

From February 24 meeting

- 1. Council President Tom Schuster asked the following questions:**
 - a. Mr. Schuster asked if City Council may please have an update on repairs to The Lookout on Rte. 307 in the city. Council realizes the request for repairs is currently with the City Engineer and Parks Department for repair to the historic structure. Mr. Schuster asked that the city DPW department possibly clear the new graffiti presently on the walls of the Lookout.**
 - i. The Lookout is going through the process of being designated as a historic landmark and has a grant application pending with the state. DPW will investigate and remove the graffiti.
 - b. Mr. Schuster asked for a DPW Roads review of Wells Street and Marvine Avenue at the detour off N Main Avenue due to the Leggetts Creek bridge replacement project. Repairs have been made to a major pothole, but the streets are in bad shape due to heavy traffic and changing weather.**
 - i. The City meets with PennDOT routinely on this project. City DPQW has and will continue to repair the roadway. PennDOT plans to modify the detour signage to reduce the heavy traffic flow in the neighborhood and has issued a press release with updated detour information. SPD has also increased enforcement in this area to reduce truck traffic. It is likely that the street will need significant work when the project is completed.
 - c. Mr. Schuster kindly requests the presence of Atty. Andrew Cutillo, newly appointed SRA Director, at a City Council caucus in March. Updated plans for the authority by both the authority and the city. Also, what has been done over the last year.**
 - i. SRA Executive Director Andrew Cutillo appreciates the opportunity to present and has reached out to the City Clerk to schedule, tentatively for March 31.
 - d. Mr. Schuster asked if the city may provide Council with a five (5) year listing of PILOT payments made by the University of Scranton.**
 - i. Please see the attached report.
- 2. Councilman Sean McAndrew asked the following;**
 - a. Regarding the security assessment for city hall, Mr. McAndrew thanked the administration for the response. He has asked, for clarification, when was the assessment completed, by whom, and may Council have a copy of the assessment. Any copies, of course, may be shown in an executive session, due to the confidential nature such a report.**
 - i. Chief Carroll is available to answer Councilmember McAndrew's questions.
 - b. Mr. McAndrew thanked the IT Director for providing the answers and information in the 2/23 dated response from the city, and asked if all emails that were held**

due to this issue, were checked and released, so the recipients may receive and account for the emails.

- i. These emails were blocked from arrival. The nature of suspicious or compromised senders, especially given that there has been a previous ransomware attack at the school district, triggers our protocols. Our response includes not allowing any email to touch our network from the identified sender. Members of the SSD administration including Kevin Kearney <kevin.kearney@ssdedu.org> Chris Summa <chris.summa@ssdedu.org> Erin Keating <erin.keating@ssdedu.org>; and Robert Deluca <robert.deluca@ssdedu.org>; were notified of the suspension. The information provided to them is as follows:
 1. You are receiving this email as you have attempted to send an email to a user with an email address @scrantonpa.gov. Your domain triggered our cyber threat protocols, which resulted in a delivery suspension. Due to the suspension, the email was not received by the intended user. At this time, the suspension has been lifted and the domain's activity will continue to be monitored.
- ii. We will not be in a position to provide any more detailed information on this event beyond what was provided given the sensitive nature of our operational security posture.

c. Mr. McAndrew thanked the administration for the note that the DPW Director and Supervisor team will visit City Council caucus. The available dates in March now stand as 3/17, 3/24 and 3/31.

- i. Pennoni is available for a caucus on March 24. DPW is available for a caucus April 7.

d. Regarding Item 2C regarding fines and appeals in the attached 2/23 response, Councilman McAndrew asked the follow up questions below;

- i. **First, if an individual chooses not to file an appeal because the citation is \$100 and the non-refundable appeal fee begins at \$150, and instead elects to have the matter heard before the Magisterial District Judge, why is the fine being doubled?**
- ii. **Second, can you please identify where in the ordinance it authorizes the doubling of the fine if a person chooses to proceed before the Magistrate rather than pay the citation.**
 1. File of Council (FOC) #64 of 2014, Section 9, outlines fines and penalties. Quality of Life tickets were last amended under FOC #48 of 2023.

In summary:

 - a. Failure to remit payment within the time frame listed above, shall result in a late fee being imposed in the amount of ten (10%) percent of the ticket amount per day, up to ten (10) days.

- b. Failure of the person to make payment within ten (10) days of the date of a violation ticket shall result in the filing of a citation, for failure to pay, with the Magisterial District Judge.
- c. If violations are continuous or egregious, Code Officials have the right to issue citations without first issuing tickets, provided notice has been give.

3. Council Vice President Patrick Flynn asked the following question:

- a. **Mr. Flynn asked an additional query for a clearer view and process regarding pave cuts in the city. How long does the utility have to repair the pave cut after the pave cut inspector or Scranton311 makes contact with the utility? How long does the utility actually take for the repair and are there any average repair times available?**

- i. The Pave Cut process timeline is outlined below:

- 1. Temporary Restoration

- a. Opening is filled with material and compacted. Edges are not sealed.
- b. This is required to sit for 30 days before further restoration to observe any subsurface movement.
- c. If the area does experience settlement, the utility is responsible to dress the site or repatch.

- 2. Permanent Restoration

- a. This is the last step for most small cuts.
- b. Temporary patch is dug up
 - i. Pit is filled with loose stone aggregate
 - ii. Asphalt base and wearing courses are added and compacted
 - iii. Edges are sealed with tar
 - iv. Asphalt tag is pressed into hot asphalt

- 3. Final Overlay

- a. Any projects requiring extended paving or full width restoration will follow this step.
- b. The entire project area is milled and overlaid with hot asphalt.
- c. 5-year moratorium is added to protect roadway infrastructure,
 - i. Any cuts in this area for 5 years will repave the full width of the road within their excavation area plus 10 feet in both directions.

- 4. Important Notes:

- a. While a 90-day completion timer is observed, it must also be noted that winter weather and temperatures prevent the use and availability of hot asphalt. Roads simply cannot be properly restored and paved to the same level of quality

that they can in warmer stable weather. Work overlapping across the winter is given special attention and is required to be restored fully as soon as asphalt plants open in the Spring.

- b. Repair times can vary greatly due to the size of work. The City moved away from the size-based pricing model due to better represent the time spent excavating our roads. Inspectors are routinely on-site during excavation to ensure proper restoration and to flag failing work.

March 3, 2026