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

п

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

	3
1	(Pledge of Allegiance recited and
2	moment of reflection observed.)
3	MR. MCGOFF: Roll call, please.
4	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.
5	MR. WECHSLER: Here.
6	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
7	MR. ROGAN: Here.
8	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
9	MR. EVANS: Here.
10	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
11	MR. GAUGHAN: Here.
12	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
13	MR. MCGOFF: Here.
14	MS. REED: THIRD ORDER. 3-A. AUDIT
15	STATUS REPORT FROM ROBERT ROSSI & COMPANY
16	RECEIVED FEBRUARY 5, 2015.
17	MR. MCGOFF: Are there any comments?
18	If not, received and filed.
19	MS. REED: 3-B. CHECK RECEIVED
20	FEBRUARY 9, 2015 FROM COMCAST REPRESENTING
21	THE CATV FRANCHISE FEE IN THE AMOUNT OF
22	\$217,751.76.
23	MR. MCGOFF: Are there any comments?
24	If not, received and filed. Any Clerk's
25	notes?

MS. REED: Nothing, Mr. McGoff.

MR. MCGOFF: Anything from council?

MR. GAUGHAN: I have one.

MR. MCGOFF: Please.

MR. GAUGHAN: I think I mentioned this two weeks ago, there will be a benefit for Pat Walsh of Minooka tomorrow, Friday, February 13, at the Divine Mercy Parish Hall in Minooka from 5 to 11 p.m. Tickets are \$10 and can be purchased at the door. All donations will help the Walsh family offset hospital expenses due to a recent illness. That will be beverages, light fare, basket raffles and entertainment. If you would like to make a donation to help Pat and the family, checks can be sent to the Minooka Lions Club, PO Box 4071, Scranton, PA, 18505. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else? A couple of announcements. First of all, Monday, February 16, city hall will be closed in observance of Presidents Day. However, DPW is working that day, so refuse pick up will be on the schedule.

Also, some people have been asking

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

about the prior legislation and just a for information's sake, if you go onto the city's website Scrantonpa.gov and select city codes, then general code, you will be linked to ECODE 360. On that, you will have access to all legislation that was adopted through December of 2014, okay? I'll go through again. Go to the city's website Scrantonpa.gov, select city codes, then general code, and that should link to ECODE 360 and that will have all legislation adopted through December of 2014. I have been informed that that was just recently updated so everything that you are looking for prior to December of 2014 should be on there.

Also, on the agenda there will be a motion for 7-D, which is the waiving the residency requirements for Business
Administrator Dave Bulzoni. Two amendments will be -- a motion will be made to amend that legislation. It will set a termination date of December 31, 2015, and the other part of the motion will be to require payment of the city's EIT. So if you wish

to speak to that know that those motions will be made by council when the legislation is read.

MS. REED: The letter from Jason, did you want to read that now?

MR. MCGOFF: I'm sorry. Thank you. We have received information from Attorney Shrive, the city solicitor, concerning the article that was in the -- I think it was the newspaper today from the Single Tax Office concerning the extension of the discount period for taxes. I will just read this letter.

"The Lackawanna County, City of Scranton and Scranton School District taxing authorities, have all agreed to extend the real property tax discount payment deadline to March 17, 2015. The discount period is being extended as a result of tax bills being sent out later than usual. The tax bills were distributed later than unusual due to a change in the printing format of the tax bills in an effort to make the tax bills more easily understood. All Lackawanna County, City of Scranton and

Scranton School District property taxes must be paid to the Single Tax Office on or before the close of business on March 17, 2015, in order for the taxpayer to receive the applicable discount."

Okay? So the discount period is extended to St. Patrick's Day, I have to mention that, is extended to March 17. If you pay your taxes by that period or by that time you will receive a discount. Thank you.

MS. REED: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION.

MR. MCGOFF: Joan Hodowanitz.

MS. HODOWANITZ: Joan Hodowanitz,
Scranton resident and taxpayer. I'm very
pleased to hear that we can access all
legislation on the website. I would still
like to see, however, a lot of the
background documentation that city council
sees every week also posted on the website.
For example, the revised recovery plan, is
that ever going to be posted on the website?

MR. MCGOFF: That I do not know. I will inquire from PEL if that's available to

be posted.

MS. HODOWANITZ: In my opinion all documents that effect the financial status of the city, audits, the minutes of the pension board, all of those things should be on the website for public access.

And speaking of the recovery plan, are we going to have a caucus on that or did that get shelved or what's the status?

MR. MCGOFF: The recovery plan is under revision again.

MS. HODOWANITZ: Okay.

MR. MCGOFF: And as soon as it is completed and not in a draft form and it's presented to council in it's, you know, final form there being will a caucus for presentation. That was clarified at the PEL meeting this past week.

MS. HODOWANITZ: Thank you. That's good. The 2013 city audit, I saw

Mr. Rossi's 5 February letter, there was only two issues outstanding, GASBE 45 and 47 post-employment benefit calculations and the Parking Authority's financial statements.

Have we got a projected completion date?

MR. MCGOFF: We had a letter. I did 1 not read the letter that we received from 2 3 the business administrator, I'm not aware of any particular date for --4 5 MS. HODOWANITZ: I bet you 25 cents this is going to be a city record. 6 7 MR. MCGOFF: I think it already is 8 but --9 MS. HODOWANITZ: Well, in light of 10 that where do we stand about issuing an RFP 11 for the 2014 city audit? MR. MCGOFF: I guess there was some 12 13 confusion that --14 MS. HODOWANITZ: The one you referred me to last week was the single tax 15 16 audit. 17 MR. MCGOFF: I apologize, yes, last 18 week I thought that's what the --19 MS. HODOWANITZ: The point is we are 20 already behind the power curve. At this point last year Rossi had sent a letter to 21 22 the city on January 20, 2014, itemizing the 23 information that had to be submitted. 24 is February 12 and we haven't even gotten to 25 the RFP stage so I think whatever record we

set for the 2014 budget is likely to be broken by the 2013 and 2014. This is going in the wrong way on budgets -- or audits, rather.

And on the budget, the 2015
operating budget, has the business
administrator's office done anything to
amend it since the revenues and expenditures
did not match?

MR. MCGOFF: We have received some communication from Mr. Bulzoni about possible ways to reconcile that problem, nothing formal has been presented to us and I believe that anything would have to come through the law office to council, you know, as a formal piece of legislation.

MS. HODOWANITZ: Good. And on a more positive note, April 16, 2016, is the city's sesquicentennial so you will be 150 years old. Have you as council members worked with any of the other organizations in the city such as the Historical Society, the library, or any of the other organizations planning events to mark this milestone in our history?

__

MR. MCGOFF: I believe Scranton --

MR. GAUGHAN: I was just going to say, and I believe Councilman Wechsler has attended a meeting that they had held concerning that and I have attended one, our city clerk has attended the meeting so we are well aware, we have copies of the minutes of all of the previous meetings and I will say that the -- all of the people that are involved are very excited about that event and I think it's a going to be great.

MR. WECHSLER: Actually the kickoff is planned for 015, the weekend of April 27, I belive it is.

MS. HODOWANITZ: Good.

MR. WECHSLER: At Steamtown Mall.

MS. HODOWANITZ: Because as dire as our financial situation is we have many citizens past and present who should be recognized for the contribution to the city and we shouldn't let, you know, the problems that we have overshadow that responsibility. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Lee Morgan.

MR. MORGAN: Good evening, Council.

MR. GAUGHAN: Good evening.

MR. MORGAN: I had a wonderful conversation this Sunday with PEL, they called me, this city could have filed bankruptcy in 2012 and it didn't. It met all of the requirements to do so and refused to do it. I'm very troubled by the new contract that this council seems to be ramming down the throats of the citizens of this city. They are going to have very dire consequences for this city. I don't think that the city should have to wait the remaining years to go into receivership.

I stopped at State Senator Blake's office today, you know, I think all of the residents of this city need to call the Governor's Office and tell him not to give any funds to this city. It's just terrible what's going on in this city. When you look at the Local 60's contract with this city, the firemen's contract it's terrible, just it shouldn't even be considered. All of the cost saving is being put on the backs of the

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

new employees. We are giving present employees more vacation time, the city is going to pick up the costs of the PPE's in the future and the new employees are going to be met to -- be held the standards for physicals. You know, what's really going on here, you know, is just a disgrace. employees are going to have to be EMT or EMR The disability plan that's tied certified. to this pension, I mean, that's tied to this contract is just ridiculous, just makes no sense at all you and you have a copy of it, I have a copy of it. I mean, if you just have to look at it and see exactly what's being done to this city. I mean, it's just ridiculous where we are and the things that are happening and for this council to ram in contract down the throats of the citizens, you know, the PEL understands that house are being sold for almost no money in this city

We just have to ask, like I said before, does Scranton really have legitimate government? Do we? The downtown is

and the plight from there city is outrageous

and they know that.

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

abandoned, the neighborhoods are a mess, look at all of the shops that are empty. have put apartments in buildings that were designed for commerce. We have a council that admitted in the police contracts that they had no clue what those contracts meant and they were going to look for more information. Look at your own reviews when you tabled it, and I really don't think you have any idea what's going on now. know what I think, I think that Mr. Gaughan and Mr. Evans should go into court and ask the Courts, since you are councilmen, to reverse the contracts and throw them out because you have standing in court, and that would be the end of it, it would be over.

Because you know something, the city has a rough draft of the revised recovery plan, but why is the recovery plan coming after the contracts? Are we going to mesh it with the new contracts? And what's the state going to do under Act 199 when the city can't meet it's requirements? Are we have to wait all of that time to go into receivership. All of the citizens in this

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

city that can't pay their taxes and working low wage jobs.

You know, Mr. Gaughan, I asked you about the pothole paving machine, look at our city streets. Look at the amount of --Mr. Evans, look at the amount of properties we are selling in this city and how much we are selling for and then take a look at this fire contract and see just what the residents are getting. You know what I hope I hope you take that contract and vou do? put it on the city's website so that all of the people in this city can see exactly what this council is voting on and understand what's going on in here. This is a sweetheart deal in my opinion for the rank and file that went and got people elected to the city government, so we are throwing all of the rest of the people in the city over the side to create contracts that are going to go into 2021 with no real savings for the residents of this city. Just a political smoke screen, everybody in state government knows where the city is headed.

You got Senator Casey trying to

interact with the new governor to bring bailout money to the city. We have wasted so much money in this city that we could have -- the streets should have gold on them and they don't. We only have despair, poverty and just a total decline of the city. The population base is fleeing and the population base is getting smaller and we got people with pretty suits on without the ability to be honest to the voters and the residents of this city, and I really just don't think you're competent. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mr. Morgan.
Ron Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: I'm declaring war on you people, I just give up.

MR. MCGOFF: You going to make us mad at you?

MR. ELLMAN: You people need to listen to a talk show or see what people are saying about this administration. They ridicule it and detest it. One adversity after another as far as this consideration

22

23

24

25

What are you thinking? You expect us to pay our taxes, our school taxes, and employ a person that has lied to you about coming here and refuses to come here, you want to use our money for his salary when he won't contribute nothing, does that make any sense? I don't think anybody in this city is going to fall for it. This is a shameful disgrace and any of you that vote for it don't deserve to be sitting in those seats. This is terrible. Besides you open the door to anybody that comes down -- what if I want to waive my garbage fees, can I do that? What if I -- all of these things that people could ask for up here you'd be liable for if you allow this. This is -- you just don't have no business supporting or even bringing up such nonsense before the people of this city.

Like I said a dozen times, you are sitting up there, you don't know what people are saying down here. You don't listen. I know nobody listens to the radio, no one ever comments on it, what goes on in Corbett's shows or nothing. This is just --

2

4

5

6

8

7

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I just give up on you guys. I have tried to support you and I have talked to people and they wonder if I'm nuts, I guess I was.

Let me say something real quick before you throw me out of here, last month I spoke about the mall being an example like I saw in Allentown, of course you had no interest, I must have bored you with all of that, I'd like to know what the Teamster's Union thinks if they lose that mall, it's their money in it. These colleges are just sitting here like a wolf waiting to pounce on the land for that to be lost to the city and when you go in there it sure like it's next to that point. This was a good idea and I'm very glad to see a few people on-line have tried to get some support to go into it and I know it's a long-term project, I wouldn't know, but it would be -- it would rejuvenate, this whole downtown, this whole city could benefit from such a plan. people need to investigate it and support it for once, the town is getting just like Hazelton. There is just nothing left here any good. The wage taxes and why people,

22

23

24

25

want to live here anymore is because of you and the mayor. This just can't go on. taxes are three times what they were when I bought the house. My insurance is \$1,600, I used to pay 300 twenty years ago. You don't talk all of that into consideration. to get a wheel alignment, it's \$50. up there cares about it because of these potholes. I never seen such a waste of money. Yesterday morning they put that cold patch on a bunch of holes right by my house where I walk the dog, I guess it was four or five hours later they were all empty. won't stay. They need something better and I don't know what because I'm not familiar with that, I know they are trying, but there is holes out there a foot deep. Hubcaps all up and done the street for God's sake. Somebody is going to end you suing the city for \$350 and then people are going to find out and somebody else is going come down here and sue the city for 350, that would be the end of your budget.

I know I skipped all around this because I got so much on my mind and no time

up here, I appreciate you allowing me up here. And again, please, think of the city for once before you do such an idiotic thing and vote for a man that won't contribute to his salary and doesn't think enough of the people and the taxpayers to live here. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you.

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

MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia, citizen of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians, 7-A I guess this has to do with the gift you gave to the Landmark Bank for a debt that we weren't required to pay, but as you say, we got plenty of money to throw away, what difference does it make. Not only that, if we push the debt up long enough we can push the taxes up higher. We can get a lot of cheap houses in this city and grab them up.

You really, really, really don't understand what's going on in this city.

You really don't. The only person that really makes sense was Bulzoni. Believe me, he made a wise decision not to move into the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

city. That made the most sense of everything he ever did in office was not wanting to move in the city. Scranton is sinking and he sees it sinking because he is the business administrator so what does he figure he can do? Let the ship sink, be safe in a little row boat and collect anything else you can see floating down the sea, and that's what the way he sees it. You know, you said you are going to give him a little incentive, going to make EIT tax, but you didn't say if he pays anything similar to where he is now, you didn't mention that, and if he is paying say 1 percent up there then his tax in the city would only be one and a quarter or 1 1/2 percent, but you don't mention them things. I don't even know if you checked to see. No, you didn't do it and non of you will. That's your job though.

If you had done your job when the mayor appointed you to this office we wouldn't be where we are today. I blame you more than anybody for the demise of the city. You sat there and sat there and sat

there and people came before you over and over and over and told you what was going to happen now the road, but the Times didn't help either, because anybody who came and said something against the mayor they were called Legion of the Doom. Well, the doom is here. The skies are not green they are black and you got to look at that that way. You haven't done anything to really correct the problem. The nonprofits are still nonprofits.

When I asked to look and see if any kind of safety legislation could have been passed for the fire service and the police would be on like the Sewer Authority you have to pay to use them you never looked. Maybe it's not possible, but maybe it is possible, but unless you do things like that the nonprofits will never give a penny, but you can't -- you keep trying to get blood out of a stone. People really can't afford, especially the elderly who wants to die and you are taking away their right to die. You are going to make it so they can't afford to live here and that's all they want to do is

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

die in their home. That's all they want to do. Most of the elderly that's all they want to do. Why are you making it so hard for them to do it?

Have you done anything at all to try and lift the burden? You are still giving contracts like crazy out. Every time you read the paper you are giving a new contract, more contracts, more contracts. The Democratic party and all parties exist for two things, patronage and contracts and that's what's the problem with Scranton is. We gave too many contracts out and too much patronage. What good is sitting there if you only are remembered as a person who ruined the city and that's what it's going to be, that's going to be your legacy. person who sat there and watched the city burn and not lift a finger to help put out the fire. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you.

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening. Dave
Dobrzyn, resident, citizen of Scranton. Or
7-B once again I just heard from Joan this
week is a lot of this legislation going to

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

now be sponsored on the website where a person can read it? I don't care about the language, I will understand the language, I've read technical language all of my life, but I certainly hope so because, well, naturally, last week I said, you know, that I got the roof company to fix what and basically the guy was a nice guy, he had guys tripping over each other giving each other orders so that's probably where the flashing got ignored on the chimney, but the point being I wouldn't climb up on the roof to do a roof job, I don't have an ability and I never will, but for things that can be done I certainly hope that the city plans to work with people because we are close to the bone, folks, you know?

And on 7-D I certainly hope that if this is passed we have some kind of arrangement where Scranton taxes are paid.

What's good for the goose is good for the gander and that comes from a Republican,

Mr. Romney.

And, once again, the trash was taken out last weak in my neighborhood but the

recycling wasn't. Now, I presume that they are behind and they had to come downtown and remove snow but we are the last day of the week, this is your neighborhood, too, I don't know you are probably Thursday; right?

MR. EVANS: On Wednesday, but they

MR. DOBRZYN: You're Wednesday.

MR. EVANS: They picked up the recycling Friday.

MR. DOBRZYN: Well, if you get it on Friday now, it started with Martin Luther King Day and the snowstorm and then we had another snowstorm issue and now Monday is President's Day so conceivably I have four weeks worth of cans and bottles hanging around my property and other people have six weeks already as of next Friday hanging around their property, and if they miss us again that will be eight weeks for cans and bottles, and if you put it in the trash, by the way, there's a nice heavy fine; right?

MR. EVANS: Should be.

MR. DOBRZYN: There we go. So it's incumbent that some kind much a plan be made

1

4

3

5 6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that can't just be the upper South Side neighborhood passed by every time there is a problem, you know, I called a guy and one of the guys from the DPW and he was polite and I'm sure he tried but he takes orders, you know, so it comes to the top. Too bad the stuff doesn't blowup hill instead of downhill.

Now, one thing that hasn't been mentioned tonight is these pensions that were doubled up and all kinds of whacky stuff going on. That's where our last mayor, I mean, council just left things go. They didn't question Mayor Doherty in too many instances, especially after DiBileo and that crew left and nobody reviewed anything and certainly, I mean, they caught Jack Loscombe on a questionable thing and then our controller didn't happen to catch anything of that, so there is another area of fault, but when Mrs. Evans took over it got very contentious, but what you are supposed to do with a mayor that just does what he wants? I mean, we are supposed to have a legislative and executive branch here

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and this is an example of how things just got so messy. It's not right. And, unfortunately, now I don't know if those people could ever be made even ethically to pay that money back, but certainly it shouldn't continue.

And finally, once again, with all of these contracts and so forth 7-F and the police contract I was very disappointed a few years ago when I found that most of the public safety workers in Ohio voted at 70 percent for John Kasick and he stooped them. He started beating them to death on their contracts and they were on the Edgehill, which is a left wing news show complaining, and it's time to start telling your congressmen, especially in Washington, it's incumbent upon you people as you are getting a tough time the wage taxes are low and they should be double what they are now and instead we're going the other way and that's where a big part of the problem is. please, no to the Transpacific Trade Pack. I don't know where Obama is, totally frustrated with him, too. It's sad. No. no

more trade packs. We have lot 50,000 factories since 2002.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mr. Dobrzyn.

MR. DOBRZYN: Thank you. Have a good night.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening,
Council. Marie Schumacher, resident and
taxpayer. First of all, I would like to
start by thanking Mr. Rogan and Mr. Wechsler
for making my point of setting a precedent
with 7-D. The first thing they did was
bring up George Parker. Now we are going to
have a second precedent. Does anybody on
here know what Mr. Parker paid, if anything,
back to the city for the privilege of
remaining in Moscow? I think perhaps we
should they check that out and table 7-D
until we know the answer to that, because I
think if we are going to do a precedent then
I think we should have a similar precedent.

MR. ROGAN: We all --

MS. SCHUMACHER: It's my time, thank you. I don't think -- I still don't think he has got enough skin in the game. There is nothing like owning a piece of property,

and a retirees favorite past time is not watching one of their major investments wither away and until you've felt that personally you don't know what it is you are doing to the taxpayers so I still am against this, but I know you are going to vote for

Do we have any idea when the revised recovery plan will be presented, a number of weeks? No? Okay.

MR. MCGOFF: Well, okay.

it, I still think it should be tabled.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay. Now, at the end of last month the Times-Tribune reported that police would be administering a drug that is it reported to be an antidote for heroin and opiate overdoses. I'm concerned about several issues. First, has this action of diagnosis and treatment been cleared with our insurance coverage as I'm concerned about liability lawsuits. Two, do we have a publically available policy on these actions and does it include those whose lives have been saved will have to agree to treatment or is there any limit to the number of the times that an individual

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

will be saved, from themselves I might add, and will the same person's insurance company be billed for this service and the drugs that are administered to them? I think that's only fair.

Next, in mid-December of last year the city business administrator announced that the city was close to landing a \$5 million loan which would be applied to the Supreme Court award to the uniformed employees. Eight weeks have passed without an update. During motions I would like an update because I find it incredible that the business administrator was able to find a loan to repay the Scranton Parking Authority loan that was not guaranteed by the city, but pays off the loan to his former employer with the Scranton Parking Authority rather than paying what we have been owing for several years now to our uniform police and firemen? It just doesn't make I sense.

Three weeks ago I noticed that it's been a long time since Mr. Rogan reported on all of defaulted loans over the last decade and requested that maybe the following week

he would let us know what that status is.

Mr. Rogan replied, "Sure. I'll reach out to

Attorney Hickey and Linda."

Still don't have that report. It's not a pretty report, maybe that's why, maybe we don't want the public to know but especially with this new KCRIZ that they are talking about if it turns out the same way as that I think we need to look at some of our history before we get even further in debt.

And then, Mr. Evans, you have material for me that tonight on the rental registration that you brought last week and I left too early to collect?

MR. EVANS: I e-mailed that information.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Okay, while I'm on you, what happens to our 2014 unfunded debt of \$4.9 million? The last two years of the administration of Mr. Doherty it went to Court to get -- have borrowings. I don't believe it's in the 2015 budget so what happens? I know it doesn't disappear, it has go be paid, that's almost \$5 million.

1

Are we going to take something out of this year's budget or just end up 2015 with another big unfunded debt?

And then on -- if I may finish one On the quality of life, today is -this week is paper recyclables. We are expecting high winds tomorrow morning and I can envision what's it's going to be with everybody's trash bins out, are we supposed to bring them in if they are not collected by DPW or the day that they are supposed to be or is there some way DPW could put something in the paper when they know they are not going to be collecting until the following day? Especially with paper when you are going to have high winds I think that will be very nice. I'll save the rest until next week. Thank you.

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

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

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Wechsler?

MR. WECHSLER: Thank you, Mr.

McGoff. You know, this week I did something

follow-up with Chief Graziano in regards to the quality of life legislation and also the new police contract that went into effect, specifically, I asked him about where we are at with enforcing the new quality of life ordinance and his response was that the Director of LIPS is finalizing the final ticket and the ordinance that will be issued by the police and LIPS' employees and the LIPS Department will be responsible for tracking all of that information related to ticketed issues, so the quality of life ordinance has not been fully enforced yet as they are waiting for the actual tickets to be prepared.

I also asked that chief in regards to what took place since the new contract was put into action and he informed me that the manning changes per the contract went into effect on February 9. Parking enforcement personnel are targeted for going into place on April 1, and they are also in the process of getting software and ticketing devices to make that ordinance more efficient.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would like to make one comment on the recent issue in the paper about double pensions, and actually what I have done this week is I have contacted our solicitor to look into the matter of what council can or should do and I will not have any further comment until his review is complete.

Stating that it is a concern I think at this time is an understatement.

In regards to another issue that I have been working on, the Duffy park statute, currently right now we are in the process we have found a location for it be stored in the next couple of weeks. statute is actually going to go over to the National Parks Service. We have an agreement with them for storage. evaluation of the statute has been completed. There was some bad news in that the statute probably should not be stored outside anymore. There is some contemplation of perhaps making a bronze casting of the statute. The bronze statute would take the place of that in the new Duffy Park and the old Duffy Park statute

will be placed somewhere inside for safekeeping. It is only one of the few left in the United States and it deserves to be protected and respected and that's what our goal is from the very beginning of this, so right now there is nothing set in stone but the original idea of restoring that statute and putting it back in Duffy Park does not seem to be practical for the statute.

My other comments I have I will reserve until motions.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. Mr. Rogan?

MR. ROGAN: Yes, a number of items briefly. Councilman McGoff mentioned the extension of the discount period to March 17 and I think if something were all concerned about. I know I was contacted by a number of residents who were wondering when they would receive their tax bill and to get it in under the discount period. I also spoke to the mayor today regarding this issue and one thing I think that should be looked into moving forward is making the discount period out to March 17 on a permanent basis. I think three of the last four years it has

been extended on a temporary basis, but I think with rising taxes I think it would be make sense to extend that out at least to March 17 on a permanent basis to make it easier for residents to pay their taxes.

Secondly, just a report, demolition of hazardous structures through the city has begun. A few properties in South Side were -- I believe one was the demolished already, a few others are ready to go so that is ongoing.

A couple of issues that were brought up from the podium, the issue regarding the OECD loans, I did speak to Attorney Hickey and I did request reports from Linda Aebli, I haven't received a report from Ms. Aebli as of yet but I did speak to Attorney Hickey at length about the delinquent loans which has been a long outstanding problem for over a decade now and they are going being looked into. Two lawsuits have been filed and they are continuing to go through each delinquency and determine the best course of the action on each case.

A question was also brought up

1

5 6

4

8

9

7

10 11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

regarding an antidote for those who have been overdosed on certain drugs. This is nasal spray and it's a statewide program that police departments across the entire state are being trained to administer this antidote to hopefully save lives.

And finally, the two issues I wanted to talk the most about today besides the agenda items, the first one is the article that was in the newspaper and the Facebook page regarding I think it's Reading Terminal at The Mall at Steamtown. I spent much of the week reading many of the posts on there and I know Council McGoff had commented on some as well. It is a very good idea for the mall and there are a number of good ideas that have been brought up by face-to-face with us, at that podium here, out in the community, on social media, and the list goes on and on and all of the great ideas but the one big problem -- the big obstacle that we are facing regarding this mall is the ownership of it. It would be great if the five of us up here and the mayor could say this is what we want to do,

the mall is a private property. It's not owned by the government and Mr. Boscov has, unfortunately, driven the mall down a path where you see these high vacancy rates.

Some people believe that that is being done intentionally to drive down the price of the mall so can come in and buy it. There are many ideas out there for the mall and I think it has to start with new ownership of that building, new private ownership. The idea the county commissioners floated of making the building government offices would be a disaster, but there are so many good ideas out there from the public.

I think the idea of the Reading
Terminal market style venue would be great.
I think the idea of a casino would be great.
Many other stories that were floated around or a hybrid where you would have loft apartments on the top and shops and restaurants on the bottom. There are many ideas and they are all great, but I firmly believe that the biggest problem facing that mall right now is the ownership and Mr. Boscov.

Finally, regarding the articles in the paper regarding the double pensions, I know that Councilman Wechsler touched on this a little bit, obviously moving forward we want to make sure this doesn't happen again, but yet it's also our obligation to find out how this happened under the previous administration and the city controller's watch.

So, Mrs. Reed, if it's agreeable could we please send a letter to City Controller Rosanne Novembrino asking for a report on how this error did occur and what she is doing to try and correct this moving forward so it doesn't happen again.

Two other brief items actually I'll bring up now. We did receive a memo from the business administrator that bids will be opened in council chambers on March 4 for the maintenance of streetlights. I know that's been brought up quite a bit at the meetings. Hopefully, a new vendor will be chosen that be will little bit more efficient than our current vendor.

And regarding Mr. Bulzoni, I guess I

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

will comment on this now, I know I spoke to Councilman Evans multiple times on this issue and he prepared some amendments to make that issue regarding Mr. Bulzoni's residency more fair, requiring him to pay the wage tax to the City of Scranton and placing I believe it's to the end of the year limit on when the waiver will expire and he will have to move into the city.

As was mentioned, some people have said, well, this is setting precedent for future employees, and in the past a blind eye was just turned to these issues. is setting a precedent that there is a proper procedure to follow if there is an employee that doesn't live in the city or that is considering one of these positions that doesn't live in the city. I firmly believe that anyone who does work for the city that's living outside should pay the wage tax to the city. I discussed with some of my colleagues that for me that was the big item and if that wasn't included I wouldn't have voted for the waiver. So I'm hopeful that this will pass, the amendments

will pass and make it more fair situation, and that is all for tonight. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Evans?

MR. EVANS: Very brief comments.

After tonight's meeting concludes I'm
looking forward to making progress on some
other items that this council has previously
discussed, for example, revised recovery
plan, review of the rental registration
ordinance, the city's condemnation policy,
tightening the language and ordinance for
approval of disability pensions, the land
bank initiative, a real discussion on
nonprofits, and quite a few other issues
that were set aside while we debated the
labor contracts over the last two months, so
that's all I have at this time.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Gaughan?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, thank you. I received numerous complaints about an empty lot in the 600 block of Fig Street in South Side. The lot is overgrown and is littered with debris and there is a major problem with cats and various other animals that are causing neighbors in that area grief. Our

office has sent a request to the Licensing,
Inspection and Permits Department to ask
that they investigate and hopefully get the
owner to clean the lot up.

A few weeks ago I was contacted by citizens who were requesting a stop sign at the intersection of Los Robles Street and North Sumner Avenue. An evaluation of the area was performed by city engineer John Pocius and the police department and it was determined that a stop sign should be installed at this intersection. An evaluation was also done at the intersection of Alder Street and South Webster Avenue and it was determined that a stop sign was not warranted at that intersection.

I was also asked about an update on the Rockwell Avenue bridge project.

Obviously because of the winter weather there is currently no construction activity. The contractor is scheduled to start construction again in late March. And that is all I have this week. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. Again, just a few brief comments. First of all, we had

5

4

7 8

6

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a caucus this evening and at the caucus Mr. Charlesworth of Trout Unlimited made a short presentation. Apparently there is going to be convention of Trout Unlimited in the City of Scranton in September I believe he said, a five-day convention that will bring he said somewhere over 500 fishermen and environmentalist to the city for that five-day convention. Not being a fisherman, I was not aware of the fact that the Lackawanna River and some of it's distributaries have become a destination site for trout fisherman. As I said, I'm not a fisherman, I didn't know that, but he claimed that, you know, the economic impact of this convention and designating part of this as kind of a designation for trout fishermen can be very, very beneficial. We will hear more from Mr. Charlesworth as the convention gets closer.

Also, I would like to make mention,
I criticized the newspaper for it's
reporting of the MOU for the police
contract, I would like to say that I believe
that the reporting of the MOU for the

Scranton firefighters was much more fair and equitable. While I don't necessarily agree with the opinions that have been put forward by the newspaper, I do appreciate the reporting of the MOU for the Scranton firefighters. And that's all.

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

SIXTH ORDER. 6-A. READING BY TITLE
- FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 82, 2015 - AN

ORDINANCE - AUTHORIZING THE REMOVAL OF THE
EXISTING "NO PARKING" SIGNS LOCATED IN THE
500 AND 600 BLOCKS OF ADAMS AVENUE
(S.R.3023) AND REPLACING THOSE SIGNS WITH
NEW R7-302 NO PARKING SYMBOL/ARROW SIGNS AT
ADEQUATE INTERVALS ALONG THE WESTERLY SIDE
AND EASTERLY SIDE OF THE 500 AND 600 BLOCKS
OF ADAMS AVENUE (S.R.3023) FROM THE
INTERSECTION AT VINE STREET TO THE
INTERSECTIONS WITH NORTH WASHINGTON AVENUE.

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

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

MR. WECHSLER: Second.

1 MS. MCGOFF: On the question? A11 2 those in favor signify by saying aye. 3 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 4 MR. ROGAN: Aye. MR. EVANS: Aye. 5 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 6 7 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The 8 ayes have it and so moved. 9 MS. REED: SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. F0R CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE -10 FOR ADOPTION FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 80, 11 12 2015 - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 58, 13 2014, AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED "GENERAL CITY 14 OPERATING BUDGET 2015" BY CREATING A NEW EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT NO. 01.401.15333.4299 15 ENTITLED NON-DEPARTMENTAL EXPENDITURES OPR 16 17 TSF TO DEBT SVC LANDMARK RESERVE ACCOUNT AND 18 TRANSFERRING FUNDS FROM ACCOUNT NO. 01.401.15319.4299 NON-DEPARTMENTAL 19 EXPENDITURES OPER TSF TO DEBT SVC SCRANTON 20 21 PARKING AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE FOR MONTHLY DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS TO LANDMARK BANK. 22 23 MR. MCGOFF: What is the 24 recommendation of the Chair for the 25 Committee on Finance?

	40
1	MR. EVANS: As Chairperson for the
2	Committee on Finance, I recommend final
3	passage of Item 7-A.
4	MR. ROGAN: Second.
5	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll
6	call, please?
7	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.
8	MR. WECHSLER: Yes.
9	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
10	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
11	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
12	MR. EVANS: Yes.
13	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
14	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
15	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
16	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
17	Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted.
18	MS. REED: 7-B. FOR CONSIDERATION BY
19	THE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - FOR
20	ADOPTION - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 81, 2015
21	- AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
22	APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AND
23	ENTER INTO A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH NORTHEAST
24	INSPECTION CONSULTANTS ("NEIC") FOR THE
25	FORMER SUPPLY ROOM IN THE LICENSING,

	47
1	INSPECTIONS AND PERMITS DEPARTMENT (LIPS),
2	FOURTH FLOOR, CITY HALL TO BE USED FOR
3	THIRD-PARTY INSPECTIONS.
4	MR. MCGOFF: What is the
5	recommendation of the Chair for the
6	Committee on Community Development?
7	MR. ROGAN: As Chairperson for the
8	Committee on Community Development, I
9	recommend final passage of Item 7-B.
10	MR. WECHSLER: Second.
11	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll
12	call, please?
13	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.
14	MR. WECHSLER: Yes.
15	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
16	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
17	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
18	MR. EVANS: Yes.
19	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
20	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
21	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
22	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
23	Item 7-B legally and lawfully adopted.
24	MS. REED: 7-C. FOR CONSIDERATION BY
25	THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE - FOR ADOPTION -

23

24

25

RESOLUTION NO. 121, 2015 - 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 CORPORATION; 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 ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE"; AND AUTHORIZING OTHER NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE ACTION.

	1
1	MR. MCGOFF: What is the
2	recommendation of the Chair for the
3	Committee on Finance?
4	MR. EVANS: As Chairperson for the
5	Committee on Finance, I recommend final
6	passage of Item 7-C.
7	MR. ROGAN: Second.
8	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll
9	call, please?
10	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.
11	MR. WECHSLER: Yes.
12	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
13	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
14	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
15	MR. EVANS: Yes.
16	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
17	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
18	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
19	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
20	Item 7-C legally and lawfully adopted.
21	MS. REED: 7-D. FOR CONSIDERATION BY
22	THE COMMITTEE ON RULES - FOR ADOPTION -
23	RESOLUTION NO. 122, 2015 - AUTHORIZING THE
24	MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS
25	TO WAIVE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR

1	DAVID BULZONI, CITY OF SCRANTON BUSINESS
2	ADMINISTRATOR.
3	MR. EVANS: I make a motion to Item
4	7-B per the following: Amending Section II
5	to include, "To temporarily extend the
6	waiver of the residency requirement for the
7	City of Scranton employee until 12-31-2015,
8	and to require David Bulzoni to pay the City
9	of Scranton earned income tax during the
10	term of this employment."
11	MR. ROGAN: Second.
12	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? All
13	those in favor of the motion to amend Item
14	7-D signify by saying aye.
15	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
16	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
17	MR. EVANS: Aye.
18	MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed?
19	MR. GAUGHAN: No.
20	MR. MCGOFF: The ayes have it and so
21	moved. Excuse me. As Chairperson for the
22	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
23	passage of Item 7-D, as amended.
24	MR. ROGAN: Second.
25	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

I will be voting against this waiver tonight as I did last week for introduction. As I

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question.

mentioned last week, I have a great respect

for Mr. Bulzoni and the difficult job he has

as business administrator. However, I can't

going to set a bad precedent moving forward

vote for this waiver because I feel it's

for the city. All city employees are

required to live in Scranton and pay

property taxes and various fees. I don't

think it's right that this waiver has come

down six months after the original six month

period in which Mr. Bulzoni had to move into

the city which expired back in June of 2014

and at the end of the day I think this comes

down to a question of fairness and that is

the reason I will be voting no. Thank you.

On the question, my

personal feelings are voting against
Mr. Bulzoni and not having him at this

MR. EVANS:

critical juncture of the city's financial

situation would be viewed as reckless and

somewhat irresponsible so this amendment to

me gives Mr. Bulzoni further time to move

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

into the city or if you not he will have to properly transition a new position with a new business administrator. This is a sound process that I feel that the financial community will understand and should feel good about as we prepare for 2016.

MR. WECHSLER: On the question, the way I look at this is the end date is the end date and it's the same result as if we took action on it today. If Mr. Bulzoni does not move into the city, he will not be the business administrator anymore, but the benefit to us is the work that he is doing right now and the effort that he has put into it should not be wasted. We should take advantage of his knowledge until the end of the year. As we approach the end of the year, it will become obvious if Mr. Bulzoni is going to remain the business administrator or not. In that case as we approach into the fall and into the budget process whoever the new business administrator may be, or Mr. Bulzoni may move into the city, but whoever that new administrator would be we need to have a

smooth transition for Mr. Bulzoni to whoever may take his place if necessary.

I don't believe that the city should be penalized for an error that the administration made. Mr. Bulzoni has made, as I said, a lot of progress and we talk about skin in the game, I don't think there is anybody here that works longer hours that Mr. Bulzoni and I don't believe that the city should be penalized for a mistake in terms of this waiver. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else?

MR. ROGAN: Just two final points, and Mr. Evans brought up a very good point, if this were to be voted down tonight I guess that would mean the city as of tomorrow would have no business administrator. I don't think anyone thinks that's practical. By allowing Mr. Bulzoni to the end of the year to hopefully obtain residency in the City of Scranton, which is I think what all of us on council would like to happen, we are at that point in time it would allow the mayor to find a suitable replacement.

19 20

17

18

21

23

22

24 25

And as was mentioned last week and was mentioned from the podium, this isn't the first time there was a member of administration that wasn't living within city limits. This is just the first time that it's been done through the right process of the vote of council.

MR. MCGOFF: I'd like to follow-up, too, just a very briefly. I believe that this does set a precedent and I think the precedent is that if this occurs again it will be reviewed by council, by the administration to determine if, in fact, there is reason to extend a waiver or to make some changes or some requirements for that extension. I think that is the precedent that we are setting and I believe it's a good precedent to have.

> Anyone else? Roll call, please.

MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.

MR. WECHSLER: Yes.

MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.

MR. ROGAN: Yes.

MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Yes.

1	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
2	MR. GAUGHAN: No.
3	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
4	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
5	Item 7-D, as amended, legally and lawfully
6	adopted.
7	MS. REED: 7-E. FOR CONSIDERATION BY
8	THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS - FOR ADOPTION
9	- RESOLUTION NO. 123, 2015 - AUTHORIZING THE
10	MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS
11	TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO A MEMBERSHIP
12	AGREEMENT WITH PENNSYLVANIA ONE CALL SYSTEM,
13	INC. (POCS) IN ORDER TO IDENTIFY ALL
14	UNDERGROUND FACILITIES THAT ARE OWNED BY THE
15	CITY AND LOCATE THE SAME ON MAPPING.
16	MR. MCGOFF: What is the
17	recommendation of the Chair for the
18	Committee on Public Works?
19	MR. GAUGHAN: As Chairperson for the
20	Committee on Public Works, I recommend final
21	passage of Item 7-E.
22	MR. ROGAN: Second.
23	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll
24	call, please?
25	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.

	56
1	MR. WECHSLER: Yes.
2	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
3	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
4	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
5	MR. EVANS: Yes.
6	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
7	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
8	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
9	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
10	Item 7-E legally and lawfully adopted.
11	MS. REED: 7-F. FOR CONSIDERATION BY
12	THE COMMITTEE ON RULES - FOR ADOPTION -
13	RESOLUTION NO. 124, 2015 - AUTHORIZING THE
14	MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS
15	TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO A MEMORANDUM OF
16	UNDERSTANDING BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF
17	SCRANTON AND LOCAL UNION NO. 60 OF THE
18	INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE FIGHTERS,
19	AFL-CIO.
20	MR. MCGOFF: As Chairperson for the
21	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
22	passage of Item 7-F.
23	MR. ROGAN: Second.
24	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll
25	call, please?

•

MR. EVANS: On the question.

MR. MCGOFF: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. EVANS: You want to go?

MR. GAUGHAN: I'll go first, thank you. I will be voting against this legislation tonight. Extending contracts until 2021 in light of the City's Act 47 deadline and dire financial situation along long with passing contracts in advance of the revised recovery plan is grossly irresponsible and extremely short-sided.

Giving out raises, giving back retiree health care, giving more vacation time and taking the cap off sick days is not something a financially distressed city should be doing.

It's clear to me and many citizens I have spoke to over the last few weeks that Mayor Courtright is hoping that our problems will just go away and maybe someone else will make the tough decisions later on.

Mayor Courtright should understand that kicking the can down the road isn't going to work much longer because he is running out of road. My decision to vote no on the both

contracts isn't simply to be a cog in the wheel of this administration. I want Mayor Courtright and our city to succeed. My job, however, is to review all of the facts and make a decision that I feel is in about best interest of the taxpayers and the future of this city.

It bothers me that going back to the police contract I submitted at least 15 or 16 specific questions and I have not -- still have not received answers to those questions which I find outrageous. They were legitimate questions, and even though the police contract has passed I still want those questions answered. I submitted two questions about the fire contract and I haven't received a response to those questions as of yet, so hopefully I will receive those at some point within the next year.

I feel Councilman Evans and I have presented legitimate, valid arguments and concerns over the past few weeks. I respect my colleagues, but I strongly disagree with their vote on these issues and I do not

think this is a good deal for the taxpayers of this city. Thank you.

MR. EVANS: On the question, as we enter into our closing arguments, last week I mentioned part of the proposed MOU and I certainly appreciate the efforts by the bargaining teams on what they were able to accomplish on many, many facets of the contract. However, in reviewing the firefighters MOU I came to several different conclusions on the savings aspect and those that were presented.

First of all, the savings of nearly \$1.5 million was achieved on the premise that if the city went to arbitration the salary increases of 3 percent would be expected, yet, there have been some indication that th is trend may have shifted, especially considering the financial status of cities like Scranton. If arbitration brought in 1 percent less than projected, those cost savings would be eradicated and neither scenario is speculative at best.

Additionally, savings through the

sick day enhancement, vacation increases and retirement changes are based mostly on expecting changes in behavior. By offering enhancement to the sick day policy by adding vacation time, by giving retiree health care, they are taking a very carrot and a small stick approach to saving money.

Frankly, in some cases we are hoping for change and cost savings by rewarding even bad behavior, particularly as relates to disability pensions, but if behavior doesn't change projected savings may be reduced or eliminated and we are left with only the costs.

While this might be a very interesting case study for future labor contracts through the use of human behavior patterns and psychology, I am finding it difficult to hold the projected savings in as high regard as some others have. Yet, the future legacy costs that I have discussed during the FOP contract are real. The administration put a dollar amount of \$224,000 per retiree from the FOP contract on retiree benefits. Basic math will tell

you that if all 99 of those police officers take this benefit it would cost a minimum of \$22 million.

While it's more difficult to determine the cost of retiree health care for the 60 elderly firefighters, because we haven't seen an estimate provided in this MOU, but because the language is tighter in the firefighters' contract, even if we conservatively estimated that would be 75 percent of the FOP contract or \$168,000 per retiree, this would still mean an additional cost of a minimum of over \$10 million.

These are legacy costs that will begin in the 2020 to 2021 timeframe and extend for the next ten years and beyond.

These are costs that are not accounted for.

If everything somehow goes well financially, almost perfectly over the next few years, we could exit the distressed city status in 2020 or earlier and then find out that we have an additional \$32 million or more still waiting for us on the other side.

Therefore, I can't in good conscience vote for something that I believe

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

will subject future taxpayers and
Scrantonians to increased long-term legacy
costs in exchange for short-term gains, some
of which are simply tied to the change in
behavior. I can only hope and pray that I'm
wrong, but I truly believe this MOU will
ultimately bring us back full circle to
financial distress or worse, and for those
reasons I will be voting "no" to this
legislation. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else?

MR. ROGAN: I guess I'll respond, I was content with voting on it because I think we have all discussed this quite a bit over the last few weeks and there are many reasons why I believe this is a good plan for the taxpayers and I think the majority of this council when we will vote will agree, and the first one is, and this is where Councilman Evans and I strongly disagree, is regarding arbitration. You heard last week and also with the police contract what going to arbitration under the previous administration cost the city. costs were astronomical. Raises over 50

percent to police officers and firefighters when compounded. An arbitration award that we still owe that was in excess of \$40 million, is now -- it was reduced through a union concession to approximately \$20 million and the interest on that award is growing at a rate of approximately \$100,000 per month. That was the result of letting old contracts expire and failing to renegotiate. Although it is possible that when the city goes to arbitration we could get a better deal then we currently have, judging by the past arbitrations of this city that is very, very unlikely.

In addition to the cost savings that were outlined in this proposal, and I have to agree with Councilman McGoff's earlier statements that the reporting from the Scranton Times regarding the fire contract has been much more fair than the reporting for the police contract, but another item that is very important outside of the financial aspect is keeping our firehouses open. We saw what happened when former Mayor Doherty closed firehouses on East

Mountain and in other areas of the city. It was a disaster. This proposal will keep neighborhood firehouses open and it could possibly reduce the overtime cost to zero if we get the SAFER grant in the amount that we are applying for, which is a much lesser amount because of the lower wages in this contract compared to the wages under the current contract.

For those reasons and many, many more than I can probably go on for another 15 minutes, I will be voting "yes" for this contract and I'll be very happy that it is going to pass tonight.

MR. WECHSLER: I just have a few things here. Number one, a copy of the confidential agreement was provided to the Scranton Times this week including all of the information in color so that was -- I think it's part of the reason why reporting on this issue was a bit more fair than the previous one, they were provided more information so that was good.

I would like to address the changes in behavior. The changes that are going to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be required, as Mr. Evans mentioned, weren't determined by the city, these changes in terms of the physical fitness of the officers, the training of the officers, the different reviews of disabilities, those came from the members. Our fire department right now is in transition. There are several younger firefighters and perhaps the new ones that are going to come on board have a different attitude towards firefighting. They are firefighting professionals. Many of them have college degrees in various fire science, some of them are accountants, some are even attorneys, so there is going to be a change in behavior just because the face of the organization is changing.

Another thing that I would like to mention is many of these concessions that were finally agreed upon were very similar to the ones that were suggested in the first recovery plan that 70 percent of the citizens of Scranton voted for. We got those concessions, we went at it a different way this time. The last time we went at it

it costs us \$40 million, later to be reduced to \$22 million with interest still growing on that.

Also, in touching on what Mr. Rogan said, keeping neighborhood firehouses are very important to me. Coming from East Mountain, we want to see Engine 10 remain open and one of the ways to do this is to add more firefighters to our force and the only way we can do that is to get some new personnel in there. This new contract as ratified will make it easier for the SAFER grant to be awarded to us.

When we talk about the legacy cost, I can use the same argument on legacy costs, if we are going to say that the city will do better in arbitration because of it's status I don't see why we can't use that same logic to say that in the future if the city can't afford that legacy cost why couldn't the arbitrator negotiate it out. A lot of the arguments that are used against can be turned the same way for. And lot of it, and we are forced to deal with this, it is in the future, but I can't see waiting two

17 18

20

19

21

2223

24

25

years and doing nothing when the end result may be worse. Here we are being proactive trying to make something happen here. know, if we sit and do nothing I'm not sure where we will end up so I will be voting for this, and also, and just like I did tonight I followed up with the police, with the FOP, with Chief Graziano. It's going to take a lot of monitoring and commitment by the administration and council and the union to make these things work. It's going to be more of a partnership I hope than it has been in the past. We saw that with the information that was given back and forth last week. Like I said, even given to the Scranton Times.

So I'm optimistic about this. I'm I nervous about it, yes, but I am optimist that in the short-term and in the long-term this is the way to go for the city. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: As far as the contract is concerned, Mr. Evans used the word "if" quite a bit in his comments and I agree with him there are a lot of ifs both positive and

24

25

negative concerning this contrat if behavior doesn't change. You know, those types of things are assumptions that are being made. I would rather take a look at some of the actual concrete changes that will take place because of this contract, some of which have already been mentioned. The disability language will close up some of the gaps in disability pensions. I think that's a great step forward that this contract will provide. The department reorganization both in the police and the fire department I think will improve public safety, something that we all desire. Increase pension contributions. While it may not be everything that was anticipated it is a concrete change, it is something that will help improve the pension situation. Employment requirements that somebody actually criticized. These are requirements that will help improve the fire department, will help insure the health of fire personnel, something again, which will help as far as disabilities and other requirements.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I believe the concrete changes that are in both contracts are something that are -- things that are desired and will help improve the status of the police and fire departments and also will benefit the economic situation of the City of Scranton.

MR. GAUGHAN: I just have one final comment.

MR. MCGOFF: Sure.

Mr. Wechsler mentioned MR. GAUGHAN: the recovery plan and that we are doing some things in these two contracts, I guess, that coincide with that the recovery plan says. We are also doing things that go against what is in the recovery plan. The revised recovery plan and the recovery plan that we are currently under says no retiree health It says not to take the cap off of the sick days. It says no more vacation days, no increase in vacation days so we are at odds with the current recovery plan and with the draft version of the revised recovery plan, and I think for me the most troubling part of this whole thing is that we are extending a contract until 2021 as I

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have mentioned ad nauseam over the past month. That's what makes me nervous is that in 2017 it's either, you know, get out of distressed status or go into receivership.

If we get a three-year extension we have to until 2020 to either get out of distressed status or go into receivership. These two contracts take us a year past all of that so, you know, that makes me really nervous. Thank you.

MR. WECHSLER: Just one comment, the recovery plan that I'm speaking about was the one that Mayor Doherty had put up for the referendum. The thing that I have learned while I have learned from council for many years that these recovery plans are living and breathing documents. They don't -- they are not able to be set in stone, I know that they should but they are not. facts of every situation have to be taken into consideration in these recovery plans. The recovery plan that's issued is going to ask us for savings. The savings that are coming from these contracts are where those savings are going to come from. The

recovery plan in issue without these savings we're faced with severe cuts that have to come from somewhere.

MR. ROGAN: Just one final comment, it's been -- the idea has been floated a few times that this violates the recovery plan, which certainly isn't true. As council -- I believe Councilman McGoff alluded to this two weeks ago, if there was one lesson that was learned from the court case is that Act 111 trumps Act 47 so the city has the right to collectively bargain and that was the big question regarding the recovery plan why the previous recovery plan went to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and why the city ultimately lost is because Act 47 does not trump Act 11.

In addition, PEL, the recovery plan coordinator who it's no secret I'm not a fan of the Pennsylvania Economy League, but they have not objected to the FOP contract or the current contract for the firefighters.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else.

MR. EVANS: Briefly I want to touch back and circle back a little bit on the

change in behaviors comments I made. This contract alludes to saving almost \$1.7 million simply by changing behavior by enhancing sick days and stating that if each firefighter reduces their sick days either by two we get \$1.7 million. That's changing behavior. That's purely speculative. That's why I feel the way I do on a lot of the contract, but again, a lot of the things in the contract it's just a different concept and philosophy. You know, my philosophy is we have to take care of those costs down the road we can't keep on adding legacy costs and years from now that's why we are where we are today because decisions weren't made in the past that addressed those issues. That's all I have. MR. MCGOFF: Roll call, please?

MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.

MR. WECHSLER: Yes.

MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.

MR. ROGAN: Yes.

MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: No.

MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.

24

21

22

23

25

4	MD CAUCHAN, No
1	MR. GAUGHAN: No.
2	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
3	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
4	Item 7-F legally and lawfully adopted.
5	MS. REED: 7-G. FOR CONSIDERATION BY
6	THE COMMITTEE ON RULES - FOR ADOPTION -
7	RESOLUTION NO. 125, 2015 - REPEALING
8	RESOLUTION NO. 29, 2014 (AS AMENDED)
9	APPOINTMENT OF TIMOTHY PERRY, 2325 BIRNEY
10	AVENUE, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, 18505 AS A
11	MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF THE SCRANTON
12	REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY. MR. PERRY WILL BE
13	REPLACING PETER RIEBE WHOSE TERM EXPIRED ON
14	FEBRUARY 4, 2010. MR. PERRY'S TERM WILL
15	EXPIRE ON FEBRUARY 4, 2015. THERE WAS A
16	DISCREPANCY AS TO THE LIMIT OF MR. RIEBE'S
17	TERM AND LITIGATION WAS FILED.
18	MR. MCGOFF: As Chair for the
19	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
20	passage of Item 7-G.
21	MR. ROGAN: Second.
22	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll
23	call, please?
24	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.
25	MR. WECHSLER: Yes.

	74
1	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.
2	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
3	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
4	MR. EVANS: Yes.
5	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
6	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
7	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
8	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
9	Item 7-G legally and lawfully adopted.
10	MS. REED: 7-H. FOR CONSIDERATION BY
11	THE COMMITTEE ON RULES - FOR ADOPTION -
12	RESOLUTION NO. 126, 2015 - APPOINTMENT OF
13	TIMOTHY PERRY, 2325 BIRNEY AVENUE, SCRANTON,
14	PENNSYLVANIA, 18505 AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD
15	OF THE SCRANTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.
16	MR. PERRY WILL BE REPLACING PETER RIEBE
17	WHOSE TERM EXPIRED ON FEBRUARY 4, 2015. MR.
18	PERRY'S TERM WILL EXPIRE ON FEBRUARY 4,
19	2020.
20	MR. MCGOFF: As Chair for the
21	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
22	passage of Item 7-H.
23	MR. ROGAN: Second.
24	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll
25	call, please?

	75
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-H legally and lawfully adopted.
12	If there is no business, I'll
13	entertain a motion to adjourn.
14	MR. ROGAN: Motion to adjourn.
15	MR. MCGOFF: Meeting is adjourned.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE

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