	1
1	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
2	SPECIAL MEETING
3	
4	
5	HELD:
6	
7	Thursday, December 16, 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	CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR – OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
24	SATILAL S. MANDOZZI, KIK - SITISIAL COURT KLIUKILK
25	

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL: JANET EVANS, PRESIDENT FRANK JOYCE, VICE-PRESIDENT ROBERT MCGOFF PAT ROGAN JOHN LOSCOMBE NANCY KRAKE, CITY CLERK KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK BOYD HUGHES, SOLICITOR (Not present)

	ļ
1	(Pledge of Allegiance recited and
2	moment of reflection observed.)
3	MS. EVANS: Roll call, please.
4	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
5	MR. MCGOFF: Here.
6	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
7	MR. ROGAN: Here.
8	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe.
9	MR. LOSCOMBE: Here.
10	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Joyce.
11	MR. JOYCE: Here.
12	MS. CARRERA: Mrs. Evans.
13	MS. EVANS: Here. Dispense with the
14	reading of the minutes, please?
15	MS. KRAKE: THIRD ORDER. NO
16	BUSINESS AT THIS TIME.
17	MS. EVANS: Do we have any Clerk's
18	notes tonight, Mrs. Krake?
19	MS. KRAKE: No, Mrs. Evans.
20	MS. EVANS: Thank you. Do any
21	council members have announcements at this
22	time?
23	MR. JOYCE: Yes, I have one. Before
24	we begin citizens' participation, I think
25	it's important that the public knows the

reason why the mayor vetoed the budget amendments, so what I am going to do right now since I didn't see it in the newspaper or on-line anywhere is read the message, the veto letter, that was sent up from the mayor's office to city council's office before we begin so the public may comment on that, and it's, of course, addressed to our city clerk, Mrs. Krake.

"Dear Mrs. Krake, pursuant to
Section 504 of the Home Rule Charter, you
sent me File of Council 55-2013, an
ordinance. Please be advised that I hereby
veto File of Council No 55 of 2013 for the
reasons set forth in this veto message.

- (1). Violations of Section 905 of the Home Rule Charter.
- (A). Council violated Section 905 of the Home Rule Charter in that the record clearly reflects that I sent in my 2014 operating budget to council on November 15, 2013 in compliance with Section 902 of the Home Rule Charter, and Council did not conduct a public hearing on the same until December 5, 2013. As it clearly states in

Section 905 of the Home Rule Charter, "a public hearing shall take place no later than December 1 of the fiscal year" (emphasis added). This language is mandatory; hence, Council's non-compliance with Section 905 makes any amendments to my budget improper and illegal.

(B). Council also violated Section 905 of the Home Rule Charter by making changes in budgetary items that exceeded 10 percent of my recommended budget, to wit:

Increasing the Mayor's Confidential Secretary's salary from \$31,085 to \$36,085.

Decreasing the City Council Solicitor's salary from \$45,000 to \$40,000.

Increasing the Fire Chief's salary from \$50,000 to \$67,228.

Decreasing the amount of the overtime in the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Refuse, from \$100,000 to \$82,771,89.

Adding a new position in the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Refuse, at a salary of \$30,000.

Increasing the Business

Administrator's salary from \$53,550 to \$85,000.

Increasing the Finance Manager's salary from \$37,400 to \$50,000.

Adding a knew position in the Business Administrator Office at a salary of \$35,000.

Increasing the standard salary in the Department of the Business Administration, Bureau of Administration, from \$238,904.21 to \$317,954.21.

Adding a line item and new account to Rents and Concessions for cell phone tower leases in the amount of \$18,000.

All of the changes listed above required that a public hearing take place within 72 hours to justify said changes pursuant to Section 905 of the Home Rule Charter. This requirement was not met; hence, the changes are illegal and improper.

Reason number II. Administration meetings with the Pennsylvania Economy League. The Business Administrator and I met with Jerry Cross and Joe O'Boyle from the Pennsylvania Economy League for the

24

25

purpose of reviewing my proposed 2014 operating budget prior to forwarding it to council. PEL indicated that my proposed 2014 operating budget was reasonable and Such a budget is necessary for realistic. the City to continue operations as well as obtain a Tax Anticipation Note for 2014. Since that meeting, not one PEL representative nor anyone from the Mayor-Elect's transition team, nor the Mayor-Elect himself has contacted me to discuss any amendments to my budget, despite the fact that on November 6, 2013, I personally contacted the Mayor-Elect and invited him to take part in the 2014 operating budget process. On December 12, 2013, myself, the Business Administrator and the City Solicitor confirmed via telephone conversation with Gerald Cross, Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Economy League that my proposed 2014 operating budget was reasonable and adequately meets the requirements the city must meet to continue operations in 2014.

Reason number III. Mayor's proposed

2014 operating budget procured 2014 TAN-A.

As evidenced by Council's passage of File of Council 56 of 2013, my budget procured a 2014 Tax Anticipation Note, which will permit the City to have the proper cash flow throughout the fiscal year of 2014.

The procurement of this note was based on my proposed 2014 operating butt.

Number IV. Amendments are fiscally irresponsible.

The amendments as specified in Paragraph 1-B, above, created new positions and increase in salaries that Council itself had previously reduced, cannot be justified and are fiscally irresponsible. At no time did Council members McGoff, Rogan and Loscombe meet with me since I forwarded my proposed 2014 operating budget on November 15, 2013, to discuss or justify these amendments.

Further, as I prepared this veto message, the Department of Public Works is readying its fleet and employees for a major winter storm that will bring six inches of snow to the city. Myself and the City

Controller have prepared an Emergency
Certificate regarding this weather event.
It is fiscally irresponsible for Council to
amendment any overtime salary in the
Department of Public Works any further, due
to the unpredictability of weather in
Northeast Pennsylvania.

Also, it has come to my attention that Council's amendments to the Business Administration Office are to be funded by an alleged grant from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In pursuit of this alleged funding, Councilman Rogan at last night's meeting stated he had a letter from the Department of Community and Economic Development regarding this grant. The administration has reached out to the Pennsylvania Economy League and PEL indicated it was not aware of said correspondence with DCED.

Finally, Council's amendments
seeking to eliminate the Support Service
Specialist position in the Office of
Economic and Community Development and
increase the funding for neighborhood police

by the same amount is procedurally impossible. I have personally contacted the OECD director and have been advised that the maximum allotment towards public safety through OECD is 15 percent and that level has already been met in my budget.

And the mayor's conclusion: For all of the reasons cited above, I hereby veto File of Council No. 55 of 2013.

Sincerely, Christopher A. Doherty."

So I just wanted the public to know the message that the mayor had sent to us prior to voicing your comments.

MR. LOSCOMBE: May I just make a correction?

MR. JOYCE: Sure.

MR. LOSCOMBE: In Article IV of the mayor's veto it states, "The amendments as specifically listed in Paragraph 1-B above, creating new positions and increasing salaries that Council itself has previously reduced cannot be justified and are fiscally irresponsible. At no time did Council members McGoff, Rogan and Loscombe meet with me since I forwarded my proposed 2014

operating budget on November 15, 2013, to discuss and/or justify these amendments."

I did state at last week's meeting that I did meet with the mayor. At that time I didn't have any amendments in my hand, but we did discuss the budget, and his main concern was that his tax increase remain without change. That was the crux of the whole conversation and I did meet with him, so that's not a correct statement under Article IV, and I just wanted to correct that for the record.

Unless he knew beforehand, before the meeting, that there was going to be a -- that he was going to be veto it, then that's an incorrect statement. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: I would also add there are a number of other things that are incorrect, which I will address under motions.

MS. EVANS: The purpose of the tonight's special meeting of Scranton City Council is to address solely one agenda

item, Mayor Doherty's veto of the amendments to the 2014 operating budget of the City of Scranton. Council members will vote either to override the mayor's veto, thereby including 17 amendments to the mayor's budget, or to sustain the mayor's veto, thereby eliminating these amendments.

During citizens' participation, speakers may address only this agenda item. No other issues can be discussed. And that's it.

MS. KRAKE: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS'
PARTICIPATION.

MS. EVANS: Our first speaker this evening is Dave Dobrzyn.

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Dave Dobrzyn.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. DOBRZYN: Well, we have some tough calls here, but my personal opinion is it's time to take that final bow and leave the city go on. We have 9 percent unemployed, and I don't have any animosity towards the union settlements or whatever,

but it's time to stop watching Fox news and listen to Rush Limbaugh and that's how we got here. You know, people vote for the state and stuck it to us, and people are voting away as they're told to on television and it's ashame, but I would say I don't have any problem with overriding the veto.

And one question, could

Mr. Courtright, Mayor-Elect Courtright,
reopen the budget after --

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. DOBRZYN: -- the first of the year?

MR. JOYCE: Yes. he can.

MR. DOBRZYN: So this isn't the final say on this then?

MS. EVANS: No.

MR. DOBRZYN: In other words. Okay, but however anybody votes it's, you know, basically I don't care for the fact that he overrode the veto at all. He decided not to run again for mayor and it's time to take the final bow and go out smiling. Have a good day.

MR. JOYCE: Thank you. You have a

good day, too.

MS. EVANS: Our next speaker is Doug Miller.

MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council.

Doug Miller, Scranton.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MR. MILLER: You know, I'm basically going to reiterate a lot of the statements I made last week prior to council voting in Seventh Order on the budget. And once again express my grave concern I have for these amendments.

It's my personal opinion that I believe council this evening should sustain this veto. We have two budgets in front of us, we have the mayor's proposed budget, and we have the lazy man's version, as Mrs. Evans summed that up quite well last week with that terminology because that is, in fact, what this is.

MS. EVANS: Mr. Miller, I'm sorry to interrupt you, but that actually -- that statement actually applies to the mayor's proposed budget as well.

_

MR. MILLER: Okay. Well,

absolutely, I agree. They are both, you know, budgets that are certainly unacceptable. But, unfortunately, this evening, you know, we have to pass a budget and a budget is obviously going to have to become reality and, believe me, neither one of them is any good any my book, but certainly when it comes down to it I don't feel that it is the common sense thing to do in terms of raising salaries, creating jobs.

We are looking at a 57 percent tax increase, a 69 percent increase in the garbage fee, astronomical increases in the rental registration program, meter rate increases, just to name a few, and then are you going to come forward and ask for raises and create jobs. It certainly doesn't look good in the public eye.

In the last week I have talked to many citizens throughout the city and it certainly came as a surprise listening to the amendments last week because they expected to hear a council who tried to reduce the tax increase. Now, we all knew

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the tax increase was inevitable, I'm not going to say that, you know, I'm not going to make it sound as if a tax increases is uncalled for, we knew it had to happen, but the reality of the situation is there was no attempt to reduce the burden that was placed on the taxpayers.

There is no excuse for raising the garbage fee 69 percent. That does not have There is no excuse that we have to happen. to raise the rental registration. That also does not have to happen. There were many opportunities that council had, more importantly that the administration had, in following through on council recommended revenue enhancements that we certainly missed out on several opportunities, and that's inexcusable and had we followed through on those things we would obviously be in a much different situation this evening. We wouldn't be looking at, you know, increases in this amount.

But, you know, it upsets me that we have come to this position where it seems to me that we are doing all of the work for the

next administration and throughout this whole process we haven't heard anything from the transition team other than raising salaries and creating jobs, and if those are the answers, if that's what the next four years looks like, how are we going to ever turn this city around?

And we've heard that it's unfair to criticize the next administration because they haven't been sworn in yet, there is no justification for it, that doesn't mean anything. When the next administration that's coming in has an obligation to review the budget and make appropriate adjustments to help this city survive, that hasn't happened.

And, you know, we heard that the raises and the creation of the jobs are coming from grants and DCED, but what we failed to mention is, you know, yeah, it's nice to say it's a grant, but that's just a fancy -- that's just another fancy way of saying tax dollars because we are still paying for it.

So there is the right thing to do

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for the next regime.

tonight and there is the political thing to do tonight and, unfortunately, we seem to go, continue to go down the path of doing the political thing, and we haven't heard from the next administration and I'm very troubled by that. They haven't reached out to our Finance Chair, which I think to not even have the courtesy to respond back to a message or to, you know, an inquiry I think is totally inexcusable, but ultimately this Council should not be doing the dirty work

I feel that this veto should be I think the next administration should come in, let them reopen the budget and let them explain to the taxpayers the justification of the raising salaries and creating jobs when their taxes are going up 57 percent and the hardworking people of this community are paying \$300 a year for garbage and the rental registration fee is going up and it's going to drive people out of this city. Let Mr. Courtright and his group of the transition come in and explain that to the residents of this city because

it's not fair.

And is this the Christmas present we want to leave the residents of this city with? I don't think so because it discredits all the work that the majority of this council has accomplished in the last four years and I'd hate to see it end this way. Do the right thing, sustain the veto, and give the taxpayers what they deserve and put politics to bed once and for all. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. That concludes our sign-in sheet, is there anyone else who cares it address council?

MR. MORGAN: Good evening, Council.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening.

MS. EVANS: Good evening.

MR. MORGAN: I'm probably going to not use five minutes because what I have to say isn't going to take a lot of time. I'm hoping that council sustains the veto and the reason for that is that I just think that there is a lot of politics at play here in every direction. We had the council members elects and we have the mayor-elect

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

during the campaign that had a vision for the city that just is totally opposite of what's occurring here.

And the other question I have is the way the council is kind of split lately with the 3-2 split. And it's only, you know, look it, I don't have any disrespect for anybody on this council, but is the mayor-elect trying to have this council implement things that he wouldn't implement on his own? And I think it's time for the mayor-elect to come forward, explain to the city what he wants, it's time for the council members to get the council member elects to come forward and tell us their vision and how they are going to change this city, and I don't know of all of the politics that might be playing behind the scenes, but it's time for the city to leave politics behind because we are in a very troubled position here. Just the TANS we are going to borrow next year is scary to me.

And, you know, I know a lot of people out there they are looking for jobs

and everybody in the country is basically looking for jobs because unemployment is fairly high right now, but I think the next mayor needs to come in here and determine where he is going to make major cuts to this budget and stop borrowing because he is talking about going in a new direction and having the ability to work with this city labor unions. He said that during the campaign that they would only negotiate with him.

And if we are going to turn the city around then we need an elected body that can stand up and explain why they are doing it and what they are doing and, of course, why they are doing what they are doing, and I just think that it's time to really to sustain the mayor's veto, let all of the parties come forward, present their arguments, and present them substantive to the voters and the vast majority of the people who have given up on the system because Scrantonians deserve a lot better than what we have been offered.

And look it, the last thing I would

like to say, I don't know if I'll be at the next meetings, but I really appreciate every single council member and everybody who has run for elected office and I really appreciate your thoughts and your concerns for this city even if I disagree. Thank you. Have a Merry Christmas.

MS. EVANS: Merry Christmas.

MR. JOYCE: Merry Christmas to you,

MS. FRANUS: Fay Franus.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening.

MS. FRANUS: It seems that everybody knows what the act is here but this council, Mr. McGoff, Mr. Rogan, Mr. Loscombe, all voted for those amendments last week and it's very apparent that Bill Courtright had you do his work for him. He wanted you to pass them, praying that they would get passed and he wouldn't look bad. Now he is going to have to open the budget and probably put all of those amendments, which are his to start with, not Pat Rogan's or Jack Loscombe's or Bob McGoff's, they weren't theirs, they did the work for Billy

Courtright, Billy Boy.

So he doesn't like it, but he is going to have take the flap. He will put all those amendments in and he probably will raise the taxes because Attorney Hickey came here saying we needed more taxes and he spoke for Bill Courtright, make no mistake about that.

And here we have Councilman Rogan who sat there for years and years and voted no to any tax increase, no, and I vow I will never raise taxes on the people. Boy, you really changed your tune, and maybe you think you just got elected for four years and that's going to be make a difference, four years goes by very quickly and if anybody -- if you run for another job, whether it be the council or whether it be the county, there is going to be plenty, plenty of tapes out there that show you voting for all of these tax increases, and if anybody wants any pages contact me or go to the library because, boy, you can sure use that for a campaign commercial against Pat Rogan, the one who wants to raise the

24

25

1

taxes for the people, the one who vowed he never would.

And you also said just now that you wanted to make corrections to what the mayor amended, what is the reasons for saying the veto, why he wanted to veto because of your amendments, so you are going to say what they were in motions. Well, I have a clue for some of the people out there, just because Pat Rogan says it doesn't mean it's true, so takes what he says in motions with a grain of salt because he has been known to lie up there many, many times and just because Pat Rogan says it doesn't mean it's true.

And just know that Mr. McGoff and Pat Rogan have been working with Bill Courtright. Anything he wants, go right through because he is -- they are his puppets. Bill Gaughan is going to be you're only one up here for the people. Hopefully Jack Loscombe will continue through the way he has, and please sustain this veto. Thank you.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Is there

1 anyone else who cares to address council? Mrs. Krake? 2 3 MS. KRAKE: 5-A. MOTIONS. MS. EVANS: Councilman McGoff, do 4 5 you have any comments or motions tonight? MR. MCGOFF: I'll just I think that 6 7 we have debated this enough and I'm ready to 8 vote and I will respect the considered vote 9 of all of my colleagues. 10 MS. EVANS: Thank you. 11 MR. JOYCE: Thank you. 12 MS. EVANS: And, Councilman Rogan, 13 do you have any comments or motions? 14 MR. ROGAN: Yes, I'll be very brief, only because it's the one item and we may 15 16 debate it a little bit more when it gets 17 time for the vote, but there are a couple of 18 things in the mayor's veto message that I 19 want to dispute, and I do want to read a 20 letter that I received just today from PEL, 21 and this regarding, starting off with item 22 two, on the veto message, administrative 23 meetings with the Pennsylvania Economy 24 League. The mayor goes on to say that PEL 25 supports his budget, and basically the mayor

cites that as a reason for vetoing it.

I received this at 5:05 today, from PE. It says, "Dear Councilman Rogan, this letter is in response to your request of December 15, 2013, for a review by the Act 47 coordinator of the proposed council amendments to the mayor's proposed 2014 operating budget. We have reviewed the amendments to the City's proposed budget for both the effect on the budget's total revenues and expenditures and for the amendment relationship to the City's adopted 2012 Revised Recovery Plan.

Based on the review, the amended changes will not result in a material change to the total revenues or expenditures as proposed in the mayor's budget. The changes will effect budget positions on both number and costs and will also change the proposed salary levels for certain positions that are included in the proposed budget.

We know that one additional position is created in the Department of Business

Administration. This additional position was included in the Pennsylvania Economy

League's memo to DCED reviewing proposed staff levels in the Department of Business Administration. We did take note that the amended changes to the proposed Office of Community and Economic Development resulted in a decrease of \$1,000 in expenditures, an amount that is not material in the context of the office budget and is not otherwise available for use under the city's general fund.

We also note that the amendment provides for a reduction in budgeted expenditures for unpaid bills/court awards. We believe there is a significant budgeted amount in the contingency line item so that reduction in funding will not have an impact on the total category.

Regarding the amendments in the adopted 2012 Revised Recovery Plan, there does not appear to be a conflict between the plan's requirements for revenues to match expenditures and there does not appear to be a conflict with any current plan initiatives for 2014."

So regarding Item II in the mayor's

veto letter, PEL basically just reviewed the whole thing stating that the amendments in their eyes are fine, which is what the mayor was using as one of his reasons against the amendments.

Next, the mayor goes onto say regarding the Department of Public Works readying its fleet for a major winter storm, maybe the mayor hasn't read the amendments in full, but the amendments are to DPW refuse, not DPW highways, which the overtime for snow removal is billed out of. I don't think anyone would have supported reducing money for snow removal or highway overtime. This overtime money was specifically in the refuse division.

Finally, the mayor states that it comes to his attention that the amendments are regarding an alleged letter between PEL and DCED. He states that the administration has reached out to the Pennsylvania Economy League and PEL indicated it was not aware of the said correspondence from DCED, and I'm just going to call a spade a spade on this. The mayor is lying. The letter right here

from DCED -- from PEL to DCED that I read
last week. "To: Fred Redding. From:
Joseph L. Boyle, Senior Research Associate.
Dated" November 27, 2013. Subject: PEL
analysis of the City Business Administration
staffing."

If the mayor is unaware of this and if he actually did call PEL, which I don't believe he did, because I have the letter right here and I will provide it to the Scranton Times after the meeting.

So I did want to just rebut a couple of the errors that were in the mayor's veto letter. Other than that, I do agree with Councilman McGoff's sentiment that these items have been debated and I do believe we should vote on them and where the votes lie they lie, so that is it all I have for now and I'll probably comment a little more when we get to the vote. Thank you.

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

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes, just briefly. I again, most of it's been said at the last

meeting, what our reasonings are for different things. The bottom line is the taxes are going to remain the same regardless of which budget is passed. I had to look over the whole package and, regardless, if the mayor can open his budget or whatever, anybody that's coming in should start out with the right tools, and the right tools are what I believe were some of the amendments in the budget there.

One critical tool is going to be a Business Administrator. If you recall, when Mr. Doherty came into office his Business Administrator's position was \$85,000. I would be the first one to reduce that salary to \$40,000 for the next budget if they did not perform their tasks, but we need qualified people, as has been said in the past administration, and I'm sure future administrations will agree to that.

Another increase was the fire chief's salary. Now, this was a slap in the face to the current fire chief because last year this current mayor wanted to increase the current fire chief's pay quite a bit.

Now, he is reducing the incoming fire chief's salary almost \$20,000, which would be below the rank and file.

I mean, some of these things are a little bit ridiculous, but I had to look at the whole picture. My mother is going to be paying significantly more and more so me.

My property is on one of the upper ends of the level. I know where the taxes have to be.

We have been told many times, we've argued, we fought with PEL, DCED, yes, they have been asleep at the wheel, believe me, but now we are at the edge of the cliff so there was no way we could reduce the taxes at this point. So whatever budget passes at this point your taxes aren't going to change either way.

I looked at the whole picture and said if our amended budget gives the incoming mayor the tools to at least try to right what's been wronged that's where I'm going and that's why I'm leaning that way.

The mayor's budget takes away some tools and adds some insult to injury, and

one of our speakers has said he is going out, let him go out gracefully, you know, but he doesn't want to do that.

And I do want to quell some rumors, which I found quite amusing after last meeting. After the meeting was over I walked out the door here and I was told that I voted for these amendments, especially the DPW amendment, because my son was getting the job. Well, I want to make it perfectly clear as I sit here, anyone that knows me personally knows what I have sacrificed and will sacrifice knows that's a lie. Now, he may have been joking with someone, hell, I joked with a few people and said, "I'm going to be head of LIPS, I'm going to be the fire chief."

It's the last thing I want to do, but it was a joke, but to be accused that my vote is pending on any political vote that I make is totally incorrect because if you know the history of me, I'm totally open, you could ask me any question and my son lost his job in the school district because of my votes here and I would have been

dammed if I went and kissed anybody's butt to bring him back and keep him there.

I would never compromise a vote that I make on this panel for anybody, even in my family and they know that. He was in the school district years before I came onto city council here. Unfortunately, he wasn't in the union so he wasn't protected by the union, but we made some budget decisions here that affected some friends and he lost his position and we lived with that.

But I would never, and I know a lot of people don't believe that and they will continue these rumors and accuse me of stuff but, those that know me personally know what kind of person I am and my sacrifices know that that is not true, and I just want to clarify that because I'm hearing from different people different rumors, so I got a call today from someone he said, "I want to tell you something."

So the first thing I said, "What, am I going to be fire chief now?"

I honestly can tell everyone that's watching this that I have never sold my soul

for any position nor would I sell the soul of any of my family members. What I vote on is personally my own beliefs. If my family had their way I would have been out of here a long time ago.

I do believe we are on the edge of greatness in this city. I do believe we could turn this city around, but we have to stop the squabbling, we have to provide the tools, and we have to work together, but no matter what way this budget turns out everyone out there is going to pay the same amount of taxes. So to me, it's about the tools for the administration at this point and that's why I'm going to vote the way I voted at the last meeting.

And I just wanted to clarify a few things, but if anybody has any questions personally about me or my family don't hesitate to come to me and I will give you the facts. And that's all I have to say. Thank you.

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

MR. JOYCE: Yes, I do. I respect everyone's opinion on this panel regardless of which way they vote tonight, but like my colleagues I stand by my position that I made last week. I did take the time to look at the amendments a little bit more in-depth, and I do have some issues with the amendments.

Number one is that the amendments made will make the budget imbalanced on paper. In no way, shape or form were the raises and created position in the Business Administrator's Office that is an additional expenditure reflected on the revenue side in the additional line item for a grant.

Number two, in the amendments no allotment was made for health care expenses for the new position created in the Business Administrator's Office, which on average is about \$14,000 a year.

Also, one thing I noticed with the amendments is, okay, I agree that the fire chief's salary should be equal to what Mayor Doherty's fire chief salary is, but that's simply an easy opening of the budget for

2

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Courtright in 2014. He has the power to do that and send that one item before council.

Now, as far as the some other things that were said about DPW refuse and DPW highways, and I know this because I was criticized on it before when I made amendments to a budget years ago, when DPW highways overtime is used up for snow removal, whatnot, money is drawn out of the DPW refuse account and, furthermore, the DPW refuse account is generally a said amount to cover the days off, being holidays like Christmas, Thanksgiving, etcetera, where the DPW doesn't work, and that those overtime expenditures cover the overtime needed for the DPW to collect garbage and recyclables on those extra days where they are required to work a Saturday or possibly even a Sunday.

So I do agree with the mayor's assertion that cutting that line item may be harmful.

Now, besides all of that, in the amendments there's a 16.08 percent increase

for the mayor's confidential secretary.

There are other confidential secretaries

working in city hall that receive the lesser

salary, so I don't see how we could justify

giving a raise of a little bit over 16

percent to the mayor's confidential

secretary, which will be Bill Courtright's

secretary but not giving an identical raise

to the other confidential secretaries, which

would be the HR secretary and the

secretaries, for instance, in the law

office. You know, I think that's doing an

injustice to them.

Second of all, in the amendments there's a 58.73 percent increase in the Business Administrator's salary, and a 33.69 percent increase in the Finance Manager's salary while other administrative employees they won't get any raise.

Now, there has been some discussion that these raises are needed to find qualified people. Years ago -- or not years ago, but four years ago we made amendments to cut these salaries to save the city money and now we are going to with all of the

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

amendments raise them with a grant that is not guaranteed in stone. We don't know 100 percent if we would get that.

Now, in addition, I just wanted to point out something that I forgot, the amendments there are also no adjustments to pension obligations or necessary workers' compensation insurance for the positions that were created, so I would say whoever spoke to or whoever created these amendments I wish they would have spoke to me or the Business Administrator to obtain just some basic and necessary information because there are adjustments that would needed to I don't know if some of the these be made. amendments were reviewed by Mr. Courtright's finance team or if they were just created, but there was some pieces left out and believe me, I know, I have amended budgets before and that's -- I made that same rookie mistake in 2010 and I learned from it by working with the administration, whether I liked them or not.

But it seems like no one really reached out to the administration here to

get their opinion or feedback on these amendments and that they were just created somewhat haphazardly.

Now, I'm not in favor of either budgets. As you know, there is definitely missed opportunities. In the mayor's proposed budget we missed the boat on various revenue sources that could have been sought after, but like I said, not Mr. McGoff, not Mr. Rogan, not Mrs. Evans, not Mr. Loscombe, nor myself have control over that.

I think both budgets place undue harm on the taxpayers in this city. There are no benefits to the amendments that were proposed on Thursday night to help the people of Scranton. In my opinion, the amendments that were proposed on Thursday night only help Bill Courtright. And when I ran for office I ran on a slogan it was called "Putting People First," not putting Bill Courtright first, and I stand by that. I stand by what I ran on and that's how I feel about this and I will be voting tonight to sustain the mayor's veto because one

thing that I firmly believe it's bad enough that the two choices that we have at this point are massive tax increases, but what's even more worse is in the face of a massive tax increase there could still be almost a 59 percent raise for the BA, a 33.7 percent raise for the finance manager, and significant raise for the mayor's secretary. And that's all I have.

MS. EVANS: Thank you. Good evening. I wish to make clear that I do not support the mayor's proposed 2014 budget nor do I support the amendments to this budget. The new mayor had the opportunity to include his amendments in this budget, but he declined.

Further, he will have the authority on January 6, 2014, to open and amend the budget if he truly wishes to do so.

Ladies and gentlemen, government service and leadership are not a political game because the winners and losers are the people who we are elected to represent.

Therefore, in the face of the most drastic city tax hike and fee increases in decades,

I will not support these amendments. The salary increases and job creations they include, and the gamesmanship they represent.

In addition, I so oppose the mayor's budget that as city council president I refused to affix my signature to the 2014 operating budget legislation. Should an override of the veto occur this evening to include these amendments, again, I will not sign that legislation. The people deserve much better.

And just as a final note, concerning the letter from PEL, in the last four years almost all of the letters from the Pennsylvania Economy League have been specifically addressed to Mayor Doherty and to me as council president. This is the first time the letter that Mr. Rogan has, this the first time I never received that letter. And so though I have not spoken with the mayor about it, I would tend to believe that the mayor did not receive that letter either, just as I know I wasn't aware of the correspondence that occurred today

between Mr. Rogan and the PEL, but as our Finance Chair has shown these amendments are incorrect.

And I think what's important to pick up from all of this is PEL wasn't aware of that. PEL didn't mention any of that, did they? PEL is interested in one thing only and that's big tax increases. PEL was interested in taking us all the way to the Supreme Court, and if the new administration is already so interested in all of these deals with the Pennsylvania Economy League I think that the hopes that the people had for the next four years are quickly turning to disappointment. And that's it. Mrs. Krake?

MS. KRAKE: 5-B. NO BUSINESS AT THIS TIME.

SIXTH ORDER. NO BUSINESS AT THIS TIME.

SEVENTH ORDER. FOR CONSIDERATION BY
THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE - FOR ADOPTION FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 55 - 2013, (AS AMENDED,)
APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE
CITY GOVERNMENT FOR THE PERIOD COMMENCING ON
THE FIRST DAY OF JANUARY, 2014 TO AND

1	INCLUDING DECEMBER 31, 2014 BY THE ADOPTION
2	OF THE GENERAL CITY OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE
3	YEAR 2014. THIS VOTE WOULD BE TO OVERRIDE
4	THE MAYOR'S VETO.
5	MS. EVANS: What is the
6	recommendation of the Chair for the
7	Committee on Finance?
8	MR. JOYCE: As Chairperson for the
9	Committee on Finance, I recommend City
10	Council sustain the mayor's veto of Item
11	7-A, as amended.
12	MS. EVANS: Second. On the
13	question? Roll call, please?
14	MR. MCGOFF: Excuse me, yes. On the
15	question, maybe I misread it.
16	MS. EVANS: No, here's Mr. Joyce
17	rather than recommending an override,
18	recommended that council sustain the veto,
19	so a "yes" vote would be to sustain the
20	veto, a "no" vote would be to override it.
21	MR. MCGOFF: Thank you.
22	MS. EVANS: You are welcome. Is
23	there anyone else on the question? Roll
24	call, please.
25	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.

	44
1	MR. MCGOFF: No.
2	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
3	MR. ROGAN: No.
4	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe.
5	MR. LOSCOMBE: No.
6	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Joyce.
7	MR. JOYCE: Yes.
8	MS. CARRERA: Mrs. Evans.
9	MS. EVANS: Yes. I hereby declare
10	the Mayor's veto of Item 7-A, File of
11	Council No. 55, 2013, sustained legally and
12	lawfully.
13	I'd like to wish everyone once again
14	a very blessed and Merry Christmas and a
15	happy and healthy New Year's. If there is
16	no further business, I'll entertain a motion
17	to adjourn much.
18	MR. JOYCE: Motion to adjourn.
19	MS. EVANS: This meeting is
20	adjourned.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER