

DEPARTMENT OF CITY CLERK

CITY HALL

MAY 17, 1993

The Committee on Finance meets this day at 5:00 o'clock P.M., in Committee Room "A", City Clerk's Department, City Hall.

PRESENT: Chairman Dillon, Councilman Glavin, Councilwoman Fargnoli, Councilman Igliazzi and Councilman Fenton.

Also present are Stephen Woerner, City Internal Auditor, Patricia McLaughlin, Deputy City Solicitor, Thomas Deller, Acting Deputy Director Planning and Development, Richard Weinburg, Providence Plan, Carolyn Brassil, City Collector, Boyce Spinelli, Finance Director, Alex Prignano, Deputy Director/Budget Officer, Manuel Vieira, Communications, Joe Richardson, Deputy Director Communications, Councilman Lombardi, Councilwoman Nolan, Frank Romanelli, Public Safety, Captain Gerry Aubin, Police Department, Chief Bernard Gannon, Police Department, Michael R. Clement, City Clerk and Claire E. Brooke-Stewart, Assistant Clerk.

FEDERAL HILL EAST PROJECT TAX ABATEMENT.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: First item I wanted to take up was the Federal Hill East Project Tax Abatement. We have Mr. Deller.

MR. DELLER: In 1989 the City Council approved the redevelopment plan for the federal needs ---- project area which is basically shown here in yellow and pink. As part of that plan we identified that the Redevelopment Agency would be acquiring approximately 15 properties for the development of new single family or duplex housing. The project moved along rather slowly and then in the 90's with the process of bank lawyers and foreclosure, we, the Redevelopment Agency, was offered a number of properties, close to 20 properties that were abandoned, derelict and in disrepair. The property was turned over to the Redevelopment Agency free and clear with the responsibility of the Agency to pay property taxes or assume property taxes for sewer. We have been able to create 21 new lots. These are large lots. Most of the house lot sizes in this neighborhood were about 3,000 square feet with an average of 9 dwelling units per lot. The zoning is 79 units on 3,000 square feet. The zoning in the area is 5,000 square foot minimum, one unit for 2,000 square feet so the density is very high and what we ended up doing was going in and taking down most of the buildings. We have a few more that we

May 17, 1993

will be taking down and then 21 new houses with the Nehemiah program which will make them affordable, single family homes with second mortgages, soft second mortgages paid for with federal funds and hopefully with some cooperation with Rhode Island Housing we will get an additional ---- not due and payable until the property is sold. The Redevelopment Agency made this a point in project having intended to sell the lots for \$1.00 so that --- the speculation clause against the properties so that if someone sold the property in a four or five year period that after the unmortgages were paid off that the Agency would then stand in line to recoup some of the costs in making this development happen. The problem we are facing is that of the 18 or 20 some lots, I don't know the exact number, that we have acquired through the banks, there is a tax liability at this point of \$76,945.02, I think that is correct. Carolyn can tell me if I am wrong.

MS. BRASSIL: It is just straight tax, no interest.

MR. DELLER: We are basically requesting that if there is no reason to abate this tax that we would like to see it abated because there is a very limited budget and it would be impossible for us to sell these lots to recoup the costs. We do have a possibility if it can be worked out whereby we would be willing to take the outstanding tax liability and divide it by 21 lots and put that as part of our anti-speculation clause so that if the property were sold within a certain period of time that that liability which would be equivalent to that 3700 a lot would come back to the city if there were any outstanding profit after the sell. I am not sure what your liabilities or legal ---- are at this point so that is the situation. We are asking for the abatement of those taxes due on those properties that are deeded to us by banks or property owners who have abandoned.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Are you not also asking that why the PRA holds it, it would remain exempt. So you are not only asking that the \$78,000.00 due today?

MR. DELLER: I don't have a copy of the resolution and since I didn't write it, I am not sure what it says. Yes, that is what the resolution says, to remain tax exempt. I will say that we will be transferring all 21 lots to the Providence Plan Housing

May 17, 1993

Corporation, probably within the next 2 months.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: So my question is, there is no doubt in my mind, that eventually we are going to have to eat these taxes and the question is, should the taxes that are owed, be part of the cost of acquiring and putting this parcel together and financed over the 30 year life of the bonds on the PPHC or should we take the hit this year and write off \$78,000.00 worth of taxes, or should we leave the lien on in anti-speculation device, if you will, and does it qualify under the Ordinance we have.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, that is going to be your threshold question, do we have a legal right to abate these taxes and I don't believe you do under the present Ordinance because your present Ordinance is only to abandon buildings and none of the parcels have buildings on them.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: They do, don't they?

MR. DELLER: They did but most of them have been torn down.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: So we are building new houses.

MR. DELLER: We are getting rid of the 6 unit, 9 unit buildings to build new single family housing.

COUNCILWOMAN FARGNOLI: To whom are you going to offer these houses?

MR. DELLER: There is a mechanism that the Providence Plan will be offering, making available to people who meet the income limits in the ----. I would assume that it would first be Providence city residents, people who live in the city that are now renting but it would be under a qualification basis, people who meet the income limits.

MR. WEINBURG: In the event we have more qualified buyers, we will actually have to go to a lottery and that is mandated by part of the Nehemiah agreement.

COUNCILWOMAN FARGNOLI: Do these people have to live in those houses?

MR. WEINBURG: They have to live in those houses.

COUNCILWOMAN FARGNOLI: There is no question then of absentee landlords.

MR. WEINBURG: No.

May 17, 1993

MR. DELLER: They are owner occupied housing. That is a requirement. They have to be owner occupied.

MR. WEINBURG: There is also a restriction with the Nehemiah loan that if the property is sold, the city, or actually ---- get back the \$15,000.00 silent second mortgage.

COUNCILWOMAN FARGNOLI: Can we get back our taxes if the property is sold?

MR. WEINBURG: I think that is under Tom's suggestion.

MR. DELLER: That is under my suggestion.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: Pat, does the Ordinance say abandon house or abandon property?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Buildings.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: It does say buildings.

MR. SPINELLI: Will we get the taxes back on the anti-speculation or what I was thinking, I don't know if this --- but if you are talking about like third mortgages what about if the city's back taxes were treated like, in essence, a mortgage to be gotten back if and when the property sells down the road so we are not out --- forever.

MR. DELLER: What I am proposing is that we do that but we put in some sort of a clause that says when the property is sold but the way we took it in writing the anti-speculation clause as we normally use is that there is a time limit, 5 years if they live there for 5 years and then that anti-speculation clause starts depreciating, the value starts depreciating. Because of the nature of them, we are usually in second, third or fourth position so that when the house is sold, if the profit from the house isn't enough to pay off the third position then we eat it at that point.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Do all state taxes traditionally take precedence over a second or even a first mortgage?

MR. DELLER: The problem is if we were to put taxes in the first position then we are going to --- finance ----.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: How many total units are there?

MR. DELLER: We are doing 21 units.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Can't you spread the \$76,000.00 over the 21 units?

May 17, 1993

MR. DELLER: That is \$3,700.00 a unit.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Can we do that, Pat? \$3,700.00 a unit for taxes...

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: The problem is you can't even get to say can we put in an anti-speculation clause, can we put it in this for after, for after, for after because you can't get beyond the initial. I don't know what you are going to do with the initial taxes.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Can you call it a payment plan.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: It seems clear to me and I was just talking to Pat, that when we drafted the Ordinance, we put a definition of what the taxes are and we talk about property but when we get to the actual critical language we talk about abandoned buildings when we should have said abandoned property. Can we just amend this?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: You have to intent the same.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: I am sure we meant properties.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: But I don't know. In some cases you may not.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That is a distinction.

MR. DELLER: The way the act was written, wasn't it done for SWAP?

CHAIRMAN DILLON: It was for SWAP.

MR. DELLER: Which is houses.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: When you do land it is a big change and that is a lot of taxes you are writing off.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: No because it includes property taxes of all kinds.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: It still would come back to you. You still want a discretion and you also....

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: If they were here before they knocked down the buildings the amount would be exactly the same. The only thing is technically the buildings are gone.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: But I am just saying in another instance, they might have been vacant lots for 25 years and then there might have been taxes on them and then they would be exempt or we might not. That is a public policy question to be answered.

May 17, 1993

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Patricia, can you make this a payment plan? Just mortgage.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: You could make it as a payment plan.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Payment plan on the tax exempt.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: On a reverse mortgage.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: I don't see why you couldn't do that. Would they still be paying the taxes then.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: No, do it as a payment plan as a reversed mortgage so that they wouldn't pay off the taxes until they sold the property.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Am I right in understanding also that the Providence Plan is taking the position since they are a charitable institution, once the property goes to the Providence Plan, no taxes are assessed, right?

MR. WEINBURG: That is my understanding.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: So we are only talking from the time in which it is transferred to Providence Plan.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Right but as you say, it is the first hurdle we have to get over.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

MR. WOERNER: Once the houses are built it is taxable, right?

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Yes.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: No.

MR. WEINBURG: Something is still missing here because we are still going to get rid of that tax liability and would that property be transferred to us with the outstanding liability?

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: If we are going to change the statute, it would be transferred to Providence Housing Corporation with the tax liabilities have them pay it off and nothing would stop them from coming, if this was amended, coming back like all the other non-profits asking the tax liability be abated at a later date. In other words, Providence Housing Corporation, instead of getting the property for a \$1.00, pay off the tax liability. We just gave them 6 million dollars.

MR. DELLER: One thing you have to realize is that because of the limited funds, we are saying that we are transferring --- they are covering for us.

May 17, 1993

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: I am talking about being pragmatic to get the job done without slowing down the project.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Why not do it as a tax plan. A tax plan can say almost anything, right? It doesn't have to say you have to pay x, y and z, it just says you have to pay under these conditions so this one would say...

MS. BRASSIL: The tax payoff.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Right and this one would say, this property, the taxes will be paid off as a reverse mortgage when the property is sold by the initial buyer.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Is that what the Providence Plan initially, my understanding was that they wanted to.....

COUNCILMAN FENTON: They wanted it for goose egg but we are saying we can't give it to them for goose egg because we are prohibited, this gets the money after the somebody has built up some equity, the house is worth more, etc., etc.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: You are prohibited under the Ordinance as it reads, if you change this Ordinance to read building or lot then you have to --- then they will get it so you do have the option. It is really a policy decision if you want to.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: I would think that from what they are telling us, from the time it would take to change the statute, would slow them down. I don't want to slow them down. What I would like to do is if we could transfer to the Providence Housing Corporation, have them pay the money which clears it to keep this going and then come back and look for an abatement.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Yes but then they are out \$76,000.00.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: Not once we abate it.

Councilman Lombardi joins the Committee at this time.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Councilman, is it a fair statement that if they tried to change the Ordinance to read buildings and lot it would take too much time and put the project in jeopardy?

COUNCILMAN LOMBARDI: Let me tell you the reason why I am here. I got a call from Bill Floriani. He said that the project was in jeopardy. This is something that I have been working on for five years so when I heard that, obviously a read flag went up so I want to know why it is in jeopardy and what we are going to

May 17, 1993

do to save it because if we are not.

MR. DELLER: We are talking about the tax issue which is the problem. We are looking at a balance of about \$77,000.00, those properties that we took over from the banks, that are due and we have structure to deal with Providence Plan Housing Corporation whereby they will in effect purchase these 21 lots for us for our outstanding costs as it relates to demolition, site preparation, survey, things of that nature and we had agreed upon price of approximately somewhere between \$175,000.00 and \$200,000.00 not to exceed to cover our costs. Our costs for demolition of the remaining buildings and other things are going to be in that round so that gives me a limitation. We agreed on the price not to exceed \$200,000.00 --- spent \$175,000.00 with everything else, I don't have \$77,000.00 left for taxes. Trying to come up with a mechanism of either abating taxes or doing some sort of speculation.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: Assuming that the Council was of the mind to change the Ordinance, it appears to me that could be done in 4 weeks. How, if anything, does that slow the project down? Does it?

MR. DELLER: Not if it is done in four weeks because right now we have nine buildings to take down, we won't be transferring our probably until the middle of June, the end of June.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Can we do it in four weeks?

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: Yes if we schedule a meeting tomorrow.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: If you schedule a meeting tomorrow for Thursday, put in building and lot, you can take it off the docket for first passage on Thursday night, second passage two weeks later. You are talking two to three weeks.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Is that what you want to do though.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: I don't see the difference. If you open it up, it is still discretionary.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: It is discretionary. It still done by Council approval. --- are going to get the ones, he got it why didn't I get it.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: How about making it property just for the Providence Plan, something like that.

May 17, 1993

MR. DELLER: Redevelopment Agency. It should be a city agency.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: ---- limited to this situation. Can you do that?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: PRA is a 501C3, right?

MR. DELLER: No, we are a city agency not a 501C3.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: I don't know that.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: These are federal funds?

MR. DELLER: Yes. The federal funds are Nehemiah funds which are only for a second mortgage for the purchase price of the house. We can't use those to pay off the taxes.

MR. WOERNER: But the taxes will only be paid if whoever buys the house sells it and makes money. If they don't make money they don't pay it back to the city.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes but we can't really get to that step.

MR. WOERNER: Under the tax plan you can.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: The problem is they can't transfer title to the Providence Plan, I am assuming.

MR. WOERNER: If you have a tax plan there is no liabilities out there.

MR. WEINBURG: Could you transfer it to us with that restriction?

MR. WOERNER: You are not abating if you are doing a tax plan.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: That is to abate the taxes.

MR. WOERNER: But there is no cost to the Providence Housing Program.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: You have title, everything cleared except for the taxes.

MR. DELLER: For most of them yes.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: This goes back to something I had mentioned before about how I felt that we should try, when you take a look at this whole concept, the whole concept is to make affordable housing and make homeownership a reality for some people, hopefully for many people city wide but I also think to make that thing a reality, there has got to be all kinds of subsidies involved to get people into these houses. I don't think

May 17, 1993

it is unfair to try to recoup some of the tax payers money at the same time and why proposing for under the tax abatements was a 50% situation where we would abate 50% and they would pay the other 50% over a five year period, 10% a year for five years. So the city is able to recoup a little bit of a tax exempt per se and we are also still participating on ---- a lot these days because we are giving the CDBG money and we are giving all those other things. It is just a reasonable way to try to get a little bit. I don't think it is unfair to make that part of the total package to try to get something back for the tax payers and in this case we are talking half of \$3,700.00. If that is going to make a deal go sour, the deal is really shaky.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: I am with you all the way. I say why not get it all though. That person, by the time they are ready to sell, there is a minimum number of years that they hold onto the property, right?

MR. DELLER: If they sell the next day, the property reverts back to the seller but one of the covenants is that a Nehemiah property has to be sold to a Nehemiah eligible family and that grant then would be transferred to that family. I would not want to see it go to the family. I think the subsidies should ---- as they are purchasing the property. The --- is going to be worked in as a 50% compromise, that should be worked in on the purchase price to the PRA from the PPHC and it should never be presented to the homeowners. They are not going to do one ---- on the tax plan.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Why don't you just pay them then. Why don't you pay the whole thing?

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: I think that makes the most.....

MR. WEINBURG: Right now it has to be budget, it doesn't mean we can't go back and look at the budget. We are provided and committed to delivering this property at no cost to the -- user for \$1.00 so we can't really add that restriction in there so if we are going to negotiate the 50% to the entire amount, it should be negotiated up front. It is something that we did not count on in our budget and if we can work around that we should look to.

May 17, 1993

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Why not get it at the end when the initial owner goes to sell the property. The city is not out any money, the PPHC is not out any money, the owner is not really out of any money, they have already gotten an incredible deal from the city sponsored and they have already built up some equity, etc., and everybody is satisfied. Instead, any of these other scenarios, the city is completely out of \$76,000.00.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: And this is going to be a reoccurring problem. These abandoned houses, a lot of these guys walked away. In most cases, some of these houses, the fire department has to respond time in and time out, we probably boarded it up, we are tearing it down. When does the tax payer get a break. We are subsizing all of this to try to bring back a very important neighborhood of the city but in that complex problem, if you will, can't we put something in there to try to get our taxes back, over a period of time.

COUNCILWOMAN NOLAN: As long as you don't try to pass the taxes along to some of the non-profit --- organizations because if you are going to try to do that, they are not going to bother. Why should they be involved because it is going to up their costs too much.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: We are looking to get, ultimately, to the people who are going to buy the property.

COUNCILWOMAN NOLAN: But they are mostly low income people.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: We understand that.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: But if they have held onto the property for 10 years and they have built up equity.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: We are doing everything but making the payments for them in some of these cases. COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: What can we do ----?

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Nothing tonight ---- change in law. --- should stop payments until house is bought.

MS. BRASSIL: Have to be part of deed.

COUNCILWOMAN NOLAN: ----- Street taxes never abated ---- 200 more a month. That is what is going to happen.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: ----- committee changed others -----.

May 17, 1993

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: --- all agree want to make properties available ---- get neighborhoods ----- . ----- legal agreement. Apply ----- to various properties ---- not clear tax title ----.

COUNCILWOMAN NOLAN: Transferred --- a lien.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: ---- not be a lien, would be a contract.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Why when transferred, this not taking care of at that time.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: That is why they want abated.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: --- lot of policies, not have time on this project. Do something on this property with Providence Plan ---- authorization relies on statute.

Discussion ensues relative to the foregoing matter.

THE FOLLOWING HAVE BEEN INVITED TO ATTEND:

COLONEL BERNARD GANNON - POLICE DEPARTMENT
MR. MANUEL VIEIRA - COMMUNICATIONS

COMMUNICATIONS

MR. VIEIRA: Increase in salaries due to union contracts, slight increase to telephones, taking over Planning and Development, increase by \$20,000.00.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: \$20,000.00 reduction in Planning.

MR. PRIGNANO: \$30,000.00.

MR. VIEIRA: Overtime dropped a bit. Fire in 1991, \$102,000.00, dropped to \$90,000.00 in 1993. Police, 1990/1991 - \$101,000.00, 1991/1992 - \$63,000.00, 1992/1993 up to \$69,000.00, that increase due to a school that they had.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: --- asking for \$20,000.00 next year.

MR. VIEIRA: Decreased by \$10,000.00.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: \$50,000.00 in overtime.

MR. VIEIRA: Dropped to \$20,000.00.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: You have had some grievances that have resulted in changes of pays?

MR. VIEIRA: Yes, two chiefs and with the Chief Radio Engineer. There was a grievance.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Do you have all the papers?

MR. VIEIRA: Yes I do.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: This is the settlements. I would like to here the logic as to how some of this....

May 17, 1993

MR. WOERNER: Kathy Moretti was out today so I couldn't get it out of Personnel.

MR. VIEIRA: They claimed that their job specs changed that some of the work they were doing was not included in their job specs which it really wasn't. This is the old job spec here and this is the new, I highlighted some of the new duties that they acquired in the past several years.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Is there a new job spec that has a new date on it? Is that what that means, 360?

MR. RICHARDSON: That was the original.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: They have managed for 30 years it was okay? Do we have a new one of these?

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

MR. VIEIRA: The job spec itself has been changed. Kathy Moretti has a new job specs.

MR. WOERNER: I will get that tomorrow.

MR. VIEIRA: Other than that, Mr. Chairman, there are no other changes which is good news.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

CHAIRMAN DILLON: The first question was Sacoccia. When do we get the money for Sacoccia?

CHIEF GANNON: Sacoccia was just convicted. There is about 50 million dollars that we are looking at and realistically we are hopeful in getting about 5%, which would be about 2.5.

MR. WOERNER: Who gets the rest, the FEDS?

CHIEF GANNON: It is divided up into every agency that was involved in the investigation.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: And you only get 5%?

CHIEF GANNON: Yes, but any time anybody offers me 2.5, I very seldom say no.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Yes but we must have done most of the work, right?

CHIEF GANNON: We did a lot of the work but the FEDS did a lot and there has just been jurisdictions involved and we are dependent upon what they want to give us. 5 should be the minimal of what we are going to get.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: We had financed the cars with that, right?

May 17, 1993

CHIEF GANNON: Right.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Are we going to be able to get it in this fiscal year with the lease payments due?

CHIEF GANNON: We have already started the procedures to get it, the government has.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: When does Fleet want its first payment on the cars?

MR. PRIGNANO: If we budgeted the expense in the police and budget --- transfer them in so we could make the payment when it is due as long as we get the transfer any time by next June 30th.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Is that realistic?

CHIEF GANNON: Hopefully.

COUNCILWOMAN FARGNOLI: What is the total cost of all the new cars, do you know?

MR. AUBIN: \$450,000.00.

COUNCILWOMAN FARGNOLI: What are you going to do with the remainder of that money? Are we looking into a special computerized system to make it easier for the policemen to file their reports?

CHIEF GANNON: We have a system.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: That is question number 2. Do you want to go on with the cars?

COUNCILWOMAN FARGNOLI: I was just interested in knowing how much is left of that seizure money.

CHIEF GANNON: What you have to understand that not only have we bought cars but we are also financing a complete transfer of all communications equipment -- pay for on time. We have gotten money from ---. We are also in dire need of so many things for the men on the police department that that money is going to go for.

COUNCILWOMAN FARGNOLI: Chief, that station is deplorable.

CHIEF GANNON: If you want to look at a new police station, you are going to be looking about 32 million dollars to build a new police station. What we have done is we have done studies on the police department. There are three ----- . Number one, that we move the police department/fire department in its entirety to a place maybe up where JR's Fastlane is now a build a new

May 17, 1993

police/fire complex, 32 million dollars. Plan number 2, that the fire department stays where it is for the response. We give them living quarters and renovate the other floors, the courts into administrative buildings. The third ----, which probably at this point in time is the most realistic.....

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: How much does the plan B cost?

CHIEF GANNON: Probably very close, probably a million or so less, high 20's. Plan number 3 is re-renovate the headquarters we have now. The reason we want to move is there is absolutely no parking. Even if we renovate we are going to have to build parking garages.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: Renovating is not the answer to that place.

CHIEF GANNON: We have done extensive studies on it. The Captain and myself have been to Kansas City. We have looked at proposals and what other departments have done and just the financial atmosphere, and I don't have to tell you folks here especially on the Finance Committee, getting the money is going to be almost impossible.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: We sold the parking garage that is next to Burger King. The city owned it and sold it. You guys needed it.

CHIEF GANNON: You have to get to work an hour early to get an illegal parking place. The illegal parking places are gone. There is no place to park around headquarters. We have three districts and a headquarters. We don't need three districts. At one time, I think we had 7 precincts in Providence because of transportation. Now with transportation, the interstates, we could be housed under one roof and only have to tell the people once, not have to tell them three times, a central command. It is so much better for law enforcement yet we are still in districts because we have no parking downtown and that is the only reason.

COUNCILWOMAN NOLAN: How many square feet do you need?

CHIEF GANNON: 150,000 minimum.

COUNCILWOMAN FARGNOLI: It has to be faced.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: If we are going to spend money renovating that place, I think we are just throwing money down.

May 17, 1993

CHIEF GANNON: What would happen, if you do a cost comparison, what it would cost you to renovate and what it would cost you for a new building and after 20 years, it will probably be the same. We have one elevator that doesn't work. Our boiler is antiquated.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: But at the same time, the Old Stone Bank Building on South Main Street went for 17 million --- 33.

CHIEF GANNON: Channel 10, when they moved out of Dorrance Street would have been nice for us. We probably could have built a parking garage.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: How about Sears?

CHIEF GANNON: It is too far for one side of the city. You have to be centrally located.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: How about --- Laundry?

COUNCILWOMAN FARGNOLI: That is a good location.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: That is not a bad location, --- Laundry.

COUNCILWOMAN FARGNOLI: When the Convention Center is completed, you are going to need something downtown.

CHIEF GANNON: Want to ---- to some.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: Talk to Finance ----, would have to be a -----.

CHIEF GANNON: ----- keeping police on streets ----.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Are we saving money on ----?

Discussion ensues.

CHIEF GANNON: We are meeting with the City Solicitor tomorrow, as a matter of fact, to try to derive some means to obtain more financing from tickets that we issue out on the water.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: How many tickets have you issued?

CHIEF GANNON: Quite a few but unfortunately the City Council did not approve for the recommendations last year and as a result we have to go through the state courts.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: What do you mean?

CHIEF GANNON: We were looking for legislation, hopefully, go through an Ordinance.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: We bounced it.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: We did?

COUNCILMAN FENTON: A couple of times.

May 17, 1993

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: The Ordinance Committee did?

COUNCILMAN FENTON: No, the whole Council did.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: The Ordinance Committee passed it out.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: 3 to 2.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Is this the harbor thing.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: I have asked us to approve these exact same ones.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: The Port Authority.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: The Port Authority has asked to approve the exact same Ordinance.

CHIEF GANNON: If we are going to issue citations, the city should get some benefit from it really.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: I did get a nice letter from Mr. Ventura, Patrolman Ventura.

CHIEF GANNON: He is our officer that takes care of ---.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: He did enlighten me to a couple of issue which I was not aware of. I still have some reservations about the issue. It has to cost some amount of money to have an officer out there, regardless. There is the expense of having the officer there rather than in the neighborhood and I think that the priority should still be within having the officer dedicated to.....

CHIEF GANNON: I think, Councilman, what we are seeing now is we are seeing a new problem in law enforcement with the construction of the water front and now we have businesses on the water front there. India Point is a very busy place. We have a marina there now.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Then maybe we should address having those with docks pay for that rather than assigning a police officer.

CHIEF GANNON: Whoever pays for it is not my problem. My problem is giving equal protection to the business men on the water as we do to the people who have business downtown. Realistically, and as we sit here with the Convention Center coming in and a lot of other building of the downtown area, the Providence Police Department is --- in demand. When I came on the department, we had 500 and some officers, 43 working posts. We are down to 440 now with 25 men short and it is just impossible to

May 17, 1993

patrol the city and provide the functions. Even though the City of Providence has a population, at least in writing, of 160,000, we service a quarter to half a million people and if somebody calls we don't say, do you live in Warwick if there car is stolen in Providence, we respond and we take the reports and our response time is the most sensitive area of police community relations. Our response time is bad. Our investigations aren't what they should be. The time we spend with --- aren't what they should be. What we have done in the police department is we have a computer printout of every call that goes out and we have taken now every 5th call and we have sent a questionnaire out to that person saying, how was the response time, what was the policeman's response, was he polite, what do you suggest.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Excellent.

COUNCILWOMAN NOLAN: Is it in more than one language?

CHIEF GANNON: I don't think so at this point in time.

COUNCILWOMAN NOLAN: I would suggest that you do that.

CHIEF GANNON: Yes it is a good idea. I think it is probably right now in one language and what we are finding is that our response time is not what it should be. The services aren't what they should be and they are not going to be until we either get more people or find more innovative ways to respond to the concerns of the citizens.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: I am glad to hear you are doing that.

COUNCILWOMAN NOLAN: When you first came on board, I remember ---- with 40, is there a reason that you are not able to do that because of a lack of man power?

CHIEF GANNON: We are down 25 people. When I came on, when I came aboard, we had no community policing. We have 33 people assigned to community policing. That takes away from the minimum manning. We have not really added anyone to detectives, SIB, we are short in prosecution, we are short in all our auxiliaries by virtue of fact that I have to keep 29 men on the street.

COUNCILWOMAN NOLAN: What we have been doing in some of the neighborhoods is we have been getting the community police officers to work --- because that is the crime ---. That doesn't effect minimum manning?

May 17, 1993

CHIEF GANNON: That doesn't effect minimum manning.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Just have a car patrol.

CHIEF GANNON: Have 29.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Minus 15 Clerk III's, minus 1 Clerk IV, plus 1 Clerk Special Projects, minus 6 Detention Officers, minus 1 ---- Officer.

CHIEF GANNON: Came from ---- department, does lettering on cars.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Add ---- to police station.

CHIEF GANNON: He does everything and does work for other departments.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Just did 30 police cars, sometimes 17,000 a ----. How much ----.

CHIEF GANNON: ---- out of forfeiture money.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: Do you keep officers accountable for the condition of the cars?

CHIEF GANNON: Every morning check ----, anything wrong with the car ---.

COUNCILMAN IGLIOZZI: Can you say Officer Fenton always gets car number 32?

CHIEF GANNON: No. Three men assigned to car 12, their day off, other people are assigned to that car.

Discussion ensues

MR. AUBIN: I think we can probably go another year or two with those as they are now but I think after that, they are all going to have to be really looked, maybe we have a couple of years. We are still on the old WANG and that is good for another year or two but we are outdated.

CHIEF GANNON: -----.

Discussion ensues.

May 17, 1993

ADJOURNMENT: On motion of Councilman Glavin seconded by Councilwoman Fagnoli, it is voted to adjourn the meeting at 6:50 o'clock P.M.

Michael R. Clement
CLERK

Care E. Brooke Stewart
Assistant Clerk