	1
1	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
2	
3	
4	
5	HELD:
6	
7	Thursday, March 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 S NADDOZZI DDD AEEICIAL COUDT DEDODTED
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

1 (Pledge of Allegiance recited and moment of reflection 2 observed.) 3 MR. MCGOFF: Roll call, please. MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler. 4 MR. WECHSLER: Here. 5 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan. 6 MR. ROGAN: Here. 7 8 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans. 9 MR. EVANS: Here. 10 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan. MR. GAUGHAN: 11 Here. 12 MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff. MR. MCGOFF: Here. 13 THIRD ORDER. 14 3-A. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE MEMBERS OF SCRANTON HOUSING AUTHORITY HELD 15 16 JANUARY 5, 2015. MR. MCGOFF: Are there any comments? 17 18 If not, received and filed. Any Clerk's notes? 19 MS. REED: Nothing, Mr. McGoff. 20 21 MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. Anything from council? Any announcements? Let me 22 23 just for tonight's meeting there are two 24 pieces of legislation that will be voted on 25 to move to Sixth or Seventh Order, one is

item -- make sure I get it right, 5-C which concerns the police -- correction to the wording of the legislation for the police pension fund, that is under an emergency certificate and we will be voting to move that to Sixth on Seventh Order for final vote. The other piece of legislation is 6-B which is the revised recovery plan. There will also be a motion to move that to Seventh Order for final vote.

Prior to Seventh Order that will be an opportunity for the public to speak, a second citizens' participation, if you will, but an opportunity to speak to those two pieces of legislation. That would be prior to Seventh Order.

Just quick announcements. Scranton Fire Department is having a food drive to benefit St. Francis Kitchen and Food Pantry. This is March 26 to 21st. Donation can be accepted at any city firehouse and any donations welcome. I'm sure that that means that, you know, any type of non-perishable foods would be welcome, and any type of monetary donations will also be welcome so

that they can provide that to the shelter or to the kitchen and food pantry.

Also, this Saturday, March 14, is the St. Patrick's Day parade downtown Scranton. A couple of things, first of all, expect that there are street closures and that will be traffic delays. We may start to see those on Friday evening as they set up for the parade and certainly on Saturday morning and Saturday afternoon there will be delays downtown or street closures downtown. There is a link on the city's web page for additional information it's STPATparade, St. Pat parade dot com. and you can get information about what streets would be closed, etcetera.

Also, each year we speak to this, the St. Patrick's Day parade is a great family event. Do not confuse the parade with some events that may take place after the parade. We welcome, you know, all families to come and enjoy the parade. Hopefully the weather will cooperate. It's, as I said, a great event downtown and we welcome everyone to attend. We also please

encourage everyone who comes to the parade or comes to downtown Scranton to celebrate St. Patrick's Day to do so responsibly. This is, again, it's a wonderful for the City of Scranton, please don't ruin it by being unreasonable and taking advantage of the day and that's all.

MS. REED: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION.

MR. MCGOFF: Joan Hodowanitz.

MS. HODOWANITZ: Joan Hodowanitz, taxpayer and resident. What is the status of the 2013 audit?

MR. MCGOFF: I have no update for you.

MS. HODOWANITZ: It is 284 days

late. In 15 days, March 27, the city is due
to open bids for the 2014 through 2017

audit, assuming they receive any bids. This
is very worrisome on many levels. I saw in
the paper yesterday a story "Depasquale
Warns of Scranton Pension Debt" and he is
talking about the investigation his office
is conducting into the double pensions and
he says his office currently lacks the

ability to do forensic audits and would need more resources, and I don't know whether or not the state police have the assets and resources to conduct their own forensic audit, but if ever a city needed a forensic audit that's City of Scranton.

In the 15 months or so that I have been attending council meetings and listening to the accounting and finance issues that are plaguing this city it is clear this city needs a forensic audit, which is why it is so worrisome that nobody other than me seems to be concerned about this 2013 audit, and hopefully it will not be a whitewash.

I see also on today's agenda that there is an ordinance referring to Mr. Bulzoni, it is Item 5-D, creating and establishing a special city account entitled "EIT contribution for the purpose of accepting a 2.4 percent EIT by Business Administrator Dave Bulzoni."

Well, I give him credit for submitting that legislation. However, if the administration thinks it's appropriate

to make the LST retroactive to January 1 I think this EIT for Mr. Bulzoni should be retroactive to January 6, 2014. What is good for the goose is good for the gander and I think a lot of people are very upset that they are going to be paying a retroactive tax to fill in a hole that they have not personally dug.

And the last thing is this issue of the police union and their retirees and that legislation that you are looking at tonight. I saw an article in the paper where the president of the police union, Mr. Paul Helring, was talking about his members. Mr. Helring noted that many officers in their 40's and 50's still have children in school or college so it is not feasible for them to retire at that age as they do still need to find another job. Where are they going to find a job in Scranton?

Well, I will remind President

Helring that there are a lot of citizens and taxpayers in the city who are of that age and who also have children and do not make the pay and wages and salary and benefits

Ιt

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

that members of the police union do. Granted, police officers have what I would call a higher risk in their job duties. Nevertheless, there are citizens and taxpayers who are facing the same expenses for their families at much lower rate wage and salary benefits and so we are all in the same boat, and guess who pays the benefits to the police officers? Ultimately, it's largely on the backs of non-police taxpayers. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Ron Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: Hello, Council. seems like just about every where I go people are complaining about downtown, the mall, the way the city is going downhill and Most of you encounter this at church crime. or school. I encounter it every day when I go over the Taurus Club, it's just politics and it's bad politics and people asking what do we get for our dollar? It seems like we got Bulzoni and Amoroso and Mr. Cross, that's not very much. And four of you purposely broke a law of this city in hiring this gentleman. He shouldn't have even been

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

considered in the first place, but this is on people's mind. This is no different than if one of you had run a stop sign and you wait for that stop sign for that instant, same thing. I thought you were grabbing something to throw at me.

MR. MCGOFF: It would be bigger and heavier than this.

MR. ELLMAN: There is nobody ever comes up here and wishes you guys would do better than me and wishes the mayor would do better, but you are not. You are letting the people of this city down left and right. These are good people out there. They have reached their limits. Bulzoni sat right there last week telling everybody we need to tighten our belts. We are facing up to a 50 percent increase and blah, blah, blah. Не went on and on and on Mr. Cross went on and on, the next thing you know the SPA is trying to hire him, a consultant, after a month on the job he can't do what he was hired for. All of the trouble you went through to get him a position he is not capable of doing it. There is no if, and or

buts.

I went to the SPA meeting, it was a farce. They called the city -- the whole deal is a system. They act like we don't have no say so about the meters or what this or that. I asked when they hire someone a simple question what's the salary? They wouldn't tell me. His salary is going to be added onto what the total price is whether they lease or sell it. They say this isn't going to hurt the taxpayers. We are going to be millions of dollars less than what they owe right now on everything after they sell it so we are going to pay a salary.

He shouldn't be allowed to be hired, but this politics just never stops around here. It's impossible, you know? Like I keep telling you, you people just are out of touch with the city.

How many of you saw the cartoon this morning, Mr. Cole's cartoon? The only he didn't go far enough as far as I'm concerned. Last week I was trying to find out how much we owe, there is about 26, 27,000 taxable properties. Now, put this

down, Mr. Rogan, you are good at this, we owe about \$200 million. Last year the money that came in I think we were six or seven or eight million dollars short of everything and this is the city this lady that just spoke wants to spend money on Lackawanna Avenue. They have had their chance downtown.

Look at the streets. In fact, I want to thank you people, I broke the other strut on my car. I had to buy two of them to start with so now I'm happy. It's like getting a free one when I pay seven or eight-hundred dollars to have them installed.

Like I just said, there is nobody wishes you people more than me, but you are not doing it. You are not doing right for the people of this city anymore. You didn't do nothing expect sit and wait to see about the pension money. You should have let the fight to have that stop -- to have something found out immediately, and it's been weeks on nobody talks about no more. Nobody cares. It seems like it's over with.

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That's no way to run a city. It would be no time that mall will be off the books and it would be classrooms or something and that would be the demise of this whole downtown. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mr. Ellman.
Mr. Spindler?

MR. SPINDLER: Good evening. Spindler, city resident, homeowner and taxpayer. Last week I watched the caucus with PEL and there were many questions asked, but I think the most important question wasn't asked, and I have asked it for years, I would have asked Mr. Cross how is that you have been our recovery coordinator for 23 years and we are in worse shape now than we were 23 years ago? would ask how does he explain that. is no doubt that we are in worse shape now than we were 23 years ago. I have the answer, I have stated it here many times, they don't want us to get out of distressed status because then they would lose their cash cow. They are collecting millions of dollars from this city and doing nothing.

And I have said it many times, PEL has to go. That's one problem with this city.

Every year they come up with different ideas, different ideas, as I said, we are worse off than we were 23 years ago.

So I've said it in the past and it's fell on deaf ears, council should look into getting rid of PEL and that would be a step in the right direction because they are just wasting money that could go towards something better off in the city.

Potholes. Last year, James May from PennDOT was on Channel 16 saying Main Avenue is going to be paved from Taylor to North Scranton. Well, James May should be a politician because he lied.

MR. ROGAN: Mr. Spindler, I was actually up at PennDOT today to discuss that and a few other issues, it is going to be paved. What the delay was they are doing handicap curb cuts all along the route. In order to use the funds they need to do these curb cuts so that's why it was repaired last year, but this year that is going to be paved from the Taylor line to the

Expressway.

MR. SPINDLER: That's good. Well, it should go further.

MR. ROGAN: It's not forgotten about, I drive down that road just as much you do living in the same neighborhood and it's terrible.

MR. SPINDLER: I mean, all of Main
Avenue is bad. I drove through North
Scranton going to Dickson City from Market
Street to Parker Street, it's like a
minefield. It's ridiculous. There is two
areas where you have to go to the other side
of the road to get around those potholes and
it's a definite safety issue. I mean, you
can't go through them they are so deep, you
have to wait until a car comes and go around
them. It's ridiculous so I hope something
is done with that.

One more thing, in West Dide the corner of North Sumner and Pettibone, on Sumner there is a stop sign there it's totally white. It's got to be replaced. That's a safety hazard. I have traveled that way all the time so I know there is

supposed to be a stop sign there, but stop signs aren't supposed to be all white so if somebody can try and get that taken care of I'd appreciate it. And that's all I have tonight. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you,
Mr. Spindler. Mr. Bolus.

MR. BOLUS: Good evening, Council.
Bob Bolus, Scranton. Last week I listened
to the people that were here, but I didn't
hear one suggestion on how we are going to
save any money or make any money. A
business can't lose money, neither can the
city. They had not one suggestion other
than liquidate your assets and still have
your debt. If people will buy the Sewer
Authority they are buying it to make money.
If someone is going to buy the parking
garages they are buying it to make money.

We haven't looked at one creative avenue, all we have looked at, let's put our head in the guillotine and that's the short way of doing things here. It's like Scranton is falling in the mines and it's sinking deeper and deeper. The

9

10

8

12

11

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

pillars that held up the mines are gone and we are caving, we are going down, and we are not doing a darn thing about changing it.

We are not after the nonprofits, we are not after all those who have been taking a free ride on this city, we are not doing a thing to get any revenue in other than sacrifice the people.

As Attorney General Kane called us the regular people, that don't have the wherewithal to defend themselves that's exactly what's happening to us. We don't have the wherewithal some people have to survive in this city. You need to make changes, you need to look at the leachate line, make it a host community coming through Scranton and Dunmore, start putting money in your pockets, start taking us out of debt instead of creating an atmosphere of deeper in debt, and that's where we are heading if you liquidate your assets. will have nothing left to sell but the city itself and maybe it would be a good idea if we put signs coming down the Central Expressway on both entrances that said "City

2

3

5

6

8

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For Sale" and we would be ahead of game.

I hate to come in here and be negative, I ran for mayor in this city because I had a belief that this city could be saved. What I see, I don't see any savior out there. I don't see anybody making an effort to do it. You have to make changes, they are hardcore changes, but unless you start looking where we are going, we are not going anywhere.

Now, on an issue, a little housekeeping, I'd like to bring up about last week. I brought up about Carrie Newcomb, asked that she would be taken off the board for her comments as a public official. The other issue I have is Mr. Newcomb, who is in the back room, Charlie Newcomb, Jr., took us off the camera, Mr. Miller and myself. We were taken off the cameras last week throughout the whole council meeting as we spoke, which is totally wrong, it's a discrimination against us, everybody was there, but Mr. Newcomb took it upon himself for his own personal reasons to take us off camera. Ι

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

didn't come here to play a game or be insulted by somebody who takes his personal issues and bring them here publically.

Mr. McGoff, tonight I would like to Mr. Newcomb out here and publically apologize to us. This is your council, you're responsible for it, and what he did last week was totally uncalled for, and I'm not going to tolerate an individual like that insulting us at a public meeting that we come here and we speak here because we believe in what we are talking about. It's no more than you were an educator when you spoke before your class if your class just stood there doodling and doing things and not paying attention I could imagine what you would have done to them, okay? And that's what's happening here.

We don't come here to waste your time, sure as heck I'm busy enough not to come here and waste my time or the other people that show up here, but I'd like tan apology tonight from Mr. Newcomb. I'll settle for nothing less. He has got to be held accountable, he is a big boy, but he

1	wants to play with that camera and I expect
2	him to come out here and apologize for his
3	actions or I will get an apology another
4	way.
5	MR. MCGOFF: Were the microphones
6	on?
7	MR. BOLUS: The microphone was on,
8	the camera was taken off us.
9	MR. MCGOFF: So you could be heard?
10	MR. BOLUS: I was heard, I was not
11	seen, and this isn't a case that you could
12	put a child in a corner, okay?
13	MR. MCGOFF: So you are concerned
14	that you weren't on TV; is that it?
15	MR. BOLUS: That's correct,
16	Mr. McGoff, but everybody else was.
17	MR. MCGOFF: Is that why you are
18	here?
19	MR. BOLUS: Wait, that annoyed me
20	and that insulted me because everybody else
21	was on and I didn't really like the idea as
22	I was speaking your head was down and you
23	weren't paying attention.
24	MR. MCGOFF: I can hear you.
25	MR. BOLUS: Maybe you wouldn't

1 understand, take a look over here and pay attention to what's --2 3 MR. MCGOFF: I can hear if my head is down. 4 5 MR. BOLUS: Whatever. You were down for the whole five minutes that I spoke and 6 7 didn't look up once, okay, so --8 MR. MCGOFF: Did I hear you? 9 MR. BOLUS: I'm asking you now, 10 since you don't want to conduct the business 11 of this council, as it should be, to 12 reprimand an individual who has insulted us. MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. 13 14 MR. BOLUS: That's your responsibility. And don't ever thank me 15 16 again, Mr. McGoff, because you haven't done 17 nothing to be thankful for, and I can tell 18 you that you are running for reelection I 19 hope people pay attention and eliminate you 20 from that seat, and I will get the response 21 from Mr. Newcomb one way or the other and 22 you can take that to the bank. 23 MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. Mr. Miller. 24 MR. MILLER: Good evening, Council. 25 Doug Miller, Scranton. Before I begin I

just, you know, Mr. Rogan, is there something comical that you would like it share with us? I mean, you tend to like to smirk and snicker, you want to share what's so funny tonight?

MR. ROGAN: Sure. I thought it was comical when Mr. McGoff asked Mr. Bolus if the point was to be on TV and his response was yes.

MR. MILLER: That's amusing to you?

MR. ROGAN: That somebody would come
to a meeting just be on TV? That's normally
not the case for the people that come to our
council meeting.

MR. MILLER: We don't come here to be on TV years. I've been coming here for 12 years, I don't need face time, I come here because I believe in this city and I'm trying to make a positive difference, I don't need to be on TV. The point is that it was quite obvious that there was an intentional move made to take us off the camera, and that was quite clearly a violation of our free sweep, whether Mr. McGoff wants to talk about we could be

2

3

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

heard, of course we were heard, but there is various levels --

MR. MCGOFF: That is free speech. You were heard.

MR. MILLER: Excuse me. Excuse me. There is various levels of free speech, expression, the body language, that we weren't given that same opportunity that everybody else that spoke here was given, but it just so happens that myself and Mr. Bolus were taken off camera for the five or six minutes that we spoke. Yet you, Mr. McGoff, as the council president, won't take responsibility. These are your meetings. These are your public meetings and you have an obligation to get the job done, and Mr. Newcomb should be held accountable for what he did. If he wants to play a game with the camera and he thinks he is tough with the camera that he can hide behind and bully, that's fine. If you don't want to take action and be arrogant about it we'll take -- we'll get an apology and we'll take action outside of these chambers, but it's just really sad that we all just think

it's a joke and it's comical, and I'm really 1 disappointed that we have a council seated 2 3 here that, you know, you should be 4 embarrassed by it. 5 MR. ROGAN: How do you know you were intentionally taken off the camera because I 6 7 have watched replays of the meetings before 8 where speakers would be talking, I know the 9 one time I watched this about a month ago 10 the camera as on me for about ten minutes 11 and I wasn't speaking. 12 MR. MILLER: No, I guess, you know 13 14 MR. ROGAN: Maybe he went out to the restroom or maybe there was personal 15 16 matters. 17 MR. MILLER: Yeah. 18 MR. ROGAN: The camera operators are all volunteers. 19 20 MR. MILLER: Yeah. Well, when ten 21 people speak, okay, and two people just so 22 happen for five minutes they are not on the 23 camera, believe me, I know a game is being 24 played, okay? I want born last night, Mr. Rogan. I'm not interested when you're 25

on TV, when you take your bathroom breaks, we are talking about that we have free speech and it was violated and you have an obligation to do something about it. And you can shake your head all you want and be egoistical and arrogant like you are always are, but you have an obligation and if you are not willing to do something about it well then we'll handle it accordingly, but it's pretty sad and pathetic that you can't come to your government and expect them to represent their constituents. That's a problem.

But this is what you get when you come here and it's just like talking to the wall and we think it's a joke, we think it's a game, well, want to play the game we play the game, I don't have a problem with it. I have been doing this for a long time and I know how it works and when you are outspoken and you stand up for what you believe in you got to pay the price sometimes and people want to have personal vendettas and when they have access to certain things and they can manipulate and dictate how things are

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going to go they take advantage of it, and it will be addressed, it will be dealt with, because evidently our leaders here don't want to do something about it.

As far as your LST tax, you know, just have to ask ourselves, I mean, are we just really out of our minds here at this point? You know, the recovery plan is not a recovery plan. You know, we want to allegedly suspend the rules possibly and ram this through tonight without any discussion whatsoever on it, but that's just the philosophy we have in this government is the residents of this city's aren't looked out for. We carry the water for various special interests, the administration, that's just basically killing the city and by passing this recovery plan, tripling the LST you are only going to finish this city off once and for all, and we have come to the point where we need to really seriously consider state intervention and receivership or bankruptcy because that's where we are.

And the other question I have tonight is we have PEL talking about one

thing as far as bankruptcy and then we have the Auditor General Mr. DePasquale talking about the city being in two to four years from bankruptcy, so it seems to me that we are not on the same page here and that's a real problem and we all need to get on the same page very quick or it's going to be over and the residents have had an obligation for a long time to protect their interests and they didn't do that. Felt that friendships and political affiliation and a lot of other irrelevant things were more important and that's why we are where we are today.

But other than that I don't have much more to say because I just feel coming here sometimes you are speaking to people who just don't have the right intentions, you know. I'm thankful that we have some common sense with the two individuals seated on the end here, Mr. Gaughan and Mr. Evans, because they are the only ones that really see what's going on here because the issues they brought forward, unfortunately, have fallen on deaf areas to their colleagues.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mr. Miller.
Mr. Morgan.

MR. MORGAN: Good evening, Council.

MR. GAUGHAN: Good evening.

MR. MORGAN: The first thing I have here is I would like council to close Ash Street from North Washington Avenue all the way to the top of let's say Prescott, because the road just isn't passable. It's full of ruts and potholes, a lot of the road has just completely disappeared in the center and I just think it's a public safety issue, let alone that, I don't know, I just really can't see how a vehicle can travel up and down that road many times without sustaining an awful lot of damage and I really think that patching it definitely is not the solution.

In regard to the city's financial situation, I want to touch on something, you know, when the auditor general gets up in front of the House of Representatives and talks about the city it's not something that everybody in this Commonwealth doesn't already know. This city is dead. All it

. .

needs is a viewing. There is no where to go here. You know, we are what we are really doing in this city is we are driving all of the residents into poverty. We are selling their homes at sheriff's sales, we are raising their taxes to a point where the wage base can't sustain the tax rates, we are blaming everybody for what's happened to our city over a long course of time.

I really think that there needs to be a forensic audit done for 50 years, and not only do I think that, I think that all of the grant money, state or federal that's come in this city, needs to be investigated and I think that every party and the council that had a vote in any issue needs to be investigated and if wrongs have been occurred then whoever that council member was needs to be prosecuted. If money is owed and a vote was taken in conflict to law I think that we need to start selling councilmen's and mayor's assets. And if it reaches the state representatives, we need to sell their belongings.

You know, it's pretty easy to drive

2

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the ordinary citizen in poverty and drive them out of their city and that's what's occurred in this city. We bought a pothole machine and we were going to auction it, has that happened yet, Mr. Gaughan.

MR. GAUGHAN: Not that I'm aware of, but I will check into that.

MR. MORGAN: I'm just really troubled. You know, when I see all of these pretty suits lined up and I see the smirks and the smiles and the disrespect for speakers it doesn't trouble me because I know that we are dealing with individuals who have no respect for the sacrifices that people have made to make these council meetings and freedom of speech function. You know, when we separated ourselves from Great Britain men and woman sacrificed their life to create this country and what's happened to our country now? There is no respect for anybody. The federal government is in debt so far they can't see where they are going. We are intervening in wars all over the world, but we can't take care of the elderly. They are living on social

security and can't support themselves and there is children going to bed hungry and all the jobs in this country have been exported out of the country and the people who did that were elected.

And, you know, the sad part is I don't blame people for not voting because to be honest with you, like I said once before, it doesn't matter if only two people voted, what obligation do those who are elected have to the residents of this city and this country even if only one person elected you? Don't you have an obligation to do the people's business and conduct it in a way that shelters the citizen and the resident? That hasn't happened in this city.

And sale of the Scranton Parking
Authority, the first I'm think I'd like to
do is thank the Dunmore Council for stating
that they have no interest in a public sale
of the Scranton Sewer Authority but, you
know, if anybody looked what happened to the
Scranton Sewer Authority when American
Anglican had it, I read that agreement the
day it came out, Jimmy Connors was mayor, I

went in and asked him not to sign it because it had no benefit to the city, and then when the deal ended you find out that they ran all of the equipment into the ground, all the skimmers, all the motors, everything, right into the ground, and then the city had to pick it up, and because of the incompetent of the council at that time who voted did that lead to the massive increases in the sewer rates in Scranton and Dunmore?

I think we need to ask ourselves if it's time to get rid of the pretty suit club and elect people who understand that they have an obligation to the residents whether they vote or not to protect their interests on all levels of government. You know, we can debate a lot of things but the one thing that anybody my age understands this country is going to the wrong way and the city it's going to go into receivership no matter what you do, but to try to pay the fire and police settlement by sale of the city assets, mainly the parking garages, that's not the answer because then the city will go into bankruptcy with no assets. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mr. Morgan.

Ms. Schumacher.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening,
Council. A few short ones before I get to
my main topic which is parking meters
tonight. I'm really saddened by the number
of emergency certificates that this council
has had in their very few months or not even
two years, not even 18 months, and I think
you probably set a record for a whole term
and I just find that troubling and I would
like to know where, considering emergencies,
where is the legislation to hire an auditor
for the city's audits? Can't expect to get
something done in a couple of months if you
are not going to hire somebody.

And things I would like answers to during the Fifth Order, I would still like to know the number of trash bills that were sent out and the payments received.

I would still like, Mr. Rogan months ago promised to follow-up on the Jersey freight building where we paid well over a million dollars to put a slate roof on that with the promise it was going to be

developed and what's going on with the development of that.

I would like to call to your attention that on 5-B that that property is assessed at \$30,000 and you're apparently willing to give it away for less than half of the assessed value.

And the rest I'll hold, I understand we are going to be allowed to talk before Seventh Order on the emergency ones tonight?

MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Now, to the parking meters. I, too, attended the Scranton Parking Authority meeting the other evening and I was surprised somewhat that none of you were there. We elected you partly to protect our assets. The parking meters are an asset. They put through a resolution to go out and sell or lease or whatever this consultant comes up with the parking system, which is five -- according to their definition is five garages and 1,100 parking meters. Now, do you realize that we own those? Why are you giving the authority to an Authority? We elected you people to do

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that? Have you bought into the fact that we are going to sell the parking meters and if so is there a floor under which you will not accept a bid? And if so, how was that framed or calculated?

I'd like to go back to before the last recovery plan was coming Mr. Rogan you said, I believe it was the 22nd of November 2011, "Again, the sale of the city's parking meters to the Scranton Parking Authority. don't know why the mayor and PEL keep bringing up the sale of the parking meters. It's the one asset we have left in this city. It's the last thing we should be selling. Now, now, if they came to us and said, okay, well, here is \$100 million it's going to take up to 50 years to recoup the money before we make a profit then I'm sure all of us would consider it. You know, that sum of money could solve a lot of money -solve a lot of money in the city, but when we are selling them for six, seven, eight, nine, ten million dollars it's not worth it. If I had the kind of the credit where I could go to a bank and get \$15 million I

1 would buy the parking meters. Do you see how much money they bring in? Selling the 2 3 parking meters to the Parking Authority is simply a bailout for the Parking Authority. 4 That's all it is." 5 Now, apparently, you have changed 6 7 your mind or the council has. How can you possibly allow them to go out and offer to 8 9 sell something without you people going 10 along with it and passing legislation that 11 says it's okay to do that? 12 MR. ROGAN: Any sale would come 13 before council for a vote. 14 MS. SCHUMACHER: You don't care if 15 there is any -- so you are willing to sell 16 it or --17 MR. ROGAN: No, please stop putting 18 words in my mouth, that's two separate --19 MS. SCHUMACHER: Well, I'm asking 20 that question. 21 MR. ROGAN: I've always supported 22 selling the garages not the meters. 23 MS. SCHUMACHER: But they are in the 24 process of putting out --25 MR. ROGAN: And there is nothing

wrong with getting bids. Like I mentioned two years ago, if somebody came to us with "X" amount it's something we would continue.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Well, I'm asking -I think that's -- to be honest, having been
in private industry as many of you up there
have been, I know a business puts a certain
amount aside to bid on things, but if you
are not really willing to sell it unless
there is a floor I think you need to tell
the bidders that then and say, "We won't
sell it for less than so much."

I don't think you have doing your job for us if you are letting the appointed people do what you people should be doing as an elected officials. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Is there anyone else who would like to address council?

MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia, citizen of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians, I'm going to speak a little on this so-called recovery plan. I don't know who it's going to recover, but it's certainly ain't going to be the citizens of Scranton. As you heard Marie speak a little on the

parking garage, the reason why they want to include the parking garages and the meters is nobody wants the parking garages. They are dead issue. Even if you could sell them, you couldn't pay off the debt with the money you would get, we all know this.

Let's go to the Sewer Authority.

They want to take away the catch basins. As you know, the Sewer Authority owns the catch basins. Now, they want to take away from that and form an authority to run the catch basins and where are they going to get the money from? Well, when God sends the rain we are going to charge people for the rain. This is their solution and that's what came from PEL.

Let's keep going. You know that they want to lower the taxes on the business community and raise the taxes on the residents 56 percent this is so in the recovery plan. This is what you see in the recovery plan nothing but added debt to the citizens of Scranton. How do you figure into recovery by adding to the debt? You are not solving one darn problem, you never

did. You have been sitting there for -some of yous have been sitting there for
years and never solved one problem, all they
did was create another. And what are you
going to do by creating two new governments
making authorities to run these things. Oh,
that's what I didn't mention, they want to
take away the DPW, it's part of the DPW site
and add another authority because then they
won't show up on the books.

What a stupid PEL plan and you sit there -- and sat there and said, well, this is the thing that do. You are not Scrantonians. You are becoming a bunch of bobble heads. Just anything they say you are agreeing to it. That's not how you run a city. You got to run the city for the citizens not for the people who work for the city and that's what you are doing. Everything is for the people who work for the city. The people who work for the city. The people who work for the city put us where we are, the mayor, the council, the police, the firemen and the whole bunch. Do I feel safe? Well, maybe if I had a fire and they were able to come fast enough I

3

1

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would feel safe, but as far as police protection no. I do not feel safe because it's really not safe to walk the streets and it's going to get worse instead of better and you have put a bunch of Draconian fines on people. If they don't have the -- if they are out there and their grass is two inches above what you think they should be they should get a \$100 fine. Hide the garbage cans so nobody can see them, but if you remember -- I guess you don't remember but when they did move the garbage cans and the trash cans from where they were they said if you couldn't bring them out to the street DPW would be glad to come to the back of the yard and bring them out for you. think they are going to do that now?

I don't know where you consider yourselves Scrantonians, I really don't. I guess you are not old enough to become a Scrantonian. Scrantonian is more than sitting there and saying this, that or whatever, and it's neighborhoods. People. I grew up in Scranton when there was a lot of churches. The city of Scranton was a

city of churches because we believed in churches and we believed in people. None of yours were there when they had the depression and how it was back then. I was at the end of it, but I was there for part of it because of the war, but then you would see the people how they loved their city. Why do you think I stood here? I paid thousands of dollars into this city? Of course, I wanted my grandmother and mother not have to pay these high taxes so I paid the wage tax, but I would feel bad about this work tax that you are planning to raise to 156 bucks, that's bad because it is a work tax and that's the sad part about it. You can call it whatever you want to call it, but a stinkweed still smells like a stinkweed even if you call it a rose.

I'm very sorry for the city. My son is out of the city, thank God. If I had children, any kind of children, I would tell them to leave, too. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you,

Mr. Sbaraglia. Anyone else?

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council.

23

22

24

25

Dave Dobrzyn, resident, taxpayer. I'm going to start from the top tonight and once again call your Senators because that's where a lot of our problems start, the Transpacific trade pack and call the president.

Two-thirds of the people who lost their jobs in 2007 or since started back at 30 percent less and I would say in Scranton it could be possibly as high as 50 percent less.

Somebody I know, very close to me, used to make 35 a year and now they are making 18, so that's way less wage taxes in your pocket.

And once again we have to sue the state and the county under federal law under the constitution that 33 percent takes exempts property is slavery, and that's all there is to it. That's why we have a \$10 million hole in our property taxes every year. Every year \$10 million goes out the door to the rest of the county and the state and they get to play Santa Clause.

Now, to direct city business. The bridges, anybody ever see a Bobcat, those little loaders? They fit great on the

pavement and I think it's about time that we do that for the bridges because I have walked across some of these bridges and, I mean, I was on two feet of ice different winters. This year I didn't, but maybe it's just because I knew better to stay off of them.

And dirt banks down in South Side, we are going to be fining people, the subject just came up for untidy yards and untidy porches, well, we have a coal retrieval operation down in lower West Side and it's just been left there like that, bank, hole, bank, hole, and I think that the people involved, I know who owned it, and the people involved could at least afford to bulldoze it over and level it off at the very least, maybe plant a couple of trees for a change. They have a 400 foot dirt bank growing up in a Dunmore obviously.

And, once again, I'm going to mention on these pensions, Jack Loscombe was horribly disabled in an accident in a fire fighting a fire and they denied him his pension and it wasn't really a retirement

pension it was a disability pension and it should have been given to him and that back money should be given to him and that's all there is to it. It was the most unfair thing that I have he ever seen and any politician that was involved it did contribute to my disdain for them. There is no ifs, and or buts about it I will never, ever like that person again and certainly won't vote for them.

And on this adoption of the other recovery plan, if possible amend it that if you don't get the LST tax out of the judge it is null and void and restart all over because it constantly goes to court through a judge from out-of-town and a senior judge and they say no and then we are already signed on for some silly shenanigans, like, selling the Sewer Authority was mentioned.

Now, in Allentown there was an article in the Times, and I don't know if it was a misprint or not, it's a lot of money, \$211 million went to Allentown for sale of the sewer plant. How come Mr. Doherty only got \$5 million when he sold it or pushed the

sale because he was the councilman that lead the charge? And that's totally ridiculous for some silly amount of money, what are they going to give us magic beans? Maybe. Who knows.

And in finishing, once again, I would love to see the audit for 2013, but I don't think you guys have checked the shredder yet. Thank you and have a good night.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mr. Dobrzyn.

Anyone else would wishes to address council?

MS. REED: FIFTH ORDER. 5-A.

MR. MCGOFF: I'm sorry.

MOTIONS.

MR. NEWCOMB: Good evening, city council. I just wanted to run out real quick because I think I have to address a couple of things that I didn't want to --

MR. MCGOFF: Just state your name.

MR. NEWCOMB: Oh, sorry, Charlie
Newcomb. I am the volunteer for ECTV. I
have been doing it for 18 months, give or
take. Before the three of you were even
here under the last council I volunteered

24

25

because they reached out to me and asked if I would be interested in helping. Just like it is now, if -- last week I had to go to the bathroom, to be blunt, I stepped out to go to use the restroom and as you can see in council chambers there is four cameras. camera that is on now people at home can't see me because it's directed at you because I don't know how long somebody at the podium will be two minutes, five minutes, they go over their time, whatever, so I just wanted to address the viscous attacks that were given to me tonight and that let you know that it is not -- it wasn't done deliberately, that is the time that I had to You had a meeting that ran long before, I couldn't go in-between, so I stepped out when the meeting started, so I will not apologize because it wasn't deliberate, but I just want to thank you for the opportunity to come and address you tonight because I believe I was treated very unfairly, as usual, by two of the speakers that were here. So thank you for your time.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mr. Newcomb.

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

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Wechsler.

MR. WECHSLER: Thank you,

Mr. McGoff. I have a few things now and a few things as they move through the meeting. Some of the concerns that were raised this evening that Ms. Schumacher spoke about, I also have been contacting about the trash bills mailed and the trash bills paid and I'm also quite interested in that and have been following up on that, and I'm also anxious to see what's steps are being taken that the mailing for the 2015 bills when it goes out is accurate and timely so I am working on that.

In regards to the questions that were asked about the parking authority meeting that was held the other evening, I think that was on Tuesday, I contacted our solicitor, Mr. Minora, also to check in to see what role council should be playing or not playing in terms of this sale, and he gave me some information tonight and then we'll be firming that up to make sure we

2

4

3

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't have another error to make sure that
this is done properly and council does
participate as it should and where it should
so we are following up on that.

In regards to some of the other things that were mentioned tonight, and I have never been called a snazzy dresser, but I do take it a compliment for the rest of the suit club here, and I'd be remiss if I did not mention this sports coat, it's not a suit, was purchased at LaSalle's on South Webster Avenue, so this is where I got my sports coat, it's not a suit, and I think the reason why we wear shirts and ties is to show respect for the citizens. I don't think any smarter when I'm working in jeans and a flannel shirt then I do when I'm sitting here, maybe that's another problem, but I think we show respect by wearing our attire, and as I want to make sure you know I wore my St. Patrick's Day tie.

Some of the other matters that were talked about this evening, I do take offense and I shouldn't, i always get in trouble when I talk about this, there is no more

Scranton than I work with on a daily basis, and the other four guys that I work with here. To say that we are not Scrantonians and we're not interested in helping the people that can't be farther than the truth. We spend considerable time here, considerable time during the week, and you may not agree with what we are doing, but I know the votes that I have taken have been in the best interest of the city residents.

Another item that I seem to be getting some flak about is that I talk about the neighborhoods a lot. Well, I do talk about the neighborhoods a lot because as we heard tonight how important they are to the city. This week I did attend the Neighborhood Summit that was held at Scranton Police Headquarters. They were leaders from North Scranton and South Scranton and West Scranton and the Hill Neighborhood Association were at the meeting. Each group talked about different projects that they have going on in their certain neighborhoods and they are doing a

wonderful job trying to protect their neighborhood and they are committed to doing that and, once again, to say that the neighborhoods are a disaster area and falling apart, yes, we all know that there are problems, but it's a disservice to minimize the work that these groups are doing for their neighborhoods and they are successfully raising money, they are successfully bringing money in the community through grants and other partnerships so I congratulate them on the work they are doing and I really don't think it's fair to say that the neighborhoods aren't being watched by us or by the neighborhood groups.

In regards to talking about police protection, Chief Graziano is the chairman of these neighborhood meetings and Chief Graziano and his force they have many different programs that they are implementing to help the city protect.

There is a crime and I would rather have our police force protecting me than any other police force in this area. There is a many things that happened that go on that don't

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

make the newspaper, different investigations and so I'm proud of the work that they do.

And that's all I have at this time.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. Mr. Rogan? MR. ROGAN: Yes. As Mr. Wechsler just said, I want to address a number of items that were brought up by some of the speakers. I wasn't planning on addressing this again, but I guess I'll say a few words regarding the cameras. We have to thank our volunteers who do record this meeting, they are volunteers. Mr. Newcomb is one of them, and as I mentioned when Mr. Bolus was speaking, I remember a meeting maybe a month or so ago under Fifth Order when Mr. Evans was speaking and the camera was on myself the whole time. I didn't hear Mr. Evans complain that he wasn't on camera.

 $\label{eq:mr.evans:} \mbox{MR. EVANS:} \quad \mbox{If I knew I could I} \\ \mbox{would, but --} \\$

MR. ROGAN: Again, the volunteers they -- sometimes the meetings go long, might have to take a phone call, use the restroom, whatever it may, we thank the volunteers for broadcasting these meetings

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and it is important that they are on TV.

That's something I strongly support.

Regarding the comments Ms. Schumacher made with regarding the parking meters, I have never made a statement that I would support selling the parking meters. have always stated that I support selling the garage. I look at them as two separate assets, actually one that's an asset and one that's a liability. The meters are an asset, the garages are a liability. under the impression that one of the ideas to sell the garages was to use the meters as collateral with the banks because from what I have been hearing we are not going to get back out of the sale of the garages what was borrowed because too much money was borrowed, they should have never been built, and we are subsidizing those every year with tax dollars because they are not breaking Something has to be done to change even. that dynamic. Throwing money at the problem isn't going to solve it, and as I have mentioned numerous times, as of a few years

ago we owed \$50 million in principal on

1

6 7

5

9

8

11

12

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

those garages. If paid out over the payment schedule that would cost the taxpayers \$100 million, so anything we can do to pay down on that quicker, just like paying a credit card and not paying the minimum payments, it could save quite a bit of money in the lodge run.

Forensic audit was brought up by one of the speakers, that is something that I have always supported and I think in light of the many errors that have come to light regarding the pensions I think it would make sense to at least with the pension boards to do a forensic-type audit and find out exactly what happened. Council did receive some more documents from our request two weeks ago that shed a lit bit more light on where the request to authorize these double pensions came from. We were asked not to comment on these at this point as the investigation is ongoing, but it's certainly not forgotten about. If a few more weeks go by and we don't hear anything, you know, I will be here calling to subpoena past elected officials and one current elected

official who was there at that time as well as members of the pension board from that time. It's certainly something we need to get to the bottom of and I hope the investigation will on it's on.

I'd like to thank Chief Graziano for a quick reply to a resident complaint regarding a park cars on Snyder Avenue in West Scranton, which is a very tight neighborhood, there is very little parking, and there were three abandoned -- I'm sorry, two abandoned vehicles in that area that have been sitting there for months and months and within a day of contacting the chief an officer was out there and tagged those cars and is taking care of that situation.

And, finally, other than the agenda items I would like to wish everyone enjoy the parade. Enjoy responsibly. Please don't drink and drive, call a taxi. And I apologize, I did forget to wear, and I am Irish, Rogan is Irish, and I did forget to wear my green tie but I will wear it for St. Patrick's Day, which is the actual St.

Patrick's Day next week. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: We'll forgive you.
Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Thank you. First of all, full disclosure, the sport coat I'm wearing tonight is also purchased at LaSalle's sportswear and that's South Webster Avenue in South Side.

I'm going to comment a little bit on the public caucus that we had tonight and I would like to thank Michelle again for coming. First of all, it was nice to have some positive images and ideas about our city. Michelle and many others like her our assets to our city and we need to continue to find ways to foster that creative class in our community.

I have been involved in the beginning in the Iron District concept and I felt it was time for city council to get a feel for that was all about and what a great idea that is as well and it's very, very doable and that alone is a positive thing.

And the old Harrison Avenue bridge concept, frankly, I remember Mayor Doherty

several years ago at the site and this is an idea that he both discussed. We both felt the idea we very viable and unique and a way to preserve the bridge, create a pedestrian park and walkway, and reduce the waste and cost of the demolition of the old bridge.

Of course, the new Duffy Park that's proposed could be easily incorporated in the design. I have already talked to the Architectural Heritage Association and the Greenhouse project at Nay Aug and they are both on board with the concept and ready to help with the care of the park if it is completed.

So I would like to formally ask members of the council if possible can we request a meeting with PennDOT officials to possibly hold another caucus to discuss an update to the current existing bridge project as well as the conversation and concept that we had tonight about the old Harrison Avenue bridge to see what their thoughts are and see if this is something that we can possibly move forward. So I'm not sure how we do that, I guess, you know,

'

it's okay if --

MR. WECHSLER: Just one comment on that, topple afternoon there is a meeting with PennDOT at 2:00 to discuss the Harrison bridge and the Duffy Park and the bridge and the whole thing so I would invite you to go to that meeting if you are interested.

MR. EVANS: I'll try, I have to rearrange my schedule about that.

MR. WECHSLER: It's at 2 p.m.

MR. MCGOFF: Where is that at?

MR. WECHSLER: It's at the PennDOT office in Taylor.

MR. EVANS: Where is that?

MR. WECHSLER: Off of Main Avenue and Old Forge. In Taylor, right behind the Olecki Pharmacy right down in that area.

MR. EVANS: Okay. All right. I'll try to make that tomorrow. If not, you know, we can still have -- I think it's nice to have the public have an opportunity to hear what the plans are. I don't know if council has ever seen the design for the new bridge.

MR. WECHSLER: That's actually

what's going to be discussed tomorrow. I think they finally have some -- they had some input from the architectural board and they are working towards getting that, this is I guess the initial presentation of the plan.

MR. EVANS: Well, it would be a starting point, I'd like to still have it coming before us and have an opportunity to talk and have the citizens to have an opportunity to see what is going on with the bridge, and again, I don't if this is conversation has ever actually happened about the old bridge, so I think it's time to make that happen. So that's all I have for now.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you.

Mr. Gaughan?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, thank you. I have quite a few items so please bear with me. A gentleman called to report a tractor trailer dumping used tires at 2630 Winfield Avenue and there is a propane tank nearby and the residents were very concerned. Our city clerk, Mrs. Reed, immediately contacted

the Licensing, Inspections and Permits

Department and hopefully we will get an update on what took place there.

There was a problem with a damaged curb in the 3000 block of Colliery Avenue in Minooka that caused flooding when it rains.

A resident contacted me, I forwarded that concern to the DPW.

Two weeks ago I mentioned about having a caucus on land banks, an idea that has been floated around for the past couple of the months that would help the city fight blight and a tool that was given to us by the governor back in I think 2013. I spoke with representatives from the Pennsylvania Housing Alliance and they are willing to come up for a public caucus Thursday, April 2, at 5:30. So I urge everyone who is interested in this idea to be here and to listen to what they have to say.

I attended a Greenridge neighborhood meeting Tuesday night and have several concerns from residents to report. There is a vacant and neglected property at 1120 Columbia Street. There is an abundance of

different animals, including cats, on the property and dangerous dead trees in the yard that could possibly cause harm for the surrounding properties. There is also an issue at 1010 Electric Street. A neighbor had concerns this property was a boarding house and he cited numerous issues with this property. Letters have been sent to Director Hinton requesting information on this property since November but the resident has not heard a reply yet.

Student housing was also a major issue in the Marywood University area for The residents would like residents. clarification from LIPS on student housing and single family homes and whether or not this can be considered a common household under the zoning ordinances. Residents informed me that there is a problem with Marywood students duplicating parking permits illegally. There is also an issue in the 1200 block of Woodlawn Street with faded permit parking signs and three permit parking signs have been stolen. The residents would like these and the faded

signs replaced. The three missing signs are causing problems for residents who have students parking in front of their homes.

A dangerous issue was occurring in the 1100 block of Fisk Street that needs to be addressed. Residents have found metal blow darts in their garages and in the side of their houses. They believe that they are coming from the area of Park Gardens. There are young children in the area and this has become a major safety concern in that area. I have instructed Mrs. Reed to send a letter to the Housing Authority to notify their security team and Police Chief Carl Graziano.

Residents also inquired how they would be able get a beat cop in the Greenridge area. They are very interested in finding out more information about that so we will also contact the Chief of Police to discuss this issue further.

And finally, a resident reported
that tractor trailers are parked on top of
the enclosure of the dyke system in the area
of Glenn Street and the 1500 block of

concerns that I listened to at this
neighborhood meeting we are going to try to
address and send correspondence to the
appropriate departments so I'd like to thank
our staff for helping out with that.

And finally before my comments on

Dickson Avenue and resident feels that this

is a dangerous situation. All of these

And, finally, before my comments on the agenda items I would also like to wish everyone a good fun time this Saturday at our St. Patrick's Day parade. I would also like to thank all of the people that put the parade together, it's not easy at all and they should be congratulated for that. And I would say that for all of the Irish immigrants and really all immigrants, why do we march? We march because at one time we could not.

Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mr. Gaughan.

Just I believe that the zoning ordinance for housing is four non-related people living in one structure or one house.

MR. GAUGHAN: Yeah, but there is -- and that's being violated, I guess all over

the place and that's the major, for what I took away from that meeting, that was the major issue in that area was that, you know, besides parking people are buying single family homes and then turning them into student housing dormitories.

MR. MCGOFF: That has been addressed to me and I have, you know, brought it up before. It is a very difficult thing to enforce as we all probably know from experience especially in college housing you are never quite sure who is staying in any one place and for how long, but certainly it is an issue that needs to be addressed and should be addressed.

A couple of things that -- a lot of things actually. First of all, on the 2013 audit that was brought up, the city had received a notice from DCED that they have not received the 2013 municipal audit and financial report that was due April 1 or is due April 1, '14, and what they are saying is that if that's not received then the municipality Scranton will not in compliance with their reporting requirements and would

be ineligible for any DCED funding, so that there is pressure being placed on the city and the auditor to have this complete.

I know this is a concern, it's been an ongoing concern for many people around and hopefully, you know, this is an indication that the state and others are interested in this being done now, that this needs to be completed, and certainly we do not want to lose any source of the funding especially through DCED and hopefully this would expedite the completion of the audit which has been mentioned is severely overdue.

As far as a forensic audit, I have spoke to a person who does forensic audits for municipalities and the one thing that was said to me is that, number one, forensic audits are done when there is an indication of malfeasance, and what they need -- they are not -- somebody is not going to do an audit over a 30-year period. What they would do would be a forensic audit would be for a specific item of malfeasance, a smoking gun, if you will. They need to have

something that says, "Here's something that was done wrong over a specific period of time," not just, "Let's go look and see if we can find somebody something."

And the other thing is that forensic audits tend to be costly and if the city were to try and, you know, conduct a forensic audit it would be costly to the city to do that for even a short period of time, so while it may sound like a good idea it's really not necessarily a great possibility that this would be done by the city. Perhaps the state or someone else may come in and do it, but as far as the city conducting a forensic audit I don't see that happening merely because of the fact that at this point in time there is not any smoking gun that points to a specific item, and plus we do not have the funding to do that.

Somebody brought up about the financial advisor doing nothing or it's costing, every mayor going back as far as I know has had a financial advisor. This is not something new. I believe almost every municipality has a financial advisor and

they are working at what they are asked to do, you know, advise the city on certain financial matters including, and I'll go down to including the sale or the monetization of the parking assets.

Somebody said, you know, that there is no interest, the fact was that when the RFQ's went out there were 15 different groups that responded. That's been narrowed down now with the RFP that was being sent out I believe to five -- of those five or six of those people that were interested, so there is interest in the garages.

The problem that maybe is being brought up is that most of the bids or most of the people interested are interested in both the parking garages and the parking meters, so that they could consolidate both. Now, are we aware of that? Yes. Been aware of that for a number of years that these things would probably be united if there was to be a sale or a lease. Simply by including the meters it increases the value of the sale or lease and that's what we are looking at. That's what they are looking

at. I'm sure if there is a way of keeping the parking meters through this process the city would be interested, but going back again, this is not something that's come before council yet. We do not have anything to look at. We need, you know, if there is going to be a sale or a lease then it would come before us and then we could vote yes or no to that, but as far as voting on an RFP, you know, that's not what we are here to do. So that takes care of at least my thoughts on the parking situation.

As far as PEL is concerned, yes, they have been here for awhile. Mr. Cross has not been here, again, I would state for the entire extent of this, so to blame Mr. Cross for the entire 22 years is inaccurate. I'm not sure exactly how many years Mr. Cross has been involved, I know it's at least ten, but just so we are straight on that.

And parking signs, yes -- or stop sign, yes, the stop signs are in terrible condition throughout the city. Throughout the city you can find signs that are barely

I'll say visible as stop sign as far as the color is concerned. One of the problems is that the people that are responsible for taking care of the signs are now picking up refuse and recyclables. They have been taking off those duties because of the manpower issue at DPW.

Also, the repainting of the signs or replacing of the signs is costly. You know, it costs money to do that and in the budget yes, is there money to do that, but it's something that becomes, again, an issue of manpower and money at DPW. So, yes, do we need those signs, you know, redone. Please, they will -- it will be addressed. It has been addressed with DPW and hopefully all of those problems, the sign problems, can be taken care of.

Nobody's right to speak has been violated by council. Everyone has -- anyone, citizens of the City of Scranton or people with an interest in the City of Scranton are allowed to come to the podium and speak to council. No where does it say you have the right to be on television, and

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

if that's why people come to speak because they want to be seen on television then they should get their own television show.

That's ludicrous to say that, you know, you have a right to be on television and we are not going to pursue that matter in any way and if someone feels that that's what we should do they are entitled to that opinion, but we are not going to address that issue beyond tonight.

As far as the Auditor General, I know I'm going long here, but the Auditor General when he was here in Scranton about a week ago did speak about the idea of receivership for the City of Scranton and what he said was that receivership is not a He said what receivership does good idea. is take power out of the hands of the people and place it in the hands of the receiver and if the receiver doesn't like what either the administration or the council is doing they can simply supercede the power of the city and do whatever they want and that could be raising your taxes, you know, 100 percent.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They don't care. They are -- the job of the receiver would simply be to put the city or the municipality, you know, back on track for, you know, back on a balanced budget. They don't care how they do it. They are not going to look for other ways to bring that about. The receiver will simply look at the simplest answer and that would be raising real estate taxes or other taxes. So the Auditor General, while he says Scranton may be on the road to that doesn't believe that it's a good idea nor do most of -- I would say all of the members of the council do not believe it's a good idea as do many of the advisors that we have to the city, including PEL and Mr. Amoroso.

I'll speak now to the idea of emergency certificates. Yes, council has said that this is not something that we are comfortable with, with which we are comfortable. It has happened I'll say far too often over the months they have been here. I will attribute that to a new administration, a new law department, and the attempt as we are seeing tonight to

rectify problems over the past. Not problems, not situations that were created by either this council or this administration. Some of these are problems as tonight goes back to what 1987? And so I applaud -- I'm sorry, I have a problem with my eye. What we are trying to do is just rectify some problems that existed and a number of these things have come under emergency certificates. Do we like it, no, but we do need to deal with some of these problems and we will according to our abilities.

Last two things hopefully. The storm water problem, yes, it was something that was brought up, PEL brought up the idea of a Storm Water Authority. This is not something that is being done -- the authority is an idea that's, you know, being proposed by PEL, but the separation of the storm water situation and the compliance is compliance with state and federal regulations. These are things that are being asked of us or told that we need to do by DEP. We need to separate the systems, we

need to improve the systems, and be compliant with regulations. This is going to cause money. And if the city can't put this in the hands of an Authority then it becomes the Authority's responsibility to take care of those costs and not the city. Someone may agree with this, but it is something that we need to do by law and we will attempt to find those -- I don't want to see convenient, but the best way for everyone to bring this about.

And the last thing, somebody brought up Mr. Loscombe and his pension, that was a situation that was determined, that was finalized by the courts or by an arbitrator and that's not something that was decided by any one person or any group. Was it something that was unfortunate, maybe, but it was not council, it was not this mayor or this administration, it was a decision made by the Court or through a hearing, and I think I'm done.

MR. GAUGHAN: Could I make one additional comment --

MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

MR. GAUGHAN -- on something you said? The faded streets signs, I agree it is a major problem. Every neighborhood meeting I have gone to in the past year and a half it has come up. I believe under the Connors' administration they received a very large grant to replace a very large amount of faded street signs so I think maybe we should ask the city to investigate and see if there are any available grants out there from the state so that we can get that done. Thank you.

MR. EVANS: Yeah, a quick follow-up to one of the speakers and I think President McGoff mentioned to is the faded stop signs. I mean, that's something of immediate concern. We can't play games with saying we don't have the manpower or what are we going to do or if this guy has to come back from vacation or whatever, we have to find solutions to that today because somebody could get killed and that is serious stuff. So I would say, you know, to Mr. Gallagher tell us what you need. If you need more occasionals, we'll find to give you

1	occasionals. You need to outsource it,					
2	we'll find a way to outsource it, but those					
3	kind of things cannot be ignored day in and					
4	day out because somebody is going to get					
5	seriously hurt.					
6	MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. Anyone					
7	else? Please.					
8	MS. REED: 5-B. FOR INTRODUCTION -					
9	AN ORDINANCE - SALE OF TAX DELINQUENT					
10	PROPERTY MORE COMMONLY KNOWN AS 630 CLAY					
11	AVENUE, SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, TO JONATHAN					
12	OLIVETTI, 201 FRANKLIN AVE, 3RD FLOOR,					
13	SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, 18503, FOR THE					
14	CONSIDERATION OF \$16,000.00.					
15	MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll					
16	entertain a motion that Item 5-B be					
17	introduced into its proper committee.					
18	MR. ROGAN: So moved.					
19	MR. WECHSLER: Second.					
20	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? All					
21	those in favor of introduction signify by					
22	saying aye.					
23	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.					
24	MR. ROGAN: Aye.					
25	MR. EVANS: Aye.					

MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.

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

MS. REED: 5-C. FOR INTRODUCTION AN ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL
NO. 152 OF 1987, AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A
REVISED BENEFIT PLAN FOR THE POLICEMEN'S
PENSION FUND IN ORDER TO CORRECT AN ERROR OF
OMISSION OF SECTION 2 AGE AND SERVICE
RETIREMENT REQUIREMENTS. (EMERGENCY
CERTIFICATE ATTACHED).

MR. EVANS: I make a motion to amend Item 5-C as per the following: In the fifth whereas clause delete the entire paragraph and replace it with the following:

"Whereas, the actuarial valuation report of Conrad M. Segal, Incorporated, of January 1, 1988, also provided that eligibility for normal retirement benefits for police officers required attainment of the age 55 and completion of 25 years of service and."

MR. ROGAN: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question? All those in favor of the amendment signify by

	76				
1	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	At this time I'll entertain a motion				
9	that Item 5-C, as amended, be introduced				
10	into its property committee.				
11	MR. ROGAN: So moved.				
12	MR. WECHSLER: Second.				
13	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? If				
14	this is council has decided that if this				
15	is moved to Sixth and Seventh Order, as I				
16	said, we will speak to it in Seventh Order.				
17	All those in favor of introduction				
18	signify by saying aye.				
19	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.				
20	MR. ROGAN: Aye.				
21	MR. EVANS: Aye.				
22	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.				
23	MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The				
24	ayes have it and so moved.				
25	MR. EVANS: I make a motion to				

The

1 suspend the rules and move Item 5-C, as amended, to Sixth and Seventh Order to be 2 3 considered for final passage based on the 4 attached emergency certificate. 5 MR. ROGAN: Second. MR. MCGOFF: On the question? 6 7 those in favor of moving 5-C to Sixth and 8 Seventh Order please signify by saying aye. 9 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 10 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 11 MR. EVANS: Aye. 12 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 13 MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? 14 ayes have it and so moved. Let me just say that there will be an opportunity to speak 15 16 to this again, the public will have an 17 opportunity to speak to this again prior to 18 Seventh Order. MS. REED: 5-D. FOR INTRODUCTION -19 AN ORDINANCE CREATING AND ESTABLISHING 20 21 SPECIAL CITY ACCOUNT NO. 02.229615 ENTITLED 22 "EIT CONTRIBUTION" FOR THE PURPOSE OF 23 ACCEPTING A 2.4% EIT CONTRIBUTION BY 24 BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR, DAVE BULZONI. 25 MR. MCGOFF: At this time I'll

1 entertain a motion that Item 5-D be 2 introduced into its proper committee. 3 MR. ROGAN: So moved. 4 MR. WECHSLER: Second. 5 MR. MCGOFF: On the question? would like it make note that this was done 6 at the behest of Mr. Bulzoni so that his 7 8 contribution would be a matter of record and 9 an account for it would be created. 10 All those in favor of introduction 11 signify by saying aye. 12 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 13 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 14 MR. EVANS: Aye. MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 15 16 MS. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The 17 ayes have it and so moved. 18 MS. REED: SIXTH ORDER. 6 - A . READING BY TITLE - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 19 20 85, 2015 - AN ORDINANCE - APPROVING THE 21 TRANSFER OF A RESTAURANT LIQUOR LICENSE 22 CURRENTLY OWNED BY KOSMART ENTERPRISES, INC. D/B/A PIZZA HUT OF DUNMORE LICENSE NO. 23 24 R-14852 TO BAR PAZZO, INC. FOR USE AT 25 131-133 NORTH WASHINGTON AVENUE, SCRANTON,

PENNSYLVANIA AS REQUIRED BY THE PENNSYLVANIA 1 LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD. 2 3 MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by 4 title of Item 6-A, what is your pleasure? MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-A 5 pass reading by title. 6 7 MR. WECHSLER: Second. 8 MS. MCGOFF: On the question? There 9 is a clarification from last week. 10 Officially, Pazzo was going to move in the 11 500 block of Lackawanna Avenue, apparently 12 an agreement could not be reached between 13 the parties and the they did reach an 14 agreement with the owners or the developers of the Connell building, the lower area, and 15 16 that is where the restaurant will be located 17 which is 131-133 North Washington Avenue. 18 All those in favor signify by saying 19 aye. 20 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 21 MR. ROGAN: Aye. 22 MR. EVANS: Aye. 23 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 24 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. The ayes have it 25 and so moved.

MS. REED: 6-B. READING BY TITLE -1 2 FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 86, 2015 - AN ORDINANCE - AMENDING THE REVISED RECOVERY 3 4 PLAN FOR THE CITY OF SCRANTON PURSUANT TO THE FINANCIALLY DISTRESSED MUNICIPALITIES 5 ACT; AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OF THE CITY 6 OF SCRANTON TO ISSUE AN ORDER DIRECTING THE 7 8 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REVISED RECOVERY PLAN 9 WHICH WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE UPON ADOPTION ATTACHED HERETO AS EXHIBIT "A" IN ACCORDANCE 10 WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 249 OF THE 11 12 FINANCIALLY DISTRESSED MUNICIPALITIES ACT. 13 MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by 14 title of Item 6-B, what is your pleasure? MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-B 15 16 pass reading by title. 17 MR. WECHSLER: Second. 18 MS. MCGOFF: On the question? A11 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.

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. EVANS: I make a motion to suspend the rules and move Item 6-B to Seventh Order for final passage.

MR. ROGAN: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question.

I'd just like to recap this whole situation for a minute and how we got here. Last week PEL requested with the administration's urging that city council suspend the Rules and pass the recovery plan tonight in order to be able to get a Court date to obtain approval of the LST increase to \$156 a year. The mayor didn't seem to be that concerned about going to court to get the LST increase when he deliberately postponed the recovery plan to extend contracts for the police and fire departments. If Mayor Courtright and his administration was that concerned about getting a court date the recovery plan would have been on our agenda in late January as scheduled. The mayor basically delayed this whole process by six weeks so he could take of both departments and protect them from Now, all of a sudden, the recovery plan.

_ .

there is a sense of the urgency with the recovery plan. And, quite honestly, I really resent the fact that the burden is now on this council to change our process because of the complete lack of consideration by the mayor and others. So while I am voting for the recovery plan, I have to vote "no" on this measure and voice my descent on the way that this was done. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: I would just disagree with that characterization. We spoke about this in our caucus and the reason why it's being pushed forward is the law department believed that the time that they could petition the courts prior to the adoption and they later found it had to be -- the petition could not be filed until adoption was made. We did discuss this prior to the meeting.

MR. MCGOFF: And just to hopefully finalize, I don't think that I disagree with either Mr. Rogan or Mr. Gaughan. I believe that there was I'll say a manipulation of the process. I also agree that, you know,

once the recovery plan came before us that there was a need to expedite this in order to, you know, deal with the LST and that the courts didn't say that they wanted a final plan or agreement so, yes, is there a problem with doing this? Yes. Is there is a need to do it? Yes. So it's in the hands of council, you know, to say yes or no. That's all. Anyone else? All those in favor of moving 6-B to Seventh Order for final passage signify by saying aye.

MR. WECHSLER: Aye.

MR. ROGAN: Aye.

MR. EVANS: Aye.

MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed?

MR. GAUGHAN: No.

MR. MCGOFF: The ayes have it and so moved.

MS. REED: 6-C - FORMERLY 5-C READING BY TITLE - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO.
87 -105 - AS AMENDED- AN ORDINANCE AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 152 OF
1987, AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A REVISED
BENEFIT PLAN FOR THE POLICEMEN'S PENSION
FUND IN ORDER TO CORRECT AN ERROR OF

84
OMISSION OF SECTION 2 AGE AND SERVICE
RETIREMENT REQUIREMENTS. (EMERGENCY
CERTIFICATE ATTACHED).
MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by
title of Item 6-C, as amended, what is your
pleasure?
MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-C, as
amended, pass reading by title.
MR. WECHSLER: Second.
MS. MCGOFF: On the question? All
those in favor signify by saying aye.
MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
MR. ROGAN: Aye.
MR. EVANS: Aye.
MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
ayes have it and so moved.
MS. REED: SEVENTH ORDER.
MR. MCGOFF: As I said, if there is
anyone that wishes to speak to the two
pieces of legislation that were moved
forward they may do so at this time.
MS. SCHUMACHER: Yes. First on the
one you have moved forward on the pension,
what was 5-C at the beginning of this

evening, I'm a little confused because when those MOU's were being discussed there were several people who said we couldn't possibly afford to put those off because of arbitration and we went to arbitration and we would lose hands down, so now if I read the Times-Tribune article correctly and didn't skim over it too fast the police union is threatening a lawsuit over this so it's the same -- I mean, we are not afraid of court. We are afraid of arbitrators but we are not afraid of the courts, is that a fair conclusion?

MR. MCGOFF: No. This is something that was not part of the contract that we voted upon and approved. This is something that goes back to 1987. It's something new and distinct.

MS. SCHUMACHER: But if this is -if this is approved tonight --

MR. MCGOFF: Yes.

MS. SCHUMACHER: And the police union takes the city to court and says it has to be negotiated and we lose how many police officers would then be eligible for

1 the special retirement package that you offered to supposedly six in the MOU? 2 3 MR. GAUGHAN: I'm not sure about that, but I did -- we did pose this question 4 5 to the Human Resources Department and I 6 haven't received a response yet, but from 7 what I read in the paper if I guess the 8 number of police officers would be eligible 9 to retire if there was no age requirement at 10 55 would be 27 employees from what the paper recorded, but I can't confirm that. 11 12 MS. SCHUMACHER: You don't have that 13 from the --14 MR. GAUGHAN: From the HR Department. No, I don't. 15 16 MS. SCHUMACHER: I really think we 17 should know that. 18 MR. GAUGHAN: I did request that in 19 writing, yes. 20 MS. SCHUMACHER: And then on the 21 revised recovery plan, I know you are all 22 going to vote for it, but there is several 23 things that trouble me and the message that 24 it sends, and I'll just give you one 25 example, your earned income tax line up

item, what this says to me because we have, and I'll round it off to the hundreds of thousands, we have \$24.8 million for earned income tax in 2015, this year's budget. In 2020 we only have \$25.4. That is \$600,000 so we are saying that the payroll for people who pay the earned income tax is only going go up by enough to cut -- provide \$600,000? That says to me that we are a declaring the city economically dead. We are not going to get any new jobs, people aren't going to get raises?

MR. EVANS: That's PEL's projection, but I tend to agree with you because I think that --

MS. SCHUMACHER: I mean, anybody looking at that that wanted to come into the city and they look what does the city think they are going to do and you've got a relative almost flat --

MR. EVANS: Absolutely.

MS. SCHUMACHER: -- of earned income tax, that bothers me. That sends a message.

MR. EVANS: It bothers me, too.

Absolutely because I have been saying for

2

3

5

4

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

years every time we raise taxes we are actually going to get less in return.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Yeah. I mean, there are a lot of other line items that I could use similar comparisons, but those things bother me a whole lot, but I recognize you are all going to vote for it so I'll take my seat. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you.

Good evening, Dave MR. DOBRZYN: Dobrzyn once again, resident of Scranton, taxpayer. On the first distressed municipalities act, once again, I would like to see the method that some of the responsibilities that Henry Amoroso brought up, we lost in Court on the wage tax, on the commuter tax, and once again, it will be decided by a senior judge who never has to answer to a voter again, and I think it should be contingent. It should be inserted in there that it's null and void if we lose in court on the LST tax. It's time we start to press our end home.

And on this pension issue with the police department, one of the things, and

20

21

22

23

24

25

it's certainly nobody's fault here at council, but there are too many laws existing previously we need a forensic study of past practices and past ordinances and start to scrap what is wrong with them because this is serious, 27 people able to retire early, that's going to be one heck of a good chunk of change every year along with medical benefits. I pointed out last week that if a 21-year-old certified for a job with the police department he could retire at 46. He wouldn't even be eligible for social security until 66 so that's 20 years you are going to be carrying him on insurance and everything else, so that's a long, long time. Thank you and have a good night.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. Anyone else? Seventh Order.

MS. REED. 7-A. FOR CONSIDERATION
BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY - FOR
ADOPTION FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 84, 2015 AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE
CITY OFFICIALS TO APPROVE THE EXPANSION OF
PARKING ENFORCEMENT WITHIN THE SCRANTON

1	POLICE DEPARTMENT BY REASSIGNING TWO (2)			
2	CIVILIAN CLERKS TO THE PATROL DIVISION TO			
3	ENFORCE PARKING VIOLATIONS THROUGHOUT THE			
4	CITY.			
5	MR. MCGOFF: What is the			
6	recommendation of the Chair for the			
7	Committee on Public Safety?			
8	MR. WECHSLER: As Chairperson for			
9	the Committee on Public Safety, I recommend			
10	final passage of Item 7-A.			
11	MR. ROGAN: Second.			
12	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll			
13	call, please?			
14	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler.			
15	MR. WECHSLER: Yes.			
16	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.			
17	MR. ROGAN: Yes.			
18	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.			
19	MR. EVANS: Yes.			
20	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.			
21	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.			
22	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.			
23	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare			
24	Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted.			
25	MS. REED: 7-B. FOR CONSIDERATION			
	Π			

BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS- FOR 1 2 ADOPTION RESOLUTION NO. 130, 2015 -3 RATIFYING AND APPROVING THE SUBMISSION OF AN ACT 101. SECTION 902 RECYCLING DEVELOPMENT 4 AND IMPLEMENTATION GRANT APPLICATION 5 SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS 6 AND THE DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS 7 8 ADMINISTRATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF 9 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ("DEP"), AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE 10 CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO AN 11 AGREEMENT WITH THE COMMONWEALTH OF 12 13 PENNSYLVANIA, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ("DEP") AND TO ACCEPT THE ACT 14 101, SECTION 902 RECYCLING DEVELOPMENT AND 15 IMPLEMENTATION GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF 16 17 \$250,000.00. 18 MR. MCGOFF: What is the recommendation of the Chair for the 19 20 Committee on Public Works? 21 MR. GAUGHAN: As Chairperson for the 22 Committee on Public Works, I recommend final 23 passage of Item 7-B. 24 MR. ROGAN: Second. 25 MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Ro11

1 call, please? 2 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler. MR. WECHSLER: Yes. 3 4 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan. MR. ROGAN: Yes. 5 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans. 6 7 MR. EVANS: Yes. 8 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan. 9 MR. GAUGHAN: Yes. MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff. 10 MR. MCGOFF: Yes. 11 I hereby declare 12 Item 7-B legally and lawfully adopted. MS. REED: 7-C -FORMERLY 6-B - FOR 13 14 CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES -FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 86, 2015 15 - AMENDING THE REVISED RECOVERY PLAN FOR THE 16 17 CITY OF SCRANTON PURSUANT TO THE FINANCIALLY 18 DISTRESSED MUNICIPALITIES ACT; AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF 19 SCRANTON TO ISSUE AN ORDER DIRECTING THE 20 21 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REVISED RECOVERY PLAN WHICH WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE UPON ADOPTION 22 ATTACHED HERETO AS EXHIBIT "A" IN ACCORDANCE 23 24 WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 249 OF THE

FINANCIALLY DISTRESSED MUNICIPALITIES ACT.

25

1	MR. MCGOFF: As Chair for the			
2	Committee on Rules, I recommend final			
3	passage of Item 7-C.			
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-C legally and lawfully adopted.			
18	MS. REED: 7-D - FORMERLY 6-C - FOR			
19	CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES -			
20	FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 87,			
21	2015 - AS AMENDED - AMENDING FILE OF THE			
22	COUNCIL NO. 152 OF 1987, AN ORDINANCE			
23	ESTABLISHING A REVISED BENEFIT PLAN FOR THE			
24	POLICEMEN'S PENSION FUND IN ORDER TO CORRECT			
25	AN ERROR OF OMISSION OF SECTION 2 AGE AND			
	Π			

CERTIFICATE ATTACHED).

SERVICE RETIREMENT REQUIREMENTS. (EMERGENCY

MR. MCGOFF: As Chair for the Committee on Rules, I recommend final passage of Item 7-D, as amended.

MR. ROGAN: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question.

I'll be voting "yes" for this legislation

tonight in order to correct the error in the

1987 police pension ordinance which omitted

a retirement age requirement.

I would like to take a second and read into the record a letter we received from police union president Paul Helring on March 10. It says, "President Bob McGoff, it was just recently requested by the FOP to the Scranton Police Pension Board about the eligibility requirements for members of our bargaining unit. This was a result of the mandated changes made in the city's ordinances as a result of the Act 205 needed by September 30, 1987.

In reviewing the ordinances passed on an emergency certificate September 23,

1987, it's required for fire and clerical to have 25 years of service and be the age of 55 in order to be eligible for pension benefits. In the police ordinance, there was several changes made to our pension benefits but no age requirement.

It was just recently announced that the city council meeting that you intend to make changes to the police ordinance to mirror the other city unions benefits. This action was not bargained between the city and the FOP during our recent contract extension. The FOP is asking city council to proceed with caution when making any changes to the police pension benefit without negotiating the terms with the FOP.

We are unsure if you are aware of the 1984 Pennsylvania Supreme Court decision which addresses pension benefits unilaterally being changed after an employee is hired. This action is strictly prohibited and will cause litigation if changes are implemented by the city.

If you are any questions, feel free to contact the FOP regarding this or any

other issue before your body. Thank you.
Paul Helring. Union President."

I'd just like to say after reading that letter that the police union should first understand how government works. In Mr. Helring's letter he asked council to proceed with caution when making any changes to the police pension benefit without negotiating the terms first with the FOP.

First, council does not negotiate contracts. That responsibility, as we all know after the past few months, lies with the mayor.

Second, I'd like to clarify that it's not council's action that would trigger litigation. The mayor has the option to veto this legislation if he chooses to. It would only be challengeable if the mayor implemented it. The executive is the branch of government that executes the legislation. Mr. Helring should be cognizant much these facts before he asks council to proceed with caution, and just to be clear, council can and should pass this legislation.

Mr. Helring in his letter to council

also threatens litigation if this
legislation is passed which, again, I'll
point out simply corrects a clerical error.
I'm disgusted and outraged that the police
union has decided this is the course of
action they plan on taking. They must not
understand that dire financial situation the
city is in and the condition of their
pension which is clearly on life support.

Many people I have talked to find this recent news unbelievable, but to be honest, I expected it. Mayor Courtright has given every indication during his first year and half in office that he will meet the demands of the police and fire unions at any cost. We need to be clear on who's responsible for allowing the police union to think they can do things like this.

For the past 14 months Mayor

Courtright laid out the welcome mat in front of his office. Let's remember how anxious

Mayor Courtright was to renegotiate the police and fire contracts in advance of the revised recovery plan and provide them protection until 2021. We rarely ever hear

2

3

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

directly from the mayor on most issue unless it deals with the unions.

For example, the caucus we had on the budget, wasn't here. Caucus we had on the recovery plan, wasn't here. hope that we pass this legislation tonight and the mayor enforces it and doesn't back down. Let the police unions sue and then let the chips at this point fall where they I am not sure why the police union is looking to negotiate again. This city and the taxpayers have nothing left to give. Mayor Courtright gave away the store and the shelves at this point are empty. The only thing we have left is to beg the police union not to bankrupt the pensions and, therefore, the city and if 27 employees are allowed to retire early before age 55 my fear is that's exactly what will happen.

The delusion and greed that is involved here is both astounding and disgusting. Government should exist to serve the people. In Scranton it seems as if government exists to employee people and pay them money and benefits it can no longer

2

3

5 6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

afford. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Sure. I guess Mr. Gaughan won't miss an opportunity to throw stones at the administration, this came from the city solicitor authorized by the mayor to correct an issue that started when you and I were less than one year old. It's certainly not Mayor Courtright's fault, it's certainly not the fault of anyone on this board. I don't think anybody was in government at the time when this occurred except for maybe the city controller, but there is nobody on this board that was and I don't understand how you criticize the mayor for laying out a welcome mat for the unions when it's his legislation the unions are opposing.

I think we all agree that this needs to be done. It should be -- I believe it will be a unanimous vote because it isn't right and the union is wrong. This has been a past practice, there was an error that was made, unfortunately, it took nearly 28 years for anyone to realize that it existed and these are the type of things that keep

happening over and over and over again and every other week it's one thing after another.

This week it's the item that we are dealing with now, two weeks ago it was people that were receiving double pensions for a year. A few years before that it was a business administrator under a previous administration that miscounted for a million dollars, a tax collector misappropriated \$5 million. When is all of this stuff going to end? There needs to be some accountability and, unfortunately, with many of these issues they are not. We don't find them out until the people that were there at the time they occurred are all out of office.

But I commend the mayor and the solicitor for doing the right thing and fighting the union on this issue. It is the right thing to do and I hope it will pass unanimously and I sure the mayor will sign it into law tomorrow.

MR. MCGOFF: Let me just say that in the emergency certificate it delineates the intent of the 1987 ordinance and in the back

up to this legislation tonight we have the ordinance from 1987. It goes from Section I, membership, to Section III, age and service retirement benefit. Obviously, there was a Section II that should have been there. For some reason that was not included. There were two other contracts that were approved that evening that had a Section II. One for I think it was the clerical union, and one for fire. Both of them had a Section II or a section that said 25 and 55. Obviously, the intent of the legislation was to include that.

Also, an actuarial study done in 1987 by Bayer also included the 25/55 in their study, so it becomes obvious that the intent of the law was to include that. A clerical error left it out. All we are doing is putting that section back. What was the intent in 1987 and all we are doing is saying, yes, we believe this was the intent of the law and this is how it should be followed.

This was done -- this is not being done by council without some advice. This

is being done upon the advice of the city solicitor, the council solicitor, I believe the Pension Board solicitor, all agree that this should be rectified at this point in time and that that was the intent in 1987 and that the city should enforce the intent of the 1987 ordinance.

Did I say anything improper or did I miss anything, Mr. Minora?

MR. MINORA: Got it all right.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. I know it was long and involved.

MR. WECHSLER: Mr. McGoff, the one point that I would like to bring out all during the debate on the contract in the beginning of the year I believe it was the understanding that the fire union was under the assumption that it was 25/55. All during that debate we never heard anything different than 25/55.

And, also, I would also like to point out that I'm sure in the new contract if these people are eligible to retire the new health benefit does not kick in. It's very clear that the health benefit does not

kick in until 25 years of service and 55
years old so I'm not sure if these -somehow this happened that the retirees
would be eligible for health care until they
are 55.

MR. EVANS: On the question, to say
I was angry when I read the front page of
the newspaper about the police unions
stating that they are going to fight the age
requirement for a pension is an
understatement. It's two days later and
that hasn't changed one bit.

Let me recap some things that we need to remember. Number one, the police union signed a contract where they received retiree health care benefits, additional vacation time, enhanced sick day policy and the union president gets a day off each week to perform union duties, all of this while negotiating with a city that was in financial distress on the verge of bankruptcy.

Number two, their pension plan will be broke in five years and 50 percent of their members are on disability pensions.

Three. The auditor general has predicted that we could be in receivership or bankruptcy as early as two years without drastic changes to our pension plans, and the response from the union representative to this latest pension revelation was, "We are going to put them on the notice that it's illegal because of a clerical error."

Really? I commented last week that we have a government that appears to be more employee-centric than citizen-centric. This latest situation has done nothing but enhance that perception. That's all I have.

MR. MCGOFF: Final comment, as I said to the newspaper, I believe that given what has been done for the FOP over the past number of years, including the contract that we voted on earlier this year, that it would be a good faith gesture by the FOP to say we understand that the intent of the law was 25/55 and let it go at that.

MR. ROGAN: I would just add one other item, Mr. McGoff is absolutely correct and in my five years on council there have been two FOP grievances that I strongly

1 disagreed with, this is the second one. The first one was when Chief Duffy was as chief 2 3 making arrests and the union filed their 4 grievance that they were taking away union 5 While I generally agree with police work. much of what the FOP pushes on that issue 6 7 and on this one they are certainly wrong. 8 MR. MCGOFF: Roll call, please. 9 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler. MR. WECHSLER: Yes. 10 11 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan. 12 MR. ROGAN: Yes. 13 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans. 14 MR. EVANS: Yes. MS. CARRERA: 15 Mr. Gaughan. 16 MR. GAUGHAN: Yes. 17 MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff. 18 MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare 19 Item 7-D, as amended, legally and lawfully 20 adopted and I would hope that the FOP would 21 recognize what we have done and, as I said, 22 make that good faith gesture. 23 If there is no further business, 24 I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. ROGAN:

Motion to adjourn.

25

				106
1	MR. MCG	OFF: This	meeting	is
2	adjourned.			
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

ability.

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

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER