

DEPARTMENT OF CITY CLERK

CITY HALL

AUGUST 25, 1993

RECONVENTION

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

PRESENT: Chairman Igliazzi, Vice-Chairwoman Williams, Councilman Clarkin and Councilman Fenton.

ABSENT: Councilwoman DiRuzzo.

Also present is John D'Amico, Deputy City Solicitor, Barbara A. Poirier, Second Deputy City Clerk and Lesley M. Albanese, Assistant Clerk.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 11 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF PROVIDENCE, AS AMENDED.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: The last time we talked about the Harbor Ordinance before last night, John, there were changes that were sent over by the Port Commission which we asked you to review and see if you understood and appreciated it.

MR. D'AMICO: The Councilwoman was kind enough to provide me with a copy of the revisions that had been included by the Port Commission. Also, if I recall, you folks had suggested that we determine how much monies in difference the ordinance would mean. They forwarded a copy of a letter to me which I had not had an opportunity to bring here because I was tied up today. However, my understanding I can articulate to some extent - - I asked them to send you a copy today.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I have a copy right here. For the record, I am referring to a fax that I received today dated August 20, 1993. It was to Colonel Bernard Gannon, Chief of Police from Patrolman David Ventura.

PROVIDENCE POLICE DEPARTMENT

August 20, 1993

Exhibit A

TO Colonel Bernard E. Gannon, Chief of Police

FROM Patrolman David Ventura, Police boat

SUBJECT Operating cost of police boat

The following is a brief overview of the costs associated with operating the Providence Police boat for the past two years. Also included is a projection as to what monies can be expected in the future.

During the first year operation of the boat (1992) a total of \$4,700.00 was generated. During this initial year, the boat was not in service for the full summer and for the majority of the time only one officer was assigned. The cost associated with the boat was, base pay for the officer and approximately \$1,000 in boat related costs: gas, oil and routine needs.

For the current summer (1993) the police boat has generated a total of \$7,000.00 to date. This amount is below what could have been generated. Enforcement was not as aggressive, due to the fact that the proposed City Ordinance has yet to be passed. The total expenses for the boat this year will amount to \$1,650.00 plus base pay for the officers.

(cont.)

August 25, 1993

It should be noted that the police boat is given docking space at a marina in Providence at no cost to the city. The boat has been stored at a City owned facility for the winter, and again, the City incurs no charges as a result.

For the summer of 1994, with the passage of the boating ordinance, it is anticipated that revenues will exceed \$15,000.00. The costs for boat operation should remain constant at approximately \$ 1,700.00 for gas, oil and routine needs. The salary expenses will be base pay for two officers.

Additionally, with aggressive patrols, the use of radar and frequent boardings, the possibility exists that a seizure of a boat or property may result. Should this materialize, the revenues for the next summer would increase significantly.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Base Weekly Pay for
Patrolman is 606.23*

DAVID VENTURA
Patrolman
Boat Patrol Unit

*Boat is operational
for approx 9-10 hrs
PER SUMMER.*

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: Mr. Chairman, last Friday I was down at Shooters maybe around 6:00 o'clock at night and I saw three boats take off from there and if they weren't doing 35 to 45 miles a hour. They went right off the pier, you wouldn't believe how fast. I can't say I have ever paid attention before but after seeing this thing.....if there was any little guy out there on a small sail boat or something like that, he would have been just pushed right aside. These guys were moving.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: I don't think there is a need for just in terms of the presence there will help to keep the speed down. I think really need to look at the hours that the boat is there. I think it would be more appropriate for the boat patrol to be there Friday, Saturday and Sunday as opposed to the weekdays during the day when there is not a whole lot of action. But, that is an administration concern that has to be addressed but we can't legislate that. But, I do think that is a important service that the city has a responsibility to provide.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: John, did you have a chance to review the changes?

MR. D'AMICO: Yes, I did.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Could you just reflect on them for the record.

MR. D'AMICO: Bascially, the changes indicate a shift of some responsibility from the Police Department to the Port Commission. The examples are the designation of wake areas, where you get a mourning permit, the way in which you conduct a regatta - - as a

August 25, 1993

function of the Port Commission. That really isn't something that I have any strong feeling on one way or another. Certainly if the Committee or the Council is determined where it wants to have that authority vested. The only question that I have is in Article 4.....

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: What do we have here? Is this the proposed one or is this the amended one?

MR. D'AMICO: I would have to take a good look at

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: This is the amended one that we have. It's the one that was amended....

MR. D'AMICO: Subsequent to the Port Commission revision.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Okay, so you are in Article 4....

MR. D'AMICO: The one that you have in front of you indicates that in A) "the City shall have the authority to enforce the provisions of this section". And really the purpose of this ordinance is to determine which department the Council and Administration want this authority to invest. That is really the only one of the revisions that I really think is worthy of much comment other than the idea of where you want to invest the authority. But, to say that the City shall have the authority is clearly due. Because we are doing it - - and it is where you want to put the enforcement authority within the City. That would be the only objection that I would.....

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: You are saying that they should say Police Department?

MR. D'AMICO: It originally said Police Department, I mean if you feel that it should be some place else.....

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I didn't have anything to do with changing that.....

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: I'll tell you actually the change that was recommended under Article IV was "the City or its lawful designated agent shall have the authority to enforce the provisions of the section". Would that make it better?

MR. D'AMICO: At some point we are going to have to determine who the lawfully designated agent is and what department you want this enforcement to take place.

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: There is nothing wrong with having different departments. I want the Parks Department, the Police Department and

August 25, 1993

I want the Port Authority, right. I mean you can have three or four? Well, the State Police and the Providence Police can both stop cars in Providence, right?

COUNCILMAN FENTON: You can't give a law enforcement ... a non-law enforcement officer law enforcement powers.

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: I am just saying theoretically.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Yeah, but they are sworn in, they have police powers.

MR. D'AMICO: You can deputize them. There are certain statues which allow for the deputization of individuals. What I would say is that I suggest that you don't want to spread it out so that you have all these....

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN:by just saying city it still covers us.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: That's right, that's the point.

MR. D'AMICO: But, I would say to that, who's going to go do it?

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: But, you know what John, this is a ordinance and we have to leave it open enough so that you don't have to go and change this ordinance. And if some point in the future instead of having the Police Department enforce this, the city ten years from now when we don't own the Port anymore and a Harbor Master rather than the ...if we don't have a Port Commission anymore because we don't own the Port. It may be that there would be a Harbor Master, who would be responsible for mourning and enforcing this. So, I think as long as it is someone designated by the City then it gives you that leeway. That is the reason why we changed that.

MR. D'AMICO: If that is the purpose then I think you necessarily have to designate the Administration of the Mayor to appointing thehow would you act otherwise.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: The original language was "the City or it lawfully....."

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: No, it said the Chief of Police.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Your saying the amendment. What was the language.....

August 25, 1993

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: The amendment said "the City or its lawfully designated agent"

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Okay how about "lawfully designated agent" and then put a section in who designates them.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: The city would be the City Administration. I think that is what the city.....

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: As designated by the City Administration.

MR. D'AMICO: I haven't seen that. I have seen designated by the Mayor.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Do you have a problem with that?

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: No.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Then why don't we do that. Why don't you make that change. We don't need to debate it. They want it to be wide enough that the Mayor can designate a Harbor Master or somebody else with some sort of law enforcement power.

MR. D'AMICO: I have "the City or its lawful agent as designated by the Mayor".....

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: That's fine, it is perfect. That satisfies the concerns of a Harbor Master. Do we have a motion to amend it.....

On motion of Councilwoman Williams, seconded by Councilman Clarkin, it is voted to amend the foregoing Ordinance.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: All those in favor? Aye. Those opposed? The Ayes have it. Does any one else on the committee have any concerns or comments or amendments in regards to the form of the ordinance. Hearing none, Councilman Fenton.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Mr. Chairman, let me relay a story. Last night I went to a neighborhood meeting of the Greater Camp Street Concerned Citizens. There were probably 20 people there as well as myself, Representative Fox, Representative Ajello, Senator Perry, Major Devine and our community Police Officer Joe Almeida. These people are begging for more police attention in their neighborhood. Major Devine says he doesn't have it. Between the combination of the Union contract and the bidding and the number of men on the force, they do not have it. And then you want to create a vehicle which really locks this whole idea in of a Police boat on the Bay. At least for the next two or three years in which a police officer is going

August 25, 1993

to spend his or her time out on the Bay really for what is in many cases malicious mischief. It is things of ...certainly there is drunken boating going on and that is a major concern and it is a health and safety issue. But, I don't think we have the resources when we are 30 officers down. When they can't cover the Sergeants in the City, when they can't fill all the cars. Meeting a bare minimum of 16 men minimum manning that we should be passing this ordinance. Some where down the road if we ever get the - - - to make the appropriate cuts at the Fire Department and put the staffing at the Police Department that we need in an urban city. Then maybe we should look at having a function like this. But, right now my major concerns are not whether or not kids are driving up from East Greenwich are boating safely or not. I understand that there are Providence residents using the River as well and using it related to boating club. But, the two do not interact that often. Most of the rowing goes on early in the morning during week days, most of the recreational boating from outside of Providence takes place on the weekends. I have had this discussion with Patrolman Ventura. He makes some very valid points, but when you are weighing the two between the neighborhood needs and the needs on the Harbor it is not even close.

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: I can relate to what Josh just said in some ways. But, seeing that I do border that River and as I just said last Friday I was down. I couldn't believe the speed that these things had going. Just nothing the potential danger that it could be there. That is the main reason why I would support it. It wasn't a top priority but when I saw a few of these things. The amount of traffic down there now. It wasn't like that, I used to hang and live in that River when I was 12, 13 years of age. I used to walk down and you would never see a boat and when you did it was a big thing. Today it is like East Greenwich. I understand the man power of the Police Department and I over man power of the Fire Department.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: You of all people would understand that.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, may I also point out that the season is a short one. It is not like it is a 12 month position either. This is a season need. So, for 4 months or so out

August 25, 1993

of year we are talking about the safety of the harbor. I do think this ordinance is needed.

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: I am going to say one other thing on the same subject. Basically, they are there right now anyway. They are doing their job even though we are not collecting money. That is about all the ordinance does.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Just to respond to that. I think we have a much better chance of getting that officer back on the streets in the neighborhood. If the ordinance doesn't pass then if the ordinance does pass. And in the case that you just mentioned that you saw three boats speeding while he was out there. And obviously it is not having an effect and it is the second summer. So,

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: Or was he out there? How late was it?

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: It was about 6:00 or 7:00 o'clock.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: He probably was not even around.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: You meet the same problems with the union contract when their one. There is only got one or two covering that boat. Their not going to be on Friday, Friday night, Saturday, Saturday night.....

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: They should be.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Yeah, I know.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: But, I think that if we do have the ordinance then perhaps.....

COUNCILMAN FENTON: I doesn't change the contract.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: No, it doesn't change the contract but if we make it know to the Chief this very issue about the hours that perhaps.....

COUNCILMAN FENTON: That is what we did last year.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: I've got to check on that. I haven't taken the time. I do know that for example the Mounted Patrol is on Thayer Street and we requested that instead of being there during the day that they be there Friday night and Saturday night. And that is going to happen. So, that.....

COUNCILMAN FENTON: But, you have 8 different officers who are - - - certified...

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: Four.

August 25, 1993

COUNCILMAN FENTON: No, there is 8 for --- they have four horses at any one time. There is 8 officers for

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: I was just over there today and I said how many do you have and he said 4.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: There are 4 stationed at any one time but there are 8 in total that are certified.

On motion of Councilwoman Williams, seconded by Councilman Clarkin, it is voted to approve the foregoing Ordinance as amended.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: All those in favor? Aye. Those opposed.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Nay.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: The next item on the agenda I understand it is the alarm ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE REGULATING SECURITY ALARM SYSTEMS WITHIN THE CITY OF PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I got a call from Councilwoman Fagnoli today. I never spoke to her on the phone. She has some input to put into this ordinance and I understand we can not be here tonight. I know that you have been working on this Josh.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: She has been invited when this got introduced there was some concern alarm companies in the city. So, I think we have three or four meetings with Colonel Gannon, Sergeant Balcun, all the representatives of the alarm companies, as well as the State Alarm Association, couple of citizens and Councilwoman Fagnoli was invited to each and every one of those meeting. Although I don't think she attended anyone of them. We went through a number of revisions. The one before you is the final version.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Have you look this John?

MR. D'AMICO: I have not had an opportunity to look at this. I mentioned that to the Councilman on the way up stairs.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: This is the final version?

COUNCILMAN FENTON: This is what everyone agreed to. Let me just give you a couple of facts. When it was first introduced a number of years ago by Councilwoman Fagnoli, the Police Department had run a record of the number of false alarms in a six month period. And I think there was a total of about 7,000 in a six month period. When we began the process of meeting with the alarm companies, the

August 25, 1993

Police Department ran it again. There were 14,000 in the preceding 16 months. It is one out of every 6.6 calls is a false alarm. There is an average number of 81 alarm bells each day. Ninety-six percent of the alarm bells are false. That should give you an idea of 75, 76 false alarms everyday.

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: You said 1 out 6 are a false alarm that would be

COUNCILMAN FENTON: One out of six calls to the Police Department is a false alarm. One out of every six, rapes, murders, stolen cars, noise, one out of six is a false alarm.

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: Alarms....how is the percent?

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Ninety-six percent. It add up to about 206 police days per year is what it works out to. The industry also ran their records. Because they have a central station which takes all the companies in or the vast minority of the company and they came up with even more calls. The number of businesses and households that were repeat offenders was especially disturbing. And it really breaks down to, just to give you an idea one 3,000 false alarms - 640 were from 640 different. But, there was one place that was a cause of 26. So, that gives you an idea. It is very top heavy as to which number of locations are the ones that are the consistent offenders. Most of them are commercial and they are caused by the lack of training of their staffs and there is no penalty right now. So, there is no reason not to have the police officer show up every night when they close up and every morning when they open up. One six month period, I think one business had 80 something.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: That is a lot of false alarms.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: I don't know if anybody has ever ridden with the Police Department but when they get a false alarm it is the type call, priority call. They send more then one police officer as back up because it means potentially that there is an intruder in the building or in the residence. So, they either send two or three cars. So, that means and I have been with them, they'll say respond to 17 Blackstone Blvd. and it is a top priority response so their racing like mad. And they know that it is the same place over and over again. And I think it a real effect on the moral on the Police

August 25, 1993

Department when one out of every six on average is a false alarm that they are consistently going to the same businesses. What we worked out it mostly was really mostly technical in nature, it was cleaning up some language. We took out the permit fee when you initially get licensed and get your decal for your alarm. So, there would be no cost to the average well operating alarm. The fines would only begin after the fourth false alarm in the calendar year. That was a change from three, and that would increase to Fifty Dollars for a fifth and \$100.00. There is an appeals process with the Chief of Police in which they can show it was a cause of nature or that they were getting it fixed.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Something other negligence.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: That's right. There is also a False Alarm Monitoring Program Advisory Committee which would have representatives of the Council, appointees of the Council, appointees of Mayor and appointees of Industry who would review this and report back in a year and to see it is working. Those were the major changes. There was also some concerns by citizens, they were two citizens one up in John Lombardi's ward and I don't remember were they other one was from on when they put in their own kind of alarm. When they go down to Radio Shack and buy an alarm system themselves and they wouldn't be precluded from doing that. And we corrected that language so that they wouldn't be negatively impacted. So, I think it covered all the bases and we met three or four times for at least an hour to two hours each time.

COUNCILMAN CLARKIN: Mr. Chairman, I personally can support this in a minute. As I said at one Council meeting, the house across the street from me. It was right across from Carolyn's house there and I ran over at least 4 or 5 times and really after the alarm went off, I said forget that. But, I know Evelyn had said she wanted to look at it and I think we allow her that.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Also as a policy in the committee, we always have John read it. I would hate to have anything come out of this committee that doesn't get reviewed. And for the record, I am in support of it and I was in support of it before. I know that at the public meeting if my recollection serves me correct the only people that were concerned were the alarm company and

August 25, 1993

in response to their concern, we agreed we would have joint meetings which Councilman Fenton agreed he would take on that responsibility. And I think he has done a fine job and came back with the corrected language that choose that. For the most part, you satisfied their needs. If somebody has four alarms in a year before they get a \$50.00 Dollar fine.....

COUNCILMAN FENTON: \$25.00.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: \$25.00 Dollars, I mean that is really really not much, I don't think.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: Now, let me ask you a question. Because I didn't go to any of the meetings and I must have missed the public hearing on this also. Does this say that every one who has an alarm system must report it to the.....

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Yeah, they most register it.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: Suppose someone hasn't register and has an alarm and it goes off andthe police wouldn't be notified unless they were in the area and heard the alarm.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: No, almost 90% of the alarms report in to the central alarm station which then relay it the Police Department. There is very, very few that just have the bell. If they did not register their alarm there is a provision in there and it says I think they would get a warning and then after the warning they would receive a fine of \$25.00.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Let's just assume....like we got a very simple alarm in my house, it goes off and a tape recorder calls five neighbors and the police station. So, let's assume that I didn't register. The police when they get that false alarm are going to show up and they are going to find out that registered and when they see me they are going to say I'm giving you a warning to get it register. So, now I gct to run down and register it and this is your first alarm keep in mind that if you get four of them within calendar year you pay a \$25.00 Dollar fine. So, they'll let me know and I would assume there should a provision that the Police if not there should be some language that the Police should notify people about thein otherwords the first time they get an alarm they should be notified. Hey listen you know false alarms you get

August 25, 1993

fined in the city after four. If somebody had that in the back of their mind, I don't know....

COUNCILMAN FENTON: The Police I guarantee they will be saying it with absolute vengeance. Because this is a big drag for them, I don't know if you have ever ridden with them. They got to respond and that is why they go....

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI:alarm companies who were first afraid as I recall from the testimony at the hearing of being fined for all their customers. Because they are responsible but this doesn't do that. This put the responsibility on the customer and it also gives them four free bites at the apple and no cost to get it. It is really.....

COUNCILMAN FENTON: It also does a consumer thing which is the way it is structured it encourages people who are putting in an alarm to put in an alarm with a reputable central station type of agency. It is one of the reason why the alarm companies, they major one do. You are not going to have these fly by night things taking advantage of the consumer as liking. Because there would be an incentive to work through them....

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: Well, today coming to this meeting there was an alarm two doors away from my house. There were no police cars and it may be something that they put in and it is not even hooked up. So, there was no response and all it did was annoy the neighborhood.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: And the police may come and no one is there.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: It needs control, I agree.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: So, if everybody agrees we will refer this to the City Solicitor and give it one last review and contact Evelyn Fagnoli is the primary sponsor of this ordinance originally. Let her know

COUNCILMAN FENTON: I just want to say it is a different version, it is one that the Police Department had.....

MR. D'AMICO: I think that she has been listed as a cosponsor of what pending to this point and there was an effort to combine the previous ordinance.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: There was two of them, I recall. I would

August 25, 1993

like a letter sent to Evelyn.

DEPUTY POIRIER: I already put a copy in her box for tomorrow night because she is coming to Finance.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: The other pending matters I know we have to at some point, the committee has to discuss what and I don't know what to do with this. I think the Council as a general rule kind of give us the Casino issue into this committee. I personally don't think that, I am just bringing this up unless somebody as anything else to discuss about the False Alarm Ordinance?

COUNCILMAN FENTON: We had talked about moving subsequent to review.

MR. D'AMICO: I didn't know about Evelyn.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Well, I'll just say she was invited to each and every meeting.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: When is the next Council meeting?

DEPUTY POIRIER: September 2nd.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: And when's the deadline?

DEPUTY POIRIER: This Friday.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: So, we will recess the meeting for tomorrow for the purpose of contacting Evelyn and having John review language. I just don't want to send something out and then have to send something back in. I don't mind coming back here for 5:00 o'clock. If there is a problem ...why don't we do this, we'll recess to the call of the Chair and I'm letting you know that I am going to call if for 4:45 tomorrow. Because if he has a major problem then we're not going to come here unless we are here to resolve. With that said let's just move to continue this item.

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

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: With regard to pending matters, the only one that I briefly mention and I want to talk about is this Casino Report that was referred to us. I don't know how the Committee wants to handle this. I know there was a committee created that did public hearings and a host of investigations. I personally don't that we should go through the exercise again, I personally believe that the Council as a general rule referred it to this committee for what I really don't know what purpose we serve since there was a special

August 25, 1993

Casino Committee created to do the work. There is no work for us to do. If this Committee wants to hold another set of public hearings, if they some desire to do that thats fine. But, I got to tell you I recommend against it, I don't think we should be doing work over again. But, I am here to take comment whether you want to kill it, move it, what you want to do with it?

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Kill it.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: My only comment as part of the discussion was, wasn't the purpose for us to then look at the possibility to put it out to the voters?

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I thought that was the Committee was for.

MR. D'AMICO: If I may, I really don't have good recollection of this. But, my recollection is that in the draft resolution that - - - from that special committee there was some problem with the language.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: It was completely vague, it didn't say what it is going to say.

MR. D'AMICO: One of the things that the Committee my want to consider is to draft some language and move the resolution.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: I'll tell you what John you know what I would like to do, I didn't look at the report and I have my own personal feelings. I don't need a report to tell me how I would vote on the issue.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: The Council should have voted it up or down.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: That's what I thought to. It has always been my position that a Committee does Committee work. When it gets out to the Council floor it should either pass or fail. I personally think whatever we do should not come out of this committee with the recommendation. It came out of a committee that was specially created for that purpose. If it is for this purpose of looking at language, let's look at the language and refer it back to the Council. I'm make my vote known on the floor. Whatever the committee wants to do is fine with me.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: I move indefinite postponement.

On motion of Councilman Fenton, seconded by Councilman Clarkin, it is voted to postpone indefinitely the foregoing Resolution on Casino Gambling.

August 25, 1993

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: They want us to put this on the 1994, should this go on. Should Casino style gambling be permitted in the City of Providence? I don't know how that can happen.

COUNCILWOMAN WILLIAMS: First of all, you need State approval and if the City of Providence voters approved casino gambling in Providence, you couldn't do it unless there was a State bill.

COUNCILMAN FENTON: Drivers Bill certainly takes that, you need to change the State laws. He bill outlaws casino gambling.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: Has that passed? It is a mute question because if you look at this, this to be of any value would say as the Statewe went down this road. The State voters have to approve casino gambling in certain sites designated by some authority. Let's say the State would say gambling can be approve by any city or town in which the electors approve it and then we go to this in 1994. You know the way I look at if you want to resurrect this resolution anybody can do. We kill it tonight anyone can resurrect a resolution. Next meeting you decide that you want this to come out you can just get a photo copy of this and it could - - from the ccmmittee. Correct me if I am wrong? Do you see any need to have a hearing on this? Your the City Solicitor.

MR. D'AMICO: My understanding is that the Council through a committee has already engaged in that exercise. And it may have been refer here for some very specific reason it would really require an additional hearings.

CHAIRMAN IGLIOZZI: There has been a motion to approve an indefinite postpone by Councilman Fenton and seconded by Councilman Clarkin. All those in favor? Aye. Those opposed? The Ayes have it. We are going to recess to the Call of the Chair.

On motion Councilman Clarkin, seconded by Councilwoman Williams, it is voted to recess to the call of the Chair.

Lesley M. Albanese
Assistant Clerk

Barbara A. Fairies
SECOND DEPUTY CITY CLERK