

DEPARTMENT OF CITY CLERK

CITY HALL

MARCH 19, 1990

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

PRESENT: Councilman Glavin, Councilman Rollins and Councilman Farmer

ABSENT: Chairman Dillon and Councilwoman Fargnoli.

Also present are Ed Clifton, City Solicitor, Tim Duffy of the Mayor's Office, Council President Nicholas Easton, Steven Woerner, City Internal Auditor, Joseph Almagno, Superintendent of Schools, John Simmons, Director of Administration, (Rose M. Mendonca, City Clerk, Claire E. Brooke-Stewart, Assistant Clerk)

(Subsequently Chairman Dillon joins the Committee).

Councilman Farmer moves that Councilman Glavin be acting Chairman and this motion is seconded by Councilman Rollins.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: I call the meeting to order and have the Clerk call the Roll.

CLERK: We have a quorum.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: We will try to dispose of some of the lesser items until Chairman Dillon shows up because a few of us do have to leave.

REQUEST OF BERNADETTE PAGLIARO, EMPLOYED IN THE ASSESSOR'S OFFICE FOR A LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM MARCH 5, 1990 TO APRIL 13, 1990 FOR MEDICAL REASONS

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: The first one is the request of Bernadette Pagliaro for a leave of absence, what is it for thirty days.

COUNCILMAN FARMER: Yes, what is the reason.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: For medical reasons. She has used all accumulated sick leave and vacation as has been advised by her physician that he will re-evaluate her at the end of the full period as to her ability to try to work. Miss Pagliaro has been treated for infectious mononucleosis.

COUNCILMAN FARMER: I move approval.

COUNCILMAN ROLLINS: Second.

MARCH 19, 1990

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: All those in favor. "Aye". So moved.

REQUEST OF MALINDA W. HOWARD, EMPLOYED IN THE HOUSING COURT FOR A LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM MARCH 5, 1990 TO MARCH 4, 1991, FOR PERSONAL REASONS

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: The next one is another request of a leave of absence from Malinda Howard from the Housing Court for a one year period and all it states is for personal reasons.

COUNCILMAN FARMER: Nothing from the Housing Court?

CLERK: I requested a letter be received from the Court via the Personnel Director twice.

COUNCILMAN FARMER: I move to continue.

COUNCILMAN ROLLINS: I second.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: All those in favor. "Aye". Motion is approved, the request is continued.

Do you want to do three Rose? Relative to Auditing on Financial Records, or do you want to wait for David.

CLERK: I think we should wait for David.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: That's a Monday yes.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Has he been working on that?

CLERK: Yes, well it's a question on whether we are going to go out to bid or Continue the firm we have.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: That's relative to Peat Marwick, they are looking to continue that again, aren't they?

COUNCILMAN FARMER: Yes.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Without bidding?

RESOLUTION ENDORSING HOUSE BILL 90-H 8896, PRESENTLY PENDING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY RELATING TO CRIMINAL OFFENSES - CONTROL OF FIREARMS

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: It's a Resolution sponsored by the President relative to an act pending before the house Judiciary Committee relative to criminal offenses and firearms, the one Council President Easton was talking about. This act is to control firearms and as is our usual procedure, we don't recommend approval of a piece of legislation until we really know what we are recommending.

COUNCILMAN FARMER: I'm in favor of it.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Well I don't think any of us are

MARCH 19, 1990

necessarily opposed to gun control but I think we have to look at the more practical aspects, the Assessor's Office comes to us and says oh, you wish.

ED CLIFTON: Basically what that does is it changes the title as presently the law which prohibits, any local city or town from having anything to do with the issue of firearms, but the intent of the legislation is, as I understand, is just to be to amend that section to allow the City of Providence to have some substantial say with respect to the issuance.

COUNCILMAN FARMER: Exclusive say.

ED CLIFTON: Exclusive say, that's correct, with respect to the firearms within this jurisdiction. The state statute title 45-6-1 of the General Laws which gives to cities and towns the right to have Ordinances relating to a number of items including firearms.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Do we have an Ordinance being drafted now to implement that, if it is successful, ready.

ED CLIFTON: No.

TIM DUFFY: My estimate is that you will probably see some action from the house running into opposition on the senate side.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: What my initial question was, what are we defining by Ordinance, which department would regulate this, would it be the Bureau of Licenses, the initial question here is to where we are going to go with this. I remember a couple years ago, Councilman Pitts wanted to ban handguns in the City of Providence and a very long, steamy meeting was held in the Council Chamber. We want to see where we are going to go with this thing, how realistic are we being in attempting to regulate all of this and enforcing it if anything else. We're having problems getting stop signs and red lights and we want to regulate firearms.

ED CLIFTON: Well, trying to address your question, as far as the License Bureau, but it seems like one of the most likely and logical places is to begin with. Some weapons would have to be licensed, understanding that not all "firearms" will need to have a license to either purchase or

MARCH 19, 1990

to carry, it's only concealed weapons that you need a licence to carry and I don't think we can impose a more restricted Ordinance, more restricted than for example, the second right of the United States Constitution right to bear arms. I really haven't had a chance, Councilman, to speak with the proponent either on the State side or on the City side on this Ordinance or on the amendment so I'm really not in a position to respond, I don't think, intelligently.

TIM DUFFY: I believe Councilman Easton is next door.

CLERK: Council President Easton and Councilwoman Young are the ones that sponsored this.

TIM DUFFY: Do you want to see if they will come over?

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Sure.

Do we want to be involved in all the various aspects that are listed in that legislation, let's look at it this way, if that law passed, would we be given, whether we wanted it or not the responsibility for everything, say, all the registration all the various components.

ED CLIFTON: We would have to establish some public mechanism to show this.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Okay. I heard some of the people probing on legislation to settle a performance, we may not want to get into that aspect and this is just an initial piece of legislation and I suppose in all likelihood it they will be amended at the State House, that's a possibility.

TIM DUFFY: Council President Easton is going to be in as soon as he gets off the phone.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Do you want to do the teachers?

COUNCILMAN FARMER: Yes.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Until one of the sponsors come in. Okay, we're looking for seven extensions. This is Joseph Almagno's request.

At this time Chairman Dillon joins the meeting.

Councilman Dillon in the Chair.

Council President Easton joins the Committee at this time.

RESOLUTION GRANTING AN EXTENSION IN TIME FOR CERTAIN TEACHERS FROM THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS ESTABLISHED

MARCH 19, 1990

UNDER SECTION 1210 OF THE PROVIDENCE HOME RULE CHARTER OF 1980, UNTIL JUNE 30, 1990

JOSEPH ALMAGNO: This is just to get them through the end of the year.

COUNCILMAN FARMER: I move approval.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: I second the motion. Are you going to be coming back for another extension for these people?

JOSEPH ALMAGNO: No, I would imagine that at least five of these people will be terminated as of the specific date that their extension expires.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Thank you.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: It would be nice if, that you, the representatives of the legislation, and that is that I think that it would be very helpful to the City Council if we all respect the Mayor's coalition on wanting to put this whole residency question on the ballot. It would be helpful if we had some resolution of that earlier on so that we are not discussing this two days before the deadline. There is a number of people on the City Council who have their own ideas about the appropriate format and I know that there has been discussions, but it would be nice again if we had some upfront discussion about what the appropriate way is to bring that discussion to before it is on the ballot.

TIM DUFFY: Maybe I could offer a suggestion on that, it would be in the form of a Resolution that should appear on the ballot. Maybe Administration could submit to the City Council asking that the Committee, City Council and Administration sit down and discuss the form and type of Resolution that should appear on the ballot or if you just want to meet and talk about it we could just do it that way too and then at the appropriate time make a decision.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Okay, thank you. So do we have a motion on this.

COUNCILMAN ROLLINS: So move.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: I second.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: All those in favor. "Aye". Opposed. Motion carries.

-----

MARCH 19, 1990

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: We invited the Council President in because we were discussing this Resolution about enacting legislation relating to criminal offenses --- control of firearms.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: I want to discuss the auditing of Financial Records, Mr. President, do you want to move quickly on your Resolution here.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Well we were just talking about the merits of the piece of legislation and I had a question because I heard Nick on the radio and he was talking about different aspects of the piece of legislation and next time we may not want to get into that area, so the question I proposed to the City Solicitor was, if this act in its present form, passed will it then revert to the City of Providence for us to implement all those aspects of it and he was just arguing that he felt might, etc., etc. and that's where we were and do we want to get into say registration are we going set up a whole other bureaucracy to handle this, I think they're fair questions.

ED CLIFTON: Well in looking at it, everything that is presently with the State of Rhode Island if the legislation passes, would be with the City of Providence. locked, stock and barrel, the whole nine yards.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: That existed prior to 1984 anyway, so I don't know if it would be that cumbersome, before 1984, the cities and towns had the exclusive rights in all of the areas. Then the 1984 law took it away from them and said the State should have it all. I think, going a little bit further with this line of questioning, what happens to the existing laws that pertain to the State of Rhode Island and the City of Providence, in other words, with passage of this Resolution, does it simply mean that we can now begin to amend the existing laws and change them as it relates to the City of Providence or does it mean for all intents and purposes that all laws currently pertaining to the State of Rhode Island seem to pertain to the City of Providence.

ED CLIFTON: I would think that there would have to be

MARCH 19, 1990

body of laws for the City of Providence, there would be a body of laws also for the State of Rhode Island. There would be a body of laws for the City of Providence until the City Council were to enact a body of laws which regulate the town regulations within it's boundaries so that, you know, one could argue, assume for the moment that it is illegal to possess a certain type of weapon in the State of Rhode Island that once the City of Providence were to pass something given the exclusive sole right to regulate that conduct that if the person had that particular weapon within the boundaries of the City of Providence, -----.

COUNCILMAN ROLLINS: Wouldn't the more stringent law with that take precedent?

ED CLIFTON: What you have is a state law that requires to all the other 38 cities and towns.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Except as otherwise provided in this chapter and is registered to the City of Providence.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: Although it does say the power to regulate, well anyway, we can spend a lot of time on that. I think what we need to do, and I think that it is very good that Tom raised these questions because they are extremely important fundamental background issues, but maybe before the next Finance Committee you could have somebody on your staff address the question of what would be the status of gun control if this were passed tomorrow. What would be the status of all gun laws, registration, taxation, etc., within the City of Providence in the interim period before the City Council made any such laws.

COUNCILMAN ROLLINS: It could be what the present status of the laws pertaining to the State of Rhode Island as a whole.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: Okay, so before we need anything the other laws would stay in touch. All right, well that was my question.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Well. it's part of your question. the question is, what are we going to need, what are we going to have to do, let's say this hypothetically and we have the

MARCH 19, 1990

authority to do all these things that we're looking to regulate ownership, transportation, transfers, sales, you've got a lot of complicated clerical things, you're going to need some entity to handle these. I asked the solution if there was any Ordinance being constructed right now in anticipation of it and he said no there wasn't, so we have to look beyond just this piece of legislation, because what we've got to do is, if it's written how we're going to deal to enforce of the law, because we're looking. I think I'm a little tense, you know, we're very concerned about the cooperation of a violent crime in the City of Providence and I'm sure across the Country, but, you know, are we going to get any better just by the State saying, okay now you guys take care of it and maybe we don't have it put together to really handle that.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: Let me say though, I'm fairly comfortable with that Tom because we did have all those powers up until 1984.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Yes, we did.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: We did, in fact, we still issue firearm permits.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Well the Chief does.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: The Commissioner.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: The Commissioner, but that's really normal.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: I think that's all that exists in the law that applies anyway.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: There are other things that, there is a broad extension of what they did before. I'm not saying I'm opposed or for it, I would like to have a logical idea of what we're going to be involved in before we say we want to do it.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: So maybe the solution to what Tom is raising is to look at what gun control laws exist state-wide.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: I think the better idea is, if this is passed, what is the City of Providence going to have to do to if nothing else to maintain the level of gun control to



MARCH 19, 1990

improve upon that which is existing and what would that entail as far as support from within the City Government?

That probably, you know, short of a referendum and I think that was something that we discussed a few years back and I was quite surprised at the level of people within the City of Providence that came out and testified against banning firearms. Personally I have no ----- to it but I think that there is a very high level of support in the Community for ownership of handguns and I think what a lot of us and legislators are trying to do is, well if the prevailing action of people is that you should own firearms do it intelligently. Do it in such a way that anyone just can't go in, I was watching a program last night that we saw on TV, inside LA gangs, it was on one of the cable programs, it was a very interesting program. They were interviewing various gang members and they were talking about guns and the guy said how do you get guns and he said well, very simple we go find someone, in this case a junky, we give him money, we give him so much money and say go buy me this, he will go, he will buy the particular weapon, he will come back give it to the person and get the rest of the money and his need for money to sustain his drug habit, he'll go around. Like years ago, people who had alcoholic problems would go and sell blood to get \$25 and \$30 or whatever and the casualness that these young gang members were talking about how easy it was to purchase firearms, it was really something that was quite frightening. The guy said, no big deal, we don't have to, there are people they can get guns from, but the way this guy was talking, no we can go to the store and get them.

ED CLIFTON: Particularly, I think that, first of all on registration and purchasing of firearms that is a regular industry and one of the things that you have including purchasing is to attest that you are not addicted to drugs or anything, declared to be mentally insane, etc., etc. The point of that is that you can have all the laws in the books. There are ways around it so then again it goes to the whole issue of whether or not there is bureaucracy that exists that

MARCH 19, 1990

would be able to address all those things.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Well that is my biggest question. Where are we going? This is something in my participation on the Ordinance Committee in all these years always comes out. I mean, if any one of us who is an elected official or involved in government has dealt with people, I mean we could put laws on the books every year, some people question all the laws, all the 8,000 laws generated every year from General Assembly. I mean really, how effectively enforced are those laws, we've got laws for just about everything you can think about.

ED CLIFTON: There's no laws indicating introducing a new law?

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Well there is no law against introducing, I think maybe we should look at that, but, seriously, you know, many of us on the City Council complain about the fact that we're unable to satisfy our constituent's demands. We're looking to get into a very complicated and very difficult issue of gun enforcement, I just think, I'm not opposed to or in support of it, but, I think we've got to look at the reality of the situation and are we necessary putting up a law that sounds like it's a good piece of legislation that we don't really have the mechanism to effectively enforce and I think before we send this up there endorsing it, I think we should have our act together, I don't think we quite have all the answers.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: That's why I'm saying the most important thing we can do today, and I know that the Chairman does not want to spend a lot of time on this issue, the most important thing we can do today is to try to give any sense of what kind of background information we need to know from a legalistic standpoint before we decide if we want to venture into this whole game, if we otherwise would want to, and I think as Tom said, I think we're all anxious to find some solution to this problem. but we need to know whether or not we're going to get ourselves into such a bureaucratic nightmare that would in fact potentially not make the problem

MARCH 19, 1990

work.

COUNCILMAN ROLLINS: Was the Police Department consulted under this?

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: They were consulted and they were at the press conference when we announced this and are very much in support of this, or at least they professed to be.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Well I think that most Police Departments are in support of gun control because they are the people that deal with the aftermath, and again looking beyond that to the bureaucratic mechanism that is going to be necessary to enact it within City Hall and the problem of City Hall within the law enforcement community. I would like to move to Continue the Resolution.

COUNCILMAN ROLLINS: I second.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Are we going to be meeting in the next week or two?

CHAIRMAN DILLON: I'm sure we are going to be meeting. but I just want to say, that you know, I don't think this Committee, we're going to have the budget, we're going to have the capital budget, we have fairness in purchasing, we have a pension Ordinance, there is a limit to how much we can do, I don't want to get into a lengthy discussion on this legislation, my sense is to pass it as a request and if they pass it at the State House, then you can have the honors of advising it.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: The increase in violent crime is upsetting to everyone, those who live in the neighborhoods of the City of Providence. This is a very complicated and important issue and I don't think, and I understand what you're saying, I know we put a lot of work ahead of us and I'm not looking for more work. This is important stuff, I think we might not look at it as professional as we think we are. and we may not be solving what we want to do.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: And again. if the answers come out right to the kinds of questions we're posing, then I don't think what you and Tom are saying is much different, I think

MARCH 19, 1990

what Tom is saying is, as long as we can satisfy ourselves that passage of this resolution does not cause us some harm, if we never decide on the new gun control measure that we want, that he's willing to take up the measure. It's a very good question, suppose this Resolution passes and the law passes could we conceivably take our time about doing something about gun control, but we now have the power, but without doing any harm to the overall issue, that's the case.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Well the other side of the argument is I'm not sure this is going to have a public hearing and I think it would, look again unprofessional, for us to be up there and pressing something and not have a plan to implement it. It would sort of be a little silly I think, and I really wouldn't want my name on it.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: There is a motion made and seconded to Continue, all those in favor. "Aye". Those opposed. Motion carries.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Whatever you think is important next Mr. Chairman because I've got to leave.

RELATIVE TO AUDITING OF FINANCIAL RECORDS

CHAIRMAN DILLON: The only other thing is relative to auditing the financial records for the fiscal year ending 1990 Peat Marwick, KMPG has suggested that they would do it again at the same price as last year. I'm kind of concerned about next year being more of a problem than this year, I 'm afraid that the year ending June 30, 1991, you're going to find a lot of new people in government, potentially, you're also potentially having a difficult year, financially, and I am concerned that you would have all new people and then if you had a new auditor, to you could lose a lot of stuff in the translation. They also said that they would do it again, continue it for us like a 4% increase for the year after that. I'll just bring it up for discussion. You can have a formal presentation.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: You and I discussed this and you mentioned to me, I appreciate that. The one major reservation

MARCH 19, 1990

I have I expressed it to you and for the record. is that we extended without competitive bid. I think it is important to note that, maintaining Peat Marwick as the Auditor even a year or two ago, and at that time I believe that there was some concern expressed that instead of going out for competitive bid we would just continuing the work, and I think the concern of a lot of us on the Finance Committee then was, and I'm not saying they were attempting to do this, I want to specify, I'm not implying that Peat Marwick was attempting this, but indirectly it could be backdooring their way into continuing the work. Now all of us are pleased by Peat Marwick's work, they're certainly a recognizable firm, there's no question from that perspective, but I think it sort of undermines the competitive bidding process that we have really tried and Mayor Paolino, in particular, has bent over backwards to try to enforce that in the City of Providence sometimes to the ----- of the Department Heads who urgently need goods and services and I think when it comes to something as critical as the auditing of the City of Providence financial condition. I think we all went along and fine, but to do it a second time I personally have some problems with it, I really would

STEVEN WOERNER: That was back in 1985 or 1986 I believe, Tom maybe 1987. It was a two year, usually you go at least two or three year packages.

CLERK: We did extend it, but we did advertise, we did have people in and for the best interest of the City Peat Marwick was recommended.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: It wasn't that big of a spread.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: But I know this situation did come across the floor. We did advertise.

STEVEN WOERNER: And what's important as David said to us, if you go out for bid, you want to make sure you go out for more than a one year period. The worst thing for the Administration and for the Auditors is that transition period when they come in the first year and have to learn the whole system, learn what's going on.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT EASTON: Well except saying we did that

MARCH 19, 1990

last year

CHAIRMAN DILLON: The only thing is if they're saying they'll hold the price.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: I understand that.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Now if we put it out to bid they may not be the low bidder.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Well you also run the risk of any other accounting firms that have been a little bit tight and might be able to do the audit, I'm not trying to dump Peat Marwick, in no way shape or form, but I do remember we did it one other time before and I wasn't comfortable with it at that time, but we did it.

Also at that time I think other members of the Committee also expressed some uncomfortableness with the situation, I mean, John, Chief of Administration was pretty convincing. We tried to go along with the situation, we thought at that time it didn't represent a major compromise on the part of the City, but I think to do it again, within a two or three year period, I'm just uncomfortable with it, I'm just one member of the Committee, I've got a problem with it.

JOHN SIMMONS: We had done that originally I think in 1985 or 1986 if I remember correctly, we continued the transition. I think back in 1988 we advertised and awarded in the best interest in the City, we would rather have the expertise and experience in doing this. If you want my recommendation in January the time period when you have a potentially a new Mayor coming in, and what will be the transition period, that transition for a new Mayor, I know that one Mayor left and the mayor used the procedure audit was beneficial to have an Auditor that knew how the system works, how it's supposed to work to attain the actual transition. An independent auditor in the first issue, the second part is the purposes of transition which is just important and I guess what is the least important is the price.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: This doesn't have to be and there is not a formal document in front of us on this, I brought it up for discussion.

MARCH 19, 1990

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: When do we have to make a decision?

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Well if we're going to advertise for bids and we're going to have to do that first.

COUNCILMAN ROLLINS: I am on the same trend of thought, I understand what John is saying, you know, as far as transition, but I'm very strong on competitive things. There is a possibility of getting a lower price and with a new firm and if we put it out to bid Peat Marwick has that same opportunity, like they said they would do their price or go lower, but just probably say let's extend it again, I wasn't here before when it was extended, I wasn't on the Committee.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Do you want us to make a motion or something? Or are we going to decide to go out for competitive bids or just get this in the works.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Yes, we'll probably decide to go to competitive bid, then you'll have to get the work right away.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: My honest opinion, I'm being honest, and I told you this when we talked before, I'm just not comfortable sending it again under the circumstances, I think that we should, my recommendation would be to go to competitive bid and seek proposals. We had some pretty good bids last time I thought. We chose not the lowest bidder because of a case like this we felt that the person we awarded it to had sufficient expertise and whatever for the difference. I think it's always in the City's best interest to keep everyone on their toes and I think it keeps Peat Marwick on their toes. I think it keeps the other potential people who want to do business on their toes and if you want a motion, I will make a motion, if you don't want a motion, I won't make a motion.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: To Mr. Woerner. Why don't you have prepared for the next time the specs or whatever is necessary.

STEVEN WOERNER: Okay, we'll just update what we had last time, they were pretty good.

RELATIVE TO FAIRNESS IN PURCHASING ORDINANCE

CHAIRMAN DILLON: We need to set up the fairness in purchasing Ordinance hearing. The City Solicitor has been

MARCH 19, 1990

working diligently along with others and because there are some changes to the Ordinance we feel that we have to set another Public Hearing in this regard.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Why do you need another Public Hearing? The first Public Hearing was really to try to ascertain the documentation that the Federal Government is saying is necessary to substantiate the introduction of the Ordinance. Are we having a second Public Hearing to try and ascertain a second time that information?

CHAIRMAN DILLON: I think that because of the controversial nature of the Ordinance, we did not want to have a situation where a potential litigant could nullify the Ordinance based on the fact that we substantially changed the Ordinance after the Public Hearing, I understanding what you're saying, we did have a public hearing before.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Even if the Ordinance is substantially changed it doesn't mean you have to have another Public Hearing.

TIM DUFFY: I think what the Chairman is saying Tom. is that probably in an abundance caution, because this Ordinance has been controversial, why give anybody a chance to hold it up on a technicality as opposed.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: Okay, so we need to set a date, and you need how many days to do that Rose?

CLERK: Well, the ad is ready to put the dates in, I can get it in Thursday or Friday's paper then you can't have the hearing ten days after that.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Ten days after Thursday?

CLERK: Not before that, you can have it anytime after but not before it.

ED CLIFTON: This Thursday is the 22nd, ten days afterward would be the 2nd of April.

COUNCILMAN GLAVIN: Tuesday?

ED CLIFTON: Monday.

CLERK: He's not saying to have it Monday. that's the minimum. You can't have it before that date.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: And then where does that leave us for



MARCH 19, 1990

the City Council.

ED CLIFTON: City Council meets the 5th of April and the 19th of April.

CHAIRMAN DILLON: The second is probably a good date then because we're going to have the budget in here and I think you want to get this out of the way before you have it. So is the second okay?

6:30, that sounds good to me.

Okay do we have a motion to adjourn?

On motion of Councilman Rollins, seconded by Councilman Glavin, it is voted to adjourn at 6:10 o'clock P.M.

*Rose M. Mendonca*  
CLERK

*Claire E. Brooke Stewart*  
Assistant Clerk

Copied *CS*