COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA
PUBLIC HEARING - COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

- - -

Room 400, City Hall
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Monday, November 22, 2004, 10:47 a.m.

- - -

040832 - Resolution authorizing City Council's Committee of the Whole to hold public hearings to investigate the Philadelphia Fire Department's proposed deployment; and, in furtherance of such investigation, authorizing the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents to the full extent authorized under section 2-401 of the Home Rule Charter.

040759 - An Ordinance amending Chapter 20-300 of The Philadelphia Code by changing the annual salaries of the members of the Board of Revision of Taxes and members of the Board of Viewers, all under certain terms and conditions.

PRESENT:

COUNCIL PRESIDENT ANNA C. VERNA
COUNCILWOMAN JANNIE L. BLACKWELL
COUNCILWOMAN BLONDELL REYNOLDS BROWN
COUNCILMAN DARRELL L. CLARKE
COUNCILMAN DAVID COHEN
COUNCILMAN FRANK DI CICCO
COUNCILMAN JACK KELLY
COUNCILMAN JAMES F. KENNEY
COUNCILWOMAN JOAN L. KRAJEWSKI
COUNCILMAN RICHARD T. MARIANO
COUNCILWOMAN DONNA REED MILLER
COUNCILMAN MICHAEL A. NUTTER
COUNCILMAN JUAN F. RAMOS
COUNCILWOMAN MARIAN B. TASCO

- - -

V A R A L L O Incorporated
Litigation Support Services
1835 Market Street, Suite 600
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
215.561.2220 215.567.2670

- - -

P R O C E E D I N G S

- - -

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Good morning, everyone.

This is a public hearing of the Committee of the Whole.

I would ask Mr. McPherson to please read the title of Resolution 040832.

MR. McPHERSON: A resolution authorizing City Council's Committee of the Whole to hold public hearings to investigate the Philadelphia Fire Department's proposed deployment; and, in furtherance of such investigation, authorizing the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents to the full extent authorized under section 2-401 of the Home Rule Charter.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: It is my understanding that the Managing Director will testify on this Bill. Is he here?

Please approach the witness table.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Good morning,

Council...

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Good morning.

MR. GOLDSMITH: ...President Verna and other Council people. My name is Phil Goldsmith, Managing Director of the City of Philadelphia.

And on behalf of the administration, I'm respectfully requesting a postponement for the appearance of administration witnesses until after the formal arbitration process on this issue concludes.

As you know, the issue of removing from service four engine and ladder companies has been taken to court and subsequently ordered to arbitration.

The IAFF has presented its case in arbitration, and the administration's case is still being heard.

Commissioner Ayers is scheduled to testify on December 2nd. And we believe that will conclude the administration's testimony and case before the arbitrator. We believe for Commissioner Ayers and other officials,

to have to provide testimony today, prior to the December 2nd date is premature and places the administration in an unfair position.

In the meantime, I remind you that the status quo remains in effect. No engine or ladder companies have been taken out of service. And delaying our testimony will have no impact on the current situation.

We do not dispute Council's right to hold hearings on this issue, nor for you to hear from other witnesses today.

We are simply requesting that our testimony be delayed until we have been given the same opportunity to present our full case to the arbitrator as the IAFF has already had.

Thank you very much.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: You're welcome.

The Chair at this time recognizes Councilman DiCicco.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Good morning. Thank you, Madam President. Good morning, Mr. Goldsmith.

Mr. Goldsmith, how long has the City been in arbitration with the union?

(Cell phone rings.)

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: A little musical rendition puts us at all ease.

MR. GOLDSMITH: I would have a much different theme song, believe me.

I think -- I don't have the dates. I actually left them back at my office. I can provide them for you. But I think it's been since September when the arbitrator was selected, but I'm not exactly sure. I can provide that information.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Well, I think it's a little bit longer than that. I mean, this whole discussion has been at least several months that we began to hear from the administration.

I think it was back in last April or May when we had a briefing with the former Fire Commissioner Hairston. That's when the... It was right about the time that the administration broke the news of these closures or reconfiguration of the Fire

Department to the media.

And subsequently to that we've had a number -- We had at least one briefing. And I know that I testified in front of Judge Carrafiello on the issue of a TRO. So I'm going to say it's at least seven months, if not for the full arbitration but at least discussions have been going on.

I'm just... You and I had a conversation Friday night when you called me to advise me that the administration made the decision that there would be no testimony forthcoming today.

Do you know how long it's been since this resolution was introduced?

MR. GOLDSMITH: I do not know.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Well, if I can tell you, it's been at least about four weeks.

I just find this to be... And this isn't personal. I say this often to people who come to testify. I don't like making these things personal. And I have a very difficult time when I'm trying to express my

dissatisfaction with the way things are going, and keep reminding myself that all of us have a job.

But I think this is a total disrespect for this Council and the City of Philadelphia, that after four weeks that a resolution has been sitting around, that the administration on the eve of the hearings decides by way of their counsel that they are not going to participate in these hearings today.

I think this is just another sign of the arrogance that we've all had to live with over these past several years. And again, this is not meant personally for you. You're appointed by the Mayor. And I understand when you get your marching orders, you have to do what you have to do.

But that being said, I don't know how -- And I expressed it to you on Friday night -- we were to be able to get this out to the public that the administration was not going to be testifying today.

So, I'm going to ask you a few

questions. I'm sure you'll decide which ones you think you should answer or which ones are appropriate to answer, based on your testimony. And then we'll go from there.

You're aware that this Council overrode the Mayor's veto last week in restoring the $67.7 million cuts to the Fire Department's budget?

MR. GOLDSMITH: Yes, I'm aware of that.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Do you have any idea what the administration intends to do with that money?

MR. GOLDSMITH: I do not know.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: On that same note, are you aware that we submitted -- I believe you submitted or the administration submitted to PICA in the revised five-year plan the Fire Department's budget increase by $6.7 million?

MR. GOLDSMITH: I'm not aware of the details of the PICA problem.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Well, the administration's five-year plan that was

resubmitted to PICA restored $6.7 million to the Fire Department's budget, which is about $47,000 less than the original Fire Department's budget.

Forgetting what Council did, forget the resolution, the transfer ordinance, forgetting the fact that we passed it unanimously, putting aside the fact that we overrode the Mayor's veto unanimously which says to the Mayor, we're giving you the money but we understand under the Charter the Mayor doesn't have to spend it, the administration restores all but $47,000 of the Fire Department's budget.

Do you have any idea what they intend to do with the money that they're putting into the Fire Department?

MR. GOLDSMITH: I'm not aware of the details.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: As the Managing Director, you oversee all departments, including the Fire Department?

MR. GOLDSMITH: That's correct.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Has the

Commissioner of the Fire Department discussed with you, advised you, as to what he would do with the $6.7 million that's being restored?

MR. GOLDSMITH: We have not had those discussions since the PICA report was filed.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Do you know where that money is coming from, the restoration?

MR. GOLDSMITH: I do not know.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: If I told you it was coming from fringe benefits, where we have talked about all along possibly using that original money? When we did the ordinance we suggested maybe it comes from fringe benefits, if I told you that's where it's coming from, would you believe that? Are you aware of that?

MR. GOLDSMITH: I know that's where it was slated to come from.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: So the Fire Commissioner won't be here today to testify either; is that correct?

MR. GOLDSMITH: That's correct.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Do you know when the Fire Fighters' Union wrapped up its arbitration?

MR. GOLDSMITH: Now, let me say, I do have my Blackberry here, and if I can just give you the exact dates, the arbitration process began in October. I think October 5th was the first hearing.

There have been six hearing dates, October 5th, October 6th, October 8th, October 13th, October 26th and November 12th.

Two dates, October 7th and October 28th, were postponed for a death in the arbitrator's family and a serious illness in the family of one of our attorneys.

The next hearing date is December 2nd. I don't know when the arbitrators... the union concluded its testimony, but it was several weeks ago.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: It's about a month. It's about a month.

And I'm not asking for specific dates, unless you have them. But it's about a month ago that the union wrapped up its

case. City has not yet. Do you have any idea when they will?

MR. GOLDSMITH: Well, as I indicated, I think Commissioner Ayers will be our last witness. That's December 2nd.

We have been told that the union plans to introduce some rebuttal witnesses. We do not know who they are or how many. So that could prolong it past December 2nd.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: When the former Fire Commissioner and others testified at a briefing before City Council in the caucus room last spring, the former Fire Commissioner stated then, as he did at the hearing in front of Judge Carrafiello, that were it not for the budget, he would have never made these recommendations in the first place.

Do you know if the administration's position has changed in any way since then, in the interest of public safety, at least, that we all recognize that this is going to have a very negative impact on the issue of public safety, not only for the people who I

represent in the First Councilmanic District, which would experience 11 fire company engines being replaced or shut down? Has there been any discussion since then on the issue of public safety?

MR. GOLDSMITH: I have had discussions with the current Fire Commissioner and his deputies. And I believe as former Commissioner Hairston said that this would not jeopardize public safety.

Obviously, if we had more funds in the City, it probably would not be something that we would wish to do. But both Commissioner Hairston, Commissioner Ayers, in my judgment would not recommend and have not recommended anything that would jeopardize public safety.

I might add that our scenario was to use this restructuring and reconfiguration to provide more medic units which we do believe the City desperately needs.

And so, we think that there's two sides of the public safety coin here.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: I could agree.

And I also think that when you reduce the number of fire apparatus, and you have a reconfiguration of 15 fire stations throughout the City -- and I don't mean this to be in any way humorous -- I think the number of incidents that would require EMS units is going to increase, because the longer it takes for fire personnel to respond, the likelihood is that people who are involved in that fire will experience potential to be become harmed or injured, as would the fire personnel.

I think when you remove it -- And the reason we have such a great, I think, one of the -- We have, if those numbers are correct, and I'll believe them, that the number of fires have gone down significantly is that is a direct correlation to the Fire Department.

I mean, their role is not just to put out fires. They play a significant role in this City in educating people on the prevention of fire. They go throughout neighborhoods installing smoke detectors.

That's part of the function of the Fire Department, in addition to many other things, they respond to emergencies before an EMS unit gets there, in many instances.

Those numbers, I think, will go up dramatically if we reduce this Fire Department any further than we are today.

How many fire personnel are there; do you know?

MR. GOLDSMITH: I'm not sure of the exact number right now.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: I think it's 20 something hundred? 2200? Down significantly. I don't know what it was -- Do you know what it was five years ago? Anybody can answer that, it would be helpful.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 2400.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: 2400 acting?

When the Fire Commissioner made those recommendations, he testified also that there was an in-house study done.

We have consistently asked that an independent study be conducted. This Council was prepared to spend its money from its

budget to retain an independent consultant to do a study.

And we all agreed, including me, that if that study were to support what the recommendations of this administration are or any other cuts, that we'd all have to walk away and call it a day, including the Fire Department, the fire unit, the firefighters unit. They all said the same thing. We were ready to spend the money. The City refused to cooperate.

Do you have any sense if they'd be willing to cooperate today on supplying that independent consultant with the materials that are necessary to do an independent study?

MR. GOLDSMITH: I think right now we're in the arbitration process. You were a litigant in the court decision that put us into arbitration. We believe that the arbitration process should be followed. Each side has the opportunity to present its case.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: But I think that that's --

MR. GOLDSMITH: Councilman, let me say, the one thing I clearly remember in that caucus room is your saying that you didn't care what the facts showed, that you would be against any configuration. That's something that I --

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: No. That's --

MR. GOLDSMITH: -- specifically recall you saying that.

So I'm not sure whether an independent study, regardless of what it shows, is going to resolve this issue.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: I don't recall in what context I said that.

But I'm saying it now on the record that I always say -- I believe I said -- and if I said it and it came out differently, I apologize -- that an independent study we always felt was the correct way to go.

We wouldn't be in arbitration if that study was being conducted or had been completed by now.

I know we're not going to really get anywhere today. And I apologize to the

people who came here today. I appreciate their support.

And had we known that we were not going to get any testimony, real testimony today, we certainly would have decided whether or not we wanted to go forward with these hearings.

So I apologize to my colleagues and the members of the public.

I just need to ask you one other question. How many new positions have been created in the Managing Director's Office in the last 30 days?

MR. GOLDSMITH: I'll be glad to provide that information.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Have there been new positions created?

MR. GOLDSMITH: There have been new positions, yes.

One new position that I'm aware of. We have hired someone. We've had replacement positions, obviously, as all departments do from time to time.

I have created a position, brought

someone in for Office of Emergency Management, someone that has served in Iraq, who's got an MBA, who we think is expert in logistics, and is just the type of person we need to help us with public safety. And that's a position that I have no problem defending.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: And I'm sure the person is qualified. And I certainly understand the importance of hiring someone in that position, in this day that we live in, with terrorists and all the other problems that we have to face. And I'm certainly not questioning this person's qualifications.

In fact, I don't even know what the positions are, but I've been led to believe that there have been at least six new hires, not replacements. These are six new hires in the last month or so.

And I was just curious if you can give me a dollar figure on what the average salary is for those new positions.

MR. GOLDSMITH: I would have to get

back to you on that.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Would you supply that to the Chair? I'd appreciate it.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Sure.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Could you tell us who that person is that you hired for the Emergency Management?

MR. GOLDSMITH: Chad Bowen.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Chad?

MR. GOLDSMITH: Bowen, B-o-w-e-n.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Bowen. Thank you.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Who just returned from Iraq, and I think, again, will bring his own assets to the City, in terms of public safety.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Thank you, Mr. Goldsmith.

And thank you, Madam Chair. I have no further questions at this time.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Councilman Kenney.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: Thank you, Madam

President.

Just for the record, Mr. Goldsmith, I assume there are also firefighters who are returning from Iraq and going to Iraq as we speak. And I think there's been contributions to this war from, you know, many, many sectors in our city government.

And just to make sure the record's clear, that there's firefighters that are protecting us here and abroad.

Let me ask you a question about the legal issues, relative to your decision or the administrations' decision not to testify here today.

An arbitration is not a jury trial, where if someone hears information outside of the courtroom or outside of the hearing room, that there's any meaningful harm.

I mean, I don't imagine you're going to say anything differently to the arbitrator than you're going to say to us here today, to the public. And I don't think -- The arbitrator's probably not in the room.

I don't understand the exposure you

think the City has by just telling the truth today and telling the truth in front of the arbitrator on December 2nd.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Well, we plan to tell the truth.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: And I'm not saying you're not.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Right.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: What's the difference?

MR. GOLDSMITH: Well, the difference is quite clear because... because the union's here, and the union representatives are here. And it's -- You know, if you want to go into legal terms -- while I'm a lawyer, I don't practice law -- it's a form of discovery.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: Well, their case is already presented.

MR. GOLDSMITH: No.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: And they're not the enemy.

MR. GOLDSMITH: No.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: I mean --

MR. GOLDSMITH: Of course they're

not. Nor is the administration the enemy, I might add.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: Right. I mean, this is not -- this is not -- This is --

MR. GOLDSMITH: We're just asking for -- We're just asking -- You know, let me get back to the notification process.

There was a miscommunication between the Mayor's Office and the Managing Director's Office as to the time of this hearing, which I will take responsibility for.

And we did not learn of it until Friday. And while I now know that there was notice a month ago, I did not know about it.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: I have no dispute with that.

My question is...

MR. GOLDSMITH: Right.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: ...is that you have a set of facts. Union had a set of facts.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Right.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: They put their

set of facts forward. You have your ending set of facts you've been putting forward. And December 2nd you expect to wrap it up.

They're all the same facts. There are two different viewpoints.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Right.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: But where's the legal harm in having a discussion about it today? I don't understand.

MR. GOLDSMITH: I'm not sure -- I'm not sure -- I -- Because I don't understand why Council can't wait until after that date, and let us conclude our case. They have concluded their case. It just seems to me to be a certain sense of equilibrium about it. And...

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: The thing I'm having trouble understanding is, what impact discussion in this chamber today has on the arbitration, when it's going to be the same set of facts, the same position that you have now, that you'll have December 2nd, that you've had, and then the arbitrator in a separate exercise will make a decision. And

we here in a separate exercise will come up with our conclusions. It's all the same information. What's so secret about it?

MR. GOLDSMITH: Well, it's -- it's not a -- It's not a question of being secret. It's a question of, we did not know -- we did not have the opportunity to -- to hear in public what the -- the union representatives were going to say.

And we didn't have our counsel there to prepare -- to prepare based on what they would say in public for their cross-examination.

Our witnesses are cross-examined, as they should be. And it's just -- I don't think it's necessary.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: I think the sad part about it is, this is not about somebody winning or losing.

This is about how best to serve the public. And obviously the administration has a position on that, and Council has their views, and the union and firefighters have their views.

But it's all for the same goal of serving the public. And this kind of adversarial attitude or adversarial position that, we can't let them hear what we have to say, and they can't hear what we have to say, and Council can't hear it until after December 2nd, to me is kind of silly.

And I wonder: In your testimony today, there's no mention of the Law Department advising you to do this. Have you sought advice from the Law Department?

MR. GOLDSMITH: I have -- I have sought advice from the Law Department.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: And under legal advice, is this what -- I mean, usually in testimony, if your lawyers tell you not to do something, you usually say, under advice of counsel, and that's not in here.

MR. GOLDSMITH: I'm not -- I'm not going on legal grounds solely. I think obviously if Council wants to subpoena the witnesses, they can subpoena the witness.

I'm just saying out of a question of fairness --

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: Fairness to who?

MR. GOLDSMITH: Well, fairness -- fairness to both sides here, and that --

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: Both sides are serving the same public.

MR. GOLDSMITH: I understand that.

And both sides have different points of view.

And we believe that since the arbitration process has begun, since we have we are close to conclusion, we don't see the harm to wait for this, our witnesses to testify here, until we've had the full chance to present our view.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: And I guess --

MR. GOLDSMITH: I just don't understand.

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: Because --

MR. GOLDSMITH: That's not adversarial. That's just to me, you know...

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: I think probably we're in this dilemma because Councilman DiCicco organized the hearing, did the resolution. We have almost a full Council

here, witnesses here, people here in the public.

And as Councilman said, you know, Friday afternoon we find out that the rules have changed or the game plan has changed. It is difficult.

This is a public process, and people go out of their way and are inconvenienced to come here, and then are told when they get here, we're not going to talk.

So, I mean, I just don't see there's any harm in having this discussion today and having it on December 2nd, and having the arbitrator make whatever decision they're going to make.

I just don't understand, frankly, why we can't know about what our government is doing, or what it wants to do, or why. And I think that's part of what we're sitting here doing, is representing people who want to know from us, through us, why the government takes certain actions.

And right now, to be told we can't tell you, or you can't know, or it's a secret

is really not acceptable. So...

But thank you.

Councilman DiCicco, I think you had a follow-up.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: The Chair recognizes Councilman DiCicco.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Madam Chair, just to follow up on Councilman Kenney's comments, on the advice of the Law Department or legal counsel, is it also the opinion of the outside counsel? Because outside counsel is representing the city in this arbitration?

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: The testimony does not mention on the advice of counsel. And I don't think that the Managing Director confirmed that he got advice from the Law Department on this, but for other factors involved. So, to make sure, I mean, I don't think any lawyer told him not to come here.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: That's what I was asking. That's basically my question.

MR. GOLDSMITH: No. I'm -- I'm -- I'm -- I'm coming here based on conversations that I've -- I've -- I've had with -- with

the Law Department, based on the fact that... that I personally and the Fire Commissioner did not receive notice on this till late Friday.

And as a -- as a matter of -- in my strong belief, that since we are in arbitration -- the arbitration is almost concluded -- asking Council for a delay in hearing our -- our -- our witnesses. I'm not standing on legal grounds. I'm just standing on asking for your indulgence.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Okay. And I just wanted to be clear on that because I know there is outside counsel, I believe, that was retained to represent the city in this arbitration matter. They were retained also on the TRO.

MR. GOLDSMITH: That's correct.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: That's correct.

Madam Chair, just one more statement, and then I'm probably wrap it up. I'll go back to one of my original --

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Councilman DiCicco, by any chance do you have a copy of

the letter that we forwarded to the Mayor, requesting certain witnesses be here to testify?

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Not with me, Madam President. It's back at our office. And that was... A week ago? A week ago this past Friday I believe the letter was sent out. So, whatever date that was, the 11th or 12th. I'm not sure of the exact date.

And not to put the Managing Director on the spot, my legislative assistant, Mr. Abernathy, informed me that the Mayor's Office -- people he spoke with in the Mayor's Office said that they had contacted the Managing Director's Office as early as... and the Commissioner as early as last week for information that could have been used at this hearing.

And I take Mr. Goldsmith at his word. I told him that Friday night. I believe that he was not aware of this until Friday. And I fully believe that he's telling me the truth, so I have no question -- no problems with that.

I just want to remind everybody again, that forgetting the action of the City Council when we introduced the appropriations transfer, which passed unanimously, we overrode the Mayor's veto this past Thursday unanimously, the administration in its own five-year revised budget to PICA, fully restores the money to the Fire Department.

I don't know why we need to even go to arbitration. Why don't we just call this a day, and do the right thing and maintain the Fire Department at its current level --

(Applause and cheers.)

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: -- at its current level, and put this thing to rest?

To me, the one thing I always remember saying is, none of this ever made sense to me, to make these cuts, and in particular the 11 departments in my District, in the most densely populated neighborhoods in the City of Philadelphia, and some of the -- probably the fewer neighborhoods in the City that are repopulating, to reduce the number of fire personnel just doesn't make

sense to me. Never did; never will.

And the only thing I said -- And maybe that's where the confusion is, Mr. Goldsmith, as to whether or not I would accept things. I just kept saying, I can't accept this, because it makes no sense.

But needless to say, there is an arbitration hearing, unless the Mayor does the right thing between now and December 2nd. Just let's wrap this thing up and get back to business on the other things we need to do, so that the public can rest and the firefighters can rest easy, knowing that they're going to have what they need to put out fires, which is what their job is -- and we depend on them -- and the citizens of this city can rest a little bit easier.

My God, we spent $50 million on Safe Streets. Now we're talking about laying off cops, I guess because the streets are so safe in Philadelphia today because of Safe Streets we don't need as many cops.

So, you know, let's put some money back into the Fire Department.

(Applause and cheers.)

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Are there any other questions from members of the Committee of Mr. Goldsmith?

(No response.)

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Seeing none, Mr. Goldsmith, thank you.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Thank you very much.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Are we allowed to hear from any other witnesses at this point in time?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: We are?

Are there any witnesses that would like to testify?

Please approach the witness table.

(Applause.)

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Kindly identify yourself for the record and proceed with your testimony.

MR. GAUL: Good morning, City Council.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Good morning.

MR. GAUL: My name is Bill Gaul. I'm the Vice President of the Philadelphia Firefighters Union.

MR. POULSON: Good morning, Madam President and members of Council.

My name is Richard Poulson. I'm an attorney with the firm of Willig, Williams & Davidson, and we are counsel to the Philadelphia Firefighters Union, IAFF Local 22.

And Vice President Gaul asked me to appear with him this morning because there were questions concerning an ongoing arbitration between the City and Local 22.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Okay.

MR. GAUL: Go ahead?

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Please do.

MR. POULSON: Thank you, ma'am.

MR. GAUL: First of all, I'd like to apologize for my President not being here. And I'd like to thank City Council, the citizens and the firefighters for showing up. And I want to thank you for the $6.7 million you gave to our budget.

We're in arbitration right now, but we're fully prepared -- the local is fully prepared to answer any questions.

Nothing prevents this administration right now from agreeing to an independent study. That's all we want. Yous already gave us the money for that. An unbiased, professional opinion is basically all we're asking for in this arbitration.

If the administration does not take this opportunity, we believe it's appropriate for City Council to demand that they do, ma'am.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: No.

MR. GAUL: We have until June 30th. They're going to delay this grievance procedure as long as they have, which is all right because the companies are still open.

But it's wrong. This arbitrator doesn't want to make a decision.

This is going to end up going into our Act 111.

Basically we look forward to rescheduling this event. And I -- My

membership and the citizens feel it's wrong that the Fire Department is not here answering the questions. Nobody in the Fire Department believes this is safe.

(Applause.)

MR. GAUL: Two people -- and they're political appointees. No fireman behind me will tell you that this plan is safe.

All the cuts are in the same neighborhood. Why? If they do an independent study, what they're going to find out is, we're completely under protected in all of our perimeter neighborhoods: South, southwest, northeast, northwest. Roxborough. We're all completely under protected.

Closing these companies is just going to increase response time.

You increase response time, we're not going to get there.

We don't get there, your stuff is going to burn. You're going to get injured, and you might die.

Then firemen are going to get injured. Firemen can't sue the city, but the

dependents can.

And I'm here to tell you that I will hold Mayor Street, Phil Goldsmith, Lloyd Ayers, John McGrath, and Ernie Hargate publicly and personally responsible for any injuries to any of my members. I will have their dependents.

Thank you very much for the money.

(Applause and cheers.)

MR. GAUL: We're in arbitration right now, but we'll answer any questions, Council people.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: I would just like the record to reflect that we in Council were certainly willing to pay for an independent study.

However, when we communicated with a consultant, I believe from Boston, he had indicated that he would not -- He certainly wanted to do the study.

However, he would not accept our offer unless we gave him a commitment that the administration would supply them with all information that they needed and data that

they needed to have in order to participate.

And we were told that that would not be forthcoming.

So he said that he certainly would not, he would not be the consultant.

So, any consultant that we would attempt to hire would certainly need the information that this particular consultant needed.

But I want you to know and the record to reflect that Council was certainly willing to do just that.

MR. GAUL: Yes, ma'am. And for that we're very appreciative.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Thank you.

Are there any questions or comments fromany members of the Committee?

(No response.)

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Seeing none, I thank you, gentlemen.

COUNCILMAN COHEN: Madam President.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Yes, sir.

COUNCILMAN COHEN: I think Councilman DiCicco made out the case that the

Council was dealing with the other day at the Council meeting.

Any delay in response time means real threats to the safety of both the firemen and all the citizens of Philadelphia.

And I think it's a disgrace that the Mayor of the city is refusing to take the appropriate action. If he has the money, what's he saving it for?

(Applause.)

COUNCILMAN COHEN: What could be more important than the welfare of the people?

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Thank you.

MR. GAUL: Thank you very much, Councilman.

MR. POULSON: Madam President.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Mr. Poulson.

MR. POULSON: Vice President Gaul has asked me to address the city's assertion that there is -- the fact that there's an ongoing arbitration hearing somehow precludes the administration from responding to

Council's request that they appear today and testify concerning this issue of public safety.

And I just want to make clear to Council that the arbitration currently that's in process is not over whether or not the city's required to perform an independent study before it closes fire companies.

The question is whether the city violated its legal and contractual obligations to Local 22's bargaining unit members.

And it will result in either the fire companies staying open or the fire companies closing.

Ultimately, as a city we're going to have to deal with the question of how is the Fire Department going to look in the future.

And there is nothing involved in this arbitration that prevents the city or anyone from participating in a process to determine how the department is going to look.

Local 22 from day one has said that

all we want is a study, and we're willing to live with the results of the study. It may show increases. It may show that there are decreases, but it's about the process in this case.

It appears that this administration is not concerned with process. They're more concerned with what they want to do, and not what they're required to do.

And we think that there's a real leadership vacuum. And if the City is not taken -- If the administration has not taken this opportunity that Council unanimously has provided the administration, with an additional seven months of full funding so that they can study, we believe it's appropriate for Council to consider steps that it may take in order to legislate a solution that would require an independent study.

Thank you.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Thank you, Mr. Poulson.

Councilman Cohen, are you finished,

sir? Do you still have more questions or comments?

COUNCILMAN COHEN: No. I've completed my comment.

It's very much like people who are subject to grand jury consideration or their stories out that they're being investigated.

If they didn't want to talk in the first place, somehow they use the grand jury investigation as a further shield against talking.

The grand jury investigation, if it means anything, means an effort to restore in Philadelphia openness, honesty and confidence in its citizenry.

You never achieve those goals if you remain quiet. And the administration is trying to use the arbitration as a weapon in its favor, and it's dead wrong.

People have a right to know. And there's no legal bar whatever, none whatever, to both sides discussing fully all the issues at arbitration. And anybody who says differently is trying to hide something. And

that's what I think is occuring here.

(Applause.)

COUNCILMAN COHEN: Thank you, Madam President.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Thank you, Councilman Cohen.

The Chair recognizes Councilman DiCicco.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Madam President, I'm sorry. My light was on. My mistake. Sorry.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Okay.

Are there any other questions of the witnesses, any members of the Committee?

Councilwoman Miller.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I just have one question, and that actually is a request. And that would be that we receive a copy of any cutbacks or projected cutbacks from the Fire Department from the Managing Director city-wide because I don't think that all Council members are very clear how any of the cutbacks would

impact their individual Council Districts.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: We'll ask the Managing Director to certainly provide that information.

COUNCILWOMAN MILLER: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure I asked that before the Committee hearing was recessed.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Thank you.

Any other questions or comments from members of the Committee?

Gentlemen, thank you very much.

Do we have anyone else to testify on this resolution?

Please approach the witness table.

(Applause.)

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Good morning. Please identify yourself for the record.

MS. CANCILLARI: Good morning. My name is Lisa Cancillari. I am the Principal of Holy Redeemer School at 915 Vine Street.

And I thank you for the opportunity to just let the record reflect how some of these cuts will impact some of the people in

the various Districts, particularly ours.

I come here on behalf of quite a few people, probably well over a thousand people, when you consider our students, their families, and our teachers.

And the number of lives that would actually be affected by a fire tragedy would be much, much higher. The impact that the loss of lives would have on our community would be immense.

And we... Really, this only represents a small portion of the Chinatown community. And I'm heartened to hear that Council is so appalled that they're even considering cutting back on fire safety.

We teach our students at our school about fire prevention and fire safety, and we work very closely with the Fire Department on this.

We brought our junior fire patrol here today. They work throughout the year in our school and in our community to raise awareness about prevention and safety. And we thought it was important for them to come

and see city government in action.

(Applause.)

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: We welcome you.

MS. CANCILLARI: We want our children to grow up with a sense of responsibility for each other.

And what I've heard today in Council is that awareness. And Council members have been echoing that same idea of being responsible for each other and for people's lives.

Our students also learn that government is established to insure the common good.

And I remember that a few short years ago we were right here testifying about the stadium. And the psychological effects of building a new stadium were justification enough to build this entertainment venue. How would this affect the people, and how would this affect them psychologically?

Well, imagine the psychological effects of closing all of these fire

stations, and what effect that would have?

If our city government is really considering, you know, how important this is to the people, and how important that was, then certainly they'll realize what a mistake it would be to close all of these fire stations.

So we're just asking that our city government do the responsible thing, be a model of responsibility for our children, and take lives into consideration, and don't close any fire stations.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Thank you.

I certainly want to thank you and your students for coming in and testifying. We appreciate your concern, and we welcome you at any time. Thank you so much.

(Applause.)

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: do we have any other witnesses to testify?

(No response.)

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: No? Okay.

Then we will go on with our public hearing.

Gentlemen, I'm sure you all have other things that you would like to be doing. We're not going to conclude this hearing until we hear from -- We still have another bill to be considered, but we will be continuing this particular resolution until the call of the Chair. Okay.

And we thank you. And we do apologize. We did not know that there was going to be a request made this morning that we not have a public hearing on this resolution.

So, I do apologize to all of you. We certainly would have notified you had we known on Friday. Thank you again.

(Pause.)

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: I would ask Mr. McPherson to please rad the title of Bill Number 040759.

MR. McPHERSON: An Ordinance amending Chapter 20-300 of The Philadelphia Code by changing the annual salaries of the members of the Board of Revision of Taxes and

members of the Board of Viewers, all under certain terms and conditions.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Mr. Glancey, would you take the witness table, please. Good morning. Thank you for your patience.

MR. GLANCEY: Good morning. Good morning, Madam President and members of City Council.

My name is David Glancey, and I am the Chairperson of the Board of Revision of Taxes.

And thank you for giving me the opportunity today to speak on this Bill.

We sent in written testimony, so I'm not going to read the testimony that we sent in. The most important part about my testimony this morning is that we're not asking for any increased appropriation from Council in this Bill or from the administration. We're asking for no increase in appropriation.

We have this money in our budget. But as you know, unlike other departments of

the city, we need the legislative authority from City Council in order to increase the compensation for members of the Board of Revision of Taxes and for the members of the Board of View.

And that's why I'm here today. That's why that bill was introduced, was to get that legislative authority from Council. And as I indicated, we do have the money that exists in the budget.

With that, I'd be happy just to take any questions that any Council people may have on this matter.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: All right. Mr. Glancey, to the best of your knowledge, you have indicated that the administration is in favor.

MR. GLANCEY: Let me clarify. I thought that was the case when I spoke to you earlier this morning. I have just been told by the representative from the administration that the administration's official position on this is no position.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: No

position?

COUNCILMAN KENNEY: Consistent.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: That's unusual.

Councilwoman Brown.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Thank you, Madam President.

I would be curious to know the last time there was a salary increase for members of the board.

MR. GLANCEY: Sure. For the board of Revision of Taxes, Councilwoman, it was eight years ago.

For the Board of View, it was 16 years ago. There hasn't been an increment for the Board of View in 16 years and for the Board of Revision 8 years.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: What is the number, the membership of both institutions?

MR. GLANCEY: There are seven members of the Board of Revision of Taxes, and there are three members of the Board of View, although the Board of Revision may also serve as Viewers.

However, since I'm the Chairperson administratively of the Board of View as well, all of the condemnation matters have been sent to just the Board of Viewers. They hear all of our condemnation matters at this point.

And of course, as you know, hopefully, there will be some substantial condemnations, with the expansion of the Convention Center that will be taking place in the future.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Thank you for your testimony.

Thank you, Madam President.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: You're welcome.

The Chair recognizes Councilwoman Tasco.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you.

Good morning. Are these positions full-time?

MR. GLANCEY: Can't hear you.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Are these positions full-time? Are they based on --

MR. GLANCEY: No, they're not per diem. There is -- The salaries are full-time salaries. Under the City Code, members of the board may have other positions, may be parts of law firms, may be parts of accounting firms.

I will tell you, however, that I went through the board -- When this question was kind of posed by somebody over in my office, I went to the web site, the city web site, and took a list of all the boards and commissions that the city has.

And I was trying to figure out what is the most -- what board or commission are we most analogous to.

And believe it or not, we are not like any of the per diem boards. And most of the boards and commissions are that way. We are probably closest in analogy to the City Commissioners.

The Board of City Commissioners has to run their office, and they also have to run elections. The Board of Revision of Taxes has to run the assessment process and

hear all the appeals from that particular process as well.

Seems to me -- And I don't have any idea what the compensation of the Board of Commissioners is, nor do I care. But when you just look at the function of it, that's what happens.

And the board members, I will tell you, just by time, we roughly, six to seven months a year, are in hearings, roughly six months a year, three days a week in hearings.

There are times when some of the board members don't have to be there, but I'm there all the time, as is the secretary and as is the vice chairman.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: You said that the board, members of the Board of Revision of Taxes -- (Microphone not on, not reportable.)

MR. GLANCEY: We also have that authority to be members of the Board of view, Yes. When we are sworn in as members of the Board of Revision of Taxes, we are also sworn in as members of the Board of Viewers.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So how are you paid? Do you get paid to serve on both committees?

MR. GLANCEY: No, we do not. It's just one salary, that's correct.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: You're welcome.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Hold on a second.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: The Chair recognizes -- Oh, Councilwoman Tasco.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Say you have the money in your budget, is this ongoing? Will you come into Council at your next budget and say, we need to have the money to sustain those pieces that we gave them this year? Is the money enough money to sustain them without asking for an increase?

MR. GLANCEY: We do. We have that money in the budget currently. Assuming we don't lose any of the money in our '05-'06 budget, we will not be asking you for any further increment.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: How much does it cover, the total?

MR. GLANCEY: The total would be $100,000. There are ten members. If you take the Board of Revision of Taxes, seven, and three members of the Board of View, it would be $10,000 for each of those members.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: So, $100,000?

MR. GLANCEY: Yes.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: The Chair recognizes Councilman Mariano.

COUNCILMAN MARIANO: Thank you, Madam President.

Mr. Glancey, this isn't about your raise, right?

MR. GLANCEY: I'm sorry?

COUNCILMAN MARIANO: This isn't about a raise for you, because I know you work hard, because I call you 7. Days a week, 24 hours a day.

MR. GLANCEY: That's right. That's right.

COUNCILMAN MARIANO: This isn't about you, right? You don't get a raise out

of this, do you?

MR. GLANCEY: Of course I do.

COUNCILMAN MARIANO: Oh, you do?

MR. GLANCEY: Yes.

COUNCILMAN MARIANO: I'm sorry. I'm not following.

MR. GLANCEY: No. Yes, this is for all the board, all the members of the board.

COUNCILMAN MARIANO: I thought you were, like, the Executive Director or something.

MR. GLANCEY: No. No, not for this. This is for the board.

COUNCILMAN MARIANO: So we've got to sit you here and ask you if it's all right for you to get a raise?

MR. GLANCEY: That's correct.

COUNCILMAN MARIANO: What are you supposed to say? No?

Who else is on the board?

MR. GLANCEY: I thought I put it attached to the testimony, but I can tell you Robert Nix is the Secretary of the Board. David Zwanetz is the Vice Chairman of the

Board. Dveral Silberstein is a member of the Board. Charlesretta Meade is a member of the Board. Harvey Levin is a member of the Board. And finally, our newest member is Joseph Russo.

I might add -- and it's interesting the way you asked the question -- is that two members of the Board will be on the DROP program.

COUNCILMAN MARIANO: One.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: One member, Mr. Zwanetz, is leaving January 30th of '05.

The other member in the DROP program is me, and I will be leaving the board in March of '07.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Who are the members of the Board of View?

MR. GLANCEY: Who are the members of the Board of View?

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: For the record.

MR. GLANCEY: For the record, the Chairperson of that is a new member, Mr. Jim

O'Connell. He is the attorney member that we need to have.

Ms. Jane Scaccetti is also a member. She's a CPA. She's a member of that particular board, as is Maurice Floyd.

COUNCILMAN MARIANO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Glancey.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Councilman Cohen.

COUNCILMAN COHEN: I would be helped if you could tell us what the salaries are now and how it will change.

MR. GLANCEY: The current salaries of the Board of Revision of Taxes are $60,000 for all members, $65,000 for the Chairperson.

The Board of View is $40,000. Each member gets $40,000.

The change would be: The members of the Board of Revision of Taxes from $60,000 to $70,000 and the Chairman from $65,000 to $75,000.

And a $10,000 increment for the Board of View would be $40,000 to $50,000.

COUNCILMAN COHEN: Seems to me the increases are very reasonable. And we ought to have no problem at all with them.

And we ought to applaud the Chair of the Board that's testifying for having accumulated the budgets that he doesn't want to add to our fiscal problem at all.

So I think we ought to give approval as quickly as possible and applaud the Chairman for the action taken, and wish him well in whatever new endeavors...

MR. GLANCEY: Thank you.

COUNCILMAN COHEN: ...he gets involved in.

MR. GLANCEY: I have two more years. I hope my endeavors will still be here for a good two full years anyway.

COUNCILMAN COHEN: Good. Good. We'll add for that, and maybe we'll come to you after that to stay two more years ad infinitum.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Who says you'r not agreeable.

The Chair recognizes --

COUNCILMAN COHEN: Who said that, Mariano? That's because Mariano thinks of me as his grandfather. I always think of him as my grandson. So it's fair enough.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: The Chair recognizes Councilman DiCicco.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

And good morning, Mr. Glancey. I was out of the room, so I apologize if the question has been asked already.

When was the last time you folks got a raise?

MR. GLANCEY: The last time the Board of Revision of Taxes received an increase was eight years ago, 1996.

The last time the Board of View received an increase was in 1988, 16 years ago.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Thank you. Again, I apologize if it was already asked. I was out of the room.

And I do appreciate all the work that you've done. Someone last year, the

year before, was up there almost daily. And has given me good service. When I say me, meaning my constituents.

And through that whole proceedings during the recent increases, I don't recall any one person who we represented calling me up saying they were not satisfied with the readjustment and the fact that they all believe they were treated professionally.

And I want to thank you again publicly for that.

MR. GLANCEY: Thank you.

COUNCILMAN DiCICCO: Thank you again, Madam Chair.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Councilwoman Blackwell.

COUNCILWOMAN BLACKWELL: Thank you, Madam President.

I agree with all that has been said today. And, in fact, as has been said, it's extremely reasonable. The money's there. All we're talking about is authority.

And we could have dealt with this

during the budget process, but just so that they were patient enough even, Mr. Glancey was patient enough to say, wait a minute. He didn't want to get caught up with all the issues of raises.

And so they waited until now. And I think they've been more than fair with us. Absolutely we're also satisfied with the job that they do. And certainly we are happy to support this legislation.

Thank you, Madam President.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Councilman Kelly.

COUNCILMAN KELLY: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I just want to mention that as a former employee of the Board of Revision of Taxes, I'm probably more aware of what goes on there than probably most people in Council.

But I know that there are a lot of dedicated people there that do an excellent job. They have been, and they I'm sure

they're going to continue.

But I just want to say, and I want to commend the Chairman for the way that he conducts those hearings on appeals.

Now, most of us -- I know that I for one would sit there day in and day out to listen to some of them, the same stories over and over.

But yet, the Chairman, I have noticed when I was there, he treats everyone as if that's the only thing he's heard that day. And I think that's a real, real commendable thing that he's been doing. And he's been doing it for years. And I just want to let him know that I really appreciate it.

MR. GLANCEY: Thank you.

COUNCILMAN KELLY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Chair recognizes Councilwoman Tasco.

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Thank you.

(Microphone not on, not reportable.)

I don't know what's wrong with my

mike. But when -- When each department is asked to cut their budget back by a percentage, are you in your department asked to cut back?

MR. GLANCEY: Your question is were we asked to cut back money?

COUNCILWOMAN TASCO: Right.

MR. GLANCEY: Not in the budget go-round we were not.

And the reason, I believe -- and I won't speak for the administration -- but I think it was pretty obvious, is that even though we don't do the taxes -- it's not up to us -- we are obviously a part of the revenue raising function of the City of Philadelphia, to a certain degree.

And even more so was, in the past, Councilwoman, we had pared down from the early '90s up until the current period of time, actually up until about the year 2002. We had pared down about 35 percent of the staff we had, beginning in the early '90s. So we had done what I would consider yoeman's work beforehand, and we haven't been asked to

do that again this year.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: The Chair recognizes Councilwoman Krajewski.

COUNCILWOMAN KRAJEWSKI: Thank you.

I just wanted to go on record as well as to compliment Mr. Glancey. There hasn't been a time where I haven't been over the Board where he has shown his politeness, his generosity to an extent -- I don't always agree with him. But he was always there. And any time I would call him on the phone, he'd pick up that phone and get right on there.

And since everyone else is giving their accolades, I'd like to just say one thing: My mother thanks you, my father thanks you, and I thank you.

MR. GLANCEY: Thank you.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: And I think if you stay here long enough, there may be those who feel that $10,000 is not enough for an increase. So, maybe... Now, this ordinance will take effect retroactively; will it not?

MR. GLANCEY: Yeah. The reason the date of July 1st is there, as Counselwoman Blackwell stated, this was prepared to be introduced prior to the end of the spring session.

So it was the beginning of that particular fiscal year, so that's why we have the date of July 1st.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: That's fine.

Any other questiones or comments from members of the Committee?

(No response.)

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Seeing none, I thank you.

MR. GLANCEY: Thank you.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Thank you.

MR. GLANCEY: Thank you, Council members.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Do we have anyone else to testify on this bill?

(No response.)

COUNCIL PRESIDENT VERNA: Seeing none, this will conclude our public hearing.

CERTIFICATE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the stenographic notes taken by me upon the public hearing of The Philadelphia City Council, taken on November 22, 2004, and that this is a true and correct transcript of same.

_____

DAVID A. DEIK, RPR and
Commissioner of Deeds

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