1						
2	CITY OF SPOKANE ETHICS COMMISSION					
3	Neil Muller,					
4	VS.	Complainant,	EC-23-05			
5						
6	Betsy Wilke	rson,	FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISION			
7 8		Respondent.				
8 9						
10	INTRODUCTION					
11	The City of Spokane Ethics Commission held a hearing on December 14, 2023,					
12						
13	pursuant to SMC 1.04A.110F. Before the Commission was the complaint filed by Neil					
14	Muller against Betsy Wilkerson and Betsy Wilkerson's motion to dismiss. Neil Muller,					
15	complainant, was present, and Betsy Wilkerson, respondent, was present and					
16	represented by attorney Jeffry Finer.					
17						
18	The following documents were considered:					
19	5/31/23	5/31/23 Complaint by Muller				
20	7/11/23	7/11/23 Wilkerson Jurisdictional Response				
21	10/25/23	10/25/23 Muller Opening Brief re: Wilkerson				
22 23	10/31/23	Wilkerson Request for Contir	luance			
23 24	11/9/23 Second Amended Consolidated Prehearing Order					
25	11/22/23	Muller Witness List re: Comp	aint re Wilkerson			
26	11/29/23	11/29/23 Wilkerson Response to Opening Brief and Motion to Dismiss				
27	12/6/23	Muller Reply to Wilkerson Re	sponse to Opening Brief			
28						
29						
30						
	FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISION Page 1					

After review of the documents and filings outlined above (along with attachments) and
 consideration of the arguments presented by the Parties, this Commission makes the
 following Findings, Conclusions, and Decision.

FINDINGS

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

8 The complaint alleges that Ms. Wilkerson violated provisions of the City of 9 Spokane's Ethics Code contained in SMC 1.04A.030 through her conduct relating to 10 11 the adoption of the City's Redistricting Plan contained in Ordinance No. C-36298. 12 Specifically, Mr. Muller alleges that Ms. Wilkerson's receipt of an unsolicited e-mail from 13 a private citizen to Ms. Wilkerson's private e-mail address regarding neighborhood 14 15 councils and reappointments constituted conducting City business on a private 16 communication device and that such conduct violated the prohibited conduct against 17 conflicts of interest under SMC 1.04A.030 A, G and K. 18

Ms. Wilkerson's response to this complaint included a motion to dismiss based in part on the argument that her conduct in the adoption of Ordinance No. C-36298 was permitted under SMC 1.04A.030 (G), which provides in part that "City council members shall not be prohibited from participating in the adoption of legislation when the council member has only a remote interest in the legislation, which has been disclosed, and the legislation is applicable to the general public and not unique to the council member." Ms. Wilkerson further argues that she never knew that the single unsolicited e-mail was sent to her private account, never viewed or acted upon that single e-mail and

29 30

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

4

5

6

7

1	consulted with the City's Human Resources Department once she learned of the e-mail				
2	and the allegations in the ethics complaint.				
3	CONCLUSIONS				
4 5	Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Ethics Commission enters the				
5 6	following Conclusions:				
7	 The unsolicited receipt of a single e-mail to Ms. Wilkerson's person e-mail 				
8	account is not a violation of prohibited conduct enumerated in the Ethics				
9					
10	Code;				
11	2) There is no obligation set out in the Ethics Code that the recipient of an e-				
12 13	mail to their private e-mail account must forward or disclose the e-mail;				
13	3) There is no evidence presented to the Ethics Commission that Ms.				
15	Wilkerson's conduct in the receipt of this unsolicited e-mail constitutes a				
16	violation of the Ethics Code's prohibited conduct set out in SMC 1.04A.030;				
17	and				
18					
19 20	4) The evidence and arguments presented by Mr. Muller are insufficient to				
20 21	enable this complaint to proceed to a hearing on the merits.				
21 22	DECISION				
23	Based upon the Findings and Conclusions set forth above and the deliberation of				
24	the Ethics Commission, the Ethics Commission concludes that a violation of Spokan				
25 26	Code of Ethics did not occur, that the Motion to Dismiss the complaint is granted				
26 27	pursuant to SMC 1.04A.110.F1. and the complaint is, therefore, dismissed.				
28					
29					
30					
	FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISION Page 3				

1	The decision was approved by a vote of 4 to 0 of the Ethics Commission				
2	members present for and participating in the hearing. Co-Chair Sarah O'Hare recused				
3	herself.				
4					
5	DATED this <u></u> day of December, 2023.				
6					
7	Ohnher Metzy?				
8					
9	Clayton McFarland Co-Chair				
10	City of Spokane Ethics Commission				
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					
	FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND DECISION Page 4				

.