



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

DECISION OF THE BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION DENYING THE EXEMPTION APPLICATION OF FRANK LIQUORI PLUMBING & HEATING INC. FOR A REGISTRATION TO OPERATE AS A TRADE WASTE BUSINESS

Frank Liquori Plumbing & Heating Inc. ("FLP&H" or the "Applicant") has applied 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.

On October 5, 2007, FLP&H 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”).

Based upon the record as to the Applicant, the Commission, for the following independently sufficient reasons, denies FLP&H’s exemption application and refuses to issue FLP&H a registration:

- The Commission Previously Found that the Applicant Lacked Good Character, Honesty and Integrity

I. REGULATORY 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.

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. Cty. 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).

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, No. 107859/07 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cty. April 1, 2008)(Commission denial based on a criminal conviction, identification as an organized crime associate and false and misleading statements not considered arbitrary and capricious). 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

FLP&H is a plumbing company owned and operated by Frank Liquori, Sr. ("Liquori"), President. See 2007 Exemption Application of FLP&H ("2007 Application") at 9. The Applicant's other principal is Liquori's wife, Lorraine K. Schaffer Liquori, Secretary. Id.

FLP&H previously filed another application with the Commission in 2005 seeking an exemption from licensing and a trade waste registration. See 2005 Exemption application of FLP&H ("2005 Application"). On March 14, 2006, the Commission found that the Applicant lacked good character, honesty and integrity and denied its 2005 application. See Decision of the Business Integrity Commission Denying the Exemption Application of Frank Liquori Plumbing & Heating Inc. for a Registration to Operate as a Trade Waste Business ("Decision on 2005 Application").

On October 5, 2007, FLP&H filed another application for an exemption from licensing and a trade waste registration. See 2007 Application. The staff has conducted an investigation of the Applicant and its principals. On April 17, 2008, the staff issued a 7-page recommendation that the application be denied. The Applicant was served with the recommendation on April 18, 2008 and was granted ten business days to respond (May 2, 2008). See 17 RCNY §2-08(a). The Applicant failed to submit a response (or a request for additional time) by that deadline.

Nevertheless, on June 12, 2008, the Commission received a 2-page handwritten letter from Liquori, in which he describes his business and the projects he worked on recently and discussed the underlying facts of his bribery conviction, suggesting that it

was necessary for Liquori to pay corrupt inspectors in order to finish his projects. See Liquori Letter, dated June 10, 2008. On June 16, 2006, the Commission received a one-page handwritten letter from Liquori, supplementing the June 10th letter, further describing his company's projects, including excavation of sidewalks and relocation of fire hydrants. See Undated Liquori Letter, received June 16, 2008. On June 10, 2008, the Commission received a letter forwarded by the New York City Police Department, in which Liquori described his company and asked the Police Commissioner for a BIC license despite his admission that "[b]ecause of previous charges against me, I don't qualify." See Liquori Letter to NYPD, dated May 5, 2008. The letters did not provide any justification for the failure to submit a timely response.

The Commission has carefully considered both the staff's recommendation and the Applicant's failure to submit a timely response. The Applicant's untimely response need not be considered by the Commission, thereby leaving the evidence against the Applicant uncontested. Regardless, despite the tardiness of the response, the Commission has considered the arguments raised by the Applicant – which failed to identify any circumstances that had changed since the prior denial - and has found them to be unpersuasive. For the reasons stated below, the Commission finds that the Applicant lacks good character, honesty, and integrity and denies its application.

A. The Commission Previously Found that the Applicant Lacked Good Character, Honesty and Integrity

"The commission may refuse to issue a license or registration to an applicant ... who has otherwise failed to demonstrate eligibility for such license under this chapter". See Admin. Code §16-509(b).

On September 2, 2005, the Applicant filed an application with the Commission seeking an exemption from licensing and a registration to operate a trade waste business. See 2005 Application. The staff conducted an investigation of the Applicant and its principals. On January 27, 2006, the staff issued a 7-page recommendation that the application be denied. The Applicant was served with the recommendation on February 1, 2006 and granted ten business days to respond. On February 14, 2006, the Applicant's attorney requested additional time and was granted an extension until February 21, 2006. On February 21, 2006, the Applicant submitted a 4-page response. See Affidavit of Frank Liquori, Sr.

On March 14, 2006, the Commission found that the Applicant lacked good character, honesty and integrity and denied its application. See Decision on 2005 Application. The decision specifically relied upon Liquori's 2004 federal conviction for Conspiracy to Bribe a Public Official, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §371. See Decision on 2005 Application at 5-7.

As the Commission stated:

In 2004, Frank Liquori, the President and sole owner of F.L.P.&H., was convicted of Conspiracy to Bribe a Public Official, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §371. Under that statute, "If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency

thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

The investigation began in October 1999 after an inspector employed by the New York City Department of Buildings ("DOB"), acting as an agent of the New York City Department of Environmental Protection ("DEP"), reported receiving a bribe from a plumber. Thereafter, the inspector agreed to actively cooperate with law enforcement and began wearing a recording device. The inspector recorded numerous conversations with Liquori and other plumbers, who collectively paid the inspector on over 100 occasions in amounts ranging from \$20 to \$1,400 to obtain expedited approvals for work or approvals without the necessary DOB/DEP inspections or permits. Liquori and the other plumbers paid a total of approximately \$34,000 in bribes to the inspector. A total of fourteen (14) plumbers and two developers were arrested and charged after the investigation was completed.

The investigation revealed that Liquori and four of his co-defendants formed a "club" and offered to pay the inspector \$400 monthly to obtain approvals for all the work performed by their respective companies. The club defendants even offered to pay the inspector an additional monthly sum of \$600 to encourage the inspector to deny approval of the work performed by their principal competitor.

On October 30, 2003, Liquori and his co-defendants were arrested and charged with Bribery and Mail Fraud. On April 20, 2004, Liquori pleaded guilty to Conspiracy to Bribe a Public Official, in violation of 18 U.S.C. 371. On December 3, 2004, Liquori was sentenced to three years probation, a \$10,000 fine, a \$100 special assessment and 1040 hours of community service. Liquori is still serving the probationary portion of his sentence.

In its response, the Applicant did not dispute the conviction or the underlying facts. Instead, Liquori argued that he had no other criminal record besides this incident and that he was remorseful. However, Liquori's purported remorse was not for his own actions, but for the "scandal involving [his co-defendant] Mr. Gregorio and the bribery charges." Rather than fully accepting responsibility for his own actions, he attempted to shift blame to his co-defendant, Louis Gregorio. His remorse focused on the impact of his arrest and conviction rather than sincere regret for committing the crimes.

Furthermore, the Applicant's argument that Liquori's criminal record was limited to the bribery conviction is not persuasive. The Commission does not find the absence of additional aggravating factors to be a mitigating factor in the Applicant's favor. This crime was not an isolated incident committed by a naïve youth; rather, this crime consisted of multiple criminal acts committed over a lengthy period of time by an experienced businessman in furtherance of the Applicant business.

The President of the Applicant committed crimes that go directly to the heart of Liquori's "good character, honesty and integrity." His crimes constitute "racketeering activities" under 18 U.S.C. §1961(1) and NYS Penal Law §460.10(1). As the sole owner and President of the Applicant, there is no distinction between Liquori and the Applicant business; as a result, a conviction that demonstrates a lack of good character of the sole principal necessarily demonstrates a lack of good character of the Applicant business as well. The conviction of Liquori is an independently sufficient basis to deny FLP&H's exemption application. See Admin. Code §16-509(a)(v).

See Decision on 2005 Application at 5-7 (citations omitted). The Applicant never filed a court challenge to the legality or sufficiency of the denial decision.

Furthermore, the Applicant failed to inform the Commission in its application of any circumstances that had changed since the denial. In an undated letter received by the Commission on August 29, 2007, Liquori requested an application. See Liquori Letter to BIC. The staff mailed him an application with a cover letter noting that Liquori had been the principal of FLP&H, a company previously denied by the Commission, and that any application submitted should "include a statement as to why the Commission should revisit that decision and a description of the circumstances that have changed, if any, since [his] prior application." See BIC Letter to Liquori, dated September 7, 2007.

On October 5, 2007, the Applicant filed another exemption application with the Commission. See 2007 Application. Attached to the 2007 Application were two handwritten letters: (a) a list of all of the projects the Applicant has worked on recently and (b) a discussion of the underlying facts of his bribery conviction, suggesting that it was necessary for Liquori to pay the bribes so that he could finish his projects. See Liquori First Handwritten Letter; Liquori Second Handwritten Letter. Notably, neither the 2007 Application nor the two letters contained any references to circumstances that had changed since the prior denial.

The staff has not found any reason for the Commission to revisit its decision in this matter, nor has the Applicant offered any reason, despite a specific instruction to do so. The Applicant failed to submit a timely response, thereby leaving the evidence against it uncontested. Regardless, despite the tardiness of the response, the Commission has considered the arguments raised by the Applicant – which failed to identify any circumstances that had changed since the prior denial - and has found them to be unpersuasive. Accordingly, the Commission denies the Applicant's second application to the Commission.

III. CONCLUSION

The Commission is vested with broad discretion to refuse to issue a registration to any applicant that it determines lacks good character, honesty, and integrity. The evidence recounted above demonstrates that FLP&H falls far short of that standard. It is of grave concern to the Commission that the sole principal of the Applicant engaged in a large-scale bribery operation on behalf of the Applicant. Based upon the above independently sufficient reasons, the Commission denies FLP&H's exemption application and registration.


This exemption/registration denial is effective immediately. FLP&H may not operate as a trade waste business in the City of New York.

Dated: June 24, 2008

THE BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION




Michael J. Mansfield
Chairman




John Doherty, Commissioner
Department of Sanitation



Rose Gill Hearn, Commissioner
Department of Investigation



Jonathan Mintz, Commissioner
Department of Consumer Affairs



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



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