

From: [Jett Oristaglio](#)
To: [Chris Hammer](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on COIB — Donations and Gifts to the City – extension of public comment period
Date: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 12:00:45 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report suspected phishing emails with the Phish Alert Button or forward them to phish@oti.nyc.gov as an attachment.

Hello! I gave public testimony today at the COIB public hearing on Donations and Gifts to the City – extension of public comment period.

I was told that I could upload my comments on the <https://rules.cityofnewyork.us> website until midnight tonight, but when I went to upload my comments at 11:55, it was already closed. I would like to send you my comments.

Comments on COIB — Jett Oristaglio

Good morning, members of the Board. My name is Jett Oristaglio, and I'm here as a private citizen. I was born in New York, I moved back to New York five years ago, and I intend to spend the rest of my life in New York. This city has given me more than I can easily repay, and I care a great deal about how it's governed. The institutions and people I trust most are the ones who lead with transparency as the default. I hold this city to that standard, and that's what brings me here.

I write in support of the Board's proposed amendments to its rules on the reporting of donations and gifts to the City, and in particular the new public reporting requirement for travel paid for by outside parties under proposed Section 1-19.

Part of this proposal is straightforward, and I won't dwell on it. A \$5,000 reporting threshold is a strange place to draw the line for a gift of travel; most single trips don't clear it, which means the current rule mostly reports the exceptions and misses the ordinary case. Setting the threshold at \$1,000, in line with the Annual Disclosure Law, fixes that and brings these rules into step with the rest of the City's disclosure regime. I support it without reservation. That said, the threshold is the easy part of this discussion. I want to focus on the more nuanced part: the objection that disclosure itself will do more harm than good.

The concern, raised in earlier comments, is that reporting travel tied to things like continuing legal education will discourage public servants from accepting it. The stated reason is that being named on a public list of "gifts" will brand legitimate professional development as something it isn't. I understand the worry, but I believe it gets the purpose of disclosure backwards. Notably, Section 1-19 does not simply report a bare gift and a dollar figure. It reports who traveled, the event that necessitated the travel, and where and when it took place. The legitimate context is a core piece of the disclosure. A continuing-education program doesn't appear as an anonymous favor, it reads as what it is: a named professional event, attended for a stated reason. That level of detail is what shows the travel for what it is, which is why disclosure protects honest public servants rather than exposing them. An official whose

travel is legitimate has nothing to fear from a record that states, in specific terms, what happened and for what purpose.

So I ask the Board to adopt the reporting requirement. This rule points toward a government who treats transparency as the default, who surfaces potential conflicts before they become problems, whose actions match their values, and who respects and trusts us, the people of New York, to understand what's in our own interests and act accordingly. That is exactly what integrity looks like in practice, and it is something we can rightly ask of the city that we love, and that gives us so much.

I'm grateful to the Board for taking this up, and to the staff for the evident care behind this proposal — down to the discretion it preserves for genuinely sensitive cases. Thank you for the work, and for holding this city to the highest standard of integrity.