

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE TORRANCE BLUE RIBBON
COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND INTEGRITY**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Torrance Blue Ribbon Committee on Ethics and Integrity convened in a regular meeting at 7:01 p.m. on December 6, 2006, in the Cultural Arts Center Garden Room.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Members Adelsman, Benoit, Furey, Gallagher, Gottshall-Sayed, Hardison, Mayeda, McCabe,* Montoya, Payne, and Skoll.

Absent: None.

Also Present: Assistant City Attorney Pohl, Management Associate Fulton, and Assistant City Manager Sunshine.

* Member McCabe arrived at 7:03 p.m.

3. AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

Assistant City Manager Sunshine indicated that the affidavit of posting had been received.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – NOVEMBER 1, 2006

MOTION: Member Gottshall-Sayed moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Member Mayeda seconded the motion and a voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

- 5.** Discussion Items which may involve review of such issues as gifts and gratuities, campaign finances, conflicts of interest, statements of economic interest, misuse of public funds; revolving door issues (post employment lobbying), meals, and staging photos for elections involving city vehicles and uniformed employees.

Chair Hardison reported that Frank Tyrrell who had spoken at the previous meeting had stopped by and left a cake and more reading items for the Committee Members. The Committee expressed appreciation for the materials and enjoyed the cake.

The Committee discussed meeting dates for the upcoming year and Member Furey indicated a conflict with the January 3, 2007 meeting. Member Adelsman reported that she would have to miss the May meeting and Chair Hardison acknowledged that they would look for an alternate date for the meeting currently scheduled for July 4th.

a) Review and discuss Strategic Plan Values

Chair Hardison expressed hope that the Committee would clarify the values perspective they want to approach the code from. She reported that they had received the City's strategic plan values which were displayed on the wall and she asked Members to condense the wording of the values.

The group formulated a broad list of values they felt were important:

Avoid Conflicts of Interest	Fairness	Recognition
Be Ethical	Faithfulness	Respect
Commitment	Golden Rule	Respect Diversity
Community Service	Honesty	Responsible
Compassion	Honor	Responsibility
Courtesy	Impartiality	Responsiveness
Creativity	Innovation	Strive to Excel
Dedicated	Integrity	Sunshine
Dedication	Integrity in Decision Making	Transparency
Diversity	Loyalty	Transparency to Build Trust
Duty	Open Communication	Trust
Ethical Honest Decisions	Public Trust	Trustworthiness
Excellence	Quality	Vision

The Committee discussed the merits of individual values listed and whether they were clear enough or conveyed the proper message; they discussed breaking the list into main and subcategories; and similar values were consolidated.

Vice Chair Gallagher suggested that integrity was a good word for a theme to establish an ethics code noting that ethics can be an explosive word.

Member Payne read the dictionary definition for ethics: a set of high moral guidelines that everyone can understand. He reported that integrity was defined as following those guidelines.

Member Skoll stated that integrity meant taking responsibility for your actions.

Vice Chair Gallagher questioned what integrity on the job meant and Member Gottshall-Sayed felt that a code would articulate what is expected of employees.

Member Furey reported that the League of California Cities had a sample of the ethics codes for all the cities and Santa Clara has an award winning code. Vice Chair Gallagher observed that the website went into great detail about the year long process that Santa Clara went through with much outside help. The process was expensive and labor intensive, and the city provided follow through after the code was developed as well as training for people associated with the city.

Chair Hardison commented that different cities grouped things differently in ways that made sense for each city.

Chair Hardison observed that everyone agreed that the word integrity should be used as an umbrella and as a focus for what the task is about and she suggested formulating what they think would be the key values underneath.

Member Montoya pointed out the importance of instant recognition and he reported that the back of Northrop employee badges has a list of that company's values.

Vice Chair Gallagher did not want ethics as a header as he felt it important to portray nuts and bolts instead of broader concepts and he felt the code should be concrete so people can identify with it.

Member Gottshall-Sayed indicated that the approach was aspirational and inspirational rather than a mandate. Vice Chair Gallagher agreed noting that the primary objective is to teach and to guide, not to correct. Member McCabe felt the code needed to be very simple.

Member Skoll questioned whether employees were considered government employees noting that he had printed out the code of ethics for government service because it covered things he felt should be included.

Chair Hardison hoped that they would develop a broad enough code so that commissioners, city staff members, elected officials or those running for office would be able to use it. She suggested starting with a focus toward elected officials, then commissioners, then staff.

The group narrowed the original list of 40 values down to: Honesty, Respect, Integrity, Trust, Responsibility, Transparency, Excellence, Fairness, Diversity, Dedication, and Compassion.

Member Adelman questioned whether the code covered union employees and whether that required negotiation.

Assistant City Attorney Pohl explained that there were rules for which the employee can be disciplined if they break them and that is the bottom level of expectation. If employees steal they are charged by the code for dishonesty but he did not think they needed to bargain for that type of promulgation.

Chair Hardison indicated that she would confirm that Councilmembers want an umbrella to cover all areas and she noted that City employees would be involved in the process as the implementation discussion happens.

The Committee further narrowed the list of values down to their top five values:
Honesty, Respect, Trust, Responsibility, Transparency

The Committee discussed alternatives for the word transparency as some felt the meaning would not be clear enough. Member Gottshall-Sayed supported the word as she felt it conveyed a vision that their acts would be seen and were subject to scrutiny, not hidden from view

Member Montoya questioned why values were being limited to one word as he felt that other adjectives would be needed.

Chair Hardison explained that more information would be listed underneath each key word but if they wanted the code to be distilled down to a brief statement they would need keywords.

The group discussed mission statements vs. values and Member Furey questioned whether transparency applied toward employees.

Assistant City Attorney Pohl noted that there were privacy laws and employees had certain rights to privacy. He added that there were certain things that were not transparent even for elected officials such as City Council closed sessions.

Chair Hardison clarified that they were referring to the concept of openness. She questioned whether members felt their key values had been covered and the Committee created a list of boxed values to be kept in mind.

Excellence Fairness Diversity Dedication Compassion

Other values the Committee wanted to keep in mind were:

Creativity Innovation Vision

Loyalty
Impartiality
Responsiveness

b. Develop statements to align with values

The Committee agreed that each member would return at the next meeting with 12 copies of three standards that they each formulate for each of the top five values chosen and Chair Hardison suggested referring to examples from other cities for guidance.

Chair Hardison indicated that she would go to the City Council meeting on the first Tuesday of February to present the Committee's values and expressions, and seek concurrence from the Council that they are comfortable with the direction the Committee is going in. She also indicated that she would ask the Council whether they envisioned the document as something affecting Councilmembers and Commissioners as a Phase 1 and she noted that while that would change implementation, it should not change the values as they should remain constant for everyone.

Vice Chair Gallagher suggested that there could be differences as they address a different audience and he felt there should be specific examples.

Member Skoll reported that things he had read were very specific as to who the code was directed to.

Chair Hardison indicated that there would be core values for everyone with a separate page for different groups. She stated that their initial focus would be on Commissioners and elected officials who are similar, and she felt there would be much commonality to the other groups also.

c. Discuss development of sub-committees

To be discussed at the next meeting.

d. Instructions to staff

See item 6c.

6. ACTION ITEMS

6a. Develop Values Statements

To be discussed at the next meeting.

6b. Select Sub-committees

To be discussed at the next meeting.

6c. Instructions to Staff

Chair Hardison asked staff to provide a list of the top five, the boxed five and all the other identified values to committee members by Monday, December 11, 2006. Vice Chair Gallagher felt that some of the values that had been skipped over would emerge again and he noted that the background materials provided by staff had enabled the Committee to make progress quickly.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:07 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, January 3, 2007 at 7:00 p.m., in the Cultural Arts Center Garden Room.

Approved as Amended January 3, 2007 s/ Sue Herbers, City Clerk
--