



WILDWOOD

JANUARY 9, 2014
6:00 P.M.
BOARD OF ETHICS MEETING
COMMUNITY ROOM

The meeting was called to order at 6:15 P.M.

A roll call was taken, with the following results:

Present at Roll Call:

Board of Ethics Member Karen Calcaterra, Chair
Board of Ethics Member Lezli Jones
Board of Ethics Alternate Member Arnie Sprunger

Absent: Board of Ethics Member David Ferman

A quorum was present.

Also present: Ms. Lynne Greene-Beldner,
Deputy City Administrator/City Clerk
City Attorney Robert Golterman

Chair Calcaterra opened the meeting; introduced City Attorney Golterman, who gave a brief summary of his definition of substantial or private interest. City Attorney Golterman discussed his amendments based on comments and discussion by City Council Members for potential language; and put in the code those thoughts and recommendations.

Discussion was held regarding: some of the wording seems redundant; Council wanted it simple; some of the language was suggested by Council Member McGowen; are there things that an entity could have with the City that might not warrant being regulated; limit where there might be some concern; would that apply to for profit business; if owner of business would have interest in business is covered under #2; discussion on something that would require a vote; push to not distinguish between profit and non-profit; after that it tends to get fuzzy; last line talking about business entity only want a direct definition; if try to include examples; people will try to tear it apart; plenty of examples given with training; suggest putting a period at end of business entity and leave it at that; City Attorney Golterman asked to what extent do you want to regulate relationships; broadening the definition takes into consideration what was being challenged from the Council; need to lose last sentence; middle section seems hard to read, end it at second line; is there any kind of time limitations to be mindful of; in the code already notes a 2 year window; does note officer and employee; there is a timeframe; asked questions about paragraph #1; how precise are we trying to get; ok with language in #1 and #2 and change #3 to end of a business entity; would have to tweak some language within the code if change the definition of substantial or private interest; code does not get into business of trying to influence; City Attorney Golterman noted that section #604 does relate to influence, pretty clear.

Public Participation

Tammy Shea, 18132 Sunny Top Ct., spoke regarding the definition of remote interest; a non-salaried officer of a not for profit also includes the municipal officer; then there will not be any question and will be pretty clear; also include that it should be disclosed and part of public record; any entity who contracts with City should disclose on front end of discussion.

Discussion continued regarding the following: what is the definition of remote interest; not covered with what was presented by City Attorney; think it does but for clarity add definition of remote interest; purpose of review to give clarity; disclosure and instructions on when not to vote 125.070 covers disclosure 125.090 it does give reason; when you fill out financial disclosure shows what you have interest in, whole section talks about disclosure already; in 070 (c) is the disclosure part of the record; was remote interest discussed as used all over the United States; and clarified; been discussed many times; did review examples and by defining directors, etc; could use concept of remote interest and put in there; less concerned about structure of document; key thing is whether covering items that need to be covered; clearly first pass did not make major changes; kept structure in place; tried to close gap with some of the language; did not want to do a complete overhaul; did not need to start from scratch; to do a definition on remote would have to do throughout document; current document absorbs remote or is it totally lacking; maybe just substantial or private or remote interest if helps to call out; concept of remote interest would answer a lot of problems; example of remote interest; would be creating a different category; a lot is already covered; remote makes it more unclear; is there a need to create a whole separate definition for remote interest; examples were from law reviews not municipal code; is there a sense that someone who has a remote interest needs to have more restrictions than is already in the code; apply suggestions from beginning answers the questions about remote interest; use language City Attorney crafted covering the remote interest; change definition of substantial, or private to include remote; concept is there so do not need to include.

A motion was made by Board of Ethics Member Karen Calcaterra, seconded by Board of Ethics Member Lezli Jones to present the amended language to the Code of Ethics to the City Council,. A voice vote was taken for approval of the motion with a unanimous affirmative result and the motion was declared passed.

Board of Ethics Members agreed to meet one more time to review amended Code before presenting to City Council.

A motion was made by Board of Ethics Member Karen Calcaterra, seconded by Board of Ethics Member Lezli Jones to approve the minutes. A voice vote was taken for approval of the minutes with a unanimous affirmative result and the motion was declared passed.

Board of Ethics Member Karen Calcaterra made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Board of Ethics Member Lezli Jones. Meeting was adjourned at 7:26 p.m.