	1
1	
2	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
3	
4	
5	
6	HELD:
7	
8	Thursday, January 22, 2015
9	
10	LOCATION:
11	Council Chambers
12	Scranton City Hall
13	340 North Washington Avenue
14	Scranton, Pennsylvania
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR – OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
25	

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL:

ROBERT MCGOFF, PRESIDENT

PATRICK ROGAN, VICE-PRESIDENT

WAYNE EVANS

JOSEPH WECHSLER

WILLIAM GAUGHAN

LORI REED, CITY CLERK

JAMIE MARCIANO, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

AMIL MINORA, SOLICITOR

1	MR. MCGOFF: Please rise for the
2	Pledge of Allegiance and we have a special
3	guest, Eagle Scout Brian BoutonBrandon
4	Bouton, I'm sorry, will lead us in the
5	allegiance.
6	MR. BOUNTON: Could everyone please
7	place their had over their heart for the
8	Pledge of Allegiance.
9	(Pledge of Allegiance recited and
10	moment of reflection observed.)
11	MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. Roll call,
12	please.
13	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Wechsler.
14	MR. WECHSLER: Here.
15	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan.
16	MR. ROGAN: Here.
17	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Evans.
18	MR. EVANS: Here.
19	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Gaughan.
20	MR. GAUGHAN: Here.
21	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
22	MR. MCGOFF: Here. At this point in
23	time we do have a proclamation for our Eagle
24	Scout and if Brandon and his family I would
	II

like welcome to come forward.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. It's an honor to read this proclamation. I have known Brandon and his family for quite some time, congratulations.

WHEREAS, the COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON is desirous of honoring "BRANDON JAMES BOUTON", son of Brian Bouton and Christine Stange-Bouton and grandson of Lance and Nancy Stange and Al and Christine Bouton; and

WHEREAS, "BRANDON", a sophomore at Scranton High School, is a member of the Ski Club and played violin in the school orchestra; and

WHEREAS, "BRANDON" is studying welding at the Career Technology Center of Lackawanna County where he was named Student of the Month for December 2014. His future plans include attending Johnson College and enlisting in the United States Navy to be an underwater welder; and.

WHEREAS, "BRANDON" is a member of the Hickory Street Presbyterian Church and also attends the First United Church of Christ; and

WHEREAS, "BRANDON" began his scouting career in 2005 as a Tiger Cut at Cub Pack 42. Upon transferring to Cub Pack 16, he progressed through Webelos 2 and earned the Arrow of Light Award; and.

WHEREAS, "BRANDON" crossed over into Boy Scouts in Troop 16 in 2010 where he has held the positions of patrol leader, instructor, and Scoutmaster for Troop 16.

"BRANDON" is a member of the Order of the Arrow Lowwapaneu Lodge 191 and received his brotherhood membership in 2014. He was presented with the God and Life Award in December 2014 at the First United Church of Christ; and

WHEREAS, for his Eagle Scout

Project, "BRANDON" organized and conducted

fund raising to provide labor and materials

to stain 462 linear feet of fencing at

Marley's Mission, Clarks Summit. His

project contributed materially to the

appearance of and extending the life span of
the fencing; and

WHEREAS, "BRANDON" participated in the Honor Flight Philadelphia trip to

Washington, D.C. where he served as a Guardian to the World War II United States Army Veteran. He has also attended numerous camping trips to Good Pond, Antietam, Gettysburg, Washington, D.C. and the Florida Keys.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that on Thursday, January 22, 2015, Scranton City Council wishes to congratulate "BRANDON JAMES BOUTON", his Family, Scout Leaders and Teachers for his outstanding achievements and extend our best wishes for success in all future endeavors.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Proclamation be made a permanent part of the Minutes of this Council, as lasting tribute to "BRANDON JAMES BOUTON".

MR. ROGAN: I'd like to make a motion to take from the table the resolution regarding the memorandum of understanding between the City and the Fraternal Order of Police.

MR. WECHSLER: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

MR. WECHSLER: Aye.

MR. ROGAN: Aye.

MR. EVANS: No.

MR. GAUGHAN: No.

MR. MCGOFF: 1

Ī

MR. MCGOFF: The ayes have it and so

moved. Just a brief comment, when people, you know, the youth of today and what they are doing, it's nice to know that there are students and young men like Brandon that exemplify what the future generation will be, what their generation will be. And congratulation to Brandon and a fine example for all of us and especially for your family

congratulations again.

and your Boy Scout Troop.

The motion that was just made by and approved by council is to remove the memorandum of understanding concerning the police contract from the table. It will be in Fifth Order this evening. It's removed from the table to allow for discussion and possibly introduction of it, had it remained on the table by rule there could be no discussion on that particular issue, so that will be in Fifth Order and anyone who wishes

1 to speak to that please did so during citizens' participation. 2 3 I would also like to or need to mention that prior to our caucus this 4 5 evening we had a brief executive session concerning a personnel matter and by rule we 6 7 need to announce that at the next possible 8 meeting, it was very brief meeting and, as I 9 said, it was just to discuss a personnel 10 issue. Anything from council? No. 11 12 MS. REED: THIRD ORDER. 3-A. SINGLE TAX OFFICE CITY FUNDS DISTRIBUTED COMPARISON 13 14 REPORT 2014-2013. MR. MCGOFF: Are there any comments? 15 16 If not, received and filed. 17 MS. REED: 3-B. TAX ASSESSOR'S 18 RESULTS REPORT FOR HEARING DATE HELD JANUARY 7, 2015. 19 20 MR. MCGOFF: Are there any comments? 21 If not, received and filed. MS. REED: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZEN'S 22 PARTICIPATION. 23 24 MR. MCGOFF: Joan Hodowanitz. 25 MS. HODOWANITZ: Joan Hodowanitz,

Scranton resident. I am so mad I could spit nails. I have asked for several weeks after you passed the 2015 operating budget on December 4 for that to be posted to the website and it was posted on the website on January 12. If the version on the website is the same one, as I understand it that you approved on December 4 so someone please tell me why on the desk in the Clerk's Office there is a beautiful bound copy of the budget and it says "File of Council No. 58, and the numbers do not match the numbers in the copy on the website.

Now, I'm a taxpayer and I have a right to that information. I offered to pay the money to put it on the website. I did everything but kiss Mr. Bulzoni's derriere. Why is the version different? Is it going to change every week?

MR. MCGOFF: I was unaware --

MS. HODOWANITZ: It is.

MR. MCGOFF: I was unaware that there was a discrepancy and I have no idea why there is one.

MS. HODOWANITZ: Since January 12 I

printed that document off the website and I have been analyzing it on Excel and now I'm going to do it all over again. Now, I want to know why the numbers were changed, why there was no announcement made to the public that the numbers have changed, do you even know as a council that the numbers have changed? You should. This isn't Monopoly money, it's my money and their money. Okay.

Next thing, since you are taking the FOP memorandum after the table I want to remind the public that next Wednesday at 11 a.m. is the Composite Pension Board meeting in this room. I believe before that they have police and fire pension meetings, I don't know if those two were open to the public. The Composite Board at 11 is open to the public. If you are concerned about the distressed status of these pensions you might want it attend if you're able to get here. Wednesday at 11 a.m. in this room.

What's the status of the 2013 audit?

MR. MCGOFF: I have no --

MS. HODOWANITZ: I saw a hand go up.

MR. MCGOFF: I have not asked that

question.

MS. HODOWANITZ: I'd like to know that next week, and I do have some good news, I was at the VA and I found out that if you are a veteran and you have 100 percent disability and you are income is under \$87,212 you are exempt from paying real estate tax and I would like to every veteran that qualifies to know this because you are do not want to get hosed by the county, the school board and the state. If you are entitled to that benefit, by all means take it. We deserve it.

As you were mentioning when you begin council meeting to remember those who have passed away, I would like to mention Attorney Robert Gownley, Sr., 104 years old. I understand he was the oldest member of the Pennsylvania Bar Association and he had his credentials current as of last year. Wonderful, wonderful man.

MR. MCGOFF: Yes, and thank you for mentioning that. I neglected to.

MS. HODOWANITZ: He's the kind of citizen we need more of. Thank you. That's

all I have.

2

3

Hodowanitz.

4

Gerard Hetman.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Ms.

5

MR. HETMAN:

Good evening, Council.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Gerard Hetman from Lackawanna County Community Relations Department, good to see you as always. To begin this evening, many of the programs that we mentioned out of the County Commissioner's Office at the start of the year come from the Lackawanna County branch of the Penn State extension. mention three of those programs this evening. Each of the programs I will mention has sessions that start in early February. Some of them run just for a few weeks where as others carry out over many months or they may have one or more sessions later in the year, but because of their different start dates and run times just to consolidate I'll mention the number for Penn State extension at the end of remarks and encourage anyone who is interested in one or more of the programs to contact our Penn State Extension Office.

With that in mind, our first program is a called Dining with Diabetes. It's a program that helps adults who suffer from Type II diabetes to manage their illness through diet and exercise programs. There are four classes in the program, each are taught by registered dieticians. The cost to participate is \$40 for one person or \$55 for two family members in the same household and financial assistance is available to those who may struggle to pay that cost.

Second program is called Growing
Stronger, strength training classes for
older adults. This is a 12-week class to
help older adults improve muscle strength
and bone density through fitness training
and we should note here that older adults as
defined by the Penn State Extension's Office
are any individuals age 40 and up. Please,
that's not our department putting that
qualification in there, but anyone who is
age 40 and older is eligible to participate.
The classes are held at the Advocacy Senior
Center and the West Scranton Senior Center.
The cost to participate is \$115 and

2

4

5

7

6

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

financial assistance is available to those who may not be able to make the entire payment to participate.

The third program is known as the Strengthening Families Program and this is a program for young adults age 10 to 14 years old to avoid substance abuse and other problematic behaviors that they may encounter in their adolescent years. sessions are all held at the Carbondale Middle School, and because I also represent the commissioners through the City of Carbondale and the Carbondale School District I have had chance to meet a number of those students and faculty members who participated in the program in recent years. They speak very highly as to its effectiveness and its ability to be a game changer in the life of a young adult, and any young adult from he Lackawanna County can participate. There is certainly no restrictions on residency. They would have a have to travel to Carbondale, but again, a it is a very effective program and we encourage everyone in the city and beyond to

take a look if they feel that their child may benefit or they may benefit from participation.

So, again, the registration required, there is registration required for each program, and some of them run long, some of them have several sessions throughout the year. So we encourage everyone who has an interest in one or more items to contact the Penn State Extension in Lackawanna County, the phone number is 570-963-6842. It's 570 963-6842.

And our second program to mention, the second item to mention is the annual Lackawanna County winter golf clinic. This is the first of many camps, clinics and sports leagues that are hosted by the Lackawanna County Parks and Recreation Department. The lessons are held at South Scranton Intermediate School and the program runs from February 23 to March 20. They are all taught by PGA certified instructors. There are four weekly sessions for adults and children. The children sessions I believe are all held on Friday afternoons.

The adult sessions are held Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. Also, if an individual couldn't make it let's say Monday they could go to the Tuesday session or the Wednesday session and so on and so forth for adults. The cost is \$40 per person to participate and the individuals must register before February 20 by calling 570-963-6764. Again, it's Lackawanna County parks and Recreation Department, 570-963-6764.

That's all I have for this evening.

Are there any questions from council?

MR. MCGOFF: No, but, I would like to -- I can now tell my children that they are officially old.

MR. HETMAN: I completely understand. Again, Penn State Extension's definition, not ours. Your counterparts in Carbondale were quite surprised when I told them that on Tuesday night, but there you have it. Thanks you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank, Mr. Hetman.
Ron Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: Hello, Council. I was

24

25

walking around Honesdale this morning after lunch and I never been there before, and I noticed all of the businesses downtown. I think it's Ninth Street, I don't know if it's downtown, they all had a little sticker for the Chamber of Commerce. You know, this Chamber of Commerce has been pathetic for 50 years. My son showed me on the computer, we went back and back and back there is not one positive thing they have done for the city. Nothing. I don't know how I come to this conclusion really, it's just listening to people but I believe this administration has been taken orders from the Chamber of Commerce through Amoroso this whole year who dictates to the mayor how things are supposed to be. Fortunately, they seem to turn out just to be one failure after another but nobody I have talked to can figure out why the Chamber wanted to go spend \$65,000 to go through all of this with the city. Well, I won't go on. This man is just a snack oil salesman and he hasn't given us anything positive in a year.

Which brings about I hope Mr. McHale

shows more respect for the people of Dunmore than he did this city about selling the Sewer Authority. Today's paper ought to show with all of that interest in it their rates will skyrocket, there is no doubt about it and there are smarter people than me saying that.

Well, I guess I've alienated you for the night so I'll say something positive as much as I don't -- I don't like Al Boscov I'm going to tell you a foolproof method what to do with that mall and if you don't like my idea I want to say that I don't see a thing wrong with a casino, but I don't think it's just -- I don't think it would be ever be feasible, and it just seems like something so farfetched, but it's certainly -- I don't know gamble anymore.

Last Friday I was in Allentown and I went to eat at a place called Farmer's

Market, I don't know if any of you all have been to the fairgrounds, but it's a good ways from downtown, like, two or three miles isn't it, Mr. McGoff? Anyways, it's far from town so they can have buildings and

24

25

parking and animals and so forth, and Farmer's Market is the inside it's a closed building, it's about the size of a football field I would say. There is a row of stores and a row of stores and then two more row of They are made up of restaurants, sandwich shops, meat markets, just everything you can think of and they are small businesses, little tiny businesses, you know, like the size up there where you are sitting and this place is packed. It's open Thursday, Friday and Saturday. I'm not telling you it's busy, it's so packed you just sort of got to go through wiggle around and go through it, and that mall would work for this. You got houses all around it and, I mean, apartments right downtown. You got buses, you got parking, if they could make that place in Allentown that busy you can certainly do it with the mall here, but you got to do something quick before these universities steal another piece of property and that will be the end of the city right there when they take that away, and I wish one of you could go see this place over the

weekend. Like I said, it would fit into that mall and it would save that mall and the surrounding areas downtown. I guess that's all the brilliant things I have to say tonight.

MR. MCGOFF: Well, thank you for your brilliance.

MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for letting me talk and I really wish somebody would go see this mall in operation over the weekend and consider it, because this is our savior for the mall. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Bob Bolus.

MR. BOLUS: Good evening, Council, Bob Bolus, Scranton. On 6-G I believe it should be tabled until other areas of revenue are looked into and usually if are you passing a garbage fee then you have to pass this fee across everyone within the City of Scranton, that's your KOZ's, your nonprofits. That's the purpose of a fee. This is basically a taxation without representation because we pay taxes to have our garbage picked up and taken care of and

now we are being taxed basically for more to do what? We are not getting any other benefits out of if. It's the same garbage that people put out one bag here, two bags there, yet all of the nonprofits in the city whether they have it done commercially or otherwise should be paying a fee.

I brought it up in the past that if you put a 1 percent fee on everybody in this city on their gross it will include all your KOZ's and nonprofits, and they will have to now then pay their favor share. That's been ignored time and time again. As I said, if you increase the tax base you will decrease the tax rate. Here you are increasing the tax rate and increasing the tax base and that's unfair to the people of this community so there should be other avenues to look at this or put it across everybody. Other than that, it's a fee that can't be challenged.

On the contract, I'll elaborate more on that in the Fifth Order, I guess,

Mr. McGoff, it will be Fifth Order as far as the contract; am I correct?

2

3

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MCGOFF: I'm sorry?

MR. BOLUS: Are you going to have somebody, like, speaking on it in Fifth Order regarding the contracts?

MR. MCGOFF: No, you have an opportunity now.

MR. BOLUS: Okay. As far as I'm concerned with the contract, it should be out here, it shouldn't be in a backroom in caucus, this was issues we had many, many times over many, many years. We need open discussions here because the people who can't be here have to rely on what they may read in the Scranton Times or the newscast or whatever it may be. When they hear it here and it's live no matter how long it takes they are now informed and they may want to attend a meeting, but if they can't have that opportunity it's not only unfair to them but it's unfair to our union employees because people are looking at them in different lights, just like Ned Abrahamsen said, "Oh, well, let's keep this quiet on this end, we can't show our hand here because somebody over here will know

what's going on."

That's totally unfair to union members because people look at them in a different light because their taxes are going up, say pay them this or their pensions, so in all honesty to the people, council and the administration should bring it out in the open and that's doing it the right way and the honest way for people in the city that are going to be burdened in paying these new increases and everything else.

On East Mountain Road when that was widened, and Mr. Wechsler brought that up that he was involved with East Mountain Road and Joe knows what it was like before, but right now it's dangerous, in fact, it's more dangerous now than it was before because when it snows and you have a plow or one of the fire trucks trying to get down that mountain cars are parked all along the edge of it. What was the purpose of widening the road out if people are all parked there and it's still a narrow two-lane road? There should be off-road parking there or make it

a snow emergency that when it snows these people pull in their driveways like they did in the past. That's for the safety of everybody up there and I think that's seriously got to be looked into. I came down here the other day and I'm in the towing recovery business and we are accustomed to being out in the snow, it's very slick and anybody could have hit him especially where it curves, so it's a serious issue and it has to be addressed.

On the casino, Mr. McGoff, I'm going to raise this issue because I was a little upset with the comment last week that this isn't a city issue, this casino idea is definitely a city issue. It's not an issue for Dunmore, Throop, the Abingtons, it's the city that's in dire need of salvation. As a business, I have been in business over 50 years, the last thing I do is put the cart before the horse. I don't need to go ask the gaming board, "Here is my application, now do you want to go look at it."

This is the legislator's problem.

This is their responsibility why they stood

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

up and took an oath. This is the responsibility of this council, the administration, the legislators, state representatives to come forward and send a letter to the Gaming Board asking them would they consider a license for the City of Scranton for a casino. If they say yes, they will, we will be more than glad to tell you who we are and what we are all about because we are about saving Scranton and you are not investing one penny of what we intend to do, and if you want to see the city die ignore what I'm saying and you will see it die, you will see the county take over the mall and spend your tax dollars but Scranton will die if you don't stop and pay attention and think from a businessman's point of view not from some ridiculous statement that this isn't the city's problem or go get a license or make application without support. If you want to support it, we'll tell you who we are at that time.

And last, I brought up last week about Carrie Newcomb, I asked that she be removed from the zoning board, this is about

me, not Mr. Miller, she made statements about me, she made them public, and I'm -- she put it on the internet, however, it got out there, I really don't care. She is a city official and she made comments derogatory to me and I'm asking that she be removed or I will litigate it and you can take me on that, you can take my word on that right to the bank. This is your responsibility, she is a city official, she was blasted nationally and made us all look like a bunch of fools in the city again no more than we couldn't even pay our employees. Okay.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you.

MR. BOLUS: That's what I'm asking.

I won't ask again. Thank you.

MR. MILLER: Good evening. Doug
Miller, Scranton. You know, just to
reiterate feelings on what took place last
week, I'm not going to get into the
specifics of the contract, really not
relevant for me to do that tonight, what
really disturbed me though throughout the
whole process is just the fact that it

20

21

22

23

24

25

room and the public is not aware of what's going on. Again, I'm really interested in the fact that people are welcome to go back in this office, we are talking become thousands of people who have an inability to get down here on a Thursday night and rely on the public access because one thing we all know, gentleman, that camera doesn't lie and I think what we have seen since this majority of council has taken over we have seen a lot of smoke and mirrors and a lack of transparency and that's not how government is supposed to be. You know, I hope that you wouldn't continue to pull the wool over the public's eyes because you are doing that them a disjustice. Remember, you represent us, it's not the other way around and until we lose that mentality we are now going to move anywhere.

really upsets me when things go on in a back

You know, this morning we saw the article again talking about selling off assets, you know, we're talking about the Sewer Authority again. You know, it just really discourages me to see this and, you

know, we knew it was something that was going to come forward and was recognized under the Amoroso plan and, you know, I just question that these aren't real solutions.

Selling assets aren't solutions.

We elected a council, we elected a mayor who came claim they had plan through the election. We get here. Not interested in a man from New Jersey, interested in the people that we put in these seats and we haven't heard anything. Heard a lot of promises, a lot of plans throughout the campaign, talk is cheap, let's see some work. Haven't seen any yet.

You know, we talk about the need for people to come up here and be positive and, you know, I brought up positive suggestion for many years, a lot of other people have brought up positive suggestions, but, you know, going back to January again, I just think ever since this council has taken over, and I just solely speak for myself, but I feel when I walk into this chamber I don't get the same feeling that I used to get in the past. I get a feeling of

22

23 24 25 darkness, I get a feeling of just a lot of disrespect from our elected officials and that really upsets me. I don't believe we are taken serious. I believe the insults and the mockery that's made of us is very insulting and I think the gestures speak volumes from our leaders and, you know, I'm a grown individual and I really don't need to have, you know, people offer gestures that don't belong here, and it's not just me it's a lot of other people that come up here and are treated improperly and that needs to change. The attitude from our leaders needs to change if we want to talk about being positive because it starts with you people, not us.

Tuesday night I had a chance to attend a neighborhood meeting in South Side and, you know, I have had a chance through the years to attend a lot of meetings, I know I saw Mr. Wechsler over in Greenridge a few weeks ago and I know you folks have a chance to go around and you get a real education when you talk to these people and you just sit back and you listen to them for

1

3

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a few moments and having the chance to listen to some senior citizens who I basically just get the idea that they are totally disgusted with what's going on in this city over taxation, blight, people just trying to get out of here as quick as they can, and it's really disheartening to hear that, but you hear a lot of sad stories because there is a lot of poverty. You know, particularly, we talk South Side in particular and what's going on there and how it just spread throughout this entire city, throughout West Side, the Hill Section, everywhere. And, you know, a lot of these individuals are looking for solutions and they have really given up on the system.

You know, you talk about 30 percent of the voters coming out in the election and how that's a really troubling thing and that it's easy to throw in the towel and give up, but that's really not going to solve the problem. You know, as they talked about the need if we are not satisfied with where are government is taking us, well, then in four years you hand them the pink slip and you

25

hire people that are independent and are willing to do the right thing, put politics aside, and I think everybody at that meeting and just a lot of the pulse you get from the citizens in this community are that politics has just completely destroyed the city and the more we continue to play that game we are just going to continue to kill off the city that's, quite frankly, already on life support and we have come to the point now where we are just waiting on when we are going to pull the plug, and bankruptcy was brought up and it's been brought up here many times and when that discuss has been brought up a lot of those people are criticized and ridiculed for talking about that, but I think that's something that at this point we have all acknowledged has to be serious discussion at this point because we have nothing coming from this chamber, we have nothing coming from downstairs, and we just have to wonder where we are really going here. Is there a light at the end of this tunnel. So I'm hoping we can see some leadership moving forward.

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

MR. MORGAN: Good evening, Council. I'd glad everybody has there suit on today. It makes me very confident. You know, I think it's time to realize one thing, the government is not serving us, the people are serving government. We are prisoners to government's lack of the action and inaction generally. There is no where for this city to go at this point. You know, we have listened to all of the silliness we can listen to, we need to take a look at the American Anglian deal that was entered into during the Connors' administration and there needs to be some real discussion where the money came from to pay that debt off.

Selling parking garages and a billion dollar asset the Sewer Authority is just ludicrous and, of course, people are going to line up because they are going to make millions and millions of dollars, but the average citizens aren't going to make any money, they are going to be billed for it all. And, you know, when you look at the

increases in the sewer rates is how much of is that is responsible for, you know, the borrowing that took place when they created this privatization of the Scranton Sewer Authority?

You know, another thing is I have no ax to grind with the municipal unions, but, you know, I really feel bad for them in a way because they have never really earned the money they deserve, you got to be honest about that if you are truthful to yourself but, you know, a city and a government without money that's borrowed itself out so far really can't pay the people that work for it.

You know, on the way here today down in front of Mr. Z's there was an accident, we had fire and police there, they do a great job, there is no doubt. And I have to ask myself another -- reason another thing is why were there pensions never fully funded for people that serve us so well? There is no doubt that we are really in a tough situation, and I don't -- I don't agree with this new contract that's come

here before the council for a multitude of reasons, but it's not that I don't respect the fire and police, I just think it's the wrong plan and I think we need a better plan than the one we have been presented.

You know, Mr. McGoff I don't know -maybe you can answer this, do you know how you control your future? Do you know how to

MR. MCGOFF: How to control my

MR. MORGAN: Yeah, when you are talking about government how do you control your future if you are in government?

MR. MCGOFF: I really don't

MR. MORGAN: Well, if you are trying to make a city prosperous and create a future for it how do you do that?

MR. MCGOFF: You do it by making

Well, in order to control your future you have to control your past, so if we enter into contracts that offer the city no future we are not

2

4

3

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

controlling our past to give ourselves a future. If we keep borrowing and selling our all of our assets off we won't have a future then either.

You know, there is more to government than getting dressed up and, you know, the saddest part of it all is that you had a whole year to take this budget apart and look at it. Now, I'm going to be honest in my opinion we have got four politicians on council and one statesman, and the only reason I say we have a statesman there is because, Mr. Evans, you volunteered for that job, you weren't elected and I respect you for that, there is no doubt about it. you know, when you take a look at the inability to sell property in this city and when you take a look at all of the fees and all of the taxes we have don't you think it's time to reorganize city government? Don't you think it's time to live within our means? Do you possibly think it's that time to stop doing borrowing and tax anticipation? I mean, how is the city going to have a future?

You know, they are talking about a new plan for the mall, any business you put in this city is going to be strangled by a lack of credible leadership, by the people that were elected and when you see all of the people that have walked away from the vote you can't deny that they're disgusted, but the most important thing they have is their vote, and when you look at seniors, retired people that are grandparents and their grandchildren are somewhere else they have to look at themselves for not grabbing ahold of this government and making it a function so their children can grow up here and their grandchildren can be here.

You know, the Scranton Chamber of Commerce is going to come up with a new Scranton plan, but the one thing they forget is a legitimate government that understands the constraints government has and the ability to borrow. Even the county is almost at the limit of its borrowing and the city is well beyond that and, you know, the new Act 47 that's nothing because the legislature doesn't want to face up to their

21222324

25

20

And, you know, discussing things in back rooms, that belongs in bar rooms, okay? When you are talking about government, that should take place in the open so that people can see government function and get confidence that government is functioning but in this country they know government is not functioning, but keep wearing pretty skirts and blouses and maybe it will all work out. Thank you.

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council.

Dave Dobrzyn, resident.

own problems. They are 50 or 60 billion

dollars down in pension debt and the last

you know, the truth of the matter is this,

because you are elected doesn't mean you are

ability to lead because in order to lead you

something we are missing here because maybe

a leader and it doesn't mean you have the

thing they want is the city's debt.

leaders lead, but you know what?

you need intellect and maybe that's

there is no thought taking place.

MR. GAUGHAN: Good evening.

MR. DOBRZYN: Taxes paid so far. I

4

5

8

9

7

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have a concern here and the concern is with our websites. Once again the last time I was here I mentioned that our quality of life ordinance is not listed on the website. Personally, I feel that all of the ordinances even before they were adopted It's should be listed on the website. nearly impossible to make any kind of constructive critique or suggestions if you don't know what you are talking about. ashame that we don't use this website because at times people are going to get unpleasant surprises unless they run around and jump through hoops and get down to the library and pay money on top of what they have already paid for net service which is somewhere around \$180 a month for your triple play, and if you go to the phone company for one thing and the television company for another you wind up with pretty much the same charges so you can't win for losing.

And I'd also like council to look into cash for clunkers. There are several towing companies in the area that have a

salvage license and if you have a clunker in the backyard that you have been a dang gum good fix or God knows how long, you can get one hundred or 200 bucks for it, sometimes more, and if you could drive it to the salvage yard sometimes it's as high as \$500 so certainly that's preferable to having it hauled off and paying \$150 fine or whatever and you should have on that list license salvage toe operators, there are several of them, I know one, I'll give you a name and number at the end of the night and hopefully you request look into it.

On trash, once again, we have a high trash fee this year, and I see where a lot of people just don't care about recycling which lowers the landfill rates, but also I'm also concerned from what I can deduce landlords get to pay partial years and so forth, I don't see that as proper and here's why. We have to buy trucks, we have to employ men, we have to supply fuel and maintenance and everything else and we have to drive-by that house just to see if there is a trash there all year and then at the

1

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

end of the year there are back looking for a break. That is not suitable. If they want to be in business fine, pay what everybody else pays because I'm not getting on to look any easier.

And as far as your transparency, I have to give this last year a great deed because of the lack of the use of the website for ordinances and whatever, it's just not right to have to jump through hoops, and now in Harrisburg I don't know if you got any of these, but I got this mailing in my mailbox the he last day or so, don't let wealthy nonprofits change the rules and stick homeowners with the bigger tax bill, so it would be my hope that you do some research into in as I intend to and I think they get enough of a break already. don't need -- and it's not all nonprofits, it's tax exempts, it has nothing to do with There is a man named Larusso, he nonprofit. had the tea party express, he conned people out of million of dollars to start television stations, never produced, now he is collecting money for veterans and he pays

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

himself about 30 or 40 percent. He paid himself a million dollars last year, collected about two and a half or three, shame on him but, you know, he is a nonprofit.

And finally, we have the Transpacific Trade Pack. Well, if you are sick and tired of hearing about people complaining the money they are in the making anymore and you are sick and tired of hearing about the jobless and you are sick and tired of hearing about how much taxes aren't being collected because wage taxes -because people aren't making money anymore call your national government, your federal government representatives, and the president and tell them to take their Transpacific Trade Pack and stuff it in the trash can or wherever else they have to do it. Thank you and have a good night.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening,
Council, Marie Schumacher, taxpayer. First,
I'd like to thank the Times-Tribune, which I
intended to do last week for all of the

articles they have written on the MOU and seeking professional out-of-area input, and for the DPW for the job they have been doing on the streets. I think they have done a good job this time and I'd like to thank them for that, and Joan for the time and effort that she is put into this budget and for revealing tonight to us that numbers change from the time the budget was approved by you all last year and what is currently apparently the official version.

Especially on troubling on top of the Controller's revelation last year, all of the inappropriate transfers that were made between accounts throughout the year and I think somebody really needs to sit down and talk to the business administrator and maybe give them a copy of the rules and regulations of how to operate.

And a few -- couple of things. Is this the final year that Rossi will be doing the audit before it's put out to bid?

MR. ROGAN: I believe so.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Could somebody find that out, I don't know who is in charge of

the that area, but if somebody could check.

MR. ROGAN: We could check. I'm almost certain it's being bid out again this year.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay, but I'd like a for sure. And will PEL come up and present the revised recovery plan next week, which is the last -- I believe the last Thursday in January which I thought was the intent.

MR. MCGOFF: I do have a letter from PEL that I can access in a moment and I'll answer during motions.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Thank you. And on rental registration I don't know whose bailiwick that falls in, but for next week I would like to know during calendar year '14 what the number of the registered properties was and how many of the inspections that are required by the ordinance that invokes the fee have been performed. Who should I look to for response on that?

MR. EVANS: I'll find out for you.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Thank you. And then, Mr. Rogan, it's been a long time since

you reported on all of the defaulted loans over the last decade, maybe you could do that next week and let us know what the status is of all of those?

MR. ROGAN: Sure, I'll reach out to Attorney Hickey and Linda.

MS. SCHUMACHER: There is way too many. And then this was brought up during the caucus, but it wasn't really assigned to anybody so I would like to know with certainty what the contract with Joyce for the replacement of the streetlights what it specifies files as far as replacement time that was guaranteed from the report to the fixing of the lights and the replacement.

And I will be anxious to sit down and listen to what you are going to do discuss with regard to the MOU tonight, I do hope it's not introduced, I'm looking forward to -- I'm sure you will be sharing the information that you were scheduled to receive this week, I do have a comment on that.

And I would also one thing that really troubled me is back in 2012 there was

24

25

a police officer that got in some kind of hot water and the powers that be, I guess the District Attorney and whoever refused to press criminal charges but reverted back to the chief of police and there was action apparently taken that was reported, but we don't know what that person did, and that really bothers me because you cannot help -we need to trust our police and by and large I do, but somebody did something that was serious enough to go to the District Attorney for possible criminal and that's protected by the contract, and I did not realize that this memorandum of understanding was an actual renegotiation of the contract because that's something -that's a clause I think should be deleted from there for one thing, and I came down to verify that it was, in fact, illegal because I was incredulous that it could possibly -that that information was not available to the public, so I did go down and reviewed the contract and I got several pages, actually quite a few, reproduced after my review and what troubles me now, and I'll

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

conclude with this, is there is a reluctant, it was apparent to me from Mr. Abrahamasen to include the six officers that were to be named by name, but yet on page six of the existing contract that was in the settlement by and between the City of Scranton and Lodge No. 2 of the Fraternal Order of Police, Item No. 9, it says, "Upon their retirement from employment, the city shall provide bargaining unit members," and there is one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight names, their spouses and dependents with the health insurance benefits free of charge that were in effect at the date of retirement for their lives and that of their spouse.

Now, if it could be done then why can't it be done now? You can't help but wonder if it wasn't included and to deceive us. If they are reluctant to put those names in and tighten that up then I have to wonder if it wasn't meant to be a big open door, and I'll see you next week. I hope that's not reintroduced tonight. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else who wishes

to address council? Just to answer the question you had about the recovery plan, we did receive a draft copy today via e-mail, it's 59 pages so I did not have chance to look at it, a final copy will be made available next week, the 29th, it will be made available to council. To the administration and also to the office for public inspection, and we will request of PEL and they did say that they would come to a public caucus in council chambers to present the final draft of the recovery plan, so when we have that finalized we will have that.

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

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Wechsler?

MR. WECHSLER: Thank you,

Mr. McGoff. Last week I seconded a motion to table the memo of understanding and the reason why I did that is that last week was we really didn't have enough time to consume the information that was given to us and also there was some information that was lacking that I needed to start making an

informed decision. Since that time last week I had met with Mayor Courtright and Attorney Abrahamsen and I have also had phone conversations with Chief Graziano, Solicitor Shrive, Union President Paul Helring and John Judge. The administration has provided us with information of the benefits and costs of the proposed contract. I'm still evaluating the numbers and I do still share some concerns about the health insurance for our retirees, but I think at this time the information that's forthcoming from the administration is what it is, and I think we have to evaluate it and make our best informed decision.

One again, I am still concerned about the health benefits for the retirees. Attorney Abrahamsen is supposed to get me some more information on that and I am waiting for that, but tonight I will be voting to reintroduce this legislation because I think by next week we do have to have this decision to vote on this up or down. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Rogan?

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROGAN: Yes, a few comments regarding the new contract and the concessions from the police union, and I want to take a stroll down memory lane for a minute here, and this placed in my mailbox today, I don't know who requested it, but I certainly appreciate it because it will come in handy and I do want to read this.

"Background. After negotiations between EB Jermyn Lodge No. 2 with the Fraternal Order of Police and the City of Scranton for a collective bargaining agreement to be effective June 2008 and failed to reach an agreement, an impasse was declared and the parties requested an Act 111 arbitration panel. The FOP designated Thomas W. Jenkins to serve as it's party designated arbitrator and the city designated Timothy P. O'Reilly to serve as it's party designated arbitrator. party arbitrators then designated Edward J. O'Connor to serve as the impartial chair of In lieu of evidentiary hearings, the panel. the parties agree to present their positions and evidence and support thereof by way of

written submissions to the panel.

In addition to the factual submissions, the parties each prepared legal memoranda in support of their positions.

Subsequent to the receipt of presentation, the panel met in a number of executive sessions and considered the evidence and arguments presented. After a review of the evidence and arguments presented by both the FOP and the city, the panel issues the following order:

Award. The contract shall be a term for seven years commencing on January 1, 2008, and continuing through January 31, 2014.

Wages. And this is the interesting part, these are the raises that were awarded the FOP by refusing to negotiate. January 1, 2008, 8 percent increase across the board. January 1, 2009, 3 percent increase across the board. July 1, still in 2009, 3 percent increase across the board. In 2010 there were two raises, January 1 and July 1, both 3 percent, a total of six. In 2011, same thing, January and July 1, 3 percent

increase, 3 percent increase. 2012, January 1 and July 1, 3 percent increase, 3 percent increase. January 1, 2013, 3.2 percent increase across the board. July 1, 2013, 3.2 percent across the board. January 1, 2014, 3.2 percent increase across the board. July 1, 2014, 3.2 percent increase across the board. July 1, 2014, 3.2 percent increase across the board. Add it all up it comes to a 44.8 percent increase in pay by failing to negotiate and basically going to war with the city unions. That was the tactic that our former mayor took and these are the results.

In addition to what's here, the city still owes to our police and fire in excess of \$20 million which is a growing at a rate of over \$100,000 per month just on the interest because the city doesn't have the funds to pay. The actual award was over \$40 million prior to receiving concessions from the unions at that point in time. Moving on to some of the information that was presented regarding this contract, there are some expenses, there are some expenses and there are savings. The wage increases are

22

23

24

25

around 1 to 2 percent per year. Much better than the 11 and 6 percent increases that we saw over the previous years. There are many savings outlined in the new contract. Savings for new hires are projected around 1.4 million through the course of the new contract. Pension contributions increase. Now, this will not effect the general fund, but it will effect the pension funds which I do know are severely distressed, 1.2 million over the course of the contract. Changes in minimum shift manning \$1.3 million in The elimination of weekends off for the highway division, approximately \$700,000 in savings. Sick time incentive approximately 60,000 in savings. Elimination of a patrol captain, nearly \$150,000 in savings. Civilian parking enforcement projects nearly a 25 percent -or \$2.5 million in revenue into the city.

Now, that doesn't come without costs, some of the costs, health insurance for six retirees \$449,000. An extra week of vacation for employees that have met a certain threshold \$177,000, and the sick

1

4

3

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

time bonus by not using the sick days of approximately \$58,000. Now, if you add that all up according to these numbers it comes to an approximate \$6.8 million in savings. I would argue that the pension savings should be taken out of that because it doesn't directly effect the budget, but this is an outline of what we are voting on So you have what we are currently looking at by negotiating by the union and the city coming together to reach an agreement that not only keeps the level of protection where it is, which to me is very important, so you have a new contract by negotiating or you could go the way that our former mayor did by going to war with city unions and we all saw what the end result of that was.

After analyzing what has been given to us, talking to union leaders, city leaders, attorneys, our police chief, our mayor, solicitors, it is my analysis that this is a good deal for the city especially in comparison to doing nothing and letting this contract expire and ending up in front

of an arbitrator like we did a few years ago and owing a \$40 million award and owing nearly 50 percent in raises, and that's not even compounding it. I was just adding them straight so the actual amount if you compound this is even higher. So that is --

MR. MCGOFF: 55 percent.

MR. ROGAN: If you compound it, it's over 55 percent, thank you, Councilman McGoff. So that is why I do support this measure. It's unfortunate that for some reason the newspaper has decided to run multiple articles on each component the city gave, and there is validity to most of those articles, but there are items that the city gave, but why not run an individual article on each one of the items that the union gave back to the city? That hasn't happened.

In addition, an article was put in regarding a "Me, too" clause that has been out since the Connors' administration.

Unfortunately, the media has driven this discussion away from an objective analysis of these numbers. By looking at it, to me it a good deal and most importantly it will

7 8

9

6

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

keep our level of protection, which is the main function of the government and it's the main function of our police department and they do a great job, just compare us to other cities in our region of similar size and of smaller size and our neighborhoods are much safer, so for these reasons I will be supporting this item. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: I'd like to do a brief recap of where we are financially at this time. The pension plans are insolvent and on life support, 5.2 million of our pension payment goes towards disability pensions in a number that's approximately ten times that of other Pennsylvania cities our size. have a recurrent structural deficit, we are looking to monetize the Sewer Authority to super fund the pension, we are looking to monetize the parking authority. We just had a 19 percent tax increase. Our garbage fee is almost doubled from what it once was just two years ago. Our wage tax has already proven to be a large disincentive to attracting and maintaining the middle class.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The mercantile and business privilege tax continues to drive out businesses and restrict growth. We have increased property taxes on residents and business owners approximately 110 percent since 2010.

Remember, this was and still is the backdrop for asking the unions for concessions. Nothing has changed. This council and this administration have been largely on the same page as we try to work together through the many financial issues the city faces, and I have been consistent in my goal to look for long-term solutions versus short-term fixes, and sometimes people have disagreements about certain issues, but that does not mean we will or should stop working together to achieve financial solvency, and while I respect the work the administration has done looking for union concessions, and there is much that I do like about the MOU, there are several things that I still can't come to terms I will offer further comment on those when the opportunity presents itself later in the tonight's meeting. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. I just wanted to apologize for not getting back to a few people that contacted me over the past week, I have been sick. Let me remind everybody to please get your flu shot. I received a citizens' request about two streetlights that have been out for over a month at Olive Street and Quincy Avenue and 713-715 North Irving Avenue. Our office has forwarded the information to DPW and Joyce Electric.

Residents had also contacted me this week about a "No Parking" sign being torn down at the intersection of McDonough Street and Birney Avenue in Minooka. This intersection is very dangerous when cars are pulling out and our office will contact DPW to see if this sign can be replaced.

And I'll hold the rest of my comments for agenda items. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. Just a couple of quick things, responses. First of all, we will try and resolve the budget discrepancy by next week. We should have an answer as to which is the correct budget and

what numbers are correct. I think that is a legitimate request and something that the correct budget should be placed on the website, and if that is it not correct then it should be changed what's there.

Also, we will try and determine what the status of the audit is, the 2013 audit, and when it will be completed. Hopefully we will have that answer, again, by next week.

Just a general comment, somebody talked about -- I find it unusual that Lackawanna County is one of the few that does not have a county fairgrounds.

MR. ROGAN: We are the only one in the state that does not.

MR. MCGOFF: Really? And we have no countywide event, and I'm not doing that as a criticism it's just something that has never been done in Lackawanna County and, like I said, you know, being the only one it's very unusual, I guess.

MR. EVANS: Maybe Mr. Hetman should take that back and let's get that done.

MR. HETMAN: I will take it back.

MR. MCGOFF: The other thing, the

suggestion about East Mountain Road I think is a valid one and perhaps we can look into how we would go about declaring that as a snow emergency route. I think that that would be a good idea for the future.

Also, again, in response to the idea of a casino, it is not the city's responsibility to go out and get a casino license. The first step would be for somebody to apply for a license. If that were to be done then we would poll council and the administration to see we were in favor of the supporting that application. We can't support something that doesn't exist, at least that is my belief, and when somebody presents us with an application or has an application we will, in fact, do what I just said.

Also, the comments about smoke and mirrors and insults from council and council being disrespectful to people at the podium, I would like somebody to provide evidence of any council member being disrespectful to anyone at the podium. In this past year I cannot remember any time that that took

2

4

3

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

place. If anything, the insults and disrespect came from the podium towards council and there is ample evidence of that.

And as far as the caucus, we keep going over this, and the purpose -- we have a public caucus every week. That is something that was not done in the past. Every week we meet before the meeting and discuss what will happen at that week's meeting, and the purpose of the caucus is to inform council members as to the legislation and what will be happen during the meeting. That is the purpose of the caucus and always I think that we have been more has been. open about what we are doing than any council in the past and I believe that I would get support on that from, you know, Mr. Rogan who has been here in the past.

MR. ROGAN: The caucuses have been very informative and the public is welcome to attend.

MR. MCGOFF: And I do take issue with people criticizing what we are doing because what we are doing is something that is not or has not happened in the past.

And as far as anything else, I'll reserve comment for the agenda items.

MS. REED: 5-B. FOR INTRODUCTION A RESOLUTION - REPEALING RESOLUTION NO. 103,
2014 APPOINTMENT OF KRISTIN JENKINS, 818
CAPOUSE AVENUE, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA,
18509 AS A MEMBER OF THE SCRANTON MUNICIPAL
RECREATION AUTHORITY. MS. JENKINS WILL BE
REPLACING ANTHONY MARINUCCI WHO RESIGNED
EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 2, 2014. MS. JENKINS
WILL FULFILL THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF MR.
MARINUCCI WHICH WILL EXPIRE ON JUNE 17,
2015. MR. MARINUCCI RESCINDED HIS
RESIGNATION.

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. WECHSLER: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question? I'd just like to make note that Ms. Jenkins was appointed to fill the spot of Mr. Marinucci who we thought -- or the administration thought had resigned. That resignation apparently was rescinded and we need to

1	repeal this legislation since Ms. Jenkins
2	could not replace someone who was already
3	there so that is he purpose of repealing
4	this legislation.
5	All those in favor of introduction
6	signify by saying aye.
7	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
8	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
9	MR. EVANS: Aye.
10	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
11	MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
12	ayes have it and so moved.
13	MS. REED: 5-C. FOR INTRODUCTION -
14	A RESOLUTION - APPOINTMENT OF KRISTIN
15	JENKINS, 818 CAPOUSE AVENUE, SCRANTON,
16	PENNSYLVANIA, 18509, AS A MEMBER OF THE
17	SCRANTON MUNICIPAL RECREATION AUTHORITY.
18	MS. JENKINS WILL FULFILL THE UNEXPIRED TERM
19	OF MARCIE RIEBE WHOSE TERM IS SCHEDULED TO
20	EXPIRE ON MARCH 1, 2016.
21	MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll
22	entertain a motion that Item 5-C be
23	introduced into its proper committee.
24	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
25	MR. WECHSLER: Second.

1 MR. MCGOFF: On the question? this is the same Mrs. Jenkins that was 2 3 unappointed, she is now being appointed to a position that is vacant. All those in favor 4 5 of introduction signify by saying aye. MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 6 7 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 8 MR. EVANS: Aye. 9 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 10 MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The 11 ayes have it and so moved. 12 MS. REED: 5-D. FOR INTRODUCTION -A RESOLUTION - APPOINTMENT OF JUDE J. 13 14 MCANDREW, 745 NORTH BROMLEY AVENUE, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, 18504, AS A MEMBER 15 OF THE SCRANTON MUNICIPAL RECREATION 16 17 AUTHORITY. MR. MCANDREW WILL BE REPLACING 18 JACK DELEO WHO RESIGNED JANUARY 6, 2015. MR. MCANDREW WILL FULFILL THE UNEXPIRED TERM 19 OF MR. DELEO WHOSE TERM IS SCHEDULED TO 20 21 EXPIRE ON DECEMBER 31, 2017. 22 MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll 23 entertain a motion that Item 5-D be 24 introduced into its proper committee. 25 MR. ROGAN: So moved.

MR. WECHSLER: Second. 1 2 MR. MCGOFF: On the question? A11 3 those in favor of introduction signify by 4 saying aye. 5 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 6 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 7 MR. EVANS: Aye. 8 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 9 MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The 10 ayes have it and so moved. 11 MS. REED: 5-E - PREVIOUSLY TABLED -12 FOR INTRODUCTION - A RESOLUTION -AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE 13 14 CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AN ENTER INTO A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BY AND BETWEEN 15 THE CITY OF SCRANTON AND LODGE NO. 2 OF THE 16 17 FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE. 18 MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll entertain a motion that Item 5-E be 19 20 introduced into its proper committee. 21 MR. ROGAN: So moved. 22 MR. WECHSLER: Second. 23 MR. MCGOFF: On the question? 24 MR. WECHSLER: Yes, Mr. McGoff. 25 Just a brief comment because there will be

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

more as we move into it, part of the consideration that has to be made when we are evaluating this ordinance or resolution is the reality that if this does not pass we will stay under the current contract until 2017, and as a result of that we will probably be entering into arbitration in 2018. The City has not done well in arbitration in the pat.

If we do not -- if we are unable to pass this new contract, the savings that we would experience will not be experienced. So I think that's some of the things that have to be considered besides a valid extension as we look at it here. There is also three grievances currently that the police department has that will be waived if the contract passes, which is another potential savings of a lot of money, so besides when we look at this everyone has to look at the whole picture and consider if we can start to take advantage of those savings Thank you, Mr. McGoff. now.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else?

MR. EVANS: Yes, on the question.

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Amoroso plan, which I have been steadfast in support of says the following, "Reopen the city contracts with the collecting bargaining units, focus on renegotiating health care and especially pension reform as well as changes to starting salaries, time between steps and ranking standards and distribution."

That sounds like a blueprint or concessions. Our goal was union concessions and somehow we veered off in the direction we have. We've turned it into a fully renegotiated contract. Sometimes I look for simple answers for complex problem and I'm afraid that somehow this MOA may have complicated the process even more and, quite frankly, I'm still trying to figure out the savings and the costs to this MOA. We have received documentation from Chief Graziano and Attorney Abrahamsen and Business Administrator Dave Bulzoni, all comprehensive, but all separate and different and unique in their own way. appreciate their hard work, but again, I am seeking simple clear and concise answers to

this complex issue. I am looking for one set of comprehensive answers in an easily understandable format, period, and I just don't have that at this point.

As I mentioned, there are many things I do like about this MOA and I will say that the section that -- the section that covers the personnel restructuring and some others that were clearly were a result of Chief Graziano's involvement were well though out and will have a positive effect on the manpower and overtime in the department, and the addition of two SIT clerks to enforce on-street parking citywide is a concession 20 years in the making, so thank you, Chief, and Union leadership for your efforts on those issues.

However, I'm not a fan of other areas of the contract, particularly adding the fifth week of vacation, liberal sick leave policy, retirement and health care section, and the fact that there is no reference to Pennsylvania reform for new hires. With changes in those areas I would easily vote for this plan. If I may, I'd

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

like to expand on one of those issues, retiree health care. The intent is to allow

six eligible employees to participate in

this benefit, and in some way even help

lower the disability pension requests by

some officers that are approaching

retirement age. However, as written

according to the Scranton Times, there were

99 police officers that were hired after

January 1, 1994, and will eventually be

eligible to participate in retiree health

care benefits. The argument that this

benefit will be negotiated out of the

contract when this contract expires to me

has no merit. First of all, more than 65

percent of the voting members of the FOP

will be eligible for this benefit when the

next contract is negotiated. Human nature

simply would indicate that those 65 percent

that are eligible would not going to remove

a benefit that would allow them personally

and their spouses to have retiree benefits.

Now, let's talk about the cost of

this benefit if it remains in effect beyond

the contract period. The administration's

own numbers have indicated a \$224,780 per employee for ten years of retiree benefits for them and their spouse. In today's healthcare dollars that would mean that all 99 eligible employees eventually elected to take it, if they did, it would cost the city over \$22 million. Again, that is in today's health care cost dollars. If must be assumed that health care costs, as they always do, continue to rise and increase over the years.

Additionally, if it is proven that the fire department has a parity clause, and even if doesn't, surely they will want this language in their renegotiated contract. There are approximately 65 firemen that will fit in this category as well. Adding to this number, another \$14 million based on the police calculation. This would mean a total in the are of \$36 million. again, using today's health care costs. So what would appear to be a cost of \$449,520 that's present by the administration for the MOA period most likely could cost as much as \$40 million or more if the retiree health

care benefit cost is not negotiated out in the future.

So once again, in my opinion we are kicking the can down the road, opting for what appears to be a short-term fix and setting ourselves up for another long-term fiscal climate. It is no longer somebody else's problem, it is our problem. We are the ones that are here today making decisions that we feel will be in the city's best interest and we do have a choice.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question.

That's all I have for now.

Thank you. I will be voting against introducing this legislation tonight. After reviewing the information that was given to us piecemeal and at times begrudgingly, which I still find completely shocking, over the past two weeks, I still have many concerns. I think it would be irresponsible to introduce this contract even for consideration. Let's first remember that the entire purpose of asking for concessions was to address the city's escalating

financial crises with the goal of saving money. This was not supposed to be a full blown contract negotiation.

Scranton is careening off a fiscal cliff and is in no position and certainly under no obligation to offer additional benefits that will sink the city even further. Two weeks ago the mayor touted that this contract will save \$750,000 to a million dollars annually over the life of the agreement. If this was such a critical savings and the city was in such dire financial condition, then why would the mayor add over \$1 million of discretionary expenditures to the 2015 budget that was just passed a month ago?

If you add all of the new positions, all of the salary increases, and increases in departmental expenditures, which I did, and I was very generous, I didn't include some that I thought we might need, you get a total of over \$1 million, and that's not including contractual expenses. For a city that's on financial life support this made absolutely no sense, so the alleged savings

2

4

3

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and numbers that I still find somewhat questionable that had been touted in this contract will just about cover the mayor's increases in this year's budget.

It's my opinion that the city taxpayers still end up on the losing end here and the city in the long-term doesn't really save any money. There are specific revisions to this contract that I have serious concerns with. The first is something that Mr. Evans touched on. The administration agreed to give back health care benefits to employees and their spouses hired after January 1, 1994. administration has said the change is intended to effect only six employees. However, those employees are not mentioned in the agreement and the city may be required to offer spousal health care benefits to all employees hired after 1994, and Mr. Evans and the paper mentioned that that I think is 99 employees.

So my question is and has been why are these six employees not specifically mentioned in the agreement? Why is that

provision ambiguous? It's my opinion that this could end up having a devastating crippling effect on the city's finances. Employees will receive a 9 percent salary increase over the life of the contract. I have asked for a detailed breakdown of how this will cost the city over the life of the agreement. I can't understand how this administration and the financial state that it finds itself in can afford to give out raises.

The administration has touted an increase in the pension contribution, which is good, but the fact of the matter is that that the employees will only be contributing 2 1/2 percent more to their pension, which is an investment in their own retirement. I talked to many residents over the past two and a half weeks who have endured wage freezes in their own jobs during this tough economic times who cannot fathom how a struggling municipality can give out raises.

This administration expects our citizens to make sacrifices financially, yet, we never seem to practice what we

preach.

Some of the other revisions that I'm having trouble understanding is the sick time policy. As the paper pointed out, it's exceptionally generous. Other cities similarly sized have no where near the same policy that we are going to institute, and so to me that makes no sense. The extra week of vacation, the parking enforcement, which I believe is making money, and is not a savings, it's a revenue generator so who knows how that will pan out.

But one of the most troubling parts of this whole agreement in my opinion is it the extension of the contract until 2021.

Last year, as we know, the state legislation made provisions to Act 47, the Distressed Municipalities Act. One of the most significant changes was to impose a timeline for cities to get out of distressed status.

Scranton has until 2017 to make progress toward exiting Act 47. If we are not out of the distressed status in 2017, we will have to request a three-year extension which is then dependent upon approval of a three-year

exit plan. If the request is approved,
Scranton's final deadline is 2020 before it
faces either receivership, bankruptcy or
dissolution as a municipality.

The existing police contract is said to expire proximate 2017. If it is extended to 2021, I believe that it would tie the city's hands in two ways moving forward. First, we eliminate the possibility of the city to renegotiate the police contract in 2017 when preparing the important three-year exit plan.

Second, the extended contract would still be in effect for an additional year after the final deadline in 2020. This means that both the city and the state will be bound to this contract for a full year after our Act 47 status expires. So this four-year extension I fear may have a negative effect on the city's ability to get out of distressed status before the mandated deadline.

The definition of concession is something done or agreed to improve a situation. After reviewing this contract, I

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

believe this administration will once again be kicking the can down the road. This administration will once again be making decisions that will shackle us financially for years to come and this administration is once again gambling with the future of our city. Scranton taxpayers deserve a good deal and when I see one I will vote for it. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: A couple of comments. First of all, my belief is that the current contract that we have is not sustainable. There are raises, there are other benefits that are included in this contract that the current contract that I believe will move us toward further towards the cliff that Mr. Gaughan mentioned. I think that the revision that were made in the proposed contract are things that are sustainable. When this was proposed or when this negotiation stated there were three things that I was looking for: First, some concern about the pension, and I believe that by increasing the pension contributions of the police department or employees to the police

department while it doesn't necessarily, you know, fund the pension completely it is a step forward. It is something that was needed to be done.

I also was concerned about new hires and in the proposed contract the salary provisions for new hires I think is of great savings moving forward.

I was also concerned about overtime.

We are spending close to a million dollars

in overtime at the current -- under the

current contract. I believe that the

provisions that are in the proposed contract

will do something to decrease this overtime.

Also, included are things that I didn't expect, what I would call extra benefits, the reorganization of the police department. I think will go a long way to making the police department more efficient and also go a long way to putting more people -- more policemen on the streets where they are needed.

Also, the revisions in the manning of the police department I think it's a great savings and the SIT reemployment or

reemployment of SIT personnel was another thing that is a benefit under this proposed contract.

Are there concerns, yes? And I believe that Councilman Gaughan and Councilman Evans, you know, delineated those. Health care for retirees is a concern, but it's a concern as we move to 2021. We don't possess the ability to foresee what will happen in 2021. While Councilman Gaughan talks about maybe money, I talk about this is a maybe expenditure. We don't know what will happen there.

Also, the concern that Councilman
Gaughan brought about the length of the
contract that is also a concern. It goes
beyond the length of what will be the
revised recovery plan. That is a concern,
but I believe that the benefits that we will
see through the length of the contract,
while you may call them short-term benefits,
I believe that those benefits are things
that we need in order to make the city whole
again. We need relief now and if we don't
get something, as I said, I don't believe

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that the current contract is something that we can sustain.

MR. ROGAN: I already made the vast majority of my comments on this under motions, but there was one other thing that I did want to point out, and it's something that a lot of people don't understand unless you are in government or in a union it's difficult to understand, contract negotiations between the public sector union and the municipality are not capable to the private sector. There are fair labor practice laws in the city. If the city were to come in and say, "We think police officers are making too much money, we want to cut everyone's pay 10 percent" or as the previous mayor did freeze wages for a certain period of time, it goes to an arbitrator. We don't have the flexibility that somebody in a private sector would or with our at-will employees which we do have that flexibility to flatly change salaries.

The idea that an arbitrator would air with the city versus the unions and give a contract that has wage cuts or stagnant

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

wages is unrealistic. Evidence of that is what happened the last time a mayor tried to tactic. It didn't work.

Would we like to see more as far as concessions? Of course, everyone would, but this is a fair contract. It gives minimal raises, which are actually more than upset by the increase in pension contributions by the employees.

I think the vast majority of the items in here are helpful for the city. Obviously, as mentioned by my colleagues there are some concerns, and I do think it's dangerous to go out and say, well, because of this contract that's going to effect 90 some more employees because we don't know what we are going to be in seven years. Hopefully the city will be in a much better financial position, that's all of our goal, but that might not be the case. A lot can happen between now and then and this deal is by far the best deal that can be negotiated besides going to an arbitrator where we would get destroyed and have increases, you know, in pay of 55 percent, retroactive

benefits, and not only that but just for the morale of the city and the morale of the city employees the period of time over the previous administration was one of labor unrest, especially amongst the public safety employees which are certainly the most important employees the city has.

So I will not -- I won't go on too long about this, but that's how I feel on about this issue and mainly the points that I made earlier comparing what's happened in the past to what we are currently considering.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else?

MR. EVANS: Yeah, I'd like to touch on the pension contributions just for one second. I'm very happy that we have pension contributions in this contract, but I'm very, very disappointed that we do not have pension reform for the new hires. It would have been a very, very simple fix to have an optional pension plan, a 401K, a hybrid and a directional plan available for all new hires. That didn't happen and I am very, very disappointed in that as well. Thank

2

you.

1617

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GAUGHAN: I'd just like to make one final comment. I would agree with Mr. Rogan that the arbitration process seems to be -- the city never wins, but I think maybe people out to look at maybe there is something wrong with that whole process, the arbitration process. I mean, it just, you know, just because the city is going to lose all the time, I mean, it just to me maybe statewide that whole process needs to look at because the city has got to have some recourse eventually to do something, to have some kind of way to control their financial future, so --

MR. ROGAN: I think that's something we all agree.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else? All those in favor of introduction signify by saying aye.

MR. WECHSLER: Aye.

MR. ROGAN: Aye.

MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed?

MR. EVANS: No.

MR. GAUGHAN: No.

1	MR. MCGOFF: The ayes have it and so
2	moved.
3	MS. REED: SIXTH ORDER. 6-A.
4	READING BY TITLE - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO.
5	71, 2015 - AN ORDINANCE REPEALING FILE OF
6	THE COUNCIL NO. 50, 2014 ENTITLED "CREATING
7	AND ESTABLISHING SPECIAL CITY ACCOUNT NO.
8	02.229613 ENTITLED "LIQUID FUELS" FOR THE
9	RECEIPT AND DISBURSEMENT OF THOSE FUNDS
10	RECEIVED FOR THIS PURPOSE".
11	MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by
12	title of Item 6-A, what is your pleasure?
13	MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-A
14	pass reading by title.
15	MR. WECHSLER: Second.
16	MS. MCGOFF: On the question? All
17	those in favor signify by saying aye.
18	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
19	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
20	MR. EVANS: Aye.
21	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
22	MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
23	ayes have it and so moved.
24	MS. REED: 6-B. READING BY TITLE -
25	FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 72, 2015 - AN

I'd

ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 1 2 58. 2014. AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED "GENERAL CITY OPERATING BUDGET 2015" BY ESTABLISHING 3 4 SEPARATE "03" FUND ACCOUNTS TO DEFINE ACTUAL LIQUID FUEL EXPENDITURES THROUGH THE "03" 5 FUND DESIGNATION; BY REDESIGNATING FUNDS 6 FROM CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND 7 DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING, INSPECTIONS AND 8 9 PERMITS ACCOUNTS LISTED BELOW TO THE "03" ACCOUNTS; THE DEPARTMENT, BUREAU AND LINE 10 ITEM DESCRIPTION WILL REMAIN THE SAME. 11 12 MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by 13 title of Item 6-B, what is your pleasure? 14 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-B 15 pass reading by title. 16 MR. WECHSLER: Second. 17 MS. MCGOFF: On the question? 18 just like to remind people, this is being 19 done under a state mandate for auditing 20 purposes. All those in favor signify by 21 saying aye. 22 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 23 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 24 MR. EVANS: Aye. 25

MR. GAUGHAN:

Aye.

1	MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
2	ayes have it and so moved.
3	MS. REED: 6-C. READING BY TITLE -
4	FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 73, 2015 - AN
5	ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO.
6	100, 1976, ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS
7	AMENDED) LEVYING GENERAL AND SPECIAL TAXES
8	FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1977", BY SETTING THE
9	MILLAGE FOR THE YEAR 2015 AND THE SAME SHALL
10	REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT ANNUALLY
11	THEREAFTER.
12	MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by
13	title of Item 6-C, what is your pleasure?
14	MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-C
15	pass reading by title.
16	MR. WECHSLER: Second.
17	MS. MCGOFF: On the question? All
18	those in favor signify by saying aye.
19	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
20	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
21	MR. EVANS: Aye.
22	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
23	MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
24	ayes have it and so moved.
25	MS. REED: 6-D. READING BY TITLE -

1 FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 74, 2015 - AN 2 ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 3 6, 1976 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED) IMPOSING A TAX FOR GENERAL REVENUE PURPOSES 4 ON THE TRANSFER OF REAL PROPERTY SITUATE 5 WITHIN THE CITY OF SCRANTON; PRESCRIBING AND 6 REGULATING THE METHOD OF EVIDENCING THE 7 8 PAYMENT OF SUCH TAX; CONFERRING POWERS AND 9 IMPOSING DUTIES UPON CERTAIN PERSONS, AND PROVIDING PENALTIES", BY IMPOSING THE RATE 10 OF THE REALTY TRANSFER TAX AT TWO AND NINE 11 12 TENTHS PERCENT (2.9%) FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2015 AND THE SAME SHALL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND 13 14 EFFECT ANNUALLY THEREAFTER. MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by 15 16 title of Item 6-D, what is your pleasure? 17 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-D 18 pass reading by title. MR. WECHSLER: Second. 19 20 MS. MCGOFF: On the question? A11 21 those in favor signify by saying aye. 22 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 23 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 24 MR. EVANS: Aye. 25 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.

1 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The 2 ayes have it and so moved. 3 MS. REED: 6-E. READING BY TITLE -FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 75, 2015 - AN 4 ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 5 7, 1976, ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED) 6 IMPOSING A MERCANTILE LICENSE TAX OF 2 MILLS 7 8 FOR THE YEAR 1976 AND ANNUALLY THEREAFTER 9 UPON PERSONS ENGAGING IN CERTAIN OCCUPATIONS AND BUSINESSES THEREIN; PROVIDING FOR ITS 10 LEVY AND COLLECTION AND FOR THE ISSUANCE OF 11 12 MERCANTILE LICENSES; CONFERRING AND IMPOSING POWERS AND DUTIES UPON THE TAX COLLECTOR OF 13 14 THE CITY OF SCRANTON; AND IMPOSING PENALTIES". BY IMPOSING THE MERCANTILE 15 16 LICENSE TAX AT ONE (1) MILL (.001) FOR 17 CALENDAR YEAR 2015 AND THE SAME SHALL REMAIN 18 IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT ANNUALLY THEREAFTER. 19 MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by 20 title of Item 6-E, what is your pleasure? 21 22 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-E 23 pass reading by title. 24 MR. WECHSLER: Second. 25 MS. MCGOFF: On the question? A11

1 those in favor signify by saying aye. 2 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 3 MR. ROGAN: Aye. MR. EVANS: Aye. 4 5 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? 6 The ayes have it and so moved. 7 8 MS. REED: 6-F. READING BY TITLE -9 FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 76, 2015 - AN ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 10 8, 1976, ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED) 11 12 PROVIDING FOR THE GENERAL REVENUE BY 13 IMPOSING A TAX AT THE RATE OF TWO (2) MILLS 14 UPON THE PRIVILEGE OF OPERATING OR CONDUCTING BUSINESS IN THE CITY OF SCRANTON 15 16 AS MEASURED BY THE GROSS RECEIPTS THEREFROM; 17 REQUIRING REGISTRATION AND PAYMENT OF THE 18 TAX AS CONDITION TO THE CONDUCTING OF SUCH BUSINESS; PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND 19 20 COLLECTION OF SUCH TAX; PRESCRIBING SUCH REQUIREMENTS FOR RETURNS AND RECORDS; 21 CONFERRING POWERS AND DUTIES UPON THE TAX 22 23 COLLECTOR; AND IMPOSING PENALTIES", BY 24 IMPOSING THE BUSINESS PRIVILEGE TAX AT THE 25 RATE OF ONE (1) MILL (.001) FOR CALENDAR

1	YEAR 2015 AND THE SAME SHALL REMAIN IN FULL
2	FORCE AND EFFECT ANNUALLY THEREAFTER.
3	MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by
4	title of Item 6-F, what is your pleasure?
5	MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-F
6	pass reading by title.
7	MR. WECHSLER: Second.
8	MS. MCGOFF: On the question? All
9	those in favor signify by saying aye.
10	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
11	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
12	MR. EVANS: Aye.
13	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
14	MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
15	ayes have it and so moved.
16	MS. REED: 6-G. READING BY TITLE -
17	FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 77, 2015 - AN
18	ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO.
19	11, 1976, ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS
20	AMENDED) ENACTING, IMPOSING A TAX FOR
21	GENERAL REVENUE PURPOSES IN THE AMOUNT OF
22	TWO PERCENT (2%) ON EARNED INCOME AND NET
23	PROFITS ON PERSONS, INDIVIDUALS,
24	ASSOCIATIONS AND BUSINESSES WHO ARE
25	RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON, OR

25

1

NON-RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON, FOR WORK DONE. SERVICES PERFORMED OR BUSINESS CONDUCTED WITHIN THE CITY OF SCRANTON. REQUIRING THE FILING OF RETURNS BY TAXPAYERS SUBJECT TO THE TAX; REQUIRING EMPLOYERS TO COLLECT THE TAX AT SOURCE; PROVIDING FOR THE ADMINISTRATION, COLLECTION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE SAID TAX; AND IMPOSING PENALTIES FOR THE VIOLATIONS", BY RE-ENACTING THE IMPOSITION OF THE WAGE TAX AT TWO AND FOUR TENTHS (2.4%) PERCENT ON EARNED INCOME FOR RESIDENTS AND ONE (1%) PERCENT ON EARNED INCOME FOR NON-RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON. FOR WORK DONE. SERVICES PERFORMED OR BUSINESS CONDUCTED WITHIN THE CITY OF SCRANTON FOR THE YEAR 2015 AND THE SAME SHALL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT ANNUALLY THEREAFTER.

MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by title of Item 6-G, what is your pleasure?

MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-G pass reading by title.

MR. WECHSLER: Second.

MS. MCGOFF: On the question? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

1 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 2 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 3 MR. EVANS: Aye. 4 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 5 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and so moved. 6 7 MS. REED: 6-H. READING BY TITLE -8 FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 78, 2015 - AN 9 ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 17, 1994 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE (AS AMENDED) 10 AUTHORIZING THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY 11 OF SCRANTON TO ENACT 'A WASTE DISPOSAL AND 12 COLLECTION FEE' FOR THE PURPOSE OF RAISING 13 14 REVENUE TO COVER THE WASTE DISPOSAL AND COLLECTION COSTS INCURRED BY THE CITY OF 15 16 SCRANTON FOR THE DISPOSAL OF REFUSE", BY 17 IMPOSING A WASTE DISPOSAL AND COLLECTION FEE 18 OF \$300.00 FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2015 AND THE SAME SHALL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT 19 ANNUALLY THEREAFTER. 20 21 MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by 22 title of Item 6-H, what is your pleasure? 23 MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-H 24 pass reading by title. 25 MR. WECHSLER: Second.

1	MS. MCGOFF: On the question? I
2	would like to just reiterate that the
3	garbage bills will be collected semiannually
4	with the first one being due on May 1 and
5	second on September 1. All those in favor
6	signify by saying aye.
7	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
8	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
9	MR. EVANS: Aye.
10	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
11	MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
12	ayes have it and so moved.
13	MS. REED: 6-I. READING BY TITLE -
14	FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 79, 2015 - AN
15	ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO.
16	145 OF 2007 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE RENAMING
17	THE EMERGENCY AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES TAX
18	("EMST") TO LOCAL SERVICE TAX ("LST")" AND
19	BY IMPOSING A WITHHOLDING OF \$52.00 FOR THE
20	CALENDAR YEAR 2015 AND THE SAME SHALL REMAIN
21	IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT ANNUALLY
22	THEREAFTER.
23	MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by
24	title of Item 6-I, what is your pleasure?
25	MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-I

	93
1	pass reading by title.
2	MR. WECHSLER: Second.
3	MS. MCGOFF: On the question? All
4	those in favor signify by saying aye.
5	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
6	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
7	MR. EVANS: Aye.
8	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
9	MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
10	ayes have it and so moved.
11	MS. REED: SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. FOR
12	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
13	-FOR ADOPTION RESOLUTION NO. 114, 2015 -
14	AUTHORIZING THE ABATEMENT OF CITY OF
15	SCRANTON DELINQUENT REAL ESTATE TAXES,
16	PENALTIES AND INTEREST ON PROPERTY LOCATED
17	AT 1621 WASHBURN STREET, SCRANTON,
18	PENNSYLVANIA ALSO KNOW AS PIN
19	NO.14517-030-052.01.
20	MR. MCGOFF: What is the
21	recommendation of the Chair for the
22	Committee on Finance.
23	MR. EVANS: As Chairperson for the
24	Committee on Finance, I recommend final
25	passage of Item 7-A.

1 MR. ROGAN: Second. 2 MR. MCGOFF: On the question? 3 MR. GAUGHAN: I was just going to 4 say, I see Mrs. Foster here tonight and the 5 Lewis family and I know a lot of work has been put into getting this project off of 6 the ground and I think it's going to be a 7 great improvement for that area of West 8 9 Scranton and I wish you all the best of luck. 10 11 MR. MCGOFF: And I would like to 12 also mention that this tax abatement has 13 already been approved by the Scranton School 14 District and by Lackawanna County, and as Councilman Gaughan said, good luck in the 15 16 project in West Scranton. 17 Roll call, please? 18 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Wechsler. 19 MR. WECHSLER: Yes. 20 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Rogan. 21 MR. ROGAN: Yes. 22 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Evans. 23 MR. EVANS: Yes. 24 MS. MARCIANO: Mr. Gaughan. 25 MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.

_	
	95
1	MS. MARCIANO: Mr. McGoff.
2	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
3	Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted.
4	If there is no further business,
5	I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
6	MR. ROGAN: Motion to adjourn.
7	MR. MCGOFF: Meeting adjourned.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

C E R T I F I C A T E

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