

June 8, 2022

Spokane Ethics Commission Members
Via Sam Faggiano

Delivered via email

Re: 5/5/2022 Complaint

**Dear Commission Members:** 

Mr. Faggiano invited me to your upcoming commission meeting where you will consider jurisdiction over the above referenced matter. I have enclosed a brief statement I prepared upon receipt of the complaint along with some relevant email attachments that may be useful in your consideration.

I respectfully request that you consider declining jurisdiction over this complaint because it does not allege any specific facts, that if true, would be an ethics code violation as defined at SMC 1.04A.030 (I) or (K). In fact, Attachment 1 to the complaint doesn't allege an actual violation, only that there "may" have been a violation. Based on the undisputed facts that the email was not addressed to anybody other than city employees and that it did not benefit me personally, any further investigation is likely unwarranted.

Section K relates to personal gain or benefit. I don't see any allegations in the complaint that my circulation of an email to councilmembers and council staff would result in any benefit or gain to myself - nor has any conceivable benefit been identified.

Section I relates to public disclosure of information that the discloser knows to be confidential and for the purpose of benefitting the discloser. As one can see from the copies of the emails provided by both myself and the complainant, the email with attachments that I sent was only directed to city councilmembers and their staff for purposes of consideration at an upcoming meeting. There was no disclosure to the public or anyone outside the council office and the only purpose was to assist councilmembers in preparing for a meeting to discuss the proposals. There is also no allegation in the complaint that my sharing this information with the rest of the council would benefit me personally in any way. Finally, the emails I sent to the Administration about the proposals prior to my email to the council demonstrate my understanding that the proposals were not confidential because the RFP Committee had completed its scoring process.

In summary, under all the specific facts alleged in the complaint, there is no allegation that I personally benefited from emailing the rest of council the proposals we would be reviewing at our next meeting; and there is no factual allegation that I ever disclosed these proposals to the public. For those reasons, I

request that the Commission find that there is insufficient evidence in this complaint to pursue any further investigation and that this matter be dismissed.

Thanks in advance for your consideration and all that you do for our city.

Best,

Breean Beggs, Spokane City Council President

## Statement from Council President Breean Beggs on Council Review of Homeless Shelter Proposals

The recent ethics complaint presented by Tom Bassler has no merit and further delays the process of opening needed shelter beds in Spokane. There was no public disclosure of confidential information. Instead, only Council Members and their staff were provided with the three responsive proposals for review in advance of an April 21, 2022, Council Study Session on the topic <u>after</u> the Continuum of Care (CoC) RFP Committee had completed its rating process and <u>after</u> the CoC Board had voted on the proposals.

City Council has the final responsibility for choosing which contract to sign to provide homeless shelter services when using City funds. The Administration chose to ask the CoC Board to provide alternative input to Council and asked Council to delay review of the specific proposals until after the CoC RFP Committee had submitted their ratings and recommendation, which was completed and submitted on 4/13. On 4/15 the CoC Board met and voted on the RFP Committee's recommendation and did not endorse any of the proposals. On the afternoon of 4/18, I emailed the Administration twice to let them know that it was time for Council to review the proposals and I also advised them that Council would be discussing them at its upcoming study session on 4/21 (see attached emails). None of the three members of Administration staff informed of the upcoming Council meeting ever responded with any objection to Council reviewing the proposals. I made a request to the CoC Board to attend our 4/21 Council Study Session to discuss the proposals and their advisory process, which they did.

In order to prepare for the Study Session, and having received no objection from the Administration, I emailed the three proposals that I received from the CoC Board after their 4/14 vote to Council and its staff only. I did not disclose them to the public. I had no reason to believe that the documents I emailed to Council could be considered confidential since I had received them from outside the City and after the RFP committee rating process had been completed, nor did I disclose them to anyone outside the City. As Council President, I have a duty to ensure that Council Members have the materials they need to review prior to considering a decision on any issue, including contracting for homeless shelter services. I fulfilled that duty in advance of the 4/21 study session on the topic after notifying the Administration and did not violate any provision of the ethics code or any other City ordinance.

The submission of a meritless ethics complaint sadly distracts and delays City government from promptly opening acutely needed shelter beds while the homeless camp near Second and Ray continues to grow. This is the second time this year that a plan to open more shelter beds has been delayed by a misleading narrative. City Council did not need a definitive recommendation from the CoC Board to make a final decision between the three proposals for operating the Trent shelter and the continued delay in submitting the decision to Council is hurting our city.

Similarly, the City could have, but didn't, open a fenced large tent shelter on City-owned land in northeast Spokane that was ready to open weeks ago. Either would have improved the situation for those who are unhoused and those who are experiencing the secondary impacts of unauthorized encampments.

We have finally created a broad consensus in Spokane that we need to promptly open additional low barrier shelter beds. To make this happen as quickly as is needed, we need more transparency and collaboration, and fewer unforced delays in allowing Council to consider operator proposals. I look forward to continuing my longstanding efforts to open more of these beds faster so that we can improve living conditions for all people in Spokane and restore enforcement of ordinances that preclude camping in the public right of way.

From:

Beggs, Breean

To:

Finch, Eric

Cc:

Cerecedes, Jennifer; Perkins, Johnnie

Subject: Date: Shelter Operator Proposals Monday, April 18, 2022 12:45:07 PM

Eric,

Now that the review committee has completed their work, can you email full council the three proposals?

Best,

Breean

 From:
 Beggs, Breean

 To:
 Perkins, Johnnie

Cc: Finch, Eric; Cerecedes, Jennifer; Allers, Hannahlee; McClatchey, Brian; Kinnear, Lori

**Subject:** Operator Proposals

**Date:** Monday, April 18, 2022 4:55:25 PM

I believe we can make time at study session this week at 12 noon to hear from Administration and the COC on the proposals, but Council still needs to see the proposals. I recall Eric telling us last week that we could get them as soon as the RFP review committee had finished, which they have, so hoping those can be sent around ASAP.

Best,

Breean

From:

Beggs, Breean

To: Subject: <u>City Council Members and Staff</u> Proposals for Trent Shelter

Date:

Monday, April 18, 2022 8:21:21 PM

Attachments:

2022-2026 The Way In Phase One Shelter RFP Budget (with edits).xlsx

Budget Narrative 3.21.22.pdf

Copy of The Guardians Foundation - 2022 Surge Shelter Budget Workbook.xlsx

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL-2022 RFP.pdf Management Proposal.pdf

RFP2022 - Hope Village - Budget (1).xlsx RFP2022 - Hope Village - JHH Submission.pdf The Guardians Foundation Surge Shelter RFP.pdf

## Dear All (please don't reply all):

I have asked the Administration several times for the proposals without really getting a response. I was able to secure from another source these attachments, which appear to be the proposals. My hope is to carve out time at this week's study session to hear from the Continuum of Care and the Administration on the subject.

Best,

Breean