F		
		1
1	SCRANTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING	
2		
3		
4		
5	HELD:	
6		
7	Thursday, July 9, 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. NARDOZZI, RPR - OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER	
24		
25		

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited and moment of reflection 1 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. 11 MR. GAUGHAN: Here. 12 MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff. 13 MR. MCGOFF: Here. Dispense with 14 the reading of the minutes, and prior to Third Order I'd just like to announce that 15 16 we did have a brief executive session prior to the meeting. This executive session was 17 18 to discuss some ongoing litigation with the 19 city. MS. REED: THIRD ORDER. 3-A. TAX 20 21 ASSESSOR'S REPORT FOR HEARING DATE TO BE 22 HELD JULY 22, 2015. 23 MR. MCGOFF: Are there any comments? 24 If not, received and filed. MS. REED: 3-B. SINGLE TAX OFFICE 25

CITY FUNDS DISTRIBUTED COMPARISON REPORT 2015-2014.

MR. MCGOFF: Are there any comments?

If not, received and filed. Any Clerk's

notes?

MS. REED: Nothing, Mr. McGoff.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. I would like to also announce that tonight's meeting at 7:30 we will be hearing -- approximately 7:30 we will be hearing from Mr. Amoroso and the mayor, this was announced last week and/or confirmed last week. The time change or the time was to accommodate the schedules of both the mayor and Mr. Amoroso, so at approximately 7:30 we will be hearing from them.

MR. GAUGHAN: I have one. The

Scranton Neighborhood Summit is presenting a
picnic in the park, Saturday, July 1, from

12 to 3 p.m. at Nay Aug Park across from the
Everhart Museum. There will be free food,
attractions, free swimming for everyone,
Lackawanna County's mounted unit, magicians,

face painting and music and there will also

Anything from members of council?

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be free document shredding from 12 to 2 p.m.

Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else?

MS. REED: FOURTH ORDER. CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION.

MR. MCGOFF: Lee Morgan.

MR. MORGAN: Good evening, Council. Lee Morgan. Well, today, I would have hope that the mayor and Mr. Amoroso would have met before the meeting and I do understand that there seems to be some time constraints here that President McGoff is talking about, but, you know, the borrowing money to pay the city's fire and police, the money we owe them, we could have paid that over so many millions of dollars a year and it could have been dispersed through the budget, borrowing money is not the solution to the City's problems and, you know, we have presidential candidates now that are talking utter silliness, too, about Americans working more and the truth of the matter is that Americans probably work more than any other group of people in the world, and the only problem is what's happened to our wages is

25

they have been confiscated by our government because the government has just wasted so much money over an extended period of time that everything on every level of government is bankrupt. You know, it's not just the pensions, it's just ridiculous because we just elected a governor he wants to raise the sales tax and the personal income tax and, you know, I just think that, you know, when we are talking about a city like Scranton that, you know, we have got the Adams Plaza right here, and Lackawanna College says it's an investor in the city. It's a nonprofit and it really doesn't pay anything to the city and we have got a lot of people that aren't paying in the city, and when you talk about ordinary Scrantonians there are some changes that really need to be done. The city wage tax should be cut to 1.4 percent immediately and the property tax should be reduced. The city is part of the property tax which is the only part of city itself has control over, should be cut by a minimum of 50 percent, and where are we going to get the

money to run government? Well, it's quite obvious that the City's population base has declined over an extended period of time and instead of electing people with the vision to see that the city was shrinking and becoming poorer we just enacted higher taxes and just ignored all of the things that were going on and now I'm assuming that the mayor and Mr. Amoroso are going to come in and talk how great it's going to be to sell the parking garages off with funding which came from multiple different levels.

And, you know, when you take in the Sewer Authority all of the bonds that were floated and the Sewer Authority, you know, I really think the Sewer Authority should be left alone and I just think that when you elect people who don't have the ability to govern and hide from the public or enact laws that don't empower people, but really destroy them, I mean, you have to ask yourself why do senior citizens reverse mortgage their homes and why are the tax rates so high? And where are all of our investments over all of this time, and as

elected officials with the power of subpoena it's never been used. It's really troubling.

And, you know, they are talking today on the radio, and I don't know if it's true or not, but they are talking about how Hillary Clinton came to Old Forge in the last election cycle and didn't pay the bills she had, you know, run up at the various fundraisers she was at and, you know, is that what politicians really do because we had a mayor that did the same thing here allegedly?

And my point is, you know, you can keep, you know, raising fees and taxes and see where it's taken us and see where it's taken our country, I mean, we have a state that just took it's state flag down, I believe, but they don't have another flag to replace it with. We have a country that's just lost and, you know, when you look at people they are so detached from reality, but today I had an opportunity to talk with somebody who really understood what was going on, it was amazing, and he said the

21

22

23

24

25

American people will never figure it out because they don't want to see the truth, they don't want to know the truth, they want to hide between all of these make believe scenarios they have but, you know, nobody can deny that the federal government is broke or the state is broke or the county is broke or the city is broke, okay? And the average taxpayer that goes to work like myself and works just much too much losing a third of their income every week to a government that has that no discipline in spending and no obligation on it's own part to be responsible, that feels candidates who have no clue what they're going to do when they get elected because it's all about winning an election but it's not about enacting a government that moves for the benefit of the people. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mr. Miller. Bob Bolus.

MR. BOLUS: Good evening, Council.

Bob Bolus, Scranton. First of all, I'd just
like to say that earlier some words were
offered, a very close friend of my, I just

left the funeral home, Charlie Hucklewhite.

His dad had worked for me many years. Bob

Hucklewhite passed away the other day and

there was a wake for him this evening. He

was a special kind of kid. I have known him

since literally the day he was born and at

51 he passed away.

But tonight I'm here on a very serious matter. Mr. Wechsler had made comments, which I think were very inappropriate, regarding 6-B, the containers. He made the statement, Mr. Wechsler I'm quoting now, Mr. Wechsler said, "It's unfortunate that regulations are needed but some residents are not good neighbors in how they place and use containers."

And, Mr. Wechsler, I'm here to challenge you tonight face to face who are the bad neighbors?

MR. WECHSLER: Mr. Bolus, I did not mention anyone specifically.

MR. BOLUS: I'm asking you who specifically who --

MR. WECHSLER: We have had several

1 complaints in the city about trailers being 2 parked on the street that are causing 3 problems. MR. BOLUS: No, no, not the way the 4 5 ordinance is written, Mr. Wechsler, I want to know here and now who the bad neighbors 6 7 are. 8 MR. WECHSLER: I just mentioned to 9 you, people that are parking these --10 MR. BOLUS: Like who, give me a name? 11 12 MR. WECHSLER: All through South 13 Side, all through West Side. 14 MR. BOLUS: No, no, that's not a good enough answer. If they put stuff in 15 16 the paper, don't bury your head in the sand 17 18 MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Bolus, what you are 19 doing is badgering. 20 MR. BOLUS: And I can tell you what, 21 Mr. McGoff, the ordinance is directed at me, 22 okay? You can shake your head all day. 23 This ordinance is directed because --24 MR. WECHSLER: You have quite a 25 large opinion of yourself, Mr. Bolus.

MR. BOLUS: Pardon?

MR. WECHSLER: It's not directed at you, it's directed throughout the city, but if you feel that you have been a bad neighbor perhaps that's why you are here tonight.

MR. BOLUS: Well, I'm here to confront you face-to-face as a resident of the city and you, as a public official, that needs accountability when you make a statement publically regarding someone.

MR. WECHSLER: And I just explained it.

MR. BOLUS: And as you know in the past there has been issues regarding containers at my home on the East Mountain, okay? And I want it very, very clear that the way this ordinance is written it's prejudicial, it's very defining. The City of Scranton in the past, and I'm going to read it to you, this is the city code right here, "Trailer of a tractor trailer, commercial vehicle the length of 20 feet or more that is not self-propelled that is intended to haul materials, vehicles, goods,

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gases or liquids and that is intended to be pulled by a tractor as defined above And that is not a recreational vehicle. Tractor of a trailer. A truck with a minimum of three axles that is primarily intended to pull a trailer as defined below and not primarily to carry goods itself."

That's your own definition. Those are what are on my property, and there is four of them. We went to Court. The City took me to Court over containers I had, there were three of them. They don't like the fact that they had landing gears on them and heater boxes to keep my stuff inside that we are storing because the city illegally condemned my home. I don't hear you say a word about illegal actions of the city, I didn't hear you mention anything about a neighbor who built his house over a city-owned property, and the city loss a \$50,000 bid we put on it. I didn't hear you say a word about that.

MR. WECHSLER: Because it has nothing to do with it.

MR. BOLUS: I'm not finished. Oh.

it does with the ordinance.

MR. WECHSLER: That's in your brain.

MR. BOLUS: No, I'm here to confront you to the statement you made, okay? It's as cut and dry as that. In the ordinance our vehicles complied with that ordinance. You are now amending the ordinance to be very specific, and it's very specific in your ordinance that you are putting in here, if I may take a moment, in the ordinance tonight the term "portable on demand", "Temporary storage containers shall be defined to be any container, storage unit, shed, light container or other portable structures specifically made."

Okay. "It is unlawful to convert, alter or change automobiles, trailers, tractor trailers, trailer of a tractor or any similar unit of this nature into a temporary portable space."

Okay? You are totally contradictory to the ordinance already in place. That's number one. What our challenge to you is the way you defined what you could put there. You can't put a 40-foot trailer, you

can't do this, you can't do that. What you are doing here is selectively challenging what's on my property. There are four containers. The original containers were removed in compliance with the Court order because we didn't want to sue the city and we didn't want to spend any more money playing games so I removed them. It's well documented. The containers were removed, they had been replaced. Prior to this ordinance being enacted, in here you don't put anything in here about what's grandfathered in or prior.

What are you going to do about that part of the ordinance on containers that are throughout Market Street, all over the City of Scranton, already in place yet you don't define on a commercial end the same containers, CVS, and others -- if I may, Mr. McGoff, this is a critical because I'm trying to avert the city spending a lot of money in legal litigation, okay? These containers are on Keyser Avenue, they are all over. We have over 400 containers such as this all over the place. It's our

1

commercial business. These are privately owned by me, number one. What are you going to do to units that are grandfathered in already on the property? You can't remove them, your ordinance does not comply to that Do you understand where I'm at ordinance. here, and I'm asking council tonight to table this and modify it to prevent some very serious litigation and discrimination against me because of the way they are defined as trailers, trailers and tractor trailers and trailers that used to be trailers and Mr. Wechsler's comments who are bad neighbors but doesn't have the integrity to discuss it.

Well, Mr. Wechsler worked for a local company and he was the plant manager he made the same excuse then when the city was full of illegal aliens --

> MR. MCGOFF: Please.

That he should have had MR. BOLUS: that responsibility for.

MR. MCGOFF: You are out of order.

MR. BOLUS: Mr. McGoff, I'm asking for accountability from a city councilman

23

20

21

22

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

and he dozes to us sitting here and if he doesn't have what it takes then he should get the hell of the seat and resign. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: You are out of order.

Doug Miller.

MR. MILLER: Doug Miller, Scranton. You know, just I guess in regards to 6-B it's kind of in my opinion completely ridiculous that we are even discussing this issue. I personally believe that anybody with any ounce of common sense would probably find it quite ironic that some of the issues that have taken place recently, specifically on East Mountain, where all of a sudden now this legislation just happens to find its way on the agenda, and I think it's quite safe to say that it is an example of selective enforcement, and I personally believe if you read it, I don't see how city government can tell someone what they can and cannot have on their property, I don't believe that's your call, and I personally don't believe that this ordinance will stand in Court and, quite frankly, when it is

1

6

5

8

7

10

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

passed, which I'm sure it will be, I certainly hope it is challenged in Court and I hope this city is held accountable because it's just an absurdity. All of the problems this community faces at this time the fact that we are even entertaining this legislation I just think is completely ludicrous. There's a lot of question marks with it, and again, it's selective enforcement because certain individuals have political vendettas and they want to, I guess for whatever reason abuse their ability as an elected official to hold someone accountable when, quite frankly, our priorities just aren't straight at this point.

You know, in regards to the meeting later on with the mayor and Mr. Amoroso, I don't see the point in it. What's the point? What are we intending on hearing tonight other than the same silliness that we hear time and time again. The same fictitious fairytale plans, raise taxes, sell assets. These aren't solutions. These are just attempts to just kill the city off

22

23 24

25

once and for all and you may have people seated up on this council that may not appreciate the things I'm saying, but it's reality and a lot of the residents that you speak to they see it coming. They are not fooled by what they hear from some of you and this administration. We have been lied to and we been sold down the river for a very long time because the problem in this town is we put people in these seats who, quite frankly, aren't qualified to be in these seats because they are not elected based on qualifications or what they are going to do to turn this city around, they are hand selected by an elite few my special interests who control our elections, and a very few amount of people in the city come out to vote. I mean, look at the last election, 22 or 23 percent of the voters. mean, that basically sums it right up there in a nutshell. That's your voter base. That's pathetic.

Borrowing money to pay the Supreme Court award and paying it back over 20 years I don't know what's that's going to do.

25

is going to be left 20 years from now to pay this back? That's my question. We have borrowed and borrowed our way out of just about everything and where has it gotten us today? No where. It's the same position we were 15, 20 years ago. haven't turned a corner at all because we have no leadership, we have people making decisions who don't base any of it on fact. We vote on sound bites. We just -- it's just really sad and it really just frightens me to think where we are going to be five years from now, ten years from now, where this city is actually going to be. neighborhoods are dead. We have talked about trying to have a vibrant downtown, look around, the downtown is dead. Look at the millions and millions of dollars that was invested in that downtown. Maybe all of that money should have been invested into the neighborhoods, but then again, we blame the wrong people for the problems we have in the neighborhoods and that's what really just gets me is we want to put it on landlords and people who just aren't the

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

cause of the problem.

We need to start holding our elected officials accountable. Those who have raised taxes and put us where we are today. Take a look at the amount of taxes and properties throughout this community and what have we ever done about that? Nothing. We just continue to let it happen. And the reason for that is real simple, this definitely it brings you back to just the reality of everything, the people that we elect they don't care. They don't care about the people in this city, that's not all elected officials, but the good majority of the people we elect they are not looking out for us, they are looking out for themselves and where they can advance their career, what next step can they take, how can they take themselves successful. that's the real sad about the political arena is that the majority of the people that we elect aren't in it for the right reasons and those that actually do care and want to make a difference they don't have a chance because they don't have a special

interest behind them, they don't have the money behind them, and the little guy is just going to keep getting kicked to the curb and battered around the pinata. I just don't -- this city is right now headed for disaster and I think the only thing we should be talking about tonight with the mayor and Mr. Amoroso, not a failed recovery plan, but maybe we should start talking about reality and that's bringing in a receiver and looking at bankruptcy because that's where we are right now. You can fool yourselves, but you can't fool the residents of this city. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Ron Ellman.

MR. ELLMAN: Hello, Council. Ronnie
Ellman. I'm so tired picking at you guys
every week and Mr. Minora and Mr. Amoroso,
I'm going to take a vacation for a week.
With your permission I got a couple of
things that of the subject a little bit, but
I found it very interesting, they relate to
the city sort of. Now, think of this, in
1933, what's that 82 years ago, 1933
sometimes me and others complain the city is

1

5

6

4

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not getting things done. A congressman from Illinois named Brittany brought up a bill in Congress to prohibit American flags, badges, all of that Fourth of July stuff from being imported from foreign countries. 82 years ago, and nothing has been done and the reason he was so mad someone noted that his little American flag lapel pin was made in Japan. That's a true story.

And two days before this happened this is about not getting things done, too, two days before this a Mr. Harrison from Mississippi introduced a bill to prohibit all of the dumping of foreign goods on our Isn't that something? All of these soil. engineers and nothing. Two important bills and nothing ever come of them. They were talking about buying American goods before the stockmarket crashed, an organization started to buy American good. They had signs and posters and in the movies they had trailers, buy American steel, by American cars, and use American labor, everything American. I bet not a one of you can make a guess, this was a big organization 80 years

ago, I don't know how they are now. Anybody make a guess who that country could be?

KKK. Isn't that something? 82 years ago.

I don't know, you can change -- you can change the flag and pull it down and you can't change history, get rid of pictures and statutes and everything else, it's still going to be there. I got one other little quip here, this one surprised me, about George, the father of our country, he made a statement, now, listen to it because I guess it's old English or something, at every place of trust today put none but Americans on guard. You know what that means? No foreigners, all Americans. The father of our country said that.

MR. MCGOFF: He was an isolationist.

MR. ELLMAN: Well, it surprised me that, you know, that this man would say something like that but I never read much about it. Last night I was reading about the seventh president, after I saw it on TV, Andrew Jackson. He had trouble I think in the 1830's with South Carolina, did you know they wanted to succeed from the union?

MR. MCGOFF: Nullification crisis. 1 MR. ELLMAN: Have you read the 2 3 letter that he wrote them? MR. MCGOFF: I'm sorry? 4 5 MR. ELLMAN: Did you ever read that lengthy letter that he wrote the government 6 of South Carolina? 7 8 MR. MCGOFF: I don't know offhand. 9 MR. ELLMAN: Page and pages, I 10 couldn't believe it. This is 11 another educated man. He didn't go to 12 college or nothing, you should read that 13 letter. Well, thank you for letting me get 14 off the subject, you know. Next week I'll come back in my badmouthing everybody, 15 16 especially you. Anyone else who wishes to 17 address counsel? 18 MR. SBARAGLIA: Andy Sbaraglia, 19 citizen of Scranton. Fellow Scrantonians, 20 let's look at reality for a change. 21 mayor goes ahead with a plan to borrow it's 22 going to cost the taxpayers over the life of 23 the agreement \$50 million. You have to look 24 at that, the total picture, not just 24 or

26, and then you got to watch and make sure

25

that for the election coming up that he doesn't incorporate paying off the bond for a few years with the borrowing, that could happen because it happened before, it can happen again.

Okay, let's look at the state of the pension. According to everybody we got about three and a half years left in the pension. If the state takes that pension over how much are we going to mandate to pay to bring that up to par and over what term? You may be talking another \$15 million a year to bring them up to par if they only wanted three years. You got to look at that and got to tell the people what to expect.

Now you are talking about a changing the mercantile and business privilege, how many of you people up there own a business that would be effected by this? Okay, do you expect your taxes to go up or down? I know I expect mine to go up 20 percent.

MR. EVANS: What taxes, mercantile tax?

MR. SBARAGLIA: The tax you are paying, mercantile and business privilege.

MR. EVANS: Well, if they're eliminated they would go down.

MR. SBARAGLIA: You're expecting yours to go down; right?

MR. EVANS: Yeah.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Someone else is expecting theirs to go up and, I know it, and they are going to go to Courts, they are going to fire people, the best way to lower the "K" tax is fire people then you don't have that many employees left. That could happen, everything could happen.

MR. EVANS: According to the information we received recently there are 2,400 businesses that would pay a payroll tax and there is approximately 340 that are paying the mercantile tax. What that tells me is that it would be a broader, more equal tax because people aren't paying the mercantile tax now anyway. It's a volunteer tax that probably one-third of the businesses are paying.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Why aren't they paying?

MR. EVANS: Why aren't they paying?

.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Yeah.

MR. EVANS: I'd like to know why they're not paying.

MR. SBARAGLIA: Well, there you go, there's the reason. It's not being enforced, obviously, but the poor taxpayer in the home as soon as he misses a payment --

MR. EVANS: Yeah.

MR. SBARAGLIA: -- he gets on the delinquent list and then you are going to accelerate with this land bank, take people's property faster.

Okay, let's look at these things.

These are the total pictures. I'm lucky.

With any luck I only have about seven years

left so I'll miss all of this junk that's

going to happen, but it would behoove me if

I didn't bring it out, and tell the people

what's happening because they got to know.

I don't know what's wrong with you, you

should get out there and be telling people

everything you can and what to expect. Me,

I tell them to get the heck out of the city

if you can. If you are a renter, move. If

21

22

23

24

25

you got children that is small when they hit college age, get them out because this city is no good anymore. I paid high taxes when I worked to keep my grandmother, mothers, in their homes. You raised the real estate tax up where they can't afford it and can't care less and still nitpick everything you can nitpick. How long before you charge people for parking on the streets, which is probably on your mind, too? Look how much money you can make from everybody that parks on the street could pay a fine -- I mean a fee to park on the street? That's probably on your mind, too. Don't ever criticize the English for what they did to your relatives in Ireland because you are doing the same thing to us now. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Anyone else?

MR. DOBRZYN: Good evening, Council.

Dave Dobrzyn, resident. Taxes and fees
paid, not without some pain. First of all,
I'd like to start off with trade packs once
again. I don't have the numbers tonight,
but if you tired of depressed wages plus
taxes coming in, let's start to lobby for a

change. People spread the manure up the hill instead of down the hill for a change. It smells better that way.

Streets, how many people up there go over Moosic Street on a nature daily basis?

Isn't it horrible? That was two years ago.

Now we just passed an ordinance; am I not correct?

MR. WECHSLER: It doesn't apply to state roads.

MR. DOBRZYN: What's that?

MR. WECHSLER: It does not apply to state roads.

MR. DOBRZYN: It doesn't apply to state roads. Okay, well, at any point we should try to do what we can because that is a sin and it's happening all over towns, so the sooner we can expect and enforce these diggings by utilities, I think we are all be in a better frame of mind.

On tax exempts, we really need to look into going after the state for compensation because it's their constitution and our constitution, but I think a lot of people just love passing us the bag, the

empty bag here.

And on the bond issue, I'm willing to listen, I think it's preferable to selling things.

Tax sales. Ma Schumacher brought up a few weeks ago there is a considerable amount of property being acquired under tax sales and the titles aren't pursued and there is no deeds, no back taxes paid and etcetera, is that something we should be looking into? It sounds like a lot of money and it's not right that somebody should be able to buy something and not paying taxes on it for five or six years and then all of a sudden rush in when they finally have a need for it or find they can make a dollar on it.

Now, I'm glad Pat is back because I had a few questions on the mall and I feel that in order to correct the problems of the past we have to recognize the problems of the past. Do you have any idea how much actual money of these grants and so forth and loans that were supposed to be shelled back to the city how much money are we out

approximately?

MR. ROGAN: I've actually been going back and forth with OECD on this for the last two weeks, there is a number -- part of this is there is a number of ways to interpret whose money it is. Many of the programs were federal dollars that were given to the city, that were given to the Steamtown Mall Associates. There were state dollars that were funneled through.

Regarding money that the city is out currently, it would be the Section 108 loans that Mr. Boscov referenced, but there are also other loans that if they were paid back those funds would have been available for other economic development projects in the city and that's what I'm trying to get to the bottom of and that's where its gets a little bit confusing, but I have been working with Ms. Aebli on trying to get to the bottom of that.

MR. DOBRZYN: So I'll leave a question mark by the 108's, they would be paid back to the federal government?

MR. ROGAN: They would come off our

line of credit, the allotment we receive from HUD each year, so if they are paid basically we will have fewer federal dollars to use for total community programs.

MR. DOBRZYN: So in reality it's just kind of the money we are out.

MR. ROGAN: Correct.

MR. DOBRZYN: It's millions and millions. Now, what was the number of the other or any kind of title to the other loans that you mentioned other than 108?

MR. ROGAN: I think some might have been through the UDAG program. I have all it on my computer at home because I have been going back and forth, there is I think three or four different programs that we use. So there is a number of different programs.

MR. DOBRZYN: So, in other words, if you really interpret it liberally in our favor it might be ten or --

MR. ROGAN: That's the way I interpret it, the city is out tens of millions of dollars because of the loan default.

MR. DOBRZYN: Right. Right. Okay.

Well, maybe you can brush over it with your busy schedule and, you know, figure it out a little better, but it's really we need to hold a seminar on these type of things and decide where we went wrong and we have to avoid them down the line. I was glad everybody stood their ground a few weeks ago. Hopefully the mall won't go to a

MS. SCHUMACHER: Good evening,
Council. Marie Schumacher.

MR. GAUGHAN: Good evening.

non-profit, but what can you do. Thank you.

MS. SCHUMACHER: I have to agree with Andy and thank him for what he is saying and I keep reckoning back to the caucus probably a month or so ago now where the people that, I don't know if we have hired them yet or not to do the tax collections, attitude was, "We know who has checkbooks."

Well, you all know the property
owners have checkbooks and if they can they
are going to use their checkbooks rather
than lose their home, but it is getting

somewhat ridiculous. We don't go after the people who don't pay, again, it was just brought up, and I did the calculations on those properties and if anybody is interested I have all of the information here, but the properties that were -- that were okayed by council in May of 2010, if you take what they agreed to purchase price and the taxes that hadn't been paid to date we are, the taxpayers are, the property owners, getting socked with \$70,221.

Now, I don't know if the Pittsburgh Plan, and Mr. Evans probably does but he has left the dais, but one of the things I hope he adds to his August project of getting a mater plan together is making a list of items where we need help from our state legislators. If the Pittsburgh Plan truly allows somebody to come and offer to buy a property and then let it sit or even use it, as I believe some of these properties are, for five years, not pay the purchase price for \$100, you can really hold a property for five years and not pay the amount or pay the taxes on it? If it's not -- can you wait

2

3

6

5

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

until Fifth Order because I have some things--

MR. GAUGHAN: Sure.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, but that's one example and now this debt that you are going to put on. I mean, my generation paid for their college, it was affordable with some pinched pennies and dollars, but today's generation are coming out with debt equivalent to a home mortgage and now we are going to put on -- put them further into debt, they may not have even lived here. And I agree with Andy, I don't know any reason why anybody if they are young don't even think about buying in Scranton. You got the high taxes, you have got the high wage tax, it's just -- it's crazy and it's got to stop someplace.

And I, again, Mr. Evans has left, but I would like to know what the chances are that the rental registration revision will be on the agenda prior to the August recess, which you are taking a recess, right, that's been established or not yet?

MR. MCGOFF: We have not decided.

2

3

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SCHUMACHER: I wasn't sure.

MR. MCGOFF: But probably.

MS. SCHUMACHER: Now. the Third Order items, you know, week after week they are read into order but, you know, I just wish people would sit down and read them. obtained the minutes from the Non-Uniform Municipal Pension Board meetings for the year of 2007, and if somebody had just read I'm sure their eyes would have been opened. The very first meeting of the year, January 24, 2007, someone asked if the pension was double with the benefits as the people who received this in 2002. The attorney told them they would receive the same as those who retired in 2002. Certainly that should have caused somebody if they were truly naive whiplash to get on the phone and say, "What do you mean we are paying double pensions?"

But yet this council has not taken any action to even request that the second pension or the second half of the double pension be put in escrow until this matter is settled? Because why? Oh, yeah, the

good old property owners have checkbooks, you can always come back to them.

So I'll bring the rest back next week. Thank you.

MR. ROGAN: I just want to address two of those points that were brought up. The first one regarding those minutes, and we do receive the minutes from the Pension Board meetings, and I think we all read them, the minutes you are referring to in 2007 I don't believe any of us up here were on city council at that point in time to have even seen that.

Secondly, regarding the double pensions, ever single one of us on here wants the double pensions to stop, there is no question that. We have spoken to our attorney about what actions, if any, city council could take and at this point in time the hearings are, you know, proceeding and it will be worked out through the Pension Board, which council does have a vote on, how we would use that vote would be a collaborative decision I guess between all of us on the Board if we could reach a

consensus, but council is very active on this issue since the day is started.

Unfortunately, we do not have the authority to stop a pension payment. That rests with the Pension Boards so that's why there hasn't been much done legislatively by city council, but it is an issue we are very concerned about as I mentioned last week regarding the investigation as well. Sorry about that.

MS. HODOWANITZ: Joan Hodowanitz, city resident and taxpayer. I have been living in downtown Scranton for 16 years and this is the first year that I attended the Fourth of July festivities at courthouse square and I was very pleasantly surprised. It was a very well done event. The music, fireworks, very family oriented affair. I didn't see any incidents whatsoever, even the weather cooperated. Only one disappointment, when they did the 1812 overture they failed to use actual cannons. In the Army, we used the howitzers. You need to fix that next year. That's true. 36 Army band of Arizona we always used

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

cannons and it worked very well.

With regard to Mayor Courtright's appearance later tonight, since it is a public caucus you will be the only ones with an opportunity I assume to ask the mayor and any staff who is with him questions; correct?

MR. MCGOFF: Correct.

MS. HODOWANITZ: So it then becomes your responsibility to represent us citizens and ask some very hard and pointed Do not simply be in receive questions. Listen with a critical ear and a critical eye and you need to ask the hard questions about taking on another bond for the Court award. You need to ask the hard questions on what's going on with the pensions. It's not enough to say, well, you know, we will take out a bond and we'll pay off that Court award so we don't have a \$100,000 in interest every year and it will make us look good with the banks, you have to ask those hard questions about those 20-year repayment, what is the total cost to the taxpayer, and who does Mayor Courtright

think is going to be here 20 years from now to pay it off? Those are legitimate questions.

The same things goes with the pensions, the monetization of the Parking Authority, the Sewer Authority and so on and so forth. We cannot ask questions, you have to ask them for us. Do not let him get off with a cute pony and dog show. You know, we can't ask them, you must ask them for us.

where do we stand with the 2015 operating budget? We are in the seventh month of the year. Are revenues and expenditures where he expected them to be? If there is a shortfall what is he doing about it? You know, you are going to turn around twice and he is going to be giving you a 2016 budget. Are we looking at another deficit? Are we going to miss the December 31 pension MMO? What kind of interest are we going to be paying on that? We have already got a couple of holes in the budget that weren't anticipated.

I hope that you have come prepared with a list of questions or if you haven't

22

23

24

25

1

2

you need to be writing as soon as he starts talking. And I hope that it's not a mayor giving a few introductory comments and then passing the baton to Mr. Amoroso. I did not elect Mr. Amoroso. I didn't elect Mayor Courtright, but Mayor Courtright is my mayor. I want to hear him talk, I want to hear him explain, I want him to answer the hard questions and I hope down the road in the not too distance future he will schedule a town hall meeting so that the citizens can ask him some of these questions directly because we are owed some answers by now. Не has been in office over 18 months. should know what he is a doing. Thank you.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you, Mrs.

Hodowanitz. Anyone else who wishes to

address council? Please go to Fifth Order

and start.

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

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Wechsler?

MR. WECHSLER: Thank you,

Mr. McGoff. In regard to the bond for the

judgment, I share some of the concerns also that have been mentioned this evening. I also am quite concerned that each day and each month, each year, the amount of money that we owe on that also grows so there does have to be an evaluation on what it does for us to get that off our books and perhaps fix it over the long-term, but that's a question that we have to determine. But I do agree with the fact that we have been looking at getting this judgment settled and I do congratulate the mayor and Business

Administrator Bulzoni for the work the he has done to date on this.

Last week we talked about the possibility of liening citizens who have not paid their garbage tax. We have researched it this week and NRS does have the ability to file liens against delinquent tax garbage bills. So we will be working with them and also with the administration and also Treasurer Wayne Beck to see what process we have to go through right now to be determined, some of them will be which bills are collectable, how far back it would go,

but we have to get started on this because I don't I think it's very fair that everyone pays their garbage bill and some people don't and there is no repercussion when they don't pay, so I'm very anxious to get this moving forward.

As was discussed in caucus, there has been some activity in regards to parking garages and the only reason why I mentioned this is wanted to bring three things together that we have been talking about. We hear a lot about bankruptcy and I'm not in favor of bankruptcy and right now I'm not in favor of receivership, and part of the reason why actually, even though as bad as things seem, just the three things that I have mentioned are one of the reasons why we are really right now are not eligible for receivership or bankruptcy.

Number one, we do have the ability to issue bonds. A bankrupt city can't do that. We do have uncollected garbage fees out there, millions off dollars of garbage fees. That's another reason why you probably can't enter into receivership. The

third, we do have assets that we can either lease or sell, the parking garages and/or the Sewer Authority. So as we talk about bankruptcy it really right now I don't see the state allowing us to go into receivership or bankruptcy. We really have to go through all of these exercises that we are going through before that's a possibility and then hopefully, and I'm hopeful, in my judgment that we will be able to avoid it because of the creative things that we are working now and some other things that we are doing.

I just want to make a quick comment about what Mr. Bolus had to say tonight. If you were listening at the end, Mr. Bolus said these trailers are all over the city. He is correct. They are several trailers all over of the city. My guess would be the ones that are there will be grandfathered in, that will be my guess because they are here for years and years, but by his own comment that's why we need this type of legislation. We need to get some control over these storage trailers that are

throughout the city and placed on the streets and placed on people's property that are an eyesore sometimes if they are not maintained properly.

So this legislation was not targeted to Mr. Bolus. I feel bad that he feels that way. He has had his problems with the city in terms of some trailers that he has on his property, but this is legislation that came from the administration through the LIPS Department and I can tell you that I was not involved in the preparation of this as a target for Mr. Bolus, but, like I said, sa he stated, it is a requirement that we get this things under control. That's all I have at this time. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Rogan?

MR. ROGAN: Yes, two very, very brief points, I will do most of my comments and questioning during the public hearing.

I am thankful that the mayor and Mr. Amoroso are coming into tonight. Despite what some say this mayor, Mayor Courtright, in 18 months has to been to city council more than the previous mayor has been for 12 years so

we certainly appreciate him and Mr. Amoroso and other members of the staff coming in to answer some questions for city council.

Secondly, regarding the Court award, obviously nobody -- there is nobody in the city government that wants to take on more debt, but we are currently paying 6 percent interest to have a debt continue to grow but not be paid off. By issuing the bonds, hopefully at a favorable rate, yes, we will still be paying interest but the debt will be paid off it and won't continue to grow as it currently is. As one of the speakers mentioned, we are paying nearly \$100,000 in interest per month currently and the debt is only growing, it's not even being paid off to the unions, so that is all. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Evans?

MR. EVANS: Just a brief comment about the award and the possible financing of it, the only thing I want to bring up, and I mentioned this many, many times before, if we finally pay off this award I would expect and I would appreciate if the unions would participate in this by taking a

good portion of that money and funding their pension plan with it. I'm not sure if this has been a discussion between the administration and our unions, but I think it's appropriate, that we have the worse pensions probably in the state and I think that if we are going to pay out or borrow \$24 million I feel there should be some skin in the game from the unions to put some money into their own distressed pension plan. The rest of my comments will be reserved for the public hearing.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Gaughan.

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, thank you.

First, I would just like to thank Mary
Gaughan, who is in the audience tonight. We
may or may not be related, I'm not sure, we
are still researching that, but she gave me
a beautiful card for my grandmother who
passed away last April, so I really
appreciate that.

MS. GAUGHAN: You are very welcome.

MR. GAUGHAN: Residents contacted me and would like the garbage and recyclable pickups to be put on the city's website,

which I think possible and makes a lot of since, so we will this week contact DPW and the IT Department to see if they can make that happen. July 13 through the 17 the street sweeper is scheduled to be in the South Scranton area from Cherry Street to Breck Street.

I do have an update on the Land Bank Authority, as you know a few weeks ago the county passed and authorized an ordinance that created the Authority. I spoke to George Kelly, who was in charge of the Lackawanna County Office of Economic and Community Development, the first step that the Authority Board -- the Authority has to take is to appoint members. The second step is the policies, procedures and practices of the bank must be established and approved by the Board and then an intergovernmental cooperation agreement will be adopted by the land bank and the City of Scranton.

Also, keep in mind that the school board has to agree to participate and agree to the policies, procedures, and practices of the land bank.

There are numerous potholes on

Morris Court in West Scranton that neighbors
would like to be patched and our office has
spoken with DPW and they are going to put
that on the list.

A gentleman had contacted me last week about making west Elm Street a one-way from Meridian to South Sixth Avenue. City engineer John Pocius performed a site visit and its his professional opinion that making this block one-way will not have any impact on speeding vehicles. We did make Chief Graziano aware again that the residents in this area are really concerned about speeding.

And that is all I have for this week. Thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. A couple of responses. First of all, the meeting tonight with Mr. Amoroso was really at the behest of the public. People have asked us repeatedly if we could hear from Mr. Amoroso and the mayor. Council, too, has been awaiting it, but that was not something that, you know, just council wanted. This

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is something that people have asked for and thankfully we are having this meeting this evening and, as was said, it's nice to see the mayor in the council chambers again, this has not happened very often in the past and hopefully we will see more of it in the future.

future. Also, as was mentioned, as far as the pensions are concerned, the double pensions, and I know we spoke last week about investigations and, you know, all of that, we rely upon our solicitor for advice when it comes to these legal matters and it's not that we don't wish to pursue things, it is not in the best interest of the council based on the solicitor's advice to pursue anything at this time, and whether that's perceived as not being involved and not having some interest in that would be wrong. We are greatly interested in the double pensions, it would be nice to see what would happen, what's going to happen with the arbitrations, it would also be helpful to find out what's going to happen or what happened with the state police

3

2

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

investigation, where it's at, whether there is ever going to be anything published and when those things happen then we can see what we recourse we have as a city council.

As far as bankruptcy, Mr. Wechsler brought it up, in August of 2016 PEL will make a recommendation to the state as to the status of the City of Scranton whether it could be granted another few years to get out of distressed status or whether it, you know, has no future and will need to go into receivership or bankruptcy. Until that time, we are doing our best to avoid the possibility of receivership and bankruptcy and I think we have made strides towards that. A lot of our things that are ongoing may be not spoken about, but we as a council, we as a city, are trying to get out of the distressed status. Nobody wants to be there, nobody wants to go to bankruptcy, we will do our job, we will do our best to avoid that and in August of 2016 we will see where we stand.

The Court award is a difficult situation and it's obvious that the city

21

22

23

24

25

does not have the money to pay back -- to pay that award. We need to get the money from somewhere. We need to borrow it, obviously, there is no other recourse, but when we go there, there are couple of things that need to be considered. What are the back wages that are owed to, you know, hiring and placement? What is owed to retirees? And lastly, what is the status of the interest on that? Is it to be paid to the firemen and policemen? You know, where does that money go? That's not part of the award and so there are a lot of things to look at in this award, and hopefully it will I would like to see it be resolved. resolved before the end of the year in a satisfactory way for the people that deserve the money and also for the City of Scranton.

Brought up the refuse schedule, again, I don't know how many times we have asked for this to be on the website. I think there are -- there are number of things that need to be on the City of Scranton's website. Our IT Department consists of two people. Again, you know,

like many of the departments in the city the staffing is not adequate to the work that's involved, but something like the refuse schedule should be simple and we will ask again and try to see that is on there and hopefully upgrade the website as we go along, and I believe that is all I have.

At this time, I'd like to make a motion to take a brief recess.

MR. ROGAN: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question.

Can we get through legislation first before
we bring the mayor in, wouldn't that make
more sense?

MR. MCGOFF: We said that it would be at approximately 7:30, I don't know how long it will take to get through the legislation, and it's more appropriate to actually do this during Fifth Order I would think.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay.

MR. MCGOFF: We'd just call it part of Fifth Order. So we'll take a brief recess and return in approximately ten

1 |

minutes.

(A brief recess was taken.)

MR. MCGOFF: I'd like to call this meeting back to order. We'll continue Fifth Order tonight with kind of a continuation of our public caucus and tonight we have with us from the city administration, Mayor Bill Courtright, Solicitor Jason Shrive, and Business Administrator David Bulzoni. And from HJH Strategies Mr. Henry Amoroso and Mr. Edmund Weiss.

We would like to thank you for coming. We feel that at this point in time it would be a good idea to at least update the citizens of the Scranton on the, for want of a better term what has been called the Amoroso plan or I'll say the city plan for economic revival, and so council will have a number of questions, I don't that there is anyone who would like to make an introductory statement.

MR. COURTRIGHT: Thank you,

President McGoff. Henry has prepared an

overview of where we have been and where we

are going so we thank you for having us here

2

3

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and if you don't mind we'll start it off with a brief overview of where we are at.

MR. MCGOFF: Absolutely. Mr. Amoroso?

MR. AMOROSO: Thank you. Thank you, members of council, for having us back. We'll start with reminding everyone that our plan had essentially 12 components to it. Those 12 components had, included among others things, certain taxes, certain assumptions on the LST. There was a change in the law from the time that we moved forward with the 205 tax and with the LST, and I'll talk a little bit about that as well, and much of our plan, if not the entirety of our plan, was incorporated into the PEL recovery plan that you have all participated in, so we have been working on the plan, moving it along item through item, all 12 of our items, each of them moving forward consistent with what our expectations are.

So if you were to ask now where we think the plan stand I think that we are on track and I think in some areas we are

exceeded expectations, and I think in some areas we are just a little bit behind on timing, but we have had some of our best conversations with the state and with the city administration and with outside lenders and bondholders and interest in the recovery plan, that really is terrific.

So I think the first six months,
Dave can certainly supplement this, we are
on track on revenue, we are on track on
expenses, we are meeting or expectations.
On the bigger issues in the plan, we are
moving forward on the timelines both for the
parking monetization. We are moving forward
I think better than expected on different
areas and one of the areas we are exceeding
expectation is on the judgment refinancing,
and we are making significant progress on
pension solutions.

As you might recall, when I was last here I said all roads lead through the pension problem. The pension problem is what needs to be solved, and not simply because it's a pension problem. If you don't solve that problem you can't take the

pressure off the property taxes, and this plan is premised on the levering reliance on property taxes on a going forward basis.

The City of Scranton's budget is about 30 percent reliant on property taxes so 60 percent of your revenue comes from sources other than property taxes. If any of those other revenue sources fail that revenue cycle at any point, it becomes stressed or we are not able to collect, as we might expect to select, it naturally defaults to property taxes. Property taxes essentially then your own elastic tax that you have, so this plan is very much premised upon reducing the reliance on property taxes on a going out basis.

You also, as you know, have this very odd distribution of assessed value in Scranton. We, as a matter of policy, have concerns about that because we think this bifurcated assessment that you have, high on one end, low on the other end, not properly distributed, is a disincentive to economic development because new constructions are being taxed at a higher number, so if you go

up by 10 percent property taxes that's already too high, a percentage of your population bears that more than does the rest of the population. It's not properly distributed. Add that to an already high, relatively high EIT tax, are barriers to economic development.

So we know that in order for the plan to work and not just to fix the budget short term, but to create the time of the stability that credit markets look at, that investors look at, that people who are exploring economic opportunity look at we need something that's reliable and stable and one that levers that reliance on property taxes, which is big, and I think, unfortunately, a very difficult experience in Scranton.

So we are far along on the judgment negotiation. We are far along in the process of parking discussions. There is still a lot of homework to do there, a lot of due diligence taking place, a lot of negotiation that still has to go on. We are in conversations with the Sewer Authority

and that is probably one of the most critical components of the whole plan and particularly if you want to reduce our reliance on the 205 tax and we are doing well in the basic assumptions on cash flows and doing very well on the assumptions on the revenue and expenses. Dave, again, can certainly supplement any of these things I'm saying, but there has really been a very, very aggressive administrative pursuit of every opportunity inside of the budget. You never get 100 percent, but it's moving along pretty well.

With that, one area I would like to discuss and explain is the concerns I have on the pension. Obviously, we have all been party to the Auditor General's report relative to the pension and it's alarming, and not just for the underlying conduct, we will leave that to others to speak about, but it confirms our concerns about how underfunded the pension really is, and pensions are a product of actuarial assumptions, the number of people in the plan, the expected life span, the salaries

in the plan, as well as a whole bunch of other issues. What are your rates of return, what is your rate of expected growth and expenses.

So we are working with the mayor and working with Dave, working with the mayor's team and both inside and outside counsel, we were very concerned about insuring that the contract negotiations with the unions would lead to a more predictable escalation than Scranton has experienced over several years.

So by way of the example to put some illustration around this, there is an assumption from your Pension Board that it will earn 8 percent, and that assumption is married to an expected growth of expense of 5 percent. Well, 5 percent is particularly high, but that had been the experience of what your contracts were going at, so one of the key components of our plan was to negotiate those contracts in ways that had some very obvious profit/loss benefits, but also would have a longer term benefit on the pension.

Now because we have a controlled

growth in the contract and a significantly lower rate, the actuarial experience changes dramatically and could be very favorable to the city and will be very favorable to the city. So the growth rate is no longer 5 percent, the growth rate is going to be something closer to 2 percent, and that growth at 2 percent becomes a factor in the actuarial's analysis of what the pension exposure is.

So if you look, for example, at the local pension you would say the expected rate of return is 8 percent. It's aggressive by any national standard, by any local standard, too, by our admission, and they had an expected growth rate expense of 5 percent. The state by contrast predicts 5 1/2 percent return, something more conservative, more true for the 20 or 30 year history, but they only have a 2 percent expense rate, so the spread for the state is 3 1/2 percent, the spread for the city is 3 percent.

So we have already approved with the state model because of the contracts that

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have been negotiated to a 1/2 percent benefit in the spring predicting the pensions.

That's just one example of the very connected nature of the plan and all of the things that have to happen in order to get this right, and I'll say it again and answer any questions that any of you have, the pension obligation that will hit Scranton in 2016 and particularly 2017 is completely unsustainable, and there is only one way you can make up that cost difference which is estimated to be in excess of \$5 million, there is only one way to do that and that's property taxes that's you have on the table right now and you don't want it to be reliant on property taxes. That can't So the only way to avoid that is to come up with other means to lower that pension obligation come 2016 and 2017 and the only way to do that is to super fund the pension, and the only way to super fund the pension is to find cash to super fund it, or to find a debt mechanism to fund it with a revenue stream, and that is what's got to

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

happen between this time now and some time in the first quarter of 2016 for this plan to continue to track.

MR. MCGOFF: I guess the first question, what revisions have you been forced to make in the plan in this first 18 months of the administration?

MR. AMOROSO: The two biggest pieces were that we originally assumed a tripling of the LST because of your Act 47 status, and we also assumed a way to super fund the pension would be an Act 205 commuter tax, and if you recall the city's argument was that the residents of the city already pay a very high EIT tax and they wanted a relatively modest commuter tax on commuters. That was struck down in Court and an interpretation was made that there has to be some balance. It's unclear in the Court decision whether it has to be even, but it looks like presumptively like it might have to be even, so in order to have a 205 tax we would have to increased the EIT tax by some small percentage on Scranton residents as well as commuters to generate what was in

our plan roughly \$5 million a year and that \$5 million a year was aimed at being able to secure a pension bond, so we now have taken that out of the model because there seems to be a reluctance to go in the direction of the 205 tax, at least as an early strategy, and that should be an absolute last move if it's to take place at all if there is a will to resolve pensions. So we've had to take that \$5 million generating the super fund for the pension out of the budget.

Essentially it's net neutral on the budget because the money that was going to be raised was going to be used for a pension bond. However, the legislature changed the law and said if the city does an Act 205 tax it will lose the tripling effect of the LST and the LST will only double and that's about a million point five, about a million point five hit to the city.

So without the 205 tax and no way to super fund the pension, but we have the tripling of the LST and that tripling of the LST can exist only while are you in Act 47. So if you are going to exit Act 47 that

tripling of the LST goes away so we would have to come up with a mechanism to replace that \$3 million.

MR. MCGOFF: How have the union contracts effected the plan? Have they in any way?

MR. AMOROSO: Yeah, favorably. I think in some part, you know, union contracts are hard particularly when opening midstream, and there is a general sentiment because there is so many different views on contracts, you've got to really look at the cost of the contract not just in what the pay increase is, there is 2 percent, 3 p percent, 4 percent, but I'm also looking at it in the contract what happens on the work rules, and work rules are an important aspect to renegotiating because they really effect costs, particularly around things like overtime and those aspects.

So the city has a contract, I think it negotiated a good contract, but it has to be able to manage the contract effectively and that's not an easy thing to do because you have a very tight bandwidth, so there is

some headwinds there, it's hard to manage because you have some tight bandwidth.

But the important part of it was that the city was able to deliver the 2 percent increases, which was on the mark, to try to tie it into the states expected rate of increase and generally what municipalities or caps are calling for in different states, New York, New Jersey. They are capping those 2 percent increase closer to the cost of living, and that helps us very much reestablish the pension integrity.

There is still more to do on the pensions, there is other elements of the contract that have to be negotiated visa via the pension, but this is an important, very important, and very good first step.

MR. MCGOFF: Two more questions, have you been actively involved in the discussions with the Scranton Sewer Authority? Since we are not part of it since it is an authority can't act independently.

MR. AMOROSO: We are in discussion

with them. They have hosted two or three meetings with the mayor and some of the team that you see here today. We don't think that we have adequate information to appropriately advise and guide the city notwithstanding independent authority.

Nonetheless, the city remains it's creator and a very important stakeholder and we do believe that there needs to be greater transparency on some of the processes taking place, though there has been a good flow of communication, in order for us to properly advise the city we need to have access to more information.

MR. MCGOFF: And last, was a payroll tax included in part of your budget?

MR. AMOROSO: Yeah, on the payroll tax, it was a recommendation of the Pennsylvania Economy League in the recovery plan. It was not an actual part of our plan, but not for any other reason, we just didn't put it in, but we endorse it and support it and we believe that the public policy instituted by the state has commissioned a study and we're awaiting the

results of that study, which are forthcoming in 30 or 45 days, but it would be something that I would favor.

MR. MCGOFF: Thank you. Mr. Rogan?

MR. ROGAN: Thank you. First, I'd

like to, as I mentioned this during the

regular meeting as well, I would thank all

of you for coming in today, especially Mayor

Courtright. In just 18 months we have had

more of these sessions with you all in here

than we did in 12 years on the previous

administration, so on behalf of all of

council we certainly appreciate you coming
in.

Mr. Amoroso, you spoke about
long-term growth in the city, can you talk a
little bit more about that because I think
the key to, and I think the general public
will all agree, the key to get Scranton back
on track is a long-term strategy where we
could increase homeownership in the city,
increase our population in the city and get
businesses back in, can you talk a little
bit more about all that?

MR. AMOROSO: Sure. In our recent

contract with the Chamber of Commerce we were charged with doing research and making some recommendations relative to economic development opportunities. No matter what you read or what you study, and there is a number of great books that are out there right now, there is actually a body of academia building around what works for distressed cities, and part of what works for distressed cities is getting a budget stable, stabilizing the budget.

Predictability in the budget is important for any business because they have to do their own planning, their own budget planning, so if there are wild cards on tax increases, property tax increases, new fees, those items are always happening and without some predictability attached to them they can't plan well so the intent to stay away from cities that go through recovery without the element of predictability.

Second is very important to recovering the city's economic development is the strength of what we call the core competencies of cities. The core competency

of the city are essentially policing, fire protection, Department of Public Works, recreational activities. You, as council, don't have control over schools, but a lot of folks who invest in cities look at what the school reality might be in making those decisions.

So from our perspective there is an opportunity to promote economic development, but it's hard to do in a headwind of uncertain taxes, whether it be EIT or property tax, very hard for the city administration to sit down and give a package of incentives when the state hasn't really given you those incentives to use so it's a little bit harder in a -- it's been a zero subgame for the municipalities in the northeast in particular to try and to attract business.

So what's attractive is good housing stock, good core competencies, stable budget, stable school system, you have got the road infrastructure, you got the location, you've got the greater attractions around Scranton, the terrific opportunity of

the city on entrepreneurial activity, but it's just not -- it can't be supercharged. It really cannot be deployed very effectively until you get this budget stuff done.

The pensions are a really dark cloud and no one is going to want to come to a city if they can't fix that issue that's facing the probability of a bankruptcy.

MR. ROGAN: And the growth issue that was exactly what I was hoping to hear because from looking at other cities in Northeastern Pennsylvania we are much safer. We have the best police department around, we have the best fire department around, and I think that has to be key to the growth, future growth of the City of Scranton, that we have good neighborhoods, you know, we have great fire departments, and hopefully that can be used as an incentive to promote the city in the future so I was really glad to hear that.

For all of five years I have been on city council two things I have been saying the city should do is reevaluate its

position in the Scranton Parking authority and the Scranton Sewer Authority. I know you probably can't get into specifics because there are, you know, on the parking end there are bids that have been received and negotiations are going on, but can you give a update on where the current status of the Sewer Authority and the Parking Authority stand.

MR. AMOROSO: Sure, to the extent I can we are deeply involved in all of the discussions relative to the Parking Authority, the city has assembled truly a first rate team, that every participant in the team is working in a weekly fashion with the phone calls, with the meetings, strategy sessions, tremendous loop of information. The mayor is deeply involved in that process, so we are excited in the direction which it's going. I think that city is going to end up in taking what is a bad situation and making it as good as it can be.

And the Sewer Authority discussions it's harder to handicap right now because

we're -- the Sewer Authority is running the process and they are sharing certain information with us, but we are having a good, healthy conversation with their representative. Timing on that is probably a little bit different than the Parking Authority, and the Parking Authority discussion, as you recall, has a timeline in the PEL recovery plan.

MR. ROGAN: And just one, also, even though he is not here, Scranton Parking Authority solicitor Todd Johns has done a great job communicating with council, myself, any time I place a phone call to him we get a call immediately with any answers to questions that we have.

And my final question is regarding the Court award from the previous administration with the unions, and it's been brought up by some in the public at tonight's meeting, it's been something that we have been dealing with in the city for well over a decade, the frustration on my end for me personally is that we are currently paying interest on a debt that's

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

continuing to grow. At least by issuing bonds or however it's paid off. Granted, we will still be paying that interest, which nobody wants to pay, but the debt will finally be retired. Can you talk a little bit more about the paying off of the Court award, and maybe this is too earlier, but a an approximate interest rate of what we would be paying on that debt?

MR. AMOROSO: We are involved, but Dave is really the person leading the strategy on that and Dave has brought it to the place where it is. Just to indicate where the recovery plan is, if the recovery plan weren't tracking as it's tracking proof would be that we would not be having the conversations with lenders to fund in the marketplace the judgment of satisfaction. The fact that we are able to actually get bankers to more than sit with us and talk about funding the whole judgment means that they are beginning to believe and have confidence in the structured plan and the team that's here, and Dave, I would defer to Dave on that question, but he has very much

2

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

driven that strategy, and that's why we have the opportunity to refund the judgment, refinance this judgment.

MR. ROGAN: Do you care to comment, Mr. Bulzoni?

MR. BULZONI: Well, what I think I can say it's taken an incredible amount of creativity to move it along. We didn't exactly have any interested parties that were very serious about the city's credit in the early stages of the administration last year, so what we did put together I think was a fairly creative structure and the Times have reported on it fairly thoroughly and has reported on it well. Much more to We obviously created a structure which involves the Commonwealth through the Department of Labor and Industry, and at least to date they have given us some favorable commentary on the structure and how it is involving now. We also through working with various financing arms have looked at a structure where obviously we want competitive interest rates so part of how we drove this process was to be able to

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

create a structure to allow us to issue debt with competitive interest rates.

We will be meeting with bargain units to discuss the matter so at least at this point in time I can't get into too much detail beyond what I had just commented on, but I believe we are reasonably close to being able to put it together.

Thank you very much, and MR. ROGAN: again, I'd like to thank all of you for coming in, and just a few years ago I was on council at the time when the city was paying its employees minimum wage because there were no funds in the account and nobody would borrow to us -- lend to us. of the year we were concerned whether we would have a TAN or not, and I know to the public, you know, reading the paper every day and seeing what's going on in the city these things may not mean a lot to them, but they are very large steps in the right direction, so thank you for all of your hard work on those issues and thanks for coming in again.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Wechsler?

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WECHSLER: Thank you,

Mr. McGoff. How involved have you been working with the state representatives and the state senator in terms of impacting this plan?

MR. AMOROSO: Not as much in this current contract cycle as I was in the last where we met with them with some regularity. We have, however, been meeting I'd say almost monthly, if not a little bit more frequently, with the Department of I think it's DCED here so we have a meeting in Harrisburg quite regularly on the plan, but not as much on the legislative side yet because we don't really have a legislative There will be a time when we mass in place. do have more said mass, but that will probably follow some of these other executions parking, sewer, judgment, which are the immediate concerns right now where we need state cooperation.

MR. WECHSLER: It just seems there is many programs that the city hasn't been allowed to participate in that would be tremendous for our downtown, and we talked

about economic development and other areas are benefitting, but we are the poor stepchild up here and not getting that.

MR. COURTRIGHT: We've met with Senator Blake and Representative Farina and Flynn, Senator Blake is doing his best to get us included in those programs that you mentioned that we are excluded from, it almost seemed like they purposely excluded the City of Scranton, so he is working towards that goal.

MR. WECHSLER: Is there any anything that we as a council should be doing to help facilitate that?

MR. COURTRIGHT: I don't know. I'm sure the senator would welcome any questions you have, he is doing what he could. He is in a situation where they are in a minority, so he is doing the best he could, I believe, but he has been in contact with us all the time, and yet we have had one meeting only with all three of them together, but I have met with Senator Blake on several occasions.

MR. WECHSLER: Is it possible just to expand a little bit on the help that we

are getting from the Governor's Office?

MR. COURTRIGHT: I'm going to defer to Jason, I don't know what we could say more than we said. I will say this that we have been working with him day in and day out, and DCED and they have been extremely cooperative, I think they agree with what we are tying to do, what we told them we want to do and they are behind us, I think it would be helpful, I just don't know what we are or not able to say so I'll defer to the solicitor on that one.

MR. SHRIVE: We have had regular meetings with representatives in Governor Wolf's administration and have a serious and true partner in Harrisburg on not just pension reform, but on municipal government reform and municipal financial reform. The Governor seems to really get it. He knows what the municipality needs and he has got into focus to do that, it's just not lip service at this point. He has made available to us members of his cabinet on multiple occasions whenever we call. You know, the mayor is able to call the

20

21

22

23

24

25

Governor's chief of the staff at the drop of a hat and ask her a question. He has included us in the statewide pension reform discussions and the mayor and I have participated in some meetings with the Governor and other mayors statewide as far as what we hope to see in pension reform and I think one of the clearest examples of that is the task force that he put together and had the State Auditor General chair. was maybe a two-month turn around from the meeting we had with him and other mayors to the time the task force finished and gave its report, and I think you will see some legislation in the near future from the state administration that incorporates the Auditor General's Task Force report and a lot of their recommendations, and I think that's a testament to his focus on the municipal financial reform.

We can't get into a lot of the specifics as far as what they going to be because that really would be for the Governor to talk to and I wouldn't want to speak on his behalf, but I can say the

Governor and our state senator and both of our state reps and our federal legislative delegation, our senators and are congressmen have really been champions for Scranton, and any time we have contacted them they have really helped us out in any way they could.

MR. MCGOFF: Could I just interrupt for a second, since you brought up the Auditor General, do you feel, and I'll say anyone, has the Auditor General been fair in his assessment of the finances of the City of Scranton?

MR. AMOROSO: I think he has been accurate.

MR. MCGOFF: I'm sorry?

MR. AMOROSO: I think he has been accurate.

MR. MCGOFF: The hearing aids aren't working.

MR. AMOROSO: I'm sorry? I would also answer an add that we have been working with Senator Casey's office almost on a really twice a month basis where he has asked of us to give him some suggestions from experiences we have had with United

States Senators bringing stuff home to the communities, what are the types of things he can help do and we have been doing that with him.

MR. WECHSLER: Yeah, I'm happy to hear that because really I have not been aware of it, you know, you hear things, but I work with Senator Blake and Senator Farina and Flynn on a regular basis myself, always very receptive, great to work with, but it's good to hear that it's pursuing on this level as well because they are tightlipped about what's going on, also, as they should be so it's good to hear that everyone is on the same page and on the same team for this issue.

MR. COURTRIGHT: I asked to meet with Senator Casey of state agendas and he actually took me to lunch and we spent an hour and a half, so he has been extremely helpful and more than willing to help and I am think he was got our foot in the door actually with the Governor, but I've talked it over with him on more than one occasion and he is doing and willing to do anything

he can to help us.

MR. WECHSLER: Great. One thing that the council and the citizenry has been asking for is some type of score card matrix that we can keep up-to-date on the progress that is being made. Recently we attended the PEL meeting and they are kind of working towards that, also, but myself as a council person I don't have a tool where I could sit down and evaluate where we are at, and pick any kind of period, a monthly, quarterly or whatever kind of period, is there anything we are developing or anything that available that the public and council could use as a tool?

MR. AMOROSO: Well, from our perspective we can certainly -- we work with PEL multiple times a week on these very issues, progress to objectives. Some of the progress to objectives don't have the type of thing that would form -- fit nicely with a score card, the parking monetization, for example, is a complicated process now for the next eight weeks it's going to be a very intense process, but we can certainly give

you status reports on the plan along with
PEL and the recovery plan and I don't
anticipate that that would be a problem. It
just might not be the thing that looks like
a dashboard --

MR. WECHSLER: Yeah, I'm not sure how it would look, but that's why you are the consultant so that's where we need a format there.

MR. AMOROSO: Yup, we'll get you something.

MR. WECHSLER: Is there any other fault that there has been zero on?

MR. AMOROSO: Well, there is zero progress on moving the Act 205 tax forward, which is one of my 12, in part because we are looking at other alternatives to that. As I said, there is given the legal decision, given some of the disposition of the state and some of the legislators you reference there is an expectation that we can look at that as an absolutely last resort, there is other means of solving the pension problem, and there are, they are complicated but there are.

MR. WECHSLER: And how does this all tie into the 2016 budget, where are we at getting that going? Unfortunately, I was new to this last year and I'd like to be more involved just from an information standpoint that when the budget arrives us to us in November that we know kind of how we got to that point. Last year we kind of got it and kind of learned what questions to ask about, so I have more questions this year than I did last year and I was just wondering where we're at at this stage of developing the 2016.

MR. AMAROSO: Again to defer to Dave on that, but I'd say our plan called for a -- articulated what's called a 6 percent property tax increase for next year and I don't see why we shouldn't be able to achieve that. What could create problems in achieving in that are a delay in execution on some of the monetizations, which were baked into the plan and refinances, but from what I see so far the city is doing it's budget on an expense basis and on a revenue basis and our expectations will hit that,

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

but I turn to Dave who is writing the budget on a daily basis.

MR. BULZONI: Just briefly, I guess I would state that everything that Mr. Amoroso is discussing intertwined in a lot of detail with the budget, so just think of one component of when you look at the parking monetization what can be achieved in theory and hopefully in practice and keep in mind that we have budgeted approximately \$2.9 million for debt service relative to the Parking Authority's bonds. through monetization process you hope that you were able to eliminate that guaranteed burden, obviously it may be shifted in some respects, but as you can see everything is intertwined. As much relief as we can generate on a day-to-day basis we look at. Broadening the revenue spread is critical and you know probably as well as anyone a lot of the concepts that have been introduced at the PEL meetings particularly looking at various revenue components that are realistic and we think could be helpful regardless of the dollar amount, so it

1 requires an adjustment on a day-to-day basis, there is no question. 2 3 We are reasonably confident that it's tracking accordingly. Obviously, you 4 5 have issues that can tend to create some concerns with individual line items in the 6 budget and you try and make adjustments in 7 8 others to compensate, but it is a 9 day-to-process without any question. 10 MR. WECHSLER: And just to finish 11 up, who will be responsible for getting us 12 that progress report? 13 MR. AMOROSO: We'll prepare 14 something and submit to the administration. So we'll go through MR. WECHSLER: 15 16 the mayor's office. 17 MR. AMOROSO: And we'll also solicit 18 PEL's input on that. 19 MR. WECHSLER: Would you like to put 20 monthly or, I mean, I don't think weekly is 21 necessary, but monthly is that --22 MR. AMOROSO: We are happy to send 23 you -- we are happy to -- we report 24 regularly so we'll be happy to put it in a 25 format and defer to the administration how

they want to get it to you.

MR. COURTRIGHT: What I do is I usually meet with Bob on Monday, so when Henry forwards it to me I'll deliver it to the president.

MR. WECHSLER: Thank you very much.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Evans? Oh, I'm sorry, were you finished Mr. Wechsler?

MR. WECHSLER: Yes, thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Thank you. Again, thank you all for coming tonight, we really appreciate it. Of course when you get down this end of the table many of the question are already asked and asked so it's a little more difficult. I want to read a quote from the plan, the Amoroso plan: "It's vitally important that the individual elements of the overall strategy occur essentially in tandem."

So I totally agree with that statement that points the need to create a timeline for each of the elements within the plan so that's why I concur with what Councilman Wechsler is talking about, that's

why it's so important for us to see a timeline, benchmarks, as progress is made on one item we move to the next one because they are linked together and they are all in tandem, when one happens the second one has to happen so that's very, very important, but tonight I'd like to address some of the parts of the plan that there might have been a little progress on getting things done.

For example, and this is a big issue, reassessment. We need a reassessment. Scranton property owners are getting crushed by assessed values that are based on a 1970 version of Scranton, and a 1970's version of the rest of the county. Where we have seen property values generally decline in the city, they have increased in the suburbs and the current assessment does not reflect a 45-year change. So part of the plan is to ask the mayor, and I'm not sure did --

MR. COURTRIGHT: Could I interrupt for a second? I asked the current commissioners or the previous ones and they verbally they had no interest in

reassessment so we will be seeing a new regime come in and I will make that request again.

MR. EVANS: I agree 100 percent, we have to keep on beating the drum to our property owners. I mean, it's exacerbated by the recent tax increases, of course, but it's the assessment that, you know, and I I'm a real estate broker so I can tell you case after case after case where property owners are just getting hurt by the assessment. It's hurting our economic development.

MR. COURTRIGHT: It is.

MR. EVANS: Our homeowners, it's a travesty and we finally have to get something done on that.

Pension reform, and the mayor and I have had this conversation before, too, it's a simple process, I think, but it's something that I think would send a message to everybody in the community, financial community as well, that if the non-union or the cabinet members or however you want to call it, would switch over to a 401-K style

plan on a going forward basis so we can finally say, look it, here is what we are doing, we are making the effort, as pension reform is being discussed daily in Harrisburg, you know, that would send a message I think to the financial community that, you know, we are getting our house in order in that small aspect.

MR. COURTRIGHT: I didn't mean to talk while you are speaking, I was just asking him a question about if that would be complex or not for us to, I don't have a problem with doing it, but I'll let Mr. Bulzoni might want to speak to it.

MR. EVANS: Yeah, I don't know if there is any legal issues to doing it or anything, but I think it's something that -- and it is being addressed in the new recovery plan, revised recovery plan, so I think it's something that we should put on the table, and I think actually, to be honest with you, I think it's to the benefit of the non-union personnel because there's a big turnover there, there is more people coming and going with the administration,

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it's a portable pension so I think it would actually better for everyone concerned.

Monetization of the Sewer Authority obviously is a key plan to the funding of the pensions. While I agree in principle, and I do, without substantia reform to the Pension Board, the pension ordinances and other initiatives, we are going to be putting good money after bad, so what's the plan to avoid some of the scenarios that have happened in the past? What are we going to put in place, what controls via a pension ordinance or revisions of the Pension Board, is there anything in the plan right now to make sure that we super fund the pension, we are not turning it over to a scenario where we are going to get hurt again?

MR. AMOROSO: There are currently sessions taking place with the state relative to the level of participation support they are giving the city, which I'm sure are going to have some conditions attached to, and some that you might expect we would have to the recent report. The

mayor has loudly called for turning the pension management over to the state.

In order to do that, you would have to come to compliance with the state requirements, which are almost best practices. Our belief is that is the best interest of the pension holders, retired and present, to go into the state plan. That going into the state plan means conforming to the state plan. It doesn't mean the state picks up the debt, but I would tend to agree with you absent that we can put money at risk.

MR. EVANS: Absolutely. And we all agreed on council that that was a move when the mayor announced it that we all agreed with, it's something that we see that must happen. Now, how it happens, I understand the unions have to take a vote and I don't know if that's the only way that it's done, but --

MR. COURTRIGHT: Attorney Shrive is working to get somebody from PMRS to come up here, I spoke to them verbally, some of the union heads, and they weren't opposed to it,

but they had questions that needed to be answered and so we figured we would bring the experts up so he is working to that end to bring them up here and hopefully we will have a favorable outcome.

MR. EVANS: Great.

MR. SHRIVE: When we do have that meeting set up I will definitely invite all of the members of council to come in and sit in and have any questions answered that they have as well.

MR. EVANS: Yeah, that would be very informative and help me out. On the settlement, I do agree that the settlement has to happen obviously, you know, we continue to go down that path and not pay that off. I have made the statement, it may be something that's doable, it may not be, but it's the way I feel, that the unions should have some skin in the game. If we are going to pay out \$24 million -- or borrow \$24 million they need or should at least take a portion of that and help fund the pension. Now, if that's realistic or not as far as the unions are concerned I

don't know, frankly I don't care, that's my opinion and I hope they step up because there is going to be a process in place to super fund the pensions which will include the settlement possibly, the SSA monetization, the pension bond issue, I think everybody needs to contribute because the larger amount that goes into that pension fund the less the payment is going to be and the more solvent the city is going to be so that's probably more of a statement than a question, but I think somebody had to say it, I'm not sure how this is going to flow but that's something I feel very important about.

PILOTS. Now, obviously your plan and the recovery plan are sort of meshed now. In the new recovery plan as part of a mandate it talks about verification of property exempt from taxation status. This is something that took place in Allegheny County that works very, very well, and what they do -- the County does it, I'm not sure we can get the county to do it, I'm hoping at some point in time it's mandated for 2015

20

21

22

23

24

25

and 2016 in the plan, what you basically do is send out verification on every single parcel that's owned by a nonprofit and that nonprofit has to substantiate or justify why that piece of the property, if it is exempt under the category of purely charitable organization or through the HUP test. It's some heavy lifting, I understand that, and something we have to talk about how that gets done, if it's through an RFP or if it's through some other opportunity, but I think it's something that we should discuss in the I think it's a battle, that it's a way to address the PILOTS, because I think what happens. I was the director of the assessment office for awhile and when I came into the office I put a policy in place that whenever a property came in it was automatically deemed taxable and it was up to the property owner to come in and tell us why it shouldn't be taxable.

That policy has changed and now it basically, you know, it works the property comes in and it's listed as a nonprofit, I don't want to give any names, but nonprofit,

they will automatically make that property nontaxable. We don't know if that is legitimate or not because it could be an empty lot, it has no bearing whatsoever on being a Purely Charitable Act.

So I think it's something open for discussion with the nonprofits as far as the PILOTS, it might be something worthwhile having that conversation with them when you're meeting with them. I offered my services, I'm available any time to meet with PILOTS if you need, I could be of some help, but that's all I have on PILOTS.

That's another one of my passions.

MR. AMOROSO: If I might echo that last comment, one of the larger cities that we worked with we have helped them put the process in for examining just that. There is a body of law developing now in a number of states about really what constitutes a nonprofit, particularly the larger institutions who have for profit enterprise inside of them, and there is some very interesting decisions coming down, we can share one of them with you, but I couldn't

agree with you more.

But, again, Scranton's fire is fighting some big problems and it's got to move through these things with a methodology that doesn't make it such that their bandwidth can't be successful.

MR. EVANS: No, I agree and I think that goes back to the opening statement about everything being done in tandem and part of the bigger picture.

I'll touch a little bit on taxes, which we talked about before. I'm a firm believer that we can no longer tax our way out of distressed status. Every time we tax, have higher property tax, we are losing families, we're losing businesses, mercantile taxes, the tax certainly has to go.

The mayor touched on this, and I appreciate that you have talked to representatives and Senator Blake, Allentown has a NIZ which has turned that city around. To date, on the books, are being planned \$1.3 billion in investment in a five-block area and along the riverfront. Bethlehem

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and Reading or Lancaster has KRIZ's. we have been isolated, we are been shut out, I know Senator Blake has worked on this, I wish we could help, I have no problem going and knocking on doors of the House and the State Senator leadership if we have to. know it's a different party at this point in time than what our representatives are, but this is bigger than that, you know? the poster child for this type of program. You know, we are in Act 47 for over 20 years. We need to, you know, this an opportunity for us to grow out of the situation that can no longer go back to the taxpayers for so at this point that's all I Thank you guys for coming in, I really appreciate it.

MR. MCGOFF: Mr. Gaughan?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, thank you. First of all, I would just like to thank Mayor Courtright, Mr. Bulzoni, Attorney Shrive, Mr. Amoroso and Mr. Weiss for coming in. As my colleagues have stated, we really truly appreciate having this conversation because it's an important one.

We recently learned that Mr.

Amoroso's contract is extended again, this time for three years, for an amount of \$200,000 and Allied Services, Lackawanna College and Geisinger Foundations came forward to foot the bill. Mayor Courtright, can you tell us your decision making process in retaining Mr. Amoroso for an additional two years and exactly what responsibilities he has?

MR. COURTRIGHT: Well, I think if you are listening what he said here today his expertise is more than valuable. Everything that he and what people want to call the Amoroso plan just about became the recovery plan, and I think his services are invaluable and I believe that those three entities felt the same way and that's why they stepped forward to pay for him.

MR. AMOROSO: There is one piece to add there just for purposes of clarifying, the \$200,000 is to HJ Strategies, it's not for my services alone. It includes, and this was part of the grant proposal to those entities, it includes assistance with

communicating the plan and writing part of the plan up, much of which is beyond our bandwidth. The original scope of what was expected of us has increased substantially and we needed assistance with that.

MR. GAUGHAN: Do you report to the Chamber or the mayor, how does that work?

MR. AMOROSO: I do periodically meet with the Chamber and give them a -- a small group an up-to-date report in more generalities. They are more focused on our thinking on economic development and economic development opportunities, but report to the mayor on a nearly regular basis. There are very few days where we are not here. This morning started in Harrisburg with very long meeting with DCED, a series of meetings up here this afternoon and tonight. So there is some element of us every day here.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Thank you very much. Mayor Courtright, in Mr. Amoroso's report he recommended several operational improvements and strategic initiatives such as wellness coaching, city-run healthcare

centers, shared services, and as Mr. Evans had touched on PILOTS, have you begun any of these improvements or initiatives and, if so, what is the progress?

MR. COURTRIGHT: We met with a couple of nonprofits for PILOTS, we've made process, significant progress on one, but I don't believe we've locked it down so we are not at liberty to say what it is.

MR. GAUGHAN: On the other --

MR. MCGOFF: Can I interrupt you one second for one question? Just kind of jumping back on one question, do you feel that there is a conflict of interest between HJH Strategies vis-a-vie the three nonprofits entities that are paying for your services?

MR. GAUGHAN: That was my next question, but that's okay.

MR. AMOROSO: No, I don't. No, I don't. We work through chambers in some cases, in some cases we work for cities directly, but the credibility of our work is -- it's important that it maintain its independence, so notwithstanding whatever

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

grant anyone gave, and I'm not entirely sure I know exactly who gave these grants, I have heard that, but I don't know that specifically because I didn't negotiate any of them, I don't believe there is any impairment of our independence whatsoever.

I do want to add in response to Councilman Gaughan's question, he mentioned healthcare, I think, and the wellness area. The city has launched a study that's been done presently, we are awaiting the results, and we still maintain and believe that there is significant opportunity on health care savings to be achieved. If you wanted to create a priority of big ticket items, putting a great deal of energy into the Sewer and Parking Authority by letting that track at some level is good, but we have had some very meaningful conversations relative to the PILOTS, some which we believe will bear fruit in near order, and we are waiting for results of some studies on the healthcare piece.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. In the plan it says that the city should strive to

hit a \$1.5 million annual PILOT target for 2015, '16 and '17, are we anywhere close to that or --

MR. AMOROSO: Yeah, I don't think that you're lucky to hit \$1.5 million in 2015, I think we are going to have significant process in 2016, but we would have to really count all of the things that are being done, even though they may not fit the definition of PILOTS, things ranging from contributions to recreational undertakings, subsidizing of costs that would otherwise be the cities, as I said, as well as talking to some of our PILOT partners achieving capital support because the city was starved for capital appointment.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. Just to touch on the pensions a little bit, Mayor Court right, you recently held a press conference asking that the City Pension Boards turn their pension plans over to the state, did you have conversations with the unions and Pension Boards priority to your press conference regarding relinquishing

that control?

MR. COURTRIGHT: Did I speak to them beforehand?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.

MR. COURTRIGHT: No.

MR. GAUGHAN: And have you engaged the unions and Pension Boards since your press conference to discuss the request?

MR. COURTRIGHT: Not the Pension
Boards, I spoke to the union, I would think
you would call them presidents, and that's
when they had said to me, not that they
weren't interested, but they had questions
and that's why Attorney Shrive is working to
bring PMRS up here.

MR. GAUGHAN: And can you ex just explain the whole process of turning the pensions over the state? What are the primary benefits, what impact would it have on our budget, does it help us out financially? I mean, and I agree that it should be done, so I agree with your press conference, but can you explain what the thinking behind that was, like, what are the primary benefits, why do you support that?

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. COURTRIGHT: Well, they are experts and they do best practices and that's what we need, that's what we're lacking right now, I believe.

MR. GAUGHAN: How does the process work? What would have to happen for the pension boards to --

MR. COURTRIGHT: I'll defer to Mr. Shrive, but I believe we need their agreement would be the first step.

MR. SHRIVE: Right, I think that PMRS is probably better to speak to the entire process and what benefits they derive from coming and taking over the plans, but some of the information that has already been reported in the newspaper as far as 75 percent of the vote of the pensioners and the like would be required to be able to do I think that we'll have a lot better understanding of the pensioners, and council and anybody else that's really interested in the process when we bring PMRS up to talk about it because it's not a quick fix, it's not PMRS providing us with the pension payment or with the MMO, the city is still

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on the hook financially for the pensions, but they are run in a professional manner by experts in investment and actuarial science and people that do it for a living, not people that are volunteering to help out their fellow union members or retirees, it's somebody that has a day-to-day experience with it, they have the ability to hire professionals. They do it on statewide basis where just the volume of it alone provides more protection for the plan. But I think that when we have this meeting, are hoping to have it in the very near future and a lot more details will become available.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay, thank you very much. This has already been touched on but, Mayor, as you know it's been well-documented that the City of Scranton has the highest disability pension rate in the state, there were 151 retired firefighters receiving pensions of which 88 or 58 percent are disability pensions. The police department had 146 retirees of whom 73 or 50 percent were on disability pensions and this has

cost the fund \$5.2 million. I, along with my colleagues, have been quite vocal on a call to reform the proces for disability pensions, and we have been told it's been review for months now. Have any measures been taken to reform the disability pension process and what is your take on that, Mayor?

MR. COURTRIGHT: I'm going to ask

Mr. Shrive to speak to it, but we do put in
the contract when it came down to if you
apply for a disability pension that you
couldn't just go to a doctor your choice,
and one other doctor, it would be a doctor
designated by the City and a doctor who is
an expert in that particular field.

MR. SHRIVE: That's one area that would tighten up the process and provide for one expert in that specific medical field as opposed to, you know, a union doctor, a city doctor, a family doctor and a majority rule type of the situation that was before. We have also engaged with an our third party administrator for Workers' Comp to bring about best practices as far as how to reduce

MR. GAUGHAN:

the risk of disability and work comp injury and they are exploring that as we speak.

I think in the future you will see a significant decrease in our disability pensions, and I think that a turnover to PMRS will also help alleviate that issue.

MR. GAUGHAN: Can we expect any time soon a change, something that comes down to council legislation wise amending the pension ordinances as it relates to disability?

MR. SHRIVE: One thing that we have to remember when we are dealing with the pensions is in Pennsylvania all of them are subject to Act 111 and the negotiation process, so any changes that we make on a going forward basis would have to be by agreement as well as the PMRS changeover, but you won't have anything to council until we have an agreement on the specific issues like we did in the fire contract with the change to the way that the disabilities are approved by one doctor as opposed to the three.

Right.

MR. SHRIVE: But we are definitely working on it and meeting with the unions to try and make it definitely a more efficient process.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you.

Mr. Amoroso, as you are well aware, back in January and February of 2015 the mayor renegotiated contracts with the fire and police unions. Mayor Courtright said that we should expect to see up to \$1 million in savings from these new contracts. First, how are we tracking these savings? Are we able to actually track the savings and where are we in that process? How much have we saved and will be able to see that \$1 million figure?

able to see the \$1 million figure.

Remember, part of the contract requires, as I said earlier in my opening, that the city be in a position through it's director who has a relatively tight bandwidth that they be able to manage under the terms of those contracts. So in order to achieve those savings we have to manage things like

MR. AMOROSO: I do believe you will

overtime, we have to manage other activities and there could be unforeseen circumstances that could justify the overtime, but the city has to manage that as well, it's not easy. It sounds like it is, but it's not easy, but the contracts if measured and scored do produce a million dollar savings.

MR. GAUGHAN: Do we know where we are at in that process? Can we actually look at and say, "Okay, so far we have saved this much?"

Are we 50 percent of the way through?

MR. AMOROSO: I don't know. Again,
I would probably defer that to Dave, but
it's probably too early given how soon that
they have been implemented.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay.

MR. COURTRIGHT: If I could say this, I spoke to the chief earlier this week, Chief Graziano, and he said to me that if we hadn't done the contracts as we did it that we would have expended an additional \$300,000 from what we expended now and I believe Councilman Wechsler has spoken to

both chiefs, have you not?

MR. WECHSLER: Correct, and that was the same information he gave me.

MR. GAUGHAN: Mayor Courtright, and this has been touched on a little bit, are we still on track for 2016 and 2017 tax increases as it relates, Mr. Amoroso mentioned the 6 percent in 2016 and 4 percent to 2017, are we still on track for that?

MR. COURTRIGHT: I believe we are for 2016, I can't see that far out for 2017.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay. Is there anything that could happen within the plan that would -- any shortfall that we are looking at right now that would call for an additional increase, higher than 6 percent?

MR. AMOROSO: Yes. If we are unable to resolve the pension issue, if we are unable to refinance the judgment, if we can't execute on the parking monetization the way that makes sense for the city and kick the can down the road to another day, there is no other source of revenue that has elasticity, as painful as it is, other than

3

5

7

6

8

10

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the property tax. So if those things don't happen, this is the important part of the plan, that there has -- the pension bill is going to go up. It's certain it's going to go up. The extent to which it goes up is a function of an actuarial calculation that will potentially be improved in the state pension plan, but if we give the state to the state pension plan, super fund the pension, which means executing on the Sewer Authority monetization of which you folks don't have a lot of resent control over, the parking monetization, and the refinancing of the judgment at proper rates, those things don't happen. They all produce expenses that are not called for in the plan, greater than what the calls for, there is only one place for it to land, property taxes.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay, thank you. This was touched on also, but it's something that's brought up to all council members regularly, especially when we're out in the public and I think there is a disconnect people, don't understand the difference between personal bankruptcy or Chapter 9

bankruptcy, so could you just explain what would have to happen for the city to go into receivership and bankruptcy and explain that process. Is it a good thing, a bad thing?

MR. AMOROSO: Well, personally, and from my experience and from what we study, okay, we don't see municipal bankruptcies as a good thing, we see them as a bad thing. They are very different than personal or corporate restructures, Chapter 7 or 11. A Chapter 9 also requires approval of the state. So even if the City of Scranton wanted to go into bankruptcy you would have to petition the state and the state would have to say, "We approve it."

The state might say, "We don't approve the bankruptcy, we don't think that's in the best interest of the Commonwealth."

In the overall picture, bankruptcy could effect the rest of our credit, it would effect the rest of these marginal pensions and, therefore, we are going to appoint a receiver and a receiver is going to come to town, a receiver is going to have

protect the revenue. The receiver has to secure the revenue. So a receiver will come to town and lift your property taxes because they have to secure the revenue stream.

So a lot of people speak about let's go bankrupt.

MR. GAUGHAN: Right.

MR. AMOROSO: And that fixes the problems, but I don't know that it's well thought out when they say it. I certainly empathize with the instinct that because of what they read in the newspaper, whether it be personal or whether it be some corporation somewhere, it just doesn't work that way in municipalities. So in some of these counties they have seen pensions cut in half, the City's credit destroyed and business leave.

In Detroit it's not a comparison by any stretch of the imagination like here.

There was such participation by a large foundation or foundations and others, millions of dollars, very different type of problem. My expectation is the state does not want to see the City of Scranton file

for bankruptcy. The state probably doesn't want to see it because it's not good for Scranton, it's not good for the state and you would invite a receiver who would solve the problem with property taxes.

MR. GAUGHAN: Right.

MR. MCGOFF: Isn't that also in the hands of PEL in August of 2016 in their recommendation to the state?

MR. AMOROSO: If the city's plan, the timeline that was discussed broader strokes in the PEL recovery plan, if the city has not been able to achieve aspects of the plan it could pave the way for a receiver. It could pave the way for a receiver.

MR. GAUGHAN: And just a clarify,
I'm not advocating for bankruptcy, I just
want a clarification because, as I said, we
all hear it almost every day --

MR. AMOROSO: Sure.

MR. GAUGHAN: Mayor Courtright, besides the city's finances are you working on any other initiatives for economic development throughout the city and

downtown? What other initiatives outside of the Amoroso plan are you working on or have you thought about?

MR. COURTRIGHT: I think Mr. Preambo and Ms. Aebli be sending some legislation down this week and then some in maybe a week or two from now on two businesses that they have been working on so they are actively working on it. It's not easy, I think as everybody knows, to get somebody to move into the city, but they have been working very hard and I do want to credit both Mr. Preambo and his team for all their hard work.

MR. GAUGHAN: Are there any other initiatives besides that that you are working on?

MR. COURTRIGHT: I think the main thing is that we get our finances in order. If the people see that the city has their finances in order they are going to want to come here. If they see that we are floundering and going down they are not going to so I think that's our main focus and always has been our main focus to get

our finances in order.

MR. GAUGHAN: I just have two questions, when will the city receive a favorable bond rating? Is there a timeline for that? Are we close, are we not close? I don't know if you will able to answer that question.

MR. BULZONI: There has been some discussion, especially recently, about actually approaching the rating agencies to see if we can secure a rating. You know, certainly the rating would be a lower tier rating at this point, not having a rating is not preventing us from looking at issuing debt, but certainly having a rating would open the door for us to achieve a more favorable debt structure, possibly secure insurance which would, again, drop the cost of borrowing as well.

The fact we are talking about it now is really very surprising. Initially, when we first started discussing that prospect we were thinking maybe the end of next year. We are thinking that if a lot of these initiatives that we are working on continue

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to flow pretty conveniently, we may be having some of those discussions closer to the end of this year.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you.

MR. AMOROSO: I would just add as well, we had an opportunity to speak about debt with the rating agencies on a regular basis as well as the national publication that cover it. They are all accelerating their reviews of Scranton in part because they see certain economic activity, they see the recovery plan taking place, they see the symmetry of some of the work with the state, they see the plan, so we have gotten particularly good coverage in some of the bond and trader type of articles and the rating agencies are asking questions every week relative to the plan, which I think to Dave's point has accelerated the probability that the city will be rated sooner than we had anticipated.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you.

MR. COURTRIGHT: One thing maybe I can mention as a side, is I think the biggest economic development I think we

undertook was just that we are going to have 3 point some million dollars in paving, which the city hasn't seen in decades.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. Mayor, and this might be unrealistic, but it's a question that I get all of the time, has anyone asked or have you approached the unions or anyone in your administration and ask if they would forgive the judgment or the interest on the judgment or, as Mr. Evans had mentioned, put it back into the pension? Has there been any meaningful discussion on that, Mayor Courtright?

MR. SHRIVE: Not to interrupt, but because the arbitration award and the judgment are subject to negotiation, including the way that we pay it out and what they would accept we can't comment on it at this point because it would be an unfair labor practice.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you. The rental registration lawsuit, do we have a plan to address that and the shortfall that it might cause in next year's budgets since we are putting it in an escrow, can you not answer

that either?

MR. SHRIVE: My last response, because it's ongoing litigation we can certainly discuss it with attorney Minora and he can brief you on an executive session or I can come to an executive session and brief you on the case, but because it's still ongoing we wouldn't be able to discuss that.

MR. GAUGHAN: But is there -- I mean, I don't know if you can talk about this, but is there at least a plan budget wise how we are going to make up for that lost revenue?

MR. SHRIVE: I really couldn't comment on it at this point, because to comment would be to comment on whether the lawsuit was viable or not.

MR. GAUGHAN: Okay, and one final question, as it relates to the \$1 million in contract savings, will you able to give a document or a something to council to show us where we are with that at the end of the year or will we be able to see if we hit that mark? And the reason I ask is because

I think it's important because it was touted, it was a reason, it was justification for some of the things that we may have given away, so I just think it's important that the public and council be able to see if you've hit that mark.

MR. AMOROSO: We'd have to look at what the cost run would have been and there is some variables in that, had the contract not been negotiated what that expense would be and what did the expense number come out at the end of the year. So those two whole numbers might not spread a million dollars, the reality that didn't occur, the cost that you might have otherwise incurred without the contract being modified we should be able to score that.

MR. GAUGHAN: Thank you very much and I'd just like to thank you again for coming in.

MR. MCGOFF: I'm going to ask one additional question, what is the -- are we going to be able to meet the 2015 MMO? Is there a likelihood as you see as we progress?

1 MR. BULZONI: Yes. 2 MR. MCGOFF: There is a lot of 3 consultation there for a yes. 4 MR. EVANS: Before we break up, I 5 would like to take up Attorney Shrive on your offer to meet in executive session to 6 7 talk about the rental registration so we can 8 make arrangements for that. Thank you. 9 MR. GAUGHAN: I have one additional 10 that I just thought of, sorry, and this is 11 Mayor, this is in the plan, the last one. 12 and I think it's important, have you 13 appointed a commission on various 14 stakeholders and leaders from both inside and outside government to develop a strategy 15 16 on the implementation of various shared 17 services program? 18 MR. COURTRIGHT: Shared services? 19 No. 20 MR. GAUGHAN: Yeah -- okay, thank 21 you. 22 MR. MCGOFF: Anything else? 23 comments? 24 MR. COURTRIGHT: Just thank you for 25 hearing us. All of us are working hard each

10 11

8

9

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and every day and we are working very close with the state and we trying to give you all of the information we could, obviously some of the information we just can't, but we are working very hard each and every day and I do want to thank the senators, Senator Blake, Senator Casey, Congressman Cartright and our two representatives Flynn and Farina and especially the governor for all the access they have given us. I mean, we have had unprecedented access to DCED. I believe that Dave and every -- all of us here, but probably mostly Dave and Mr. Amoroso, talk to people from the state multiple times each and every single day. So sometimes it may not seem like things are getting done, but trust me people are all working very hard, so thank you.

MR. MCGOFF: And last thing, I would really like to thank you, I know this was a lengthy conversation or dialogue, but thank you for coming and hopefully in the future we can get updates that will suffice so that we may not need to go through the lengthy session that we had this evening but, again,

21

22

23

24

25

thank you for coming and have a safe trip.

(The panel leaves chambers.)

MR. MCGOFF: That concludes 5-A, motions, and we will move forward.

5-B. FOR INTRODUCTION -MS. REED: AN ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 14, 2010, ENTITLED AN ORDINANCE "AMENDING THE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE OF THE CITY OF SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, SECTION 6-14 CONTRACTS, SUBSECTION (A) TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT ABOVE WHICH COMPETITIVE BIDDING IS REQUIRED FROM \$20,000.00 TO \$10,000.00 AND TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT ABOVE WHICH QUOTES MUST BE OBTAINED FROM \$5,000.00 TO \$4,000.00" TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT ABOVE WHICH COMPETITIVE BIDDING IS REQUIRED FROM \$10,000.00 TO \$19,400.00 AND TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT FROM WHICH QUOTES MUST BE OBTAINED FROM \$4,000.00 TO \$10,500.00 TO BE IN LINE WITH COMMONWEALTH STANDARDS AND OTHER SIMILARLY SITUATED MUNICIPALITIES WITH REGARD TO BIDDING THRESHOLD.

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

1	MR. ROGAN: So moved.
2	MR. WECHSLER: Second.
3	MR. MCGOFF: On the question? All
4	those in favor oh, I'm sorry.
5	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question,
6	we did discuss this back in caucus, and I
7	did have one question, and I don't know if
8	will be able to find it out, but I would
9	like to know what the average amount is that
10	the city spends on advertising and what
11	would be the estimated amount of savings
12	should this legislation pass because we
13	might save on advertising so that's
14	something that I will be looking into this
15	week.
16	MR. MCGOFF: All those in favor of
17	introduction signify by saying aye.
18	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.
19	MR. ROGAN: Aye.
20	MR. EVANS: Aye.
21	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.
22	MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The
23	ayes have it and so moved.
24	MS. REED: 5-C. FOR INTRODUCTION -
25	AN ORDINANCE - AMENDING FILE OF THE COUNCIL

NO. 41, 2010, AN ORDINANCE ENTITLED
"AMENDING THE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE OF THE
CITY OF SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA, SECTION 6-14
CONTRACTS, SUBSECTION (C) TO PUBLICLY BID
FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES" TO INCREASE THE
COST OF THE BIDDING THRESHOLD FROM
\$10,000.00 TO \$25,000.00 IN ORDER TO PROVIDE
FOR MORE EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF MUNICIPAL
SERVICES AND TO CHANGE PROPOSALS TO
QUALIFICATIONS.

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

MR. ROGAN: So moved.

MR. WECHSLER: Second.

MR. MCGOFF: On the question?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, on the question another question on this legislation that I'll be trying to find out this week is where the \$20,000 figure -- how the administration arrived at that figure and what the justification is for the increase.

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

	12	9
1	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.	
2	MR. ROGAN: Aye.	
3	MR. EVANS: Aye.	
4	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.	
5	MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The	
6	ayes have it and so moved.	
7	MS. REED: SIXTH ORDER. 6-A.	
8	READING BY TITLE - FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO.	
9	106, 2015 – AN ORDINANCE – CREATING THE	
10	POSITION OF POLICE CHAPLAIN WITHIN THE	
11	SCRANTON POLICE DEPARTMENT.	
12	MR. MCGOFF: You've heard reading by	
13	title of Item 6-A, what is your pleasure?	
14	MR. ROGAN: I move that Item 6-A	
15	pass reading by title.	
16	MR. WECHSLER: Second.	
17	MS. MCGOFF: On the question? All	
18	those in favor signify by saying aye.	
19	MR. WECHSLER: Aye.	
20	MR. ROGAN: Aye.	
21	MR. EVANS: Aye.	
22	MR. GAUGHAN: Aye.	
23	MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The	
24	ayes have it and so moved.	
25	MS. REED: 6-B. READING BY TITLE -	

FILE OF THE COUNCIL NO. 107, 2015 - AN

ORDINANCE - DEFINING AND REGULATING THE

SIZE, OPERATION AND USE OF PORTABLE

ON-DEMAND TEMPORARY STORAGE CONTAINERS, AS

DEFINED HEREIN AND AUTHORIZING ENFORCEMENT,

AND IMPOSITION OF PENALTIES AND FEES FOR

VIOLATIONS WITHIN THE CITY OF SCRANTON.

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

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ ROGAN: I move that Item 6-B pass reading by title.

MR. WECHSLER: Second.

MS. MCGOFF: On the question?

MR. GAUGHAN: Yes, I do still have a couple of questions about this and we touched on it in caucus, one of them is the question of enforcement. As was brought up tonight in the meeting, there does seem to be a lot of these on demand storage containers throughout the city. You know, one of the questions that I would have for Licensing and Inspections is how would we enforce that, is it enforceable? The other thing that was brought up tonight that is, I think it is a good question, will the other

1 storage containers that are out there be grandfathered in, and I still have a 2 3 question of the \$50 fee what the justification is for that and where they 4 5 came up with that figure. MR. MCGOFF: Certainly if those 6 questions aren't answered we could table 7 8 this next week until they are, but I prefer 9 that we vote on it this evening. 10 MR. GAUGHAN: Yeah. I agree with 11 that. 12 MR. MCGOFF: All those in favor 13 signify by saying aye. 14 MR. WECHSLER: Aye. 15 MR. ROGAN: Aye. MR. EVANS: Aye. 16 17 MR. GAUGHAN: Aye. 18 MR. MCGOFF: Aye. Opposed? The 19 ayes have it and so moved. SEVENTH ORDER. 7-A. FOR 20 MS. REED: 21 CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - FOR ADOPTION - FILE OF THE 22 23 COUNCIL NO. 105, 2015 - AMENDING FILE OF THE 24 COUNCIL NO. 35, 2013, AN ORDINANCE, AS 25 AMENDED ENTITLED "AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND

OTHER APPROPRIATE CITY OFFICIALS TO DISBURSE 1 2 THIRTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$30,000.00) FROM THE ACCOUNT INTO WHICH REPAYMENT OF URBAN 3 4 DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANTS (UDAG) ARE DEPOSITED (UDAG REPAYMENT ACCOUNT) FOR THE 5 CONNELL PARK AND NOVEMBRINO SWIMMING POOLS 6 TO BE OPENED IN TIME FOR THE 2013 SWIM 7 8 SEASON" TO ALLOW THE REMAINING FUNDS IN THE 9 ACCOUNT TO BE USED FOR REPAIRS DONE TO THE CONNELL PARK SWIMMING POOL IN 2014 AND THE 10 REPAIRS CURRENTLY BEING DONE FOR THE 2015 11 SWIM SEASON OR UNTIL ALL FUNDS ARE 12 EXHAUSTED. 13 14 MR. MCGOFF: What is the recommendation of the Chair for the 15 16 Committee on Community Development? 17 MR. ROGAN: As Chairperson for the 18 Committee on Community Development, I 19 recommend final passage of Item 7-A. 20 MR. WECHSLER: Second. 21 MR. MCGOFF: On the question? Roll 22 call, please? 23 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Wechsler. 24 MR. WECHSLER: Yes. 25 MS. CARRERA: Mr. Rogan.

_	
	133
1	MR. ROGAN: Yes.
2	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Evans.
3	MR. EVANS: Yes.
4	MS. CARRERA: Mr. Gaughan.
5	MR. GAUGHAN: Yes.
6	MS. CARRERA: Mr. McGoff.
7	MR. MCGOFF: Yes. I hereby declare
8	Item 7-A legally and lawfully adopted.
9	If there is no further business,
10	I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
11	MR. ROGAN: Motion to adjourn.
12	MR. MCGOFF: This meeting is
13	adjourned.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

-

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

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

CATHENE S. NARDOZZI, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER