22	(No response.)
MS. EVANS: All those in favor	23	MS. EVANS: All those in favor
signify by saying aye.	24	signify by saying aye.
MS. EVANS: Aye.	25	MS. EVANS: Aye.

1	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
2	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
3	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
4	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
5	MS. EVANS: Opposed?
6	(No response.)
7	MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and
8	so moved.
9	MS. KRAKE: 6-A. READING BY
10	TITLE - FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 51, 2012 -
11	AN ORDINANCE - ORDINANCE OF THE CITY
12	OF SCRANTON, LACKAWANNA COUNTY,
13	PENNSYLVANIA APPOINTING W. BOYD
14	HUGHES, ESQUIRE AND PAUL A. KELLY,
15	JR., ESQUIRE AS SPECIAL COUNSEL TO THE
16	CITY OF SCRANTON AND CASECON
17	CAPITAL, INC. AS CO-FINANCIAL ADVISOR
18	TO THE CITY OF SCRANTON ON THE
19	ISSUANCE AND PLACEMENT OF ANY
20	BONDS, NOTES OR FINANCING OF THE CITY
21	OF SCRANTON'S UNFUNDED DEBT OR
22	REFINANCING OR REFUNDING OF ANY OF
23	THE CITY'S OUTSTANDING BOND ISSUES AND
24	2012 TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE B AND
25	AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
	1

1	APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE
2	A CONTRACT WITH CASECON CAPITAL, INC.
3	MS. EVANS: You've heard reading
4	by title of Item 6-A. What is your
5	pleasure?
6	MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-A
7	pass written by title.
8	MR. JOYCE: Second.
9	MS. EVANS: On the question?
10	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I wasn't here
11	last week when this was introduced.
12	Is there a dollar amount on the
13	contract with Casecon.
14	MS. EVANS: No. And it will not
15	taken from the operating budget. It
16	will be included in the costs of the
17	issuance of the TAN.
18	MR. MCGOFF: Thank you.
19	MS. EVANS: And the legislation
20	was sent down to us from the
21	administration.
22	MR. ROGAN: I would just add. I
23	like the idea of having the solicitor
24	from city council and the city
25	solicitor involved even though I was

1	against the unfunded borrowing, it
2	passed. It has to be done right. You
3	know, I believe having both branches
4	of government involved is always the
5	best way to go.
6	MS. EVANS: Anyone else on the
7	question?
8	(No response.)
9	MS. EVANS: All those I'm
10	sorry. Yes, okay. So All those in
11	favor signify by saying aye.
12	MS. EVANS: Aye.
13	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
14	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
15	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
16	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
17	MS. EVANS: Opposed?
18	(No response.)
19	MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and
20	so moved.
21	MR. LOSCOMBE: I make a motion to
22	suspend the rules to move Item 6-A to
23	7th order to be considered for final
24	passage.
25	MR. JOYCE: Second.

1	MS. EVANS: On the question?
2	(No response.)
3	MS. EVANS: All those in favor
4	signify by saying aye.
5	MS. EVANS: Aye.
6	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
7	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
8	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
9	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
10	MS. EVANS: Opposed?
11	(No response.)
12	MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and
13	so moved.
14	MS. KRAKE: 6-B FORMERLY 5-B,
15	READING BY TITLE FILE OF COUNCIL NO.
16	NO. 52, 2012, AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING
17	THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY
18	OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO
19	RECEIVE AN INTEREST FREE LOAN IN THE
20	AMOUNT OF TWO MILLION DOLLARS FROM THE
21	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
22	DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC
23	DEVELOPMENT AND TO RECEIVE A GRANT OF
24	\$250,000 FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF
25	PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY

1	AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT THE
2	MUNICIPALITIES FINANCIAL RECOVERY ACT,
3	ACT 47 OF 1987, AS AMENDED.
4	MS. EVANS: You've heard reading
5	by title of Item 6-B. What is you
6	pleasure?
7	MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-B
8	pass reading by title.
9	MR. MCGOFF: Second.
10	MS. EVANS: On the question?
11	(No response.)
12	MS. EVANS: All those in favor
13	signify by saying aye.
14	MS. EVANS: Aye.
15	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
16	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
17	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
18	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
19	MS. EVANS: Opposed?
20	(No response.)
21	MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and
22	so moved.
23	MS. KRAKE: READING BY 6-C,
24	FORMERLY 5-C READING BY TITLE FILE OF
25	COUNCIL NO. 53, 2012, AN ORDINANCE

1	AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF A
2	SIX MILLION TWO HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND
3	DOLLARS PRINCIPAL AMOUNT, TAX
4	ANTICIPATION NOTE OF THE CITY OF
5	SCRANTON KNOWN AS TAN SERIES B-2012
6	AWARDED TO AMALGAMATED BANK;
7	DETERMINING THE FORM AND TERM OF SAID
8	NOTE; AWARDING SAID NOTE; AUTHORIZING
9	AND DIRECTING THE FILING OF CERTAIN
10	DOCUMENTS; AND DIRECTING THE PROPER
11	OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO
12	TAKE ANY AND ALL OTHER ACTIONS AS MAY
13	BE REQUIRED IN CONNECTION WITH THE
14	ISSUANCE OF SAID NOTE.
15	MS. EVANS: You've heard reading
16	by title of Item 6-C. What is your
17	please?
18	MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-C
19	pass reading by title.
20	MR. JOYCE: Second.
21	MS. EVANS: On the question?
22	(No response.)
23	MS. EVANS: All those in favor
24	signify by saying aye.
25	MS. EVANS: Aye.

1	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
2	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
3	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
4	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
5	MS. EVANS: Opposed?
6	(No response.)
7	MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and
8	so moved.
9	MS. KRAKE: 7th Order, 7-A. FOR
10	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON
11	FINANCE FOR ADOPTION -FILE OF COUNCIL
12	NO. 50, 2012 - AMENDING FILE OF
13	COUNCIL NO. 56, 2011, AN ORDINANCE
14	ENTITLED "GENERAL CITY OPERATING
15	BUDGET 2012" BY TRANSFERRING
16	\$178,000.00 FROM ACCOUNT NO.
17	01.401.13090.4299 (NONDEPARTMENTAL
18	OPERATING EXPENSES - CONTINGENCY) TO
19	THE ACCOUNTS LISTED BELOW TO PROVIDE
20	FUNDING FOR LIFE/DISABILITY
21	INSURANCE PAYMENTS THROUGH THE PERIOD
22	ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2012.
23	MS. EVANS: What is the
24	recommendation of the chair for the
25	Committee on Finance?

1	MR. ROGAN: As chairperson for
2	Committee on Finance, I recommend
3	final passage of Item 7-A.
4	MR. ROGAN: Second.
5	MS. EVANS: On the question?
6	(No response.)
7	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
8	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
9	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
10	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
11	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
12	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
13	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
14	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
15	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
16	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
17	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby
18	declare 7-A legally and lawfully
19	adopted.
20	MS. KRAKE: 7-B. FOR
21	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON
22	RULES FOR ADOPTION -FILE OF COUNCIL
23	NO. 49, 2012 - AMENDING THE REVISED
24	RECOVERY PLAN FOR THE CITY OF SCRANTON
25	PURSUANT TO THE FINANCIALLY DISTRESSED

MUNICIPALITIES ACT: AND AUTHORIZING 1 2 THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO 3 ISSUE AN ORDER DIRECTING THE 4 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REVISED RECOVERY PLAN DATED AUGUST 1, 2012, ATTACHED 5 6 HERETO AS EXHIBIT "A" IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 245 OF 7 8 THE FINANCIALLY DISTRESSED 9 MUNICIPALITIES ACT. 10 MR. JOYCE: I'd like to make a 11 motion to amend Item 7-B as follows: 12 No. 1, in summary title, second line, 13 delete financially distressed 14 municipalities act and insert 15 Municipalities Financial Recovery Act. 16 No. 2, also in the summary title, 17 fifth line, delete the date of 18 August 1st and change to August 21st, 19 2012. No. 3, again in summary title, 20 sixth line, delete Section 245 of the 21 Financially Distressed Municipalities Act and insert Section 249 22 23 Municipalities Financial Recovery Act. 24 No. 4, in the first whereas clause 25 delete Distressed Municipalities Act

24

25

and insert Municipalities Financial Recovery Act, Act 47 of 1987 as amended. No. 5, in the third whereas clause, second line, delete prepared and insert filed and delete August 1st and insert August 24th. No. 6, delete the fourth whereas clause as it is written and replace it with whereas Act 47, Section 249 states that an amendment to adopted plan shall be adopted by ordinance. No. 7, in the now therefore clause, first line, delete submitted and insert filed. No. 8, in the now therefore clause, third line, after the word approved, insert, and adopted in accordance with the provision of Section 249 of the Municipalities Financial Recovery Act. No. 9, delete the entire first be it further ordained paragraph. No. 10, delete Exhibit A revised recovery plan for the City of Scranton dated August 2nd, 2012, and insert corrected copy, Exhibit A, revised and updated Act 47 recovery plan for the City of Scranton

dated August 24th, 2012. No. 11, on Page 4-2 of Exhibit A under the general plan provisions insert, following the adoption of the revised recovery plan Scranton City Council shall implement a forensic audit of the finances of the City of Scranton.

MS. EVANS: We have a motion to amend on the floor. Do we have a second?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

MS. EVANS: On the question?

MR. MCGOFF: Just on No. 11, it says Scranton City Council shall implement a forensic audit of the finances of the City of Scranton. It does not give any date for the extent of the audit.

MS. EVANS: I believe that the number of years that would be covered in the audit will in great part be determined by the amount of funding that is available in the budget to provide for it. This amendment was discussed with the mayor, DCED and PEL

1	and they are in agreement.
2	MR. ROGAN: Also I think Mr.
3	Loscombe also made a motion.
4	MS. EVANS: Yes.
5	MR. ROGAN: At council
6	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
7	MR. ROGAN: And I would just
8	add I do have to agree with the
9	aspect of having a financial a
10	forensic audit. We desperately need
11	to know where the money is.
12	MS. EVANS: Anyone else on the
13	question?
14	(No response.)
15	MS. EVANS: All those in favor
16	signify by saying aye.
17	MS. EVANS: Aye.
18	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
19	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
20	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
21	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
21 22	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.  MS. EVANS: Opposed?
22	MS. EVANS: Opposed?

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

so moved. As chair for the Committee on Rules, I recommend final passage of Item 7-B as amended.

MR. JOYCE: Second.

MS. EVANS: On the question?

MR. ROGAN: I'll be very brief since we've already went over all of this the last few weeks. Mr. McGoff, Mr. Joyce and Mr. Loss mentioned a lot of numbers tonight and they're accurate, the price of the tax increase going up for a specific person. You know, they range from \$108 on property in this so-called best scenario. But that scenario would also levy a one percent tax on goods which would be any good that you purchased currently that is taxed by the state on the exemptions from what I've gathered by talking to Mr. McGoff would be the same, so food, clothing, things of that nature but anything else other than there's a one percent sales tax included. The worst case scenario \$219.62 for -- I believe that

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was the resident that was in the newspaper that Mr. Loscombe was talking about. And, you know, someone who is currently looking to purchase a house in the City of Scranton I'll say this it's certainly a buyer's market so we welcome everybody to come into the city and purchase property. But one of the things that anyone who is purchasing property looks at the tax rates. And somebody like myself who works three jobs can absolutely afford to pay these level of taxes. You know, if something like that comes -you know, I can work an extra night here or there. But what worries me is there are people that, you know, four dollars a week, six dollars a week through the course of a year, it's not that easy to put money away. We all know that. Things happen. Cars breakdown. You know, you need repairs in your home. You need medicine. different things happen and it's sounds so easy to say, well, this is

20

21

22

23

24

25

only six dollars a week or this is only eight dollars a week but when you add it up and you go to that person who may be on a fixed income who receives \$500 a month in Social Security, it's very difficult for that person to save money along the way. And for them to come up with that much at the end of the year it's very difficult. And there's no question about it that what was mentioned that the school taxes and the county are the bulk of the property tax bill. And for many senior citizens it's especially frustrating because many of the their children didn't even attend public schools in the city. Some of them did 50 years ago and they're still paying. So there's a lot of frustration on the part of the day taxpayer. I do support cuts outside of public safety within the budget. If that means eliminating almost every other department besides public safety and I would include housing

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

inspections dollars in with public safety because that is a matter of safety and with the rental registration ordinance, again, that was something else that I supported. If that's all the city provides is a service, we keep the people safe, I think the city did their job. I spoke with residents in Hanover Township who have private garbage service and I understand it cannot be done in 2013. I'm not saying it can. It's something that can be done 2014 moving forward as many of these items are. They're garbage fee is \$22 more than the City of Scranton for a weekly pickup, not per bag. It's a weekly pickup and once a month you can put out -basically they call it a clean up day where you can put out whatever you want. You know, that's \$22 more and you said say, well, it's \$22 more through the course of a year. but at the same time the taxes that subsidize the DPW could be -- the

23

24

25

burden of a tax increase could be less than that aspect. And also there may be windfall that's realized by the initial sale of pack masters and things of that nature. I also believe that, you know, that I like the idea of there being some departmental expenditure cuts in there. I was under the assumption that they were going to be realized through the budget and Mr. Joyce mentioned that the department heads would be making the choices. I hope that they submit recommendations before budget time. But all and all by speaking to residents and, you know, some people say well it's easy to just vote no. It's not easy to just vote no. You know, being on a losing end of a four/one vote is not an easy thing. But I firmly believe that this is not the best plan for the city, and I stand by that and I will be voting no.

MR. JOYCE: Though I respect your opinion I humbly disagree. Right now

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we're faced a financial crisis.

Without a revised recovery plan we can't get any bank in the world to loan us money let alone in the United States or the State of Pennsylvania. We need money to survive. Right now if the city doesn't receive unfunded borrowing it false into the abyss. Ιf the city doesn't receive this tax anticipation note, how do we make payroll? How do we pay our bills? We can't. If the city doesn't receive the money to pay the firefighters and police officers which will have to been done in terms of a loan or a bond issue, what do we do then? That leads us into the bankruptcy option. when we get into the bankruptcy option, what happens, the state fights it, they appoint a receiver, the taxes go up at the receiver's will. At that point instead of a 39.2 percent tax increase, best case scenario 79 percent tax increase, worst case

scenario, we could be looking at

23

24

25

possibly 150 percent tax increase because that receiver that's appointed isn't going to care about what gets raised and the people move out of So I'm voting yes for this recovery plan because though it's a big burden -- and believe me, the last thing I want to do is raise taxes on people but we've come to a situation where it's not do we want to it but rather do we have to do it in order for the city to survive and this right now is the only way for the city to Believe me, I've been on survive. calls with Ryan McGowan trying to get a bank to loan us and they are not biting without a recovery plan at this point. So though I humbly disagree with your opinion, I will be voting yes for this piece of legislation. 21 22

MR. LOSCOMBE: And I think I made may comments earlier. I think everybody knows where I stand.

MS. EVANS: I think the most difficult, most difficult position

21

22

23

24

25

here is to take responsibility, to do all the work involved and to step up to the plate and approve this and I've been on council now since 2004 and I never before approved borrowing, I never approved tax increases, but each time I've provided a plan. Granted my council colleagues did not agree with my plans and so they were unsuccessful. But I think it is too easy just to say no and to think that this is an easy decision for anyone up here, it is not. It certainly is not. This is the first time I've ever had to do something like this and I do so because I don't want you to have to suffer what will come without this recovery plan. Now, you can say we've gut the budget but I can say from just city council standpoint we do not function alone. We have a staff. We have a city clerk and we have two employees and everything that we do -on Thursday evenings just as one example is produced by this office,

the legislation is written by the women in this office. The calls that are fielded everyday in terms of answering citizen's problems, pointing them in the right directions, the amount of research that is done by our office so that I am better enabled to negotiate with DCED, PEL, Senator Blake, Mayor Doherty is imperative. And so we're saying, well, we would gut a budget. That would leave council unable to even conduct its weekly meetings.

MR. ROGAN: I believe the city clerk is mandated by the Home Rule Charter; is that correct?

MS. EVANS: Yes, it is.

MR. JOYCE: Yes, it.

MS. EVANS: But so are, you know, quite a number, quite a number of other things and all of the city departments, et cetera, they are mandated in the Home Rule Charter but you're proposing cutting them. So government would be unable to function

24

25

and, you know, I have heard many suggestions and I wish they could be implemented, suggestions like cutting all salaries to under \$50,000 but all that does is create labor unrest for the next decade and flushing millions of dollars down the toilet in legal fees from one court battle to another. It simply cannot be done. contracts have been negotiated. are in place until their termination dates and those wages were set by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court so no one on this council, no one in city government and forgive my verbiage here but even God, himself, cannot change those salaries and so it is, it is a very difficult thing to do and this recovery plan and this financing that we have just approved was realized through the combined efforts and cooperation of the mayor, city council, DCED, PEL, and the city unions and there were many tough decisions to make and those decisions

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

arose from factors like the Supreme Court award and ever growing pension obligations and rises in health care, they had to be an addressed. throughout all of this our goal remained to make the best attempt possible not to over burden the Scranton taxpayer and to provide a plan that fairly shares the burden among all the stakeholders of this city. And I believe that's been achieved because PEL had 129 percent on its plate for you, the mayor originally had 78 percent and city council through its negotiations with all of the aforementioned parties have cut that in more than half and going forward throughout the next three years it will require the cooperation of the city, the county and the state to realize the goals of this revised recovery plan. So I'm not naive but I do believe just because something is or because someone says to me you can't do that, my answer is why can't

I do that, why not. And if not now, when. Saying that a nonprofit doesn't have to pay, that's all well and good. But if you don't make the attempt, they never well. You're giving them a license to just carry on with business as usual and that can't be allowed anymore because 30 percent of our property has -- more than 30 percent of our taxable property has been devoured by nonprofits who are continuing to grow as we speak. The attempts have to be made. A commuter tax, well, the city cannot even petition the Lackawanna County courts for a commuter tax until it has passed a revised recovery plan. These things have to been done. And it isn't -like I said, it is not an easy thing and I would echo what you said earlier Councilman Joyce, I won't sleep well. I don't sleep well. And this has required tremendous work round the clock to try to save the city but more than saving the city, it's saving you,

232425

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	the people of this city.
2	And if anyone else has anything
3	to say on the question?
4	(No response.)
5	MS. EVANS: If not, I think we
6	can go to roll call.
7	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
8	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
9	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
10	MR. ROGAN: No.
11	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
12	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
13	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
14	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
15	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
16	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby
17	declare Item 7-B as amended legally
18	and lawfully adopted.
19	MS. KRAKE: 7-C. FOR
20	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON
21	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FOR ADOPTION -
22	RESOLUTION NO. 38, 2012 - AUTHORIZING
23	THE DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS FROM
24	SCRANTON'S OFFICE OF ECONOMIC AND
25	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT UDAG REPAYMENT

1	CHECKING ACCOUNT NO. 56-202174-9
2	ENTITLED URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION
3	GRANT REPAYMENT ACCOUNT, SAID FUNDS TO
4	BE UTILIZED FOR FINAL PAYMENTS DUE AND
5	OWING WITH RESPECT TO WORK
6	PERFORMED REGARDING THE CRISP AVENUE
7	BRIDGE PROJECT.
8	MS. EVANS: What is the
9	recommendation of the chair for the
10	Committee on Community Development.
11	MR. ROGAN: As chair for the
12	Committee Development, I recommend
13	final passage of Item 7-C.
14	MR. ROGAN: Second.
15	MS. EVANS: On the question?
16	(No response.)
17	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
18	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
19	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
20	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
21	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
22	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
23	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
24	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
25	MR. JOYCE: Yes.

1	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
2	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby
3	declare Item 7-C legally and lawfully
4	adopted.
5	MS. KRAKE: 7-D. FOR
6	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON
7	PUBLIC SAFETY FOR ADOPTION -RESOLUTION
8	NO. 39, 2012 – AUTHORIZING
9	THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY
10	OFFICIALS FOR THE CITY OF SCRANTON TO
11	ENTER INTO A GRANT AGREEMENT BETWEEN
12	THE PENNSYLVANIA EMERGENCY
13	MANAGEMENT AGENCY AND THE SCRANTON
14	POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FEDERAL
15	FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2009
16	BUFFER ZONE PROTECTION PROGRAM AND
17	ACCEPT GRANT FUNDING IN THE AMOUNT OF
18	\$27,685.91.
19	MS. EVANS: What is the
20	recommendation of the chair for the
21	Committee on Public Safety?
22	MR. LOSCOMBE: As chairperson for
23	the Committee on Public Safety, I
24	recommend final passage of Item 7-D.
25	MR. ROGAN: Second.

1	MS. EVANS: On the question?
2	(No response.)
3	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
4	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
5	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
6	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
7	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
8	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
9	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
10	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
11	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
12	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
13	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby
14	declare Item 7-D legally and lawfully
15	adopted.
16	MS. KRAKE: 7-E. FOR
17	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON
18	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FOR ADOPTION -
19	RESOLUTION NO. 40, 2012 -
20	AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
21	APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE
22	AND ENTER INTO A DESIGN AND
23	CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION SERVICES
24	CONTRACT WITH REILLY ASSOCIATES TO
25	PROVIDE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

1	INSPECTION SERVICES FOR THE
2	CONSTRUCTION WORK FOR THE PROJECT
3	ENTITLED: "RECONSTRUCTION
4	OF THE CITY STREETS TO INCLUDE
5	HANDICAPPED CURB CUTS".
6	MS. EVANS: What is the
7	recommendation of the chair for the
8	Committee on Community Development?
9	MR. ROGAN: As chair for the
10	Committee on Community Development, I
11	recommend final passage of Item 7-E.
12	MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.
13	MS. EVANS: On the questions?
14	(No response.)
15	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
16	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
17	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
18	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
19	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
20	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
21	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
22	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
23	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
24	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
25	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby

declare Item 7-E legally and lawfully adopted.

Is there anyone who wishes to address council on Items 7-F, 7-G and 7-H the legislation that has been moved to 7th Order.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Yeah. Bill
Jackowitz. You know, I understand and really basically the state is helping us out by giving us an interest free loan and they're also giving us a \$250,000 grant so I believe that the state actually is helping us out but I'm not happy about that. I'm not happy about that. I'm not happy about the fact that we have to take another two million dollar loan that we have to pay back. We do have to pay that back, do we not, the loan?

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

MR. JACKOWITZ: Just to make payroll? Just to make -- is that the way the city operate? Is that a way a municipality should be operating? Is it? Should we have to borrow money

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that the taxpayers have to pay back. The taxpayers have to pay that money back. Why are we there? We've been distressed for 7,231 days. Don't you think that was long enough for the mayor, the city councils and the business administrators for the last 20 years to come up with a plan and do something to rectify that problem? Now here we are on the 23rd of August, 2012, and we have to borrow two million dollars from the state. The state is running the city. The mayor is not running the city. City council is not running the city. The state is running it right now because they're giving us our money to pay our police officers, our firefighters, our clerks, our DPW people. And if you think I'm happy about that, I'm not. You think I'm going to applaud getting this loan. I'm not. Because it should have never happened but I'm realistic enough and smart enough and intelligent enough to realize that it

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

did happen but I'm not happy about it. And when is it going to stop? What is going to happen in 2013? Are we going to have to take out more loans to pay our day-to-day expenses and bills? That's ludicrous. That's ridiculous. And applaud you, Mrs. Evans, and applaud Frank Joyce and everyone of you up there but I'm not happy about it. And I'm not going to stand up and cheer about it because it never should have happened but it did happen. think it's embarrassing that we have to borrow two million dollars to pay our city employees. And I appreciate the state giving it to us at interest free, I really do, and I appreciate them giving us a \$250,000 grant that we don't have to pay back but I'm not happy about it and I hope 2013 is completely different than what 2012 -from 1992 to 2012 has been. And I tell you what, every week that I come to city council meeting, I'm going to remind you of how many days it's been

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it is.

and how many months that we have been distressed and I'm going to expect results. That's why you were elected. That's why the mayor was elected to get results and produce results. happened in the past happened in the past. Nobody listened in the past. Ι hope people start listening in the future starting today.

MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else? Thank you for MR. DOBRZYN: letting me speak quick. I'll make it I'd like to thank all the out sources and chief and everybody else that can contributed to all of the economic problems in this country and these would be anthill compared to what -- if things weren't just outsourced and we weren't sold down the river by the federal government right on down and I have no problem with anything that's going on here tonight. I support council. what has to be done and that's the way Thank you and have a good

1	night.
2	MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.
3	MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else
4	who care to address council?
5	(No response.)
6	MS. EVANS: Mrs. Krake.
7	MS. KRAKE: 7-F FORMERLY 6-B FOR
8	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON
9	FINANCE FOR ADOPTION ORDINANCE NO. 52,
10	2012, AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
11	APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS OF THE CITY
12	OF SCRANTON TO RECEIVE AN INTEREST
13	FREE LOAN IN THE AMOUNT OF TWO MILLION
14	DOLLARS FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF
15	PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY
16	AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TO
17	RECEIVE A GRANT OF \$250,000 FROM THE
18	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
19	DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC
20	DEVELOPMENT THE MUNICIPALITIES
21	FINANCIAL RECOVERY ACT, ACT 47 OF
22	1987, AS AMENDED.
23	MS. EVANS: What is the
24	recommendation of the chair for the
25	Committee on Finance?

1	MR. JOYCE: As chairperson for
2	the Committee on Finance, I recommend
3	final passage of Item 7-F.
4	MR. ROGAN: Second.
5	MS. EVANS: On the question?
6	(No response.)
7	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
8	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
9	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
10	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
11	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
12	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
13	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
14	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
15	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
16	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
17	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby
18	declare Item 7-F legally and lawfully
19	adopted.
20	MS. KRAKE: 7-G FORMERLY 6-C FOR
21	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON
22	FINANCE FOR ADOPTION FILE OF COUNCIL
23	NO. 53, 2012, AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING
24	THE ISSUANCE AND SALE OF A SIX MILLION
25	TWO HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS

1	PRINCIPAL AMOUNT, TAX ANTICIPATION
2	NOTE OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON KNOWN AS
3	TAN SERIES B-2012 AWARDED TO
4	AMALGAMATED BANK; DETERMINING THE FORM
5	AND TERM OF SAID NOTE; AWARDING SAID
6	NOTE; AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE
7	FILING OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS; AND
8	DIRECTING THE PROPER OFFICIALS OF THE
9	CITY OF SCRANTON TO TAKE ANY AND ALL
10	OTHER ACTIONS AS MAY BE REQUIRED IN
11	CONNECTION WITH THE ISSUANCE OF SAID
12	NOTE.
13	MS. EVANS: What is the
14	recommendation of the chair for the
15	Committee on Finance?
16	MR. JOYCE: As chairperson for
17	the Committee on Finance, I recommend
18	final passage of Item 7-G.
19	MR. ROGAN: Second.
20	MS. EVANS: On the question?
21	(No response.)
22	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
23	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
24	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
25	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.

1	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
2	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
3	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
4	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
5	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
6	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
7	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby
8	declare Item 7-G legally and lawfully
9	adopted.
10	MS. KRAKE: 7-H FORMERLY 6-A FOR
11	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON 51,
12	2012 - AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF
13	SCRANTON, LACKAWANNA COUNTY,
14	PENNSYLVANIA APPOINTING W. BOYD
15	HUGHES, ESQUIRE AND PAUL A. KELLY,
16	JR., ESQUIRE AS SPECIAL COUNSEL TO THE
17	CITY OF SCRANTON AND CASECON
18	CAPITAL, INC., AS CO-FINANCIAL ADVISOR
19	TO THE CITY OF SCRANTON ON THE
20	ISSUANCE AND PLACEMENT OF ANY
21	BONDS, NOTES OR FINANCING OF THE CITY
22	OF SCRANTON'S UNFUNDED DEBT OR
23	REFINANCING OR REFUNDING OF ANY OF
24	THE CITY'S OUTSTANDING BOND ISSUES AND
25	2012 TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE B AND

1	AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
2	APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE
3	A CONTRACT WITH CASECON CAPITAL, INC.
4	MS. EVANS: As chair for the
5	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
6	passage of Item 7-H.
7	MR. ROGAN: Second.
8	MS. EVANS: On the question?
9	(No response.)
10	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
11	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
12	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
13	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
14	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
15	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
16	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
17	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
18	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
19	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
20	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby
21	declare Item 7-H legally and lawfully
22	adopted.
23	In July I had stated that city
24	council would remain in session
25	throughout August until the financial

1	crisis was resolved. The passing of
2	the revised recovery plan TAN-B and
3	the 2.25 million from DCED will
4	address the crisis. Therefore, I move
5	that city council will not meet on
6	August 30th, 2012.
7	MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.
8	MS. EVANS: On the question?
9	(No response.)
10	MS. EVANS: All those in favor
11	signify by saying aye.
12	MS. EVANS: Aye.
13	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
14	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
15	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
16	MS. EVANS: Opposed?
17	MR. ROGAN: No.
18	MS. EVANS: The ayes have it and
19	so moved.
20	If there is no further business,
21	I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
22	MR. JOYCE: Motion to adjourn.
23	MS. EVANS: This meeting is
24	adjourned.
25	(Proceedings concluded at 9:55 p.m.)
	1

C E R T I F I C A T E

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me of the above-cause and that this copy is a correct transcript of the same to the best of my ability.

Amelia Nicol, RPR Official Court Reporter