

CITY OF SPOKANE ETHICS COMMISSION

Neil Muller,

Complainant,

**EC-23-03**

vs.

Mark Carlos,

Respondent.

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND  
DECISION**

**INTRODUCTION**

The City of Spokane Ethics Commission held a hearing on December 14, 2023, pursuant to SMC 1.04A.110F. Before the Commission was the complaint filed by Neil Muller against Mark Carlos and Mark Carlos' motion to dismiss. Also before the Commission was Mark Carlos' objection to a potential conflict of interest between Commissioner McFarland and complainant Neil Muller. Neil Muller, complainant, was present. Mark Carlos, Respondent, was present via video.

The following documents were considered:

5/31/23	Complaint by Muller
7/12/23	Carlos Jurisdictional Response
10/25/23	Muller Opening Brief re: Carlos
10/25/23	Carlos Objection to Potential Conflict of Interest Between Commissioner McFarland and the Complainant Neil Muller
11/9/23	Second Amended Consolidated Prehearing Order
11/22/23	Muller Witness List for Complaint re: Carlos
11/29/23	Carlos Response to Opening Brief and Motion to Dismiss
11/29/23	Muller Response to Objections by Ethics Violation Respondents (Zappone, Carlos and Gunn) re: Potential Conflict of Interest

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISION

Page 1

1 11/30/23 Carlos Reply to Muller Response to Objections by Ethics Violation  
2 Respondents (Zappone, Carlos and Gunn) re: Potential Conflict of  
3 Interest  
4 12/6/23 Muller Reply to Carlos Response to Opening Brief  
5 12/14/23 Commissioner McFarland's Written Response to Potential Conflict of  
6 Interest

7  
8 After review of the documents and filings outlined above (along with attachments) and  
9 consideration of the arguments presented by the parties, this Commission makes the  
10 following findings, conclusions, and decision.

11  
12 **FINDINGS**

13 On May 31, 2023, complainant Neil Muller filed his complaint with the City of  
14 Spokane Ethics Commission.

15 The complaint alleges that Mr. Carlos violated provisions of the City of  
16 Spokane's Code of Ethics contained in SMC 1.04A.030 through his conduct relating to  
17 the adoption of the City's Redistricting Plan contained in Ordinance No. C-36298.  
18 Specifically, the complaint alleges that Mr. Carlos violated SMC 1.04A.030 A, General  
19 Prohibition Against Conflicts of Interest, SMC 1.04A.030 G, Personal Interest in  
20 Legislation Prohibited, SMC 1.04A.030 K, Fair and Equitable Treatment, SMC  
21 1.04A.030 M, Aiding Others Prohibited, and SMC 1.04A.030 N, Commissions of Acts of  
22 Moral Turpitude or Dishonesty Prohibited. The alleged conducts of Mr. Carlos  
23 attributed by Mr. Muller as having constituted prohibited conduct includes texting with  
24 Council Member Zappone and other staff in an unprofessional manner regarding  
25 constituents, conducting city business on private electronic devices and maintaining a  
26 conflict of interest in the adoption of the redistricting ordinance.  
27  
28  
29  
30

1 Mr. Carlos responded in part by stating that he did not maintain a personal  
2 interest in the legislation adopting the redistricting ordinance because he testified on his  
3 own personal time, as a private citizen and as a former Neighborhood Council Chair of  
4 the Emerson Garfield Neighborhood.  
5

### 6 **CONCLUSIONS**

7 Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Ethics Commission enters the  
8 following Conclusions:  
9

- 10 1) The Motion to Dismiss is denied;
- 11 2) The mannerism, tenor, and tone of communications is not a violation of the  
12 Code of Ethics;
- 13 3) The communication of City business on personal electronic devices, while it  
14 may be a violation of the City's administrative policies, is not a prohibited  
15 conduct enumerated in SMC 1.04A.030;
- 16 4) Based on the preponderance of the evidence standard, there is insufficient  
17 evidence presented to the Ethics Commission that Mr. Carlos' conduct  
18 alleged in the complaint constituted a violation of the Code of Ethics; and.  
19 5) While the Ethics Commission has determined that there is no violation of the  
20 Ethics Code, it does note that all City employees need to understand and  
21 follow the City's administrative policies regarding the use of personal devices  
22 to when conducting City business.  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 **DECISION**

28 Based upon the Findings and Conclusions set forth above and the deliberation of  
29 the Ethics Commission, the Ethics Commission concludes by preponderance of the  
30

1 evidence that a violation of Spokane Code of Ethics did not occur, and that the  
2 complaint is dismissed accordingly pursuant to SMC 1.04A.110 F 2 and 3.

3 The decision was approved by a vote of 4 to 0 of the Ethics Commission  
4 members present for and participating in the hearing. Co-Chair Sarah O'Hare recused  
5 herself.  
6

7 DATED this 20 day of December, 2023.  
8

9  
10   
11 Clayton McFarland  
12 Co-Chair  
13 City of Spokane Ethics Commission  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30