SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING

Maria McCool, RPR

Official Court Reporter

IN RE: FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 35 2020 APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE CITY GOVERNMENT FOR THE PERIOD COMMENCING ON THE FIRST DAY OF JANUARY, 2021 TO AND INCLUDING DECEMBER 31, 2021 BY THE ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL CITY OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2021.

DATE: December 1st, 2020

TIME: 5:45 p.m.

LOCATION: Zoom

_		
		2
1	COUNCIL MEMBERS:	
2		
3	WILLIAM GAUGHAN, PRESIDENT	
4	KYLE DONAHUE, VICE PRESIDENT	
5	MARK MCANDREW	
6	JESSICA ROTHCHILD	
7	THOMAS SCHUSTER	
8		
9		
10	LORI REED, CITY CLERK	
11	KATHY CARRERA, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK	
12	KEVIN HAYES, COUNCIL SOLICITOR	
13		
14		ļ
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	A .	

MR. GAUGHAN: I'd like to call this 1 public hearing to order. Roll call, please. 2 3 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Schuster. Mr. 4 McAndrew. 5 MR. MCANDREW: Present. MS. CARRERA: Dr. Rothchild. 6 7 DR. ROTHCHILD: Here. 8 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Donahue. 9 MR. DONAHUE: Here. Mr. Gaughan. 10 MS. CARRERA: 11 MR. GAUGHAN: Here. Thank you, Miss 12 Carrera. 13 MS. REED: The purpose of said 14 public hearing is to hear testimony and discuss the following: 15 FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 35 2020 16 17 APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE 18 CITY GOVERNMENT FOR THE PERIOD COMMENCING ON 19 THE FIRST DAY OF JANUARY, 2021 TO AND INCLUDING 20 DECEMBER 31, 2021 BY THE ADOPTION OF THE GENERAL CITY OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 21 2021. 22 23 MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you, Mrs. Reed. 24 At this time, I'd ask someone to please make a

motion to accept public comment from the

25

1 following individual, Marie Schumacher. 2 MR. DONAHUE: So moved. 3 MR. SCHUSTER: Second. 4 MR. GAUGHAN: There's been a motion 5 and a second to accept public comment related to the budget. Mrs. Reed, would you please 6 read Miss Schumacher's comments into the 7 8 record? 9 MS. REED: Thank you. The comments 10 are as follows: 11 Considering the Budget volume and 12 having requested the public be allowed more 13 time than the usual five-minute Council limit, 14 I have done my best to meet your requirements. 15 I was disappointed the Home Rule 16 Charter-required balanced Budget was not 17 submitted and I hope the 2022 Budget will 18 arrive balanced. 19 I do not get any sense of where 20 the City is going, Exiting Act 47 appears to be 21 a technique to manipulate some unspoken 22 strategy. 23 Overall, it appears the City 24 wants to bite off more than the taxpayers can 25 chew taking over by taking over projects that

belong to the County while not be able to negotiate either a Property Reassessment or a Stormwater Authority.

The Administration wants the former Reserve Center to become something that will want to be utilized by area municipalities but where was the details of this transformation? They also want a Health Department when they have a non-profit (Geisinger Community Medical School) that instituted a Community program. I say let this be a payment-in-lieu-of-taxes (PILOT).

O Speaking of PILOTS, the taxpayers need to know when they are going to start contributing at least something to the Operating Budget. The Housing Authority as contributed in the past, why not now.

Since Public Safety (Police and Fire) are available to all, I believe what Bob Bolus recommended years ago and that is a fee for this protection. In the immediate past the Harrison Avenue Bridge could not be used by Fire Trucks, but that changed and where is the Study showing the Fire Department savings?

O I am against the large jumps in

salary for City employees setting the low end of salaries at levels at least double that of the residents. We have yet to see the Job Descriptions and how much they will save expenses. Meanwhile the Council could and should increase the pay of the City Controller's \$40,000 salary.

O What has happened to our Parking Enforcement Program. Those two positions increased safety and I cringe at the possible return of vehicles parked to close to the end of the road that drivers have to say a prayer and pull out. Also, I believe these two positions brought in considerable revenue.

- 0 We definitely need to provide funding for all ECTV does.
- O Finally, it would be nice if an expected 2021 Cast Flow would be made available so our municipalities health may be tracked.

MS. REED: As submitted by City resident Marie Schumacher.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you, Mrs. Reed.

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

MR. SCHUSTER: Aye.

MR. MCANDREW: Aye.

MR. DONAHUE: Aye.

DR. ROTHCHILD: Aye.

MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and so moved.

And now as part of this public hearing, Mayor Cognetti and Business

Administrator, Carl Deeley are joining us to answer questions and respond to comments from the public and the only questions or comments we got tonight on the 2021 budget was from Marie Schumacher.

So I'll turn it over now, Mayor

Cognetti and Mr. Deeley, if you want to respond
to any of those questions or comments and
provide any feedback.

MAYOR COGNETTI: Sure. Good evening. How are you guys? Thank you for allowing us to be on tonight. I thought it might be helpful if we could answer a couple of the questions. Yeah, I think some of the commentary was just commentary.

So we'll kind of take a few of the questions that Miss Schumacher posed. On the

county piece, I think that she's referring to the health department. So as you all know, we're looking to explore potentially having a City health department as we've spoken about before.

I'm agnostic to what the best solution is, County or City. We just need to have something because to this day, we need more data and we cannot access that Department of Health data until we have a health department here locally.

Al Lucas continues to be an incredible manager along my side while we look at this. He and Amanda Hallock who's in our IT Department have been pulling data and trying to collate all of these things. But there is nothing that would be better than having a Department of Health data.

And we won't be able to get that unless we have -- whether it be County or City a health department. So I think it's important that we try to move forward with that.

Miss Schumacher mentions the Geisinger Commonwealth Medical College.
Unfortunately, that wouldn't solve our problem

because we would need to be a government entity in order to get that data.

So it's an imperfect system as we know. We're just looking for the ways that we might be able to mitigate these things going forward. And we really can use that data. But in the mean time, a big thanks especially to Al Lucas who is continuing to get that information out to us.

Councilperson Gaughan, I know you're on the e-mails about hospitalizations. They are pulling data on their own. It's not something that's just sent to us like I believe it should be.

On the pilot piece, I want you all to know that we sent out I think two weeks ago we sent out letters to all tax exempt properties -- organizations to ask them to help fund city government in some way in some sort of form of a payment in lieu of taxes.

We have gotten, as you know, which you see in the budget the Lutherwood Senior Center and the University of Scranton have pledged 200,000 and \$6,000. We're hoping that we might get some other pledges or some other

different types of funding.

And, you know, if it's not this year, we know there's a lot of organizations that are really hurting. We're hoping that we set the tone with these letters and with this outreach for more success in the coming years. So I'll look forward to working with all of you on that.

The other -- oh, I don't want to jump too far ahead. Carl, you wanted to maybe address the Serrenti Center.

MR. DEELEY: Yes, absolutely. So the question was around the progress on that and what the plans are. And absolutely, the City's obviously made some substantial commitment. So the last several years our intention was to bring that building in line to actually bring some added value to the City.

So this is being done in phases. So currently the first phase that we have is to install a simulator -- a police simulator which has been purchased through previous budgets and needs to be installed so we can actually use it.

That first phase currently is going

through the RFP process for the building work.

And we also got an LSA grant out for \$250,000 which has been applied for.

So that first phase has utilized money that's already been spent on the simulator. And as soon as we've got the RFPs opened we'll get that work going quickly as we can.

In terms of the longer term plan, absolutely, yeah, the plan here is to obviously use that building on multipurpose and, indeed, in the future we're looking to make that into a revenue generating facility where we can, indeed, kind of get county and maybe statewide support for that as well in terms of its usage.

I think there's a question too about the parking? Yes, I could take that on the parking. And absolutely, Miss Schumacher is correct. In the -- previously in the budgets the -- we have a budget for 2020 around \$11,000 in terms revenue.

Year to date obviously it's much lower than that, we're around the 3,000 mark mainly because COVID and the lack of the traffic through the City. But that's now

reopened.

The budget for next year is \$10,000. There are two positions -- those two positions are still in play. We have one position which is open, the other position which is filled. And that person is actually fulfilling those roles right now. So there is no intention right now to cut those jobs.

MAYOR COGNETTI: Reviewing the comments, I think the only other thing I see would be the -- we did send you all job descriptions. Maybe those haven't made it to the public yet. So -- or Miss Schumacher might have written that before those were into the record.

And on the -- in terms of the salary scale, I think that there are a lot of other government entities around us that have a higher salary scale than the City, not just other cities which you saw in the overview that we're far under the salary scale for a lot of other cities.

But I think having -- a lot of us having come from the school district, for example, the management salaries, they are far

higher than anything that we're proposing for the City.

And, you know, state jobs, county jobs are higher. So I think it's important that we remember the context that we're in.

And we're trying to -- we're trying to retain talent. We're trying to attract talent. We're never going get there if we don't set the bar a little bit higher.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Thank you.

Anything else Mayor or Mr. Deeley?

MAYOR COGNETTI: I don't think I have anything else tonight. Any of the questions that you guys have we can stay on or we can hop off and let you get to it.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. I don't have -does anybody else have any questions regarding
the public hearing or the budget at this point?

MR. MCANDREW: Yeah, just the three questions that I posed two weeks ago at the work session and then they were e-mailed last week. I'm still awaiting the responses for them.

MR. DEELEY: Yeah, Councilman

McAndrew, I do have those, yeah, and we're

working on those right now. And I'll start to get those answers to you tonight.

MR. MCANDREW: Thank you.

MR. DEELEY: Thank you, sir.

MR. GAUGHAN: Anyone else?

MAYOR COGNETTI: Tom -- or

Councilman Schuster, I will -- I'll respond formally to your letter. I think it's important to remember that a couple years back when we were on the School Board we were looking at -- we were looking at financial fees.

We were really focused on the financial advisor who was there that was charging a percentage and made 1.2 million dollars off the backs of the taxpayers in four years at the school district. That was egregious and you and Councilperson McAndrew were right by my side with that. And I appreciate that.

Those were exorbitant fees and the three of us along with Miss Gilmartin were able to make sure that that person was no longer working at the school district. That's a different -- that's a different scale than

looking at the transaction fees that we're looking for for the TAN. But I'll respond to you formally.

MR. SCHUSTER: Yeah, I think when we're looking at those, I mean, that tally for 1.2 million was huge there. And, I mean, there was, you know, some laws that may have been skirted there. But, I mean, when it comes to this, I mean, tightening our belt with everything, the type of transaction it is, I think we could have saved some money on that. But I'll await the response.

MAYOR COGNETTI: Yeah, and we had looked back at prior years. A couple years ago the fees were 94,000 for that transaction. So we're on -- we're definitely on a downward trend pretty quickly. And we'll continue to review those.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Anybody else?

All right. Thank you very much, Mayor and

Mr. Deeley, for coming and answering those

questions. We appreciate it. Have a good

night.

MR. DEELEY: Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: All right. At this

time since there is no further business or further questions, I'd like to make a motion to adjourn this public hearing. MR. MCANDREW: Second. MR. DONAHUE: So moved. MR. GAUGHAN: So there's been a motion and a second. On the question? This public hearing is adjourned. Thank you everyone.

$\mathsf{C} \; \mathsf{E} \; \mathsf{R} \; \mathsf{T} \; \mathsf{I} \; \mathsf{F} \; \mathsf{I} \; \mathsf{C} \; \mathsf{A} \; \mathsf{T} \; \mathsf{E}$

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me of the above-cause and that this copy is a correct transcript of the same to the best of my ability.

Maria McCool,

RPR

Official Court Reporter

. .

(The foregoing certificate of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or supervision of the certifying reporter.)