

**BEFORE THE  
PHILADELPHIA WATER, SEWER AND STORMWATER RATE BOARD**

In the Matter of the Philadelphia Water Department's Proposed Change in Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Rates and Related Charges : Fiscal Years 2024 – 2025 Rates and Charges to Become Effective : September 1, 2023 and September 1, 2024

**EXCEPTION**

6/5/23

**Filed by Michael Skiendzielewski, Pro Se**

As a registered participant in the current Water Rate Board proceedings, this Philadelphia citizen and PWD consumer requests certain information, details, and records pertaining to one of the more time-consuming, human resource intensive and equipment involved efforts that the PWD is involved on a continuous basis and since all of the factors listed are involved in a collaborative task, a review, understanding and record/process review of this activity most certainly is related to the WRB's primary task of reviewing and addressing matters, issues and concerns that directly affect the water and sewer rates that impact all PWD customers.

Consequently, I am requesting from the PWD the current protocol and standards used in the identification, investigation, planning and initiation of work at consumer's residences related to necessary long lateral sewer repairs and other related or contingent repair work, which may or may not be the responsibility of the PWD or the property owner. I also request any PWD correspondence or files that describe the monitoring and oversight process and procedure by management in the initiation of any PWD excavation projects related to such work in place while such excavation and repair work is being conducted either by the PWD or private contractor as a result of a notice to the property owner that a sewer defect must be corrected. Finally, I request any and all information related to a review, evaluation, critique and study after the assignment is completed of a particular excavation project under the auspices of the PWD which provides an analysis of the standards followed, any difficulties identified, and any excavation work, conduct and decision-making, whether on-site or in PWD management, that was in accordance with the PWD protocol in such projects or alternatively, any steps, actions or decisions that did not adhere to the policy and protocol established by PWD management for such excavation and repair work regarding residential sewer matters.

Such a study, review and analysis of the elements of the PWD diagnosis, investigation, initiation, excavation, monitoring of the project, as well as follow-up review, study, critique and

professional analysis of the steps and decisions in the entire process related to excavation for sewer problems at consumers' residences is of critical importance since it is a time, employee and resource rich and expensive endeavor and every professional organization should be interested in and dedicated to ongoing study and evaluation of its practices and procedures.

Certainly, in this consumer's experience, I was a PWD customer involved in such an excavation for a faulty sewer lateral and a process that lasted a considerable length of time from the Spring 2014 to the Fall 2017, with several PWD interventions and procedures utilized to address the deteriorating conditions outside of my residence near the street where PWD worked to address several distinct issues and problems. The unfortunate fact is that the conditions have never been satisfactorily addressed and resolved and the area in the grassy footway near the street, where PWD performed a number of excavations and operations to address various issues, continues to deteriorate, sink and need intermittent intervention to refill and level the area.

=====

**General Objections submitted by PWD in response to request for records:**

1. PWD objects to each interrogatory and request to the extent that it seeks information that is not relevant and not material to the PWD proposed changes in rates and charges as set forth in the 2023 general rate case filing, and as such, is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence for purposes of rate setting.
2. By answering any part of the interrogatory and request or producing any part of the requested information, PWD does not concede the relevance, materiality or admissibility of any of the information sought therein for use as evidence in any hearing.
3. The Department objects to each interrogatory and request insofar as it seeks the production and disclosure of documents or information subject to any applicable privilege (including government decision making and deliberations; attorney client privilege; and attorney work product), rule, doctrine or immunity whether created by statute or common law

=====

**Hearing Officer's Sustaining PWD objections to records requested**

**Since the Rate Board lacks jurisdiction – and therefore can take no action - over these issues, it would be a fruitless exercise and a misuse of scarce resources of time and money to allow Mr. Skiendzielewski to continually raise issues which he has been explicitly and repeatedly told are not within the Rate Board's jurisdiction.**

That assertion is blatantly inaccurate and invalid. What time, effort and money is used/wasted for the ~~PWD to~~ present what they undoubtedly have as a standard operating procedure protocol for the identification, investigation, planning, excavation, monitoring and review of their excavation projects and exercises that occur day in and day out. Yes, the WRB does not have the authority, according to the current ineffective and powerless interpretation of the regulations, to act on such information as the elements of the PWD protocol process but the key point is this: **THE DETAILS AND INFORMATION WOULD BE IN THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR ALL PWD CONSUMERS TO SEE, REVIEW AND INSPECT.** And as this family's late special needs daughter, who was wise beyond her years, opined quite often: Knowledge is

power. And for the most part, that is what most of my efforts over all of these hearings has been about.....sharing facts, details, evidence and yes management and city attorney conduct with those citizens and consumers who are entitled to know how a \$1 billion agency operates and conducts their business.

More to the point here in this exception, the construction protocol would be extremely valuable as I share the details of PWD management action, decisions, correspondence, facts, etc. here from the start of the work at my residence in 2014 through the succeeding years until now. Let us all see how the state of the art construction protocol review, management and monitoring is utilized by senior management at PWD over that time. The details presented here are from written correspondence shared between this PWD consumer and first with the Deputy Commissioner Operations, PWD and then the Commissioner of the PWD, Debra McCarty.

In the spring of 2014, when PWD and private contractor were repairing failed long laterals at a neighbor's residence down the street, I asked PWD to look at and inspect my property since the area in the grassy footway by the street was eroding and sinking. Subsequent testing was conducted by PWD and the long sewer laterals at my property were identified as defective and it would be necessary for the homeowner to pay for these repairs. *It is critical to note that, at this time, no other failures or defects were identified at my residence, even though, after the long laterals were replaced, the deterioration, sinking and erosion continued and continues even to this day.*

In August 2014, Deputy Commissioner of Operations McCarty, when asked about the 55% loan reduction agreement for my neighbor, responded that she did not know who I was referring to about their HELP loan being reduced by 40%, so I cannot speak to the specifics and reasoning. Yet, in this same email message, Ms. McCarty copied Derrick Segers who is the manager in charge of the PWD HELP loan program at PWD, who knew about the discounted loan and, as a matter of fact, was the PWD official who signed the loan reduction, costing the PWD \$5500. Predictably, the Deputy Commissioner immediately conflated this "OUTSIDE THE TRB" agreement with appeals some consumers file with the Tax Review Board.

Ms. McCarty follows up with a statement that there has been issues with laterals in the community and that is indeed accurate, since there were at least four homeowners who had to pay for their lateral repair. Please see attached document for details of corruption and arrests related to L and I plumbing inspectors by the FBI during the construction of the homes in this development. (Incidentally, work was done in 2005 at my property and my neighbors for replacing of sanitary and storm curb traps and insurance covered this).

When questioned about the corruption and arrests of L and I plumbing inspectors and what specific department was responsible for signing off on the completed work at the final inspection of the sewer/lateral installation in the late 1990's, Deputy Commission McCarty did not provide a response. She subsequently suggested that I reach out to the L and I Commissioner but those efforts were unsuccessful.

In September 2014, I did advise Ms. McCarty that I was initiating an appeal with the Tax Review Board and it was important to retrieve and share information re the corruption matter with plumbing inspectors as well as the ongoing problem in the community with failed sewer laterals. I received no response.

Approximately a year after the long laterals were replaced, I corresponded again with the Deputy Commissioner informing her once again of a significant depression in the street, two holes that had opened, a crack in the new curb paid for by this homeowner and significant erosion in the grassy and pavement areas of my property that needed to be addressed quite often. The Streets Department filled in the holes in the street but PWD did not respond to the other issues on my property.

When Ms. McCarty was appointed Commissioner in early 2016, I sent her an email of congratulations and once again repeated the ever present issues of erosion, deterioration and sinking in the grassy and pavement areas of my property. It was in this reply correspondence that Commissioner McCarty suggested that it may be the case that the pipes between the curb trap and my basement may have failed. According to the Commissioner, "it is unfortunate that the developer apparently used poor workmanship when installing the plumbing in your development." *It is important to note that on this occasion and on another occasion when Commissioner McCarty suggested the same cause for erosion, I secured the professional services of a master plumber, \$300 each time, who certified that there were no failures, cracks or breaks in the plumbing, pipes and lines on my property.*

Of critical importance is the email message sent by Commissioner McCarty on March 4, 2016 in which she states the following:

*"As for the supposed fair resolution for 518 Park Hollow (consumer with 55% discount), I have repeatedly stated that I am not familiar with the details and thus do not know if the situation was comparable to yours or not. If you ever obtain any documentation that elaborates on the details, I would be happy to again review this matter."*

Given the information thus far from this consumer as well as PWD sources, including HELP loan manager, Mr. Segers, it is hard to believe that the Commissioner is "not familiar with the details". There is a computer print-out record detailing the reasons for the lateral failures at 518 Park Hollow and I shared with PWD my \$400 PE certified report by a licensed engineer who documented the identical reasons for the lateral failures at my property.

*"In closing, I again offer that if you ever obtain the salient details of what occurred at 516 Parkhollow (I did, forwarded them, the certified engineer's report, to the Commissioner and there was no response) I would be willing to reconsider your position. However, at this time I know of no reason to change our position."*

On March 1, 2016, my appeal was heard before the Tax Review Board and the appeal was denied relating to the lateral expenses incurred at my residence.

The email message from Commissioner McCarty is of extreme value and importance:

*"As you point out, the TRB (and not PWD) reduced modified the HELP loan at 518 ParkHollow. (THAT IS SIMPLY UNTRUE.....the loan agreement was signed by the homeowner, the Asst. City Solicitor and Mr. Segers, PWD HELP loan manager.....as Commissioner, Ms. McCarty would have been aware of the conduct of her HELP loan manager). We have not control over the TRB and it is not clear why that decision was made (ANOTHER UNTRUE STATEMENT.....IT IS CLEAR WHY THE DECISION WAS MADE, YOUR HELP LOAN MANAGER WAS ONE OF TWO CITY EMPLOYEES WHO AUTHORIZED THE DISCOUNT). Given the results of both of*

*your appeals, one could surmise (NO NEED TO SURMISE WHEN YOU HAVE THE FACTS, ENGINEER REPORTS, ETC. AT PWD) that your situation is different.”*

It was during that TRB appeal hearing that the PWD employee mentioned that there was a breach in the wall, the sewer wall at the foot of my property in the street. I notified the Commissioner of this statement.

FINALLY, on March 30, 2016, after repeated notification to first Deputy Commissioner McCarty and then Commissioner McCarty over a period of two years from the first inspection at my property, with the failures, erosion, deterioration and sinking continuing without fail, “the PWD conducted the additional dye test and camera inspection today. The results indicate that the inlet lateral is defective. A crew will return to perform repairs.” per Commissioner McCarty.

Interestingly and ironically, on April 1, 2016, Commissioner McCarty issued this declaration in an email message:

**“The HELP loan program.....we must administer that program in a fair and equitable manner. Doing otherwise is a disservice to our customers and rate payers.”**

Since April 1, 2016 appears to be a special day for remarkable statements from the Commissioner:

**“The Department will repair the defective inlet lateral. This problem is separate and distinct from the problem that occurred over 1 ½ years ago w/ your laterals.”**

How did Commissioner McCarty make such a definite and clear statement that she knew that the two problems, the original failed laterals (homeowner responsibility) and the defective inlet laterals (PWD responsibility) were not related or connected? Where is the proof and evidence corroborating the claim by the Commissioner?

When PWD personnel came to my residence to repair the PWD defective inlet lateral, I witnessed and photographed an excavation technique and method which looked unsafe. Upon further investigation with professional and industry sources in civil engineering, it was determined that the particular action taken at the time violated industry standards for safety and the professional methods in civil engineering associations. I secured a PE certification as to this dangerous operation, both for PWD personnel and passersby and notified PWD and city officials of this fact. There was no response or interest in this serious matter and when, at a subsequent public meeting as part of the WRB process I shared the specifics of this problem, Commission McCarty subsequently addressed the people present and said that there was no danger and the operation was safe. I subsequently reached out to [nearmissmgnt.com](http://nearmissmgnt.com), an international company in downtown Philadelphia that specializes in near-miss management systems to confirm my concerns. Why? Our city and its administration has a sorry and tragic history of disregarding warnings and cautions from its citizens regarding dangerous situations and conditions, taking no action and then tragedy strikes with death and serious injury. This

occurred in the Pier Collapse in 2000 and the Salvation Army collapse in 2013. The specifics of the dangerous operation in question was the unsafe and dangerous use of the outrigger/stabilizer of the PWD machinery and there still exists evidence at my property that corroborates this claim/allegation.

In an email message shortly after the unsafe operation, on April 7, 2016, Commissioner McCarty acknowledges my claim that my curb was damaged as a result of PWD activities but does not refer as to how it occurred. The follow-up from the Commissioner was an email on April 26 that the repairs had been done to the curb (broken in two places).

During this time, Commissioner McCarty related that there was no problem with the sewer wall and “crack” as related by her employee at the TRB hearing. I raise this matter since even though Commission McCarty claimed that the crack was not the source of the problem, and in September 2017, as the erosion and deterioration continued at the site, the Deputy Commission or Operations Donna Schwartz sent PWD personnel out to my residence to “parge” the crack in the sewer wall. In her correspondence, Ms. Schwartz stated that the “parging” was only a precautionary measure and had nothing to do with any erosion or sinking at that location. Why was “parging” done, if it was not necessary or purposeful? Of course, the parging did not last and the crack now is once again evident on the sewer wall.

Another attempt was subsequently implemented by PWD personnel where areas were dug out on either side of pavement blocks and cement forced under the block to prevent further sinking. In August 2016, PWD personnel came out once again and drilled a bore hole in the street, performed a dye test and the results were negative for any failures.

=====

Though everyone knows that the WRB has no authority or oversight in these circumstances, it would be beneficial and constructive to have the construction/excavation protocol and management procedure of PWD produced for everyone to view in order to correlate the elements of their system with the path of investigation, planning, review, excavation, followup and monitoring of the action, decisions and STATEMENTS made by senior PWD officials presented in this exception submitted. For sure, the evidence here in the management of the disaster at my residence shows management failures, misstatements, feigned ignorance of issues and conditions and a general path of responding IFF the consumer continues to draw attention to a set of conditions that needs to be investigated, reviewed, corrected, and monitored correctly and properly, given the professional personnel and expertise available in this \$1 billion agency.

Michael Skiendzielewski

There are two issues regarding the professional conduct and decision-making in this matter and it concerns that of the WRB counsel and long-time counsel to the PWD, a senior deputy city solicitor, Daniel Cantu Hertzler.

The focus of the present concern is that of discussions I have attempted to have on several occasions with this city attorney relative to the matter of one’s legal

**and professional responsibilities, duties and obligations compared to those that we have in our own personal and individual philosophy regarding what is right, proper and appropriate given our own set of values and principles. Given the fact that I was a Captain, a senior level official within the PPD and he is a senior deputy city solicitor, who was awarded the Integrity Award from the City of Philadelphia in 2015, it is clear that our positions of authority granted us a wide discretion when applying the legal and professional duties and regulations of our official positions, given the unique elements and circumstances of the particular matter under our consideration, review, and action/decision.**

**Interestingly and sadly, on certain instances of such discussion, when this writer and Mr Cantu-Hertzler fully discussed the discretion, power and authority we both had in our professional capacities, when we went to discuss the matter of how our personal values, principles and ethics were utilized in some of the more difficult and problematic situations we faced in our leadership positions, Mr. Cantu-Hertzler abruptly discontinued the discussion with such excuses as I cannot talk now, I am busy with other matters and/or I do not have time for such concerns. I remember these occasions distinctly because the decision by this city attorney to turn away from such a critical, serious and vital concern for every single one of us who work in public service is alarming, troubling and, thankfully, quite revealing.**

**Yes, it is about the inequity, unfairness and lack of integrity with which exactly the same PWD HELP loans were issued, managed and resolved. Over and over again, this senior city solicitor, a man of integrity according to the City of Philadelphia, blames this citizen and pro se participant for the disparate outcome in my action through the appeals process within the Tax Review Board and my decision to forego an appeal to the Court of Common Pleas. What Mr. Daniel Cantu-Hertzler is not sharing with you, does not have to share with you and it is in his best professional interests not to reveal is the fact that as the supervisor of the unit within the Office of the City Solicitor for providing legal services to the Tax Review Board, the Office of Administrative Review and his subordinates who were assigned to the actual hearings being conducted, he failed through his misconduct to advise and notify PWD customers who were appealing via the TRB of the availability of a second appeal to the TRB (after a first rejection) in the short 4 page regulations of the TRB and this gross failure and injustice to the participants happened over a period of several years. When I asked Mr. Cantu-Hertzler what the city was going to do to address and rectify the harm and negative consequences that impacted many petitioners over such a long period of time, he replied that nothing would be done. In a subsequent conversation on the same topic, when I asked him about the negative consequences, financial loss, that may have impacted a large number of petitioners who were deprived of the opportunity of a second appeal, he said that no one was harmed. That simply is not the case and Mr.**

**Hertzler would not have the facts, evidence, and/or records to substantiate such a reckless assertion. I can tell you in my instance, after the first appeal, I would not have appealed to the Court of Common Pleas, as I suspect many other petitioners would have made a similar decision, due to the cost, time and legal expense involved compared to the amount of money being appealed.**

**But right here, the question of personal or individual ethics or principles should be and needs to be addressed. When Mr. Cantu-Hertzler becomes aware of his failure and professional misconduct which undoubtedly impacted some of the many petitioners who were deprived of the opportunity of a second appeal to the TRB over a span of years, what guides his decision making and conduct relative to this critical issue? Of course, considering his professional and legal duties and responsibilities as an employee and attorney with the city, he knows that he need do nothing since it would be up to an aggrieved former TRB petitioner to file suit and have the matter heard in court. But what about the other critical part of a professional's conduct, the personal and individual ethics and values that are used in our decisions in our place of employment throughout the day. Are those values used in his consideration for a response to the probable negative financial consequences that some appellants to the TRB undoubtedly sustained as a result of his failure to properly notify them? The city TRB website makes it very clear that participants need not have an attorney during the appeal process, suggesting that city officials will provide the needed information, details and facts to undertake the appeal properly and according to the regulations.**

**I was the individual who notified the city, the Office of the City Solicitor and Mr. Cantu-Hertzler personally of this lack of properly notifying TRB petitioners under Article 15 of the TRB regulations. After a significant effort and advocacy in this regard, the city acknowledged the error and I was granted a second appeal to the TRB. But, what if I had not discovered this problem, would the oversight still be in place today, negatively impacting more petitioners before the TRB? Ironically, at the time of my case, the first appeal rejection letter from the TRB contained the information that the next course of action was to appeal to the Court of Common Pleas. As a result of my intervention, the city placed a small notice regarding the second appeal, which for years they failed to do, on the application form that a petitioner completes when filing an appeal. Clearly, the location of such information here is inappropriate and unreasonable and should be included in the letter received by the petitioner after the first appeal is rejected. Was this second appeal notice placed accidentally, intentionally or recklessly on the application form?**

**Yes, I received my second appeal and the outcome was never in question. When the Commission PWD (McCarty), who is responsible for a \$1 billion**



department takes the time to testify at a TRB hearing where the amount involved is approximately \$7,000, certainly my appeal was rejected.

But even here, raising the PWD HELP loan matter again, Mr. Cantu-Hertzler is sure to conflate the issue in a manner that needs to be addressed. The first PWD HELP loan for my neighbor, discounted 55%, was settled OUTSIDE OF THE JURISDICTION OF THE TAX REVIEW BOARD in a settlement agreement between the PWD, the homeowner and the Office of the City Solicitor of Philadelphia. The assistance city solicitor who signed this agreement, Sarah Stevenson, was employed by the city for approximately a year, and she was in the solicitor unit supervised by Daniel Cantu-Hertzler. This agreement was ultimately under his authority and responsibility, though, in a subsequent conversation about this matter, Mr. Cantu-Hertzler told me that Ms. Stevenson would have had the authority to approve this settlement agreement where the city and PWD discounted \$5500. Is there anyone who believes that a city attorney with a year's experience would be able unilaterally to approve such an agreement without oversight, review and approval?

So we return once again to the matter of personal and individual ethics and principles, values and integrity. If Mr. Cantu-Hertzler is directly aware of the approved discounted loan agreement which occurred OUTSIDE OF THE PURVIEW OF THE TRB, and most certainly he was since had the ultimate authority and responsibility regarding this transaction, then what principles, ethics, values, etc. guided Cantu-Hertzler in the handling, management and disposition of my PWD HELP loan, with identical conditions, circumstances, evidence, official engineering reports for cause of failure, etc.? Whether it is inside the professional legal arena or in the personal, private ethical world, what would be the equitable, fair and "integrity" solution here?

In a follow-up email correspondence from Mr. Cantu-Hertzler in response to my inquiry re disparate, uneven and divergent PWD HELP loan outcomes, he informed me that according to the law, the city is under no obligation to treat people the same given the same facts, circumstances, etc. If I were to pursue legal action in court to secure the same PWD HELP loan outcome as my neighbor, the city would win the case. So, no longer does anyone have to wonder what set of principles were used by Mr. Cantu-Hertzler to decide what position was the one he would take in this matter, the legal one it is incumbent on the aggrieved party to pursue action to be treated fairly, equitably and "with integrity".

I wish I could cease with the examples exhibiting the kind of professional conduct exhibited by Mr. Cantu-Hertzler during the course of our resolution of the issues in this case but that is not possible. I must do so since he is and has been for

**several WRB hearings, the counsel to the Water Rate Board and I submit that the citizens of Philadelphia as well as the consumers of the Philadelphia Water Department must be made aware of the facts, details, conduct and statements made by this senior deputy city solicitor who exercises major legal impact and oversight over the functioning of the PWD and the procedures of the WRB.**

**There was another occasion when I was discussing the options or alternatives available to me to bring the facts, issues and decisions in this case to a larger audience via those rights and responsibilities provided and guaranteed under the First Amendment of the PA and US Constitutions. Specifically, distribution of materials and leafleting in neighborhoods across the city comes these guaranteed rights and Mr. Cantu-Herzler responded that my consideration of such advocacy and efforts was “threatening” to him. For someone in law enforcement, who oftentimes was responsible for ensuring that these rights and privileges to protest and gather peacefully were protected and ensured for Philadelphia citizens, I certainly was shocked and astounded. Clearly, this graduate of Harvard Law School knows the facts of the First Amendment and his statement was reckless and irresponsible.**

**And here, I finally arrive at one of the important points I wish to make and that has to do with the personal and individual values and principles that one considers in order take steps or make decisions to address an issue. I have had many, many years in advocacy in the field of disability rights and services and it is very important and necessary that a person uses his/her values and ethics to guide the conduct and behavior, not matter what the environment, in our work lives and personal lives. I also adhere to this decision because the particular facts and decision-making here by Mr. Cantu-Hertzler have also impacted certain departments, procedures and professionals in a disadvantageous manner and even though he may not see it, wish to see it or understand it, I can see that his fellow professionals accept, permit and tolerate what I deem as unprofessional and unethical and he has taken little if any steps to bring this matter to a reasonable resolution.**

**The following two statements are illustrative of the professional conduct, demeanor and philosophy of the WRB counsel, Daniel Cantu-Hertzler, with whom I have corresponded with over a period of several years, ever since I reached out to PWD and their counsel to be treated fairly, equitably and reasonably in matters related to identical PWD HELP loans for adjoining neighbors. As mentioned earlier in this presentation, Mr. Cantu-Hertzler was quite firm and adamant that the City of Philadelphia is under no legal obligation to treat people, citizens/PWD consumers, the same given identical facts, evidence, circumstances and conditions and if legal action were instituted in that regard by a citizen/PWD consumer, the city would**

win such a case in court. It is indeed a sad day for this city, its leadership and citizenry for one of its senior attorneys to abide by such a standard and principle, particularly in light of a number of egregious, unethical and unconstitutional statements and stances he has taken over the years of my discussions with this winner of the Integrity Award from the City of Philadelphia in 2015.

(1) WRB counsel and, Daniel Cantu-Hertzler is ironically the inaugural winner of the City of Philadelphia's Integrity Award in 2015. This is the same attorney who issued a public statement to this citizen:

***".....The City's correspondence with you is over, as are any and all City investigations at your behest....." May 10, 2018 via email***

(2) Years ago, in a case where a citizen was appealing a tax issue in Kansas City, US Supreme Court Justice Gorsuch stated:

***"When public officials feel free to wield the powers of their office as weapons against those who question their decisions, they do damage not merely to the citizen in their sights, but also to the First Amendment liberties," Judge Gorsuch wrote.***

+++++

Regardless of the eventual disposition of the issues and concerns in my particular case with the PWD and senior leadership in the Law Department, what I have shared here with the WRB audience and really all Philadelphia citizens since this document is now in the public record and on the WRB website, I have done what I feel is necessary, standing up to professional conduct and decision-making, both in the PWD and the Law Department, that portrays a very sad, disconcerting and troubling philosophy and pattern of conduct for those in senior leadership positions. Once again, for the most difficult of matters, it very often is a matter of doing what is right and a matter of one's principles rather doing what is expeditious and permissible given the protections and regulations provided to one in senior management in public administration.

Michael Skiendzielewski

## **Feds indict 13 Philly inspectors**

April 1, 2002 **PHILADELPHIA** A federal grand jury has indicted 13 current or former Philadelphia plumbing inspectors for taking bribes from plumbing contractors for as long as 20

**years. The inspectors, who worked for the city's Construction Services Department in the Department of Licenses and Inspections, were accused of taking bribes from \$5 to \$20 at a time, with the money**

**PHILADELPHIA — A federal grand jury has indicted 13 current or former Philadelphia plumbing inspectors for taking bribes from plumbing contractors for as long as 20 years. The inspectors, who worked for the city's Construction Services Department in the Department of Licenses and Inspections, were accused of taking bribes from \$5 to \$20 at a time, with the money concealed inside triplicate permit forms or palmed in handshakes.**