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 RENEWAL APPLICATION OF MECC CONTRACTING, INC. A REGISTRATION TO OPERATE AS A TRADE WASTE BUSINESS

MECC Contracting, Inc.[1] ("MECC" or the "Applicant") has applied to the New York City Business Integrity Commission ("Commission"), formerly named the New York City Trade Waste Commission, pursuant to Local Law 42 of 1996, for renewal of its exemption from licensing requirements and a registration to operate a trade waste business. See Title 16-A of the New York City Administrative Code ("Admin. Code"), §16-505(a). Local Law 42 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.

MECC applied to the Commission for an exemption from the licensing requirements and 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." See Admin. Code §16-505(a). Local Law 42 authorizes the Commission to review and determine such applications for registration. See id. If, upon review and investigation of the application, the Commission grants the applicant a registration, the applicant becomes "exempt" from the licensing requirement applicable to businesses that remove other types of waste. See id.

In determining whether to grant 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); Breeze Carting Corp. v. The City of New York, 52

[1] Previously known as MEC. Construction Corp. See infra at 6-7.

A.D.3d 424, 860 N.Y.S.2d 103 (1st Dept. 2008). Central to the Commission's investigation and determination of a registration 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); compare Admin. Code § 16-509(a) (authorizing Commission to refuse to issue licenses to applicants lacking "good character, honesty and integrity"). Local Law 42 makes clear that the Commission is not limited to consideration of the enumerated factors; the list is meant to be illustrative and not exhaustive.

Based upon the record as to the Applicant, the Commission denies MECC's registration renewal application for the following independently sufficient reasons:

A. The Applicant knowingly failed to answer the Commission's inquiries.

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 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 facial and as-applied constitutional challenges 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, 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. HISTORY OF THE APPLICANT

MEC. Construction Corp. ("MEC") was incorporated on January 7, 1986. On August 27, 1996, MEC applied to the Commission for a registration to operate a trade waste business. See MEC's Application for Exemption from Licensing Requirement for Removal of Construction and Demolition Debris ("Registration Application"). The reported principals of MEC were Joseph Meccariello, Vincenzo L. Melisi, Antonio Napolitano, Vincenzo P. Melisi, and Luigi Moccia. See id. Joseph Meccariello was listed as MECC's President and the other principals were listed as shareholders. See id. Each principal was listed as owning a 20% share in the company. On or about June 4, 2002, the Commission granted the Applicant a trade waste registration and it was effective for two years. See id.

On May 28, 2004, the Applicant filed an application to renew its registration with the Commission. See MEC's First Renewal Application for License or Registration as a Trade Waste Business, ("First Renewal Application"). The reported principals and ownership composition were unchanged. See id. Following the Commission's investigation, on December 9, 2004, the Commission granted the First Renewal Application.

On March 30, 2006, MEC again applied to the Commission for a renewal of its registration. See MEC's Second Renewal Application for License or Registration as a Trade Waste Business, ("Second Renewal Application"). On the Second Renewal Application, it was reported that MEC had been dissolved and replaced by a successor company MECC. The new entity, MECC, listed Joseph Meccarello as its Chief Executive Officer, and Luigi Moccia as its President. Antonio Napolitano and Vincenzo P. Melisi were listed as shareholders. As Vincenzo L. Melisi was not listed, each principal now owned a 25% share of the company.[2] Following the Commission's investigation, the Commission granted the Second Renewal Application and renewed its registration effective June 1, 2006 in the name of MECC. The registration was valid for a period of two years.

On December 12, 2006, Ultimate Concrete Works, Inc. ("UCW") applied to the Commission for a registration to operate a trade waste business. See UCW's Application for Exemption from Licensing Requirement for Removal of Construction and Demolition Debris ("UCW's Registration Application"). On UCW's Registration Application, the sole reported principal was Sharon Moccia ("Sharon"), whose husband, Angelo Moccia ("Angelo"), is Luigi Moccia's brother. The Commission ultimately denied UCW's application because the Commission's investigation revealed that Sharon was not the sole principal of UCW and that her husband, Angelo, controlled all aspects of the company's operations and management. See UCW Denial Decision. It is probable that UCW failed to disclose Angelo because he and his brother Pasquale Moccia ("Pasquale") were convicted of felony charges in connection with a large scale drug conspiracy operating out of Queens County, New York.[3]

Over the course of the Commission's investigation of the UCW's Registration Application, Sharon was ordered to appear to give sworn testimony in a deposition on May 9, 2007. In Sharon's deposition questionnaire and during her deposition testimony, she stated that Angelo was employed at MEC from 1999 – 2002 as a forman and that Pasquale was currently working at MECC. See Moccia Questionnaire at 4 and 10; and see Sharon Moccia Deposition Transcript at 25-26 and 57.

This information contradicted the representations that the Applicant made in filings with the Commission which failed to report that Angelo and Pasquale were employed. Question number 6 of the renewal applications reads: "Have you or any of

---

[2] On April 9, 2008, BIC was notified that Antonio Napolitano retired from the MECC increasing each principal's ownership to 33.33%.

[3] On April 3, 2003, the Queens County District Attorney Office issued a press release announcing the indictment of Angelo Moccia along with 28 other defendants in connection with a large scale drug distribution ring operating out of Howard Beach. See Queens County District Attorney Press Release dated April 3, 2003. Among Angelo Moccia's co-defendants were his brother Pasquale Moccia and Christopher Carneglia, son of a reputed Gambino crime family caporegime. The indictment charged Angelo Moccia and Pasquale Moccia with the sale of over ½ ounce of cocaine to an undercover police officer in exchange for $1,400.00. Simultaneous with the arrest of Angelo Moccia and Pasquale Moccia, narcotics detectives executed a search warrant at 153-23 79th Street, Ozone Park, NY, the home of Sharon, Angelo and Pasquale Moccia. Pursuant to the warrant, detectives recovered several guns, a quantity of marijuana, drug paraphernalia and $12,384 in cash. On October 20, 2003, Angelo Moccia pleaded guilty to Conspiracy in the Fourth Degree, and was sentenced to a five year term of probation. On October 20, 2003, Pasquale Moccia pleaded guilty to Conspiracy in the Second Degree and was sentenced to a prison term of 3.5 year to 10.5 years in prison.

your principals, employees, or affiliates been convicted of any criminal offenses in any jurisdiction, or been the subject of criminal charges in any jurisdiction?" The Applicant answered "no" in each renewal application.[4] See First Renewal Application; and see Second Renewal Application. According to Sharon's deposition testimony, these answers were in fact false as Angelo and Pasquale, both convicted felons, were employed by the Applicant.

On April 15, 2008, the Applicant applied to the Commission for a renewal of its registration. See MECC's 2008 Renewal Application for License or Registration as a Trade Waste Business, ("Third Renewal Application"). The reported ownership composition was unchanged. MECC, however, again answered "no" in response to question number 6. Based upon the conflict with Sharon's deposition testimony, the Commission sought to clarify Angelo's or Pasquale's involvement with the company. Therefore, the Commission ordered Luigi Moccia to appear for a deposition on October 20, 2009. Prior to the deposition, Luigi Moccia was emailed the deposition questionnaire and was required to complete it. See Email to Luigi Moccia dated Friday, October 16, 2009. In response to the Deposition Questionnaire, Luigi Moccia emailed Special Counsel the following statement:

> "I find this questionnaire to be unethical and completely unrelated to my license. Most of the questions on this questionnaire are unrelated to my business, do you know we only have a CL.2-exempt registration." See Email to Michael Mirabella, dated October 16, 2009.

Following this email, Special Counsel Michael Mirabella called Luigi Moccia and instructed him that he must complete the questionnaire before appearing for the deposition.

On October 20, 2010, Luigi Moccia appeared at the Commission at the scheduled time. While he answered general questions about his health and ability to answer the questions truthfully, he refused to complete the Deposition Questionnaire, and refused to answer any substantive questions. See Luigi Moccia's Deposition Transcript at 7-9. Before Luigi Moccia discontinued the deposition, he was warned that refusing to answer the Commission's questions could be grounds for denial of his renewal application.[5] After acknowledging that he understood Counsel to the Commission's warning, he discontinued his testimony. Id.

On July 9, 2010, the Commission's Staff served a denial recommendation via certified U.S. mail on the Applicant. On July April 19, 2010, the applicant responded to the staff's denial recommendation ("Response") in an unsworn letter which made various

---

[4] This question also requires the Applicant to disclose additional information relating to any conviction, if applicable. MECC failed to include any additional information.

[5] Luigi Moccia was advised: "Again, I have to advise you that refusing to answer questions for the Commission may be grounds for the denial of your registration application which means your registration may be revoked, which means in the future, should you try to registration trucks, or should you try to seek a new registration under this company or another company, your registration application may be denied." See Luigi Moccia's Deposition Transcript at 8-9.

assertions of fact, but failed to address the ground cited for the denial of MECC's application, leaving it uncontested.

III. DISCUSSION

The Commission has reviewed the application and has conducted a background investigation of the Applicant. For the reason set forth below, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate eligibility for a registration and the Commission finds that the Applicant lacks good character, honesty, and integrity.

A. The Applicant Knowingly Failed to Answer the Commission's Inquiries.

The Commission directed Luigi Moccia, MECC's President, to appear at a deposition in connection with the Third Renewal Application and to complete the Deposition Questionnaire. While Luigi Moccia physically appeared at the Commission on the scheduled date and time, he failed to complete the Deposition Questionnaire and he refused to answer the Commission's questions.[6] See Luigi Moccia Deposition Transcript at 3-9. The information sought by the Commission was clearly material to the Commission's determination of the Applicant's fitness for registration. The evidence before the Commission strongly suggested that Applicant made false statements in its filings with the Commission and that the Applicant had an employment relationship with Angelo and Pasquale, who are both convicted felons.[7] The Commission's questions were, inter alia, narrowly tailored to investigate these issues. As the Applicant failed to cooperate with the Commission's inquiry, it has failed to demonstrate eligibility for a trade waste registration. Additionally, the Applicant's Response failed to address the ground cited in the denial recommendation, it is therefore uncontested.

The Applicant's President has failed to provide material information to the Commission, therefore Commission finds that MECC lacks good character, honest and integrity, and denies their renewal application.

---

[6] The Response asserts that Counsel to the Commission Michael Mirabella's call for questioning and the deposition questionnaire submitted were "were all directed to [the Applicant's] heritage as an Italian American (sic)." However, it is clear that the Commission was justified in investigating the apparent discrepancy between Sharon's testimony and the submitted applications. Further, the deposition questionnaire is generally completed by individuals who appear before the Commission to give deposition testimony. It consists of 10 pages of questions eliciting pedigree type information including previous education, past employment, family relations, criminal history, real estate holdings and financial holdings. Its purpose is to elicit material and relevant information and shorten the duration of deposition testimony.

[7] The Applicant's response admitted that Angelo, Pasquale and other convicted felons were currently employed by MECC. The Commission does not prohibit the hiring of convicted felons, however, question number 6 and the statute requires timely disclosure of these individuals so that an investigation can commence.

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 MECC falls far short of that standard.

It is of grave concern to the Commission that the Applicant and its principal failed to cooperate with the Commission's inquiry. Based upon the independently sufficient reason, the Commission denies MECC's exemption application and registration.

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

Dated: August 3, 2010

THE BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION

Michael J. Mansfield
Commissioner/Chair

John Doherty, Commissioner
Department of Sanitation

Andrew Eiler, Director of Legislative Affairs (designee)
Department of Consumer Affairs

Jayme Naberezny, Inspector General (designee)
Department of Investigation

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

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