THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION
100 CHURCH STREET, 20TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10007

**DECISION OF THE BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION TO DENY THE APPLICATION OF CLEAN RIGHT INDUSTRIES, INC. A CLASS 2 REGISTRATION TO OPERATE AS A TRADE WASTE BUSINESS.**

On April 20, 2007, Clean Right Industries, Inc. ("Clean Right" or the "Applicant") submitted an application to the New York City Business Integrity Commission ("Commission"), formerly known as the New York City Trade Waste Commission, for an exemption from licensing requirements and a registration to operate a trade waste business pursuant to Local Law 42 of 1996. See Title 16-A of the New York City Administrative Code ("Admin. Code"), § 16-505(a). Local Law 42, which created the Commission to regulate the trade waste removal industry in New York City, was enacted to address pervasive organized crime and other corruption in the commercial carting industry, to protect businesses using private carting services, and to increase competition in the industry and thereby reduce prices.

Clean Right has applied to the Commission for an exemption from licensing requirements and for a registration enabling it to operate a trade waste business "solely engaged in the removal of waste materials resulting from building demolition, construction, alteration or excavation" – a type of waste commonly known as construction and demolition debris, or "c & d." Admin. Code § 16-505(a). Local Law 42 authorizes the Commission to review and determine such applications for exemptions. See id. If, upon review and investigation of the exemption application, the Commission grants the applicant an exemption from licensing requirements applicable to businesses that remove other types of waste, the applicant will be issued a registration. See id.

In determining whether to grant an exemption from licensing requirements and a registration to operate a construction and demolition debris removal business, the Commission considers the same types of factors that are pertinent to the Commission's determination whether to issue a license to a business seeking to remove other types of waste. See, e.g., Admin Code § 16-504(a) (empowering Commission to issue and establish standards for issuance, suspension, and revocation of licenses and registrations); compare Title 17, Rules of the City of New York ("RCNY") §§ 1-06 & 2-02 (specifying information required to be submitted by license applicant) with id. §§ 1-06 & 2-03(b) (specifying information required to be submitted by registration applicant); see also

Admin. Code §16-513(a)(i) (authorizing suspension or revocation of license or registration for violation of Local Law 42 or any rule promulgated pursuant thereto). Central to the Commission's investigation and determination of an exemption application is whether the applicant has business integrity. See 17 RCNY § 1-09 (prohibiting numerous types of conduct reflecting lack of business integrity, including violations of law, knowing association with organized crime figures, false or misleading statements to the Commission, and deceptive trade practices); Admin. Code § 16-509(a) (authorizing Commission to refuse to issue licenses to applicants lacking "good character, honesty and integrity"); Breeze Carting Corp. v. The City of New York, 52 A.D.3d 424, 860 N.Y.S.2d 103 (1st Dept. 2008).

Based upon the record as to the Applicant, the Commission, for the following sufficient reason, denies its registration application:

- The Applicant knowingly failed to provide information to the Commission.

## I. BACKGROUND

### A. The New York City Carting Industry

Virtually all of the more than 200,000 commercial business establishments in New York City contract with private carting companies to remove and dispose of their refuse. Historically, those services have been provided by several hundred companies. For the past four decades, and until only a few years ago, the private carting industry in the City was operated as an organized crime-controlled cartel engaging in a pervasive pattern of racketeering and anticompetitive practices. The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has described that cartel as "a 'black hole' in New York City's economic life." Sanitation & Recycling Industry, Inc. v. City of New York, 107 F.3d 985, 989 (2d Cir. 1997) ("SRI").

Extensive testimonial and documentary evidence adduced during lengthy City Council hearings addressing the corruption that historically has plagued this industry revealed the nature of the cartel: an entrenched anti-competitive conspiracy carried out through customer-allocation agreements among carters, who sold to one another the exclusive right to service customers, and enforced by organized crime-connected racketeers, who mediated disputes among carters. See generally Peter Reuter, Racketeering in Legitimate Industries: A Study in the Economics of Intimidation (RAND Corp. 1987). After hearing the evidence, the City Council made numerous factual findings concerning organized crime's longstanding and corrupting influence over the City's carting industry and its effects, including the anticompetitive cartel, exorbitant carting rates, and rampant customer overcharging. More generally, the Council found "that unscrupulous businesses in the industry have taken advantage of the absence of an effective regulatory scheme to engage in fraudulent conduct." Local Law 42, § 1.

The City Council's findings of extensive corruption in the commercial carting industry have been validated by the successful prosecution of many of the leading figures

and companies in the industry. In 1995 and 1996, the Manhattan District Attorney obtained racketeering indictments against more than sixty individuals and firms connected to the City's waste removal industry, including powerful mob figures such as Genovese organized crime family capo Alphonse Malangone and Gambino soldier Joseph Francolino. Simply put, the industry's entire modus operandi, the cartel, was indicted as a criminal enterprise. Since then, all of the defendants have either pleaded guilty or been found guilty of felonies; many have been sentenced to lengthy prison terms, and many millions of dollars in fines and forfeitures have been imposed.

The Commission's regulatory and law-enforcement investigations have confirmed that organized crime has long infiltrated the construction and demolition debris removal sector of the carting industry as well as the garbage hauling sector that was the focus of the Manhattan District Attorney's prosecution. In light of the close nexus between the c & d sector of the carting industry and the construction industry, mob influence in the former should come as no surprise. The construction industry in New York City has been corrupted by organized crime for decades. See, e.g., James B. Jacobs, Gotham Unbound: How New York City Was Liberated from the Grip of Organized Crime 96-115 (1999) (detailing La Cosa Nostra's influence and criminal activity in the concrete, masonry, drywall, carpentry, painting, trucking, and other sectors of the City's construction industry).

Moreover, the c & d sector of the carting industry has been a subject of significant federal prosecutions over the past decade. In 1990, Anthony Vulpis, an associate of both the Gambino and the Genovese organized crime families, Angelo Paccione, and six waste hauling companies owned or controlled by them were convicted of multiple counts of racketeering and mail fraud in connection with their operation of a massive illegal landfill on Staten Island. See United States v. Paccione, 949 F.2d 1183, 1186-88 (2d Cir. 1991), cert. denied, 505 U.S. 1220 (1992). Many c & d haulers dumped their loads at this illegal landfill, which accumulated 550,000 cubic yards of refuse over a mere four-month period in 1988; during that period, "the City experienced a sharp decline in the tonnage of construction waste deposited" at its Fresh Kills landfill, as well as "a concomitant decline in revenue" from the fees that would have been charged for dumping at a legal landfill. 949 F.2d at 1188. The trial judge described this scheme as "one of the largest and most serious frauds involving environmental crimes ever prosecuted in the United States." United States v. Paccione, 751 F. Supp. 368, 371 (S.D.N.Y. 1990).

Another illegal waste disposal scheme also prominently featured haulers of construction and demolition debris. This scheme involved certain "cover" programs instituted by the City of New York at Fresh Kills, under which the City obtained materials needed to cover the garbage and other waste dumped at the landfill. Under the "free cover" program, transfer stations and carting companies could dispose of "clean fill" (i.e., soil uncontaminated by debris) at Fresh Kills free of charge. Under the "paid cover" program, the City contracted with and paid carting companies to bring clean fill to Fresh Kills. Numerous transfer stations and carters, however, abetted by corrupt City sanitation workers, dumped non-qualifying materials (including c & d) at Fresh Kills under the guise of clean fill. This was done by "cocktailing" the refuse: Refuse was

placed beneath, and hidden by, a layer of dirt on top of a truckload. When the trucks arrived at Fresh Kills, they appeared to contain nothing but clean fill, which could be dumped free of charge.

In 1994, twenty-eight individuals, including numerous owners of transfer stations and carting and trucking companies, were indicted in connection with this scheme, which deprived the City of approximately $10 million in disposal fees. The indictments charged that from January 1988 through April 1992, the defendants participated in a racketeering conspiracy and engaged in bribery and mail fraud in connection with the operation of the City's "cover" programs. The various hauling companies, from Brooklyn, Queens, and Staten Island, were charged with paying hundreds of thousands of dollars in bribes to Department of Sanitation employees to allow them to dump non-qualifying materials at Fresh Kills without paying the City's tipping fees. See United States v. Cafra, et al., No. 94 Cr. 380 (S.D.N.Y.); United States v. Barbieri, et al., No. 94 Cr. 518 (S.D.N.Y.); see also United States v. Caccio, et al., Nos. 94 Cr. 357,358, 359, 367 (four felony informations). Twenty-seven defendants pleaded guilty in 1994 and 1995, and the remaining defendant was found guilty in 1996 after trial.

In sum, the need to root organized crime and other forms of corruption out of the City's waste removal industry applies with equal force to the garbage hauling and the c & d sectors of the industry. Local Law 42 recognizes this fact in requiring c & d haulers to obtain registrations from the Commission in order to operate in the City. See Attonito v. Maldonado, 3 A.D.3d 415, 771 N.Y.S.2d 97 (1st Dept. 2004).

### B. Local Law 42

Upon the enactment of Local Law 42, the Commission assumed regulatory authority from the Department of Consumer Affairs ("DCA") for the licensing and registration of businesses that remove, collect, or dispose of trade waste. See Admin. Code § 16-503. "Trade waste" is broadly defined and specifically includes "construction and demolition debris." Id. § 16-501(f)(1). The carting industry quickly challenged the new law, but the courts have consistently upheld Local Law 42 against repeated constitutional challenges (both facial and as applied) by New York City carters. See, e.g., Sanitation & Recycling Industry, Inc. v. City of New York, 928 F. Supp. 407 (S.D.N.Y. 1996), aff'd, 107 F.3d 985 (2d Cir. 1997); Universal Sanitation Corp. v. Trade Waste Comm'n, No. 96 Civ. 6581 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 16, 1996); Vigliotti Bros. Carting Co. v. Trade Waste Comm'n, No. 115993/96 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. City. Dec. 4, 1996); Fava v. City of New York, No. CV-97-0179 (E.D.N.Y. May 12, 1997); Imperial Sanitation Corp. v. City of New York, No. 97 CV 682 (E.D.N.Y. June 23, 1997); PJC Sanitation Services, Inc. v. City of New York, No. 97-CV-364 (E.D.N.Y. July 7, 1997). The United States Court of Appeals has definitively ruled that an applicant for a trade waste removal license under Local Law 42 has no entitlement to and no property interest in a license, and the Commission is vested with broad discretion to grant or deny a license application. SRI, 107 F.3d at 995; see also Daxor Corp. v. New York Dep't of Health, 90 N.Y.2d 89, 98-100, 681 N.E.2d 356, 659 N.Y.S.2d 189 (1997); Attonito, 3 A.D.3d 415.

Local Law 42 specifically permits the Commission to refuse to issue a registration to an applicant "who has knowingly failed to provide the information and/or documentation required by the commission pursuant to [Title 16 of the Administrative Code or any rules promulgated thereto]" or "who has otherwise failed to demonstrate eligibility for such license." Admin. Code §16-509(b). Applicants who knowingly fail to provide information required by the Commission (whether they fail to provide the information altogether or they provide false and misleading information) fall under the first prong. In Attonito v. Maldonado, 3 A.D.3d 415 (1st Dept. 2004); *leave denied*, 2 N.Y.3d 705 (2004), the Appellate Division affirmed the authority of the Commission to "review" exemption applications, to fully investigate any matter within its jurisdiction and to deny such applications in those cases "where the applicant fails to provide the necessary information, or knowingly provides false information." It further affirmed the authority of the Commission to investigate the accuracy of the information provided in an application. Id.

Applicants who fail to demonstrate good character, honesty and integrity using the criteria by which license applicants are judged fall under the second prong of §16-509(b). While the Appellate Division in Attonito did not directly address the second prong, by affirming the Commission's authority to investigate matters within the trade waste industry, it necessarily follows that the Commission need not ignore the results of its investigation that bear on an applicant's good character, honesty and integrity. Id.; accord Breeze Carting Corp. v. The City of New York, 52 A.D.3d 424, 860 N.Y.S.2d 103 (1st Dept. 2008) (Commission denial not arbitrary and capricious where based on a criminal conviction, identification as an organized crime associate, and false and misleading statements). Accordingly, the Commission evaluates whether applicants meet the fitness standard using the same criteria upon which license applicants may be denied, including:

1. failure by such applicant to provide truthful information in connection with the application;

2. a pending indictment or criminal action against such applicant for a crime which under this subdivision would provide a basis for the refusal of such license, or a pending civil or administrative action to which such applicant is a party and which directly relates to the fitness to conduct the business or perform the work for which the license is sought, in which cases the commission may defer consideration of an application until a decision has been reached by the court or administrative tribunal before which such action is pending;

3. conviction of such applicant for a crime which, considering the factors set forth in section seven hundred fifty-three of the correction law, would provide a basis under such law for the refusal of such license;

4. a finding of liability in a civil or administrative action that bears a direct relationship to the fitness of the applicant to conduct the business for which the license is sought;

5. commission of a racketeering activity or knowing association with a person who has been convicted of a racketeering activity, including but not limited to the offenses listed in subdivision one of section nineteen hundred sixty-one of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations statute (18 U.S.C. § 1961 et seq.) or of an offense listed in subdivision one of section 460.10 of the penal law, as such statutes may be amended from time to time, or the equivalent offense under the laws of any other jurisdiction;

6. association with any member or associate of an organized crime group as identified by a federal, state or city law enforcement or investigative agency when the applicant knew or should have known of the organized crime associations of such person;

7. having been a principal in a predecessor trade waste business as such term is defined in subdivision a of section 16-508 of this chapter where the commission would be authorized to deny a license to such predecessor business pursuant to this subdivision;

8. current membership in a trade association where such membership would be prohibited to a licensee pursuant to subdivision j of section 16-520 of this chapter unless the commission has determined, pursuant to such subdivision, that such association does not operate in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of this chapter;

9. the holding of a position in a trade association where membership or the holding of such position would be prohibited to a licensee pursuant to subdivision j of section 16-520 of this chapter;

10. failure to pay any tax, fine, penalty, or fee related to the applicant's business for which liability has been admitted by the person liable therefor, or for which judgment has been entered by a court or administrative tribunal of competent jurisdiction.

Admin. Code § 16-509(a)(i)-(x). While the presence of one of the above factors in the record of a registration applicant would not necessarily require a denial as a matter of law, the Commission may consider such evidence as a factor in determining overall eligibility.

## II. DISCUSSION

On April 20, 2007, Clean Right filed an application for an exemption from licensing and a trade waste registration for removal of construction and demolition debris (the "Registration Application"). The sole principal disclosed on the application is Ina Patar Romano ("Ms. Romano"). See Registration Application at 10. Ms. Romano is married to Ralph Romano Jr. ("Romano Jr."). See Romano Deposition Transcript ("Romano Tr.") at 4.

Ralph Romano Jr. was convicted on November 5, 2001 for the June 7, 1989 murder of John Spensieri ("Spensieri"). Romano Jr.'s garbage hauling company, College Point Carting, was having financial difficulties. See People v. Romano, 2005 NY Slip op 5182OU; 9 Misc. 3d 1127A; 2005 N.Y. Misc. LEXIS 2501. After Romano Jr. learned that one of his key employees was leaving his employ to work for a company owned by Spensieri, Romano Jr. shot and killed Spensieri. Id. Romano Jr. went to Spensieri's home, lured him to the basement, shot him several times in the back and then stood over him and shot him repeatedly in the face. See November 9, 2005 Queens County District Attorney's Office Press Release. On November 5, 2001, Romano Jr. was convicted of Murder in the Second Degree. The jury's verdict was set aside and a second trial in 2005 resulted in Romano Jr.'s conviction for Murder in the Second Degree. Romano Jr. was sentenced to eighteen years to life in prison. Romano Jr. is currently in prison.

Ralph Romano Jr.'s father was Ralph Romano Sr. Before his death, Ralph Romano Sr. was publicly identified by law enforcement as an associate of the Lucchese crime family. See, e.g., Herbert Lowe, *Judge Voids Murder Rap*, NEWSDAY, April 25, 2003; Scott Shifrel, *Mob Son Gets 18 To Life In Slaying*, N.Y. DAILY NEWS, November 10, 2005; Sarah Kershaw, *Painting Contractor Charged With 1989 Murder in Queens*, N.Y. TIMES, May 3, 2000.

The Commission has reviewed the application and has conducted a background investigation of the Applicant. As part of the Commission's investigation, the Commission tried several times to take Ms. Romano's testimony. After the Commission agreed with Ms. Romano's requests to adjourn her deposition several times, Ms. Romano sought to withdraw the application rather than testify, thereby effectively obstructing the Commission's investigation. See infra at 8-9.

On September 15, 2008, the staff issued a 9-page recommendation that the application be denied. The Applicant was served with the recommendation on or about September 15, 2008, and was granted ten business days to respond (September 29, 2008). See 17 RCNY §2-08(a). The Applicant failed to submit a response, thereby leaving the evidence against it uncontested.

## III. GROUNDS FOR DENIAL

### A. The Applicant knowingly failed to provide information to the Commission.

The Commission has the power "[t]o investigate any matter within the jurisdiction conferred by [Local Law 42] and [has] full power to compel the attendance, examine and take testimony under oath of such persons as it may deem necessary in relation to such investigation, and to require the production of books, accounts, papers and other evidence relevant to such investigation." Admin. Code §16-504(c). On numerous occasions, the Applicant hindered the Commission's requests for its principal to appear for a deposition, culminating in the Applicant's willful failure to provide requested information.

On January 2, 2008, the Applicant was advised that the Commission wished to take the deposition of its principal, Ina Patar Romano, on January 29, 2008. See letter from the Commission to the Applicant dated January 2, 2008. The January 2, 2008 letter advised Ms. Romano that her "failure to appear... is an adequate ground upon which to deny [Clean Right's] registration application." See id. On January 24, 2008, Ms. Romano contacted the Commission, and requested that her deposition be adjourned. In accordance with this request, the Commission's staff and Ms. Romano agreed to reschedule the deposition for February 6, 2008. See letter from the Commission to the Applicant dated January 24, 2008. The January 24, 2008 letter reminded Ms. Romano that her "failure to appear... is an adequate ground upon which to deny [Clean Right's] registration application." See id.

On February 5, 2008, Ms. Romano and her attorney contacted the Commission by telephone. Ms. Romano and her attorney stated that Ms. Romano would not appear for her deposition and that Ms. Romano wished to withdraw Clean Right's application. Ms. Romano repeated her request to withdraw the application in a letter dated February 5, 2008. See letter from Ms. Romano to the Commission dated February 5, 2008. The Commission declined the Applicant's request to withdraw the application and rescheduled Ms. Romano's deposition for February 28, 2008. See letter from the Commission to Ms. Romano dated February 13, 2008. Again, the Commission reminded the Applicant, "the Commission will consider your refusal [to testify at a deposition] in its decision on the application." See id.

On February 27, 2008, Ms. Romano contacted the Commission and again requested to adjourn her deposition to March 11, 2008. The Commission agreed to Ms. Romano's request. See letter from the Commission to Ms. Romano dated February 27, 2008.

On March 11, 2008, Ms. Romano appeared at the Commission with attorney Steven R. Miller. Ms. Romano refused to complete a pre-deposition questionnaire and refused to make notations on a list of names provided by the Commission. See March 11, 2008 Ina Romano Deposition Transcript at 4-5. At the deposition, Ms. Romano again requested that the application be withdrawn. See id. The Commission's staff advised

Ms. Romano that her failure to answer questions at the deposition could result in the denial of the application. See id. Ms. Romano still refused to answer any questions. See id. at 6.

The Commission's staff would have asked Ms. Romano questions about subjects including, but not limited to her husband, Ralph Romano Jr., her father in law, Ralph Romano Sr., her connections to the carting industry and organized crime.

The Applicant was advised throughout that the failure to answer questions at a deposition is an adequate ground upon which to deny the registration application. The Commission may refuse to grant a registration if an applicant "has knowingly failed to provide the information and/or documentation required by the commission . . ." Admin. Code. § 16-509(b). The Applicant failed to submit a response, thereby leaving the evidence against it uncontested. The refusal of Ina Patar Romano to provide sworn testimony in connection with the registration application of Clean Right constitutes the basis on which the Commission denies this application.

## IV. CONCLUSION

The Commission is vested with broad discretion to refuse to issue a license or registration to any applicant that it determines lacks good character, honesty, and integrity. The evidence recounted above demonstrates convincingly that Clean Right falls far short of that standard. Based upon the above sufficient reason, the Commission denies Clean Right's exemption application and registration.

This exemption/registration denial is effective immediately. Clean Right Industries, Inc. may not operate as a trade waste business in the City of New York.

Dated: November 7, 2008

**THE BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION**

Michael J. Mansfield
Commissioner/Chair

John Doherty, Commissioner
Department of Sanitation

Jonathan Mintz, Commissioner
Department of Consumer Affairs

Rose Gill Hearn, Commissioner
Department of Investigation

Deborah Buyer, General Counsel (designee)
Department of Business Services

Brian O'Neill, Inspector (designee)
New York City Police Department