Good evening, I am Ralph Kanz here this evening in my capacity as Vice president of the MGO Democratic Club and a member of the MGO Government Accountability Task Force.

MGO believes that the Public Ethics Commission needs to be a model for how public officials should deal with issues involving not only legal conflicts of interest, but also perceived conflicts. Public perception of conflicts of interest greatly influences how much faith they place in the governmental process. As such we believe that with regard to proposed Section 2.24.050 Qualifications and Restrictions the following additions be made.

No person shall be appointed to the commission who: (1) is married to or the domestic partner of any person whose business activities or conduct are regulated by or subject to commission review or (2) is a city official or employee or the domestic partner or spouse of a city official or employee.

These prohibitions would address the concerns about the appearance of conflict of interest and the protection of public respect for the commission.

We would suggest that the Commission add an additional section to the proposed ordinance concerning recusal. Last year the City Council adopted language in the Anti-Nepotism Ordinance stating that:

> *The purpose of this anti-nepotism ordinance is to eliminate actual or perceived conflicts of interest, partiality or favoritism in the City workplace due to nepotism and/or cronyism and to maintain public confidence in the fairness of the City's hiring and employment practices as well as in the competence of City employees.*
>
> *"Cronyism" means participating in any employment decision that may be viewed as a conflict of interest, such as one involving a close friend, a business partner, and/or professional, political, or commercial relationship, that would lead to preferential treatment or compromise the appearance of fairness.*

Using this language as a standard for recusal would greatly increase public confidence in the governmental process. Along with this language would be an additional requirement that as now, the reason for any recusal must be disclosed. Minor changes to this already adopted policy could be extended to actions not only PEC members, but members of all commissions in the City.

Item_____
Date_____
_____ of_____