F		
		1
1	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING	
2		
3		
4		
5	HELD:	
6		
7	Thursday, June 19, 2014	
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	J. W. W. S. W. W. S. W. W. S. W.	
25		

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL: ROBERT MCGOFF, PRESIDENT PATRICK ROGAN, VICE-PRESIDENT JOHN LOSCOMBE JOSEPH WECHSLER WILLIAM GAUGHAN LORI REED, CITY CLERK KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK AMIL MINORA, SOLICITOR

1	(Pledge of Allegiance recited and moment of reflection
2	observed.)
3	MR. MCGOFF: Roll call, please.
4	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.
5	MR. WECHSLER: Here.
6	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
7	MR. ROGAN: Here.
8	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe.
9	MR. LOSCOMBE: Here.
10	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
11	MR. GAUGHAN: Here.
12	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
13	MR. MCGOFF: Here. Dispense with
14	the reading of the minutes.
15	MS. REED: 3-A. COMPARISON OF CITY
16	FUNDS DISTRIBUTED FROM THE SINGLE TAX OFFICE
17	FOR THE YEARS 2013 AND 2014.
18	MR. MCGOFF: Are there any comments?
19	If not, received and filed. Any Clerk's
20	notes?
21	MS. REED: Nothing, Mr. McGoff.
22	MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mrs. Reed.
23	Any council members have announcements at
24	this time?
25	MR. ROGAN: Yes, I have one. Street

Cat Scranton will be having two low cost spade neuter clinics on July 29 at the Keyser Valley Community Center and previous to that at Ms. D's on Washington Avenue.

Anyone who would like to make an appointment or has any questions can call 570-994-5846 or e-mail EPAAon-line2009@gmail.com.

And anyone who attends the July 16 clinic at Mrs. D's please be sure to check out their food. They have some delicious food over there. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else?

MS. REED: Fourth order. Citizens' participation.

MR. MCGOFF: Our first speaker is Spencer Jahnke. I don't know if I pronounced that correctly. If not, my apologies.

MR. JAHNKE: Close enough. How are you doing, members of Council. My name is Spencer Jahnke from the 900 block of Prescott Avenue. First, I'd like to thank DPW for clearing up the obstruction on the stop sign at the corner of Myrtle and Jefferson. The first three weeks I lived in

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

the Hill, I'm not going to lie, I honestly did not know there was a stop sign there. But the problem I have to bring up here is we have a problem with the internet not only here in the City of Scranton but also across the United States as a whole. As some may know, we are locked into two companies, both Verizon and Comcast. We also have Frontier which is a -- they use Verizon lines so I'm just going to use Verizon there, and they have non-compete clause with the city, Comcast does. My problem there is that we have bigger and better companies that could bring internet to the City of Scranton at lower costs faster speeds, but because of the Comcast no compete clause we cannot get these companies in.

So I would like to more or less bring up a solution that we start building our own fiber optic network here in the city so that not so much that we have another tax on individuals, but they have the option of whether or not to use the big companies like the Verizons and Comcast or we could use our own fiber optic network where we can bring

in our own revenue and supply faster more -just better internet service to the citizens
of Scranton, so within the next few weeks
I'd like to keep bringing up the issue.

MR. MCGOFF: My recommendation would be that if -- and I assume you are serious in this venture?

MR. JAHNKE: Yes, sir.

MR. MCGOFF: That you contact the IT Department in the City of Scranton with your ideas. I'm a neo-luddite. Technology is pretty foreign to me, so you could speak all you wanted about fiber optic networks and so on and honestly it would not be meaningless, but certainly I would not understand it as well as the IT Department for the city.

MR. JAHNKE: Okay.

MR. MCGOFF: And you can probably get that phone number, I don't have if offhand, but if you were to call the City Clerk's Office or to call that mayor's office they could give you that number and you could speak with the members of the IT Department.

MR. JAHNKE: Okay. And while I

still have a minute here I'd like to ask the 1 members of council here whose idea was it to 2 3 go on vacation during the month of August? 4 MR. MCGOFF: Whose idea? MR. JAHNKE: Yes. 5 MR. MCGOFF: It's actually in the 6 7 Home Rule Charter and the Home Rule Charter 8 was adopted in 1980 something. 9 MR. ROGAN: I believe it says council may recess. 10 11 MR. MCGOFF: Well, but it's been 12 something that's in the Home Rule Charter, 13 it's been something that's been done on a 14 regular basis. MR. JAHNKE: All right, but why have 15 16 you decided to recess while we are hundreds 17 of millions of dollars in debt? 18 MR. MCGOFF: It's a decision that 19 was made by the members of council. 20 sure each of us may have different reasons, 21 I personally am going to be on vacation for 22 most of the month of August. 23 MR. LOSCOMBE: And I think another 24 big issue to that is it gives our staff an 25 opportunity to catch up on filings and

everything in the office because it's going 24 -- you know, seven days a week for the full year, so that's their opportunity, they don't have to put a council agenda together. It gives help an opportunity to give the legislation filed and the recorded and scanned and whatever they have to do.

MR. JAHNKE: But if you are in recess you can't do that stuff; correct?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Our staff is here full-time. They are still here Monday until Friday.

MR. WECHSLER: And we are not taking a month off being councilmen, we do council business every day. It's not that we just work on Thursdays. The fact that we are not here for a meeting, we'll still be out doing council business and it just gives us an opportunity, I know myself plan my vacation for that time. I'm here every Thursday during the course of the year. If something comes up, we can reschedule a meeting. It just gives a little bit of flexibility for our personal lives, which we do have, even though we're still on council.

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JAHNKE: All right.

MR. ROGAN: I would just say everyone knows how I feel about this issue. When I ran for city council back in 2007 unsuccessfully it was on eo the big issues that I felt it was wrong that council didn't meet in the month of August. I thought it was wrong for previous councils and I think it's wrong under this council and it's, you know, it's one day a week for the meeting and Mr. Wechsler is correct, much of what council does is outside of this chambers, but for one month, 1/12 of the year not one piece of legislation can be voted on or could be introduced or can be passed to help make the City of Scranton a better play, and the city is in tough shape now and there are a lot of issues that need to be addressed.

If you look -- if you take say take the past say 24 years the city has been distressed and council recessed every August during that 24 years that's two full years wasted where not one thing could have been voted on and introduced to help the people of Scranton. That's why I think council

should meet for the month of the August. I will always support it, I always will.

MR. JAHNKE: I appreciate you,
Mr. Rogan, voting to keep council going
during the month of August.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you.

MR. JAHNKE: Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Ozzie Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Good afternoon. I don't know if this mic is on, people were talking, about. Marie, can you hear that? She can't hear me.

First I'd like to say the Hill
Neighborhood Association will meet next
Wednesday, June 25, at 7 p.m. at Immaculate
Conception Church Hall, 800 Taylor Avenue.
Police Chief Carl Graziano will be the
speaker. Council is invited to attend.

The next thing is Kids Swim Free.

We are still looking for funding, raising funds to help kids swim free from the Hill Section who are in need of assistance, and also, anyone has any funds that they can donate, any money they can donate send it to the Hill Section HNA, 419 Prescott Avenue,

||

Scranton, 18510.

Unfortunately, the zoning board turned down -- turned down the Hill Section neighbor's petition and a HNA letter last week opposing a neighborhood parking plan in our neighborhood. A petition signed by more than 50 residents opposing the parking plan in the vicinity of the former Barman Factory at 970 Ridge Avenue at the end of the 1500 block of Ash Street was ignored by the zoning board at the June 12, 2014, hearing.

The neighbors opposed the parking plan for the convection of the former factory into 12 apartments. The developer, who is an absentee landlord, proposes to convert the factory into apartment as an insidious parking plan for 18 cars which will ingress and egress at the dogleg at both the end of the 900 block of Ridge Avenue and the end of the top of the 1600 block of Ash Street. If anybody has ever been up there, at Penn Security Bank where you go down the hill towards Heil's, the dogleg, they plan to come out on the Ash Street side there, okay?

The parking plan for the tenants cars is located on the vacant irregular shaped lot where a house was demolished.

Also, HNA wrote a letter to the Zoning Board for the Zoning Board supporting the neighbors, however, the Board would not allow the neighbors to read the letter at the zoning hearing. It was a slap in the face to the membership of the HNA and the neighbors. The Board voted to approve the parking plan 3 to 2.

A variance is a permitted violation of a zoning ordinance. That's what a variance is. In order to have a variance approved, the variance must meet five criteria. The HNA and the petitioners believe that two of the three -- two of the five criteria have not been met as written in the Pennsylvania Municipal Planning Code as follows:

That such unnecessary hardship has not been created by the applicant. We feel the applicant/developer was aware that a variance for parking would be required for the construction of a multi-unit dwelling

structure, therefore, the applicant developer inflicted a hardship upon himself.

Two, that the variance will not alter the essential of the neighborhood or district in which the property is located now substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use of development of adjacent property nor return to the public welfare.

We feel that it's going to have a big impact on the public welfare in that area.

MR. ROGAN: Mr. Quinn, did you bring these concerns up at the zoning meeting?

MR. QUINN: You know, last week my grandson graduated from high school at the zoning meeting and I couldn't bring them up, okay, but they were brought up by Anthony Ruscelewicz who is representing the -- he took my letter and had the petition of more than 50 people and he brought it into the hearing and spoke and brought it and entered into the hearing.

MR. ROGAN: Okay.

MR. QUINN: You know, again, people don't win, you know? In addition to a safety concern, the HNA requested the letter

to stop allowing absentee Hill Section
developers convert businesses and commercial
entities into multi-housing units in the
Hill Section. The HNA have addressed for
the past years the blight and drug related
episodes emanated from diverted structures
we got a lot of them, okay?

Last paragraph, a PennDOT highway occupancy permit on state roads is required. Although Ash Street isn't a state road, the HNA doubts if it were a state -- the state would approve it because of the safety reasons. And myself being on the Planning Commission I'm well aware of that I don't think they would either. The HNA and the more than 50 petitioners request Mr. Gaughan and the city engineer, John Pocius, to meet with the HNA and petitioner representatives on site to see for themselves that a variance should have not been approved by the Zoning Board.

I would appreciate if you can meet with us, Mr. Gaughan, and ask Mr. Pocius where we could show you this dogleg. It's going to be ingress and egress, 18 parking

spots on that and that's unbelievable how it was approved. I can't understand, beyond my comprehension how that was approved. And once you see that dogleg and where you see where we are going to come in and out, you are going to say, "Woah." There is a blind spot, it's going to be -- it's going to cause a terrible accident, so I'd appreciate it if you would -- at your convenience if you can get in touch with me, okay?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yeah.

MR. QUINN: I'll convey it to
Mr. Ruscelewicz, okay? Thank you very much.
Appreciate it.

MR. MCGOFF: Doug Miller.

MR. MILLER: Good evening. Doug
Miller, Scranton. I'd just like to respond
to some of the statements that I made last
week. I understand -- I wasn't here during
motions, but I understand that some of my
statements were rebutted during motions by
Mr. Loscombe in terms of my characterization
as I was quoted in the newspaper of saying
we are raiding the Workers' Comp Fund.

Let me just clarify a little bit of

what I said last week and how I still think it's a completely asinine idea. We all know we owe the unions a lot of money, 20 some million dollars, that's not even including the interest. That's grows every day, so I think we can all agree one thing, gentlemen, we don't have that money; correct? Do we have \$21 million at this time? Do we?

Okay, now we want to go ahead and we want to borrow \$5 million, okay. We are asking the state for permission to use the Workers' Comp Fund as collateral. The collateral, okay? So let's define what collateral is, and while we define what the collateral is let's take a look at the city's history of loans and how we have a history of repetitively defaulting on the loans and so that's where the "collateral" comes into play.

So we want to borrow \$5 million that we don't have, so before I even go any further let me ask this question, we borrow \$5 million, gentlemen, where is the \$5 million coming from to pay back that loan,

1 do we know? Okay, so we don't know. Okay, so where our collateral comes 2 3 into play and let's, you know, with the 4 expression on your face unless you have an 5 answer, do we know where the \$5 million is coming from? 6 7 MR. MCGOFF: I'm aware of the 8 proposal that's being made, yes. 9 MR. MILLER: Well, where is the 10 money coming from to pay the loan back? 11 MR. MCGOFF: It's a proposal that's 12 being made from the state. 13 MR. MILLER: Could you please share 14 that with the public? MR. MCGOFF: Not at this time. 15 16 MR. MILLER: Why is that? 17 MR. MCGOFF: Because it's still in 18 the negotiation stage. 19 MR. MILLER: Well, I just think 20 that's deceptive and deceiving the public. 21 There is no transparency. 22 MR. MCGOFF: It's not deceiving 23 anyone. 24 MR. MILLER: Well, you know, I asked 25 the question, I think the public has the

right to know where the money is coming from. We are taking out a \$5 million dollar loan, money we don't have, yet again we continue to borrow, borrow and borrow to pay back and it's just a repetitive effect that gets us nowhere, and you know darn well we are going to default on the loan because we have a history of it. So you mean to tell me all of a sudden miraculously we are going to come up with \$5 million without putting the screws to the people by raising taxes, obsessively raising fees like we have done in the past.

So, you know, you can shake, you an snicker, I mean, that's fine, really, I understand how are you as an individual, so you could roll your eyes all you want at me it really doesn't affect me, I understand you have a lack of professionalism, so I'm going to shy away from that, but I know it's comical, Mr. McGoff, and believe me, it's just as comical to me, too, coming here and addressing you every week, but believe me, I don't know do it for you.

I just feel that the public should

24

25

know how we are paying this loan back and I think they should know that and, quite frankly, when it comes to the collateral, yeah, in the sense we are looking at collateral, we are tapping into the Workmens' Comp Fund and I just think it's a real troubling thing, and so you can twist my words all you want, but because the city has a history of defaulting on loans you know darn well that when it comes time to pay the piper they want their money, and how are they going to get it? They are going to reach into that collateral, which is the Workmens' Comp Fund and that's why it's a completely ludicrous thing to do. And the fact that we have a proposal, I can't wait to hear this grand proposal, I really can't. We have a lot of wonderful proposals and we see where they have taken us, so it's just ridiculous and, you know, it just goes back to, you know, the frustration, the lack of the transparency in the government, again nothing has changed. We can't get answers to simple questions.

You know, I come here this evening,

second week in a row, as you know, miniscule as it sounds a simple thing as going to wash my hands we can't even put soap in the soap dispensers in the city in city hall. I mean, are things that bad that we can't even refill the soap dispensers? We can't keep the lights on on the Electric City sign, all of a sudden we just woke up one day and realized that. I noticed that the last six months, I just haven't addressed that.

So no swimming pools, you know, the list goes on and on. We can't maintain our streets. You know, now we have to give federal funds back because we are so incompetent and inept that we can't keep simple accounting. I mean, it's just completely frustrating and we can't get answers. Everything is a joke. You know, we are treated with disrespect.

You know, the gentleman this evening, I agree, should we meet in August? We probably should. Have there been times in the past on special instances or certain situations where we have had, you know, special meetings of council, that's

happened, but why even have these meetings when nothing productive even happens. We talk and talk and talk, what comes out of it other than we all know we can work together and get along. Other than that, business as usual. It's pathetic.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Mr. Miller, I just wanted to correct the record, I was the one that, as you stated, discussed the collateral, but I didn't mention any speaker's name. That was the newspaper. I just said one of our speakers.

MR. MILLER: Oh, no, I know you didn't mention me by name, I just want to clarify what I was trying to say was that knowing the city's history on how we have an inability to pay things back, my fear is that, you know, I just have scary feeling that it's going to backfire on us, and that that Workmen's Comp Fund is going to be jeopardized and that's not what I want to see happen. I want to see the plan, this miraculous plan Mr. McGoff won't share with us, let's see it and how we are coming with the \$5 million.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: That's a lot of money.

Yeah, you're welcome.

MR. MCGOFF: Gerard Hetman.

MR. HETMAN: Good evening, Council.

Gerard Hetman from the Lackawanna County

Community Relations Department, good to see you as always.

To begin this evening, I'd just like to discuss the details on a popular program that comes up each year at this time, one we received many questions on. In cooperation with the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, the Lackawanna County Area Agency on Aging will be distributing farmers market nutritional program vouchers beginning later this month at each of the senior centers located within Lackawanna County. This is a program that provides eligible seniors with up to four vouchers valued at \$5 each to be redeemed for the purchase of fresh fruits and produce at local farmers markets in Lackawanna County.

In order for seniors to qualify they must be Lackawanna County residents, 60

years of age of older, and must meet certain income specific guidelines, those being their household income for the year must not exceed \$21,590 for a one-person household, \$29,101 for a two-person household, or \$36,612 for a three-person household.

Senior must also present proof of address such as driver's license or a utility bill as well as proof of age, such as a driver's license or birth certificate, when redeeming their youchers.

Now, each senior center in

Lackawanna County does have a specific day
of when seniors can go and renew vouchers
and they can go to any senior center in

Lackawanna County, so a Scranton resident
doesn't have to necessarily go to the
neighborhood senior center, they can go
anywhere.

But the dates of the distribution, and all of these distribution dates begin at 9 a.m. on the dates specified for the senior centers in Scranton. The West Side Senior Center will have their day on Monday, June 30. The downtown senior center on

Wednesday, July 2. The South Side senior center on Monday, July 14, and the Jewish Community Center on Wednesday, July 16.

Again, residents can come beginning at 9 a.m. and need to be bring proof of their residency in Lackawanna County and also proof of their age to redeem the vouchers.

If residents cannot come in person, they can appoint a proxy to come and pick up the vouchers for them, but that person does need to notify the Area Aging on Aging in advance of the pickup date.

For more information on the program in general, on how to appoint a proxy or any or questions, seniors and their relatives can contact the Lackawanna County Area Agency on Aging at 570-963-6740. That's 570-963-6740.

Also, the Penn State extension of the master gardening program in Lackawanna County will conduct an open house at the Plow and Heart at the Shoppes at Montage on Saturday, June 28, from noon to three p.m. There will be various demonstrations, exhibitions and giveaways relating to

gardening, landscaping and all forms of horticulture that the master gardeners practice and enjoy. For more information on the program call 570-963-6842 or e-mail LackawannaNG@PSU.EDU.

And lastly, the 2014 Lackawanna

County 3-on-3 basketball tournament is set

for August 1st through the 3rd on the first

two blocks of Wyoming Avenue, the 100 and

200 blocks. It will be the third straight

year that the tournament is held in downtown

Scranton and we received great feedback on

this from the participants, residents and

business owners downtown in that area.

Cost of registration is \$90 per team or \$75 if registration is complete before

July 1. That includes t-shirts for each team member and also a three-game guarantee for each team, and there are teams for boys and girls, men and women, from age third grade up through adult open divisions.

For more information or to register
visit the Lackawanna County website at
www.Lackawanna County.org or contact the
Lackawanna County Convention and Visitors

Thank

Bureau at 1-800-22-Welcome or 570-496-1701. 1 2 That's all we have for this evening. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. 3 MR. ROGAN: Mr. Hetman, if you would 4 5 be able to e-mail that information for the vouchers? 6 MR. HETMAN: 7 Sure. I can give you a 8 paper copy after the meeting. 9 MR. ROGAN: Oh, even better. 10 you. 11 MR. HETMAN: Thank you. MR. MCGOFF: Dave Dobrzyn. 12 13 MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council. 14 Dave Dobrzyn, resident. MR. LOSCOMBE: Good evening. 15 16 MR. DOBRZYN: And all taxes and fees 17 paid, I'd appreciate if people with the 18 money would do the same. Also, I'd like to 19 mention on that issue that if we have people 20 that are unable to pay and qualify for 21 reverse mortgages and so forth that I can 22 the city should adopt a program to help 23 steer these people sooner than have them 24 wind up in the tax upset sale and some 25 shiester grabs her house out from under her

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for a couple of hundred bucks or a couple of thousands dollars. We really need to look into this and I would like to see some activity on it and then possibly you people won't be up against it so much for money.

Once again on speeding, Mr. Gaughan is mentioned it last week, and I read an article in the paper, maybe Jack could help us out in the near future with this, I understand that the Scranton Police Department has a laser technology that can set speed traps or people going ridiculous rates of the speed. I no sooner walked out of here, I parked over on Adams last week and they must have been doing 40 miles an hour by the time I was at the corner of the Adams and Mulberry. They had just come from a red light. So it's all fun and games until you see a bloody face staring at you through your windshield. I don't want to run over somebody's dog or feral rabbit that lives in the backyard let alone a person.

Also, on those vacant lots, I'd appreciate some activity with them, maybe we can get Mr. Koldjeski in here and get some

better justice because at the current situation if you buy a vacant lot that's not even developable you are probably going to pay for it every five or six years once over again, and that's if you paid a going rate, so it's needed.

And I was happy to hear about Nay

Aug electric from Pat last week, the PPL

with the power lines, and don't take the

first offer, find out what the farmers are

getting out of it when they run across their

land and stuff because they should be paying

a considerable amount of money. Who knows,

maybe we could have kids swim free.

A few weeks ago, I don't know if you remember whether it was Andy Sbaraglia or Mr. Jackowitz asked about a loan from Boscov's and as I remember it Boscov's had expanded in an unwise fashion, Al Boscov had to come back from retirement and Governor Ed Rendell was on it so that was probably three, three and a half years ago. Boscov was loaned \$2 million from the city to get his financial house in order and that may be where the loan that was being asked about

that nobody seemed to remember.

I remember seeing Mayor Doherty on television and he said, What do you want me to do? If I don't grant this money it's a good chance that the mall will be closed within six months."

So even Ed Rendell, and I think they got about \$20 million from the state or something like that to refinance their shops and decide what they wanted to keep and close.

On Comcast, it was brought up again, and in your -- that Triple Play, XFinity type deal it's regulated and it's like \$35, \$40 a month, and here we take a little bits of money as a percentage or whatever and my bill is \$176 month. I pay more for internet and phone service and television that -- the cheaper channels are the ones that I don't watch, I watch all of the documentaries, so if I want them I have to pay 80 bucks a month instead of 20 or 21, and it's just ridiculous how much money they charge.

Once again -- oh, also, I just wanted to mention quick, grills, if you are

grilling with charcoal don't start a fire,
put it after it's no longer attended and you
can actually save the charcoal and dry it in
the sun.

And don't forget, call your congressmen and tell them no more trade packs. Bawk, bawk. Higher wages mean more taxes coming in so it is a local issue. Thank you and have a good night. Don't forget to bawk, bawk again.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else who wishes to address council?

MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia, citizen of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians, I have to disagree with Mr. Rogan, I'd like to see you take six months off. To me the best government is the least government, but let's get on with something in here.

Let's go down to your "B" under your motions, you got a little thing in there, why are we exempting educational parking?

Your thing here, education, you want me to read it for you?

MR. MCGOFF: I just didn't hear you,

1 |

I'm sorry.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Yeah, educational parking, you are exempting it from your "B" under motions, why? If the University or anyone else is charging for parking why aren't we getting our fair cut of them? Why are you exempting them? Here it is. One it says here, definition by adding an exemption of educational parking. I assume that's the University, they don't want to pay, they are suing and we don't want to fight or somebody got something to do with the University.

Why are we exempting them? I asked you, of course you don't probably know.

MR. MCGOFF: My assumption is, as you said, that they -- because of the lawsuit and it's been difficult to enforce so that --

MR. SBARAGLIA: I hope it's that or I hope somebody isn't getting a cut of the action that the city should be getting.

Okay, let's go down to something else. Let's go into your legislation for your parking. Please explain to me what you mean by non-parking. You have metered

parking and non-metered parking. What are they saying there? I don't want to see a mess like you did with tax on amusement because there is no -- there is no amusement in Scranton. Casey has struck out. This is Mudville again. What is it and what do you consider non-metered parking.

MR. LOSCOMBE: 15-minute parking spots, 30-minute parking spots where there is no meters.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Or parking at a house?

MR. LOSCOMBE: No, no, no.

MR. SBARAGLIA: You have to read it and make sure because you made a lot of mistakes with your quick action.

MR. LOSCOMBE: This is strictly downtown business district anyway.

MR. SBARAGLIA: It doesn't say that. You have to read your complete legislation. If I had it, I could bring it down, but unfortunately I didn't take it. But when it said non-metered parking that meant a lot. It could have meant there or it could mean a lot more. It's a broad curb. If you put

it -- if that legislation says, "Only within central city" or something I can understand it, but I don't have the legislation and I wish when you do read it you read it with that and you give a lot of different interpretation to what is meant by non-metered parking because the last time it came up I brought it up, too, and that was maybe two or three years ago.

That I thought was a little worse because I think the idea was people to go out and ticket cars outside of the city -- I mean, outside the meeting part of the city, central city. In other words, if you were parked the wrong way or something, which was the job of the police department, but I read that there and it seemed like that was in it and I just hope it's not that same little piece of legislation.

I'm a stickler for that, just like the deal with the parking at the University or anywhere else. Everyone else has to pay, but the University doesn't. You have to take that into account. These kids are paying for that parking and we should get a

percentage of it, there is no question about it. What has to do with education, I can understand that, but when you talk about all of those other little things that run in there, you know, I mean, their bookstore they make money on that, we should get a part of the business. It should come under the mercantile tax. You got to start cracking down on the University and any legal way you can do it or anyway. We can't afford it. We can't afford what's happening.

I understand what the collateral thing was, collateral was just something that says maybe we can borrow at a lower rate. That's all that was for. Of course, had we failed we can never take that, but I know we could borrow at something other than 9.1 percent, but I don't know. I don't know how far down the line we are. I know the state is trying to come up with some kind of a bailout for it, but I don't know.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else who wishes to address council?

have, which is not necessarily educational.

At least those should be taxed if the private contractors are going to be taxed in my opinion.

they also charge for special events they

And 5-C is there a change in the fees of the actual dollar fees from the former legislation that's being amended or that is proposed being amended? File of Council No. 79 of 2012?

MR. MCGOFF: Not that I know.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I haven't seen the current -- I just got the packet this evening, but it was several weeks ago we were in discussions, excuse me, about the fees and that and there were at that time, which I haven't had a chance to look at it, which I was going to look now, but they did discuss stepping the fees down a little bit, some of them were a little bit prohibitive tive for smaller businesses and that, and also I think there was one forgiveness, but now there is two. At one time there was three so --

MS. SCHUMACHER: Well, yeah, what

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was discussed and what's in the legislation

I would like a definitive on what is in

legislation.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Sure.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Maybe that could be provided next week. There will be three readings. If not, maybe I can get into the office or get it e-mailed to me.

On 5-F there was some really very interesting information provided in tonight's caucus and after listening to that I would very much like to hear the BA defend the administration's choice as it certainly seems far better than the choice that's being asked for in the resolution and because I think it reflects not only attitude of the city towards it's consumer of its services, but also on the selection process and the individuals who are making those, so I hope you will vote tonight to table that piece of legislation until we can have that, hear from the BA on why the administration thinks that Pango is better than Mobile Now.

And anyone know whether the gift of

- '

software we received from the state several months back is installed or when it will be? Okay, another letter.

And anything more on Mr. Amaroso?

The date of his contract are winding down,
do we know if that's going to be extended or
if there is going to be the format of the
report, since it was a private entity that
-- the contract was issued by the ownership
of the Chamber of Commerce or will the
public be privy to that?

MR. MCGOFF: I don't know that I have an answer to your specific question, I do know that Mr. Amaroso has -- we are not negotiating, but trying to find a date when Mr. Amaroso can make a presentation to council. There are a couple of dates mentioned, some of them were -- we were unable to be here and so we are trying to work on a date. It will probably be in early July that the final -- his final recommendations would be presented to the council.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Thank you and,
Mr. McGoff --

MR. MCGOFF: As far as the contract, since the contract was not with us I have no idea what is going to happen once that is terminated or --

MS. SCHUMACHER: Completed. Okay, I believe you mentioned a date specific for the receipt of the 2013 audit report a couple of the weeks back and I didn't make note of it, can you tell me again what -- or tell everybody what that date was?

MR. MCGOFF: I don't remember saying that.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Maybe I misheard.

Is there a date --

MR. MCGOFF: The only thing I remember saying is that I thought that we would be closer to an audit by the end of the summer than -- or sooner than we have had in the past. I was thinking end of the summer, I may be wrong.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay, and if I may just slip one more in here, the Act 47 there was an article in the paper today if perhaps during motions you all could say, you know, whether you communicated with Senator Blake

and what you think of the proposal and what was in the paper today, and other than that I will return next week. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else who wishes to address council?

MS. REED: FIFTH ORDER. 5-A. MOTIONS.

MR. MCGOFF: Maybe before we go to individual motions maybe as a response to Ms. Schumacher's question about the Act 47 proposals made by Senator Blake and others to council, I'll respond that I know that the administration was hoping and has been lobbying with Senator Blake to have the LST increased, and that I would that would become a integral part of any, you know, financial arrangements moving forward.

The administration and I personally would be in full support of those amendments made by Senator Blake. I think it would go a long way to helping the city move from the distressed status that we are in towards a recovery. That's my own feeling and anyone else that wants to weigh in at this time.

MR. WECHSLER: Well, I have been

speaking to Senator Blake about this since last year as well, and it was one of the things that he thought that he could help us with in the city. I think it's another option for our city to increase some revenues, and I also think it's something that is, as said in the paper today, it's a uniform and fair tax and it does not have to stigma of the commuter tax. It's just something that's already on the books. Although it is increase, there is something that people are familiar with this tax and know what it goes for so I'm very happy to hear that Senator Blake is being successful in this effort and I hope that it comes to pass.

MR. ROGAN: I would just comment two-fold, as far as Act 47 reforms go anything that is sent -- passed through the state is just an option for the city, so personally I would welcome, you know, a broad group of reforms that would give the city more options and more tools to get out of distressed status.

Specifically on what was mentioned

17

13

14

15

16

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the paper, obviously nobody ever wants to raise any taxes, and me more so than others as I'm always against raising taxes wherever I can be, but the one thing I do like about this fee is it's not going on the backs of the senior citizens and the homeowners once again. It would be paid for by people like me who are still working. That is one thing that I do like about it that tax or others.

But I think the thing that Senator
Blake could really do to help, which he
hasn't, is to sign onto Senate Bill 76 which
would eliminate property taxes for the
school portion of your bill. That would be
help the City of Scranton and the residents
of Scranton more than any Act 47 reform that
can be passed.

But specifically on the reforms, hopefully it will be a broad package that passes and then at the end of the day the decisions will be left to the mayor and to city council to decide what to adopt and what not to adopt, just like Mr. Amaroso's report. It will just be a recommendation, it won't be anything that has to be adopted,

but that's all how I feel about it.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else? Thank you. Mr. Wechsler?

MR. WECHSLER: Thank you,

Mr. McGoff. In regard to the questions that were asked last week, I do have some answers and then some are still waiting for. One of the questions was the number of trash bills that were mailed in 2014 compared to 2013. In 2013 there were 20,713 garbage bills mailed. In 2014 there was 20,479. According to Treasurer Wayne Beck, the list has been scrubbed of some empty properties and some properties that have been demolished so that's why the number has decreased.

Another question was the number of the bills at the end of May that were paid in full compared to 2013 and 2014. In 2013 they were 12,525 bills either partially paid or fully paid. The reporting system right now does not distinguish between full and partial payments, but that's something we are going to hope to get into next year. In 2014, the total paid to date was 10.709. I

think that reflects a couple of different things that the bills are made a little later, and we did increase the forgiveness time that people have to pay the bill.

The question in regards to landfill costs, that's something that I'm still working on getting an answers and working with Mr. Bulzoni.

Parking meter revenue received from January through May '13 and '14, in 2013 the city received \$364,468, and in 2014 to date we have received \$467,541.

In regards to the number of businesses paying mercantile tax, the 2013 total was 2,635. Right now it's anticipated that that amount of payers should remain about the same. That office also is going through and upgrading a new computer system and when we asked this question the exact data was not available.

In regards to a yearend forecast, I cannot say that there will be a specific yearend forecast available by the end of July. We are always going through the numbers and preparing actuals to projected,

2

4

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that's something that we are doing and we will continue to do that and report as best as we can. If there is a report that will have to come from the Business

Administrator's Office, it will not come from the city council.

This week I attended a few neighborhood meetings I attended a Bulls Head Neighborhood Association meeting the They raised some concerns other night. about the some damage that's being done to the top of the levy system by quad riders. They are up and down the bank and they road This is it something that we have to carefully about because the city is required to maintain those levies. audited by the Corp of Engineers and we must have it audited in acceptable shape to continue to being certified and also to have them help us out so I would ask that every effort be made by the Scranton Police, I know the quads are hard to pursue, and actually you are not allowed to pursue them, but I understand that the quad riders can be cited if they are filling up at gas station

and don't have the proper permits on the their vehicle so I was hoping that the something the police department could also do as well.

Last night I attended the South
Scranton crime watch meeting and, you know,
we talk about things for kids to do in the
summer, this group along with the United
Neighborhood Centers is running some free
events at Connors Park. They are going to
have something every day -- I'm sorry,
almost every day during the week. On
Tuesday it will be art in the park, which is
a 12:30. On Wednesdays they will have
reading and other activities at the park.
They will also have some special bike safety
days and kids nutritional education.

One of the questions though that was raised while I was at the meeting was when Connors Park was built there was a sprinkler system installed at the facility and due to the fact that some of the remnants of the former foundation of the building that were there the sprinkler system was not allowed to be submerged before below the frost level

so right now some of that is damaged. The way the water system works there is you can't turn water on without turning it on for the whole sprinkler system, so the group is requesting that the city come over and just do a repair that would turn off the water running into the sprinkler system and allow the users of the park, especially during this program, that they could have some water at the facility because they have some events that require water.

And one other thing I would like to mention, one of the speakers said tonight talking about developers of some projects, the developer of the Hill Neighborhood project is not an absentee landlord. The developer of this project has done several projects throughout the city, that night at the zoning board he had a presentation where he doing another project at Marshall school. This developer has done projects throughout the city and I think we do him a disservice calling him an absentee landlord because h is not. He lives in the city, he has businesses in the city, and you can disagree

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

or agree with the project, but I don't think calling him an absentee landlord does him any service. Thank you, Mr. McGoff.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Rogan?

MR. ROGAN: Yes. First a couple of responses to issues that were brought up. Our office has been in contact with Mr. Koldjeski regarding the vacant lots throughout the city and trying to set up and talk to him about possibly setting up a land back or a different program to make it easier for neighbors to buy vacant lots next to them so they could use it to improve their land, put in gardens, pools, driveways, etcetera, so that something I think all of us on council are looking forward to, and because they're so prevalent throughout the city so if you can get those property back on the tax rolls and get them so they are working for the people in the neighborhoods.

Next, just in response to a few other items --

MR. MCGOFF: I believe Mr. Koldjeski is coming is it next week?

MS. REED: Right.

MR. ROGAN: Next Thursday.

Regarding a couple of questions that were posed, Ms. Schumacher asked me about OECD loans. I did speak to Attorney Hickey regarding those, specifically Alexander's, that's something we are going to continue to work on, and the status of the park I'm still waiting on a reply so I'll get back to you on that one.

Also, I'll bring up I guess the zoning issues. I think our zoning board in the city by and large has done a great job being objective and trying to do what's right for the city as a whole and for neighborhoods. At times it may not always be the popular thing to do, but as Mr. Wechsler mentioned, both of these projects are being done by a very reputable developer and I know in my neighborhood I live a few blocks from the Marshall School and that sat vacant for a few years not bringing in any tax revenue as a school district property. Now, that property will be sold to the school district, put back on

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 rolls and developed in a desirable way that the neighbors wanted, so I am hopeful that both projects will come out in a good way for the neighborhoods and for the city.

Onto another neighborhood/zoning issue, I was contacted today from a few people from the South Scranton Neighborhood Watch regarding 929 Cedar, which for those in the area it's the old Pennswood Manor. Back in 2011, I did speak about this issue a few times on city council, what had happened is there were new developers that took over that property and they were trying to convert it into a halfway house. At that time, bear were me, I'm just reading from my notes here, they did go to the zoning board and were denied a variance. They appealed to the Court of Common Pleas and were once again denied a variance and they are now appealing on a state level for a variance, so this is multiple times they have been denied a variance to operate a halfway house right in the middle of a residential neighborhood in South Side, and I come to

2

4

5

6 7

8

10

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

find out that this company Cedar Residence, which is the name of the halfway house at 929 Cedar, I come to find out today that the Lackawanna County Commissioners entered into a contract to reimburse this halfway house in the middle of South Scranton.

And I do have a copy of e-mail that was sent to the Commissioners Office. I'm hopeful that, one, they will reconsider that The last thing South Scranton decision. needs is a halfway house in the middle of a neighborhood; and secondly, I did send these into our city clerk and we are going to look at it to see what could be done as far as the violation of the zoning because the variance has never been approved. denied at the initial level and denied at the appeal level, and it is pending at the state level. Whether they hear it or not, it's up to them, but a variance has never been granted to operate this halfway house and I know the residents in South Scranton are very concerned.

I know that area very well when it was a nursing home, there weren't any

problems there. It was senior citizens who needed care and provided jobs for that community and provided care for the seniors. Now that the neighbors are very concerned, especially the neighbors with children at this halfway house, so this is an issue that I will continue to work on, I'm hopeful that it will be resolved in a way favorable for the residents of South Side and Scranton and I hope that the county commissioners reconsider their decision to subsidize this halfway house with taxpayer dollars. And that is all for tonight. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Loscombe?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes, thank you. Just to address a couple of things that were mentioned this evening, on 5-B, our motion for the parking, I'm not sure, this is the first I saw that amendment in there, and I do have a questions for the solicitor as far as educational, and again, it could have been dealing with a lawsuit that was currently pending, but, you know, I would let that ride and continue with the way it was. It just seems like an additional lost

revenue to us from entities that are charging the revenue, so I would like to -- I will vote for introduction this evening on that, but I would like to discuss it with the solicitor a little further.

Next is on the alarms. As far as the charge section for the alarms, and it is significantly better than it was for the consumer, it was never meant to penalize, but it was meant to offset some of the costs of responding to multiple false alarms, and it's a two-stage set up. The fire alarm charges are a bit different than the police charges because the fire department responds with more manpower and more equipment and naturally there are far more police false alarms, too, so it's sort of offsets there.

But the new setup for fire department alarms is the first and second false alarm there is no charge. The third and fourth false alarm is \$250 charged. Fifth false alarm \$500 and the sixth and subsequent false alarms are \$1,000 each, and this is within a calendar year just to make that clear. That was the fire department.

On the police department side, the first and second false alarms there are no charge. The third and fourth false alarms will be \$100 each. The fifth false alarm \$250, and the sixth and subsequent false alarms will be \$500 each. Again, that's in a calendar year.

And there are exceptions. Alarms caused by testing failure or repair of telephone lines, the entity shall be responsible for notifying their alarm company prior to testing, but sometimes that's not possible, but, you know, the administration will work with that. An alarm caused by an act of God such as earthquakes, floods, windstorm, thunder or lighting. Those are exceptions.

And there is one other I would like to discuss with the solicitor because we have had an incident just recently that I brought to his attention, it's a small business, and three times during the evening it started with midnight the police were called to their business so they ended up getting a fine because it was a third call,

but, unfortunately, they weren't able to get ahold of their alarm provider, every time they reset it would go and two hours later it ended up to be a faulty alarm so the with the statement from the alarm company that, you know, it was a malfunctioning alarm or whatever I think we could work on something with that, too, so we are not penalizing the small business because in this case he said, "They couldn't even rob \$500 worth of stuff from me, I might as well turn my alarm off."

Well, this is not to do that either, you know, we want everybody to be safe and we want everybody to use their alarm system so we understand there are circumstances and the administration and police chief did work with this business on that as they are with other businesses, but what has caused the problem with nuisance alarms were, you know, they set alarms where they are easily accessible to children or they have the same problem over and over. You know, I know back in the day hospitals when they used to use a spray treatment in the patient's room they were supposed to cover the detector and

rather than take the time to do that, they would spray it and then the alarm they respond.

You know, so there is a lot of little things that have to be ironed out here, but I think for the most part they made a little bit better, because there were some hefty fines on the old ordinance, so I think with a little tweaking here and there it should benefit everybody, but I urge nobody to turn their alarms off because, you know, at what price is a life, and that's all I have on the alarms.

Now, I have come complaints about, as we all do, potholes on the roads and stuff like that, well, we have potholes and we have craters and I have run across a couple of craters that have been sitting for awhile and I know there is probably many more but these are two that I have run across, and I'll get the information, we could pass it onto our Department of Public Works, but the 100 block of South Rebecca Avenue there is a pretty significant crater, and the 300 block of South Webster another

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

significant crater there.

And speaking of roads and driving around, I have mentioned at this podium every time a new paving project came up or we are going to bid out paving that somebody, either the engineer or the contractor ought to reach out to the utilities and find out if they have any forthcoming work in those areas before they did the final blacktopping and it falls on deaf ears. I don't know what happens, but it continues. We have got brand new paved streets in the city and not even a month, South Grant Avenue the 100 block the Sewer Authority already dug two holes in there, it wasn't paved a month ago. It's never going to be the same as if it was paved the first time.

Now they have markings on the 100 block of South Van Buren Avenue, and it is the Sewer Authority, they haven't cut it yet, but it's obvious they are. I would like to send a letter to the Sewer Authority to find out what their anticipation is as far as -- because some of these roads we

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have on our paving list they may be putting new sewer lines in under this Chesapeake plan and it's just ashame that the taxpayers are paying for the blacktop at a high price and they may have a nice smooth road for a week or two and then it's back to the old ways. It's get frustrating for me, I can imagine the people that live on all of these streets.

So we to get this coordinated and who in the administration will do it, we But it frustrates me as I have to find out. know it does others. And also, I mean, on the 700 block of Prescott I notice markings on the pavement there in the pavement, and I'm sure it's all over, so before any more paving are done on new black top I think we need a meeting between maybe utilities and their planning on doing it, they should have to repave the whole street. I mean, this should be part of our policy, but something Emergencies I could has to done. understand, but these are not emergencies.

I know manhole covers were paved over and I know there are still some

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

complaints in these neighborhood about sidewalks that are dug up, concrete sidewalks where they threw back top patch there and grass was torn up so there is still a lot of issues and, you know, hopefully we can get together on that and work those issues out, and that's enough on the streets.

But just to go, as was mentioned, 5-F about the contract for self-parking. one of our speakers mentioned, we did have a presentation from the other bidder prior to our meeting, it was a public caucus and I welcome Pango to also appear and explain their things and our business administrator. I have some questions and, you know, I look back at the history and, unfortunately, I have been involved in the parking issue here for some time trying to get things done, and I'm one to blame for the Parking Authority defaulting, and if I had to do it tomorrow I would do it all over again because we would be paying a lot more today if we didn't put a stop to it. Naturally, there is still a lot of things that have to be straightened

out there, but if you remember the history under the past administration we had Central Parking taking care of the garages, that's who the banks put in charge of it. Now, all of a sudden a contract comes by us to give them the on-street set up. No discussion, no bidding, nothing like that.

It was this council that pushed to have that bid out and guess what, we got a lot better deal when was bid out and it ended up going to Republic Parking, who seems to be doing a great job, we have no complaints, we have heard no complaints about that and the city is benefiting from it. Had we just accepted that other contract on their recommendation without questions, we would be paying more and making less right now. So I think it's good to discuss some of these issues.

With this Pango situation right now,
Pango never came before city council, that
contract, it was never bid out. That
contract was given out by the past
administration without our knowledge or our
approval or our vote. Is it a nice program?

25

1

Certainly for those who utilize it they all say it's a great program, nothing against it, but just the way it came in this town and proceeded and I think we are making the same mistakes now because four bidders bid, apparently the administration said two of them didn't have all of the credentials, so it was narrowed down to two, Pango and Mobile Now I believe it was, the people that spoke to us today, and I had some questions because I had, again, researched all of this stuff for the past several years. companies are coming on board, stuff like I had some questions, I discussed it with the people from Mobile Now and tonight was the first time I actually met any of I haven't spoken to anybody from them. Pango or met with them, I hope to see them and that they can answer some of these questions, but I think this is a lot of things in their contract that end up costing the end user and not benefiting the citizens or the city as much as some of the things that were presented by the other contractor.

You know, there has been several

issues, not all of them were brought up this evening, and there may be more than are presented, but I just think a fair shake for everyone, not just cart blanch saying, yeah, he said it's okay, so we all question everything here, we should and in this particular case I'm questioning disapproval and, you know, I don't think at this time all of my questions are answered and I don't think at this time I can give a vote either way.

And with that said, and I don't think I will, but I would like to ask for a motion to be table this until we hear from the other entities, until we hear from our Business Administration and our -- and the Pango people.

MR. ROGAN: Is that a motion?

MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.

MR. ROGAN: I'll second.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: A motion has been made to table, and I do not have the -- a motion has been made to table 5-F. On the question?

MR. ROGAN: I stated during the caucus, and I don't have a problem with introducing it this week and tabling it next week or tabling this, but, do think there is some more discussion that needs to take place.

Just for background, this was bid out and it came down to two bidders, Pango and the other one I believe this looks like Mobile Now, and on the face of it, it appears Pango it the lowest bidder, but Pango some other fees and different items in their proposal that seems Mobile Now doesn't.

I would just like to get all the information before we take a final vote that's why I agree with Councilman Loscombe. I don't have a horse in the race either way, I just think we need to make the best decision for the city.

MR. GAUGHAN: Yeah, personally I don't think we should table it. I don't know see why we don't vote to introduce it and then get all of the information during the week. We have a letter here from

Mr. Bulzoni dated May 30 explaining why he chose Pango over Mobile Now and we knew this was going to be on agenda, I just don't understand why the questions weren't asked to Mr. Bulzoni within the past week or he was notified or Mobile Now went to him with their concerns. That's just my thoughts on that.

MR. LOSCOMBE: If I may, may I add to that? Unfortunately, I just received the hard copies yesterday of the bids so I didn't have all week to review them. I did have some questions and I presented them today and they were happy -- I mean, I did discuss some issues that I had about 15 cents and that. It's a lot more than a nickle and dime here and there, believe me, folks.

We went through the Central Parking/
Republican Park situation and, you know, the
Business Administrator, God bless him, I
think he is doing a hell of job but his
hands are full. He is working here until
midnight some nights. I don't think he can
make a decision on everything or review

everything. You know, we work full time, too, and unfortunately, this is only a two vote scenario, tonight and next week.

Unfortunately, I won't have the opportunity during this next week because of my work schedule to have the opportunity to get some of these issues straightened out, so I was hoping that they would appear at one of our caucuses before the meeting or whatever, but I don't think one week is going to hurt anybody tabling it because right now Pango is under an agreement to continue service until that contract is it awarded.

And, ultimately, it could be Pango, it could be this other company. I'm not saying I favor one over the other, I want what's best for the people in this city and we are charging -- I want to know what's best for them and what benefit it's going to be for our city and our citizens and I have a number of the questions and I just -- you know, I have a question about the way this came about in the beginning and I believe, if I'm not mistaken, I mentioned this to the administration a couple of months ago that

this contract was running out, but I don't know if they are aware of it because it would have automatically renewed with Pango had they not bid it out. That was in their policy.

And believe it or not, if that automatically renewed, the fees would have been more, not less. It didn't -- they didn't drop their fees until we put them up to competition, which rightfully so, that's what happens. But, you know, there is a lot of questionable tactics on how this business came here, and I have a lot of things that were brought to my attention that still don't pass the smell test and that's the way I feel.

MR. ROGAN: I would just add one key point that Councilman Loscombe just mentioned is by tabling it for a week or two weeks it's not going to hinder the current services of the downtown parking. It's not a deadline where if this isn't passed in two weeks you won't be able to pay by phone. If council wanted to table it for three months, which isn't what we should do and isn't what

we are going to do, the current service would continue, so I think this is one of the rare situations where we do have the time to make sure that this -- that we are getting the best deal that we can and it may turn out Pango is the best deal, and if they are I'll be the first one to vote for it.

MR. LOSCOMBE: I agree.

MR. ROGAN: So I don't see any harm in, you know, taking a step back and listening to either -- listening to both companies, I think that would be certainly a fair thing to do, and the Business Administrator as well.

MR. WECHSLER: I just think that can be done after we take this vote. There is nothing that's forcing us if we do introduce this tonight to vote on it next week. There is a time that it can be delayed again, and I also would like to have more information. Sitting in a 20-minute caucus and having a presentation without any data provided to you, just somebody talking to you, it was a fine presentation, but we have not heard Mr. Bulzoni has taken the information from

Pango and has provided us with a some of that. Also, with some of the information from the other bidder I think introducing now is not improper for me, but the final vote will be have to be taken after we have assembled all of the information provided by both the bidding parties and the Business Administrator.

MR. MCGOFF: I will add that just timeline on this, first of all, discussions with Pango and discussions about renewing the contract have been considered since the new administration came in. I personally have talked a number of times with Business Administrator Bulzoni and discussed the idea of putting this out for proposals. The proposals were opened May 23. Mr. Bulzoni's recommendation came to us May 30, so we are talking, you know, two full weeks that we have had these -- his recommendation, more than enough time if there were concerns that could have been answered by the Business Administrator.

I'm inclined to agree with

Mr. Wechsler that there is no need to table

this, that had there been, you know, serious questions or there are serious questions, but some of these could have been answered prior to this evening. Also, Mobile Now making a presentation when this is on the agenda for a vote seems to be a little bit late, you know, to do, but we will consider what they have said and I personally am in favor of voting on this evening.

MR. LOSCOMBE: If I may just add a little more. Mr. McGoff, when I discussed this with you several days ago you were going up to see Mr. Bulzoni and I asked you if possible if he could attend our meeting with these people to answer the questions. I don't know how you made out, obviously he didn't come to our meeting --

MR. MCGOFF: He is out of town.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Okay. Two weeks ago he made his decision, again, we are not in city hall seven days a week, five days a week, eight hours a day. We all have full-time positions, plus we have families and graduations, everything going on.

Obviously I didn't have the time, and I

the time to come over here and sit and read it, I had a copy yesterday. It was the first I was able to go over every detail in there. I'm not God, it takes me time to decipher things. I had some questions previously, and some of them were answered. I have questions that are concerning everyone here, and again, I'm not faulting Mr. Bulzoni or anyone --

MR. MCGOFF: No one said you are.

MR. LOSCOMBE: But I'm not going to always go by someone's opinion. He hasn't been involved in parking before other than loaning the parking authority some money at one time, but that was it. I went to the people that we have dealt with for five years now trying to get this parking situation straightened out and it's been an effort for five years. If we didn't make Central Parking, make that bid come to us over the parking garages -- or the off-street parking, Central Parking was getting the contract, so all I'm saying is what's it going to hurt to postpone it for a

1	week, get all the answers, get the facts out
2	and go from there? Their other contract
3	will continue if we put this off for a year,
4	so I don't know what the fear is in
5	postponing it for another week or so.
6	MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else? All those
7	in favor of tabling Item 5-F signify by
8	saying aye.
9	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
10	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
11	MR. MCGOFF: Opposed?
12	MR. WECHSLER: No.
13	MR. GAUGHAN: No.
14	MS. MCGOFF: No. Mr. Wechsler, I'm
15	sorry?
16	MR. WECHSLER: No.
17	MR. MCGOFF: Motion is defeated.
18	MR. LOSCOMBE: That's all I have.
19	Thank you.
20	MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Gaughan.
21	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, just I just
22	took issue, was a little astonished, I just
23	want to make sure I heard you right,
24	Mr. Loscombe, when you said you would vote
25	when you voted to default on the bonds

1	for the Parking Authority you said you would
2	do that all over again?
3	MR. LOSCOMBE: I certainly would. I
4	certainly would.
5	MR. GAUGHAN: I just want to make
6	sure that's on the record.
7	MR. LOSCOMBE: It was on the record
8	when I voted on it.
9	MR. GAUGHAN: Well, again, because
10	in my opinion and in the opinion of many
11	people who have far more financial expertise
12	than I do that is one of the reasons that we
13	are in the position that we are in. That is
14	why we have no credit rating because of that
15	vote.
16	MR. LOSCOMBE: We had no credit
17	rating prior to that.
18	MR. MCGOFF: Counsel, please, that's
19	not pertinent to tonight's agenda.
20	MR. GAUGHAN: Well, I just wanted to
21	make sure, I was a little taken aback by
22	that.
23	MR. LOSCOMBE: I'll repeat it, I
24	would the vote the same way again.
25	MR. MCGOFF: Thank you.

MR. LOSCOMBE: For the record.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay, from June 23 to June 27 the street sweeper is scheduled to be in the upper West Scranton area, St.

Ann's Street to Rundell Street, including all streets and avenues.

I apologize to anyone I haven't gotten back to via e-mail or telephone. My grandmother, Helen Trently, passed away this past weekend so it was a very difficult week for my family. She was a driving force behind my campaign for city council. She was very involved in Democratic politics in Scranton throughout her life and was a great inspiration to me. She raised 11 children and was one tough Irish woman. I will miss her very much. And that is all I have.

Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mr. Gaughan. First, I'd like to comment on something that one of the speakers spoke or talked about and that is the proposal that was made by the city to Bureau of Labor and Industry. The proposal that was made to the Bureau of Labor and Industry had to do with reducing

the -- I'll read from the proposal. "The Department of Labor and Industry requires the city to maintain a minimum reserve funding level of 75 percent of total discounted liabilities."

What the city proposed to them was to reduce that, reduce that to 60 percent. We are currently funding above the 75 percent limit anyhow. They are asking if they would reduce that to 60 percent, which would free up approximately \$5 million that would then be used as cash collateral for a loan to pay part of the arbitration award.

These are ongoing negotiations with the lending institution and with the Bureau of Labor and Industry. There is no proposal to council of any kind. The city is waiting on the decision from Bureau of Labor and Industry. If they were to approve this reduction in funding level in the reserve funding, that money would then be put into a separate account to be used as collateral. It would not go into the general fund, it would not go anywhere else. That amount would be reduced as the loan was being paid

off and it would be restored to its full 75 percent level at the time that the loan would be repaid. That was a presentation that was made, kind of a summary of the presentation that was made to the Bureau of Labor and Industry.

As I said, when there is either approval or disapproval from the Bureau of Labor and Industry and the proposal is made to the city then we will discuss it here.

As of now, there is no proposal before council, therefore, to speak on anything would be superfluous because we simply do not have anything to speak to.

When, in fact, that information is made available, it will certainly be made available to the public through council.

I would just a brief apology on tonight's agenda or about tonight's agenda, number one, some of the legislation was I'll say late in being presented to us. We had a somewhat short notice on some of the legislation that was on the agenda. Also, usually questions that we may have about the different pieces of legislation are answered

during our caucus, but both Mr. Bulzoni and Attorney Shrive are unavailable this evening and so we could not ask those questions of them; and also, there was a lengthy presentation during our caucus which also prevented us from asking questions about the legislation or discussing it in caucus.

Since most of -- since all of this legislation that was questioned is in Fifth Order, we will do our due diligence and provide some answers to those questions during the coming week so that we are better prepared for the next -- at the next meeting to deal with those pieces of legislation.

And that's all I have for this evening. Thank you.

MS. REED: 5-B. FOR INTRODUCTION- AN ORDINANCE — AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 30, 2012 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE IMPOSING A TAX FOR GENERAL REVENUE PURPOSES ON OPERATORS OF PARKING SPACES AT THE RATE OF FIFTEEN PERCENT (15%) UPON EACH PARKING TRANSACTION AND ESTABLISHING ANNUAL LICENSE PROCEDURES AND FEES AND PROMULGATING THE RECORD KEEPING AND REPORTING RULES AND

REGULATIONS ON PARKING TRANSACTIONS PURSUANT
TO THE LOCAL TAX ENABLING ACT 53 PA. C.S.A.
6901 ET SEQ. BY AMENDING SECTION 1.
DEFINITIONS BY ADDING THE EXEMPTION OF
EDUCATIONAL PARKING; AMENDING SECTION 3.
ANNUAL LICENSE BY CHANGING THE ANNUAL
LICENSE AT A FEE OF ONE (\$1.00) DOLLAR PER
SPACE TO A FLAT FEE OF FIFTY (\$50.00)
DOLLARS PER YEAR; AMENDING SECTION 5.
RETURN AND PAYMENTS BY CHANGING MONTHLY TO
QUARTERLY AND IN ADDITION TO CITY ADD OR THE
CITY'S DESIGNEE AND AMENDING SECTION 6 TO
ADD A DESIGNEE TO THE OVERALL MANAGEMENT OF
THE PARKING TAX.

MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll entertain a motion that Item 5-B be introduced into its proper committee.

MR. ROGAN: So moved.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question?

MR. WECHSLER: Mr. McGoff, one thing

I would like to comment on this, I would like the designee of the collector of this tax to be the Single Tax Office. The Tax Office has capacity and this is something

The

1 that they should be able to add to their 2 duties. 3 MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else? All those 4 in favor signify by saying aye. 5 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. MR. ROGAN: Aye. 6 MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye. 7 8 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 9 MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? 10 ayes have it and so moved. MS. REED: 5-C. FOR INTRODUCTION-11 12 AN ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO 79, 2012 ENTITLED AN ORDINANCE "REPEALING 13 14 ALL PRIOR ORDINANCES REGARDING FINES TO BE IMPOSED FOR POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS' 15 16 RESPONSES TO FALSE ALARMS IN THE CITY; 17 ESTABLISHING FINES TO BE IMPOSED FOR THE 18 ACTIVATION OF AN ALARM DEVICE WHICH IS DETERMINED TO BE A FALSE ALARM BY THE POLICE 19 20 DEPARTMENT OR FIRE DEPARTMENT; AUTHORIZING 21 THE ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF SAID 22 FINES: AND PRESCRIBING PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF THIS ORDINANCE" BY AMENDING 23 24 CERTAIN SECTIONS, ELIMINATING A SECTION,

RENUMBERING AND ADDING A NEW SECTION TO

25

1	PROVIDE FOR A GRADUATED FEE STRUCTURE AND TO
2	INCREASE COLLECTION AND PAYMENT OF SAID
3	SERVICE CHARGES AND TO PROVIDE FOR AN APPEAL
4	PROCESS.
5	MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll
6	entertain a motion that Item 5-C be
7	introduced into its proper committee.
8	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
9	MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.
10	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? All
11	those in favor of introduction signify by
12	saying aye.
13	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
14	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
15	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
16	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
17	MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
18	ayes have it and so moved.
19	MS. REED: 5-D. FOR INTRODUCTION-
20	AN ORDINANCE - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND
21	OTHER APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS OF THE CITY OF
22	SCRANTON TO ENTER INTO A LEASE AGREEMENT
23	WITH WEST SCRANTON LITTLE LEAGUE FOR USE OF
24	CITY OWNED PROPERTY FOR A ONE (1) YEAR
25	PERIOD COMMENCING APRIL 15, 2014 AND ENDING

APRIL 14, 2015. PER SECTION 9 OF THE LEASE
AGREEMENT THE WEST SIDE FALCONS JUNIOR
FOOTBALL TEAM WILL ENTER INTO A THIRD PARTY
AGREEMENT WITH THE WEST SCRANTON LITTLE
LEAGUE FOR USE OF THE LACKAWANNA LITTLE
LEAGUE FIELD FOR THE MONTHS OF JULY THROUGH
NOVEMBER 2014 AS SPECIFIED IN THE LEASE
AGREEMENT.

MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll entertain a motion that Item 5-D be introduced into its proper committee.

MR. ROGAN: So moved.

MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question? I would like to comment that this lease agreement was one that was agreed to by the directorships of the interested parties, it was not something that was formulated by the City of Scranton, it was an agreement formulated by those directorships and agreed to by them and now presented to us for a vote.

All those in favor of introduction signify by saying aye.

MR. WECHSLER: Aye.

	01
1	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
2	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
3	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
4	MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
5	ayes have it and so moved.
6	MS. REED: 5-E. FOR INTRODUCTION- A
7	RESOLUTION - APPOINTMENT OF SEAN MCANDREW,
8	821 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE, SCRANTON,
9	PENNSYLVANIA, 18504 AS A MEMBER OF THE
10	SCRANTON MUNICIPAL RECREATION AUTHORITY.
11	MR. MCANDREW WILL BE REPLACING COLLEEN
12	GLEASON, WHO RESIGNED JUNE 10, 2014. MR.
13	MCANDREW'S TERM WILL EXPIRE ON DECEMBER 31,
14	2017.
15	MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll
16	entertain a motion that Item 5-E be
17	introduced into its proper committee.
18	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
19	MR. LOSCOMBE: Second.
20	MR. MCGOFF: On the question?
21	MR. ROGAN: Yes, on the question, I
22	would just like to congratulate Mr. McAndrew
23	for his appointment. I know him very well.
24	He is a neighbor of mine and a friend. I
25	know he will do an excellent job as a member

	02
1	of the Recreation Authority. Even as soon
2	as being appointed he already reached out to
3	me and we are going to trying to work
4	together on some projects so looking forward
5	to have him on board.
6	MR. MCGOFF: And his resume was
7	submitted
8	MS. REED: Correct.
9	MR. MCGOFF: to Council. All
10	those in favor of introduction signify by
11	saying aye.
12	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
13	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
14	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
15	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
16	MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
17	ayes have it and so moved.
18	All those in favor of introduction
19	signify by saying aye.
20	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
21	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
22	MR. LOSCOMBE: Aye.
23	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
24	MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
25	ayes have it and so moved.

MS. REED: 5-F. FOR INTRODUCTION- A
RESOLUTION - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AND
ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH PANGO MOBILE
PARKING A/K/A PANGO USA LLC TO PROVIDE
METERED AND UNMETERED PARKING PAY-BY-CELL
SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF SCRANTON FOR THE
PERIOD OF FOUR (4) YEARS FROM JUNE 1, 2014
THROUGH MAY 31, 2018.

MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll entertain a motion that Item 5-F be introduced into its proper committee.

MR. ROGAN: So moved.

MR. WECHSLER: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question?

MR. ROGAN: Yes, on the question. I did vote to table this and I also did mention during the caucus that I don't have a problem with introducing it. I would hope that if we don't have the answers to these questions that it will be tabled next week so we can have Mr. Bulzoni, at his convenience, and have representatives from Pango and try to be sure that we are right and we have the best deal for the taxpayers

1 and for the city. 2 MR. WECHSLER: I agree, Mr. McGoff, 3 if we do not have the proper information I 4 will also vote to table this next week. 5 MR. MCGOFF: And I will make every effort to have Mr. Bulzoni provide answers 6 7 to the questions that are posed prior to our 8 meeting. 9 All those in favor of introduction 10 signify by saying aye. 11 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 12 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 13 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 14 MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? MR. LOSCOMBE: No. 15 16 MR. MCGOFF: The ayes have it and so 17 moved. 18 MS. REED: SIXTH ORDER. NO BUSINESS AT THIS TIME. 19 SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. F0R 20 21 CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY 22 DEVELOPMENT -FOR ADOPTION RESOLUTION NO. 59, 2014 - ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE 23 24 HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURE REVIEW BOARD 25 ("HARB") AND APPROVING THE CERTIFICATE OF

1	APPROPRIATENESS FOR BARTUSH SIGNS, 302 NORTH
2	WASHINGTON STREET, ORWIGSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
3	17961 TO FABRICATE AND INSTALL ONE SINGLE
4	SIDED INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED SIGN; SIGN
5	CABINET WILL BE CONSTRUCTED OF WELDED
6	ALUMINUM ON A SUB-FRAME WITH ROUTED
7	GRAPHICS; GRAPHICS WILL BE CONSTRUCTED OF
8	PLEXI-GLASS MATERIAL; INTERNAL ILLUMINATION
9	WILL BE GENERATED BY HIGH OUTPUT FLUORESCENT
10	TUBES; SIGN CONSTRUCTION WILL BE
11	APPROXIMATELY 2'X 12' AND WILL BE MOUNTED
12	OVER THE ENTRANCE OF THE UNIT AT 532
13	LACKAWANNA AVENUE, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA.
14	MR. MCGOFF: What is the
15	recommendation of the Chair for the
16	Committee on Community Development?
17	MR. ROGAN: As Chair for the
18	Committee on Community Development, I
19	recommend final passage of Item 7-A.
20	MR. MCGOFF: Is there a second?
21	MR. LOSCOMBE: Second. Sorry.
22	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll
23	call, please.
24	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.
25	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

1 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan. 2 MR. ROGAN: Yes. 3 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe. MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes. 4 5 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan. MR. GAUGHAN: Yes. 6 MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff. 7 8 MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare 9 Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted. MS. REED: 7-B. FOR CONSIDERATION BY 10 THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS - FOR ADOPTION 11 12 RESOLUTION NO. 60, 2014 - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS 13 14 TO EXECUTE RIGHT OF ENTRY FOR CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENTS WITH PROPERTY OWNERS LOCATED 15 SURROUNDING THE WEST LACKAWANNA AVENUE 16 17 BRIDGE INCLUDING AMERCO REAL ESTATE CO., OLDE GOOD THINGS, INC., SCRANTON 18 REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, AND ERWIN T. KOST, 19 FOR THE PURPOSES TO CONDUCT ENGINEERING, 20 21 SURVEYING AND INSPECTION ACTIVITIES FOR VISUAL INSPECTION AND TO CONDUCT TESTING OF 22 THE CONDITION OF THE CONCRETE ON THE WEST 23 24 LACKAWANNA AVENUE BRIDGE. 25 MR. MCGOFF: What is the

	87
1	recommendation of the Chair for the
2	Committee on Public Works?
3	MR. GAUGHAN: As Chairperson for the
4	Committee on Public Works, I recommend final
5	passage of Item 7-B.
6	MR. ROGAN: Second.
7	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll
8	call, please?
9	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.
10	MR. MCGOFF: Yes.
11	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
12	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
13	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Loscombe.
14	MR. LOSCOMBE: Yes.
15	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
16	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
17	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
18	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
19	Item 7-B legally and lawfully adopted.
20	If there is no further business,
21	I'll take a motion to adjourn.
22	MR. LOSCOMBE: Motion to adjourn.
23	MR. MCGOFF: This meeting is
24	adjourned.
25	

ability.

<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