Ü

SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL
PUBLIC HEARING

IN RE: FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 58-2014, APPROPRIATING
FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON FOR THE
PERIOD COMMENCING ON THE FIRST DAY OF JANUARY 2015 TO
AND INCLUDING DECEMBER 31, 2015, BY THE ADOPTION OF THE
GENERAL CITY OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2015.

HELD:

Thursday, November 20, 2014

LOCATION:

Council Chambers

Scranton City Hall

340 North Washington Avenue

Scranton, Pennsylvania

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL:

ROBERT MCGOFF, PRESIDENT

PATRICK ROGAN, VICE-PRESIDENT

WAYNE EVANS

JOSEPH WECHSLER

WILLIAM GAUGHAN

LORI REED, CITY CLERK

KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

AMIL MINORA, SOLICITOR

MR. MCGOFF: I'd like to call this 1 public hearing to order. Roll call, please. 2 3 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler. 4 MR. WECHSLER: Here. MS. CARRERA: 5 Mr. Rogan. MR. ROGAN: Here. 6 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans. 7 8 MR. EVANS: Here. MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan. 9 MR. GAUGHAN: 10 Here. MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff. 11 12 MR. MCGOFF: Here. The purpose of 13 said public hearing is to hear testimony and 14 discuss the following: FILE OF COUNCIL NO. 58-2014, APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR THE 15 EXPENSES OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON FOR THE 16 17 PERIOD COMMENCING ON THE FIRST DAY OF 18 JANUARY 2015 TO AND INCLUDING DECEMBER 31, 2015, BY THE ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL CITY 19 OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2015. 20 21 Tonight to present or to commentary 22 on the budget is Mr. Dave Bulzoni, Business 23 Administrator of the City of Scranton. 24 Mr. Bulzoni will speak on the budget and the

questions from council will follow and then

commentary from the public.

Mr. Bulzoni?

MR. BULZONI: Good evening, What I would like to aentlemen. Thank you. say is I prepared some budget highlights that I will go through in a minute. reviewing the document I think what you probably noticed was that what we tried to do is create an element of transparency so there is a narrative that accompanies the budget document that provides some descriptive information that helps to interpret exactly what some of the changes are or what the intent of the administration is and hopefully that information was What I will do is take a few helpful. minutes to go through some highlights and then we can discuss the budget based on whatever questions you may have.

The proposed budget amounts to \$107,398,625.02 in 2015 which is a departure form the 2014 budget which is \$130,536,998.25. The significant differences in the budget include an increase in the current real estate tax

2

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

revenue of \$4,827,848.38, a reduction in the SAFER grant from \$1.6 million to \$400,000, the removal of \$28 million in debt issuance with a lesser amount of \$4.8 million. A reduction in the liquid fuels transfers of approximately 2.4 million and a reduction in tax anticipation note of approximately \$3 million.

You likely had seen all of those changes in your review of the document. I wanted to point them out because some of the questions we had gotten immediately is why is the budget amount that much less than the current year budget. Those are really the reasons why.

estate taxes, the overall real estate tax increase is 18.99 percent. The improvement rate will increase from 40.202 mills to 47.835 mills. The land rate will increase from 184.867 mills to 219.973 mills. Within those categories, and as you probably noted, there is a millage assignment of 22.929 improvement mills for debt service, and 24.906 mills for operations, and then in the

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

land levy 105.440 mills assigned to debt service, and 114.533 mills are assigned to operations. We can get into the rationale, but what I'll do is kind of go through the highlights first and then if you have any questions on that segregation I'll be happy to answer them.

Under local taxes two items of note, one in the budget and one not in the budget. One in the budget represents tripling the local services tax, and as you are all well aware you have seen revisions that were adopted into the law under Act 47 which provides the allowance of the tripling of the local services tax. Two caveats, number one, you have to have a revised recovery plan in place, and that is something that the Pennsylvania Economy League has already started to work on; and number two, it would require Court approval. So while the amount represents an approximate tripling of the local services tax that tripling likely may not occur until the end of the first quarter.

And, also, one item that's not noted

24

that was in the Act 47 revisions is a payroll tax and that is presently being evaluated, we are really trying to define exactly what the impact is so we had reached out to the Pennsylvania Economy League to actually prepare an analysis so there is much more detailed information that can be shared with the administration and council just to determine what kind of impact that might have. Certainly it can be implemented any time if it's determined to be favorable, but I think we need more information on it to determine what the validity of it is.

Licenses and permits, what you are going to see is legislation coming down for a fairly substantial revision in many of the license and permits feet. A lot of those fees hadn't been revised in a number of years, but what it's going to take more is a more effective collection of those fees, and I think that's something that the department is certainly cognizant of so, you know, there would be a combination of a revision in the fees and also more effective management of the operation to try and make

it as productive as possible.

Intergovernmental reimbursement.

The budget forecasts a lower SAFER grant approval of \$400,000. Departmental earnings, as far as meter rates are concerned we are looking at any way we could maximize the value of the meter collections so there has been some discussion on demand base pricing, but we have not gotten to the point where we even have an analysis on what that might do, but certainly that's an alternative to help generate some additional revenue from meters.

The pave cut ordinance likely will be modified. I have a template that I'm looking at that requires some additional review and we most likely will have that completed in the first quarter of next year.

Some miscellaneous revenues, some substantial changes include the exclusion of revenue from the Icebox development, that's under review in the solicitor's office, can't really get into too much on that, but I think anyone who looked at the budget saw an amount in there, there was nothing

collected relative to that amount in 2014, it's certainly under review and further discussion at this point.

And the elimination of bond proceeds of approximately \$28 million which was primarily representative of funding the award, award settlement, and it's being replaced by an amount of approximately \$4.8 million as a component of that award settlement, and also the prospective sale of delinquent tax claims in the amount of \$1.5 million.

The tax anticipation note will be issued consistent with prior years even though the amount in the 2014 budget is much higher than prior years, but the actual funding amount was pretty consistent with the dollar amount the city had issued in prior years.

Within expenditures, just looking at some staffing items, as you are aware the union raises are all contractual so fire and police are at 1.75 percent, clerical at 3.75 percent, and DPW at 46 cents per hour.

That's all reflected in the adjustments to

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

salaries in each one of those categories. Staffing changes include one clerical position as removed from the Treasury The Legal Department removed Department. one clerical position at a salary of \$39,059 and added an assistant city solicitor at Human Resources added one clerical \$35,000. position at \$33,000 and one non-union position at \$29,000, which is the Boards and Commissions Coordinator. Licenses and Permits will ads one inspector at \$39,059. The DPW moved one chauffeur from Parks and Recreation to highways at the same rate of Part-time secretary in the mayor's pav. office was budgeted at \$11,000. The Parks and Recreation specialist was reinserted into the budget after being removed from the budget in 2014. The master mechanic was reinserted into the Fire Department, and that's not representative of a new hire. Six school resource officers are partly funded by the school district, 50 percent. Four police officers are paid from the OECD budget, and the budget also includes two new beat officers for the downtown section of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Scranton. The police department has applied for grants to offset those salaries. Human Resources Director will have a dual appointment as assistant Business Administrator with an increase in salary that's funded through a reallocation of the Act 47 grant, and we have already communicated with the Department of Community and Economic Development.

Debt service incorporates an amount based on the issuance of a \$5 million note in 2015 which would be a component of the settlement award, and it also includes lease payments for refuse packers which were -which the city had recently taken possession of as well as for the acquisition of a fire safety vehicle, and there is an amount in there which would be a component of a renewal of the city's guarantee energy savings project which concluded 2008. are evaluating a renewal and expansion that we really need more detail in order to determine whether it's feasible because, again, that process really should be transacted only based on whatever savings

you are able to achieve, so very preliminary on that.

Contingency was increased to offset an amount which may wind up incorporating the SAFER grant, so it was going from \$100,000 to \$500,000.

Unencumbered expenses continue to remain high, probably higher than it should be, but that's reflective of any payables that are carried over from one budget year into the next, so that dollar amount is reflective of payables that are carried over from in this case the 2014 into the 2015 budget.

That's it for the summary information and I'll certainly entertain any questions you may have.

MR. WECHSLER: Mr. Bulzoni, could you just touch a little bit more on the debt service since so much of the tax increase is for debt service, what exactly are we trying to pay off there?

MR. BULZONI: Well, it's not necessarily a matter of what we are paying off, there is really two reasons for carving

2

3

4

5

7

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

out millage and you're inquiring about why we are segregating --

MR. WECHSLER: Yes.

MR. BULZONI: There is two reasons for doing that: Number one, it creates a significant enhancement to the credit worthiness, a very significant credit positive which is something the city really needs right now. As you are probably aware, there certainly have been challenges for the city issued debt, any debt that has been issued over the last several years has been at very unfavorable terms. This really takes a step in the right direction for the city in not only trying to enhance its creditworthiness, but also to try and obtain a bond rating within the next year and a half hopefully, which would allow the city then to look at refinancing some of its debt.

The other side of it is it now takes away any arbitrary decision making relative to that component of the millage so that millage winds up getting pegged against your debt service requirement. If it goes down,

19 20 21

22

24

25

that component of the millage winds up going It also makes -- it also adds some transparency to the process of issuing debt which means that the administration and council have to work very cooperatively on any considerations there may be for issuing debt because what you will find out is that when you contemplate issuing debt, the repercussions or the ramifications of doing so would equate to higher millage, so the intent of this, at least in my mind, was not only to create I guess a more stable component of what the assignment of the millage is, but also to create a better level of cooperation so that if any debt issuance is contemplated the administration and council really have to start talking about that issuance very early on.

MR. WECHSLER: Okay, this years MMO are we going to make that on time, the payment?

MR. BULZONI: Well, that is our intent to do so. I think as you are well aware through discussions we have had consistently throughout the year the budget

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is somewhat weak in terms of the revenue expectations and our intent right now is to evaluate how revenues are realized through the end of the year before we make a determination on exactly how much of that debt payment will be satisfied by yearend. Again, Mr. Wechsler, that's why, as I indicated, your unencumbered expenses number is higher because unfortunately the city has been carrying over payables, including the pension payment as was the case this year. We hope that not to be the case, we had got forecast and revenues through yearend primarily in earned income taxes, but I do believe that we certainly will have a very tight budget from now through the end of the year.

MR. WECHSLER: One thing that came up in the summer when we were talking about the commuter tax a lot of people referenced the large delinquent garbage tax fee is that something that's out there? I mean, we heard numbers thrown around \$4 million, is that something that's out there or --

MR. BULZONI: Well, the receivables

22

23

24

25

amount is actually in the audit report so, you know, obviously we don't have the 2013 audit completed yet, but it will indicate what that receivables amount is. It has decreased. The expectation is that with some of the legislation that was approved to provide the collection agent with greater authority for collecting you will see some decrease in that receivable, but I think it really requires some further evaluation. How should the payments schedule be organized to maybe allow for a more efficient payment of that fee, these are all discussions that I think should occur in 2015 to try and make the process as productive as possible.

MR. WECHSLER: And my last question is, since you mentioned it, the audit. For 2014 and heading into 2015 how comfortable are you with that we are over the hump with our problems in turning in the audit?

MR. BULZONI: Not at all. Well, I think what you have to realize is that you have a significant transition just in personnel year over year, so, you know, you

21

22

23

24

25

lose your business administrator, your finance manager, who was here for 12 years had departed as well. The city was without a finance manager for a number of months, you know, a situation you are certainly all well aware of so we certainly had gotten behind in compilation information needed to generate that audit, which was the reason we brought in Parente-Beard to help with the audit prep. They have made a lot of headway in that process to the point where I'm cautiously optimistic, very cautiously, but cautiously optimistic that we will at least have a draft of the general fund audit in December.

It is critical that we accelerate that process going forward not only just from the standpoint of disseminating information, but also, you know, we are trying to do things to restore our credit worthiness, getting a audit on a relatively timely basis is critical. Now, I don't think anyone would consider having an audit completed for a city this size within six months following the conclusion of your

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

fiscal year is realistic, but I think when you get the point where you really should expect to have it completed within nine months. I think that's much more realistic and that really should be a target for the city in 2015.

MR. WECHSLER: Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Rogan?

MR. ROGAN: Just a few comments and then a couple of question as well. I'd like to thank you for coming in today and for you and the mayor and all your hard work on this budget. This is the fifth budget since I have been on council and it's by far the most detailed as far as expenditures, revenues and where the money is going. one thing I really like, and you touched upon it already, is segregating the millage for what we are paying to actually run the city today and what we are paying for debt service. Just as a matter of transparency I think that's something that the people need to see and it's, you know, really shows that we are paying much more what we are paying now versus the past, over the past however

many decades the city has spent above it's means.

Also, on the increase in the LST I do, although, I would much rather see a commuter tax, but, unfortunately the Courts and the state legislature thought otherwise, I do like that the LST will take some of the burden off of the homeowners and senior citizens in the City of Scranton and much of it will be paid by residents or non-residents, but I did have a question on the LST is there a -- I know there used to be an exemption where if you made under a certain dollar amount you were exempt from the LST, is that currently still in the ball?

MR. BULZONI: It is, and I'm not quite sure of the dollar amount, I would have to check, I think it's \$15,000.

MR. ROGAN: Yeah, I think it was 15,000 because one of the criticisms of the LST is that it would, you know, negatively impact those making lower dollars, that exemption, you know, helps with that issue as well.

3

2

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of the issues that was touched upon that I think is an important, and I just wanted to know what your thoughts were on it moving forward, is the issue of delinquencies. When we were out, I think we all have experienced this, when we go places people say, well, you know, my taxes are going up but so and so down the street hasn't paid or so and so hasn't paid their garbage fee or paid this fee or that fee, and for me there are two types of delinquents, you have people that are struggling that legitimately can't afford make ends meet, and I think the city needs to do everything we can to work with those people, and then on the other hand you have the deadbeats who just they get the bill and they rip it up and throw it away because they don't want to pay, what's the plan for next year for focusing on those deadbeats? I know you touched upon it, but if you could talk a little bit more about it.

MR. BULZONI: Well, I think with the appointment of NRS to handle delinquent collections to the real estate and refuse I

2

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

on it.

25

think you will see a more effective process, certainly more professionalized. would suggest is it's probably worth meeting with them at some point just to get their input on what the city can do to help reduce the burden of what those dollar amounts are. The city has been reasonably consistent in its collection of the current real estate taxes at around 88 percent. Now, that's not entirely favorable, but it's not inconsistent with other municipalities throughout Northeastern Pennsylvania. question is what can you pick up on the back You know, year over year, you should be collecting close to 100 percent. If you are not, what can you do to try and improve those collection rates? And again, going back to Mr. Wechsler's comment on the refuse, it's what can we do to reduce the dollar amount of those receivables year over That's really something that I think year. in order to be proactive with the process is probably to meet with NRS to get their input

MR. ROGAN: And I think all of us on

2

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

council would be willing to do anything we can to increase --

MR. BULZONI: Sure.

MR. ROGAN: -- increase payments coming in from those sources anyway. finally, just an observation I made, and I want to see if this is where you are coming from, it seems that everything that has been done over the past year, including this budget, is to restore our creditworthiness and obtain a bond rating, would I be correct in that assumption that we, you know, we don't want to recreate two years ago where the city was paying employees minimum wage and you couldn't -- you know, we didn't have anyone coming to the table for a TAN. why a lot of these measures have been taken, the segregation of funds for debt services and operations and some of the other initiatives that we have seen throughout the year?

MR. BULZONI: That's part of it, I
think that's a big part of it. The other
part of it is to create is better thought
process overall for the issuance of debt so

that it really binds council and the administration together to create those discussions very early on so that there is a lot of discussion when it comes time to issue debt, not something where at the 11th hour you are introduced with a turn sheet or a prospect of debt issuance and at that point you wind of scrambling and try to evaluate it. So you are trying to accelerate the evaluation of it, create a more transparent component, certainly evaluate to maybe have a more profound impact on the city's creditworthiness.

analysis and I had gotten some information off Mr. Gaughan as just looking at a comparative analysis with the debt that was issued to 2012 and 2013 and rates that are generally noncomparable, so 7 1/2 and 8.9 percent on debt when comparable debt is being issued between 3 and 4 percent at the highest. There is a cost associated with that, there is an interest cost that's built into your debt service component. I mean, it's pretty easy to see. Now, it's going to

be even clearer by being able to peel that out.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you very much.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Evans?

MR. EVANS: Most of my questions have been asked and answered so I'm just going to circle around a little bit to what we talked about before. It looks like it's going to be a very busy first quarter, first of all.

MR. BULZONI: It has been a very busy year, but, yeah.

MR. EVANS: On the payroll tax, I know you mentioned it before, as you know, I'm a proponent of getting rid of the mercantile tax and with the Act 47 revisions I'm a proponent of removing the mercantile tax and the business privilege tax and replacing them with a payroll tax. You mentioned when after a study has been done we had to look at the number and make sure it works, are you confident that we can do that done in the first quarter?

MR. BULZONI: I am, and I shared with you a communication I had with the

23

24

25

Pennsylvania Economy League to accelerate that, and actually what they are going to try and do, which I think we would insist upon is to have that analysis completed in conjunction with the revision and the recovery plan because if it looks like it is a viable alternative to business privilege and mercantile then I think we certainly want to have that incorporated into the revised recovery plan and look to execute it. But I think we want to -- first things first, we want to get the analysis completed, but I think it's realistic to say that we will have that completed in the first quarter.

MR. EVANS: Thank you. That's all I have.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Gaughan?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes. First of all, I just want to thank you, Mr. Bulzoni, for coming in tonight and thank you for all your hard work on this budget and your willingness to communicate with council, I think we all appreciate that very much.

I just have a few questions, the

\$400,000 transfer in from other funds what does that represent in budget revenue?

MR. BULZONI: It really would be a component of the receipt of grant money coming in from the special city's fund, and one component of it is an offset from the Act 47 grant funding to support salaries, that's one example.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay, thank you. You touched on this little bit before that the city is planning on borrowing \$4.8 million to pay a portion of the judgment, can you tell us what the debt service will be should this borrowing be approved and kind of explain how that whole process will work?

MR. BULZONI: Yeah, I actually put a debt service amount into the --

MR. GAUGHAN: Yeah, of \$1.3, I'm sorry. I mean, can you just explain how that whole process will work?

MR. BULZONI: Well, we had begun gun those discussions pretty early in the year and, you know, as I indicated there certainly have been enough challenges for the city to issue debt realistically. We

24

25

have what I think is a very favorable structured of the debt that we achieved through some discussions with Amalgamated Bank, the Department of Labor and Industry because the debt would actually be cash collateralized with a component of the Workers' Compensation funds. Overall, I think there has to be some greater discussion on what the outcome is. it is a component of the overall settlement award and I don't think we have gotten far enough yet to really discuss that occurs with the remaining amount, but again, I think there has to be quite a bit of discussion along those lines because overall it's a significant dollar amount, and especially if you are looking at it as an individual debt component now you can see what the impact of that amount would be on their millage, so I think the reason why it was deferred, and you can see there was a significant amount plugged into the budget in 2014, well, first of all, it can't be issued as anything I would call a reasonable structure; and second of all, it has a

pretty significant impact on what your future millage would be. I think that the discussion should include the prospective refinance of some existing debt to see how much you can incorporate into that to not have as much of an impact on any millage adjustment as there would be if you just issued 17 or 22 million dollars individually.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you very much.

Can you explain in a little bit more detail

the 1 percent variable increase for

promotions in the police and fire budget? I

saw that and I didn't really --

MR. BULZONI: There are promotions that are you scheduled and if they wind up occurring would impact whatever that budgeted amount is. It was difficult for us to project exactly or quantify exactly what that dollar amount would be if a promotion wound up going through, so in effect we wound up using a 1 percent cushion to be able to absorb what any one of those increases would be within the same budget year.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. That's all I have. I just will say that I'm very glad that you came tonight. I appreciate it very much, however, I am disappointed that the mayor did not decide to come. That's all I have.

MR. MCGOFF: A few questions, you brought up the payroll tax or the possibility of a payroll tax, if that were to be introduced that would replace or become -- that would replace some other taxes if I'm not mistaken?

MR. BULZONI: It would replace business privilege and mercantile taxes. It's designed to be revenue neutral in year one. I think we really, as I indicated before, need some analytical information to determine how it's implemented, what the impact would be because it certainly changes the tax structure and impacts businesses in different ways.

Also, just some variations in information we had gotten at the time the tax was being considered within the Act 47 revisions, first it was determined that it

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BULZONI: Half.

would wind up incorporating nonprofits into the fold, and then it wound up coming back to us that, no, it does not include nonprofits. So, again, more information in this case is better. You don't want to make a rash decision, but as I indicated before there is certainly an interest because we have gotten a lot of feedback from the business community that business privilege and mercantile are punitive and probably punitive to the types of businesses that we are seeing locating in the city, so I think more analysis has to be completed, more analysis has to be completed on a timely basis and then I think some discussion has to ensue kind of quickly in deciding which direction the city wants to go into.

MR. MCGOFF: I may be asking you to guess at something, but do you have an idea of what the percent of expenditures in the budget are? I think Mr. Amoroso used the term marbleized, how many of the budget is there that's just concrete that cannot be sort of touched, I guess?

MR. MCGOFF: 50 percent of it?

MR. BULZONI: Yeah. And I don't think it's a fair assessment to say that marbleized means they cannot I adjusted. They are not easily adjusted, but I think all of the budget components can be adjusted to a certain extent, some with much more difficulty than others, but, yeah, I would -- I guess I would qualify that comment about what's marbleized and what's not by saying I think anything can be adjusted, but certainly some with much greater level of difficulty than others.

MR. MCGOFF: And I know in some discussions that we have had we talk about the cost that moving forward or just increasing such as -- well, debt service, disability payments, and pension payments, around what percentage of the budget does that constitute?

MR. BULZONI: Well, I think you look at debt service approximately \$16 million.

As far as the pension payment right now, you are looking at -- well, excluding the state contribution looking at bout \$9 million,

23

24

25

that would be pretty consistent in 2015 as well. We are expecting that to ramp up, and that's the second train coming down the track and that's something the city really has to focus on for some resolution in 2015 because right now we incorporated in the budget for 2015 the payment of the MMO with the continued 25 percent reduction. That does not benefit the plan at all, but I don't think the city is in a position right now to ramp up revenues by another \$3 million, so there has got to be lot of discussion on what the resolution is to that situation going forward because when that reduction expires, which would be 2017, that's going to be an immediate \$3 million increase and that's not considering what the adjustment may be once the next review occurs of the plan assets and what's required to fund them on an annual basis so it's going to be a priority topic of conversation in 2015 as it really has been in 2014.

MR. MCGOFF: Anything else from council? At this time, we'll have public

comment. The only name on the list I guess is Joan Hodowanitz.

MS. HODOWANITZ: Joan Hodowanitz,
Scranton. Let me preface my remarks by
thanking Nancy Krake in the Business
Administrator's Office and Lori Reed's staff
in the Clerk's Office as I try to get
information on the 2015 budget they were all
very helpful and very professional and I
credit to the city.

That having been said, everything else is downhill. I keep asking this and I keep getting paltry answers, but why is the proposed budget not on the city's website? All people tell me is you never put it on before, we only put the approved budget on. Is there some law that says we can't put the proposed button the website? Whose decision was that?

MR. MCGOFF: No. No, there is not.

MS. HODOWANITZ: You know, I among other citizens I'm a stakeholder in the city and I am interested in this document and I want to be informed. I understand that it's somewhere on the Times' website, I haven't

17

18

14

15

16

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

found the link. There was a copy in the City Clerk's Office and you stand there at the counter to look at it, and there's a copy in the library and it's just not practical to sit there and taking notes, you really need your own copy, okay? simply got fed up after two days in the library and I had them Xerox me a copy at 25 cents a page, and I can afford that, that's not the problem for me, but it just irritates me that we can't put it on the website. I think one of the first things you said, Mr. Bulzoni, is going for an element of transparency? I think every financial relevant document should be on the website period starting with the proposed budget.

Next, because I didn't have ready access to my own copy for several days, one of the things I did was I printed out the original 2014 budget, okay, at least I would have that information in front of me because I compared the changes in 2015 and I noticed that they were dozen and dozen of lines where the numbers had changed without really

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

any footnoting. We are talking about changes from anywhere from one penny to \$28 million. Now, I understand that these are adjustments that have been made over the course of the last year, but even if there is just a little footnote on the bottom saying, "See council resolution "X" or see document "Y"", at least a citizen can find out why that number changed, you know, but, And the same thing is just not for financial figures but also some of the staffing figures have also changed, and if you go constantly to these meetings you may recall some of the staffing changes or some of the transfer of funds, but you can't recall them all. We are talking dozens of lines in an eight-page document, okay, and that didn't make me feel any happier.

Now let's talk about the pay raises. There is no debate with the union pay raises, those are Court mandated and that's fine, but let's start with the Office of the Mayor. The mayor's salary is going up from \$60,000 to \$65,000, and 8.33 percent increase and where is he tonight? Where is

he anywhere other than a photo op? Thank
God Mr. Bulzoni is here to represent him, he
should be here. He is the mayor of this
city. I noticed on his description of the
mayor's office among other things he is
supposed to have that office to ensure that
citizens have a voice in the responsible
delivery of services. Well, my voice says
he should be here, he should be at any of
these meetings that are so crucial to the
city.

Mayor's confidential secretary, I don't think she is one of the clerical union employees, she is getting a 16 percent raise, that's \$5,000. Mr. Bulzoni, I noticed your raise from \$53,550 to \$79,900, an increase of 49.2 percent. Now, here we are circling the financial drain in the City of Scranton and if anything the budget should reflect austerity from the leadership on down, and I know Mr. Bulzoni has done yoman's labor, but I also know that in the last six months there has been virtually no progress, according to Rossi & Company on the city's budget. I hope other people have

2

3

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

other comments to make. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Is there anyone else who wishes to address counsel?

MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia, citizen of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians, I was one of the ones that championed the raise for the mayor and I'll stand by it. Maybe I don't like his actions, but I do think he should make more than what he was getting and there is no question about that, and I was here when they cut some of the salaries of the last mayor's, how do I put it, his advisory, let's put it that way, or the department heads, whatever you want to Maybe that wasn't right and restoring say. them back again doesn't really bother me as much because I believe if they do their job that's the whole thing. If they do their job they are worth it. If they don't do their job, they ain't even worth the \$50,000 or whatever we are paying to begin with. That's the problem with this city, they don't do their job. They say a lot of things.

I read a big article in the paper,

McGoff he is sorry that Boscov didn't pay it but he has been sitting on council, he knew they weren't paying that for the last seven years, that he wasn't paying that 108 loan, and he knew it, everybody knew it that came into council. To be sorry about it now, that's ludicrous. Reminds me of the scene in Casablanca where the chief of police says I was surprised there was gambling in that back room. It's ridiculous. He knew that, he knew that.

Now, the only thing I harassed him when we got the second loan when he was going bankrupt did we loan it to Boscov or to the Mall Partners? If we lent it to the Mall Partners that's something that should be brought up in the courts because they had all intention of going bankrupt with the mall. That's the Mall Partners. That's the mall itself and not Boscov's. There is a difference between Boscov and the Mall Partners, but that's how the city is.

You gave "X" amount of money to the bank supposedly to improve our credit rating and you took it from the parking revenue.

٠.

Who has to make up the parking revenue? The poor citizens of Scranton, or do you plan to charge a dollar a minute for the parking? This is what I mean about you are doing everything you can to keep people from staying in the city. They don't with to stay in the city. People are going to be leaving in mass to what you are doing. You remind me of Caesar when they said, "Et tu, Brute?"

You are stabbing the taxpayers.

There is no question about it. You know it and how would you can sit there and smile saying that's the best thing for the city.

If you are really want to do something for the city you give up that \$12,500 that you get and come here like we do as volunteers.

Then you are doing something for the city.

You are giving back more than you are taking.

I spend a lot of time coming here, a lot of time reading a lot of literature and a lot of it is literature, and a lot of it is pipe dreams. The mayor said you want to sell the Sewer Authority, there are chances

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are you won't be able to sell it until maybe another year or two and then maybe not because it doesn't work the way you thought, and they have you on the insurance that the bondholders want to sell the parking garages? How many of you people met with the bondholders and said, "Do you want to sell the parking garages?"

And the question is how much money are they making now or how much will they make if they sell -- if they get the money for the parking garages? It's all in the question of finances. If they can get more money from the City of Scranton then they can by investing it they have no intention of selling the parking garages. I don't blame them. It's all dollar amounts. don't have the figures in front of me, what they are paying but maybe they are at 6 percent or something and they can only get 3 percent in the market. It's all how the market goes, but the question is if you have no guarantee they are going to sell the parking garages or let the city sell the parking garages then all they money you

donated to the bank for the parking garages is null. Like I said, you can't resurrect the dead and use people who try to decide get blood from a stone. You got to look at everything, dollars amount. Like I said many, many years ago, watch your pennies and your dollars will follow, but you haven't done nothing.

Last year when you were sitting there I said, "The only thing I expected from you people is higher taxes."

And we got higher taxes, and I can tell you this next year it's going to be the same, more higher taxes because you haven't solved one problem. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else?

MR. MORGAN: Good evening, Council.

You know, I was going to come up here and I

was just going to laugh and leave the podium

tonight, I'm being real honest with you. We

are just out of our mind here. What are we

tying to do? Are we trying to become credit

worthy so we can borrow more money we can't

pay back? Did you listen to any of the

speakers last week discussing the issues? I

mean, I listened to council as a matter of fact again today on the internet, I listened to the arguments from all of the things the five council members presented, and it's just ashame that you aren't all on the same page together pursuing one or two visions. Your thoughts are scattered, there is no real concrete plan, there needed to be massive cuts to the budget, massive cuts to the budget even if it required a bankruptcy petition. We have to move in a new direction.

If you can't feel the pain of the residents who live in this city, and I know you are not partners, if you can't feel that, if you can't understand that this budget, look it, you know, when you have -- when you have somebody who has the ability to determine whether something is real or false and the Commonwealth tells them they can, not a council member or a judge and he tells you that aren't and the budget isn't realistic, and I think that even though we have a different budget today it's realistic? Really is it? Have any of them

ever been? We are trying to raise money from places that don't even exist basically, trying to walk away from our assets, sell them off, just put pipe dreams in the air basically because you know something, the people have nothing left to give and I just think that this council can veto the mayor's budget. If you would have started breaking that budget down the minute you sat down and started working for the residents of this city you might have a plan and a vision, but we don't have that today.

And you know, Mr. Evans, you are a realtor, do you see a lot of people wanting to move in this city, sir? So look it, take it for what it's worth, people cannot even get out of here. They have no faith in our government and they need the government to really open it's eyes and move in a different way. I say possibly it's time to forget about Act 47. It's time to stop worrying about what the Commonwealth wants because they can't even solve their own budget problem and they are 50 or 60 billion dollars in. I don't know, what are we going

to do? Are we going to follow their failed plans because they came up with a plan to help us? They can't even solve their own problems and we have got senior citizens, not just seniors, but all kinds of workers in this city that campaign anymore.

A couple of times, like I said, with some of these papers -- well, I left it at home, but I may have come here with people who have left the city because they are not going to pay the city tax. They're not going to pay more to the city than they pay the state and not have any vision for the city and no solution to our financial problems. 22 years under Act 47 and we are going to languish there for five to eight more years? Look at, we need a new plan, sir, gentlemen.

It's not a personal thing, I have a lot of respect for you, you got a real tough job, you put your name on the ballot and you ran, I respect you for that, I have not one bad word and I have never came here and disrespected one sitting council member because not what I do, but you know

24

25

something I don't have to agree with you and it's not disrespectful to disagree, but you know we need to move in a new way and we honestly need to veto this mayor's budget and come up with a better plan, and if it's necessary we have to cut. Well, it's beyond necessary and maybe -- I don't think you'll do it, I really don't. I don't really think that the five of you can get your head around the budget right now. You wasted too much time. You needed to bring people in to help with you that, and I'm not so sure what any of our financial people in this city really understand about that budget because it's just an add on from one budget to the next budget to the next budget to the next budget? And did we did ourself a terrible disservice by jettisoning all Mr. Doherty's people who might have really understood after 12 years what was really happening in that budget and did we let politics determine who we were going to put in positions? And that's not a shout out to this, gentlemen. Everybody goes to work to make a living. You respect everybody to

goes out and gets a job, but you know something, do we really have the people in place to really give us a concrete, solid answers to our problems and firm real numbers?

And I just say veto this budget and send it back downstairs and less do what we have to do and make cuts because this taxation, you know, talking about reassessment, if a house sold for \$15,000 in the city that's what's it's worth. I don't care, you can set it for more, but it doesn't mean it's worth is really. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you.

MR. MILLER: Good evening, Doug
Miller, Scranton. You know, basically to
summarize this budget in a nutshell it's
pretty much a waste of time this whole
process here of coming forward and
discussing a budget that's basically just
punching our tickets onto the Titanic. We
look at a 19 percent tax increase, tripling
the LST tax, I don't see one thing in this
budget that did anything to protect the

interest of the residents of this city.

It's just more putting it on the shoulders of people who have been punished for decades and for some reason we have incompetent officials who insist on going back to the same people time and time again seeking something from them that they just don't possess and yeah, for whatever reason the majority of you just can't grasp that concept and that's the real discouraging thing is that yet again the little guy takes a beating.

You know, it's nice to have all of these little presentations and listen to the Amoroso plans and have Bulzoni come in tonight and give us the synopsis of the city and where we are financially, but for four years we listened to Mr. Joyce as our Finance Chair come forward and give numerous presentations be it from the dais or down here from the Power Point visual and cited everything that we are here tonight discussing and yet we are sitting here acting as if this is all a surprise or if it's all this idea that we just sit back and

brainstorm all of these things. These are all things that he went over and he put the time and effort as our Finance Chair previously to do that, and I have a lot of -- a great deal of respect for him because he was an intelligent person that at this stage in the city's history he is someone that we need here right now.

You know, when you listened to Mr. Evans last week, with all due respect to him, talk about and he made a good point that the last thing we want to do is force people from their homes, but by passing this ridiculous budget that's exactly what you are doing. You are forcing people out of their homes by passing this budget.

I hope you listen, and I see she is here this evening, Mrs. Gallagher, who I have a lot of respect for and I'm glad she is back again, I hope you listened to what she said last week because I did. This is someone who has been here for I believe she stated the last 57 years, so this is someone who is has lived through an awful lot in this city. She has seen a lot of the good

1

6

7

5

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

times and she has seen the major decline that we have had going on here within the last 20 or 30 years, so this is someone who has seen both sides of the spectrum where a lot of us haven't, we have only experienced the downturn.

So listening to her comments about the seniors just not being able to take this on anymore is the truth because I have heard I have had seniors approach me, it's not the first time I have heard it from a senior citizen. They are walking away because at the end of day they can't pay what they don't have and when they have to make a decision do I feed myself, do I buy that prescription or do I keep my home? Those are difficult decisions and that's why I said it was so important that you went around and you walked through this city and knocked on doors and you talked to people and got a pulse of what was going on here instead of just playing politics and carrying the water for this administration time and time again that leads us no where. That's why we are here today, the lack of

independence in government has also brought us to where we are today.

You know, it's easy to go back to the same tools, you know, the mayor talked about there is not many tools left in the toolbox, you know, it's really easy to go back, as even Mrs. Gallagher stated, resorting to tax increases. That doesn't solve the problem, it's only caused major decay in the city as my generation is fleeing this city on a daily basis due to a lack of opportunity and anybody else that could sell their home they are getting out of here, too, and even those that can't sell their home they are just walking away because you can't sell them.

So, you know, it's just where we are going here is just yet again just down the continual path of destruction, there is no leadership in this city. You know, we talk about the need to have to pursue the commuter tax again, Mr. Rogan and Mr. Wechsler, I mean, are we really that delusional in this government? I mean, it's really just turns your stomach. And, you

know, I have been coming here awhile and, you know, I have heard an awful lot, but you think you are getting somewhere and you think you are moving forward and we just continuing to go backward.

I mean, the residents saw their taxes go up 57 percent, we saw the garbage fee go up from 178 to 300, and we just seem to have no problem with that because there is no common sense in this government, and I will continue later on in citizens' participation. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else?

MR. BOLUS: Good evening, Council,
Bob Bolus, Scranton. I think we need to pay
serious attention. This budget is a budget
for disaster and we need to look where we
are going. Nobody is looking where we came
from and that's the problem here, how do we
get to where we are right now? There are
many screw ups here, many, many, many that
have been overlooked.

You know, we are going to put in an intermodal, who is going to come to it? The mall is dead. I sat down there through the

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the Colt's bus hearings down there, nobody else was there but I was there, and the mall is dead, yet you wouldn't support a casino, but Philadelphia just got a license for one and we propose that. It may have been a joke to some people, I'm not here to joke. I'm here for serious business, I'm here to see Scranton survive and the casinos would have had a lot to do with bringing business Don't worry about the other back here. casinos or the other players out there, they are not paying our bills. We're not getting a dime out of them, don't worry about them, worry about ourselves and that went on deaf ears.

The Ice Box, past councils what did you do a dollar a year for a lease, yet you have six, seven-hundred-thousand dollars sitting down there, another joke past administration, past councils. The golf course went down the toilet, you paid a lot of money and blew 3 1/2 plus million dollars. Blew it. You didn't get nothing out of it, look where you are today.

Impact fees, you never once put a

25

impact fee on anybody around here. Look what the University has caused just in inconvenience to the people, but it's the University so we can't talk about them.

I brought up you should charge for police and fire at the commercial rate. You cut 50 percent of the costs from the taxpayers, never looked at it, never bothered to do anything about it. Sent out token money when you go out to the nonprofits.

A DOT scale off Davis Street or up River Street, how many million of dollars they bring in? You got an interstate, the blood line, you'd make a fortune on it. I'm in the transportation business, I know what it costs us.

What about natural gas vehicles in the city? I didn't see a single one come in here yet. How about looking into the possibility of the natural gas wells within the city? Do we have gas underneath us or don't we? If we do, we should be drilling for it, but we are not doing a thing about it and that's on city-owned land. We are

giving the land away, but we are not doing anything to capitalize.

How about windmills, which I brought up, reduce the electrical debt to the city, to the residents and the businesses. Nobody is bothering to look into it but we all own land, we have all of the issues out there but nobody wants to bother with it.

How about treating the natural gas well water that's being treated in the landfills and everywhere else, they're making millions of dollars? We have a sophisticated sewage treatment plant that treats the leachate from the landfills, why aren't we treating natural gas wells? There is millions of dollars there. Let's treat it in Ohio, let's treat it all over the place, yet we ignored it.

How about an RV park up on Nay Aug?

You got a whole blacktop area, nobody

markets it, nobody does nothing with it

where CMC use to use? You got the

opportunity to bring in touristry, business

for both the park, the city and other areas.

The parking garages, you went to

sell them but you are still left with the debt. How are you going to pay the debt back? Beat up more taxpayers? Whack them 19 percent. As Mr. Wechsler said, oh, it's time for the people to pay because they haven't paid for awhile. Well, they shouldn't have to pay anything if we did the proper management and ran the city like a business not like a free for all.

them back by the city and let the city start running them because you can't control and they are running rampant. You know,

Thanksgiving we dispose of a bunch of turkeys, well, right now in the city we are disposing of a bunch of citizens and taxpayers by hammering even more taxes without any resolution, how are you going to pay your debts? You haven't came up with one solid idea, I listened to them about the budget, there is one concrete thing here that says where we are going to generate funds from other than the pocket of the people in the city.

I bought a church, I save it, I paid

20

21

22

23

24

25

\$35,000, the taxes on it are now \$46,000 because the city and the county assessed it at half a million dollars for something we are going to tear down and you want to develop this city? You want growth to happen? You know, you got to put the responsibility where it is and you're like the three blind mice around this city, you have got to become creative, put this budget to the side and for once and for all in all of the years I have come here sit down and be creative because this city is not going anywhere with another tax increase. not going to destroy the city anymore than you have already done it, and if you continue where you are going and you put this budget in, guess what, gentlemen, you will be the ones who bury Scranton. you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else who wishes to address council on the budget proposal?

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening,
Council, still Marie Schumacher. I will
read my the questions that I have and then I
can send them in in the morning and we can

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

I would like to know the get answers. presumed assessed property values and the date of those assessments. I would like to know if the rental registration component of LIPS is self-sustaining. A rather big deal is being made of how our credit rating is going to improve by segregating the property taxes, but in reality this was dictated by the Court back in 2012 for the unfunded borrowings, we were told to increase the property values for a period of ten years and I would like the split on how much of this money that's being set aside is for the continuation of the payment of those prior unfunded debt borrowings and how much is going to cover new debt.

I would like to know when the terms of the \$13 million TAN will be available to the public. I would like to know how much PFM has expended in 2014 that will have to be paid in 2015, and how much is requested for PFM's for their 2015. With only 4.6 thousand dollars good for nonresident wage taxes through September two questions are begged: First, where are the rest of these

taxes and why have they not been transmitted on a monthly basis; and second, what is the basis for the 2015 estimate of \$450,000?

What is the support for increasing the licensing and permits \$1.1 million above the extrapolation of the 2014 collections to date?

Why is the state grant receipts line item zero for 2015? Isn't the state still funding two-thirds of the increase in the BA's salary, the addition of another person in the BA's Office, etcetera?

What accounts for the 500 percent increase in dues and subscriptions for 2015?

Please provide a breakdown of the capital expenditures that are in addition to the only one that was identified, which is fleet improvements.

How many swimming pools are being supported by this proposed budget for 2015 season?

I would like a definition of the commercial recycling program as I believe commercial trash must be privately contracted and I am having difficulty with

the role of the city in commercial recycling.

And I don't believe we can afford a part-time receptionist. Staffing requirements during vacation periods should be performed a temp, same as other people do.

Where is the OECD rent revenue?

Where is the rest of the \$500,000

parking tax revenues that PEL said would be raised by instituting this tax?

How much is included in the budget for the increase in both personnel and salaries that were a 100 percent funded by the state in 2014?

I thought Republic was administering the parking meters for a fee, but it appears from the budget we are reimbursing them for the citation issuers or paying the citation issuers? Are the citation issuers city employees or Republic employees?

Is the paint and size budget sufficient to replace all of the faded stop sign and street signs that are currently unreadable?

What has changed that the Law

Department needs to increase their budget by

one-third?

Why are we funding Scranton Tomorrow with \$30,000. Have they not been self-sufficient for 2013 and why can't they -- or 2014, why can't they do that again in 2015.

The Genesis Wildlife Center has been closed for many years so why is there a \$1,500 budget line item for them?

Why the large increase for the Civil Service Commission? What has changed to dictate that increase?

MR. ELLMAN: Hello, Council. I just have a question, why can't the city go after his goods and things and have an auction? Why should we have to suffer one more time because of some deadbeat? I think that's just a-- you know, I don't know that legalities, but he had \$150,000 a couple of months ago to give to this political party, he said he had a money to try and buy the

1 mall but he doesn't have money to take care of his debts, he is not filing bankruptcy. 2 3 I want to know why we can't go after him? Maybe Mr. Minora can tell will me. 4 5 MR. MCGOFF: This is the public 6 hearing on the budget. 7 MR. ELLMAN: I understand you can't 8 go over after his personal assets, but --9 MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Ellman --10 MR. ELLMAN: But I'm talking about we gave him \$3 million, why? I fought 11 12 against this one giving him a dime when he 13 owed I think a \$1,600,000. 14 MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Ellman? MR. ELLMAN: Yes. 15 16 MR. MCGOFF: This is a public 17 hearing on the budge. 18 MR. ELLMAN: Yes. MR. MCGOFF: You don't seem to be 19 20 speaking To the budget. 21 MR. ELLMAN: That's simple. Ιt 22 looked like something could be done. 23 know, nothing is ever done about anybody 24 that owes us money, nothing, or takes 25 property away from us. Nothing. You know,

2

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you people need to come off of this ivory tower you are on and start tasting reality. The city is broke. You have to start doing something for us besides listening to Mr. Amoroso's nonsense all the time. Thank you.

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council. Dave Dobrzyn, resident and taxes paid, fees paid as usual, I like to remind you of that, and I just have one comment, I heard at home watching that we are lowering mercantile taxes, we are missing a golden opportunity here and that golden opportunity is to form a Scranton only Chamber of Commerce because the current Chamber of Commerce has done nothing but to suck businesses out of this city. I put four transmissions in cars between 2002 and 2010 until the plant pulled out of town due to the tax cuts that they got on property voided and expired and Ford Transmissions they moved it up to Scott Township and they were going and, I mean, don't tell me the Chamber of Commerce wasn't involved, so it's time that we get our own Chamber of Commerce and then I'm perfectly

willing because I do shop mainly in Scranton to give them a break, but we need a separate Chamber of Commerce. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else who wishes to address council on the budget? On the budget, Mrs. Gallagher, or do you want to wait --

MS. GALLAGHER: On the budget.

MR. MCGOFF: Please.

MS. GALLAGHER: Good evening. I'm
Rosemary Gallagher and I'm a taxpayer in
Scranton, and this young man, I don't
remember his name, he left, but he
remembered that I have been paying for taxes
for 57 years, I think that's pretty good.

I will tell you I haven't stopped thinking about you all week because I -- just my heart goes out to you to tell you the truth because you up there are the fall guys almost. You know, other people are giving you jobs to do, they are putting pressure on you and everything else, and yet you have to come up with answers, and I hope I have some answers tonight.

My philosophy of government is that

we put you in the places you hold and then we go out and we shouldn't walk away, and that's just what's happening. And you say, well, you can handle it, that's all right and if you did something I don't like I'll let you have it. I don't think that's the way to do it, it's not the mature way and it certainly isn't my way.

So in my comings and goings I have come across a number of people who obviously knew that I was here and they said, "Rosemary, why you are getting so upset?"

I said, "Well, I'll tell will you why I'm upset because it's going to damage a an awful lot of people."

But they said, "But council does that every year."

So you have to suffer for what other council have done. They push up the price and then -- percentage rather and then they come down and it's a more reasonable situation. I said, "I have a feeling that this time they are really and truly going to raise that to 19 percent."

And I thought, well, you know, I do

feel that all of us have to be involved in government, all of us have to take the responsibility for whatever situation is so, therefore, I thought well, who could be involved in this? Well, you have the City Treasurer, you have the Collector of Taxes, you have that corporation that's supposed to collect, you know, delinquent taxes and everything else and they should come up with a tighter budget -- or not budget, but, I mean, they have to have a little more morale conscience, I think, and say, you know, we have got to do an awful lot to make this city more affordable, and I think somebody has to get after these people.

Also, I think that you should get all your department heads and say, look, we are in a mess and we need your help, you know, you like your jobs, you like your benefits and everything else then, okay, help us get the money to pay you. And I think you should say to them, okay, you have about two weeks to get to tell me what will result from a 10 percent cut in your budget and this way they all feel that they have an

obligation, they are part of the whole thing and they feel important. I'm afraid sometimes in government, any form of it, people think of it as a family, they are the children, they have their hand out and poppa has to come up with the wherewithal and they are not too mature about this whole think.

I remember I had attended a -- I was a manager in a meeting and the one thing I remembered is that he said that what goes unsupervised deteriorates, and I think there has to be a little more accountability top to bottom. I don't think any one group should have to do that, but I think everybody should do that and who does the job knows how to do the job so, therefore, they should be taken into consideration when you need more money. How can we help you do your work better and give us a sense of obligations.

I saw in the paper two days ago, in fact, that the third largest economic engine, we shall say, in the world is now going into recession and it was caused by one thing, they imposed a national sales tax

1

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and as a result people stopped buying and companies stopped buying so they are in a mess and they are in the third-quarter went into recession so have you to look at that, too. We can say, well, we wanted 19 percent, but I'll tell you honestly you won't get it. You will have more people not paying and that's not a good idea.

A couple of the months ago I think it was the Times published three pages, three pages, solid pages, they were the smallest type they possibly could of people that have not paid their taxes and I was I was astounded. 5,000, 10,000, astounded. 30,000, and yet we are paying a company and giving them 25 percent to get the money in, so these are the little holes on the wall that I think we have to fill, and we can only do it if we welcome everybody and encourage everybody to come forth with some kind of idea, some kind of solid idea for getting more money in. The money isn't there and where are going to get it from? So we have to get everybody to pay and then you will see that we don't have such an

indebtedness. Thank you very much.

MR. GALLAGHER: Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you very much.

Anyone else who wishes to address council on the budget?

MR. WALSH: Can I approach and hand you guys this stuff? My name is Jay Walsh, I live in Greenridge, I have been for the last 30 years, probably 40 years out of my 58 years on the planet. I'm the founder of Occupy Wall Street. It's the worldwide movement, actually a Jesus movement, spiritual in nature.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Walsh, is this on the budget?

MR. WALSH: Yes, I'm just putting myself in context, sir. As far as your budget is concerned, I think it's a lot of smoke and mirrors. I believe that the innovative thinking that Mr. Bolus had mentioned should be examined because when people lead leaders follow, okay? What's insanity, four years of doing the same thing and expecting different results, okay?

There is called the Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania, not the Selectwealth. I'm very disappointed and I'm have a criminal complaint pending with the incoming mayor about the \$5 million that you guys get in gaming funds and put it to organizations that have lots of funding options. The Radisson, people that don't matter and are only employed there, okay? So insanity is doing the same thing over expecting different results, I don't believe you or the mayor concerning the budget. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else? This public hearing is closed.

<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