



STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

RHODE ISLAND ETHICS COMMISSION

40 Fountain Street

Providence, RI 02903

(401) 222-3790 (Voice/TT) Fax: (401) 222-3382

ethics.email@ethics.ri.gov

<https://ethics.ri.gov>

NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING

AGENDA

8th Meeting

DATE: Tuesday, September 12, 2023

TIME: 9:00 a.m.

PLACE: Rhode Island Ethics Commission
Hearing Room - 8th Floor
40 Fountain Street
Providence, RI 02903

LIVESTREAM: The Open Session portions of this meeting will be livestreamed at:
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83221364030>

1. Call to Order.
2. Administration of Oath of Office to the Honorable Frank J. Cenerini.
3. Motion to approve minutes of Open Session held on July 25, 2023.
4. Director's Report: Status report and updates regarding:
 - a.) Complaints and investigations pending;
 - b.) Advisory opinions pending;
 - c.) Access to Public Records Act requests since last meeting;
 - d.) Financial Disclosure;
 - e.) Ethics Administration/Office Update.
5. Election of Commission Vice Chair.

6. Advisory Opinions.

- a.) Catherine Lynn, a member of the Smithfield Planning Board, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether she is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from participating in Planning Board discussions and decision-making relative to matters in which Timothy Kane appears or presents evidence or arguments, given that Mr. Kane served as the closing attorney for the buyer of a house recently sold by the Petitioner. [Staff Attorney Radiches]
- b.) Wayne Zina, a Correctional Officer for the Rhode Island Department of Corrections, who in his private capacity owns and operates WSZ Plowing LLC, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether he is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from bidding in his private capacity on a winter vendor contract to provide snow plowing services to the State of Rhode Island. [Staff Attorney Radiches]
- c.) Mark Nimiroski, a member of the Tiverton Wastewater District Board of Directors, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether he is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from accepting the position of Executive Director of the Tiverton Wastewater District, provided that he resigns from the Board of Directors upon accepting the position. [Staff Attorney Radiches]
- d.) Anthony DeSisto, Esq., the Town Solicitor for the Town of Little Compton, who is also legal counsel to the Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether the Code of Ethics prohibits him from simultaneously serving in both capacities. [Staff Attorney Popova Papa]
- e.) Shaun P. Galligan, a member of the Warwick School Committee, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether the Code of Ethics prohibits him from participating in collective bargaining negotiations with the Warwick Teachers' Union, given that his brother is a principal within the Warwick School Department and, although the brother is not a member of the Warwick Teachers' Union and has his own employment contract separate from the Union contract, the brother's salary percentage increase is based on the annual teachers' salary percentage increase negotiated under the Warwick Teachers' Union contract. [Staff Attorney Popova Papa]

7. Motion to go into Executive Session, to wit:

- a.) Motion to approve minutes of Executive Session held on July 25, 2023, pursuant to R.I. Gen. Laws § 42-46-5(a)(2) & (4).
- b.) Motion to return to Open Session.

8. Report on actions taken in Executive Session.

9. New Business proposed for future Commission agendas and general comments from the Commission.
10. Motion to adjourn.

ANYONE WISHING TO ATTEND THIS MEETING WHO MAY HAVE SPECIAL NEEDS FOR ACCESS OR SERVICES SUCH AS A SIGN LANGUAGE INTERPRETER, PLEASE CONTACT THE COMMISSION BY TELEPHONE AT 222-3790, 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE SCHEDULED MEETING. THE COMMISSION ALSO MAY BE CONTACTED THROUGH RHODE ISLAND RELAY, A TELECOMMUNICATIONS RELAY SERVICE, AT 1-800-RI5-5555.

Posted on September 7, 2023

RHODE ISLAND ETHICS COMMISSION

Draft Advisory Opinion

Hearing Date: September 12, 2023

Re: Catherine Lynn

QUESTION PRESENTED:

The Petitioner, a member of the Smithfield Planning Board, a municipal appointed position, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether she is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from participating in Planning Board discussions and decision-making relative to matters in which Timothy Kane appears or presents evidence or arguments, given that Mr. Kane served as the closing attorney for the buyer of a house recently sold by the Petitioner.

RESPONSE:

It is the opinion of the Rhode Island Ethics Commission that the Petitioner, a member of the Smithfield Planning Board, a municipal appointed position, is not prohibited by the Code of Ethics from participating in Planning Board discussions and decision-making relative to matters in which Timothy Kane appears or presents evidence or arguments, notwithstanding that Mr. Kane served as the closing attorney for the buyer of a house recently sold by the Petitioner.

The Petitioner is a member of the Smithfield Planning Board (“Planning Board”), having been appointed to that position by the Smithfield Town Council on July 11, 2023. She states that she recently sold her beach house in Narragansett and that the closing took place on August 9, 2023. The Petitioner further states that the closing attorney representing the buyer of her beach house was Timothy Kane. The Petitioner represents that she did not hire an attorney to represent her interests in the sale and that Mr. Kane handled all of the paperwork associated with the closing, although the Petitioner was required to contribute \$275 toward Mr. Kane’s legal fees in her capacity as the seller. The Petitioner explains that the sale of her house has been completed and that all of the funds associated with the sale have been distributed. The Petitioner further explains that she has no plans to hire Mr. Kane to provide legal services to her in the future. The Petitioner represents that Mr. Kane periodically serves as legal counsel to developers who are involved in matters that go before the Smithfield Planning Board. It is under this set of facts that the Petitioner seeks guidance from the Ethics Commission regarding whether she is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from participating in Planning Board discussions and decision-making in matters where Mr. Kane appears or presents evidence or arguments.

Under the Code of Ethics, a public official may not participate in any matter in which she has an interest, financial or otherwise, that is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of her duties or employment in the public interest. R.I. Gen. Laws § 36-14-5(a). A public official will have an

interest that is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of her duties if it is reasonably foreseeable that a direct monetary gain or a direct monetary loss will accrue, by virtue of that public official's activity, to the public official, her family member, her business associate, or any business by which she is employed or which she represents. Section 36-14-7(a). A public official is further prohibited from using her public office, or confidential information received through her public office, to obtain financial gain for herself, any person within her family, her business associate, or any business by which she is employed or which she represents. Section 36-14-5(d). Finally, a public official must recuse from participation when her business associate or employer appears or presents evidence or arguments before her state or municipal agency. Commission Regulation 520-RICR-00-00-1.2.1(A)(2) Additional Circumstances Warranting Recusal (36-14-5002). A business associate is defined as "a person joined together with another person to achieve a common financial objective." Section 36-14-2(3).

The Ethics Commission has consistently recognized an attorney-client relationship as a business association for purposes of the Code of Ethics and has, on multiple occasions, required a public official to recuse from consideration of a matter if that public official had an ongoing attorney-client relationship with the individual appearing before his or her public body. See, e.g., A.O. 2010-47 (opining that the Middletown Solicitor was prohibited from participating in the consideration by the Zoning Board and Planning Board of a petition for a special use permit, given that one of the petitioner's private law clients had been retained to provide information and testimony in support of the permit application); A.O. 2007-54 (opining that a member of the Smithfield Zoning Board of Review was prohibited from participating in a zoning matter in which the Zoning Board of Review would be sitting as the Smithfield Board of Appeals, given that he had an ongoing attorney-client relationship with one of the attorneys representing the appellants in the matter).

However, while the Code of Ethics clearly prohibits a public official from participating in matters directly affecting his or her current business associate, the Ethics Commission has permitted a public official to participate in matters involving or impacting a *former* business associate, assuming no other conflicts were present. In determining whether a relationship between two parties constitutes an ongoing business association, the Ethics Commission examines, among other things, whether the parties are conducting ongoing business transactions, have outstanding accounts, or whether there exists an anticipated future relationship between the parties. For example, in Advisory Opinion 2021-11, a member of the State Housing Appeals Board was not prohibited by the Code of Ethics from participating in a matter before the Board in which the appellant was represented by legal counsel who had once provided legal services to the petitioner. There, the petitioner represented that the attorney-client relationship between her and the subject attorney had ended five years prior, that the attorney had been paid in full for the services he had provided to her, and that she did not anticipate any occasion for which she might require that attorney's services in the future. See also A.O. 2013-21 (opining that a member of the State Labor Relations Board, a private attorney, was not required to recuse from matters involving his former law client provided that the representation had concluded, that all outstanding legal fees had been paid in full, and that there was no reasonable likelihood of reestablishing an attorney-client relationship in the foreseeable future); A.O. 2007-5 (opining that a Smithfield Town Council member's prior attorney-client relationship with an individual who had sought legal advice from the petitioner related to the individual's property that abutted the Slacks Reservoir dam did not

prohibit the petitioner from participating in the Town Council's consideration of a matter related to the release of funds to repair the Slacks Reservoir dam, given that the attorney-client relationship, during which the client had not been charged, had ended more than a year prior with no plans for future representation).

Here, the Ethics Commission need not address whether the Petitioner's contribution to Mr. Kane's fee in his capacity as the buyer's closing attorney constituted a business associate relationship between the Petitioner and Mr. Kane because, even if that had been the case, that business associate relationship has ended for purposes of the Code of Ethics. The Petitioner states that the closing has already taken place, that all of the proceeds from the closing have been distributed, that there are no ongoing business transactions between herself and Mr. Kane, and that she does not anticipate engaging Mr. Kane for legal services in the future. Accordingly, based on the facts as represented, the applicable provisions of the Code of Ethics, and prior advisory opinions issued, it is the opinion of the Ethics Commission that the Petitioner is not prohibited by the Code of Ethics from participating in Planning Board discussions and decision-making relative to matters in which Mr. Kane appears or presents evidence.

This Draft Opinion is strictly limited to the facts stated herein and relates only to the application of the Rhode Island Code of Ethics. Under the Code of Ethics, advisory opinions are based on the representations made by, or on behalf of, a public official or employee and are not adversarial or investigative proceedings. Finally, this Commission offers no opinion on the effect that any other statute, regulation, ordinance, constitutional provision, charter provision, or canon of professional ethics may have on this situation.

Code Citations:

§ 36-14-2(3)

§ 36-14-5(a)

§ 36-14-5(d)

§ 36-14-7(a)

520-RICR-00-00-1.2.1 Additional Circumstances Warranting Recusal (36-14-5002)

Related Advisory Opinions:

A.O. 2021-11

A.O. 2013-21

A.O. 2010-47

A.O. 2007-54

A.O. 2007-5

Keywords:

Business Associate

RHODE ISLAND ETHICS COMMISSION

Draft Advisory Opinion

Hearing Date: September 12, 2023

Re: Wayne Zina

QUESTION PRESENTED:

The Petitioner, a Correctional Officer for the Rhode Island Department of Corrections, a state employee position, who in his private capacity owns and operates WSZ Plowing LLC, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether he is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from bidding in his private capacity on a winter vendor contract to provide snow plowing services to the State of Rhode Island.

RESPONSE:

It is the opinion of the Rhode Island Ethics Commission that the Petitioner, a Correctional Officer for the Rhode Island Department of Corrections, a state employee position, who in his private capacity owns and operates WSZ Plowing LLC, is not prohibited by the Code of Ethics from bidding in his private capacity on a winter vendor contract to provide snow plowing services to the State of Rhode Island, provided that the contract is awarded through an open and public bidding process.

The Petitioner is employed full-time as a Correctional Officer at the Rhode Island Department of Corrections (“DOC”) and has served continuously in that capacity since March 2013. He states that he performs most of his duties at the Adult Correctional Institutions, but that he is occasionally tasked with the transportation of prisoners. The Petitioner further states that his current work schedule is Tuesday through Saturday, from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., with Sundays and Mondays off. He adds that he expects his hours to change sometime this December to the day shift, which is 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. The Petitioner represents that, in his private capacity, he has been the sole owner and operator of WSZ Plowing LLC (“WSZ Plowing”) for the past ten years. The Petitioner further represents that he provides snow plowing services to the owners of private commercial lots and to residents who need their driveways cleared of snow. He adds that his snow removal work has never interfered with his state employment.

The Petitioner states that he would like to expand his snow plowing business by applying to become a winter vendor for the State of Rhode Island (“State”). He explains that, in order to qualify for consideration, he will be required to complete an online application that has been posted by the State Department of Transportation (“RIDOT”) on its website, and that the vehicle that he uses to plow snow would need to be inspected by a representative from the State. The Petitioner informs that the application period to become a winter vendor starts in September and runs through

November and that, if selected, his contract with the State would be for a period of one year. He represents that the State is usually short on snow plow drivers and that most applicants have an excellent chance of receiving a contract. The Petitioner states that he has no role in the bidding or selection process for the State's winter vendors.

The Petitioner represents that, if selected to become a winter vendor for the State, it would not impair his independence of judgment with respect to his official duties as a Correctional Officer. He adds that he would perform all snow plowing work on his own time and without the use of state resources and keep confidential all information obtained in connection with his state employment by the DOC. The Petitioner states that, if selected to become a winter vendor, he intends to hire a driver to cover for the Petitioner in instances where he might be unavailable to plow snow. It is in the context of these facts that the Petitioner seeks guidance from the Ethics Commission regarding whether he is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from bidding in his private capacity on a winter vendor contract to provide snow plowing services to the State.

Section 36-14-5(h) ("section 5(h)") of the Code of Ethics provides that no person subject to the Code of Ethics, or any business entity in which the person has a ten percent (10%) or greater equity interest or five thousand dollar (\$5,000) or greater cash value interest, shall enter into a contract with a state or municipal agency unless the contract has been awarded through an open and public process, including prior public notice and subsequent public disclosure of all proposals considered and contracts awarded.¹ Section 36-14-5(b) ("section 5(b)") of the Code of Ethics prohibits a public employee from accepting other employment that would impair his independence of judgment as to his official duties or employment or require or induce him to disclose confidential information acquired by him in the course of and by reason of his official duties.²

The Ethics Commission has previously, and with certain conditions attached, allowed public officials to enter into service contracts with the State and/or with the municipalities in which they served. For example, in Advisory Opinion 2011-48, the Chief Rider Coach Trainer for the Motorcycle Safety Program at the Community College of Rhode Island ("CCRI"), who in his private capacity owned and operated a local driving school, was not prohibited by the Code of Ethics from seeking, accepting, and performing a driver retraining contract for CCRI. There, the circumstances were such that the petitioner had responded to a bid posted by CCRI through an open and competitive bidding process. Also, that petitioner had not participated in the bid development process and had no advance knowledge that the Request for Qualifications had been

¹ Contracts for certain professional services which have been customarily awarded without competitive bidding shall not be subject to competitive bidding if awarded through a process of public notice and disclosure of financial details. Section 36-14-(h). The snow plowing services that the Petitioner seeks to provide to the State of Rhode Island as a winter vendor do not fall within the category of such professional services.

² The Ethics Commission examines several factors when considering potential conflicts of interest regarding secondary employment. These factors include, but are not limited to, the nexus between the official's public duties and private employment; whether the employee completes such work outside his or her normal working hours and without the use of public resources; whether the employee is to appear before, or his or her work product is to be presented to, his or her own agency; whether such work is to be conducted outside of the areas over which the person has decision-making jurisdiction; and whether the employee uses his or her position to solicit business or customers. See General Commission Advisory No. 2009-4.

posted until he inadvertently found it on the State’s website. See also A.O. 2022-5 (opining that the New Shoreham Town Clerk, who in her private capacity owned and operated Ballard’s Oil Company, was not prohibited from bidding in her private capacity on a contract, through an open and public bidding process, to provide heating and oil services to the Town of New Shoreham, a private activity which would neither impair her independence of judgment nor create an interest in substantial conflict with her public duties); A.O 2003-3 (opining that a Principal Sanitary Engineer employed by the Department of Environmental Management (“DEM”) in the Office of Water Resources, who in her private capacity owned Narragansett Research, could provide information and technology services to various offices of DEM other than Water Resources, provided that the contract offered was subject to an open and public bidding process and, further provided, that she performed all of the work on her own time and without the use of public resources).

Here, the Petitioner represents that he would like to apply to become a winter vendor for the State by completing an application that was posted by the RIDOT on its website and for which the Petitioner has no role in the bidding or selection process. Accordingly, based on the facts as represented herein, the relevant provisions of the Code of Ethics, and prior advisory opinions issued, it is the opinion of the Ethics Commission that the Petitioner is not prohibited from bidding in his private capacity on a winter vendor contract to provide snow plowing services to the State. If the Petitioner is offered such a contract through an open and public bidding process, including prior public notice and subsequent public disclosure of all proposals considered and contracts awarded, the Code of Ethics will not inherently prohibit him from accepting it, provided that the proposed activity would neither impair his independence of judgment nor create an interest in substantial conflict with his public duties. Given that the Petitioner’s provision of snow plowing services to the State would be separate and distinct from his official duties as a Correctional Officer, his work as a winter vendor would not appear to risk impairing his independence of judgment with regard to his official duties as prohibited by section 5(b). The Petitioner is reminded, however, that his bid, and all of his snow plowing work for the State, must be performed on his own time and without the use of public resources or confidential information obtained as part of his state employment as a Correctional Officer. Finally, the Petitioner may not use his public position as a Correctional Officer to promote or advertise his snow plowing business.

This Draft Opinion is strictly limited to the facts stated herein and relates only to the application of the Rhode Island Code of Ethics. Under the Code of Ethics, advisory opinions are based on the representations made by, or on behalf of, a public official or employee and are not adversarial or investigative proceedings. Finally, this Commission offers no opinion on the effect that any other statute, regulation, ordinance, constitutional provision, charter provision, or canon of professional ethics may have on this situation.

Code Citations:

§ 36-14-5(b)

§ 36-14-5(h)

Related Advisory Opinions:

A.O. 2022-5

A.O. 2011-48

A.O. 2003-3
G.C.A. 2009-4

Keywords:

Conflict of Interest

Contracts

Secondary Employment

DRAFT

RHODE ISLAND ETHICS COMMISSION

Draft Advisory Opinion

Hearing Date: September 12, 2023

Re: Mark Nimiroski

QUESTION PRESENTED:

The Petitioner, a member of the Tiverton Wastewater District Board of Directors, a quasi-municipal appointed position, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether he is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from accepting the position of Executive Director of the Tiverton Wastewater District, provided that he resigns from the Board of Directors upon accepting the position.

RESPONSE:

It is the opinion of the Rhode Island Ethics Commission that the Petitioner, a member of the Tiverton Wastewater District Board of Directors, a quasi-municipal appointed position, is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from accepting the position of Executive Director of the Tiverton Wastewater District for a period of one year following the date of severance from his position as a member of the Board of Directors.

The Petitioner states that he is a member of the Board of Directors (“Board”) of the Tiverton Wastewater District (“TWWD” or “District”), having been appointed to that position in March 2022 by the other Board members. He explains that the mission of the TWWD is to safeguard public health and protect and improve ground and service water resources by implementing efficient and effective wastewater management within the TWWD territory.

The Petitioner states that the TWWD’s staff consists of the following four positions: full-time Executive Director; part-time bookkeeper; part-time engineer who oversees operations; and part-time engineering technical consultant, which is a contract position. He further states that, since it was assembled in 2014, the Board has hired six Executive Directors. The Petitioner explains that, following the hiring and departure of three Executive Directors between 2014 and 2019, a fourth Executive Director was hired and worked for the TWWD from June 3, 2019 – August 8, 2022.¹ The Petitioner adds that the TWWD’s fifth Executive Director served from August 25, 2022 –

¹ The Petitioner and the Board’s Chair, who sent a letter to the Executive Director of the Ethics Commission in support of the Petitioner’s candidacy for the position of Executive Director, represent that this particular TWWD Executive Director’s preference for at-home or hybrid model working arrangements coming out of the COVID-19 pandemic was not conducive to the level of leadership required for the position, which led to her abrupt departure.

May 5, 2023.² The sixth and most recent Executive Director served from May 25, 2023 – July 20, 2023.³

The Petitioner states that the Board’s search efforts for the *last* Executive Director, who was hired in May of this year, included the following:

- On August 18, 2022, the position was advertised on the recruiting site Indeed.com, LinkedIn, and the District website, resulting in the submission of 12 applications.
- On March 13, 2023, the Board executed a staffing agreement with Able Associates of Fall River, Massachusetts, resulting in the submission of one application.
- On March 28, 2023, the Board placed a digital ad with the Providence Journal that was subsequently posted on other various employment boards, including Zip Recruiter, resulting in the submission of 15 applications.
- The Board also advertised the position within the following industry publications and other online resources: Rhode Island Rural Water Association newsletter (January 2023); New England Water Environment Association job bank (January 2023); and again on the TWWD website (March 2023), resulting in the submission of no applications.

The Board Chair represents that, of the 28 candidates who applied for the Executive Director position when it was advertised beginning in August of 2022, 16 candidates made it to the interview round. He further represents that most of those 16 candidates did not meet the minimum qualifications established by the Board and those that did had salary expectations far exceeding what had been budgeted for the position. Applicants meeting the requirements and within the Board’s salary budget were interviewed, resulting in an offer being made to the Executive Director who started on May 25, 2023, and left the position on July 20, 2023.

The Petitioner represents that, in the absence of an Executive Director, members of the Board have volunteered to assist the staff with the running of the TWWD office on an array of day-to-day tasks, including contractor management, vendor negotiations, and financial operations. He further represents that, at a recent meeting of the TWWD where Board members were discussing how to fill the position of Executive Director, the Petitioner expressed an interest in the position. The Petitioner, who has been employed full-time by the State of Rhode Island as a scientist with the Department of Transportation for the last seven years, added that he would resign from the Board if he became Executive Director. He states that the Board members then decided to ask the Ethics Commission for an advisory opinion on the matter.

² The Petitioner represents that this Executive Director had been a long-time municipal government employee who came out of retirement to assist the District with the understanding that his engagement would be short-term.

³ The Petitioner and the Board Chair represent that this Executive Director was hastily chosen from a limited pool of qualified candidates given the direness of the situation. They add that, after less than two months on the job, issues surfaced concerning her ability to effectively manage District staff and maintain a positive office environment. After a discussion with the Board members, she resigned on July 17, 2023, and left her position four days later on July 20, 2023.

In his letter requesting that the Petitioner be allowed to accept the position of Executive Director, the Board Chair identifies the responsibilities of that position as follows: (1) Manage the day-to-day operations, providing overall direction, supervision, and leadership to the support staff; (2) Prepare and manage the financial budgets and operational plans in accordance with the strategic direction approved by the Board of Directors;⁴ (3) Establish a collaborative relationship with the District's customers, community groups, contractors, and funding agencies in order to achieve operational and strategic goals; and (4) In conjunction with the District Engineer, provide the leadership, financial management, and technical direction for the operation, maintenance, repair, and expansion of the District's infrastructure.⁵ The Petitioner states that the current salary for the Executive Director position is \$95,000 per year, which he admits is probably lower than that of similarly employed Executive Directors in larger Rhode Island wastewater districts. He explains that larger wastewater districts in Rhode Island have an infrastructure component that Tiverton currently does not, because Tiverton sends its wastewater to Fall River for treatment at its facility.

The Board Chair states that the Board has investigated, but since abandoned, the prospect of using the services of an executive search firm to fill the vacant Executive Director position, describing that option as extremely prohibitive in cost and timeline. He adds that it could take four to six months to complete the search efforts for a new Executive Director, and the quoted prices for this service ranged from \$30,000 to \$50,000.⁶

The Board Chair states that following the departure of the last Executive Director on July 20, 2023, the Board contacted the program coordinator of the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management's Wastewater Leadership Boot Camp ("Boot Camp") and asked him to distribute notice of the Executive Director vacancy to all Boot Camp graduates. The Boot Camp outreach produced only one candidate, who was interviewed by the Board Chair, two other Board members, and two TWWD employees. An offer was extended on August 18, 2023; however, the applicant rejected the offer in consideration of the lengthy commute it would entail, notwithstanding an offer by the Board of a hybrid work schedule.

The Chair describes the Petitioner's interest in the Executive Director role as unexpected. He explains that he and the other members of the Board have since explored the Petitioner's interest and qualifications, resulting in a determination that the Petitioner is an excellent candidate for the position of Executive Director. In support of this determination, the Board Chair cites the Petitioner's background as a water quality scientist, his program and budget management experience, and his successful grant writing ability. The Chair also references the institutional knowledge amassed by the Petitioner during his tenure as a member of the Board and the respect that the Petitioner has garnered from the District staff in support of the Petitioner's candidacy. The Chair states that without an experienced executive managing the District's on-going operations and its expansion projects, the risk of business failure has become acute.

⁴ The Board Chair adds that the District's operational budget currently exceeds \$1 million annually, and is growing with on-going expansion projects having a scope of several million dollars.

⁵ The Board Chair explains that the District is in the final stages of its first major infrastructure buildout project to expand sewer access and use in the more densely populated areas of Tiverton.

⁶ The Board Chair states that the District's net operating income for the current fiscal year is budgeted at less than \$5,000.

The position of Executive Director is currently being advertised on the Indeed job search website and on the District's website. The Board Chair states that there are no candidates who were interviewed during the hiring process for the last Executive Director position that the Board would wish to re-examine. It is in the context of all of the foregoing representations that the Petitioner seeks advice from the Ethics Commission regarding whether he is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from accepting the position of Executive Director of the TWWD, provided that he resigns from the TWWD Board of Directors.

The Code of Ethics prohibits an elected or appointed official from accepting any appointment or election that requires approval by the body of which he is or was a member, to any position which carries with it any financial benefit or remuneration, until the expiration of one year following the termination of that person's membership in or on that body. Commission Regulation 520-RICR-00-00-1.5.1 Employment from Own Board (36-14-5006) ("Regulation 1.5.1"). Under Regulation 1.5.1, the Ethics Commission may approve an exception to the prohibitions outlined therein, provided that the Ethics Commission is satisfied that denial of such appointment or election would create a substantial hardship for the body, board, or municipality.

The legislative aim of the "revolving door" provisions of the Code of Ethics is to ensure that public officials and employees "adhere to the highest standard of ethical conduct, * * * avoid the appearance of impropriety and not use their position for private gain or advantage." See R.I. Const., art. III, sec. 7. "The integrity of our government officials is quintessential to our system of representation." In re Advisory Opinion From the Governor, 633 A.2d 664, 671 (R.I. 1993). In general, "the purpose of revolving-door provisions is to prevent 'government employees from unfairly profiting from or otherwise trading upon the contacts, associations and special knowledge that they acquired'" during their tenure as public servants. Id. (quoting Forti v. New York State Ethics Commission, 75 N.Y.2d 596, 605, 554 N.E.2d 876, 878, 555 N.Y.S.2d 235, 237 (1990)).

The Ethics Commission has previously determined that circumstances were such that a substantial hardship existed for a particular government body in cases where some of the following circumstances occurred: after publicly advertising the position, there was a complete absence of applicants or a lack of qualified candidates to fill the position; the position required very specific and unique skills and qualifications; the board member had no involvement in the hiring process or in the drafting of the request for proposals; the position had been vacant for a substantial period of time; and whether the employment was a temporary measure or was intended to be permanent. The key issue, however, in determining whether a hardship to a government body exists is not whether a petitioner is the most qualified candidate but, rather, whether other qualified candidates are currently available or may become available through additional advertisement of the posting.

In Advisory Opinion 2014-18, the Ethics Commission opined that a member of the Rhode Island Fire Safety Code Board of Appeal and Review ("Fire Safety Code Board") was not prohibited by the Code of Ethics from accepting an appointment to serve as the Executive Director of the Fire Safety Code Board, based upon a finding of substantial hardship to the Fire Safety Code Board, because: (1) the petitioner was the only qualified candidate⁷; (2) the Fire Safety Code Board had

⁷ The job specifications for this classified position required the Executive Director to possess the following qualifications: a thorough knowledge of the pertinent provisions of the State Fire Safety Code and the ability to interpret those provisions; a thorough knowledge of the Administrative Procedures Act; a working knowledge of state

a three-person staff and the Executive Director position had been vacant for six months and the Deputy Director position would have been vacant by the end of the month; (3) the petitioner was uniquely familiar with the responsibilities of the Executive Director which would ensure the continued functioning of the Fire Safety Code Board given the timing of the vacancies; (4) the petitioner had no involvement in the hiring process, which was conducted through an open and public process; (5) the petitioner would resign from his position on the Fire Safety Code Board; (6) the Fire Safety Code Board was required to hire someone who met the qualifications set forth in the job specification for the classified position of Executive Director; and (7) the Fire Code was a particularly complex and voluminous set of statutes, rules and regulations that since 2003 had been expanded to apply to both new construction and pre-existing structures.

Also, in Advisory Opinion 2012-31, the Ethics Commission opined that a South Kingstown Historic District Commission (“HDC”) member could be hired by the Town of South Kingstown (“Town”) to create a guide-book for homeowners in the Town’s historic districts, based upon a finding of substantial hardship to the Town and the HDC, because: (1) the Town had publicly advertised the position through its normal public bid procedures, in addition to specifically contacting five local qualified historic preservation planners identified by the Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission; (2) the petitioner was the only applicant; (3) only a small number of firms and individuals in the region possessed the qualifications required to complete this project; (4) the contract was limited to a six-month duration; and (5) the project was funded by grant money, which was only available until August 2013, leaving no time to re-issue the request for proposals.

There have also been occasions where the Ethics Commission determined that circumstances were such that a hardship was not justified. For example, in Advisory Opinion 2016-43, the Ethics Commission opined that a member of the North Smithfield Planning Board was prohibited from accepting, if offered, employment as the Town Planner while he sat on the North Smithfield Planning Board, and for one year thereafter. There, the petitioner presented no evidence that the Town of North Smithfield would suffer a substantial hardship if unable to hire the petitioner for the position of Town Planner. See also A.O. 2010-24 (opining that a member of the Coventry Housing Authority Board of Commissioners was prohibited from accepting employment from the Housing Authority as its Maintenance Director while serving on the Housing Authority Board of Commissioners and for one year thereafter); A.O. 2004-36 (opining that, absent some evidence of a dearth of other qualified individuals interested in the position, a state employee sitting on the Water Resources Board as the designee of the Director of Administration was prohibited from accepting employment with the Water Resources Board while he sat on the Board and for one year thereafter).

The facts as represented by the instant Petitioner clearly implicate the provisions of Regulation 1.5.1. At issue is whether prohibiting the Petitioner from accepting the position of Executive Director of the TWWD following his resignation from the Board would result in a substantial hardship to the Board. Here, the Ethics Commission notes that the Board has been successful in finding qualified candidates for the Executive Director position on six prior occasions in the last

and local legislative matters pertaining to codes and ordinances; the ability to represent the Fire Safety Code Board before various courts; the ability to moderate administrative hearings and to examine and cross-examine witnesses within appropriate legal boundaries; related capacities and abilities; and membership in the Rhode Island Bar.

nine years. The Board Chair also describes the extensive advertisement in which the Board engaged while searching for the last Executive Director. According to the facts as represented, since the departure of its last Executive Director on July 20, 2023, the Board's efforts to fill the position have been limited to contacting the Boot Camp's program director and the fairly recent ongoing advertisement of the position on Indeed and on the District's website. Because the position is currently being advertised, the Ethics Commission is not in a position to know at this time whether any other candidates will apply and/or be qualified to fill the position of Executive Director and to determine whether a hardship to the TWWD exists if the Petitioner is not hired as the Executive Director. Further, the Board has expressed its unwillingness to revisit any of the previously interviewed candidates produced by its search efforts leading to the hiring of the last Executive Director and has elected to not engage the services of an executive search firm due to the cost and time involved. Nor has the position been vacant for a substantial period of time.

Accordingly, based on the facts as represented, the applicable provisions of the Code of Ethics, related authorities, and prior advisory opinions issued, it is the opinion of the Rhode Island Ethics Commission that the Petitioner is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from accepting the position of Executive Director of the TWWD for a period of one year following his date of severance from his position as a member of the Board. In the event that the Petitioner wishes to seek permission in the future to accept the Executive Director position under circumstances where, following a sufficient search the Board is unable to hire a qualified candidate, he must not be involved in the drafting of the advertisement for the Executive Director position or the interview process associated with it. The Ethics Commission reiterates that the key issue in determining whether a hardship to the TWWD exists will not be whether the Petitioner is the most qualified candidate but, rather, whether other qualified candidates are currently available or may become available through additional advertisement of the posting.

This Draft Opinion is strictly limited to the facts stated herein and relates only to the application of the Rhode Island Code of Ethics. Under the Code of Ethics, advisory opinions are based on the representations made by, or on behalf of, a public official or employee and are not adversarial or investigative proceedings. Finally, this Commission offers no opinion on the effect that any other statute, regulation, ordinance, constitutional provision, charter provision, or canon of professional ethics may have on this situation.

Code Citations:

520-RICR-00-00-1.5.1 Employment from Own Board (36-14-5006)

Constitutional Authority:

R.I. Const., art III, sec. 7

Other Related Authorities:

In re Advisory Opinion From the Governor, 633 A.2d 664 (R.I. 1993)

Related Advisory Opinions:

A.O. 2016-43

A.O. 2014-18

A.O. 2012-31

A.O. 2010-24
A.O. 2004-36

Keywords:

Employment from Own Board
Hardship Exception
Revolving Door

DRAFT

RHODE ISLAND ETHICS COMMISSION

Draft Advisory Opinion

Hearing Date: September 12, 2023

Re: Anthony DeSisto, Esq.

QUESTION PRESENTED:

The Petitioner, the Town Solicitor for the Town of Little Compton, a municipal appointed position, who is also legal counsel to the Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council, an independent contractor position, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether the Code of Ethics prohibits him from simultaneously serving in both capacities.

RESPONSE:

It is the opinion of the Rhode Island Ethics Commission that the Petitioner, the Town Solicitor for the Town of Little Compton, a municipal appointed position, who is also legal counsel to the Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council, an independent contractor position, is not prohibited by the Code of Ethics from simultaneously serving in both capacities.

The Petitioner is a practicing attorney and the principal of Anthony DeSisto Law Associates, LLC (“law firm”). He represents that, in April of this year, the law firm was appointed by the Little Compton Town Council (“Town Council”) to provide legal services as Town Solicitor for the Town of Little Compton (“Town” or “Little Compton”). The Petitioner states that, according to the Town Charter, the duties of Town Solicitor include providing legal advice to the Town and all of its boards, commissions, departments, and officers thereof. The Petitioner adds that the Town Charter also provides that the Town Solicitor need not devote full-time to the office.

The Petitioner states that, since 2016, the law firm has been retained as an independent contractor to provide services as legal counsel to the Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council (“CRMC”). The CRMC is a state agency created by the General Assembly in 1971, whose “primary responsibility is for the preservation, protection, development and where possible the restoration of the coastal areas of the state via the implementation of its integrated and comprehensive coastal management plans and the issuance of permits for work with the coastal zone of the state.”¹ The CRMC is comprised of a Council consisting of members of the public and state and local government appointed by the Governor, and a staff of professional engineers, biologists, environmental scientists, and marine resources specialists.² The Petitioner represents that the legal counsel’s duties are to represent the CRMC in litigation matters and provide legal

¹ See <http://www.crmc.ri.gov/aboutcrmc.html> (last visited on August 7, 2023).

² Id.

advice to CRMC Council members and staff. The CRMC's regulatory authority generally extends from the territorial sea limit (which is 3 miles offshore) to 200 feet inland from any coastal feature.³

The Petitioner states that, pursuant to CRMC regulation 650-RICR-20-05-8.1, the CRMC may implement special area management plans ("SAMPs") for renewable energy and other offshore development as authorized by the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. The Petitioner further states that the CRMC has implemented SAMPs and enacted rules for offshore waters beyond the three nautical mile state water boundary, and within a geographic location description, in order to provide a regulatory framework for offshore development of renewable energy sources. The Petitioner explains that the CRMC has reviewed an offshore wind farm development proposed by Revolution Wind and has determined that the project is consistent with the enforceable policies of the coastal resource management plan. The Petitioner states that the proposed wind farm development would be located in a SAMP area approximately 15 nautical miles south of the Little Compton shoreline, 13 nautical miles east of Block Island, and 16 nautical miles southeast of Point Judith.

The Petitioner explains that at its meeting on April 6, 2023, the Town Council approved a resolution entitled "A Resolution in Opposition to Offshore Wind Turbines Sited Off Little Compton" ("Resolution"). The Petitioner further explains that the Resolution, which does not mention the CRMC, was forwarded to the clerks of all cities and towns in Rhode Island and to Little Compton's elected members of the Rhode Island General Assembly, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and the Governor of the State of Rhode Island. The Petitioner emphasizes that, although the Town and the CRMC may have concurrent jurisdiction over certain coastal areas, their respective types of jurisdiction differ. Specifically, he explains that the Town has zoning jurisdiction and reviews proposed projects in those areas for compliance with zoning standards, whereas the CRMC reviews proposed projects in the same areas for their ecological impact. Given this set of facts, the Petitioner seeks guidance regarding whether the Code of Ethics prohibits him from simultaneously providing legal services as Town Solicitor and as legal counsel to CRMC.

The Code of Ethics provides that no public official or employee shall have an interest or engage in any business, employment, transaction, or professional activity which is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of his duties or employment in the public interest. R.I. Gen. Laws § 36-14-5(a). A substantial conflict of interest exists if a public official or employee has reason to believe or expect that he, any person within his family, his business associate or his employer will derive a direct monetary gain or suffer a direct monetary loss by reason of his official activity. Section 36-14-7(a). The Code of Ethics also prohibits a public official or employee from engaging in any employment that would impair his independence of judgment as to his public duties. Section 36-14-5(b). Further, a public official or employee is prohibited from disclosing, for pecuniary gain, confidential information acquired by him in the course of his official duties. Section 36-14-5(c). Finally, a public official or employee is prohibited from using his public position or confidential information received through his position to obtain financial gain for himself, his family member, his business associate, or any business by which he is employed or which he represents. Section 36-14-5(d).

³ See <http://www.crmc.ri.gov/aboutermc.html> (last visited on August 7, 2023).

As an initial matter, the Ethics Commission notes that as legal counsel to the CRMC the Petitioner is an independent contractor and, as such, is not subject to the Code of Ethics and, therefore, not constrained by its conflict of interest provisions in that capacity. See Gemma v. Rhode Island Ethics Commission, No. PC94-3404 (R.I. Super. Ct., Sept. 17, 1994) (holding that an attorney contractually retained by the State was not an employee, but an independent contractor and, accordingly, was not subject to the revolving door provisions set forth in section 36-14-5(o)); A.O. 2008-32 (opining that private attorneys performing legal work for public agencies as independent contractors are neither subject to the Code of Ethics nor constrained by its conflict of interest provisions); A.O. 2007-43 (opining that a petitioner who served as legal counsel to the North Providence School Committee was an independent contractor and, thus, not subject to the Code of Ethics); A.O. 2004-19 (opining that a petitioner who served as legal counsel to the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Review for the Town of West Warwick was not subject to the Code of Ethics in that capacity, as independent contractors of a state or municipal government are neither employees nor appointed officials subject to the provisions of the Code of Ethics).

However, in his capacity as Town Solicitor, a municipal appointed position under the Town Charter, the Petitioner is subject to the Code of Ethics and its provisions, including the ones cited above. The Ethics Commission has consistently opined that public officials and employees are not inherently prohibited from holding other employment in addition to their public employment or positions subject, however, to certain restrictions and provided that their private employment would neither impair their independence of judgment nor create an interest that is in substantial conflict with their public duties. See also A.O. 2006-58 (opining that the Deputy Chief Legal Counsel employed by the Rhode Island Department of Health could accept employment by the Federation of State Medical Boards and serve as the Northeast Region attorney for a physician license verification project, provided that he completed the work on his own time, without the use of public resources, and that he not appear before his own agency).

Here, the Petitioner is an attorney who has been retained to provide legal services to two separate clients, the Town and the CRMC. The Petitioner represents that in his capacity as Town Solicitor, he does not need to devote full-time to that position. Importantly, although the Town and the CRMC have concurrent jurisdiction over certain coastal areas, the subject matter of their respective jurisdictions differ. Accordingly, based on all the representations above, it is the opinion of the Ethics Commission that there is no evidence that the Petitioner's service as legal counsel to the CRMC would either impair his independence of judgement or create an interest that is in substantial conflict with his public duties as Town Solicitor. Accordingly, the Code of Ethics does not prohibit the Petitioner from providing legal services to the CRMC while simultaneously providing legal services to the Town as Town Solicitor, provided that all of his work on behalf of the CRMC is performed on his own time and without the use of public resources or confidential information obtained as part of his duties as Town Solicitor. The Petitioner is cautioned to remain vigilant about his obligations under the Code of Ethics and to seek further guidance from the Ethics Commission in the event that a particular matter arises that may impair his independence of judgment or create an interest that is in substantial conflict with his public duties as Town Solicitor.

This Draft Opinion is strictly limited to the facts stated herein and relates only to the application of the Rhode Island Code of Ethics. Under the Code of Ethics, advisory opinions are based on the representations made by, or on behalf of, a public official or employee and

are not adversarial or investigative proceedings. Finally, this Commission offers no opinion on the effect that any other statute, regulation, ordinance, constitutional provision, charter provision, or canon of professional ethics may have on this situation.

Code Citations:

§ 36-14-5(a)
§ 36-14-5(b)
§ 36-14-5(c)
§ 36-14-5(d)
§ 36-14-7(a)

Related Advisory Opinions:

A.O. 2008-32
A.O. 2007-43
A.O. 2006-58
A.O. 2004-19

Other Related Authority:

Gemma v. Rhode Island Ethics Commission, No. PC94-3404 (R.I. Super. Ct., Sept. 17, 1994)

Keywords:

Conflict of Interest
Other Employment

RHODE ISLAND ETHICS COMMISSION

Draft Advisory Opinion

Hearing Date: September 12, 2023

Re: Shaun P. Galligan

QUESTION PRESENTED:

The Petitioner, a member of the Warwick School Committee, a municipal elected position, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether the Code of Ethics prohibits him from participating in collective bargaining negotiations with the Warwick Teachers' Union, given that his brother is a principal within the Warwick School Department and, although the brother is not a member of the Warwick Teachers' Union and has his own employment contract separate from the Union contract, the brother's salary percentage increase is based on the annual teachers' salary percentage increase negotiated under the Warwick Teachers' Union contract.

RESPONSE:

It is the opinion of the Rhode Island Ethics Commission that the Petitioner, a member of the Warwick School Committee, a municipal elected position, is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from participating in collective bargaining negotiations with the Warwick Teachers' Union, given that his brother is a principal within the Warwick School Department, notwithstanding that the brother is not a member of the Warwick Teachers' Union and has his own employment contract separate from the Union contract, because the brother's salary percentage increase is based on the annual teachers' salary percentage increase negotiated under the Warwick Teachers' Union contract. The Petitioner may, however, participate in the decision to accept or reject the Union contract as a whole, provided that his brother is impacted by the contract as a member of a significant and definable class of persons, and not individually or to any greater extent than any other similarly situated member of the class.

The Petitioner is a member of the Warwick School Committee ("School Committee"). He states that his brother ("brother") is employed as the principal at the Warwick Neck Elementary School, which is a school within the Warwick Public School system. The Petitioner further states that his brother's employment contract is for a term of three years and is separate from the Warwick Teachers' Union ("WTU") contract. The Petitioner represents that his brother's contract expires at the end of next year and that the Petitioner intends to recuse from participation in his brother's employment contract renewal process.

The Petitioner states that his brother's employment contract contains a provision specifying that the brother's "salary shall be increased based on the WTU salary increase percentage for the same year." The Petitioner further states that all of the other school administrators' employment contracts contain similar language. The Petitioner clarifies that school administrators include the following positions: Superintendent; Assistant Superintendent; Directors of Curriculum,

Information Technology, Secondary Education, and Elementary Education; Principals; and Vice Principals. The Petitioner states that, historically, the practice has been to give all of the school administrators the same salary percentage increase as the one negotiated under the WTU contract for the WTU members.

The Petitioner represents that the School Committee is currently in the process of collective bargaining negotiations with the WTU relative to a union contract that extends beyond the one-year contract that was recently negotiated.¹ Given this set of facts, the Petitioner seeks guidance from the Ethics Commission regarding whether the Code of Ethics prohibits him from participating in the negotiations with the WTU and in a vote on the final contract.

Commission Regulation 520-RICR-00-00-1.3.1 entitled Prohibited Activities-Nepotism (36-14-5004) (“Regulation 1.3.1”) contains specific regulations aimed at curbing nepotism. Regulation 1.3.1(B)(4)(a) specifically addresses participation in collective bargaining/employee contracts and provides that “[n]o person subject to the Code of Ethics shall participate in negotiations relative to an employee contract or collective bargaining which addresses or affects the employment, compensation or benefits of any person within his or her family or a household member.” This blanket prohibition against involvement in contract negotiations is based on an understanding that, during negotiations, the impact of decisions as to individual components of a contract can be difficult to predict. For that reason, a public official’s participation in a contract issue that is seemingly unrelated to a family member can have a resulting impact on other areas of the contract that would directly affect the family member.

However, Regulation 1.3.1(B)(4)(b) provides that a person subject to the Code of Ethics may participate in a decision to accept or reject an entire employee contract or collective bargaining agreement that has been negotiated by others, provided that the person within his or her family or household member is impacted by the contract or agreement as a member of a significant and definable class of persons, and not individually or to any greater extent than any other similarly situated member of the class. The basis for allowing such participation is an assumption that a vote on an entire contract, once negotiated by others, is sufficiently remote from individual contract issues impacting a family member so as not to constitute a substantial conflict of interest in violation of the Code of Ethics.

The Ethics Commission has issued numerous advisory opinions interpreting Regulation 1.3.1. In Advisory Opinion 2011-17, for example, the Ethics Commission reviewed a fact pattern similar to the one presented in the instant request. There, a Tiverton Town Council member was prohibited from participating in contract negotiations with the local police officers’ union because his father’s hourly rate as a special officer, a non-union position working construction or traffic details, was subject to the hourly pay rate for private details negotiated in the collective bargaining agreement with the local police officers’ union. That petitioner could, however, participate in the Town Council’s decision to accept or reject the union contract in its entirety once negotiated by the other Town Council members and the local police officers’ union, provided that his father would be impacted by the contract as a member of a significant and definable class of persons, and not individually or to any greater extent than other similarly situated members of that union. See also

¹ The Petitioner further represents that the one-year contract was negotiated without his participation. However, he voted on the contract as a whole after it was negotiated by his peers.

A.O. 2011-14 (opining that a member of the Foster-Glocester Regional School Committee was prohibited from participating in contract negotiations between the School Committee and the teachers' union, given that her husband was a member of the teachers' union, but could participate in the School Committee's decision to accept or reject a contract in its entirety once negotiated by others, provided that her husband would be impacted by the contract as a member of a significant and definable class of persons, and not individually or to any greater extent than other similarly situated members of the teachers' union).

In the instant matter, the Petitioner's brother is not a member of the teachers' union. Although the brother's employment contract is separate from the WTU contract, his annual percentage salary increase will be based on or the same as that for which the WTU members negotiated through collective bargaining between the School Committee and the WTU. Accordingly, based on the Petitioner's representations, the relevant provisions of the Code of Ethics, and prior advisory opinions issued, it is the opinion of the Ethics Commission that the Petitioner is prohibited from participating in the collective bargaining negotiations of the WTU contract. He is advised to recuse consistent with the provisions of section 36-14-6. The Petitioner may, however, participate in the decision to accept or reject the WTU contract as a whole, provided that his brother will be impacted by the contract as a member of a significant and definable class of persons, and not individually or to any greater extent than any other similarly situated member of the class.

Finally, although the Petitioner is permitted to participate in the discussion to approve or reject the contract as a whole, the Ethics Commission is aware that a general discussion can quickly devolve into a more narrow review of specific contractual provisions. The Petitioner must be vigilant to identify such instances where a general conversation begins to focus on individual aspects of the contract that are likely to financially impact his brother. In such circumstances, the Petitioner must recuse from further participation consistent with the provisions of section 36-14-6 or seek further guidance from the Ethics Commission.

This Draft Opinion is strictly limited to the facts stated herein and relates only to the application of the Rhode Island Code of Ethics. Under the Code of Ethics, advisory opinions are based on the representations made by, or on behalf of, a public official or employee and are not adversarial or investigative proceedings. Finally, this Commission offers no opinion on the effect that any other statute, regulation, ordinance, constitutional provision, charter provision, or canon of professional ethics may have on this situation.

Code Citations:

§ 36-14-6

520-RICR-00-00-1.3.1 entitled Prohibited Activities-Nepotism (36-14-5004)

Related Advisory Opinions:

A.O. 2011-17

A.O. 2011-14

Keywords:

Collective Bargaining

Nepotism