		1
1		
2	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING	
3		
4		
5		
6	HELD:	
7		
8	Thursday, February 5, 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	CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER	
24	OMMENE OF MANDOLLI, NEW 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 KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK PATRICK SCANLON, SOLICITOR

(Pledge of Allegiance recited and moment of reflection observed.)

MR. MCGOFF: Dispense with the reading of the minutes.

MR. EVANS: I would like to make a motion to take from the table File of Council No. 73-2015 that was tabled due to a special legal notice requirements of the intention to impose a tax increase according to the Pennsylvania statute.

MR. ROGAN: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question? This is the milliage ordinance that was needed to be tabled so that it could be properly advertised. It is now being taken off the table in Seventh Order for final vote.

Anyone who wishes to speak to this particular piece of legislation may do so during citizens' participation.

I would also like to make note officially that there was an executive session held on Tuesday, February 3, at 6:30 in the Governor's room with members of the administration and the firefighters' union regarding the personnel and labor and

negotiations.

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Are there any announcement from council?

MR. EVANS: I have one. There be will a community tribute to police set for The 911 Memorial Committee of February 8. the Lackawanna County will host a community tribute to those who protect and serve on Sunday, February 8, at Scranton High School, 63 Munchak Way near Providence Road in Scranton. The doors will open at noon at the event will start at 1:00 p.m. the event will include songs by the Scranton High School chorus and tributes to fallen State Trooper, including Byron Dickson, police and correction officers, members of Trooper Dickson's family have been invited and are expected to speak as well as President Judge Thomas Munley and District Attorney Andy Jarbola. Family members of slain corrections officer Eric Williams also will speak. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else? Just one thing that I would like to mention, yesterday was National Cancer Awareness Day.

1

I would just like to say that I know all of us have been effected in some way, you know, by this insidious disease and I would just encourage anyone that, you know, knows of someone who is fighting this or dealing with the treatments involved with cancer be a friend. One of the things that happens to cancer patients and those under treatment, depression is a very significant aspect of it, and believe it or not, simply sitting down and talking with people, going and watching a television show, bringing dinner and, you know, having something to eat with them goes a long way to helping people deal with that, and I would just encourage that, you know, if you know someone please be a friend and, you know, be part of the helping process.

MS. REED: THIRD ORDER. 3-A.

MINUTES OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON FIREFIGHTERS

PENSION COMMISSION MEETING HELD DECEMBER 10,

2014.

MR. MCGOFF: Are there any comments?

If not, received and filed.

MS. REED: 3-B. MINUTES OF THE

24

25

22

23

NON-UNIFORM MUNICIPAL PENSION BOARD MEETING 1 HELD DECEMBER 10, 2014. 2 3 MR. MCGOFF: Are there any comments? 4 If not, received and filed. MS. REED: 3-C. MINUTES OF THE 5 COMPOSITE PENSION BOARD MEETING HELD 6 DECEMBER 10, 2014. 7 8 MR. MCGOFF: Are there any comments? 9 If not, received and filed. MS. REED: 3-D. AGENDA OF THE 10 NON-UNIFORM MUNICIPAL PENSION BOARD MEETING 11 12 HELD JANUARY 28, 2015. 13 MR. MCGOFF: Are there any comments? 14 If not, received and filed. MS. REED: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS' 15 PARTICIPATION. 16 17 MR. MCGOFF: Joan Hodowanitz. 18 MS. HODOWANITZ: Joan Hodowanitz, Scranton resident. The 2013 audit is now 19 250 days late, is there any hope for it or 20 21 just kind of --22 MR. MCGOFF: I do not have any 23 further information than what was provided 24 last week or the week before. 25 MS. HODOWANITZ: Has anybody given

1 thought somebody to do the 2014 audit 2 because that's just going to be late. 3 MR. MCGOFF: I can address that during motions, but there is -- I do have an 4 5 answer for you. MS. HODOWANITZ: Okay, thank you. 6 7 The 2012 recovery plan, it is 930 days until 8 August 23, 2017, when that would have died a 9 natural death, is there any possibly they 10 might put the modified plan on the website 11 for public review? 12 MR. GAUGHAN: I don't know that they 13 put the draft on it --14 MS. HODOWANITZ: The draft. MR. GAUGHAN: -- but I think that 15 16 they would put the final version on the 17 website. I would expect that to happen. 18 MS. HODOWANITZ: Well, the 2012 one 19 isn't on the website, it's on the internet 20 but on the website. 21 MR. GAUGHAN: I don't know for sure. 22 MS. HODOWANITZ: I hope that you can 23 goose the IT Department or Mr. Bulzoni to do 24 In fact, I would really love to see that. 25 the backup paperwork that you have every

week that are public documents those should routinely be put on the website. It is not that easy to come here the day of council meeting to review those documents, they really should go on the website if you are going to have an informed citizenry.

With regard to the 2015 operating budget, which was unbalanced, the revenues did not watch the expenditures, is anything happening on that to make those amendments?

MR. GAUGHAN: In the caucus last week we did have the discussion on it briefly, and I did ask Attorney Minora to look into what the proper procedure is, whether to amend the budget or not, and Attorney Minora said that he was going to wait until he got an opinion from Attorney Shrive, the city solicitor, so right now it's kind of up in the air. I do have concerns about that and I was going to mention it in motions, but it was briefly discussed last week.

MS. HODOWANITZ: Okay. 5-D,

Mr. Bulzoni's waiver for residency. It

bothers me on many levels, but I think what

bothers me most is that he did not even request a waiver until it started becoming an issue. He should have requested it before the first six months of his employment expired. I'm also surprised that a mayor that had been a councilman and ran the Single Tax Office who should be intimately familiar with the City Code would not have discussed a request for a waiver long before January 27 of this year, but it's now in your laps.

And finally on the firefighters' contract, I'm bothered by the fact that new hires are not going to be getting some kind of change in their retirement plan because their pension plan is severely distressed and despite all of the improvements in the contract I don't see anything in this change -- in this new contract that's going to effect the distressed status of that pension plan. I know they are going to make greater percentage of contributions, but that does not really effect the hole that they are in and sooner or later the city and the unions are going to have to grapple with

2

3

5 6

7 8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that 800 pound gorilla. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mrs.

Hodowanitz. Ron Ellman?

MR. ELLMAN: Thank you, Council. Before I get everyone made at me like usual I'd like to say I was very pleased with the way the snow was removed from the streets. I didn't see any problems. In fact, you can see all of the thousands of potholes trying to dodge your way around town. I don't know how to say this, I respect the police and the fire department, but I'm just one of the many people that are just so disappointed in you three allowing these contracts like that to go by. I have talked to some people that are much more knowledgeable and know about these matters that say this is a abomination for the city people that have are involved this these contracts and all. You know, what's happened here is it's like a used car salesmen working a pencil on some poor guy that doesn't know nothing about buying a They have worked a pencil on this council. They have just sold you a bill of sale that's ten or 20 years from now it's

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

just going to be a bad effect on this city and you guys know it. You have talked about the effects in years from now. I don't think you realize the severity of the plight of this city and so many taxpayers out there. Well, I've had enough of that. I'm not going to get you real mad at me about that.

Let me get something else off my chest, I'm like Joan back there, I have been wondering six, seven months when you are going to tell this Mr. Bulzoni he is supposed to live in this city. He has had over a year to find -- there's thousands of empty houses and apartments here thanks to council on the mayor. He hasn't made any effort whatsoever to be here. I think it's time to fire him. This is a law on our There is no excuse for you people allowing him to abuse this law like that. He has known. In a year and a couple of the months he hasn't moved here he has no intentions of moving here. You know what we have here is an example of a law for you people and another law for us at out here.

Enough is enough of what's going on in this city. Like I said, we got two levels here, you guys are in your level and I'm on this level. When I talk to people at the grocery store and the Taurus Club and all. There is just so many people that can't afford things now that used to have it, you know, they have retired, they are not making the money they make ten years ago, I'm certainly not. You just out of touch with too many people, you know, of the city.

I do have a good report though, last year I blew out two tires, well, I damaged two tires, bent the rim and lost a center cap then I had my wheel alignment in Sheridan's shop, Bobby Sheridan's shop.

This year I haven't lost a tire or a rim just one center cap. I guess that's a positive report for our mayor.

And I had such hopes for Bill. I
like him and he has just -- he has failed.

A whole year there is just nothing has
happened for this city to help this city,
over a year. The only thing come up is this
brain dead stupidity of the Amoroso report

raise taxes and sell everything. You guys have just got to pull a rabbit out of the hat. You got to do something for the people out there that are paying for everything. If you could just listen to one person that has talked to me about how hard it is for them to get by now maybe you would think more about the people that are paying your way while you sit in those seats, the people that you put you in those seats. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mr. Ellman.

Anyone else who wishes to address council?

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening. Dave
Dobrzyn, resident, taxes paid so far. Once
again I was on the computer today and I went
under new laws, there was little up title
there and there was a line about two and a
half inches long, nothing. Nothing.
Nothing on any new ordinances or whatever
and how did you expect people to obey the
ordinance or comply with them when they have
no way of finding ut other than jump through
hoops and run down the library and what if
everybody lined up all at once at the
library, wouldn't that be a silly situation,

so I'm requesting that we get with it on the IT Department and start getting these I'm not against per se the quality thinas. of life, I thought that was a good idea putting all of these things in the one heading instead of having to jump around and find this out and find that out and it's a great idea, but you have to know about it to comply with it and a lot of people are asking me questions and I don't know until I get down to the library, which is something I shouldn't have to do seeing as the fees I pay to Comcast also go the city in the form of a tax, so please consider in the near future.

And on 7-A if anybody could explain to me what is a third party inspection?

MR. MCGOFF: There's a company that's contracted to do inspections that's outside -- it's not the -- it's not LIPS itself that is doing it. It's, as I said, a third party that we contract.

MR. DOBRZYN: Does it involve the homeowner?

MR. MCGOFF: I'm sorry?

2425

22

23

MR. DOBRZYN: Would it involve the homeowner?

MR. EVANS: No, these are the inspections that are done based on building permits so.

MR. DOBRZYN: Building permit.

MR. EVANS: If you get a building permit and they follow up on that to make sure the work was done properly.

MR. DOBRZYN: All right, because I just hope that the city would work with people. For instance, we put a lovely porch on our house when I first bought it and it's still standing ten or 12 years later and it's a whole heck of a lot cheaper than what I got from other contractors. I walked up and looked up along my chimney after the roof was installed and I could see the sky. I mean, we replaced the roof but we didn't fix the leak obviously. So, you know, you can always haggle later, but sometimes things are best done for yourself.

Like I said, a few weeks ago I had my car inspected, the guy slapped the brake drum brake on in kind of heavy-handed manner

and on the way home my wheel started scratching and I pulled it off and I found that he knocked the brake spring loose so there I'm having the car inspected and paying good money and to get it inspected and, you know, there is no hard feelings but I had to run out and by a brake spring because it got all eaten up, luckily it didn't damage anything else.

The subject came out on the county fair and I don't want to be facetious, but please, no tax increases of 38 percent or 50 percent to finance a county fair and no further tax exempt land within Scranton boundaries, so I would really appreciate that because we are contributing an awful lot of tax exempt and it's not just nonprofits. It's county buildings and the whole enchilada.

City services, I'm still concerned about the Sewer Authority and I hope -- I hope that any deal that comes through is keeping the people in mind and that they are not -- we just don't have a corporation sopping up money out of people's pockets

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that could have gone for a much smaller tax increase.

And back fees, please, we have to start to collecting some of these back fees. People haven't paid trash fees for 10 or 15 years, that's unacceptable, totally unacceptable. Not your fault, nobody was up there hardly when that was going on.

But finally it's too bad the unions aren't here to hear this, but once again in the Federal Congress the Transpacific Trade Pack is being bamboozled right through Congress. They have no ability to call in an expert to explain the language or anything, it's an up or down vote. Last year, last December our trade deficit was \$47 billion. That's a lot of jobs and where the city unions are losing all over the country is that nobody has a job that pays taxes to the city. So, you know, if they are not there they are not there. Thank you and have a good night. Call your Congressman and tell him no.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening.

Marie Schumacher, taxpayer. First, what

happened to the 5:30 caucus tonight on the revised recovery plan that was announced last week?

MR. MCGOFF: Because of the police contract that was passed and the proposed contract with the fire union there would be perhaps revisions needed for the recovery plan and, therefore, a presentation of it would be premature.

MS. SCHUMACHER: It would have been nice -- I think Mr. Lockwood is fairly accessible by e-mail if not by phone certainly if that had been noted and we didn't find out until, like, I didn't find out until I called because of some confusion as to whether there was a caucus at five or 5:30. I think once something has been officially announced a little blurb in the paper would be thoughtful.

5-D, I think this is an extremely bad precedent if you do it. How do you do it for one person and then not do it for another person? I don't think a waiver should be given. I think the man was aware before he came, he has been well taken care

of and now he would even deny us I guess our paltry 2.4 percent of his wages, generous wages I might add that he will retain so we have just given him another salary increase of -- well, actually, 3.4 percent because he would also have to pay 1 percent to the city. I think that's wrong. I don't know, is the waiver with backup, I didn't get down here in time, does the backup say that as a condition of getting this waiver he will pay his wage taxes?

MR. MCGOFF: That is not in there.

 $\label{eq:MS.SCHUMACHER:} \textbf{MS. SCHUMACHER:} \quad \textbf{That is not this} \\ \textbf{there.}$

MR. MCGOFF: No.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Well, I guess I would like to suggest (a) that you not approve because I do think it's a terrible precedent and (b) if you do, because you tend to do whatever the mayor wants pretty much, that a condition be put in that he has to pay his 3.4 percent wage tax to the city.

MR. MCGOFF: That has been discussed.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay, it should be

24

25

in there, I think. And again, I was hoping to talk on the revised recovery plan tonight so one thing we desperately need, as we are going through tonight and I believe Mr. Judge said something about the city had the authority to do that or if they do that, we need a matrix of all of these things that are pluses and minuses and we need a regular status report, monthly status report on how those are bearing out so we can see because, and I would like to know by next week, too, what the annual amount is. The police contract was, oh, we're going to save \$6 million or \$5 million or \$4 million, but that was over seven years. This is going to have to be incorporated into a budget so you must know what the savings are by year and the expenses for that matter. offsetting, we need to see that and we need that matrix, just a good example are the drug tests. Yeah, okay, so it's in the contract but if nobody in the administration requests that they be done or follows up then, oh, well, just like so much that goes on here or does not, fails to go on, oh,

well. We need that matrix and we need -- I want to see the updates on that on a regular basis. The overtime, the sick time that's being taken, see how we are tracking.

Then how much -- I would also like to know how much this is going to contribute to our achieving a balanced budget without any -- a balance structural budget? Does anybody have an answer to that now? Okay.

MR. ROGAN: I will take a crack at it. Well, obviously, we would realize savings every year with new hires, so what would have to be done in the budgetary process is there would have to be --

MS. SCHUMACHER: I'm not talking budgetary process --

MR. ROGAN: You asked about the structural deficit in the budget.

MR. SCHUMACHER: When you were going to achieve -- yeah, how much it would and are we adding 13 new members to the Fire Department or is that only if a SAFER grant is --

MR. EVANS: That's correct. Only if the grant is --

1	MS. SCHUMACHER: I'm sorry.
2	MR. EVANS: Only if the grant is
3	approved.
4	MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay, because I
5	remember when Mayor Doherty got raked over
6	the coals because he didn't accept he
7	rejected that portion of the SAFER grant
8	that was available and, you know,
9	Mr. Loscombe and other people, oh, there is
10	30 people or 40 people I think they even
11	said eligible to retire and really that's a
12	big mistake. Well, it would have been a big
13	mistake to hire 13 or 14 people and have to
14	lay them off so it was a good decision on
15	Mr. Doherty's part. Thank you.
16	MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else who wishes
17	to address council?
18	MS. SCHUMACHER: Could I get one
19	more quick question?
20	MR. MCGOFF: I'm sorry?
21	MS. SCHUMACHER: Could I get one
22	more quick question?
23	MR. MCGOFF: Sure.
24	MS. SCHUMACHER: One more quick
25	question, on the payment of health care for

1 up to ten years to retirement age, does the 2 spouse -- if the spouse is a younger woman, 3 since they are all men, if the spouse is younger than the employee do they get it 4 5 until they're 65 or did they only get it until the employee reaches age 65? 6 7 MR. MCGOFF: I'd have to look at the 8 9 MS. SCHUMACHER: I would like to 10 know, and if it's not I would like to see 11 the ages of the current spouses anyway. 12 Thank you. 13 MR. ROGAN: We discussed that a 14 little bit on Tuesday night during our caucus. I believe it was said that once the 15 16 employee reaches age 65 the benefit 17 terminates, but we could check to make sure. 18 MS. SCHUMACHER: Thank you. 19 MS. REED: FIFTH ORDER. 5-A. 20 MOTIONS. 21 MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Wechsler. 22 MR. WECHSLER: Thank you, Mr. President. I received a citizen's 23 24 complaint about issues on Snook Street. 25 There have been several break-ins and

1

6 7

5

8 9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

actually the neighbors assisted in an arrest up there. There were also some quality of life issues that have been ongoing for many years that we have had some progress on, but actually I'm hoping that the new quality of life ordinance will help alleviate these problems.

As was mentioned tonight in the caucus, and we've heard this a couple of different times, the type of pension plan that the city can offer because we're a class 2A city is that we are required to offer a defined benefit plan, so at this time even if the bargaining units decided to go to type of other plan it's not allowed by state law, so that is where the problem lies is that we do need statewide pension reform and perhaps we do want to start to take a look at our classification as a city because there have been several instances so far this year that we have not been allowed to participate in certain programs or have been penalized because of our single status, and the rest of my comments I will keep until motions.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Rogan?

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. I guess I'll make the majority of my comments now. I would like to agree with what Councilman Wechsler mentioned regarding the Class 2A status, that has been a hindrance for the city to achieve many items that we would like to receive. We did send a letter to Senator Blake regarding the city revitalization and improvement zone program, requesting that that legislation be changed to allow Class 2A cities.

Another item that effects class 2A cities differently is the commuter tax which has been widely discussed in this chamber for probably 20 years and the list goes on and on of items that really ask effect us because we are still considered a Class 2A city even though the population for the last two census does not show that we meet that criteria.

But onto some of the agenda items for tonight, a few comments regarding the fire contracts and a few regarding the waiver for Mr. Bulzoni, the proposed waiver

22

23

24

25

for Mr. Bulzoni. First regarding the fire contract, again, I would like to thank the administration and the union for coming tonight, and prior to tonight's meeting we were provided with a good packet of information that really outlined the cost and the benefits of this plan in a streamline manner. Through reading through it some items are similar to the police contract, some are different. I voted for the police contract, I believe it was a good deal for the city, this fire contract is an even better deal because of the some of the items that were taken from the police, and one of the most important items that was changed was regarding disability pensions, a wellness program to ensure that when people are getting hired that they are healthy and not going on disability two years later.

Additionally, and I know that the Scranton Times documented this in a multiple series regarding former city employees who are on disability pensions but working other positions. With this new agreement there would be changes to that where that wouldn't

3

4

5 6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be happening anymore. Also, the increases in the pensions, that would change as well on the disability end. So I think there are items that were sorely needed in regard to the disability pensions and the problems we have had with that in the city.

May of my comments are similar to what we saw in the police, obviously the salary savings are much greater than what would happen in the past by going to arbitration. Just for background, and I did this for the police so I think it would be fair to do it regarding the fire contract as well, this contract calls for approximately 2 percent raises and those are split midyear, and a lot of these raises in past were split midyear to achieve a little bit of savings for the city. The added costs are \$1.9 million over the life of the contract. The savings based on 3 percent are 3.4 million, and the 3 percent in historical context for the City of Scranton is a very, very, very conservative number.

I'm going to read off some of the awards that were given to the fire union

23

24

25

through arbitration, and this is the first arbitration under the previous administration. December 31, 2005, a 5.5 percent raise was awarded to the city's firefighters. The very next day on January 1, 2006, a 3.5 percent raise was awarded so that's a total of 9 percent raise in two days through the arbitration process. January 1, 2007, a raise of 4 percent was given out. January 1, 2008, and now we are into the second arbitration, the one we are still left holding a \$20 plus million dollar bill because of, which was actually \$40 million plus that half was given back, January 1, 2008, 8 percent raise. January 1, 2009, 3 percent. July 1, 2009, 3 percent, 6 percent total pay increase in 2009. January 1, 2010, 3 percent. July 1, 2010, 3 percent. 6 percent total for the year 2010. January 1, 2011, 3 percent. July 1, 2011, 3 percent. Again the total of 6 percent. January 1, 2012, 3 percent pay increase. July 1, 2012, another 3 percent pay increase. 6 percent for 2012. January 1, a 3.2 percent pay increase.

1, 3.2 percent pay increase. 6.4 percent total pay increase for 2013. January 1, 2014, 3.2 percent, and July 1, 2014, 3.2 percent. Again, a total of 6.4 percent pay increase through the arbitration process in just one year.

So you can see what can result by not negotiating a contract in good faith.

The cost are astronomical, and this totaling up is well over 50 percent just in the second arbitration alone, not even counting the 9 percent raise that firefighters received in two days because of the failing to negotiate in good faith. So that's the cost of rolling the dice and waiting until in contract expires and not negotiating.

If we chose that path this very well be the result. It may not be quite as bad, but one thing that is for sure during that period of time we will not receive \$1.5 million in increased pension contributions from city firefighters, we will not have a reduction in overtime from city firefighters, there will not be position eliminations, and when I say position

eliminations I'm not speaking of less firefighters out there fighting fires, these are higher ranks that are being eliminated, so the firefighters would remain at a lower rank which would save approximately \$232,000 through the life of the contract on the low case end, on the high estimate would be \$132,800 per year.

One additional cost that will be \$65,000, which I believe is money well spent, is the EMT changes for certification for the firefighters. It's a very small cost but it's something that will certainly come in handy when, you know, if you have a fire or an incident at your home.

And the final item is the restructuring of the salaries. That would not only save money every year, but it will also increase the chances of obtaining a SAFER grant, which really build up the city a few years under Mayor Doherty. It reopened fire houses, we were able to keep the level of protection somewhat consistent because of that grant. By applying these changes, that grant will be approximately

\$700,000 less than allocation and that will certainly increase our chance of getting the grant for those firefighters and that will help us keep our firehouses open, which is the most important thing in this whole debate.

So because of those reasons and because of the all of the information being outlined in such an easy format, I will be voting "yes" on that item tonight.

Regarding the waiver for

Mr. Bulzoni, that is something that I will
be considering or I will vote to introduce
it this week but it's something I do want to
think about. I know that we had some
discussions about possible changes that we
will talk more about in the future, but one
thing I do want to look into a little bit
and some people have mentioned, well, this
will set a precedent. I believe, and I'm
going to check into it, that former DPW
Director George Parker did not live in the
City of Scranton under Mayor Doherty. Now,
I do know that he did not go through this
process, which should happen, but I will be

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

checking into that to see if that is, in fact, the case. And there are a few others that were brought up, city employees that did not live in the city under previous administrations, so I will be checking into those items. And that is all for tonight. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: I just have some brief comments. First of all, I'd like to touch on what Councilman Wechsler said about pension reform for new hires. I'm a little concerned because I have been talking about this for six months and I only found in the last week that this is something that needs state approval. I'm not sure who missed this or why no one told me this or why we haven't had the discussion before so I would hope that in the near future we can create some kind of an opportunity to have a long discussion with our state senator and our state reps because it's something that we need to put on the front burner, and soon.

A comment on the Amoroso plan and the direct recovery plans since we had some

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

discussion on that earlier. If we have a plan and we say we are a supporter of that plan than me need to follow that plan. It really isn't much more complicated than that. It's when we change the plan that or we veer off the plan or we ignore the plan that we find ourselves getting in trouble and, of course, past history has shown that's happens.

On Mr. Bulzoni's waiver, I'm not a fan of waiver requests mostly because I have always felt that we have and we should have a rich enough talent pool of the candidates for any position already within our city boundaries and that any employee that comes from the outside of the city should want to live in the city that they are wishing to However, I am struggling a bit serve. because Mr. Bulzoni is an exceptional business administrator, so hopefully by next week we can come up with some amendments and have some more discussion on this because I think there is some ways to do this without a full waiver. And that's all I have for tonight.

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. MCGOFF: Mr. Gaughan.

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, thank you. received a lot of phone calls and concerns and complaints about the snow removal on the downtown from this past snowstorm, and I will just say that over the past year on several occasions I have met with the mayor about alternate side of the street parking and banning parking completely during and after the snowstorm to possibly make it easier for the DPW to clean up downtown and remove snow, multiple discussions. I'm not sure what else to do. It's just time to implement something that works or helps the situation because there are business people downtown who are very upset and very angry about the situation.

I would like to at this time make a motion that we table Agenda Item 5-F, the memorandum of understanding between the city and the fire department until we have adopted the 2015 revised recovery plan.

MR. EVANS: Why not. I'll second that.

MR. MCGOFF: 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

MR. GAUGHAN: On the question, I'm making this motion tonight as I did last week during the police contract debate because I feel it would be extremely irresponsible for council to pass a contract which includes an extension until 2021 in advance of the revised recovery plan. As I mentioned last week, the revised recovery plan states that the workforce provisions shall only be applicable to collective bargain agreements or arbitration settlements executed after the adoption after the revised recovery plan. Passing this contract essentially means we circumvent the recovery plan work force mandates. We are guaranteeing that the tools the recovery plan affords us will be thrown out the window.

I would urge my colleagues to take my serious concerns into consideration and table this legislation until after we have adopted the 2015 revised recovery plan and had a public caucus with PEL. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else on the question? All those in favor of tabling

signify by saying aye.

MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.

MR. EVANS: Aye.

MS. MCGOFF: Opposed?

MR. WECHSLER: No.

MR. ROGAN: No.

MR. MCGOFF: The motion is defeated.

MR. GAUGHAN: One final comment, you know, I appreciate Mr. Bulzoni and Mr. Judge and Mr. Lucas coming to our caucus tonight. One thing that I will never understand is the absence of Mayor Courtright. someone who touts the savings of the police contract and the savings in this fire contract, for him not to show up at a public caucus is disappointing, frustrating, and quite frankly embarrassing. You know, as the leader of our city he should be here and as someone who was a former city councilman who always asked that the mayor show up to council meetings I don't understand what the fear is with coming and sitting in front of us and answering simple questions or at least giving his opinion and his take in front of this council and at the very least

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

4

5

7

6

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

affording us that respect. And that's is all I have until motions -- or until agenda items. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Just to piggyback on what Councilman Gaughan has just said, members of the administration were I'll say invited to attend the caucus. It was determined Mr. Bulzoni would be the one that would represent the administration. also say that I'm disappointed in the fact that this -- the invitation to the caucus was put on the shoulders of Mr. Bulzoni and that the mayor and the solicitor, who was primarily -- and also the union or the labor attorney were not present. Although the information provided was I believe, you know, good, I think that the people that negotiated the contract or the memorandum of understanding and, you know, people that have sent this to us for approval should have been here. With that said, we move on, they weren't.

As far as the contract are concerned, I know that a number of people have commented on the contracts, and I don't

mean to get into an argument with the newspaper on this, but if you relied on the newspaper, solely the newspaper for information regarding the police contract I believe that you are misinformed. I do not believe that the newspaper provided a balanced review of that contract. They highlighted -- continually highlighted the expenditures in the contract. They in some cases I believe overestimated what those costs would be and yet failed to delineate in any way the savings in the contract.

I believe that it appears that the purpose of the newspaper is simply to discredit the mayor and the administration and not present a balanced view. I believe that what they are doing is shaping the news rather than reporting it, and when you do that all it is propaganda. I believe that the newspaper has a responsibility to present a balanced review of what is presented and I don't think they have done that.

Now, granted the information concerning the FOP contract was poorly

13 14

15

16

10

11

12

17

19

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

disseminated. I believe part of it was my fault. Perhaps we should have not -- we probably should have had a caucus as we did tonight where that information was I failed to do that and I will presented. take responsibility for that. I believe that we did tonight and the caucus should be reported and should be reported fairly as it Numbers do not was presented. necessarily -- I don't think that you should look only at the numbers that are contained in the contract. I think, as Mr. Rogan has mentioned, we should also look at the public safety issues that are part of these contracts and I don't think that those things have been fairly reported.

A political cartoon that appeared in the Times few days ago said, "Do the Math." Well, I challenge the newspaper to do the math. If you are going to do the math and you are going to come out with an accurate assessment you need to include all of the numbers, not just the ones that are appropriate to your position.

As far as the city audit, as I said,

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would provide an answer to a question that was asked earlier, we received in our mail dated February 4, "Separate sealed proposal will be received by the city controller in our office until March 6, 2015, at 10 a.m. at which time that will be read aloud in council chambers by the Business Administrator for the following: City of Scranton's independent post audit for the years 21-31-2013, 12-31-2014, as per specifications. Mandatory pre-proposal conference will be held and February 18, 2015, at 10 a.m. All bidders are required to have a representative at this conference so that there is an RFP out for the audit for future years. And that's all.

MR. GAUGHAN: Could I make one addition?

MR. MCGOFF: Sure.

MR. GAUGHAN: Just a comment on your comment, Mr. McGoff, about the newspaper.

You know, I think that the administration has a responsibility to the public and I don't think they fulfilled this responsibility with the police contract and

22

23

24

25

I think it's -- you know, the purpose of the newspaper and the media is to inform the public. I mean, my God, council -- the councilmen up here had a hard time getting information. So, you know, I mean, the enemy of success is doubt and, you know, I think with both of these contracts there seems to be that doubt and a little bit of secrecy and nobody, you know, the financial analysis and the cost savings analysis is confidential. I mean, it just -- you know, I'm not defending the newspaper here, but at some point you've got to hold the administration's feet to the fire and realize that that their sole responsibility really is to the public, and my responsibility is to my constituency, which is the public. It's not good enough for me to just to get the information, go home and look at it and say, "Oh, okay, well, it looks pretty good, I'll vote on it."

I have to answer to the people of in city and that's important to me.

MR. ROGAN: Just on that, I don't want to keep going back and forth on this,

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

but regarding some of the numbers being confidential, that was asked and answered on Tuesday night and we are told that those numbers could be given out to the public, and I believe the reason why they were marked confidential when they were initially given us to because it was prior to the union vote per labor laws.

MR. GAUGHAN: Right, I understand that and I do, but I would just -- I wanted to see a document that's not marked "confidential." I mean, we are public officials. I understand your point, Mr. Rogan, and I would just saying that, you know, I think if we are looking at this in council chambers, and I appreciate the document and the work that was done, I think that, you know, I would like to see, and I did and request from the administration an executive summary that accompanied financially analysis and the cost savings analysis that gives some sort of authorship to the document because no one's name is provided on it. You know, to me that doesn't really make much sense. I realize

there was collaboration, but at some pint you would like to see someone take ownership of the document officially in some capacity.

MR. ROGAN: That was also asked and answered at our caucus on Tuesday and again tonight.

MR. WECHSLER: I would just like to make a comment that I'm a bit offended, we all went home and did our homework. None of just accepted theses numbers as given. I know I asked several questions and went to several meetings and asked a lot of different questions and the fact that I'm satisfied with what I was given doesn't make it wrong.

MR. GAUGHAN: I don't think I said that at all. Not to belabor the point, but

MR. WECHSLER: Not to interrupt, but you did say that we just accepted the numbers. Well, that's not the case. We did our homework and the fact that I accepted the information after it was verified that it was acceptable. That doesn't make it wrong.

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GAUGHAN: I didn't say that at all, but you can spin it any way you want.

MR. MCGOFF: Let me just finish this, we all have an obligation as elected members of council to do our due diligence in voting on any legislation, and disagreement will occur. Our due diligence may produce different results and that's fine and that's the way the process is supposed to work. My point was in saying this that, yes, I agree, dissemination of information for the police contract was done poorly, I said that, and I said part of it was my fault, however, that information was disseminated and was available to everyone. At some point in time, that became available to everyone. All I was saying was I do not feel that that was fairly presented by the newspaper to the public. I felt that we tried to do that in our meetings and I do not feel that it was done by the newspaper.

All I'm asking is that as we go forward with this contract proposal that a more balanced view, since we received voluminous information this evening, that

1 this be reported in an appropriate manner. 2 That was all. And that was all. 5-B. FOR INTRODUCTION -3 MS. REED: 4 AN ORDINANCE - AUTHORIZING THE REMOVAL OF THE EXISTING "NO PARKING" SIGNS LOCATED IN 5 THE 500 AND 600 BLOCKS OF ADAMS AVENUE 6 (S.R.3023) AND REPLACING THOSE SIGNS WITH 7 8 NEW R7-302 NO PARKING SYMBOL/ARROW SIGNS AT 9 ADEQUATE INTERVALS ALONG THE WESTERLY SIDE AND EASTERLY SIDE OF THE 500 AND 600 BLOCKS 10 11 OF ADAMS AVENUE (S.R.3023) FROM THE INTERSECTION AT VINE STREET TO THE 12 INTERSECTIONS WITH NORTH WASHINGTON AVENUE. 13 14 MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll entertain a motion that Item 5-B be 15 16 introduced into its proper committee. 17 MR. ROGAN: So moved. 18 MR. WECHSLER: Second. 19 MR. MCGOFF: On the question? A11 20 those in favor of introduction signify by 21 saying aye. 22 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 23 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 24 MR. EVANS: Aye. 25 Aye. MR. GAUGHAN:

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and so moved.

MS. REED: 5-C. FOR INTRODUCTION - A RESOLUTION - APPROVING THE FINANCING BY THE SCRANTON-LACKAWANNA HEALTH AND WELFARE AUTHORITY OF CERTAIN CAPITAL PROJECTS FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALLIED HEALTH CARE SERVICES, INC., A PENNSYLVANIA NOT-FOR-PROFIT CORPORA TON; DECLARING THAT IT IS DESIRABLE FOR THE HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON, LACKAWANNA COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA. AND THE AREA SERVED BY ALLIED HEALTH CARE SERVICES, INC. TO HAVE THE PROJECTS PROVIDED BY AND FINANCED THROUGH THE AUTHORITY: DESIGNATING THE MAYOR OF THE CITY, OR, IN HIS ABSENCE, THE PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT OF THE CITY COUNCIL, AS THE PERSON TO ACT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY COUNCIL AS THE "APPLICABLE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE" WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986, AS AMENDED; AUTHORIZING SUCH MAYOR OF THE CITY OR THE PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY TO TAKE CERTAIN ACTIONS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY AS SUCH "APPLICABLE

	47
1	ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE"; AND AUTHORIZING
2	OTHER NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE ACTION.
3	MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll
4	entertain a motion that Item 5-C be
5	introduced into its proper committee.
6	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
7	MR. WECHSLER: Second.
8	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? All
9	those in favor of introduction signify by
10	saying aye.
11	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
12	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
13	MR. EVANS: Aye.
14	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
15	MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
16	ayes have it and so moved.
17	MS. REED: 5-D. FOR INTRODUCTION - A
18	RESOLUTION - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
19	APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO WAIVE THE
20	RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR DAVID BULZONI,
21	CITY OF SCRANTON BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR.
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.

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WECHSLER: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question.

I will be voting against this legislation tonight. I have great respect for Mr. Bulzoni and the job that he does as business administrator, however, at the end of the day the rules are the rules. The business administrator should live in the City of Scranton. Mr. Bulzoni said he would move into the city within six months of being appointed and that hasn't happened and I think, quite frankly, that granting a waiver sets an awful precedent for the city moving forward. The business administrator's position is it a crucial one in which decisions and recommendations are made to increase taxes and fees on the people of Scranton. I strongly believe that Mr. Bulzoni, as business administrator, should live in Scranton and pay the same taxes and fees that our citizens pay. Thank you.

MR. WECHSLER: On the question, Mr. McGoff, I wanted people to know that

3 4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Bulzoni did make an attempt to sell his home and move into the city and that did not happen, which is unfortunate, but I do believe that the mayor has some responsibility in this. The job that Mr. Bulzoni was doing is quite significant. is involved in several of the financial corrections and plans that we are making and I believe the administration should have realized this problem back in June I think when it came up because that was when the six months expired and I think if we had this question a few months ago it wouldn't be under such a light as it tonight.

And in terms of precedent, Councilman Rogan is correct there have been past administrative people who have been granted this waiver. I'm sure that -- Path said it went through council but I know that George Parker was allowed to be the DPW director and not live in the city. That's all.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else?

MR. ROGAN: I would just make a final comment that we have had discussions

about possible alterations to make this more agreeable. Obviously, we would all prefer the business administrator to live in the city as we all do and as all of our city employees do. I do think that -- I am glad to see that this is being done through the proper channels through a vote of council not just being granted on an okay basis as it was in the past, but I do think it's something that we need to take a close look at.

MR. EVANS: I think what we struggle with is the fact that we are not monitoring these city wages. We did not know Mr.
Bulzoni did not move in the city until we saw this legislation so, you know, now it's expected to come to concur and say either get a waiver or you are unemployed, so it's something that we really have to balance and I think hopefully we can come up with some solutions that will make a little more palatable for all of us.

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

	51
1	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
2	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
3	MR. EVANS: Aye.
4	MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed?
5	MR. GAUGHAN: No.
6	MR. MCGOFF: The ayes have it and so
7	moved.
8	MS. REED: 5-E. FOR INTRODUCTION -
9	A RESOLUTION - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND
10	OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE
11	AND ENTER INTO A MEMBERSHIP AGREEMENT WITH
12	PENNSYLVANIA ONE CALL SYSTEM, INC. (POCS) IN
13	ORDER TO IDENTIFY ALL UNDERGROUND FACILITIES
14	THAT ARE OWNED BY THE CITY AND LOCATE THE
15	SAME ON MAPPING.
16	MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll
17	entertain a motion that Item 5-E be
18	introduced into its proper committee.
19	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
20	MR. WECHSLER: Second.
21	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? I
22	personally would like them to identify
23	underground facilities, I didn't know that
24	we had any, but it would be interesting.
25	All those in favor of introduction

	52
1	signify by saying aye.
2	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
3	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
4	MR. EVANS: Aye.
5	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
6	MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
7	ayes have it and so moved.
8	MS. REED: 5-F. FOR INTRODUCTION - A
9	RESOLUTION - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
10	APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AND
11	ENTER INTO A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BY
12	AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF SCRANTON AND LOCAL
13	UNION NO. 60 OF THE INTERNATIONAL
14	ASSOCIATION OF FIRE FIGHTERS, AFL-CIO.
15	MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll
16	entertain a motion that Item 5-F be
17	introduced into its proper committee.
18	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
19	MR. WECHSLER: Second.
20	MR. MCGOFF: On the question?
21	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question.
22	I will be voting against this legislation
23	tonight for reasons that are very similar to
24	my dissent on the police contract a week
25	ago. I still don't understand the manner in

which all of this is being done in advance of the revised recovery plan. I think, quite frankly, that it's reckless and short-sided. The language in the recovery plan explicitly states that the workforce mandates and other tools that help the city will only be applicable to contracts that are passed after the adoption of the recovery plan. We are basically insuring that we safeguard the police and fire unions from any requirements that are included in our own recovery plan.

I'm also extremely concerned about the extension of the contract until 2021. The next few years are going to be very difficult as we are on the road towards either exiting Act 47 and distressed status or facing receivership and possible bankruptcy. Extending the contract until 2021 ties the hands the city's in my two First, we eliminate the possibility ways. of the city to renegotiate the police contract in 2017 at a very critical juncture when preparing the three-year exit plan depending on whether or not the state even

25

grants us a three-year extension on the Act 47 deadline.

Second, this extended contract would still be in effect for an additional year if we were approved by the state for the extension 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 expire. We will have no option to negotiate further fiscal relief until 2021.

It's pretty clear to me that both the police and the fire contracts are an end run around Act 47 and the revised recovery plan. We have essentially negotiated away the ability for the city to make future decisions about cost savings if need be. I believe it's our job as public servants to be aware that the important decisions that we make today will have an effect on the future of our city. It's easy to think about the effect of the decision we may have on the city tomorrow, next week, or even next year. It's important that we think about the effect that the decision we make

will have in the next five or ten years or even longer. The effect it will have on future administrations and future councils and the effect that it will have on the taxpayers of Scranton. It's my firm belief that extending contracts until 2021, contradicting our own recovery plan in many instances, and giving out raises and other perks is not the way to do business as a financially distressed city. Thank you.

MR. EVANS: On the question, my comments will be short, I will say that I am impressed by union negotiated terms of this MOU, particularly as a relates to disability pension language, reemployment examinations, annual physicals and drug screening and all the wellness program, drug and alcohol testing, light duty and rank elimination. The union leadership and the city bargaining unit should be congratulated on all of those items.

With that said, while there has been some movement on the legacy items that I posed in the FOP contract, there has not been enough change in retiree health care,

additional vacation time and sick days along with the extended term of this contract to move the doubt for me from a no to a yes.

As I have previously stated, it was less of a concern with tweaking certain sections than my stated goal of removing certain sections altogether. It is still my opinion that we are trading short-term gain for bad long-term fiscal policy, a pattern the city seems to have repeated many times before.

While I may not go as far to suggest it feels like groundhog day as one of my previous councilman has previously stated there is certainly a feeling of déjà vu.

That's all I have for now.

MR. WECHSLER: On the question, I will be voting for introduction for the MOU and the reason being is for some of the reasons that Councilman Evans just mentioned. There has been some revisions to pension contributions, disability, flexibility and staffing. Those are several of the key points that were in the very original recovery plan that was voted on by the citizens of Scranton by an overwhelming

majority that, unfortunately, the Supreme
Court did not allow us to follow. In that
case those benefits originally cost us \$40
million and right now they are still costing
us \$22 million that we have not paid yet.
We are getting these improvements that we
have been seeking for many years and now
they are agreed upon by both the
administration and the union.

The union took a very active role in improving what they saw as problems within their own department, people abusing sick time, people abusing disability and other matters like that. I'm also very excited that if it works out this way that the retirees will allow for the hiring of new firefighters. These new firefighters will come in at half the existing grade and for several years before they make their new grade.

It is also very important for me
that we maintain the staffing level that
keeps the neighborhood firehouses opens. As
everyone knows, I'm from East Mountain where
Engine 10 is an integral part of our

24

25

community. A few years ago an incident in our neighborhood where two lives were nearly lost was caused by a firehouse being closed. I don't think anyone that I have ever spoken to has asked for firehouses to be closed and there is no way really for us to maintain those firehouses without increasing our minimum -- the amount of firefighters that we have on hand. If we are able to get the SAFER grant those actual new hires will be for the first two years very little cost to the city. And I think it's very important that in the city our size and the age of our buildings that we have a reliable professional firefighting force. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: I would just like to address a couple of things. First of all, as far as the revised recovery plan is concerned I think the key word there is revised. We are looking at the mandates that were contained in the draft proposal of the revised recovery plan are things that can be revised, that's the whole idea, and they have been in the past. What these, mandates are supposed to do is provide

that we have been -- which we have been presented, how about that for proper English, if they have accomplished the same goals as the mandates in the proposal then there is no reason why revision can't be done, and it is my belief that what we are doing with these contracts, yes, are we extending them beyond what the revised recovery plan would be, yes, but I believe that what we are doing is that we can help achieve recovery through these contracts along with enhancing public safety.

I think these contacts achieve both of those goals and those are goals that I think are important to the city.

MR. ROGAN: I made the majority of my comments on this under motions, but just a few brief points. Many, and Mr. McGoff is right, the newspaper really pushed this idea that this is only a short-term savings. While the savings are \$6.5 million in this deal are great, the larger savings is by avoiding arbitration, and I don't think there is anyone out there that could say the

union would have received -- the city would have received a better deal by going to arbitration than going through this process, that's simply not true. Because of that process, as Councilman Wechsler mentioned, we still have a \$22 million bill owed to the city's police and firefighters and that's growing by over \$100,000 in interest every month, and that was because of the failure of previous administrations to negotiate a good faith, and not to put all of the blame on the former mayor but he was lead down that path by the Pennsylvania Economy:

League and by DCED.

That is -- arbitration is my biggest concern. The city has time and time again lost and lost bad at arbitration. By extending this contract out that is avoided. I know Councilman Gaughan mentioned that in 2017 that this can't be renegotiated, it certainly can, but it would take exactly what's going on right now. Right now there is a contract in place for another three years. This didn't have to take place. It was a pledge by the administration to reopen

contracts and try to receive cost saving measures for the city. Neither side was under any obligation to negotiate a contract at this point. We couldn't have waited until the contract's sunset, but this administration chose a different path than the previous one. Now, which path do you prefer to chose is certainly up to you, but I believe the path of negotiating good faith will obviously achieve better results than heading to arbitration, and that's all.

MR. EVANS: One brief comment, I think we are seeing some changes on the arbitration front across the state so I'm not so sure the arbitration boogieman is something we should be afraid of all of the time.

Secondly, my biggest concern as I said before are the long-term effects. We are adding to our legacy costs. Retiree health care is not free. There will be 60 firemen in this part of this contract and there will be 99 policemen that will be part of that that will eligible for retiree health care benefits. It's not going to go

2

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

away. The can is being kicked down the road again and it will start in 2020 and it will not end until all 150 or more are off the books, and then it starts again because new hires will also have retiree health care.

MR. GAUGHAN: And I would just comment that with the arbitration process I understand the point, but at some point -at some, you know, point you have to say to yourself how much can the city afford, how much can we pay? You know, Mr. Rogan went through the raises before that were given because of the arbitration awards and we are giving raises again now. You know, the \$22 million is still the big elephant in the How do we afford that? Who is going room. to pay that bill? I don't know. It's just, you know, I agree with Mr. Evans in the fact that there has been a shift in the arbitration awards that I think people are starting to take into account what cities and their taxpayers can afford, so that's all I have. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else?

MR. ROGAN: Just one brief comment,

I hate to belabor this point and disagree with my friend Councilman Evans, but in the current police contract through the years this contract has been approved there are seven police officers eligible for health care. Under the current fire contract, there is one. Now, when this contract expires it will then be up to the mayor, the council at that time to negotiate that part out, and some may say, well, that's never happen, but it already did happen once, and I believe Mr. Councilman Wechsler brought this up last month.

MR. WECHSLER: It has.

MR. EVANS: In a Court case it happened once and the judge ruled in our favor, ironically enough, and now we are putting him back in. So I agree with what you said, it's all true, but the reality is that once that is in the contracts it will never be taken out again because the next time a contract is up 99 people that are going to be voting for that contract are the ones that will be eligible for retiree health care benefits in the FOP. Half of

their --half of the fire department will be eligible. That means half the people potentially voting on the next contract will be voting to take out retiree health care benefits. I don't see that happening, so call it human nature, call it a hunch, but I just think that once we put it in there it's in there forever.

MR. GAUGHAN: And just to further clarify, I mean, it does say in regards to health care in the current recovery plan that we are under and in the revised one, the draft that the 2015 revised recovery plan shall not provide any retiree health care benefits to any current or future city employee that retires from city employment from the period 2015 to 2018 and indefinitely thereafter unless modified in the subsequent revised recovery plan. It says the same thing in the 2012 recovery plan. So, essentially, we are violating our own recovery plan.

MR. MCGOFF: No.

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.

MR. MCGOFF: No. Under the recovery

1 plan we are allowed to -- the city can 2 negotiate contracts, and those contracts can 3 supercede what's in the recovery plan. MR. GAUGHAN: Right, but from the 4 5 city's perspective why wouldn't I just -maybe I'm missing something, why would you 6 do that to yourself if it's, you know, like 7 Mr. Evans said the Court case came down, it 8 9 was taken out, and then, you know, it says 10 it in both recovery plans and we are putting 11 it back in. I mean, that's just I guess a 12 point of confusion on my part. 13 MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else? All those 14 in favor of introduction signify by saying 15 aye. 16 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 17 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 18 MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? 19 MR. EVANS: No. 20 MR. GAUGHAN: No. 21 MR. MCGOFF: The ayes have it and so 22 moved. 23 MS. REED: 5-G. FOR INTRODUCTION - A 24 RESOLUTION - REPEALING RESOLUTION NO. 29, 25 2014 (AS AMENDED) APPOINTMENT OF TIMOTHY

1	PERRY, 2325 BIRNEY AVENUE, SCRANTON,
2	PENNSYLVANIA, 18505 AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD
3	OF THE SCRANTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.
4	MR. PERRY WILL BE REPLACING PETER RIEBE
5	WHOSE TERM EXPIRED ON FEBRUARY 4, 2010. MR.
6	PERRY'S TERM WILL EXPIRE ON FEBRUARY 4,
7	2015. THERE WAS A DISCREPANCY AS TO THE
8	LIMIT OF MR. RIEBE'S TERM AND LITIGATION WAS
9	FILED.
10	MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll
11	entertain a motion that Item 5-G be
12	introduced into its proper committee.
13	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
14	MR. WECHSLER: Second.
15	MR. MCGOFF: On the question?
16	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question,
17	I would just like to thank Mr. Riebe for his
18	service to that board.
19	MR. MCGOFF: All those in favor
20	signify by saying aye.
21	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
22	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
23	MR. EVANS: Aye.
24	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
25	MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The

1 ayes have it and so moved. MS. REED: 5-H. FOR INTRODUCTION - A 2 3 RESOLUTION - APPOINTMENT OF TIMOTHY PERRY, 2325 BIRNEY AVENUE, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, 4 18505 AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF THE 5 SCRANTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY. MR. PERRY 6 WILL BE REPLACING PETER RIEBE WHOSE TERM 7 EXPIRED ON FEBRUARY 4, 2015. MR. PERRY'S 8 9 TERM WILL EXPIRE ON FEBRUARY 4, 2020. MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll 10 11 entertain a motion that Item 5-H be 12 introduced into its proper committee. 13 MR. ROGAN: So moved. 14 MR. WECHSLER: Second. 15 MR. MCGOFF: On the question? A11 16 those in favor of introduction signify by 17 saying aye. 18 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 19 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 20 MR. EVANS: Aye. 21 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 22 MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The 23 ayes have it and so moved. 24 MS. REED: SIXTH ORDER. 6-A. 25 READING BY TITLE - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO.

1	80, 2015 - AN ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF
2	THE COUNCIL NO. 58, 2014, AN ORDINANCE
3	ENTITLED "GENERAL CITY OPERATING BUDGET
4	2015" BY CREATING A NEW EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT
5	NO. 01.401.15333.4299 ENTITLED
6	NON-DEPARTMENTAL EXPENDITURES OPR TSF TO
7	DEBT SVC LANDMARK RESERVE ACCOUNT AND
8	TRANSFERRING FUNDS FROM ACCOUNT NO.
9	01.401.15319.4299 NON-DEPARTMENTAL
10	EXPENDITURES OPER TSF TO DEBT SVC SCRANTON
11	PARKING AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE FOR MONTHLY
12	DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS TO LANDMARK BANK.
13	MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by
14	title of Item 6-A, what is your pleasure?
15	MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-A
16	pass reading by title.
17	MR. WECHSLER: Second.
18	MS. MCGOFF: On the question? All
19	those in favor signify by saying aye.
20	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
21	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
22	MR. EVANS: Aye.
23	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
24	MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
25	ayes have it and so moved.

1	MS. REED: 6-B. READING BY TITLE -
2	FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 81, 2015 - AN
3	ORDINANCE - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
4	APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AND
5	ENTER INTO A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH NORTHEAST
6	INSPECTION CONSULTANTS ("NEIC") FOR THE
7	FORMER SUPPLY ROOM IN THE LICENSING,
8	INSPECTIONS AND PERMITS DEPARTMENT (LIPS),
9	FOURTH FLOOR, CITY HALL TO BE USED FOR
10	THIRD-PARTY INSPECTIONS.
11	MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by
12	title of Item 6-B, what is your pleasure?
13	MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-B
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: SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. FOR
25	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY

DEVELOPMENT - FOR ADOPTION RESOLUTION NO.

119, 2015 - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AND
ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH NORTHEAST
INSPECTION CONSULTANTS (NEIC) TO PROVIDE
THIRD PARTY UCC ENFORCEMENT FOR THE CITY OF
SCRANTON FOR A PERIOD OF THREE (3) YEARS
FROM FEBRUARY 6, 2015 THROUGH FEBRUARY 6,
2018.

MR. MCGOFF: What is the recommendation of the Chair for the Committee on Community Development?

MR. ROGAN: As Chairperson for the Committee on Finance, I recommend final passage of Item 7-A.

MR. WECHSLER: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question?

MR. EVANS: On the question, my understanding is NEIC is already in place and is under contract right now and from what I understand by all accounts they do a very, very good job for the city so I'll be voting yes on this.

MR. MCGOFF: Roll call, please.
Roll call, please?

	71
1	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.
2	MR. WECHSLER: Yes.
3	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
4	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
5	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
6	MR. EVANS: Yes.
7	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
8	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
9	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
10	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
11	Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted.
12	MS. REED: 7-B. FOR CONSIDERATION BY
13	THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS - FOR ADOPTION
14	RESOLUTION NO. 120, 2015 - AUTHORIZING THE
15	MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS
16	TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO A RIGHT-OF-WAY
17	AGREEMENT WITH PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES
18	CORPORATION ("PPL") IN ORDER TO ROUTE POWER
19	TO THE COLTS INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION
20	CENTER ALONG LACKAWANNA AVENUE AND CLIFF
21	STREET IN THE CITY OF SCRANTON.
22	MR. MCGOFF: What is the
23	recommendation of the Chair for the
24	Committee on Public Works?
25	MR. GAUGHAN: As Chairperson for the

	/2
1	Committee on Public Works, I recommend final
2	passage of Item 7-B.
3	MR. ROGAN: Second.
4	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll
5	call, please?
6	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.
7	MR. WECHSLER: Yes.
8	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
9	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
10	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
11	MR. EVANS: Yes.
12	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
13	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
14	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
15	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
16	Item 7-B legally and lawfully adopted.
17	MS. REED: 7-C - PREVIOUSLY TABLED -
18	FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON
19	FINANCE - FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF THE COUNCIL
20	NUMBER 73, 2015 - AMENDING FILE OF THE
21	COUNCIL NUMBER 119-76 ENTITLED "AN ORDINANCE
22	(AS AMENDED) LEVYING GENERAL LEVYING GENERAL
23	AND SPECIAL TAXES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1977
24	BY SETTING THE MILLAGE FOR THE YEAR 2015 AND
25	THE SAME SHALL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND

EFFECT ANNUALLY THEREAFTER."
MR. MCGOFF: What is the
recommendation of the Chair for the
Committee on Finance?
MR. EVANS: As Chairperson for the
Committee on Finance, I recommend final
passage of Item 7-C.
MR. ROGAN: Second.
MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll
call, please?
MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.
MR. WECHSLER: Yes.
MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
MR. ROGAN: Yes.
MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
MR. EVANS: Yes.
MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
Item 7-C legally and lawfully adopted.
If there is no further business,
motion to adjourn.
MR. ROGAN: Motion to adjourn.
MR. MCGOFF: Meeting adjourned.

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

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER