

-

THE YEAR 2013.

SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING PUBLIC HEARING

IN RE: FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 77 OF 2012

APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE CITY

GOVERNMENT FOR THE PERIOD COMMENCING ON THE 1ST DAY OF

JANUARY, 2013, TO AND INCLUDING DECEMBER 31, 2013 BY

THE ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL CITY OPERATING BUDGET FOR

HELD:

Monday, December 3, 2012

LOCATION:

Council Chambers

Scranton City Hall

340 North Washington Avenue

Scranton, Pennsylvania

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

MS. EVANS: I'd like to call this 1 public hearing to order. Roll call, please. 2 3 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff. Rogan. 4 MR. ROGAN: 5 Here. MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe. 6 7 MR. LOSCOMBE: Here. MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce. 8 9 MR. JOYCE: Here. MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans. 10 11 MS. EVANS: Here. Notice is hereby 12 given that Scranton City Council will hold a 13 public hearing on Monday, December 3, 2012, 14 at 5:00 p.m. in council chambers, second floor, municipal building, 340 North 15 16 Washington Avenue, Scranton, Pennsylvania. 17 The purpose of said public hearing 18 is to hear testimony and discuss the following: File of Council No. 77 of 2012 19 20 appropriating funds for the expenses of the 21 city government for the period commencing on 22 the 1st day of January, 2013, to and 23 including December 31, 2013 by the adoption 24 of the general city operating budget for the

Year 2013.

25

Councilman McGoff has a prior commitment and is unavailable to attend this hearing. City council will hear the testimony of residents this evening prior to presenting its amendments to the City 2013 operating budget during it's regularly scheduled meeting on December 6 and 13. We ask that all speakers would adhere to the time limit. When the bell rings, please finish your thought and be seated.

Although we do have several citizens in attendance tonight, only one has signed our speaker sign-in sheet and I will call on him. Doug Miller.

MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council.

Doug Miller, Scranton. You know, it's truly disappointing tonight to look at the crowd tonight and not see too many people here. I counted six, that's not including the media that's here, and yet we have so many outraged people in the community and I just don't see that here. It truly speaks volumes and I'm quite disappointed about that, that this our city here that we are trying to save and the public has an

opportunity to come here this evening and voice their opinion, objections or any support they have for the 2013 budget and they are not here and yet they consistently complain. It just baffles me.

But onto the issue of the budget, obviously, I had a lot of statements at our last meeting regarding my opinion on the budget the raises, particularly with Attorney Hughes, who I do support a raise for. We made it clear that Attorney Hughes has gone above and beyond on many occasions with his job duties and the things he has done to help the council, make the decisions to move the city forward, whether it was with the Parking Authority, the recovery plan throughout summer, and right now the budget.

You know, I think if we take a look through the last 12 years and think of the millions of dollars we have squandered on attorneys in the city by the administration that just spent money out of control to attorneys like Carl Greco, and we sit back and we ask ourselves what did we ever get

out of that? Nothing. So I think that when we want to criticize the council for giving an attorney a raise who has gone above and beyond and gone the extra mile for the things he has done we need to realize that Attorney Hughes has been asset not only to the council but more importantly for the taxpayers because he stood up and he has just as much of an influence on us as anyone else, and he showed time and time again that he truly does care and has our interests in mind because his actions have proven it.

He doesn't take on any other of the extra work, but he has done so because he knows what's at stake and he should be commended for it. You know, the other raises, those are issues that we can go on at another time, whether it's Chief Davis who I don't believe deserves a raise for his inability to keep fire stations open when he has stated himself at the meeting at Keyser Valley that he has the ability to make the decision of whether or not stations are open or closed. That doesn't sound like someone who deserves a raise, not someone who

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

doesn't take our safety seriously.

Attorney Kelly, I understand he has been involved in a lot of things that have gone, but I think he has caused a lot of problems in the past and at this time I don't feel he as much as an asset to the city as others are.

Last week I took issues with statements made in the newspaper by Councilman Rogan and I still take them personal because I do feel that we do do a good job around here of grandstanding and playing to the camera and not wanting to do the work that's involved. This isn't about theatrics, this isn't Broadway, this is city government, and we have tough decisions to make and whether or not we want to come down here and play to the camera that's for those individuals to decide, but I take the issue seriously and I understand and know who puts the time and the effort in to getting the work done and doing the homework and working together and not playing politics and I know those who do just exactly what I just said.

We were told we would hear

amendments tonight from Councilman Rogan 1 and, Councilman, I'd like to if you do have 2 3 those with you I would be interested in hearing what you have. 4 5 MR. ROGAN: At the regularly scheduled meeting, Mr. Miller. Thursday. 6 7 MR. MILLER: Well, since we last 8 discussed at the last meeting have you had 9 any dialogue with your colleagues to put 10 amendments together? 11 MR. ROGAN: No, I have been working 12 on my own amendments. 13 MR. MILLER: And just to clarify 14 once again for the public, you at no time throughout this whole process had any 15 16 dialogue whatsoever whether it was attending 17 meetings or anything else to give input on 18 the budget? 19 MR. ROGAN: No, I did not. 20 MR. MILLER: Why was that? 21 MR. ROGAN: As I stated previously, 22 I was invited to one meeting, it was by 23 Councilman Joyce, it was on Veteran's Day, I 24 believe, and at that point in time the 25 budget -- the draft of the budget was

2

4

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

already sent out to the printer.

MR. MILLER: That's where we go to the done deal comment. It was never a done This has nothing to do whether or not deal. draft were sent down, they can send all the paperwork and budgets they want to the printers it doesn't answer the question, the bottom line is you are a councilman elected official and you have an obligation to work with your colleagues. Whether or not the mayor or whoever sent things to the printing press has no relevance to this discussion whatsoever, but I don't want to get into an argument with you, it's not why I'm here.

As I stated, I'm here because I find this issue seriously, but I just don't feel we should be grandstanding because that's what's going on here. We don't want to do the work moved. I do look forward to hearing your amendments at some point as a lot of other people.

Regarding the article today about towing contracts in the city, I did read that. There is obviously many businesses in the community, towers that are a little

disappointed and have many questions as to what's going to go on with that, but I just want to say tonight publically that, you know. I think we need to make it clear to all the towers out there, nothing personal with the towers, but the city isn't even obligated to have any towing list and have any rotation. You know, it's doing it because we support businesses in the community, but we are also at the same time looking to generate revenue for th city and to do that you need to be creative, and that's exactly what this is, that any towed vehicles be stored behind police headquarters and generate over \$300,000, the revenue we need.

But if it's going to become an issue later on down the road then I suggest maybe the city invest in it's own rollbacks and do our own towing service and make an expansion as part of DPW and require our DPW employees to go for their CE license and let them respond tows and let's continue to generate revenue. It's about being creative, and that's what this is. And, you know, like I

said, it's nothing personal to the towers in the city, but we are looking for every dime and penny we can get at this point.

And lastly, just regarding the forensic audit, I wasn't sure if that was going to be part of any discussions here with the budget, I know we did discuss that with the recovery plan as we are just trying to account for every penny in the city looking at the mismanagement for the last 12 years and maybe that will be addressed later on. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. JOYCE: Just to clarify the truth, prior to the meeting on Veteran's Day nothing had gone out to print. Nothing went out to print until the 14th of November. There were some spreadsheets sent around prior to the Veteran's Day meeting, but there had been nothing that was actually printed prior to this meeting.

MS. EVANS: And it was printed by the IT Department, it was not sent out to be printed. That is the job of Scranton City Council and that will not occur until late

December or earlier January.

MR. ROGAN: Mr. Joyce, you stated at the council meeting that you received a draft copy of the budget. That's what I was referring to, and you can check the minutes.

MR. JOYCE: There were spreadsheets on top, but there was nothing actually sent out to be printed at that time.

MS. EVANS: But everyone had the opportunity and I feel the responsibility to participate in the development of this budget. Some chose to do so, others chose not to do so.

MR. ROGAN: I'm just going to respond, and I apologize, this is time for the residents to speak, but I just want to respond to that. I didn't sit down with the mayor and Janet Evans and Frank Joyce to come up with this budget, I have stated that a million times, but I am going to get together amendments that I will put up during motions next week, and as I stated last week, we will see where the votes are.

MS. EVANS: And just to add to that, the budget wasn't developed solely by those

three individuals, it also included the Business Administrator and the employees of his office as well as all department heads who all provided input regarding the cuts in their departments to the business administrator, so it was actually quite a large team of individuals who drafted this budget through negotiations and, as I said, everyone was invited to participate, some chose not to.

MR. ROGAN: So it was the Doherty administration and two members of council?

MS. EVANS: But you were encouraged to participate, Mr. Rogan, and you chose not to rather than you would like to I think engage in public grandstanding and operate in the Twitter sphere rather than communicating with your council colleagues or anyone in the administration.

MR. ROGAN: And, Mrs. Evans, how many times did you call myself or Mr. McGoff to consult them on the budget?

MS. EVANS: Actually, everyone on the council calls me with the exception of you, Mr. Rogan.

1 MR. ROGAN: Well, like I said, my amendments will be made, the work will be 2 3 done, and we'll see if you support eliminating the raises or not. 4 MS. EVANS: And the remainder of 5 council, I'm sure, will be making amendments 6 through the Finance Chair and hopefully you 7 8 will support those. 9 MR. ROGAN: Last I checked every 10 member's vote counts the same so I'll make 11 my amendments and vote on them. 12 MS. EVANS: And Mr. Joyce will make 13 his as well. Is there anyone else who cares 14 to address council? MR. JACKOWITZ: 15 Good evening, 16 Scranton City Council. Bill Jackowitz, 17 Scranton resident. 18 MR. JOYCE: Good evening. 19 MR. JACKOWITZ: The City of Scranton 20 has been a distressed since 10 January 1992. 21 If you do the math, that was 7,633 days ago, 22 1,090 weeks ago, 20 years 46 weeks and five 23 days ago, 252 months ago equalling 20.9 24 years ago. 25 During this period of time, the city

has had two elected mayors, Jimmy Connors and Chris Doherty. We have had several city council presidents and city council members. The current supermajority promised residents that if elected they would put the people first.

The proposed Scranton city budget

2013 is \$109 million for a city whose
population is declining, not rising.

Furthermore, the budget does not include any
layoffs for current city employees but does
call for pay raises for six city employees,
two of them being attorneys. I must ask how
can this be?

Scranton City Council and the mayor are asking residents who reside outside city limits but work in Scranton pay an additional 1 percent commuter tax to support the financially distressed city while they are dolling out raises to two attorneys, one business administrator, one fire chief who has a 93 percent no confidence vote from his subordinates, the Scranton firefighters, and two administrative appointed employees.

Again, I must ask why?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Furthermore, the mayor and city council want to raise property taxes 12 percent. The reason being to pay for the past mistakes that have cost the Scranton taxpayers millions of dollars in lost taxpayers money. Again, I must ask why? has been well documented that the nonprofits located within the city limits pay very little, and in most cases, no taxes whatsoever to the distressed City of Scranton. It appears that they will not be paying any more to the City of Scranton in 2013, but, yet the mayor and city council may raise the salaries of six Scranton appointed employees, two attorneys who are basically doing the same work, one business administrator, who has not provided the residents with the current city audit which, by the way, was due on 30th of May 2012, and the fire chief that has a 93 percent no confidence vote from his fellow firefighters. Again, I must ask why?

Most taxpayers do not mind paying higher taxes if the money is being spent wisely and actually putting the people

first. In this proposed budget I do not see that happening. The only people that are being put first are six appointed -- city appointed -- six appointed city employees who currently are being paid very handsomely by the Scranton taxpayers at this time.

The mayor, city council and the business administrator are responsible for the City of Scranton being distressed, not the taxpayers of Scranton and certainly not the taxpayers who reside in the surrounding communities who happen to work in Scranton. If the nonprofits are not willing to pay a little extra, then you should not ask their employees to pay a little extra. Smarten up, Scranton, or you will be distressed for another 7,633 days.

As far as the 12 percent tax
increase paying for the sins of the past
borrowing, I strongly recommend that the
city stop borrowing more money to prevent
the sins of the future. Stop spending money
you do not have and have no way of
generating and make the hard choices. You
were elected to be leaders. Asking people

who do not reside in the city to pay for our mistakes and your mistakes your mistakes, and when I say "you" I'm talking about Scranton City Council, past and present, raising taxes has never solved the problem and it's not going to solve the problem now.

The mistakes were made in the past and, like I said, it was 7,633 days ago.

Don't you think that's long enough? Don't you really believe that that's long enough for the citizens and the residents and the taxpayers of this city to suffer and be laughed at and be humiliated by still being a distressed city.

Everybody is talking about grandstanding and so on and so forth and people going around patting people on the back, but you know what? Nothing has been solved. The City of Scranton is still a distressed city and I guarantee you come January 2013 Scranton will still remain a distressed city and you can raise the taxes all you want and you can raise attorneys' salaries all you want, and you can raise the business administrator salary all you want,

the fire chief's salary all you want and two administrative assistants all you want and the city will still be distressed come 1 January 2013.

MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else?

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening.

Marie Schumacher, resident and taxpayer.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MS. SCHUMACHER: I will start with just two items from on the expense side and I'll complete Thursday night. I think the budget for the Parks and Recreation account for medical, chemical, lab supplies account has 91 percent of its 2012 budget remaining though 83 percent of the year is gone. Does the fact that this budget has only been reduced about 15 percent and indicator that all pools will be open in the 2013 summer and more chemicals will be required?

MS. EVANS: I think that's a question that you would have to pose to the administration, Mrs. Schumacher.

MS. SCHUMACHER: I thought this was a joint budget, so you all knew the backup for each of these, but -- the budget for the

DPW's maintenance Superfund site has been reduced 50 percent from \$100,000 down to \$50,000 for 2013, however, no money has been expended in 2012, so why is 2013 being cut more? Mr. Joyce, you can wait I'll mail these to you, e-mail them to you tomorrow.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

MS. SCHUMACHER: And maybe you can answer them on Thursday if we don't get to them.

Now, on the revenue side, the bottom line for the revenue is that I believe that it's significantly overstated. On the cable TV and miscellaneous revenues, despite the fact that cable TV revenue will probably fall short by about \$150,000 in the current year and again next year and the amount for the new MBRO program seems overly optimistic, that's small potatoes compared to the missing second unfunded debt recently approved by the Court, which I believe is included in the 20.9 million bond issue; is that correct?

MR. JOYCE: Yes, that's true.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Then why is that

not in the 2013 budget? Where are these proceeds being booked?

MR. JOYCE: They are being -- well, we are supposed to close on the second unfunded debt in 2012 and that will be used to pay off approximately \$9.75 million in bills that year.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. Yeah, I understand what the unfunded debt was this time, what is the term of that settlement of that bond that you are going to have by the end of this year?

MR. JOYCE: The exact terms?

MS. SCHUMACHER: No, the length, the duration of the bond, is it a 20-year bond, a 30-year bond, a 10-year bond?

MS. EVANS: We won't now that until actually information has been presented to us after the bonds or as the bonds are being sold, so we can't answer that.

MS. SCHUMACHER: It just seems to me it's probably going to be more than ten years and we did the first one separately and that was for ten years so now we are going to pay probably something over ten

years on the same amount of money that was dictated to be paid back in ten years and that doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me.

And then also on interfund transfers, should the 2.4 million that you voted to introduce last Thursday for the horse racing and gambling local share be included or don't you believe that this program, that this revenue would come in and the streets will not be paved? Is there some reason that's not in the budget? You're obviously going to past it this year. I don't think the revenue will come in this year, why is that 2.4 million not in the budget as revenue?

And then in 2011 the local taxes

fell \$1.7 million short of the \$28 million

budget, this year it looks to be on track to

miss the 30.7 million budget by about 3 1/2

million and now you include \$2.5 million for

a commuter tax that won't even be heard by

the Court until three days before the

announced final budget vote. Do you really

think the Court will rule that fast, is

question number one, and the second question is I think you owe the taxpayers the cuts that will be made to the budget should there either not be a decision by 2013 or 20 - or 12-12 or on Thursday, or if the commuter tax is turned town by the Court even without the \$2.5 million commuter tax, including the other local taxes being raised I would argue that the budget would still be -- is overly optimistic.

And then I'd like to switch to Page 93 of the budget where it gives the expenditures for the debt that we have incurred. There is 1.9 million shown as an expense for next year for the Scranton Parking Authority. I thought that had been negotiated down and that was a -- this was the last year, how is the 1.9 established?

MR. JOYCE: Well, we looked at the figures that Central Parking had given us as far as what they project the parking garages will bring in and there was a still a gap as far as what the Parking Authority owes on their bonds and what they projected that will bring in next year based on the first

two months of the year and what they actually did bring in so that number of what she brought in for the first two months of the year or the first two months since they have been operating the garages was stretched out over 12 months. That number was subtracted from the amount of debt service payment that they have when it came out to 1.9 million.

MS. EVANS: And I believe the actual annual payments to the SPA are maybe 3.4 million.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Well, if we had an audit we would know, unfortunately, we don't have an audit yet.

Now, the unfunded 2011 unfunded debt loan, that is the first unfunded borrowing from last year and what is the term of that borrowing, is that a ten year?

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

say?

MS. SCHUMACHER: I'll finish these couple of more here, the 2012 Series C is what, is that a payment for the 20.9?

MR. JOYCE: 2012 Series C did you

all the retired chiefs also get that raise; is that correct?

MR. LOSCOMBE: They receive a percentage of it, not the full raise.

MR. UNGVARSKY: Any idea what the percent is?

MR. LOSCOMBE: About half.

MR. UNGVARSKY: About half. There is no audit as yet, it is being held up by several different departments, can the council tell me if these departments that are holding out the audit have also reduced their budgets for the year?

MS. EVANS: Actually, the only holdup on the audit currently, well, as of the last report we received on November 29, would have been letters from seven attorneys that are required by Rossi & Company, the auditor, and I spoke with the mayor concerning that are very issue on Friday morning and I insisted that he get in touch with the attorneys in order to facilitate more quickly the letters being submitted to the city auditor and once that has been done an exit conference will be scheduled and we

1 are looking forward to that occurring in December. 2 3 MR. UNGVARSKY: Well, I was just wondering if those that are holding up the 4 5 audit are also the ones that are reluctant to reduce their budgets. 6 7 MS. EVANS: No, actually they have all turned in the information. It's in its 8 9 final stages. 10 MR. UNGVARSKY: Okay. And I really 11 realize THAT we have a tremendous increase 12 in the proposed new budget, excluding what 13 we are going to give out to the firemen and 14 policemen how does this budget compare with last year's budget? 15 16 MR. JOYCE: When you --17 MR. UNGVARSKY: This proposed 18 budget? 19 MR. JOYCE: When you factor out what 20 we are going to have to pay in the Supreme 21 Court awards along with the increase in the MMO payment and other stipulations required 22 23 by the Supreme Court award, it's very 24 similar, if not perhaps a little bit less 25 than last year's or this year's budget.

1 MR. UNGVARSKY: How about the 2 operating expenses, are they up or down and 3 by how much? MR. JOYCE: I don't have the exact 4 5 figures on me right now as far as how much the operating -- or the operating 6 7 expenditures are up or down, I know that 8 there were cuts made. 9 MS. EVANS: In most departments. 10 MR. JOYCE: In most departments, 11 yes, but also --12 MS. EVANS: For example, Scranton 13 City Council took a what, what is our 14 percentage of the cut in our department? MR. JOYCE: 48 percent, but also one 15 16 does have to realize that all of the 17 salaries of union personnel did also go up 18 through their collective bargaining 19 agreement. MR. UNGVARSKY: How much of an 20 21 increase was that from last year to this 22 year though, the total amount in the budget, 23 in the proposed budget, any idea? 24 MR. JOYCE: As far as the overall 25 percentage of salary increases or the budget

.

as a whole?

MR. UNGVARSKY: The total operating budget for 2013 as compared to 2012 excluding the \$12 million or the \$17 million for the police and firemen.

MR. JOYCE: It would be up by, let's see, I will get the exact figure if you would like.

MR. UNGVARSKY: That would help.

MR. JOYCE: Okay.

MR. UNGVARSKY: Last year city council proposed cutting four positions they weren't -- they didn't happen, however, this year you are proposing two new hires, will those two new hirees contribute or will they be a deficit to the budget?

MR. JOYCE: Well, the two positions are required by the clerical union contract. One position will be working in the Business Administrator's Office to help get information together in a more typical fashion for the audit and the other will be working on the rental registration program so hopefully, especially the person working on the rental registration program hopefully

they will be working on generating more revenue from the city than what they are actually being paid.

MR. UNGVARSKY: I realize that this is just a proposed budget, but will there be any positions cut this year?

MR. JOYCE: I cannot answer that at this time. I know some might have views and I'm still waiting to see other amendments made by colleagues so --

MR. UNGVARSKY: Okay.

MS. EVANS: I think though, as you pointed out so appropriately, it's also important to remember that I believe the last two budgets council made a number of personnel cuts and they were never realized because the mayor hires, the mayor fires, and the mayor put those individuals right back into their positions or different positions and the budget never realized those cuts.

MR. UNGVARSKY: Okay, I thank city council for their patience.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to address

council?

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council.

Dave Dobrzyn resident.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. DOBRZYN: And last week I noticed on trash week do you have a figure on what it cost to dump trash up at the Empire Landfill perhaps? It was something around \$2 million or over \$2 million a year?

MR. JOYCE: To dump trash or landfill fees?

MR. DOBRZYN: Yeah, landfill fees.

MR. JOYCE: It's roughly about \$1.5 million per year, 1.5 million and change.

MR. DOBRZYN: But that could vary according to how -- this could be for future, that could vary according to how careful people are in this town about what they are throwing out and what they are recycling and so forth; right? Would that be an honest assessment?

Okay, and as far as the borrowing is concerned now, these escrow accounts cannot be touched by anybody except for what they are presumed maybe a payment to the firemen

or whomever, some back bill, right? 1 2 can't be just shifted around by the 3 administration and we are going use the money for this and we had our fingers 4 5 crossed or whatever when we signed on the dotted line; is that correct? 6 7 MR. JOYCE: That's a correct 8 assumption, yes. 9 MR. DOBRZYN: On insurances, one of 10 my concerns was our insurances, does that 11 cover the whole family for the \$1,000 a month is it roughly per employee? Is that a 12 13 family policy or --14 MR. JOYCE: As far as --MR. DOBRZYN: Like a spouse is 15 16 covered --17 MR. JOYCE: -- an individual's 18 insurance that works for the city? MR. DOBRZYN: Yeah. 19 20 MR. JOYCE: They do have the option 21 if they have a family or if they just have a 22 wife or a husband to choose which policy 23 they would want. The city is self-insured 24 so we basically pay the medical bills. 25 MR. DOBRZYN: And MMO means minimum

monthly --

you.

MR. JOYCE: Minimum municipal obligation, that's any amount that the city is required to provide as far as pension payments.

MR. DOBRZYN: Right. Right.

MR. JOYCE: And I don't know if it's proper tonight, I missed the first part of the meeting I had to run and pick my wife up after dropping her off at work, would you like the night off now that we got you here, this auto tow and storage, I have some concerns with that, would it be proper to voice them now or I could wait until Thursday if need be?

MS. EVANS: No, you can --

MR. JOYCE: That's completely up to

MR. DOBRZYN: Well, one of my concerns is not only for you operators, but there are also warrantees on cars, extended warrantees on cars, that car must be delivered to the repairing dealership or repair facility, authorized repair facility, they might contract even in the independent

insurance policy with anybody that is certified and properly well-healed enough to handle good repairs, maybe a transmission shop and tow transmission, would those cars be directed to a repair facility or would they be taken down to a storage lot because from my experience I have 35 years of automotive experience and did a lot of warranty work, factory warrantee work, and they -- a manufacturer will not pay for those type of issues. They will pay for a tow job to the dealership and they will pay for rental cars and so forth, but if somebody's car is snagged up and parked on the lot for three or four days we used to get five days to have the car back and running and we'd give out a rental car or a loaner depending on what we kept a certain amount of loaners per one day of repairs.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I believe it would work just like it does now, if you have a warrantee and it's a warrantee situation we're talking about cars towed off the street, abandoned vehicles, stuff like that.

MR. DOBRZYN: Right. Right, either

25

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

maybe they were caught with drugs in them or maybe cars that were in an automotive crash, well, that would be a proper place for them would be to ship them right to a body shop to get them appraised and so forth, too, that somebody would running back and forth.

And also I have a concern with Steamtown being the location. That's a national historic site and I'll address that more on Thursday, but we spent \$30 million on the 500 block of Lackawanna Avenue and we are supposed to be renting out loft apartments to well-healed people and we are giving them an excellent view of a scrap yard which is basically what it's going to be if it's accident and disabled and derelict vehicles so that's something that's a big concern, and we are also -- we built a big park behind the 500 block that's supposed to open some day. So, I mean, the police cars that are there now aren't going to be in there if we going to have a bunch of smash ups and derelict cars rusted full of holes. I don't know if that would be so Thank you and I'll catch you nice to view.

Thursday.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. DOBRZYN: Bawk, bawk.

MS. EVANS: Another consideration that was proposed by I believe Corporal Bachman, who oversees all of the towers who work with the city, is that in this type of situation were it for any reason not to be feasible, the entire operation could be bid out and given to just one local company to handle everything. And, in fact, he felt that it was probably the optimal solution to this, but the city was still trying to be considerate of all 15 towers and so -- and considerate of the police department who, as I said last week, had long wanted the storage yard to be city run.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Another option would be to come under the whole control of the police department, towing, also. You know, there is many options out there so --

MR. MORGAN: Good evening, Council.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. MORGAN: The first thing I have here tonight on the budget is that, you

know, I appreciate everyone who worked on the budget no matter what department in the city, you know, whether it was the mayor or the council or whoever, if it was a joint project, you know, I'd just like to say that I do understand that people put a lot of time into it and I think that the most important thing about a budget is that the people are funding it have the ability to pay it and I think that taxation needs to be fair and I just think that when you look at the residents of this city we keep coming up with new ways of taxation, but the city continues to slide in reverse further and further into debt.

You know, I didn't come here tonight to bash council or bash the mayor or anybody in any capacity that works within the city, but you know when you drive around the city and you see business properties posted for sale and residential properties, whether they are rentals or private residences, and you talk to the residents in the city I think you have to realize that at least residents and business people, because they

are -- business people's income comes basically from the people who live here or people who may travel here, but they only have so much disposal income, I think the city has reached a point where, you know, when you look at the average wage of a Scrantonian they don't have the ability to burden, to carry this burden. They just don't. The business community doesn't have that ability either I don't think.

And I'm sure that we are going to, you know, continue on and believe that we are going to just reach a point where magically money is going to appear. It is my hope that on December 10 that the commuter tax will become a nonstarter and the Court will refuse to allow it to be implemented because we have done too much borrowing and the only real option in my opinion, as humble as it is, is bankruptcy and all of these fees and all of these discussions, you know, I don't know really where they are taking us.

We have come to a conclusion where we keep talking about cuts and city

25

government personnel. Well, you know, I had an obligation to speak to somebody here at the last council meeting out in the hallway who was a city employee -- or a former city employee, and this person seemed to understand exactly what I was talking to him and when I said to him about the amount of pension debt and the inability of the city quite possibly to reach the threshold to pay it and the inability to provide basic services in the city. We have just come to a point where we keep cutting and cutting and cutting and cutting and the residents seem to think that's the answer, but I really think that the greatest gift for this city would be to have a commission seated to try to find out what amount of taxation this city can possibly pay and still try to turn itself around, so I'd have to say something along the lines of a debtor in possession where we try to find a way to ask for relief from the Court to give us a chance to reorganize this city so that this city can flourish again, because over my lifetime being -- I'm only 53, but that's quite

2

3

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

awhile sometimes for some people and some people don't live that long.

I just watched everything just dissipate away, all of the great things of the city a lot of them are gone, some are still here. Many are on life support and I just think that maybe it's time to seat a commission and find out, you know, we are having discussions here about the towers and there is a lot of other discussions that I think we should have and coming up with a budget and increasing the dollar amount with a population without the ability to pay with looking long-range at long-term borrowing and borrowing to pay debt down that you have already borrowed, it's a solution for failure and we just need to find a way as Scrantonians to come together, not rely on our neighbors to pay our bills and find our solutions, and I think we are a strong enough community to do that.

And, like I said, I'm not here to bash any council member because the road ahead of this city is very, very difficult and it's going to take everybody coming

together on some level and putting all politics aside because I just don't see how we evolve here in a vibrant city that's going to grow when you see the amount of bleed of residents trying to leave and people in business telling you they will come if you give them something, so I hope you consider that. Thank you.

> MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Is there anyone else who cares to address council? If there is no one further, then this public hearing is adjourned.

17

25

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

<u>O E R I I I I O R I E</u>

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER