

DEPARTMENT OF CITY CLERK
CITY HALL
JULY 9, 1996

The Committee on Ordinances meets this day at 5:00 o'clock p.m.,
Committee Room "A", City Clerk's Department, City Hall.

PRESENT: Chairman Igliazzi, Councilman Allen and Councilman Clarkin.

ABSENT: Vice-Chairwoman Williams and Councilwoman DiRuzzo.

Also present is John D'Amico, Senior Assistant City Solicitor; Thomas Deller, Deputy Director, Dept. of Planning and Development; Ramzi Loqa, Director, Dept. of Inspections and Standards; Councilwoman Young; Barbara A. Poirier, Second Deputy City Clerk and Lesley M. Skeffington, Assistant Clerk.

**AN ORDINANCE CREATING AND ESTABLISHING AN
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ZONE WITHIN THE CITY OF
PROVIDENCE, PURSUANT TO 3-7-16.4 OF THE GENERAL LAWS
OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, AS AMENDED.**

MR. DELLER: As I mentioned at the public hearing, the purpose of that is to amend the Economic Development Zone by extending it 100 feet south of Atwells Avenue from Harris Interstate 95. This was introduced by Councilman Lombardi. When the Economic Development Zone was done for some reason the line was drawn right down the middle of Atwells Avenue. He wants to just include both sides.

On motion of Councilman Clarkin, seconded by Councilman Allen, it is voted to approved the foregoing Ordinance.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Questions? Comments? All those in favor?

COMMITTEE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Opposed? The ayes have it.

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY OF PROVIDENCE
ZONING ORDINANCE CHAPTER 1994-24 NO. 365, APPROVED
JUNE 27, 1994. (THIS AMENDMENT WILL GIVE PRIMARY
THROUGH SECONDARY SCHOOLS (GRADES 0-12) TWO (2)
OPTIONS TO APPLY FOR AND RECEIVE APPROVAL OF
EXPANSION PLANS.)**

MR. DELLER: Number two is an ordinance that would amend the provisions for the planned development and for Use Code 21, which would allow primary and secondary schools, such as Moses Brown and Lincoln, to prepare an Institutional Master Plan and submit it to the City and get approval so that they would have the rights for five years to pull permits without having to go to the Zoning Board every time they want to make an expansion. We think it is a reasonable proposal and we recommend adoption.

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: Now, I take it that they have to go before the people before they do this originally.

MR. DELLER: Yes, under the City Ordinance, any one who submits an Institutional Master Plan must go before the City Plan Commission and a public hearing is held, impute is taken and it's been an involved process. We have been doing it with Brown, RISD and others, and it would just be the same process for these institutions.

On motion of Councilman Clarkin, seconded by Councilman Allen, it is voted to approve the foregoing Ordinance.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Any questions, comments? Those in favor?

COMMITTEE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I'd like to have a motion to continue item number three because that is my matter and issues have not been resolved.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY OF PROVIDENCE ZONING ORDINANCE CHAPTER 1994-24 NO. 365, APPROVED JUNE 27, 1994 AND AMENDED MAY 26, 1995. (CHANGE FROM R-3 THREE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL TO C-4 HEAVY COMMERCIAL: LOTS 382 (90 FARMINGTON AVENUE) AND 261 (78 FARMINGTON AVENUE) ON ZONING DISTRICT MAP 110.

On motion of Councilman Clarkin, seconded by Councilman Allen, it is voted to continue the foregoing Ordinance.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: All those in favor?

COMMITTEE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: The ayes have it. It is continued.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY OF PROVIDENCE ZONING ORDINANCE CHAPTER 1994-24 NO. 365, APPROVED JUNE 27, 1994 AND AMENDED MAY 26, 1995. (CHANGE FROM C-2 GENERAL COMMERCIAL TO C-4 HEAVY COMMERCIAL: LOTS 320 AND 313 (396 MANTON AVENUE) ON ZONING DISTRICT MAP 34.

MR. DELLER: Item number four is for two lots at the intersection of Manton and Chalkstone Avenue. This is a piece of property that is presently used as an automotive sales facility. It is presently owned by Representative Palangio, who has requested that it be introduced. I think, Councilman Igliazzi, you introduced it for them?

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Public hearing seemed to be very positive on this.

MR. DELLER: This is adjacent to the Super Stop & Shop that was built on the former dump. It's gone from a C-2 to a C-4 and we really have no problem with it.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: And he has grandfather rights there anyway.

On motion of Councilman Allen, seconded by Councilman Clarkin, it is voted to approve the foregoing Ordinance.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: All those in favor?

COMMITTEE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Number five.

AN ORDINANCE WITH REFERENCE TO THE RESIDENCY OF EMPLOYEES, AS AMENDED.

MR. D'AMICO: Mr. Chairman, subsequent to the last meeting, I met with Councilman Allen, who chaired the special committee. And he and I have reviewed the existing document. There are some changes that we have discussed and I have incorporated into a draft. This is the original.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Does this address the issues of ACLU?

MR. D'AMICO: As a matter of fact, if I may, Mr. Chairman, I did not know about the letter itself. I did not see the letter itself. But, I had conversation with the woman from the ACLU and some of her concerns were anticipated in the new draft. What is not anticipated in the new draft is the concern of the release of any tax information which they have reservations about which I discussed with Councilman and it seems that that is the most direct method of obtaining the information that the seeks do obtain. The second point that they raised, I think it a more telling point and if the membership looks at the draft before it, it will note that....

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: These are the

MR. D'AMICO: Yes, I believe they do now.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Let's just say draft is One "a".

MR. D'AMICO: Actually this is about four, but one "a" is fine.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: We should mark this something.

MRS. POIRIER: I have them marked.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Do you? What would this be marked?

MRS. POIRIER: This would be submitted as of this date.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Then why don't you submit it as of this day.

MR. D'AMICO: The 7-9 draft, if I might, I red lined the changes on the Councilman's copy. The changes that are new to the Committee tonight that are incorporate in the 7-9 draft are "Section 3: Notification" there is a grammatical change. Rather than saying "...however failure to do shall no excuse...", it says "...failure to do so however..." That's basically that change. The definition, the most important change in this document are the definitional sections in which the

July 9, 1996

definition in the ordinance is conformed to the Charter definitions, but is made less unwieldy than they were in the original draft. Essentially, what it says here is that "Residents shall be domiciled in the City of Providence" and then it uses the domicile definition that occurs in the Charter. There is another little change in order to be parallel structure, I put "shall mean each of the definitional lines". In response to the ACLU observations, section 8 has been changed. What that says now is that an employee shall be required to provide three of the documentary evidence of residency. However, and this is the language, ".....unless the employee is not entitled to or does not qualify for such three. In such case, the Director of Personnel may use the best available evidence to determine the employee's residence. Provided, however, that upon qualifying and obtaining such documents, the same shall be tendered forthwith to the Director of Personnel." That's an effort to allow someone who is a resident of the City of Providence who may not have a driver's license or own a car or in fact vote at that time to be hired. Because the intent of the ordinance, I believe, is not to exclude residents, but rather to assure their residency. What this does is allow the Personnel Director to beyond its primary indicia of residency to use the best available evidence to make a determination. And that in fact if the individual obtains those documents that they should give them to the Director of Personnel immediately or forthwith. The last change in that section is, I think this may have been brought up in the last one, it just changes to "in all cases the Director of Personnel shall conduct an appropriate hearing." I think the previous language was "in either case".

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: What's the answer on the issue on the tax returns? What's your position on that? Can you make exposure of tax information of mandatory condition of employment?

MR. D'AMICO: Well, I don't know if the letter is accurate. My reading of the tax release is that we were only seeking the residency portion of it.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: And what would you do, -- the spouse?

MR. D'AMICO: What we've done is I've added the spouse on the waiver. Because you may have a joint return at which time you would face the prospect of the State indicating that it could not release the information because it wouldn't have the waiver of all persons who filed the return. My understanding is that you are seeking and I think it is reflected in the document that "Release any and all information relative to my legal residence, marital status and filing status on any return or document filed by me with the Division of Taxation." So you are getting three things, legal residence, marital status and filing status. "This is a limited

July 9, 1996

release and I specifically reserve all the rights to confidentiality." Concerns like this are raised and they are important concerns. But I think it is a limited waiver.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Any law on this, John? I don't know that's why I'm asking.

MR. D'AMICO: I don't know. This is the first time I spoke with the woman and the first time I saw it. But they're waiving it.

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: It's voluntary. No one is forcing them to take the job.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: For the record, I have real big concerns forcing a spouse and somebody getting a job to return to waive their information. I remember there is some law about..... Obviously, I didn't research this and I'm certainly not going to. But I thought there was some law on whether or not you could have limited waivers. I just throw that out.

MR. D'AMICO: I don't know. For me to answer would be.....

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I worry about that. But that's because I'm a firm believer in privacy and I oppose big brother to the - - degree. It's not my ordinance. Really I think we should have some law on the issue of whether or not you can have a limited waiver and two, whether or not you can have a spouse waived when she has no proprietary interest in that job. The vote is the vote. I just want my concerns on the record and I have a concern with the draft and the form. But if people want to move forward with it, they certainly can. I don't want them to say that I didn't give them advanced notice. Especially, I know you worked hard on this, Councilman Allen. But nobody worked harder on residency than me. I am a firm believer in residency. But it's got nothing to do with my concerns about tax returns, the issue of limited waiver and the issue of whether or not you can force a spouse to waive that information. So that bothers me, not the issue of residency at all. I know you are anxious on this.

COUNCILMAN ALLEN: I think it behooves this Committee, in particular to make sure we dot all our "i's" and cross all our "t's" and if that means we should go back to the research part of this to look for some case law or for some statutory activity that would support the issue of limited waiver, spousal waiver and your third point?

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: It's only the issue of limited waiver and the issue of spousal waiver. Those are the two issues. The issue of tax information in it of itself is a general broad issue that overshadows the whole issue which is raised by ACLU. My only concern and I'll just say this again is that we have something to

hang our hat on. If this ends up in litigation, you should know what our position is and I just throw that out.

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: We're not asking for tax information, what we're asking for is the tax address where they file.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I understand. I don't disagree with what your saying. I'm just saying my concern is this, I don't know if you can just do that, number one. I don't know if you can do that just have a limited waiver. I don't know if that is the state of the law. I don't know if you can do that, John. And I raise that as a question not as a response or an argument against it. I don't know the answer to that question. But I know that there is some law on waivers and how they operate. And the tax information, imposing that obligation on a spouse concerns me from my personal feeling about this whole big brother thing. Just like when the Federal Government wanted everybody to have one ID number for everything, credit cards. I don't know if anybody has ever had the experience when somebody gets a hold of your social security number, you know it can ruin your life, if somebody gets a hold of your social security number. Again, I'm just throwing it out not to belabor this. It's on the docket, people want to go forward tonight, it's fine. Those are my concerns. Otherwise, I think the document is a solid document.

COUNCILMAN ALLEN: Let me ask a question, Mr. Chair. I do have some questions about the spousal signing when in fact she or he is not having a proprietary interest in the job. However, the reason why we put it in there was an understanding that there was already effort on the part of some City workers who may be in validation of residency now to file separate returns. So if they were married and filing separate returns, one could have one address and one could where the actual domicile is.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Let me just say this, Ron. The general rule about releases of anything, whether it's release of a law suit or a release of information, is that it's a contractual thing. I give you a pen, you give a release. I give you \$10,000, you give me a release. From the spousal point of view, the City is not giving the spouse anything. So, if she refuses to sign this, then I don't know how you can say because the spouse refused to sign this, not the employee, the spouse refused to sign the waiver, how can we now in good faith fire that employee. That's my problem.

COUNCILMAN ALLEN: If we took spousal signature off and put martial status, just the filing status because from that we could know if somebody is

July 9, 1996

filing married, filing separately then that would be a red flag that we need to look at.

MR. D'AMICO: I am not convinced without the spousal signature you can get any information.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: That's the problem.

MR. D'AMICO: See, I'm unmarried, so if I sign the waiver they'll send me my return or - - the return and give you the information that your asking for. Now, the Chairman is married, without his wife's signature, she is co-signer or co-filer with the Chairman, they are not going to release any of that information.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Let me ask you this question, that's do a hypothetical. I apply to the City of Providence for a job, I get the job, I move in, I provide all the information you want and I sign the release. My wife refuses, she doesn't work for the City, she refused to sign it. You tell me we're not going to hire you, I sue the City, I prove that I'm a resident with all the indenture of information, but I couldn't get my wife, a free citizen of the United States to sign this waiver. I signed it because I want the job. Your going to be able to keep out of a job legally, I think not. I'll go to court and prove I'm a resident, especially if I'm only denied employment.

MR. D'AMICO: The residency isn't going to be the proof.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I'm saying to you is, if you say to me we're not hiring you because your wife doesn't sign it. But you did everything you wanted to do but your wife didn't. I'm going to go to court and say to the court, the only reason why I couldn't get this job is because I couldn't twist my wife's arm to sign this waiver and the purpose of the waiver is to prove my residency and here, Judge, is my prove of my residency.

MR. D'AMICO: No, that's not it. It's going to be whether or not this act is reasonably related to show proof of residency.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I understand what your saying. But the point is your not going to hire me if I don't give you my wife's signature, John.

MR. D'AMICO: That's right, I understand.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Your saying that as if your going to analyze it after the fact but your not. When I apply and I turn in my application and you say to me, you got your job but you have to sign this waiver and I say I signed it and my wife won't. I asked her, I begged. Are you going to give her some money to sign that waiver. It's a contractual thing. Do you want to give her consideration to sign that waiver?

MR. D'AMICO: So even if you give her a dollar that's not going to change her argument. It's not a consideration argument.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: The point I'm making is that's the problem.

MR. D'AMICO: - - whether or not you can exclude based on the favor of some one else - - . They do it with mortgages though.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Mortgages are a totally different thing.

MR. D'AMICO: They do it with deeds.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I understand that. But that is a totally different thing. I don't know how you can compare one with the other. Because we're more concerned about that this people is obviously qualified and been approved for the job. All we're concerned about and the only reason we want that waived is to prove that they live in Providence. If they produce deeds to a house that they own, they bring you video tape of them living there, I don't know what they would do, but you could see somebody doing something very..... that's my concern. I fought the fight long before this issue was here.

COUNCILMAN ALLEN: Yes and I appreciate and I don't have a problem with it and I think we want to dot "i's" and cross the "t's". If we only had one person signing and it was a joint return, could the information still come from the tax assessor?

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: You mean the State Tax Division.

COUNCILMAN ALLEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I don't know the answer to that.

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: We can have the person bring in his own thing.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I'm not trying to create more work for you, John. I'm just very concerned about this. It totally blew by me until I read the ACLU letter. I started thinking about tax return, tax information, very confidential information. I mean even public officials do not have to disclose their tax returns. They do not. They are not required to get elected to take that job and oath of office to dispose of their tax returns. Even public officials which arguably are a higher standard than people that are just hired. I mean you are putting a very high standard on an employee and I know you're talking about just their resident information. I don't want to get - - . I just raised the questions. I'm just giving you the reasons why I couldn't support this in its draft, not that it doesn't have the votes to go. But I couldn't support this draft for those reasons unless there was something solved or I felt comfortable that we could hang our hat - - .

July 9, 1996

COUNCILMAN ALLEN: - - Chairman of this Committee, but as an attorney, what would we have to do to create a level of comfortability for you as a Chair, but more importantly you, as an attorney, who I think has much more expertise.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I'm just giving you some general principles of other issues of law. The innocent spouse rule, John, you know always implies. People who sign tax returns and there is fraud, if the innocent spouse can prove that her husband.....she signed the return under oath, but the husband is the one who committed all the fraud. I'm giving you just general principles. So what I'm worried is we're dragging in the spouse and I don't know the answer to that. I think we need to check with the Division of Taxation and see if there is some way to do that and feel comfortable. I would want to feel comfortable that either the law allows us to do it, number one, and I mean allow us to get the spouse. That's a big issue and then also this limited waiver. Does the limited waiver protect them with regard to all other information. I mean I don't know that answer. I think that's an easier question and answer. Because I'm thinking and again I'm using principles, there are some limited releases out there, I think. Joint Tort is one limited release I'm thinking of, John. That releases one party and not the other. The release, I think we'll get over the fact that it's just limited to the information of the residency. I think there is some law on that. The spouse thing really bothers me because of my concern about people's individual rights who are not employed by the City. That's my only concern.

COUNCILMAN ALLEN: So, what do we have to do. Do we need to go back and do some research on some case law?

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: My personal opinion is, will it really hit to take a shot at it and I'm asking. I know you and Bob want to move it today. But I'm asking and I think that the prudent move would be to answer those questions, if there are answer and I think there are answers. Something that we would feel comfortable with to hang our hat on. That's my personal opinion.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Can I ask a question, through the Chair, if I may. In determining some of these verification of residences, do we use any other City or Towns? I know there is a big battle going on in Boston right now. I was reading the Boston Globe and there was something.

COUNCILMAN ALLEN: There were four, five, six other municipalities that we should to come up with this document.

July 9, 1996

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: I just happen to read in the last couple of days, there was been a big problem.

COUNCILMAN ALLEN: There was Boston; Madison, Wisconsin, I think.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Scituate is going through a big right now. I didn't know if you used any of these. The issue about the tax information, is that this issue right here?

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: That's one of the issues I have, yes.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: That's a legitimate concern. What are we looking to gain by getting their tax information?

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: That's their address usually.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Would their address on the tax be the same on the tax on their 1040? Would they probably use the same address? Doesn't the 1040 form generally have their -- . That's an individual form, that's not a - - .

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: That's right, it's usually just an individual income form.

COUNCILMAN ALLEN: I think the policeman use the Fountain Street address because of confidentiality. There was two CPA's at the meeting, but they had apprised us that the way they file their taxes would be a good place to verify people's addresses. There was some discussion if we can get it from other places. I know the Police use that 209 Fountain Street address.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: I wonder if we are ever going to get this thing refined. I mean if we have them register their car in Providence and some of the other automobile insurance, I mean if a guy out and out wants to give you all this information and still live outside the City, unless you have someone to follow them home.

COUNCILMAN ALLEN: I think there is some very soft stuff for proof that is still on that list and the crux to the matter from the Committee's standpoint was that we should have some bona fide way, some way that it would be very difficult from people to lie and that's how the whole tax - - . At first we were talking the Federal Income Tax, but then the conversation with the Tax Administrator, he said he would provide it, if there was a release that met his approval and was drafted. And that was kind of what we have here.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Through the Chair, if I could, is there a way to have them sign a release and structure the release in a such a way that a form was prepared by the City of Providence that is sent to the Tax Administrator and

incorporated that form as a release and all the Tax Administrator has to do is fill in what address they use for filing.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: If they're willing to do that.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Individually.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Yes, but that would have to be an agreement. See know that is a different story. It's like when you do a Post Office check and the Postmaster just signs on it "good address" or "no forwarding address", hand written.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: It could be blank and they would fill it in.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: They don't give you a document.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: I know what you're trying to do and I agree with you. Because you know how I feel about this issue.

MR. D'AMICO: If I may, Mr. Chairman, maybe what we can do is enlighten of the Committee's concerns, I can take a look at the two issues. I think there are only three, there is one on limited waiver. Two, can you essentially force a spouse to sign the waiver and if they do not sign the waiver, can you need not hire the other spouse and what I can do is call the Division of Taxation and see if we can work on an acceptable release.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: You know what the problem what the problem with the Committee right now is, you got one married man and two unmarried man. I know that I can't tell my wife what to do. They figure when they get married they are going to have a women they can tell what to do. Tell them, Madam Clerk, that those days are gone.

MRS. POIRIER: There gone.

On motion of Councilman Allen, seconded by Councilman Clarkin, it is voted to continue the foregoing ordinance for review legal review.

MR. D'AMICO: Are those fair estimate of what the questions are?

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Yes, they really are. I think that solves my problems. Again, I don't want to stop something that you want to go forward. I just want you to know now. Any more questions? All those in favor?

COMMITTEE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Opposed? The "ayes" have it. Now, we have Ramzi Loqa here to give us hell.

**AN ORDINANCE IN AMENDMENT OF AND IN ADDITION TO
CHAPTER 1995-21 OF THE ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF
PROVIDENCE, APPROVED AUGUST 17, 1995, AND ENTITLED
"AN ORDINANCE SETTING FEES SCHEDULES FOR NEW
CONSTRUCTION, ALTERATION, DEMOLITION OR OTHER
BUILDING OPERATIONS PURSUANT TO TITLE 23, SECTIONS
27.3-118.011.**

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: He said he was not notified of this item six. John, item six? I don't know where this failed, I think it is a standing order of this Committee that any department head, Madam Clerk, any department head or any interested party should be notified of an ordinance that effects him and he said he wasn't notified of this.

MRS. POIRIER: Not by letter, just by telephone the other day through conversation.

MR. LOQA: I didn't know about it until I heard from John.

MRS. POIRIER: John called you and then I spoke to you.

MR. LOQA: I never knew about the content of this and how this was worked out. At least my impute, I think would have been very important because it effects my department.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Who sponsored this?

MRS. POIRIER: Balbina on the last docket.

MR. DELLER: This came about through PPHC and others who have been discussing the fact their building the same house many times. We've talked in the Planning Department and we did tell them they should contact Ramzi. I didn't realize until after it was introduced when Ramzi called me and asked me about that they haven't contacted him. I felt it was their responsibility since they were doing it and they were putting it together that they should talk to him about his issues and what's going on. The basic concern was this and the reason that something like this came about, we meet with various non-profits around the City and they're talking about the issues that they face with trying to renovate abandoned property and the back taxes and the boarding liens. We've been meeting with them about how you take a vacant lot and do something with it from being as small as a garden to constructing new housing. The discussion came up with some groups that their building the identical house, 5, 6, 10 of them or like the PPHC is now doing on Blackstone in the South Side which is a project in Balbina's ward where they're building 23 houses that are in the inside and that are identical, but on the outside are a little different. I don't even know what the designs are anymore. And they were saying shouldn't there be a way that we should be able to pay less and I said I

July 9, 1996

don't know. Maybe we can talk something out and get something put together, maybe there is a way that there should be a lesser fee that the house is identical.

MR. LOQA: Right, I have no problem with that. The only problem I have with that is that the inspection process with the plumbing, electrical, mechanical, structural and plan review would be the same, your going to put the same amount of hours. So it's not fair that you reduce all the other ones to \$100 and just pay for one of them. Because all that we have to go through, we're going to spend the same amount of time in each building. You still have to go out, you still have to do the inspection, you still have to issue a certificate of occupancy. I have to pay the State \$1.00 for each \$1,000 worth of work. I have to pay the State one cent on each square feet of - - . That's ludicrous. I mean \$100 for all that work. We have churches, we have synagogues, we have non-profit organizations that pay full amounts and here we are, we reduce all that work to a \$100.

MR. DELLER: The issue was because the policy of the City Council has been to encourage the development of owner occupied housing because the market is so difficult to get a house developed. They're looking at ways of cutting costs and this was the one area that many people seemed to be coming up with saying maybe we can reduce the cost here because -- . Maybe what has to happen is there has to be a sit down with Ramzi to go through exactly what it takes to do and is there a way that that number, what it is, can be reduced a little, if it is the same house. I think the way this is written and John faxed me a copy of it, I think it has got three or more units in a redevelopment project.

COUNCILWOMAN YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, if I could interject.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Yes, absolutely.

COUNCILWOMAN YOUNG: That's in my ward and that's going to be 22 homes that we're building on the South Side. We have a budget that is not only extremely tight, but has been overextended. So that was another reason - - of the PPHC to see what we can become of this because that would help us. Because all these houses are going to be the same inside, everything is basically the same. But we could cut down the cut and - - . So we put that number out and I thought Gerry had done some research into a nominal fee.

MR. LOQA: I'm willing to sit down with the group and figure out something.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Because he's saying he has man hours that are involved. You may have a good idea, but a different way - - .

MR. LOQA: I have no problem with reducing, but not to \$100.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Do you want to continue it to let him work on that?

COUNCILWOMAN YOUNG: I appreciate that. But, just so you know how we did it, this is a project that I have been working for four years.....it's almost going to be a Mandala Woods, if we don't get the help with need and that's not going to happen. So what we looked is how we can uniform it and make that a one set fee for all of them.

MR. LOQA: Yes, sure, I have no problem with that. I just want to figure out what are the man hours, what does it get from my department for impute for this permit.

MR. DELLER: What I would offer to do, Mr. Chairman, if you continue this, I will call representatives of SWAP, Omni, PPHC and others - - .

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: But, I got to say one thing, before you get the nonprofits involved, I think you better spend some time with Ramzi. I don't want Ramzi sitting in his office trying to defend arguments against nonprofits. He's got a business to run and let's be fair, the Department of Building Inspections generates income for the City of Providence and our whole goal is to have departments generate enough money to pay for themselves.

MR. LOQA: We went up last year from 50% of sub-deficiency to 70% because of the increase that your Committee helped us. We thank you for that.

MR. DELLER: Let me just say one thing, every dollar that Ramzi generates in building permits off of the nonprofits comes out of my pocket.

On motion of Councilman Clarkin, seconded by Councilman Allen, it is voted to continue the foregoing ordinance.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: All those in favor?

COMMITTEE: Aye.

DISCUSSION RELATIVE TO THE AUTOMONY OF THE PROV. WATER SUPPLY BOARD

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Just so that everybody knows on the Committee, the Water Supply Board discussion, Joan DiRuzzo couldn't be here, she's on vacation. She asked that we continue it because she worked so hard on that task force. I know that Mr. Rafanovic is really eager and he thinks he's going to meet the deadline to get this on the State wide ballot. I got the impression and I don't want to speak for the Committee, at least my personal opinion is this is a very premature issue and I think this it is going to make this ballot in 1996 and I don't think I want to preside over giving the only asset of the City of Providence away

without some thorough work. If your worried about that deadline, I'm laying it on the table now. If your worried about meeting that ballot deadline, then you have to act. But, Councilwoman DiRuzzo asked for it to be continued, I agree with her. We should have every impute as possible. Any questions about that? Concerns about missing that deadline?

On motion of Councilman Allen, seconded by Councilman Clarkin, it is voted to continue the foregoing discussion relative to the autonomy of the Providence Water Supply Board.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Any questions, comments? All those in favor?

COMMITTEE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: The ayes have it. John, we'll schedule next meeting. We don't have anything else to do right now. As soon as you get something ready, okay?

ADJOURNMENT: On motion of Councilman Allen, seconded by Councilman Clarkin, it is voted to adjourn at 5:50 p.m.


Assistant Clerk


CLERK