		1
1		
2	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING	
3		
4		
5		
6	HELD:	
7		
8	Monday, July 16, 2018	
9		
10	LOCATION:	
11	Council Chambers	
12	Scranton City Hall	
13	340 North Washington Avenue	
14	Scranton, Pennsylvania	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR – OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER	
25		

CITY OF SCRANTON COUNCIL:

PATRICK ROGAN, PRESIDENT

TIM PERRY, VICE PRESIDENT

WILLIAM GAUGHAN

WAYNE EVANS

KYLE DONAHUE

LORI REED, CITY CLERK

JEANNIE DAVIDSON, SECRETARY

AMIL MINORA, ESQUIRE - SOLICITOR

1	(Pledge of Allegiance recited and
2	moment of reflection observed.)
3	MR. ROGAN: Roll call, please.
4	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Perry.
5	MR. PERRY: Here.
6	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Donahue.
7	MR. DONAHUE: Here.
8	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Evans.
9	MR. EVANS: Here.
10	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Gaughan.
11	MR. GAUGHAN: Here.
12	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Rogan.
13	MR. ROGAN: Here. Please dispense
14	with the reading of the minutes.
15	MS. REED: THIRD ORDER. 3-A. TAX
16	ASSESSOR'S REPORT FOR HEARING DATE TO BE
17	HELD JULY 25, 2018.
18	MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?
19	If not, received and filed.
20	MS. REED: 3-B. MINUTES OF THE
21	REGULAR MEETING OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
22	SCRANTON HOUSING AUTHORITY HELD MAY 7, 2018,
23	AND JUNE 4, 2018.
24	MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments?
25	If not, received and filed.

MS. REED: 3-C. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE LACKAWANNA COUNTY LAND BANK HELD MAY 11 2018.

MR. ROGAN: Are there any comments? If not, received and filed. Do any council members have announcements at this time? I have a few. First, an executive session was held prior to our meeting tonight regarding potential litigation. Secondly, the city will provide free electronics recycling this Friday, July 20. Residents can drop of electronic recyclables at the DPW, 101 Poplar Street from 6 a.m. to 11 a.m. Help will be available for lading items onto DPW trucks. For more information please call the recycling coordinator Tom Lynch at 570-348-4165.

Lackawanna County is distributing farmer's market nutrition vouchers this Wednesday, July 18, at the South Scranton Senior Center, 425 Alder Street from 9 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

And, finally, fireworks at Nay Aug

Park will be held on Wednesday, August 8,

following the concert. For more information

you can call the Parks Department at 570-348-4186.

MR. GAUGHAN: And I just have one.

I just want to ask everyone to keep a young man and his family in their prayers today.

A former student of mine, Devon Walker, passed away Saturday. He was a very sick young man. He was very brave and he fought very hard the last couple of years and he was a really great kid so I just want to ask everyone if they could keep him in their prayers and his family and his younger siblings. Thank you.

MS. REED: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION.

(The following speakers offered public comments as follows: Joan Hodowanitz spoke on city business. Dave Dobrzyn spoke on city business and matters of general concern. Glynnis Johns spoke on city business and matters of general concern.

Marie Schumacher spoke on agenda items and matters of general concern. Lenny Srebro spoke on city business and matters of general concern.

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

MR. ROGAN: Mr. Perry, do you have any motions or comments?

MR. PERRY: Yes, just a couple.

From last week I want to send a thank you out, we had a little DPW conversation, but I do want to send them some thanks. They installed a couple of "Children at Play" signs in the neighborhood. They were up within 24 hours. I know that because the residents gave me a call. They wanted me to pass along a thank you to DPW for that timely installation on the "Children at Play" signs.

Also, I want to send a big thank you out to the Scranton Police Department. A couple of days ago there was a wrong-way driver that hit one of my friends. The friend wasn't seriously injured but, nonetheless, was, you know, hit by a wrong-way driver and the police -- you know, when you find out somebody at that you know has been hurt, you know, you make every effort to try to do what you could and it

21

22

23

24

25

wasn't too far where I live so by the time I got there the police department was already there with and had everything under control and you talk about a very -- again, a lot of people know this who deal with first responders, but somebody like myself who don't get to deal with them every day, it's just a really little fluid environment to say the least when you get on an accident scene and, you know, their professionalism, I know we can't say this enough about them, but they really know how to handle their business and they are the best at what they do and I just want to thank them for everything they did just not only to make sure they were safe to bring justice to it, but to make sure that all of the other cars coming down the street were protected. Ιt was something to see, just a great operation there, a bunch of professionals and I want to thank them.

We talked about the capital budget,

Joan. I believe that from the sewer sale I

think we earmarked \$2 1/2 million I believe

for capital improvements and then that money

23

24

25

was up for discussion on how it was going to be spent. At the time, Mr. Bulzoni explained to us that the general budget there really wasn't much room to earmark anything for capital budget and if there was there wasn't much to get anything accomplished, so once we get this assessment of the \$8 million, and this is the jumping off point, the starting point on now if that's really what it's going to cost we know what we have, what are we going to spend it, how are we going to allocate those funds so this starts the discussion right now on what's going to be done, but I believe, don't hold me to this, I think \$2 1/2 million is what we earmarked from the sale for capital improvements, but that wasn't just necessarily for city hall that was going to be for any capital improvements that we wanted to do n any city assets so that's where we are money wise on that.

And I'm going to save everything else I have for our agenda items tonight.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Mr. Donahue, any motions or comments?

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DONAHUE: Yes. I just want to briefly comment on not only the multiple articles that have appeared in the Scranton Times over the past few weeks regarding a property on Columbia Street and also the Castle House on Ridgemont Street, but also on the overall issues regarding the Licensing and Inspection Department. In the six months I have been on council the number two -- the two biggest complaints I get involve either pave cuts or the LIPS Department, and I agree with both Councilman Gaughan that we have to work with all developers instead of working against them. And, also, with Councilman Evans that, you know, we need to address this issue before we lose more blocks and neighborhoods to blight and demolition.

The politically correct term to describe how the LIPS Department functions would be to call it selective enforcement, but I need to take it a step further because I believe it needs to be said. I believe that office is being used to try to settle personal and/or political grudges and that

needs to end immediately. This is not how government should function, and that's all I have. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Mr. Evans, do you have any motions or comments?

MR. EVANS: Yes, thank you. As a former of member of the city's Historical Architectural Review Board or HARB and a president or current member of the Architectural Heritage Association, I'm extremely encouraged by the steps being taken to finally address the much needed repairs, renovations and restoration of Scranton City Hall.

As a generation of deferred maintenance, stopgap repairs, along with the lack of foresight and finances, it's now time to stop kicking the can down the road. As stewards of this building and this government, it's now time for all of us to step up and do what needs to be done. This building is not only our link to the past but through a thoughtful restoration and a fresh look at how interior space can be better utilized, city hall can be a link to

the future as well. So I appreciate and would like to recognize BA Bulzoni for his efforts in pushing this initiative to the forefront. This building is far too important and too historically and architecturally significant to be allowed to deteriorate any further, so count me in as a support of this imitative, in fact count me as all in.

Also, as the newest member of the CDSP board, a subsidiary of NDC that is contracted to manage the city's garages and on-street parking, I was officially put on the board 6-25-18 as City Council's representative. Of course, the request for information through a Right-to-Know long before I was put on the board but in a continuing to bring a new level of transparency my request for periodic updates by NDC to Scranton City Council will begin with a public caucus on July 23 to discuss a 2018 semi-annual financial and operations report, so certainly that is encouraging.

However, as a member of the CDSP board I expect even more transparency. To

that end, I suggested in an e-mail to members of NDC management today that they may want to include information requested in a Right-to-Know request as part of their presentation to city council next week, and if that does not happen I will make a formal request to the CDSP board to release that information as soon as possible.

NDC and ABM through he CDSP board have asked us to spend public dollars to make improvements to public garages as well as make improvements to public on-street parking areas. Meetings remain private and limited information is released without great hesitation and consternation. Public officials the public deserve better. I am but one vote on the board but I will continue to press for full transparency. That's all I have for now.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. Mr. Gaughan, any motions or comments?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, thank you, quite a few. Mrs. Reed, I was approached by a resident of North Scranton about dumping in the 500 block of Wale Street, an empty lot,

2

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and the neighbors there believe that the Housing Authority owns it so if we could please check into that.

We did send a request to 2200 block of Kelly Avenue. Residents were concerned about a faded one-way sign and a "Do Not Enter" sign so we sent that to DPW. attend the zoning board meeting last week regarding the North Scranton apartment complex, the developer wants to put 252 apartment buildings, or apartments rather, throughout ten buildings in North Scranton. And I can tell you from living in that neighborhood that there is absolutely nobody that is for this project and there was I think over 100 people that packed this -these council chambers for the zoning board meeting last week in opposition to it. matter did get continued until next August, until this August coming, August 8 at 6 p.m., so I would again urge anyone in North Scranton to come out to oppose that project.

I did attend the West Scranton

Neighbor's Association meeting last week as
well and there were many issues and concerns

22

23

24

25

This was the first that were discussed. time that they had actually met. It was a room full of concerned and passionate individuals in West Scranton. Mr. Donahue already touched on this, but -- and Mr. Donahue was there as well, I can tell you that one of the major issues that the residents brought up was not getting a return phone call from people who work in city hall, whether it be a department head or one of the employees. Specifically, many of the complaints came from the Licensing and Inspections Department. So, Mrs. Reed, if we can send something to the mayor and inform him that people around the city, this isn't just in West Scranton, it's in Greenridge, it's in South Side, it's in North Scranton and really every neighborhood meeting I go to people complain they call city hall, either they don't get a return call or somebody does answer and they get booted around to different departments and then they don't know what happened with their issues, so it's extremely frustrating.

One of the programs Councilman Evans

presented a few months ago, and I think everyone on this council agrees with it, is the See, Click, Fix program. I believe that if somebody calls city hall with a complaint there should be a paper trail of that complaint. It should be logged some place so that if it's going to take a week and a half or two weeks to get fixed the person who calls should know that. They should get an e-mail, they should get a notification that their problem was taken care of.

So there are better ways or more efficient ways to deal with problems throughout the city, and I'm not just blaming this administration because I think this has gone on for decades, but there is a problem, people are frustrated and they get disgusted with city hall and they just end up giving up all together, so I would like to see something sent to the mayor so he hopefully is aware of that.

There also was a gentleman a the
West Scranton neighborhood meeting who to
his credit takes the time to clean in and
around where the viaduct is there on Fourth

21

22

23

24

25

Avenue, and I have said this before, you know, the gentleman mentioned that he ends up, you know, being the only one that cleans it. He wasn't complaining about it, but he was simply saying that people say they want to come out and help but usually they never I brought this up before, I have seen across really the country cities who have yearly neighborhood clean ups, yearly park cleans ups and the administration coordinates that and they happen at the same time every year so there is no surprise that we are going to clean Rockwell Park in April, next year it will be May, maybe June, and then it kind of gets all discombobulated.

So I do think, and I would again urge the mayor, to come up with a yearly schedule where the DPW coordinates with these neighborhood groups, they go out, they pick these spots and they clean them up because the neighbors will come out. I just think the administration needs to make that a priority.

Also, one of the issues that came

out of the neighborhood meeting was street markings, either there are none in certain parts of the West Scranton or they are faded, so if we could send something to DPW about that so somebody from DPW can go out and make an assessment of that situation, and it's also a public safety issue.

I would like somebody from Licensing and Inspections to go out and take a look at the 300 block of North Sumner Avenue, there are several quality of life issues there.

Also, the 300 block of Railroad avenue, a neighbor expressed concern that trash pickup is Friday, there are people putting their trash out a few days early not in cans, there is garbage all over the place so if we can send something to LIPS on that as well.

I also attended the Greenridge

Neighborhood meeting. They would like to
know the status of 934 Woodlawn Street.

It's apparently condemned so they would like
an update on that. There was a woman at
this meeting that complained, and I can back
her up on this, about the condition of the
3000 block of Olyphant Avenue. Several

potholes so DPW can make their way out there to fill them, and there is an overgrowth on a lot and I'll give you the address for that, Mrs. Reed, after the meeting.

Also, residents brought up, and I wasn't aware of this, construction going on near the greenhouse at Nay Aug Park. They would like to know what this is so if we could reach out to Mr. Fallon and find out what they're building there, what they're putting there.

We got an update from the city solicitor on the status of the treehouse. The engineer has completed 75 percent of the plans, the submission for repairs. Budget related questions may account for the remaining 25 percent. There would be a meeting this week, next at the latest, and the engineer will finalize following that meeting and I'm glad to see that because, you know, I use Nay Aug Park often and it is really an embarrassment that the tree house is lacked and has not been open for this long.

Also, I asked for an update of the

11

12

10

8

9

14

13

16

15

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

lawsuits from the city solicitor, the Act 511 case is pending a decision from the judge. There is still nothing on preemptory The refuse case is pending class iudament. The city opposed some of the notice. language in the notice and they are waiting on the judge to decide that. The rental registration lawsuit is in discovery which is the information sharing period of the process, and the sewer proceed lawsuit they are waiting for the oral argument on preliminary objections to be scheduled so we should see something on these lawsuits in the next few months.

I also asked also week about the recent agreement between the city and I believe the fire union employees to split the cost of the required physician evaluation which is involved with the disability pension process. I was questioning the cost of the city in this cost share arrangement so we did receive a reply from the administration. There will be a memorandum of understanding between the city and the police and fire unions. It's

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

currently being drafted, the details will be available once all parties have signed off and that. And that's I have this week.

Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: Thank you, just two First is the double pension item. Unfortunately, it has been taken longer than expected to get legislation put together, but rest assured there will be legislation coming together to prevent this from happening again. As far as comments on the report, again, we are very limited as to what we could say per the agreement between council and the state police, so the items, the individuals that are referenced in the report, unfortunately, we are not able to by Court order get into any of that. Now, we were able to by reading through that report see some of the items that happened, and at least I have an idea and a better understanding on how some people that weren't entitled to double pensions received them, but the goal is once legislation is put in place in the future there will be -if there ever is any type of incentive given

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to employees to retire early that's it's done in a thoughtful process and a process that is streamlined to avoid this type of issue from happening again.

And the second issue I wanted to talk about, Councilman Evans actually talked on already and I believe it was reported in the newspaper is the condition of city hall. For decades, as Councilman Evans said, generations city hall has been neglected from a maintenance standpoint. You could just take a walk around the building and you could see many areas that are deteriorating and you could see where repairs have to be done, and that's only what meets the eye. There is much more under the surface than what needs to be maintained and improved, including energy efficiency upgrades, a number of items. So I am in support of the city doing -- getting a full analysis of what needs to be done to get this building up to 2018 standards, but when those findings come back I think at that point in time all options need to be on the table. Again, we are talking people -- the number

of \$8 million has been thrown around to get the building to where it should be. That's an awful lot of money. There may be better options than spending \$8 million. As much as I want to see the building restored, it is a very large number, and hopefully we could find grants and be able to, you know, move things around to make city hall more efficient and work better, but we will take it step by step, but I'm glad to see that something finally is being done one way or the other with regards to the condition of the city hall. And that is it all.

MS. REED: 5-B. FOR INTRODUCTION AN ORDINANCE - GRANTING A TEMPORARY

CONSTRUCTION AND PERMANENT MAINTENANCE
EASEMENT AGREEMENT ON PROPERTY OWNED BY THE

CITY OF SCRANTON TO SCRANTON LACKAWANNA
INDUSTRIAL BUILDING COMPANY FOR THE
INSTALLATION OF SIDEWALKS AT THE MOUNT
PLEASANT CORPORATE CENTER ALONG MOUNT
PLEASANT DRIVE AS MORE FULLY DESCRIBED IN

EXHIBIT "A".

MR. ROGAN: At this time, I'll entertain a motion that Item 5-B be

1 introduced into its proper committee. MR. PERRY: So moved. 2 3 MR. EVANS: Second. 4 MR. ROGAN: On the question? A11 5 those in favor of introduction signify by saying aye. 6 7 MR. PERRY: Aye. 8 MR. DONAHUE: Aye. 9 MR. EVANS: Aye. 10 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 11 MR. ROGAN: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 12 have it and so moved. MS. REED: 5-C. FOR INTRODUCTION - A 13 14 RESOLUTION - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE 15 16 AND ENTER INTO A GRANT AGREEMENT BY AND 17 BETWEEN THE CITY OF SCRANTON (HEREINAFTER 18 REFERRED TO AS THE "CITY" AND/OR "GRANTOR") 19 AND SCRANTON LACKAWANNA INDUSTRIAL BUILDING 20 COMPANY, (HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS THE 21 "GRANTEE/SUB-RECIPIENT") IN THE AMOUNT OF 22 FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$50,000.00) FOR THE 23 INSTALLATION OF SIDEWALKS AT THE MOUNT 24 PLEASANT CORPORATE CENTER LOCATED ALONG

MOUNT PLEASANT DRIVE.

25

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROGAN: At this time, I'll entertain a motion that Item 5-C be introduced into its proper committee.

MR. PERRY: So moved.

MR. EVANS: Second.

MR. ROGAN: On the question? one item I wanted to point out because it was brought up, these items are not in relation to the Sheetz gas station being put in there. I'm sure they will benefit from the sidewalks being put it in Mt. Pleasant, but anyone that goes to, for instance, the Geisinger facility that's in there, you can see that there is not access for pedestrians and especially with a school so close by and a medical facility that if somebody who doesn't drive if they need to go to a doctor's appointment at that facility we certainly should have sidewalks in that area so I am in support of this legislation. Anyone else? All those in favor of introduction signify by saying aye.

MR. PERRY: Aye.

MR. DONAHUE: Aye.

MR. EVANS: Aye.

1 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. MR. ROGAN: Aye. Opposed? The ayes 2 3 have it and so moved. MS. REED: SIXTH ORDER. 6-A. NO 4 BUSINESS AT THIS TIME. 5 SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. FOR 6 CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE -7 8 FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 25, 9 2018 - CREATING AND ESTABLISHING SPECIAL CITY ACCOUNT NO. 02.229634 ENTITLED "POLICE 10 GRANTS" FOR RECEIVING FUNDS FROM MULTIPLE 11 12 SHORT TERM OR PASS THROUGH POLICE GRANT SOURCES THAT REQUIRE FUND ACCOUNTS SEPARATE 13 14 FROM THE GENERAL FUND. MR. ROGAN: What is the 15 recommendation of the Chair for the 16 17 Committee on Finance? 18 MR. EVANS: As Chairperson for the 19 Committee on Finance, I recommend final 20 passage of Item 7-A. 21 MR. PERRY: Second. 22 MR. ROGAN: On the question? Roll 23 call, please? 24 MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Perry. 25 MR. PERRY: Yes.

1	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Donahue.
2	MR. DONAHUE: Yes.
3	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Evans.
4	MR. EVANS: Yes.
5	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Gaughan.
6	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
7	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Rogan.
8	MR. ROGAN: Yes. I hereby declare
9	Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted.
10	MS. REED: 7-B. FOR CONSIDERATION
11	BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES - FOR ADOPTION -
12	RESOLUTION NO. 59, 2018 - AUTHORIZING THE
13	MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS
14	TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO A PROFESSIONAL
15	SERVICES CONTRACT WITH ABRAHAMSEN, CONABOY &
16	ABRAHAMSEN, P.C. FOR SPECIAL LABOR COUNSEL
17	LEGAL SERVICES FOR THE CITY OF SCRANTON.
18	MR. ROGAN: As Chairperson for the
19	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
20	passage of Item 7-B.
21	MR. PERRY: Second.
22	MR. ROGAN: On the question?
23	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question.
24	You know, at this point, I really don't even
25	know where to begin with this legislation

but let me check through some things here so that people can understand, kind of the ridiculous things that I'm dealing with and I believe the whole council is dealing with.

Last week I asked several questions about this contract and I did receive a reply from our city solicitor Jessica Eskra on Friday and I'm going to read through some of the responses, but I was not satisfied with many of them that were given because most of my questions were not actually answered they were kind of danced around and I really did not appreciate that.

So my first question was about the RFQ how it was advised I asked for an explanation of that whole process which, I mean, I thought was a pretty simple ask.

The answer was that the RFQ was advertised in the Scranton Times following the normal advertisement procedure we follow here in the city, and then the advertisement procedure was not detailed, so I had to go back and ask for that this morning and I did get it and I appreciate that but, again, I asked a simple question, did not get a

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

simple answer.

Number two, second question I asked was to provide the reason that the contract was well pass the expiration date of the contract because legislation was submitted to council's office for consideration. asked what the reason was for the delay. The answer was that -- it says, "My approach to crafting bids is to ensure that they are thorough and updated to reflect the city's present needs which requires an investment This goal must be balanced with my of time. many duties of the city with prepping and handling litigation matters, managing all insurance defense litigation and claims, preparing and negotiating contracts and agreements, researching and responding to legal questions and issues of the various city departments, involvement and oversight of various projects, etcetera, to name a few."

Again, didn't really answer my question and, quite frankly, I went back and looked at the bid, the RFP from 2014, most of the language was the same in 2018 except

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for one difference, which I'll talk about in a second, and most of it is boilerplate.

So, again, I'm not really buying that it took, you know, a few months to put that together when the contract had expired.

The third question was how much has the law firm billed the city pursuant to the previous labor contract and for any and all other work performed for the city during that time period including work to date. did receive a vendor report, and I had to add it up, obviously, because everybody is so busy in city hall. Now, the numbers were very small and I want to say I think I got this total right, but I'm sure other people will double check. To date, and this is as of June 25, Abrahamsen, Conaboy and Abrahamsen has billed the city \$890,067.63. Now, this figure does include the two separate payments of \$200,000, that would be one for the parking deal and one for the Sewer Authority deal. The parking deal was included in the vendor report of the sewer report. Pavement was obviously because money came out, proceeds of the Sewer

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Authority so close to a million dollars there.

My next question was has the city been successful in defending grievances and other labor matters that have gone to What is the percentage that arbitration? the city has actually been successful? in all of the matters what is the percentage the city has been successful? Very clear. The answer was, "Abrahamsen, Conaboy and Abrahamsen has successfully negotiated five collective bargaining agreements for the city since 2014. He served as lead counsel on the back payment mandamus for the police and fire unions which was successfully negotiated and resolved. He also successfully defended the city in the arbitrations regarding cost of living adjustment and the age requirements for retirement, which has resulted in the actuarial valuations of the city's pension funds." Most of this is already included in the memo in the RFP, by the way. "Because of the monumental successes, I have the utmost confidence in Abrahamsen, Conaboy and

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Abrahamsen to continue the City's success in labor negotiations and arbitrations.

Again, what is the percentage that the city has actually been successful. question is not answered so I would like that answered and I'm going to make a motion to table at the end of my comments here. The most egregious response here in my opinion as an elected official comes for I asked and I referenced the number five. attachment E, which is in the RFP. keep in mind I didn't put that in there, nobody on counsel put that in there. city is requesting this information from the firm that replied to the RFP. I asked why the submittal Mr. Abrahamsen did not reply because the information pertaining to the recipient, the amount of the contribution and the date in which the contribution was made is not disclosed. The answer that was given by the city solicitor is, "Information regarding political contributions are public record."

Again, that's not what I asked. I understand stand that it's public record.

My question was, "Please explain the reason for the omission of the date and the amounts of the contributions and why this was acceptable to the city."

If you are not going to require firms to fill out the RFP correctly then don't put the attachment in. So, again, I don't understand the answer here and I was not satisfied with most that I just read.

Now, one of the things that we just received early this morning right before the council meeting was a response from Abrahamsen, Conaboy and Abrahamsen and the do include the amount of the contribution, the date, and the person who contributed and who they contributed to so I appreciate that. But, again, Councilman Evans made his point in caucus, another tactic, they are giving us this information right before council meeting with little or no time to actually review the answer which, again, I find unacceptable. I asked about this last week.

Second thing, the Attachment E, the disclosure form, number eight, it clearly

24

25

asks if the person who submits the RFP has donated any money to any campaign, any candidate or a person in the State of Pennsylvania, and that was not filled out and I find it hard to believe that Mr. Abrahamsen and anyone in his law firm did not donate any money over \$500 to any other candidates in Pennsylvania, and I'll also point out, I have here for agenda item 7-C we have contract with Labella Associates for engineering services and I had Mrs. Reed print pages 51 through 65 for their Act 44 disclosure form and their affidavit, disclosure by current contractors, they submitted about 17 to 20 pages of backup where they detailed very specifically all of the contributions that they have given to candidates in Pennsylvania and Lackawanna County in the City of Scranton. So, again, I would say to my colleagues that this RFP does not comply. Again, I mean, you know, I have to wonder if I wasn't here to look at this, if I didn't bring this up, would anybody have brought this up or are we going to let it slide because this firm is a

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

contributor to the mayor's campaign. It's very simple. It's very simple in the RFP. Fill it out the right way, that's what I was saying last week and that's why I think this bid is still incomplete.

So, again, I ask this week where is the transparency? I don't think it was filled out the right way, so it's seriously concerning and the response from the city solicitor is extremely troubling. like to know why we are going to award a lawyer a contract when they were not responsive to the bid. This is not, ladies and gentlemen, a good indication of the work that they will perform and the bid, in my opinion, is unacceptable. Also, the language of the RFP, in 2014, I looked back at the RFP, and the only major change in the language of the scope of the services was that in 2018 this line was put in, "Strong preference will be given to those applications who have experience and understanding of the unique culture of the City of Scranton's labor unions."

So I would like to know, and

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hopefully this gets tabled tonight, why that language was put in. I believe Mrs. Schumacher brought it up last week, and so did I, but why was this sentence put in that RFP? What is the difference between the one in 2014 and 2018 and why was that necessary. I don't believe, quite frankly, that this language is fair and think it limits the pool of applicants and I find it extremely interesting that we would want to do that. I think you would want to get the best bang for your buck and the most qualified applicants. It seems we are directing the work to someone who currently performs it or who has done it in past so we are limiting the potential talent pool here and we do have a robust legal community in the area.

As for some of the comments made in the paper this morning, you know,
Mr. Abrahamsen was quoted as saying,
"Obviously our firm and Bill Gaughan don't see eye to eye, but if council asks us or the mayor's solicitor asked for more information we'll be happy to do so."

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First of all, the comment that we don't see eye to eye, this is nothing personal. This is a matter of transparency. A year ago all I simply did was ask for information. I was doing my job. I'm doing the same thing this year, and again, Mr. Abrahamsen is making it seem like we are asking for additional information. That was They didn't fill the included in the RFP. They either willfully did that or they should have known better, which is scary in and of itself that we are going to put our trust in the law firm and they are omitting that information.

So, again, I have serious concerns, I have questions that are still not answered. The other issue at play here is to do with the shared services committee. We have a meeting, we finally got a meeting with the city solicitor on July 24 to discuss the possibility of sharing legal services with the school district in an effort to save money and be more efficient. So we were trying to take a look at, Councilman Donahue and I and Director

Cognetti and Gilmartin, the possibility that maybe we would co-bid this labor contract, this labor RFP with the school district to be more efficient. Is that a possibility? We had asked a month or two ago for a meeting with the city solicitor and we just got one on July 24, so I'm going to ask that this legislation be tabled until I get adequate responses to my questions and we do have an opportunity to meet with the city solicitor, so at this time I would like to make a motion to table agenda item 7-B.

MR. EVANS: Second.

MR. ROGAN: On the question?

MR. PERRY: Yes, on the question,

last week I was very clear about the RFQ process. If it's on the application it has to be answered. Once we start deciding on what questions are allowed to get answered and what aren't then what's the point of a true RFQ. I believe, and question five was answered, question eight wasn't. So as far as I'm concerned this is still an incomplete RFQ and until all of the questions get answered on that I'm in agreeance with the

table.

2

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROGAN: Anyone else?

MR. EVANS: On the question, I certainly would like to see many of city council's questions answered, especially those that are within the scope of the RFP. I received a response to most of the questions and a partial reply to Attachment E at 11:50 a.m. today, so clearly we have not had an opportunity to review the answers and where we were with that information. However, I made my intentions known to my colleagues that until the lawsuit against Councilman Gaughan is withdrawn with prejudice effectively ending any chance of resurrecting the lawsuit in it's current state and until Attachment E, specifically number five, the disclosure document, is fully filled out then this resolution should not move to a full vote. I will continue to vote to table this legislation and I believe it should remain tabled until such a time as those conditions are met.

MR. GAUGHAN: And just to add to that, you know, in the newspaper this

25

morning it says that Mr. Abrahamsen was surprised that I brought up the defamation case again last week and he said it's not coming back, that's old news. I would disagree with that. I did check on the Prothonotary's website and the matter is still -- has been withdrawn without prejudice which means, and they made a point last year to say, that they could refile that at any time. Now, that doesn't bother me because I did nothing wrong. They could refile it tomorrow and I would fight it all the way to the end because I did not do anything wrong, I did not say anything wrong I was just doing my job, but as a public official I just find it amazing that there is a possibility that we are going to award a law firm who took that action that, as I think Councilman Evans said last year, sent a chilling effect and it should send a chilling effect on every public official in Lackawanna County. The fact that one person would ask a question and several of my colleagues asked the same questions thereafter and that you would then be sued

for that or the threat of a lawsuit and then dangling it over somebody's head, and then the fact that in this RFP there was things omitted, and it took me to actually say that and ask for the information, and then in the newspaper Mr. Abrahamsen is making it seem like he is doing us a favor by providing this extra information when, in fact, it was clearly requested in the RFP.

So, again, I would hope that my colleagues go along with this and table is it until we have further information and until we can meet with the city solicitor on July 24. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: All those in favor of tabling signify by saying aye.

MR. PERRY: Aye.

MR. DONAHUE: Aye.

MR. EVANS: Aye.

MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.

MR. ROGAN: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and Item 7-B is tabled.

MS. REED: 7-C. FOR CONSIDERATION BY
THE COMMITTEE ON RULES - FOR ADOPTION RESOLUTION NO. 60, 2018 - AUTHORIZING THE

	·
1	MAYOR AND OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS
2	TO EXECUTE AND ENTER INTO A PROFESSIONAL
3	SERVICES CONTRACT WITH LABELLA ASSOCIATES
4	FOR CITY OF SCRANTON GENERAL CONSULTING
5	ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE PERIOD AUGUST
6	1, 2018 THROUGH JULY 31, 2021.
7	MR. ROGAN: As Chairperson for the
8	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
9	passage of Item 7-C.
10	MR. PERRY: Second.
11	MR. ROGAN: On the question? Roll
12	call, please?
13	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Perry.
14	MR. PERRY: Yes.
15	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Donahue.
16	MR. DONAHUE: Yes.
17	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Evans.
18	MR. EVANS: Yes.
19	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Gaughan.
20	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
21	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Rogan.
22	MR. ROGAN: Yes. I hereby declare
23	Item 7-C legally and lawfully adopted.
24	MS. REED: 7-D. RESOLUTION NO. 61,
25	2018 - AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND OTHER
	II

	· ·
1	APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AND
2	ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH REUTHER + BOWEN,
3	PC FOR CITY OF SCRANTON LANDSCAPE
4	ARCHITECT/ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICES -
5	LINDEN STREET GREENSPACE AND POCKET PARK
6	PROJECT.
7	MR. ROGAN: As Chairperson for the
8	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
9	passage of Item 7-D.
10	MR. EVANS: Second.
11	MR. ROGAN: On the question? Roll
12	call, please?
13	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Perry.
14	MR. PERRY: Yes.
15	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Donahue.
16	MR. DONAHUE: Yes.
17	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Evans.
18	MR. EVANS: Yes.
19	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Gaughan.
20	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
21	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Rogan.
22	MR. ROGAN: Yes. I hereby declare
23	Item 7-D legally and lawfully adopted.
24	MS. REED: 7-E. FOR CONSIDERATION
25	BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES - FOR ADOPTION -

1	RESOLUTION NO. 62, 2018 - RE-APPOINTING
2	SHAWN WALSH, 2821 CEDAR AVE., SCRANTON,
3	PENNSYLVANIA, 18505, AS A MEMBER OF THE
4	BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS FOR THE CITY OF
5	SCRANTON. MR. WALSH'S TERM EXPIRED ON JULY
6	1, 2018 AND HIS NEW TERM WILL EXPIRE ON JULY
7	1, 2023.
8	MR. ROGAN: As Chairperson for the
9	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
10	passage of Item 7-E.
11	MR. EVANS: Second.
12	MR. ROGAN: On the question? Roll
13	call, please?
14	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Perry.
15	MR. PERRY: Yes.
16	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Donahue.
17	MR. DONAHUE: Yes.
18	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Evans.
19	MR. EVANS: Yes.
20	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Gaughan.
21	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
22	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Rogan.
23	MR. ROGAN: Yes. I hereby declare
24	Item 7-E legally and lawfully adopted.
25	MS. REED: 7-F. FOR CONSIDERATION
	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,

1	BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES - FOR ADOPTION -
2	RESOLUTION NO. 63, 2018 - APPOINTMENT OF
3	PAUL MARCKS, 724 GIBBONS STREET, SCRANTON,
4	PENNSYLVANIA, 18505 AS A MEMBER OF
5	THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS FOR THE CITY OF
6	SCRANTON. MR. MARCKS WILL REPLACE ALAN
7	O'NEILL WHOSE TERM EXPIRED ON JULY 1,
8	2018. MR. MARCKS' TERM WILL COMMENCE ON
9	JULY 2, 2018 AND EXPIRE ON JULY 1, 2023.
10	MR. ROGAN: As Chairperson for the
11	Committee on Rules, I recommend final
12	passage of Item 7-F.
13	MR. PERRY: Second.
14	MR. ROGAN: On the question? Roll
15	call, please?
16	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Perry.
17	MR. PERRY: Yes.
18	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Donahue.
19	MR. DONAHUE: Yes.
20	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Evans.
21	MR. EVANS: Yes.
22	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Gaughan.
23	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
24	MS. DAVIDSON: Mr. Rogan.
25	MR. ROGAN: Yes. I hereby declare

Item 7-F legally and lawfully adopted. If there is no further business, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn. MR. PERRY: Motion to adjourn. MR. ROGAN: Meeting adjourned.

. .

$C \ E \ R \ T \ I \ F \ I \ C \ A \ T \ E$

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER