

Items for Review by EDRP

Proposed clarifying edits to final draft, fully assembled report for context and readability

For Economic Development Reform Panel discussion and decision:

I. Executive Summary (p.1)

- a. Page 1. New paragraph 3, added to provide additional context about the reasons giving rise to all this hard work. The EDRP has stated its goal as making recommendations to restore the public trust. In so doing, it may be helpful to remind the casual observer/reader that there have not been allegations of corruption or wrongdoing by City employees generally. The Panel was created in response to the indictment of members of City Council in connection with development projects, but neither those indictments nor related circumstances suggested any wrongdoing on the part of City employees (except for elected officials). Explains, however, that EDRP decided to do a top-to-bottom review including how to support/strengthen an ethical culture among all City employees.
- b. Page 1. Revised recommendations for clarity:
 - i. Moved development-related recommendations (formerly #3 and #4) to #1 and #2 so as not to bury the lede.
 - ii. Recommendation #2. The last part of the sentence (measures to streamline the [development] process”) feels like it’s own idea – separate from Council interacting with developers. Deleted here and added to new #6.
 - iii. Recommendations 1 and 2: Clarified that a code of conduct (CoC) and training isn’t being “established” for *City employees* because mandatory ethics training, a code of conduct, and obligatory policies for conflicts of interest and reporting already exist. The recommendation would *establish* a CoC for Council, the Mayor’s Office, contractors , and lobbyists.

Instead moved *City employees* into recommendation #2, which is about *enhancement* of existing mechanisms – the existing whistleblower hotline and enhancements to current training of city employees on ethics, code of conduct, and reporting requirements.

- iv. Recommendation #3: Is this supposed to apply to “contractors” or “developers”?
- v. Recommendation #7: Edited to add more detail, for clarity, about the breadth of the recommendation for reporting.
- vi. Recommendation #8: Added new recommendation that Council provide funding/resources in service to the above recommendations.

II. Background (pp. 4-5) – No substantive Changes.

III. Development Process (p.6)

- a. Moved this entire section up from further below in the document since this is at the heart of the EDRP’s review. Has benefit, also, of explaining the development process to readers up front.
 - b. Intro, paragraphs 1-3 on p. 6. Edits to add clarity and context:
 - i. Added sentence in paragraph 2 on the point made by Markiea Carter that may be helpful to clarify to instill some confidence in the public – the administration has dozens of people working on each development project. It is impossible for the administration to take actions to approve a project outside the view of *many* employees and departments.
 - c. Financial Assistance, p.6. Added clarity re Markiea Carter’s emphasis that most economic incentives are need-based and contingent on a “but for analysis.” If they don’t demonstrate that they need an incentive, and it’s not confirmed, then the administration won’t recommend it.
 - d. CC is a legislative body, pp. 6-7. Made an edit to clarify that this is a City Manager form of government. Added a footnote to the related legal opinion so that additional background is available to readers.
- IV. Training (pp. 11-13). Various edits for background and clarity
- a. Intro. Para 1. Tried to use same categories as referred to throughout the document: “elected officials,” lobbyists, etc.
 - b. Para 2 (p.11). Edits for accuracy and to reflect existing training requirements.
 - c. City Manager’s Actions (p.11). Added a reference to the January 2021 memorandum and significant changes implemented by the City Manager in response to corruption allegations, since this is important context for persons with regard to restoring trust in the City. Added a footnote – consider including a copy in your report as an exhibit (if that is desired).
 - i. Also added suggestion that the City Manager request additional resources from Council to review and implement these recommendations.
 - d. Training for Elected Officials (p. 12)
 - i. Suggest moving this up to the top of the section since Council is the main focus of public inquiry.
 - ii. Training for Developers, Contractors, and Lobbyists.
 - 1. Need clarity on who this applies to. Lobbyists, for example, don’t seem to have been part of the training discussion thus far.
- V. Confidential Whistleblower Hotline (pp. 14-17)
- a. Made edits for clarity and deleted a repetitive section. Nonsubstantive.
- VI. Campaign Contribution Regulations and Increasing Transparency & Disclosure
- a. p. 21. Added Tim’s language re forensic audit because relevant (though exists in other section as well).
 - b. p. 22. Added reference to need for funding/resources to implement the Active Developer list/program.
- VII. Code of Conduct (pp.22-27)
- a. No substantive changes, but query whether this applies to lobbyists, contractors, and developers.
- VIII. Conclusion (p.27) – No changes.

There have been various minor/formatting/readability edits by Panel members and City staff that are not reflected above.