F		
		1
1	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING	
2		
3		
4		
5	HELD:	
6		
7	Thursday, January 24, 2013	
8		
9	LOCATION:	
10	Council Chambers	
11	Scranton City Hall	
12	340 North Washington Avenue	
13	Scranton, Pennsylvania	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23	0.70505 0 0.005077 000 000077 00007	
24	CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER	
25		

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL:

JANET EVANS, PRESIDENT

FRANK JOYCE, VICE-PRESIDENT

ROBERT MCGOFF

PAT ROGAN

JOHN LOSCOMBE

NANCY KRAKE, CITY CLERK

JAMIE MARCIANO, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

BOYD HUGHES, SOLICITOR

1	(Pledge of Allegiance recited and
2	moment of reflection observed.)
3	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
4	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
5	MR. MCGOFF: Here.
6	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
7	MR. ROGAN: Here.
8	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe. Mr.
9	Joyce. Mrs. Evans.
10	MS. EVANS: Here. Dispense with the
11	reading of the minutes.
12	MS. KRAKE: 3-A. MINUTES OF THE
13	COMPOSITE PENSION BOARD MEETING HELD
14	DECEMBER 12, 2012.
15	MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?
16	If not, received and filed.
17	(Whereupon Mr. Loscombe and Mr.
18	Joyce take the dais and join the meeting.)
19	MS. KRAKE: 3-B. FIREMEN'S PENSION
20	COMMISSION MEETING HELD DECEMBER 12, 2012.
21	MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?
22	If not, received and filed.
23	MS. KRAKE: 3-C. CONTROLLER'S REPORT
24	FOR THE MONTH ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2012.
25	MS. EVANS: Are there any comments?

If not, received and filed. 1 3-D. AGENDA FOR THE CITY 2 MS. KRAKE: 3 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TO BE HELD 4 JANUARY 23. 2013. 5 MS. EVANS: Are there any comments? If not, received and filed. Are there any 6 clerk's notes this evening? 7 8 MS. KRAKE: No, Mrs. Evans. 9 MS. EVANS: Thank you. Do any 10 council members have announcements at this 11 time? Blankets and ground coffee are needed 12 at the Bethel AME homeless shelter located 13 at 676 North Washington Avenue in Scranton 14 across the street from Cooper's Seafood Restaurant. If you have spare blankets or 15 16 extra coffee, ground coffee that is, please 17 drop them off at the shelter. I thank our 18 friend Barb O'Malley for bringing this vital to our attention, and that's it. 19 FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS' 20 MS. KRAKE: 21 PARTICIPATION. MS. EVANS: Our first speaker is Ron 22 23 Ellman. 24 MR. ELLMAN: Hello. 25 MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

22

23

24

25

MR. ELLMAN: For the last couple of weeks I sat out here quietly and patiently and listened to Mr. Burke cry and whine and complain about an apparent bad house deal he purchased in the Scranton/Dunmore area up there by the lake. It seems like when you buy a house, you look around and if you couldn't see the traffic and the trucks and everything else that goes down that road you are either blind or stupid, but I just don't want to see the City of Scranton dragged into his battle with DeNaples. We have no business whatsoever taking any interest in this, and I don't see why the council was so interested in the dirt that's being brought in there. If it was anything illegal, the newspaper would have gotten ahold of it months ago.

I could see the road is bad, but I think if you looked at Mr. Doherty's desk you will find IOUs going back 20 and 30 years that would more than pave that road. The taxpayers have just been waiting for these lawsuits and Mr. Kelly said to drop it. I think it's time to go on and worry

about 30 or 40,000 taxpayers in the city and not worry about getting involved in Mr. Burke's battle with the DeNaples.

We desperately need people like the DeNaples' enterprises and the Boluses and the Weinbergs and the Burnes in this city.

That progressive have said it all, Sister Adrian they don't do nothing about hell of.

They probably do more in one minute of their day than Mr. Burke would do if he lived to be 150 years old.

I am just asking you to stay out of this and don't drag us into losing any more money in lawsuits like we have done the past ten years. It's just got to be -- you know what, it's just doesn't seem that council knows which way the wind is blowing the flag at times. And believe me, if there is anybody that wants to see you people successful it's me, but you have some of the best people in the city take time to come up here and talk week after week and make valid suggestions about problems that one week just asinine nonsense from PEL speculation and what's going to happen, it doesn't

happen.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I was reading, you know, I don't understand what's wrong the idea about them billboards, you know, about it didn't go over that city trying to collect some money on that, but when Daron Industries was on Dickson Street they got fined twice for polluting the city. They there is so much dust people tell me they still have dust coming in their homes from them. They ran overweight, over length, over width trucks up and down that residential neighborhood Nothing was done. When council for years. had a chance to put an end to it you didn't. That's why I'm saying don't get us into another lawsuit with anybody, and I am talking as a taxpayer not as an employee of DeNaples. I ran up and down that road 40 years ago with wrecks going in when I drove a wrecker. I know the area very well.

And I just got one other thing to
talk about, last summer I think it was in
August at the Nay Aug car show I went over
to the swimming pool and looked at that
slide and I know about those slides now from

being in the swimming pool business, they are fiberglass. I know everybody up there knows what fiberglass is and what it consists of. If it isn't polished and waxed continuously it loses it's integrity. Do you understand what I'm saying? That board is supposed to be inspected, that slide is supposed to be inspected I was told and it cannot pass a legal inspection. There is loose steps on it, I was there and I was on it.

MS. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: And I don't think it's ever been waxed. My son's got a 72

Corvette, I don't think they have washed it and waxed it in 20 years, I'm serious. You run your hand on it you can get little slivers and cuts, you can imagine what a small child going down that slide if there is a cut that family will own the city. You can ask that handsome young fellow over there and he will agree.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. ELLMAN: That slide needs to be closed permanently until somebody inspects

1 it and puts a legal inspection on there because it cannot be legal. I know this is 2 3 the friend of the mayors and the concession stand, and I don't care who he is, that 4 5 slide cannot legally have been inspected the last couple of years. 6 MS. EVANS: 7 Thank you. Tony Moses. 8 MR. ELLMAN: I'm not trying to 9 offend anybody, believe me. 10 MS. EVANS: No, no, but the five 11 minutes is up. 12 MR. ELLMAN: I don't want to cast --13 get you people made at me, but you just 14 don't seem to be in touch with what people are saying out there like I am. Thank you. 15 16 MS. EVANS: Tony Moses? Bob Bolus? 17 Doug Miller. 18 MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council. 19 Doug Miller, Scranton. 20 MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening. MS. EVANS: Good evening. 21 22 MR. MILLER: I'd just like to start 23 off this evening I was ask asked by one of 24 our firemen, Tommy Pattison, to just read 25 off an announcement of his behalf. Anyone

1

4

3

6

5

7 8

10

9

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that's interested in purchasing one of the 2013 firemen parade day shirts they are on sale now. They have been on sale for quite some time now. \$10 each. And they can be purchased at headquarters or at TP Sports, 504 Luzerne Street, and the phone number is 570-479-2644 and that's for anyone that's interested in a parade day shirt.

Moving onto the MBRO's story that we had in the paper yesterday regarding the bid, a second bid that was put in, and we obviously didn't receive any bidders this We are looking to generate over \$353,000. This was part of the recovery plan and it's included in our 2013 budget. The only thing I could say tonight is maybe we can consider perhaps putting it out for bid one final time and if at that point we don't receive anything then I guess we are left with having to try and go out and find some sort of marketing firm where we can make this happen and make this a reality because we certainly don't want be looking at later on in the year having to come up with over \$300,000 and having to do it with,

obviously, what we don't like to do taxes.

So perhaps we can consider one final time with that and if not, look elsewhere.

But maybe we can even go as far as doing some research and see what other -- I'm sure we did this already, but if we can make it public as to what other communities throughout the Commonwealth have instituted such programs and determined whether or not they were successful and if not what firms did they deal with and maybe we can get an idea where we need to go moving forward.

In regard to the nonprofits, certainly we have a lack of commitment at this point. We never did receive anything in writing from the University and all of the other nonprofits and it's my recommendation at this point in time where we are looking to generate \$1.3 million this year and millions more moving forward that maybe it's time to once again put a nonprofit tax force together with members of the council, the administration and business leaders in the community so that we can get something moving forward here so that we can

2

4

3

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

expect to get something in return.

As I said, we are not looking to bully the nonprofits. You know, we have been characterized as picking on the University. We are not picking on the University, that's not what this is about. This is about paying their fair share. is about you getting services that we, the taxpayers, pay for that you don't contribute to. You know, the \$175 you give us each year, as I have said before, is a slap in the face. It's a disrespect and not just the city but most of all the residents of this city who certainly struggle enough as it is and pay enough that they are basically carrying the load for you as you sit back and contribute nothing.

So maybe it's time to look into doing that where we can go and sit down and try to compile something together because the back and forth and going on and assuming that this is going to happen is getting frustrating. You know, we need real answers here and we need to get down to it.

Dealing with the agenda tonight, 5-C

with Standard Parking, I'm pleased to see that we are moving forward with this and beginning to implement the accountability and transparency that we wanted to see with this authority or years now, and my only request would be as I look -- read the legislation moments ago, would it be fair to request a monthly report from Standard Parking to account for what's going on each month?

MS. EVANS: I'm sure they will provide that. They have been very transparent and very accountable up to this point and they pride themselves, in fact, on those characteristics, so I'm sure that can be done.

MR. MILLER: Because as we know, obviously knowing their history that things have been kept from us and we find things out at a later date when it's basically toto late to say that the mess has already occurred and we have to go and try and find a solution to fix it, so perhaps, as you said, they have a history of being transparent that they will provide counsel

with that information each month.

And, finally, 7-A on the agenda, the final order here dealing with the ordinance on Attorney Hughes, Attorney Kelly and Casecon, basically for one final time I'll just reiterate my thoughts on this. You know, this goes back to, again, the accountability and the transparency and people who have gone above and beyond.

You know, a prime example, as I just talked about 5-C on the agenda, we wouldn't be talking about 5-C on the agenda tonight had it not been for Attorney Hughes going above and beyond on behalf of the residents of this city, bringing in someone that's accountable and transparent, and not just Attorney Hughes, but others that have been involved, the council, the administration, everybody that came together knowing that we had to do something to clean up this Parking Authority.

So this is just one example of it, that it had not been for him doing what we did, we wouldn't even be talking and voting to introduce 5-C tonight, so I just thought

I would mention that because when you have people that want to come up and challenge it I think they need to take a look at the big It's not a back door raise, it's compensation to individuals who have gone above and beyond not just for the council but for the taxpayers and they should be commended for it. Thank you.

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

FIFTH ORDER. 5 - A .

Councilman McGoff, do you have any comments or motions tonight? MR. MCGOFF: Actually, no.

Moving along then to

MR. ROGAN: Yes, very quickly. First, I know Ms. Schumacher will find this -- will want a copy of this. We did receive a reply from Linda Aebli regarding the status of the loans, and I will provide a copy. It just came in yesterday and I

3

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

didn't get the chance to fully review it yet, so I will report on that next week, but also give you a copy, and Ms. Aebli also would like one of the members of the council to meet with her so I am going to contact her to try and make arrangements for a meeting to go over them and get a little more detail.

I just wanted to address, it's not really a city issue, but it was an article that was in the newspaper today regarding a new form of county government. Since the city and the county many times are connected, for instance, when myself and other members of council wanted the tax -the period for discounted taxes extended, the county commissioners and the school district would have been needed to go along, unfortunately, at that point in time Commissioner Wansack, and I don't know where Mr. O'Brien stood, but they didn't want to go along with it so the city was forced to keep the discount period as short as it is.

Now, there was an article about

Chuck Volpe pushing for a new form of county

3

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

government, and this is definitely something I think that the citizens of Scranton and the county should explore, and I know that the commissioners also were talking about consolidation plans. It's definitely -- the idea of going to a county council seems to be popular in a lot of the surrounding communities. I think it's something that as a council we should have some input on and, you know, certainly review it because the county does effect the city in many aspects, one of them being a reassessment of taxes and it hasn't been done in decades in this county, and maybe if there was a county council where you have a little more representation for the city that could Currently with the current commissioners we have one that resides in the City of Scranton and two that reside outside of Scranton even though we are by far the biggest municipality within the county.

So it was just an interesting read.

I encourage everyone to check it out and to
do the re search on it. I'm sure petitions

will be circulating around on this issue and maybe others for the upcoming election on that referendum.

Finally, just a couple of citizens' requests. A woman called the office and states that she has been trying to call LIPS for two years about a house that needs to be looked at. It's on 1346 Sanderson Avenue. And also a resident contacted me about a home on 1219 Philo Street, both are in terrible condition and they are concerned for the neighborhood.

Mrs. Krake, I will give these to you to forward.

And also, there is a huge pothole in front of 927 River Street. The resident reports they tried calling the DPW six times and they assured him that it would be done and it still hasn't been addressed as of yet. So that is all I have for tonight, and that's it. Thank you.

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

MR. LOSCOMBE: No, I don't have

neglect this evening. I may just make some comments when the legislation comes up.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Councilman Joyce?

MR. JOYCE: Yes, briefly, and I apologize for my raspy voice. As one may know, there were no biders for the rebid of the Market Based Revenue Opportunity Program for the Years of 2013 through 2015 with a two-year option. The Market Based Revenue Opportunity Program was a suggestion of the PEL in their revised recovery plan that was sent to the city in early 2012. PEL projected that an MBRO program will bring in roughly \$350,000 in year one.

To re-educate, market based revenue opportunities programs or MBRO programs are initiated by governments to realize new revenue and to defray existing costs and improve public services and they do this through a relationships with private vendors. Examples of MBROs are advertising, municipal marketing partnership and secondary use of public real estate. The main benefits of a MBRO are MBROs are cost

avoidance revenue enhancement and limit administrative burdens.

There are six general categories of MBROs. These categories are outdoor advertising, street furniture, vehicle advertising, indoor advertising, municipal marketing partnerships and secondary real estate use.

In outdoor advertising programs, governments exchange advertising rights to private companies for cash, shares of advertising revenues or donations.

In regard to street furniture,
examples of street furniture include bus
shelters, benches, news stands, trash
receptacles and bicycle racks. Many cities
have instituted street furniture programs
supported by advertising such as Boston,
Hartford, Connecticut, Los Angeles, Oakland,
Philadelphia and San Francisco.

Concerning city-owned vehicles, an increasing number of cities are exchanging rights on municipal vehicles for revenue and/or acquisition costs. In Scranton, there are already a few police vehicles with

advertisements.

Indoor advertising is conducted in municipal facilities and buildings with posters put up in high traffic areas.

There are many cities and counties which have is successful MBRO programs. For instance, New Haven, Connecticut, receives a great deal of revenue from MBROs, so does Philadelphia and other major cities.

Lackawanna County even has a successful MBRO program as you may see advertisements on buses traveling traveling throughout the county. With all of these being said, there are opportunities out there. Though we have not had any bidders for an MBRO program, which is unfortunate.

Mrs. Krake, please contact
Mr. McGowan with this in mind and ask him to
contact Lackawanna County as well as the
Cities of Philadelphia and New Haven,
Connecticut, to determine how their MBRO
programs have been implemented and what
Scranton can do to get an MBRO program up
and running. I think the quicker we act on
this the better off we will be. Obviously,

we have no bidders, but we are only advertising in the Scranton Times and there are marketing firms out there, so hopefully with some due diligence an MBRO program can be up and running.

In other matters tonight, Scranton
City Council has received correspondence
from Roseann Novembrino, our city
controller, regarding the UDAG repayment of
RE-RE account. Mrs. Novembrino reported
that there have been no payments from the
UDAG repayment account in the month of
December.

In addition, we have received a list of 2012 payment in lieu of tax donations and I would just like to thank some of the contributors being the Scranton Housing Authority, the University of Scranton, Lutherwood, Harrison House and Covenant Presbyterian Church. We are enthused that these entities have taken the time to donate to the City of Scranton and we are hopeful that they will continue to donate and will even consider contributing more in the future.

And I do have a few citizens' requests for tonight. A Scranton resident is having a tough time getting a large pothole in the center of his home file. The pothole is located directly in front of the 927 River Street.

MS. EVANS: Mr. Rogan already took care of that.

MR. JOYCE: Oh, he took care of that one? Sorry. Finally, various North
Scranton residents have voiced their concerns about the condition of the patch road directly between the 600 block of Mary Street and Market Street. Residents report large potholes making travel conditions very difficult. Residents are voicing their concerns about the road because this is now a heavily traveled area since the Rockwell Street bridge is closed and Mary Street is part of the detour around it.

Mrs. Krake, if you could please contact Director Dougher and ask him to rectify the situation as soon as possible it will be much appreciated, and that's all for tonight.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Good evening. On tonight's agenda for introduction by council is Item 5-C, an ordinance authorizing the mayor and other appropriate officials to enter into a management agreement with Standard Parking Corporation to administer and manage the city's on-street parking meter operation.

Today the administration sent two pieces of legislation related to this matter by emergency declaration to city council's office. However, council members have not seen either the final version of the parking meter agreement or the legislation to amend a previous ordinance until tonight, while our council solicitor received the final versions only today. Therefore, I have held the second piece of the legislation until our next council meeting and council will only vote to introduce the management agreement this evening.

At this time, I call on Solicitor

Hughes to provide the public with an

overview of the management agreement and the

amendments to the prior parking ordinance.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Madam

President. About a month ago I received the draft of the management agreement between the city and Standard Parking for them to manage the parking meters. At that time it was 1,095 spaces. I reviewed it on I believe it was December 18, I sent my comments to the city solicitor, had about nine comments regarding it.

The first thing, if you have a copy of it there in your packet, "Number 1, parking spaces," that was revised because the original agreement, what that had in it was it was just downtown Scranton for 1,090 spaces, and they had a map attached just of the City of Scranton. I mean, downtown of Scranton I think that was taken from a parking study.

What was my impression at the time that they are going to manage all of the parking meters, I thought that the area should be defined. I defined downtown Scranton by Mifflin Avenue, Lackawanna Avenue, I think Pine Street and Jefferson Avenue, and I recommended that also that it

be included -- that the areas around

Community Medical Center and the Moses

Taylor and Mercy also be included. So the parking spaces this was all redone.

As you know notice that what they have is that in various sections of the City of Scranton and then they have a map, on Exhibit A which is the map for just the downtown Scranton area, but the primary boundaries are Mifflin area, Arthur Avenue, of course, Nay Aug Park, East Gibson Street, which is the outer area of the former Mercy Hospital and River Street, which would bring in I believe -- I always refer it as the Chamberlin plant, and this is a total of 1,400 spaces.

If you go back there is a new whereas clause that was put in. I discussed this with the solicitor's office, I recommended that when we adopt this they will also have to amend Ordinance 100 of 2009, which is the parking for the hours, rates, and for various locations.

One area that is -- there is going to new parking meters installed is up at the

Audubon School up on Colfax and Mulberry
Street. I noticed in driving through there
that one time that was all a "No Parking"
zone because of the school, but now that the
school is closed people are parking there
free. I believe there is about anywhere
from 14 to 16 cars parking there all day all
times of the day. There is no meters. So
meters are going to be installed there.
That ordinance will be amended to include
that area to put in parking meters there.
There are parking meters on the southerly
side of Mulberry Street going up.

The other changes was that if you look at 3-G that was originally drafted that Standard Parking would submit their budget to the city and it would be deemed approved. The city had 30 days to approve the budget, that if they didn't act in 30 days it would be deemed approved. I recommended that it be at least 45 days because if it weren't 45 days there is no way it could be reviewed and legislation adopted, come to council and go to the mayor for signature, so that was changed to 45 days.

I'll go over what's here as operating expenses, and I do have a budget of this. Basically what their -- what they will receive is a commission on the total amount of revenues from the parking meters and also from the citations. This sets forth what the expenses are in there, I'll go over that in a little while, and then that sets forth the operating expenses.

Paragraph five, that were no changes to that, that's the gross receipts on net profit. I did put in there, there was one change and that was citation revenue showing all cash, including paper money, credit card payments and tokens collected. This sets up is they take the gross revenue, less the operating expenses equals the net profit.

They will receive a management fee of \$10,000 a month. That will be \$120,000 per year in addition to there percentage of the net revenue.

Under Article 8-B they will have an office to pay for -- they will have an office here in city hall of Scranton, the Treasurer's Office, where fines can be paid

for the parking citations. At one time that used to be at the Scranton Parking
Authority. Now that will be in city hall.

I believe this is where it always used to be paid down in the Treasurer's Office, so they will have an office there.

Article 9 is their insurance coverages for Workers' Compensation a \$1 million general liability, employer liability insurance of a million, commercial general liability of \$2 million, automobile liability of \$2 million, an umbrella liability of \$100 million.

And they will report to the city on a monthly basis of all of the revenue, 15 days by the end of each month.

Most of the rest of this is fairly normal as to the owner's obligations, that being the city.

14 is cross-indemnifications.

15 is the owner's insurance.

One item that was stricken, that I recommended be stricken is, of course, is out of this agreement here, that Item No. 27 is the assignment. They wanted to have the

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

right to assign this, I recommended that they not have the right to assign it without the prior written consent of the city. That wasn't in there before, they could just assign the contract. There was various language that was deleted from that and this is the language that I recommended so that the only way that they can assign this contract is with the prior consent of the city and the standard language which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld. I also recommended that they put in the city solicitor's office for any notices of the solicitor had notice of it instead of just the business administrator.

One item that was in here previously was No. 32, and that was stricken on my recommendation, that was in the event that litigation is instituted that the loser would pay attorney's fees. That's what's called the English system. In England, anyone who files a lawsuit and looses the lawsuit all costs of the litigation can be assessed against them. Of course, in the American system everybody pays their own

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

attorneys and their own legal fees.

The comparison of this is when you look at when the Parking Authority was doing this and, of course, we terminated the cooperation agreement, under the cooperation agreement the Parking Authority in the previous year they received from the City of Scranton and the budget in 2012 \$562,000 to pay for their employees and to pay for other expenses, and that was never broken down as to what it is. It was just a blanket amount that went from the city to the Parking Authority subsidize the Parking Authority for the collection of the meters and for we don't know what else the surplus of the money went for. Of course, that's done in this year's budget. That was the cost of that.

They also received 10 percent commission on all of the revenues that were collected. That would be between \$800,000 and \$1 million, it varied year-to-year, so in the best year when they collected a million dollars the city would get \$900,000, but then \$562,000 went back to them so when

you look at it the city made about \$350,000 on the parking meters after taking into account the 10 percent commission and the \$562,000 subsidy.

The citation revenue that the city received at that time was about \$700,000 last year. What Standard Parking estimates this year is that it would be a total revenue of the meters would be a \$1,268,000, which would be an increase of over last year's estimate by almost \$300,000.

The meter rate will be going up by 50 cents an hour, it will now be 25 cents for every ten minutes instead of 25 cents for every 15 minutes, that will be another \$338,000. They have another what they call standard operating practices, I don't know what that is it, but that's another \$145,000.

They estimate the citation revenue by enhancement of the meter people and, of course, with the conversion of the meters will increase from \$700,000 to \$1.8 million and they have a technology upgrade here of \$145,000 for total revenue of \$3,826,000.

They estimate that their operating expenses will be \$978,000 for total operating income before incentive fees of \$2,847,000. When you compare that, that's almost an increase of almost 280 percent. If you look at it based on my figures from last year, the city probably netted a little bit more than a million dollars on citation and meter revenue with the Parking Authority doing it.

So if they achieve what they anticipate with the meter increases, with better utilization and management of the meter reader people issuing of the citations, being vigilant with the meter enhancement program, it would appear that when you put it all together, of course, it wasn't together in any previous budgets, but the net revenue with the Parking Authority doing it of approximately \$1 million a year to an increase this year to about \$2.8 million.

If during the week after you review this you have any questions just call me,
I'll go over it with you, but that's pretty much what the agreement is. The changes,

there is only one change in there that was not made that I at least thought should be discussed, and that was the five-year contract and there is a clause in there for the management fee to increase. I thought that that should be negotiated, but that was left the same, but I don't have any problem with it. It's an inflationary rate of whatever that will be, there is a formula, and it would be, you know, I believe it's the lesser of.

So based on everything virtually after I reviewed the agreement all of the changes were made and I think it's an agreement that you had be approved by the city.

MS. EVANS: Thank you very much, Solicitor Hughes, for all of your work and for that detailed explanation. I think it is certainly a significant step in the right direction to learn that whereas in the last fiscal year the city realized only \$1 million in revenue and we can now look forward to in 2013 two point -- well, over \$2.8 million in revenue.

And so, again, I thank Solicitor

Hughes for all of his efforts concerning the

Parking Authority and to all of those who

were involved with us.

I have only a few brief updates to present tonight, and I'll begin with MBRO since many of my colleagues have discussed it. The program proposed and included in the revised recovery plan by the administration again received no bids.

Consequently, the administration is now able to contact and negotiate directly with marketing firms, and the administration has already identified quite a number of eligible firms. It's important to note that the city advertised for and continues seeking a program manager, not advertisers. Rather, it's the program manager that will solicit advertisements to be placed on the city properties and vehicles.

Though some appear to hope for the failure of all revenue generators, I fully support any and all efforts to provide new revenue for this city. These issues require unfettered work by the administration and

the support of all involved in city government because new revenue generators such as the MBRO program will lower the burden on our taxpayers. Doing nothing isn't an option. Feckless criticism devoid of feasible alternate solutions isn't an option.

Next, in regard to Lake Scranton

Road, city council sent a letter on January

18, 2013, to Civil Crossroads Consulting,

LLC, the City of Scranton's alternate

engineering firm requesting that it conduct

an engineering study of Lake Scranton Road

and the related effects of steady truck

traffic. I await their response, which I

will report publically.

Also, in response to my request during last week's council meeting for tree trimming next to 1372 Penn Avenue,

Mr. Santoli responded promptly that he is currently seeking bids for the work required to trim one tree and remove two trees in the 1300 block of Penn Avenue. As soon as the bid work is completed, the tree trimming and removal will begin immediately. Once again,

I thank Mr. Santoli, our city forester, for his timely response.

And finally, I just have one or two citizens' requests, for the past few months, residents have noted an accumulation of six to ten cars at a property in East Mountain. These cars are being repaired in a residential neighborhood. Provide the address to LIPS and ask them to assign a city inspector to visit the location.

North Scranton residents demand to know when the North Scranton Junior project will begin. Please contact the appropriate parties to learn the start update.

And finally, homeowners report that Christmas trees have not been picked up in the 600 block of Harrison Avenue in three weeks. Please address pick up as soon as possible. And that's it.

MS. KRAKE: 5-B. ESTABLISHING A "NO PARKING" ZONE ALONG THE EASTERLY SIDE OF WEST MARKET STREET (S.R. 6011) FROM BRICK AVENUE TO ROCKWELL AVENUE TO ALLOW FOR SAFE SIGHT DISTANCE FOR A PROPOSED DRIVEWAY BY NOONES MARKET FOR A PROPERTY LOCATED AT 416

WEST MARKET STREET. 1 2 MS. EVANS: At this time I'll 3 entertain a motion that Item 5-B be 4 introduced into its proper committee. MR. ROGAN: So moved. 5 MR. JOYCE: Second. 6 7 MS. EVANS: On the question? A11 8 those in favor of introduction signify by 9 saying aye. MR. MCGOFF: Aye. 10 11 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 12 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 13 MR. JOYCE: Aye. 14 MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and so moved. 15 MS. KRAKE: 5-C. AUTHORIZING THE 16 17 MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS TO 18 ENTER INTO A MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT WITH STANDARD PARKING CORPORATION TO ADMINISTER 19 20 AND MANAGE THE CITY'S ON-STREET PARKING 21 METER OPERATION; PROCURE ON-STREET PARKING 22 METER EQUIPMENT; ENFORCE VIOLATIONS OF CITY 23 ON-STREET PARKING METER ORDINANCE; EMPLOY 24 PERSONNEL TO ADMINISTER AND ENFORCE THE 25 CITY'S ON-STREET METERED PARKING OPERATION:

PREPARE AND DELIVER TO THE CITY A BUDGET
EVERY YEAR FOR CITY APPROVAL; DEPOSIT
GROSS RECEIPTS FROM MONIES COLLECTED AND
EARNED BY STANDARD INTO A FEDERALLY INSURED
BANK ACCOUNT IN EXCHANGE FOR THE SUM OF TEN
THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$10,000.00) PER MONTH FOR
A PERIOD OF FIVE (5) YEARS BEGINNING JANUARY
1, 2013 AND ENDING ON DECEMBER 31, 2017.

MS. EVANS: At this time I'll entertain a motion that Item 5-C be introduced into its proper committee.

MR. ROGAN: So moved.

MR. JOYCE: Second.

MS. EVANS: On the question?

MR. MCGOFF: Yes, I was wondering if it would be possible or if anyone else would wish to seek a caucus with someone from Standard Parking to maybe explain how it will operate, you know, and some of the changes that will take place and I do thank Attorney Hughes. I know he explained the management agreement, but --

MS. EVANS: We had discussed this actually at our last meeting with representatives from Standard and it was, in

fact, their suggestion that there would be a, oh, let's say a public relations effort, if you will, in order that they could explain fully to the public the changes that are forthcoming. They also asked that they be able to make a presentation on ECTV, a separate program, where they could explain all of the new measures that are being instituted, why it's being done, how the program is going to operate, you know, basically I think to educate the public and to get everyone on board with Standard Parking and it's changes, so if that would --

MR. MCGOFF: That would satisfy my request.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Is there anyone else on the question?

MR. ROGAN: Yes. I think that will be great to have someone on ECTV, but is someone from Standard Parking going to come into council so council members and the public could ask questions?

MS. EVANS: We can certainly -- we can ask for that. The representatives,

however, come from -- I know one is from Miami, Florida, the other --

MR. MCGOFF: Maybe we can go there.

 $\label{eq:MS.EVANS:} \textbf{MS. EVANS:} \quad \textbf{The other one is from}$ quite a distance.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Make that motion.

MS. EVANS: I believe they had been in town was it either just this week or last week to probably -- I didn't attend the meetings at that time, but I imagine they would have had discussions with the administration and probably with Mr. Washo, so I don't know that we are actually going to be able to have these gentlemen fly in in the amount of time needed to get this passed.

MR. ROGAN: I would just say I'm glad that it's not going to be passed in one reading. I think a piece of legislation this important should go through in three readings. I know before -- I'm going to vote "yes" this week so I have more time to read and it go over everything, but I do have -- I did have a few phone calls from residents and from employees of -- former

employees of the Parking Authority, I guess that would now be employees of Central Parking that wanted to discuss it, and I apologize, I didn't get back to them yet, but I do think it should go through three readings so we have more time and hopefully maybe a representative from -- if we have conference call, something of that nature where I know the public will have a lot of questions and after everyone reads it over and over again there will be more questions that come up. But, like I said, I will vote "yes" this week and give it little more time to review this.

MS. EVANS: Anyone else?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Just briefly, I've been out of the loop for a little while, I apologize, so this is all pretty new to me, this is the first time I've seen the agreement and I do and I may have some questions that I can refer to Mr. Hughes, also, but I do like the fact that they will make a presentation.

And, you know, from the beginning our whole thing was the transparency and the

proper operation and that's what we want to ensure and I will have some questions to make sure that our votes that we had placed last year assure that transparency and, you know, we are getting the best bang for the buck on that. So that's all I have.

MS. EVANS: And if I can respond to that, that both gentlemen who represent what is now Standard Parking, previously it had been Central Parking that we were working with, but Central has merged officially with Standard Parking, the largest parking company in the United States and so now their merger has, of course, created indeed, once again, the largest and most successful agency nationwide.

And both representatives, as I said, during meetings that were conducted offered sincerely and voluntarily to provide monthly reports to the city. They have been, as I said earlier, nothing but accountable and transparent, and I would suggest that between now and our next meeting if any council member has any questions about the agreement please contact our attorney,

Solicitor Hughes, I'm sure he will be very happy to answer any questions that you have.

If he doesn't know the answer, I believe we would be able to get in contact with one of the two or perhaps both of the representatives who travel to Scranton. I'd say they have probably been here once a month for the last several months, so please don't hesitate to make those contacts this week if you have questions or concerns.

MR. LOSCOMBE: If I just may, not to belabor it, but a question just from a legal standpoint or whoever it was, when we had the meters we placed out a bid to have someone, you know, bid on updating the meters and stuff like that. Now, we are supposed to have a test period with the meters, I don't believe that ever happened.

The other thing now is you know, there is a certain company named in here, but if we okayed this contract shouldn't they bid it out for the best bang for the buck again for all of us? I mean, I'm just worried that, you know, seeing some of the other technology out there now that, you

know, we may be able to get a much better deal and it may improve our city coffers, but I don't want to lose that, you know, that -- that's part of what we had not had with the Parking Authority and I don't want to see us lose that.

MS. EVANS: Well, I think the situation that was discussed during the meetings was that the city had put it out to bid twice and the company that's listed in the backup was chosen by the administration. Standard Parking has been in touch with them numerous times throughout all of these talks and I think what they were hoping for is to get this up and moving ASAP so that the \$2.8 million will be realized this year.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I understand that, but I still have questions on that aspect because, you know, now it's under a different management. There were other companies that were afraid to bid because they bid three times with the city and got no where. I mean, it was a joke. So, I mean, that's why I'm a little concerned.

MS. EVANS: If you would talk --

MR. LOSCOMBE: It's with a different company now. It was Central Parking and Standard, now they are a different company, so --

MS. EVANS: But I think --

MR. LOSCOMBE: There is objections out there to benefit us a little bit.

MS. EVANS: But I think Attorney
Hughes mentioned in his presentation though
that if the company assigns any contracts it
is with the approval of the City of
Scranton; is that correct, Solicitor Hughes?

MR. HUGHES: Yes, but that would is that Standard Parking cannot assign this to another parking company without the consent of the city, so they are locked into the management of this with the city for a five-year period.

MS. EVANS: Okay.

MR. HUGHES: What is in here, and I didn't explain, is the fact that the meter enhancements that are going to be developed such as, you know, the credit card, being able to use a credit card or that, and other technology for the enhancement, that is all

being financed by Standard Parking. I mean, they are charging us for that even though we are going to own it. They can probably get a much cheaper due to the fact that they have \$100 million policy for the -- you know, as I stated with their insurances that they can get a much better rate than the financing of the city could get. That's going to be financed over a period of five years. After that, the city would own the meters.

One of the things that was discussed at the meeting when I met with them was whether that little device that would be put in that would turn the meter back to zero, due to the expense right now and to the enhancement program that was not utilized. I think that was StreetSmart technology that Jack might have been talking about, I remember when they came in that was one of the things that they had. I mean, that's an option that they could look at and come back to the city. I mean, these are professional managers. It's not like the former Scranton Parking Authority that, you know, they just

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

really had no managerial ability in maintaining the parking meters, so I think there is other options in here that jack is talking about is that to enhance, you know, the revenue option, obviously, that's what they are going to be interested in for themselves and also for the city, that there is other areas that they could come back and recommend to the city. These are the professional managers. The largest -- you know, they even manage the parking in New York City and most major cities, so that we are not foreclosing that, and I certainly that that if any council person ever comes up with any idea, you know, give it to them and I think they are probably, you know, would probably look at implementing it.

MS. EVANS: Yes. In fact, they said this was just our starting point and throughout the life of the contract they are going to be looking to make more and more upgrades that can increase revenue and help businesses downtown and certainly, you know, as our solicitor said, they are very open to new technology, advances that can be made

that will increase the financial line.

I know, I thought we had also discussed at this point that there is -- it seems anyway, that as more time goes by the less costly all of the equipment and measures that have to be taken will become. But in addition to that, I believe they were to mention that there is -- or they had heard that there are companies now that won't even require the puck in ground that it can be done even now without that, so the technology is improving constantly and they want to keep abreast of that.

MR. LOSCOMBE: That's my only question if we are locked in for five years through one company at this point, you know, without them looking at other opportunities out there, they are just taking the company that the city said, "This is it," and that's -- you know.

MS. EVANS: Well, I think in the agreement we would be locked in with Standard. I don't know that it means we are --

MR. LOSCOMBE: I'm not talking

about -- I'm talking about the providers for the meter systems.

MS. EVANS: Right. I know what you are saying.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Not just the management company, there is probably 20 companies out there that could do the meter system.

MS. EVANS: Right. So that I'm saying is that I don't know that the contract locks us into that aspect so maybe that's something you would like to discuss with Solicitor Hughes through the week and check that out and see what that can be changed, rebid, etcetera.

MR. LOSCOMBE: And again, basically from day one that was our ultimate goal transparency and to generate as much revenue as possible, you know, and I think there is, again, it's a changing field month to month so there is more technology out there and I don't think we are locked into one particular bidder at this point because that was null and void and it should be null and void.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HUGHES: If I could, and I think that things are going getting too mixed up here, the proverbial apples with oranges. What this management agreement is, is that they are going to manage all of the parking meters for the city for a period of five That it's up to them to enhance the years. revenue and determine from other suppliers who make parking meters whether they should be installed. That stuff costs money and to do this enhancement right now it's going to cost almost, I think it's -- I forget what the exact figure is, but with interest and everything else it's like \$6,500 a month, you know, so that would come to, you know what, like, about \$78,000, rounded off to \$80,000 so it's going to be over \$400,000 over the term of this five-year agreement.

Now, if somebody else comes in with new meter technology, I mean, these are the people that are all over the country. In fact, they are worldwide in parking meter programs. You know, they know what's going on. It's up to them or us, they can come to the city and say, "Look, we can do this,

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's going to cost \$1 million. Do you want to do it? It's the best technology in the world and this is what it will do, write a ticket out automatically."

You know, somebody might come up with that, you know, with the camera on the pole when it goes out it just snaps a picture of the license plate and automatically sends them a ticket. I don't know, that's up to them. It's not up to council or the city to say -- to interfere with their management of it, but this is a management contract. They have determined right now with the city based on the city's bids that this is what should be done and this is managerial decision I believe of the mayor and with, you know, Standard and Central Parking. To say that this is what was bid, this is what we can implement, and this is going to be the cost.

So now if other technology comes along I'm sure they are going to come to the city and say, "There is 15 other companies out there that are producing --" or I don't know how many there are producing parking

1	meters, "They have come up with this
2	technology, we believe this would be better
3	for you to implement here and raise this
4	much revenue."
5	It's going to raise \$50,000 more
6	revenue a year, but the implement is going
7	to cost \$100,000, why would you do it? I
8	mean, that's what it comes down. That's
9	what these people do. You know, they are
10	there to optimize, you know, the revenue and
11	the profit for the city from those parking
12	meters.
13	MS. EVANS: Thank you. I think that
14	clears it up and we can leave those
15	decisions in their hands.
16	All those in favor of introduction
17	signify by saying aye.
18	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
19	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
20	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
21	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
22	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
23	have it and so moved.
24	MS. KRAKE: 5-D. ACCEPTING THE
25	RECOMMENDATION OF THE HISTORICAL

1	ARCHITECTURE REVIEW BOARD ("HARB") AND
2	APPROVING THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
3	FOR POCONO SIGN & GRAPHIC, 1147 THE HIDEOUT,
4	LAKE ARIEL, PENNSYLVANIA FOR REMOVAL OF
5	EXISTING SIGNAGE LOCATED ON LEFT-SIDE
6	FAÇADE; REPLACE WITH NEW SIGNAGE OF THE SAME
7	DIMENSIONS/COLOR SCHEME AND CHANGE BUSINESS
8	NAME ON EXISTING AWNING TO MATCH DIMENSION
9	OF 10"H X7' W AT 414 SPRUCE STREET,
10	SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA.
11	MS. EVANS: At this time I'll
12	entertain a motion that Item 5-D be
13	introduced into its proper committee.
14	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
15	MR. JOYCE: Second.
16	MS. EVANS: On the question? All
17	those in favor of introduction signify by
18	saying aye.
19	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
20	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
21	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
22	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
23	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
24	have it and so moved.
25	MS. KRAKE: SIXTH ORDER. 6-A.

1	READING BY TITLE - FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 3,
2	2013 - AN ORDINANCE – AMENDING FILE OF
3	COUNCIL NO. 56, 2011, AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED
4	"GENERAL OPERATING BUDGET 2012" BY
5	TRANSFERRING \$692.22 FROM ACCOUNT NO.
6	01.051.00051.4201 (LICENSING, PERMITS &
7	INSPECTIONS - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES) TO
8	ACCOUNT NO. 01.051.00051.4101 (LICENSING,
9	PERMITS & INSPECTIONS - MILEAGE /UNIFORM
10	ALLOWANCE) TO PROVIDE FUNDING FOR MILEAGE
11	REIMBURSEMENT TO INSPECTORS.
12	MS. EVANS: You've heard reading by
13	title of Item 6-A, what is your pleasure?
14	MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-A
15	pass reading by title.
16	MR. JOYCE: Second.
17	MS. EVANS: On the question? All
18	those in favor signify by saying aye.
19	MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
20	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
21	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
22	MR. JOYCE: Aye.
23	MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
24	have it and so moved.
25	MS. KRAKE: SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

FOR ADOPTION-FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 2, 2013 -ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON. LACKAWANNA COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA APPOINTING W. BOYD HUGHES, ESQUIRE AND PAUL A. KELLY, JR., ESQUIRE AS SPECIAL COUNSEL TO THE CITY OF SCRANTON AND CASECON CAPITAL, INC. AS FINANCIAL ADVISOR TO THE CITY OF SCRANTON ON THE ISSUANCE, SALE AND PLACEMENT OF ANY BONDS AND/OR NOTES FOR THE FINANCING OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON'S UNFUNDED DEBT, ANY TRANSACTION INVOLVING THE SALE LEASEBACK OF CITY ASSETS. ANY TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING THE SALE OR LEASE OF ANY AUTHORITY ASSETS WHICH REDUCES THE CITY OF SCRANTON'S BOND INDEBTEDNESS UNDER THE UNIT DEBT ACT OR RESULTS IN THE PAYMENT OR LOAN OF MONEY BY ANY AUTHORITY TO THE CITY OF SCRANTON, THE REFINANCING OR REFUNDING OF ANY OF THE CITY'S OUTSTANDING BOND ISSUES AND ANY 2013 TAX ANTICIPATING NOTES OTHER THAN THE 2013 TAN NOTE A AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH CASECON CAPITAL, INC.

1	MS. EVANS: What is the
2	recommendation of the Chair for the
3	Committee on Finance?
4	MR. JOYCE: As Chairperson for the
5	Committee on Finance, I recommend final
6	passage of Item 7-A.
7	MR. ROGAN: Second.
8	MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
9	call, please?
10	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
11	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
12	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
13	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
14	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
15	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
16	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
17	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
18	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
19	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare
20	Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted.
21	MR. ROGAN: I make a motion to take
22	Resolutions No. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of 2013
23	from the table and place them into Seventh
24	Order for final consideration.

MS. EVANS: On the question? All
those in favor signify by saying aye.
MR. MCGOFF: Aye.
MR. ROGAN: Aye.
MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
MR. JOYCE: Aye.
MS. EVANS: Aye. Opposed? The ayes
have it and so moved.
MS. KRAKE: 7-B. FOR CONSIDERATION
BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES FOR
ADOPTION-RESOLUTION NO. 2, 2013 (PREVIOUSLY
TABLED) - APPOINTMENT OF JOSEPH DEANTONA,
1331 CORNELL STREET, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA
18504 AS A MEMBER OF THE SCRANTON LACKAWANNA
HEALTH AND WELFARE AUTHORITY FOR AN
ADDITIONAL FIVE (5) YEAR TERM. MR.
DEANTONA'S CURRENT TERM EXPIRED ON
DECEMBER 31, 2012 AND HIS NEW TERM WILL
EXPIRE ON DECEMBER 31, 2017.
MS. EVANS: As Chairperson for the
Committee on Rules, I recommend final
passage of Item 7-B.
MR. ROGAN: Second.
MS. EVANS: On the question?
MR. ROGAN: Yes, on the question, I

don't believe we received resumes from any
of these individuals, have we?

MS. EVANS: No.

MR. JOYCE: No.

MR. ROGAN: As we have in the past, I will and voting "no" on all five of these items. Again, it's not a knock on the people who are applying, I know most of them and I'm friends with some of them, but we have to keep the rules the same for everyone else.

Regarding Item 7-F, I do want to note that Mr. Renda's appointment, that vote I'm going to vote "no" on that one as well but that is based on merit not just because he didn't send in a resume.

MR. JOYCE: And I'd like to echo some of Mr. Rogan's comments, I will be voting

"no" on all of the appointments as well being that they did not provide at least a letter of interest saying that they were interested in the positions or a resume or some form of letter.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I would have to agree

1	with my colleagues, and like Mr. Rogan said,
2	I mean, many of these are personal friends
3	of ours. You know, we made it known at
4	meeting after meeting there is letters sent
5	out to them, and I'm sorry they didn't take
6	the time to at least send you us a letter of
7	interest, but, you know, we have to stick to
8	our rules and I, too, will be voting "no."
9	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please?
10	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
11	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
12	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
13	MR. ROGAN: No.
14	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
15	MR. LOSCOMBE: No.
16	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
17	MR. JOYCE: No.
18	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
19	MS. EVANS: No. I hereby declare
20	Item 7-B defeated.
21	MS. KRAKE: 7-C. FOR CONSIDERATION
22	BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES FOR ADOPTION-
23	RESOLUTION NO. 3, 2013 (PREVIOUSLY
24	TABLED) - APPOINTMENT OF JOHN GRANAHAN, 1504
25	PRICE STREET, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA 18504

1	AS A MEMBER OF THE SCRANTON LACKAWANNA
2	HEALTH AND WELFARE AUTHORITY FOR AN
3	ADDITIONAL FIVE (5) YEAR TERM. MR.
4	GRANAHAN'S CURRENT TERM EXPIRED ON DECEMBER
5	31, 2012 AND HIS NEW TERM WILL EXPIRE ON
6	DECEMBER 31, 2017.
7	MS. EVANS: As Chair for the
8	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
9	passage of Item 7-C.
10	MR. ROGAN: Second.
11	MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
12	call, please.
13	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
14	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
15	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
16	MR. ROGAN: No.
17	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
18	MR. LOSCOMBE: No.
19	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
20	MR. JOYCE: No.
21	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
22	MS. EVANS: No. I hereby declare
23	Item 7-C defeated.
24	MS. KRAKE: 7-D. FOR CONSIDERATION
25	BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES FOR ADOPTION-

1	RESOLUTION NO. 4, 2013 (PREVIOUSLY
2	TABLED)– APPOINTMENT OF JACK DELEO, 125
3	WHITETAIL DRIVE, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA
4	18504 AS A MEMBER OF THE SCRANTON MUNICIPAL
5	RECREATION AUTHORITY FOR AN ADDITIONAL FIVE
6	(5) YEAR TERM. MR. DELEO'S CURRENT TERM
7	EXPIRED ON DECEMBER 31, 2012 AND HIS NEW
8	TERM WILL EXPIRE ON DECEMBER 31, 2017.
9	MS. EVANS: As Chair for the
10	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
11	passage of Item 7-D.
12	MR. ROGAN: Second.
13	MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
14	call, please.
15	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
16	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
17	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
18	MR. ROGAN: No.
19	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
20	MR. LOSCOMBE: No.
21	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
22	MR. JOYCE: No.
23	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.
24	MS. EVANS: No. I hereby declare
25	Item 7-D defeated.

1	MS. KRAKE: 7-E. FOR CONSIDERATION
2	BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES FOR ADOPTION-
3	RESOLUTION NO. 5, 2013 (PREVIOUSLY
4	TABLED) - APPOINTMENT OF COLLEEN GLEASON,
5	2104 CAPOUSE AVENUE, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA
6	18509 AS A MEMBER OF THE SCRANTON MUNICIPAL
7	RECREATION AUTHORITY FOR AN ADDITIONAL FIVE
8	(5) YEAR TERM. MRS. GLEASON'S CURRENT TERM
9	EXPIRED ON DECEMBER 31, 2012 AND HER
10	NEW TERM WILL EXPIRE ON DECEMBER 31, 2017.
11	MS. EVANS: As Chair for the
12	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
13	passage of Item 7-E.
14	MR. ROGAN: Second.
15	MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
16	call, please.
17	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
18	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
19	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
20	MR. ROGAN: No.
21	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
22	MR. LOSCOMBE: No.
23	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.
24	MR. JOYCE: No.
25	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.

1	MS. EVANS: No. I hereby declare
2	Item 7-E defeated.
3	MS. KRAKE: 7-F. FOR CONSIDERATION
4	BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES FOR ADOPTION-
5	RESOLUTION NO. 6, 2013 (PREVIOUSLY
6	TABLED) - APPOINTMENT OF STUART RENDA, 1112
7	WOODLAWN STREET, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA
8	18509 AS A MEMBER OF THE SCRANTON SEWER
9	AUTHORITY BOARD FOR AN ADDITIONAL FIVE (5)
10	YEAR TERM. MR. RENDA'S CURRENT TERM EXPIRED
11	ON DECEMBER 31, 2012 AND HIS NEW TERM WILL
12	EXPIRE ON DECEMBER 31, 2017.
13	MS. EVANS: As Chair for the
14	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
15	passage of Item 7-F.
16	MR. ROGAN: Second.
17	MS. EVANS: On the question? Roll
18	call, please.
19	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
20	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
21	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
22	MR. ROGAN: No.
23	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Loscombe.
24	MR. LOSCOMBE: No.
25	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Joyce.

		65
1	MR. JOYCE: No.	
2	MS. MARCIANO: Mrs. Evans.	
3	MS. EVANS: No. I hereby declare	
4	Item 7-F defeated.	
5	If there is no further business,	
6	I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.	
7	MR. JOYCE: Motion to adjourn.	
8	MS. EVANS: This meeting is	
9	adjourned.	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

ability.

4 -

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

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER