

February 12, 1965

City Hall
February 12, 1965

The Committee on Finance meets this day at 3:00 o'clock p.m. in the Conference Room, City Hall.

Present: Chairman Charles H. O'Connor and Messrs. Robert J. Haxton and Robert J. McOsker.

Also present are Budget Officer Moran, Finance Director Keegan and City Controller Wilkes. (Dorothy K. McGinn, Assistant Clerk)

Also present, by invitation, is Louis T. Cote, City Assessor.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE CITY COUNCIL TO APPOINT A SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO UNDERTAKE A STUDY GRANTING A ONE THOUSAND DOLLAR TAX EXEMPTION TO OWNER-OCCUPANTS OF REAL PROPERTY WHO HAVE ATTAINED THEIR SIXTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY OR OVER.

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO CONDUCT A PUBLIC HEARING UPON THE PROPOSITION THAT A ONE THOUSAND DOLLAR TAX EXEMPTION BE GRANTED TO OWNER-OCCUPANTS OF REAL PROPERTY WHO ARE SIXTY-FIVE YEARS OF AGE OR OVER.

The above Resolutions were in City Council January 21, 1965 and referred to the Committee on Finance.

They were discussed at the Finance Committee Meeting on January 29, 1965 and were referred to the City Assessor, requesting him to study same and report back to the Committee.

Mr. Cote tells the Committee that he has a list of communities granting exemptions to persons over sixty-five years of age and that fifteen communities have legislation effective now or becoming effective.

He states that Barrington has no special restrictions and that communities extend to three family most/dwellings as long as the person lives there. He states that in Bristol, gross income cannot exceed \$3,000.00. He also states that in Lincoln only about 13,551; had slightly in excess of 500 applicants as of this date and exemptions apply without ability to pay.

He states that the following communities have nothing set up Burrillville, Cumberland and Johnston. He states that North Kingston had only twenty-six applicants.

In a further discussion, Mr. Cote states that Providence has a percentage of 13.2 over sixty-five, Central Falls, 12.2.

Mr. Keegan questions if these people over sixty-five in Providence are all property owners.

Mr. Cote replies that he is relying on figures of 1960 census, and nothing to show whether or not they are property owners.

Mr. Cote further states that there are no income restrictions in Pawtucket, but must live in the property and must own it - he states that they had 1,850 as of last Monday and this is the first year.

He states that in Warwick, unless you are a registered voter, you do not qualify and applies to Real Estate and Personal Property and according to Warwick, two people can get it.

Mr. Wilkes questions about joint tenancy on property, where one person is over sixty-five and Mr. Cote replies that the one over sixty-five would qualify, and if both over sixty-five would divide it. Mr. Cote also tells the Committee that this is up to the Council as to what they would do and that all laws are based on valuation, on the assessment; if worth \$12,000.00, would pay on \$11,000.00. Mr. Cote states that Pawtucket has a three year restriction.

A discussion ensues and Mr. McOsker questions if there should be a question as to actual ownership of property - perhaps should have a requirement as to where the money comes from for mortgages, taxes, etc. Mr. Cote states that this would be difficult to police. Mr. McOsker states that he thinks the application could do it by putting forth in the affidavit, who pays the mortgage, taxes, etc.

Mr. Cote goes on further, giving figures from different towns and cities. He states that in Pawtucket there are 11.7% over sixty-five and ascertain somewhat in excess of 7,000 exemptions, which are based on the figures which he has analyzed.

In discussing Providence, Mr. Cote states that based on the figures which he has analyzed, there are 13.2% over sixty-five years of age, (27,333 people) - and that Providence would pick up a slightly greater population than these other communities.

Mr. McOsker questions pertaining to a person under sixty-five who could be a joint tenant with a Mother or Father over sixty-five and get the exemption, and Mr. Cote replies that this is according to bills in other communities, but

Providence could write it any way that they wanted to. He states that the cost would be about \$300,000.00 a year or perhaps \$273,000.00.

A discussion ensues and Mr. McOsker questions how some of these communities feel able to do it and Providence doesn't feel that they can.

Mr. Cote states that the loss of Brown and Sharpe Co. together with these exemptions on people over sixty-five would perhaps require a \$1.00 increase in the tax rate.

In a further discussion, Mr. Cote states that there are many ways you can cut down by insisting on certain restrictions - and you might make it seventy years of age and over and if able to knock 10,000 you might be able to revise the figure by one-half.

Mr. Moran states that he thinks the city first of all should find out if they can make any exemptions; if they can afford it.

In a further discussion Mr. McOsker questions why it can't be given only to people who need it and Mr. Cote states that this could be done by giving restrictions according to income.

It is the consensus that this matter should be continued for further study, Mr. Cote to study the matter further pertaining to same being based on income.

Accordingly on motion of Mr. McOsker, seconded by Mr. Haxton, it is voted to continue these two Resolutions for further study and Mr. Cote requested to investigate granting on an income basis. Mr. Cote is excused at this time.

RESOLUTION THAT THE CITY SOLICITOR CAUSE THE INTRODUCTION OF AN ACT INTO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY RECOMMENDING A PENSION FOR FORMER COUNCILMAN JOSEPH SCHLOSSBERG.

The above Resolution was in the City Council on February 4, 1965 and referred to the Committee on Finance.

In a brief discussion, Mr. McOsker states that he thinks the only way you could attack this, would be by reducing the minimum requirement for service from ten years to eight years; changing the Act as it is now, which is ten years after 1941, as can't grant him (Mr. Schlossberg) a pension under the present setup.

A discussion ensues as to how many people would be involved if this act were changed to eight years. After checking through

the Pocket Manual rather hurriedly, it is the consensus that this matter should be continued and the number of people who might be involved, checked more thoroughly.

Accordingly, on motion of Mr. McOsker, seconded by Mr. Haxton, this Resolution is continued for further study, so a more accurate record can be obtained of the number of Councilmen eligible.

ADJOURNMENT is taken at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

Dorothy K. McGinn
Dorothy K. McGinn
Assistant Clerk

Copied *DM*

Compared *DM*