

TDS: 6.12.18 KEY QUESTIONS ON ANTI-LOBBYING ORDINANCE (ALO) REFORM

1. Why has City staff refused to incorporate an appeals process into their proposed revised ordinances when ALL City advisory groups have recommended it?
2. Why has City staff refused to incorporate Council approval of ALO administrative rules when every advisory group that issued a recommendation on this proposed reform supports it?
3. Why has City staff BROADENED rather than narrowed restricted communication in “Version 3” by prohibiting “substantive information about any response or respondent with respect to the solicitation to which the communication relates?” What does this language mean?
4. Why did City staff propose removing debarment as a penalty in “Version 1” of their proposed ALO revision, but re-instate debarment as a penalty in “Version 2” and “Version 3”?
5. Why does City staff believe it is to the benefit of the City or citizens NOT to allow City vendors to respond publicly to the POLICY implications of City solicitations that typically have not been made public until they are released with the ALO in effect?
6. Would Council adoption of the “Version 3” ALO proposed by City staff allow City waste and recycling services vendors to continue to participate freely in the pending board/commission and City Council consideration of the eight policy recommendations of the Waste Management Policy Working Group? If yes, recalling that the Council waived the current ALO in April 2017 for all waste-related solicitations specifically to allow stakeholders to participate in the ongoing policy review process without fear of ALO violations, what is the specific difference between the current ALO and the “Version 3” ALO that would now allow vendors to participate freely?