CITY OF LANGLEY DRAFT COUNCIL AGENDA
April 3, 2017 5:30 PM

(*Ordinance re immigration enforcement & equal protection is under legal review and not scheduled for action at this meeting)

1. CALL TO ORDER
   a. Flag Salute
   b. Roll Call

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

3. CONSENT AGENDA
   The CONSENT AGENDA consists of routine items that normally do not require further Council discussion. A council member may ask questions about an item before the vote is taken, or request that an item be removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the regular agenda for more detailed discussion. A single vote is taken to approve all items remaining on the Consent Agenda.
   a. Approval of council meeting minutes of 3/20/17.........................................................1-5
   b. Approval of claims warrants Nos. ____ and EFTs in the amount of $43,642.78........6-10
   c. Confirmation of the Mayor’s appointment of Dominique Emerson to the Fairgrounds Advisory Committee

4. RECOGNITION/APPRECIATION

5. COMMISSION AND BOARD REPORTS
   Michael Nortier, Island Transit presentation
   Langley Library Report
   DRB semi-annual report

6. CITIZEN COMMENTS *

7. MAYOR’S REPORT

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
   Acceptance of Ethics Advisory Opinion #3.................................................................11-14
   Ordinance 1035 amending LMC 1.25 Code of Ethics – 2nd read, adoption...............15-27

9. NEW BUSINESS
   Discussion of setting business license revocation hearing.................................28-29
   Resolution No. 787 Authorizing an Interlocal Agreement with other municipalities in Skagit County, Whatcom and Island County, and agreeing to participate as a Member of a regional Consortium for funding to address homelessness and affordable homes – 1st read.......30-31

10. COUNCIL REPORTS

11. DISCUSSION ITEMS

12. ADJOURNMENT

*Citizen Comments: We welcome comments on subjects of concern or interest that are not on the agenda. Please state your name and address so this can be recorded, and limit your comments to 5 minutes. Questions will be answered immediately if the answer is brief, and the information is available. Otherwise, answers will be provided as soon as possible. Thank you for participating! If reasonable accommodation of a disability is needed please contact Debbie Mahler at (360) 221-4246 at least 48 hours prior to this meeting.
Langley City Council Meeting Minutes  
March 20, 2017

Mayor Callison called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM at the Langley United Methodist Church, Fellowship Room. Present were City Council Members Rene Neff, Bruce Allen, Dominique Emerson, Ursula Shousy and Thomas Gill. Also present were Stan Berryman, Public Works Director; Brigid Reynolds, Planning Director; Dave Marks, Police Chief; and Debbie Mahler, Finance Director/Clerk. Mayor Callison led the flag salute.

**MOTION:** To approve the agenda. Motion - Allen, 2nd - Neff. Motion carried with Dominique Emerson against. Motion to delete sanctuary resolution from meeting. M- Emerson, 2nd – Neff. Motion failed.

**MOTION:** To approve the consent agenda. Motion - Neff, 2nd - Allen. Motion was approved.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

a. Approval of council meeting minutes of 3-6-17 & 2-21-17
b. Approval of claims warrants Nos. 35769-35801 and EFT’s and manual warrants in the amount of $41,375.39
c. Approval of payroll warrants Nos. 35618-35641(2/15/17) in the amount of $41,530.15 and Nos. 35681-35719 (2/28/17) in the amount of $71,251.98
d. Liquor Licenses – Saratoga Inn, WICA renewals
e. Confirmation of the Mayor’s appointment of Rhonda Salerno and John (JR) Fulton to the Planning Advisory Board

**COMMISSION AND BOARD REPORTS**

_Brynja Almazan, PSE representative on LED Streetlights._ Coupeville just adopted the 3000 kelvin lights and they will be installed soon. Medina also reduced lighting levels from 70 watt hps light to 45 watt LED slightly lower than the 3000 kelvin. Hps color spectrum and shielding where appropriate for side lighting or glare were discussed. Mayor Callison asked if we stay with sodium vapor lighting, how soon they will be phased out. Brynja reported that they are phasing out now. The State Transportation Improvement Board is paying for LED light replacement for all jurisdictions. PSE will install another test light of lower Kelvin.

_Mayor’s report on citizen responses re LED streetlights._ Mayor Callison reported that the city sent out a flyer with city utility bills asking opinions on the LED streetlights. We received 179 ballots back. The choices were: maintain existing sodium vapor lights; 3000 kelvin LEDs: or wait for PSE to offer something different. Responses were 1/3 each. Existing LEDs have no shielding, color spectrum was an issue; people liked the softer yellow tones.

**CITIZEN COMMENTS**
Scott Chaplin said he is in support for a sanctuary/inclusive ordinance. He stated that there are over 200 sanctuary cities in the US and more throughout the world. He is a former city councilman in a city in Colorado with a high immigrant population. He urged the City Council to take a stand. He never wants anyone to be afraid to call the police, fire or aid. Barbara Small said she was formerly happy with the city’s informal policy, but now thinks that we need an ordinance. She has read the draft ordinance and does not think it violates the oaths of office. Rich Fishman is also in support of the draft ordinance. He feels it is necessary. Mike Huggins stated that he spent 35 years in a career in public policy and urged caution in passing an ordinance. He said that when making policy, one must be sure there is a need. He doesn’t feel the resolution is needed for Langley to be a sanctuary city. Reece Rose said he was worried that an ordinance will have unintended consequences. He is also concerned that Langley does not have adequate resources to welcome immigrants to our community.

Johnny Flacka is a refugee, born in Paris after his family was chased out of their native Czechoslovakia, and again when the Nazi’s invaded France. Both times his family came to America. He and his parents became citizens, but his Grandma and aunt were her without green cards using the forged identities they had used to escape the Nazi’s. His wife is the daughter of Immigrants and he is proud to be an American. He is in favor of an ordinance. Linda DiRienzo thanked council for the considering the draft ordinance. She petitioned the neighbors in her area for an ordinance. She talked with 39 of 55 people, 30 were strongly in favor, 9 said no, it is unnecessary here. She feels it is necessary. Ms. Kelman of Bayview Rd, stated that she is an immigrant and feels she can’t leave the country safely and come back in. She is here legally and is still afraid and feels this is really important. Joe Hutten said he is in favor of the resolution, as it has no teeth, but is in favor of the ordinance. He feels it is needed. Mack McDowell read from fact sheets from A, costs of detention, feds do not reimburse, liability concerns for holding people on ICF. Detainer. Ursula Rosen Runge is a first generation American, her parents are from Germany, and she has a Cambodian son. She said there was an online petition for a sanctuary ordinance with more than 400 signatures. 140 of those are Langley residents, and 104 from Langley tourists.

Bill Nesbit stated that he and his wife are proud residents and against passing an ordinance. He would endorse an inclusive resolution because it makes people feel good with no commitments. Janet Stub thanked council for considering the ordinance. To her, it is a personal and moral issue. She has no Jewish relatives left in Europe as they were all exterminated in Germany during Nazi years. She read a poem she wrote. Duane Den Adel said he has been reading about this issue and found that people are not speaking up if they are not in favor. He feels a resolution is fine, but this is a political issue that is tearing the city apart. He urged Council to vote against the ordinance. Bert Bush stated that unless immigrants have committed a crime, they have nothing to fear. US laws provide for legal immigration and there is a false sense of security from sanctuary cities. He encouraged the resolution and not the ordinance. Rufus Rose stated that he is a retired career military and he took an oath just like City elected. He feels that sanctuary should be in churches, not cities. James Delong said he is an ancestor of immigrants. Thinks we need to continue a compassionate approach to people fleeing war and other dire circumstances, and is in favor of the ordinance. Chris Carlson stated that our nation is at crossroads. The current federal administration is attacking immigrants and Muslims now. He feels we must treat everyone with compassion and dignity and passing an ordinance will not protect people who are committing crimes. He also stated that States and local governments are not obligated to enforce federal law. Megan works with survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. She has heard concerns from immigrants that they are worried about how they will be treated by police under these circumstances and wants to insure that victims of crimes can report those crime and are safe in doing so. Sharon Berlin is strongly in favor of the ordinance and feels it is time to take a stand and show courage and support for people living here now who may be undocumented; who possibly have grown up here when their parents came to this country undocumented. There will not be a Council Meeting Minutes 3-20-17
flood of refugees if the ordinance is passed; it just means we provide protection and equal opportunity she said. Diane Paul from Coupeville said she has heard people say that immigrants don’t assimilate, don’t speak the language, they are all criminals, and undocumented workers will steal our jobs. She said that is not true. She has worked with refugees all over the world and found that they all assimilated and learned English.

John Graham said this is a big issue. President Trump lost twice in court on his immigration bans already. Please pass a binding ordinance. Katrina spoke in support of the ordinance. She is a nurse that provides safe care to all. She feels this is more important than getting federal money. Will Collins supports the ordinance, as it sends a clear message and gives police clear direction. He doesn’t want city resources going to do federal ICE work. Michael Solay is in support of the ordinance. He was moved by the phrase “Liberty and Justice for All” in the pledge at the beginning of the meeting. He stated that freedom is not without cost and sacrifice, nor is justice. Compassion itself is not enough, we need legal teeth, he stated. Graham Gori lived as a refugee in South America, and his children were all born in Mexico; so they are both citizens and immigrants. He stated heart and humanity before money, the ordinance is the right thing to do. Peter Martin stayed here because he believes this to be a community of conscience. He is in favor of the ordinance. Denise Lorense, said she is in favor of resolution, but is fearful of passing an ordinance, which may have unforeseen circumstances and reactions. She urged the Council to be cautious before passing an ordinance. Donna Selwig is in favor of an ordinance and has confidence in it. Brook Williford, said his family business is in Langley. He strongly supports the resolution and ordinance. He feels the Resolution alone does not go far enough. He said they are only asking for local police to not collect data and are not asking for jobs, housing, etc. There are people living here with real fears.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

MOTION: To adopt Resolution No. 786 Declaring the City of Langley as an Inclusive City. Motion - Allen, 2nd - Gill. Motion was adopted with all in favor.

Tally of responses regarding Sanctuary City. Mayor Callison did a tally of the responses the city has received both in writing and in person. Emails that came to Mayor or individual council members, higher pro sanctuary then against. Phone calls were more con then pro. Direct discussion, more con then pro. Residents of the city, more against and outside city more pro. Bruce Allen, is not a proponent of an ordinance. He has talked with more people against then for. Rene Neff talked to many people for, none against. Dominique thought it was about 50/50. Ursula Shoudy stated that this meeting has been a pleasant surprise. There have been a lot of attacks and divisiveness on this issue. It is not just conservatives who are against this issue. She has heard many opposing opinions and many did not feel comfortable publicly stating they are against. She talks with at least ten people per day. Thomas Gill has been ill and not out in community, and he has coworkers and family that are immigrants. He has heard about 75% against, 25% for sanctuary and feels the resolution has more support. Chief Marks stated he is the one responsible for enforcing the ordinance. We have ordinances in place that say we enforce federal law. How would he punish an officer who assisted ICE? Mayor Callison stated that if an ordinance is passed, we must make sure that it does not conflict with other ordinances that do say, the city will enforce federal law.

STAFF REPORTS

Community Planning – Bridgid Reynolds reported that she met with the school district on plans for the vacant middle school. Governmental group looking at buildable lands analysis, and the Department of Commerce is working on feedback on our comp plan. Request for proposal for street dance performers has gone out.

Council Meeting Minutes 3-20-17
Public Works – Stan Berryman had a meeting with First Street homeowners regarding the proposed sidewalk and got good input. His staff renovated the small Gazebo behind city hall. The roof of City Hall is not sufficient to support solar panels and the library roof is at the wrong angle for solar exposure. A cemetery survey is being done and flushing of water mains will take place next week.

Police – Chief Marks is looking at hosting training for on dealing with autism spectrum, and trying to get other agencies involved to lower costs. His officers just attended trauma training and Chief Marks just graduated from the Criminal Justice Training command school.

Finance – Debbie Mahler distributed revenue graphs. Debbie reported that revenues are coming in quite well so far this year. Revenue and expenditure reports for February are almost complete and will be distributed this week. Debbie recently completed the tourism funding report to the State and is working on the annual reports to the Auditor’s office.

MAYOR’S REPORT

On March 8th Mayor Callison attended the Chamber meeting and on the 17th he attended a PSE meeting regarding Green energy contracts.

NEW BUSINESS

Discussion of draft ordinance re city policy with respect to immigration enforcement, equal protection, and equal provision of city services regardless of immigration status, religion, etc. Bruce Allen in conversations with many people, create signs at each entrance of the city that say “Inclusive City”.

**MOTION:** To direct the Public Works director to coordinate with Chamber to place signs at both entrances to Langley that say “Inclusive City”. Motion - Gill, 2nd – Neff. Motion passed.

Discussion ensued regarding the City attorney reviewing the draft ordinance and current code to see if there are any conflicts with existing law. Dominique Emerson wants to know whether it would violate the oath of office. Bruce Allen received an anonymous letter that was extremely rude, crude and mean. He asked that if people have an issue with him to please come to him and talk about it.

**MOTION:** To have the city attorney check current code and work with the Police chief, Mayor and Clerk to see if there are any conflicts and that oaths of office are not violated, Motion – Neff, 2nd – Emerson. Motion was approved with all in favor.

**MOTION:** To bring to a first reading, an Ordinance amending Chapter 1.25 Code of Ethics. Motion - Neff, 2nd - Allen. Motion was unanimously approved with revisions to one section. Bob Frause, Chairman of the Ethics Training and Advisory Board explained that these amendments are a cleanup of the code. It contains three
small amendments, and an addition to the purpose statement that sanctions by a government agency or conviction in a court of law are de facto unethical and in opposition to the Code of Ethics. Bob will make the language more specific prior to the second reading.

COUNCIL REPORTS

Bruce Allen reported that the HUB is going to stay open during spring break and all summer for kids. Rene Neff stated that she has mentioned resigning and has changed her mind and will serve out the rest of her term which runs until the end of this year. Dominique Emerson wants an agenda item to look at IT services for the city. Ursula Shoudy reported that the Chamber meetings are very well attended. The Clipper Ship is sailing in to Langley this weekend bringing many people in. Michaleen resigned as executive director of the Chamber as did Robin Black, president of Chamber. Nancy Rowan is serving as president until a replacement is found. Thomas Gill reported that the substance abuse coalition is on hiatus until April.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie L. Mahler, Finance Director/City Clerk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$534.75</td>
<td>Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>402-000-000-66-60-48-00</td>
<td>2017 - April</td>
<td>4/6/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,022.71</td>
<td>Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>402-000-000-65-60-48-00</td>
<td>2017 - April</td>
<td>4/6/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,525.80</td>
<td>Supplies &amp; Printing</td>
<td>001-000-070-92-20-31-00</td>
<td>2017 - April</td>
<td>4/6/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,861.00</td>
<td>Training &amp; Travel</td>
<td>001-000-110-65-60-5-0-0</td>
<td>2017 - April</td>
<td>4/6/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,525.00</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>001-000-050-61-00-80-40-02</td>
<td>2017 - April</td>
<td>4/6/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,994.37</td>
<td>Computer Printer Lease (Inc R-KM)</td>
<td>001-000-080-00-9-30-18</td>
<td>2017 - April</td>
<td>4/6/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$579.50</td>
<td>Repurchase Cemetery Plots</td>
<td>104-000-300-94-36-1-00</td>
<td>2017 - April</td>
<td>4/6/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,942.71</td>
<td>Parts, Chemicals &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>401-000-60-34-0-83-1-00</td>
<td>2017 - April</td>
<td>4/6/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$6,209.53
$4,158.12
$1,098.99
$116.43
$486.22
$7,773.75

PSE Utility-Sewer Dept.
PSE Utility-Water Dept.
PSE Utility/VC & R/PR.
PSE Street Lighting
PSE Utility-General Government
PSE Utility-Government

Mar 2017

Total Pugent Sound Energy

$1,737.56
$1,737.56

Postage Machine Expenses
Postage Machine Expenses

$9,032.00
$3,877.50
$4,477.00

Engineering
Park 1st-3rd Water main replacement
First Street Sidewalk

$666.00

2017 - April - 4/13/17
2017 - April - 4/13/17

$2,642.02
$2,642.02

Employee Reimbursement
Employee Reimbursement

$850.40
$850.40

Fuel & Maintenance
Fuel & Maintenance

$3,847.48
$3,847.48

Countywide Intercal Agreement
Countywide Intercal Agreement

$3,284.48

Tourism February 2017

$413,018,779

Total Leas Schwab The Centers

Jan/Mar 2017

Total Leas Schwab The Centers

$8,694
$8,694

PACE Engineers, Inc.
PACE Engineers, Inc.

$6,480
$6,480

Total Leas Schwab The Centers

0

Total Leas Schwab The Centers

0

Total Leas Schwab The Centers

0

Total Leas Schwab The Centers
$88.69
$88.69
$117.92
$117.92
$285.83
$417.77
$74.55
$36.70
$80.86
$9.60
$11.95
$46.55
$88.90
$14.44
$80.35

Total United Business Machines

INV35091
0

United Business Machines
Total Store Inc.
0

Total Sebo's DT Center

B263914
B269352
B280065
B2804322
B280435
B2804387
B2804367
B280385
B280385
B280385
B2802664
B2801774
B280009

Sebo's DT Center

0

Co-patient Lease (inc. Rm.)

401-000-050-518-900-60-34

04-17 - April - 4/17/17

Supplies

402-000-050-535-80-31-00

04-17 - April - 4/17/17

Parts, Chemicals & Supplies

401-000-050-534-80-31-00

04-17 - April - 4/17/17

Parts, Chemicals & Supplies

401-000-050-534-80-31-00

04-17 - April - 4/17/17

Parts, Chemicals & Supplies

401-000-050-534-80-31-00

04-17 - April - 4/17/17

Parts, Chemicals & Supplies

401-000-050-534-80-31-00

04-17 - April - 4/17/17

Supplies/Miscellaneous

101-000-050-544-90-30-00

04-17 - April - 4/17/17

Supplies/Miscellaneous

101-000-050-544-90-30-00

04-17 - April - 4/17/17

Lanley Park Maintenance

101-000-150-576-90-30-00

04-17 - April - 4/17/17

Fuel & Maintenance

101-000-050-544-90-32-00

04-17 - April - 4/17/17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9360.32</td>
<td>3/30/2017</td>
<td>Vendor Count</td>
<td>03.27-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9576.11</td>
<td>3/19.96</td>
<td>Contract Maintenance</td>
<td>104-000-000-539.6-48-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8179.58</td>
<td>3/19.96</td>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>101-000-000-544.9-31-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5931.44</td>
<td>3/31/2017</td>
<td>Shuttle Wrap</td>
<td>105-000-000-555-7-39-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5913.34</td>
<td>4/11.25</td>
<td>Winidney Seat Shuttle</td>
<td>117-032-1-COL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7391.47</td>
<td>3/23.38</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>403-000-000-531-3-49-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7263.87</td>
<td>3/23.38</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>402-000-000-335-9-49-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5157.08</td>
<td>4/30.17</td>
<td>Utilities-Underground</td>
<td>401-000-000-534-8-48-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956.48</td>
<td>4/30.17</td>
<td>Utilities-Underground</td>
<td>401-000-000-534-8-48-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Langley, Washington
Ethics Training and Advisory Board

Chairman
Bob Frause

Members
Sharon Betcher
Monica Guzman
Fred Herzon
Bob French

Ethics Advisory Opinion #3

Alleged Unethical Conduct by City Officials at February 21, 2017 City Council Meeting

Introduction

At the request of Langley citizen, Mr. Eric Hood, the City of Langley Ethics Training and Advisory Board has been asked to provide an ethics advisory opinion regarding alleged unethical conduct by City officials including Mayor Tim Callison, Councilmember Bruce Allen and the entire City Council, at the February 21, 2107 City Council Meeting.

Mr. Hood’s allegations specifically reference Mayor Callison and Councilmember Allen’s lack of adherence to Langley Municipal Code, Sections 2.06.090 (C) and (N) (Meetings – Conduct); Mayor Callison’s lack of adherence to Section 2.06.230 (Public Hearings); and the entire City Council lack of adherence to Section 2.06.220 (Ordinances and Resolutions).

Additionally, Mr. Hood alleges that conduct by Mayor Callison and Councilmember Allen “violated” Langley Ethics Code Values and Roberts Rules of Order.

Focus of Opinion

The focus of this advisory opinion considers the following:

1. Ethical conduct surrounding allegations regarding Langley Municipal Code, Sections 2.06.090 (C) and (N) (Meetings – Conduct); Section 2.06.220 (Ordinances and Resolutions) and Section 2.06.230 (Public Hearings)

2. Ethical conduct regarding Mayor Callison’s alleged “violation” of Langley’s Ethical Values.

3. Ethical conduct regarding alleged improper procedures in the conduct of the City Council meeting.
Opinion

1. It is the opinion of the Ethics Board that Mayor Callison and Councilmember Allen’s alleged lack of adherence to Langley Municipal Code, Sections 2.06.090 (C) and (N) (Meetings – Conduct); Mayor Callison’s alleged lack of adherence to Section 2.06.230 (Public Hearings); and the entire City Council’s alleged lack of adherence to Section 2.06.220 (Ordinances and Resolutions) are not the within the purview of the City of Langley’s Code of Ethics and therefore considerations regarding proper ethical conduct in all instances cited above do not apply.

2. It is the opinion of the Ethics Board that the February 21, 2017 City Council Meeting conduct of Mayor Callison was inconsistent with foundational aspirations* of the Code, but those actions are not considered unethical per se. We acknowledge the actions of Mayor Callison for recognizing those inconsistencies and offering his apology at the above referenced meeting. And, we also call attention to Section 2.06.090 of the Langley Municipal Code (Meeting -- Conduct) and suggest its timely review by all officials, employees, consultants, volunteers, vendors and citizens conducting business with and/or on behalf of the City.

* It is important to recognize that the Code’s Preamble, Purpose and Value statements provide the foundational aspirations for the Code’s Principles of Conduct and subsequently all ethical actions by City officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors. Those covered by the Code are encouraged to conduct themselves in the most professional manner possible. Mistakes are not de facto unethical, but it is imperative to recognize mistakes and take corrective action immediately. Actions specifically in opposition to the six principles of conduct (Conflict of Interest, Confidentiality, Improper Influence, Misuse of Public Resources, Representation of Private Interests and Workplace Harassment and Discrimination) are the only actions that will be considered for ethical misconduct.

3. It is the opinion of the Ethics Board that alleged improper meeting governance procedures including misuse of Roberts Rules of Order are not within the purview of the City of Langley’s Code of Ethics and therefore considerations regarding proper ethical conduct do not apply.

Respectfully submitted,

March 27, 2017
City of Langley Ethics Training and Advisory Board
Fw: complaint
1 message

Eric Hood <ericence@yahoo.com> Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 12:20 PM
Reply-To: Eric Hood <ericence@yahoo.com>
To: Debbie Mahler <clerk@langleywa.org>, Robert French <ka7woc1@gmail.com>, "ethics@langleywa.org"
<ethics@langleywa.org>

Ms Mahler,
Please present the following to the ethics board.

To the Ethics Board,

During the public comment session at the last city council meeting, nearly every person who attempted to speak was interrupted by either the mayor or Council members. Most notably, Mayor Callison angrily interrupted a woman who commented about his absence from a separate meeting, Bruce Allen dismissively referred to a comment as "crap," and another woman who questioned the City's transparency was interrupted by multiple board members.

When I attempted to speak, Mr. Callison first demanded (he did not request) that I stand, and then demanded (again, he did not request) I speak into the microphone. While his demands may have accorded with code, they were obviously prejudicial since he did not make similar demands of others he called on to speak.

With regard to the above conduct, please reference:
SEE 2.06.090 section C which refers to audience members being "heard" — i.e., discussion or interruption or shaming of speech is clearly not authorized, and section N, "No member of the city council or mayor shall use any impertinent, degrading or slanderous language as to any other member of the council, mayor or member of the public."

And see
2.06.230 Public hearings.
"any public hearing all persons who have signed in and wish to be heard shall be heard." Note that the elective sign-in provision was apparently waived by at the referenced meeting. The interruption of public speakers by council members and mayor ensured that speakers were not fully heard.

Such intentionally intimidating conduct on the part of mayor and council members clearly violates the City's "Values" code, likely violates Roberts Rules of Order, and most importantly, chills speech.

In addition, with respect to the actions regarding the Sanctuary City ordinance which was apparently changed to an inclusive city resolution, please determine whether the City properly followed code, particularly with regard to the resolution, which appeared to have been created during the meeting.
Ordinances and Resolutions.
  a. All proposed ordinances and resolutions shall be reviewed by the city attorney to see that they are in correct form prior to the final passage. All accompanying documents shall...
be available at a previous council meeting before the ordinances and resolutions can be passed;

2.06.220 Ordinances and resolutions.
    All proposed ordinances and resolutions shall be available to the council and to the public in written form five days before a regular council meeting.

Please consider this a complaint for you to investigate and resolve. An inspection of the audio recording of the meeting may assist your investigation. Please let me know if you need further information to process this complaint.

Eric Hood
5256 Foxglove Lane
Langley, WA 98260
360.321.4011 h
CITY OF LANGLEY, WASHINGTON

ORDINANCE NO. 1035

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF LANGLEY, WASHINGTON, amending Chapter 1.25 Code of Ethics.

WHEREAS, the City Council previously adopted a Code of Ethics, Langley Municipal Code Chapter 1.25; and

WHEREAS, the City Ethics and Training Advisory Board, recommends the code be revised to give guidance and clarity on purpose and on advisory opinions and the City Council finds that the amendment is in the best interests of the City and the public;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LANGLEY WASHINGTON, DO ORDAIN as follows:

Section 1. Langley Municipal Code Chapter 1.25 is hereby amended as follows

Chapter 1.25

CODE OF ETHICS

SECTIONS
1.25.010 Preamble.
1.25.020 Purpose.
1.25.030 Values.
1.25.040 Definitions.
1.25.050 Principles of Conduct.
1.25.060 Administrative Provisions.
1.25.070 Review of Ethics Training and Advisory Board.

1.25.010 Preamble.

We are agents of the collective will in whom the city has put its trust and confidence. We as officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors are entrusted with and responsible for the property, resources and reputation of the City. As such:

A. We are obligated to make decisions and implement policies free of coercive or other improper influences.
B. We are advocates for our constituents and recognize the diverse lives and livelihoods that reside together in our village.
C. We are committed to generating a place of hospitality for diverse sexual, economic, ethnic and religious expressions of self and family. We refuse the mental habit of casting difference in negative value.
D. We speak generously of and build trust between City officials and staff, whether volunteers or employees, and every citizen in our community.
E. We use our positions in the best interests of the City rather than for personal interests, 
whether they be our own interests or those of our family, friends, or business associates.
F. We do not treat any citizen preferentially. To perpetuate public trust we avoid even the 
appearance of impropriety.
G. We acknowledge our obligation to the city of Langley’s Code of Ethics and the underlying 
Values and Principles set forth in this document. (Ord. 1028 § 2, 2016)

1.25.020 Purpose.

The purposes of this Code of Ethics is as follows:
A. To establish standards of ethical conduct for Langley officials, employees, consultants, 
vendors and vendors and those who do business with the city;
B. To provide clear guidance with respect to such standards by clarifying which acts meet 
ethical standards and which do not;
C. To promote public confidence in the integrity of Langley’s governance and administration;
D. To provide for the consideration of potential ethical problems before they arise;
E. To minimize unwarranted suspicion and to enhance the accountability of our city’s 
government; and
F. To provide for the fair and effective administration of this code.

This code is enacted pursuant to RCW 35A.11.020 and is not intended to authorize any conduct 
prohibited by Chapters 42.23 (Code of Ethics for Municipal Officers – Contract Interests), 42.52 
(Ethics in Public Service), and 42.36 RCW (Appearance of Fairness Doctrine) and RCW 
42.41.050 (Local Government Employee Whistleblower Protection Act). In the event of conflict 
between this code and any applicable state or federal laws and regulations, the stricter 
interpretation is to be applied.

**Actions taken on behalf of the City of Langley by city officials, employees, consultants, 
vendors, or vendors that result in a conviction or a fine are considered to be unethical. In such 
cases, Ethics Advisory Opinions will not be rendered until legal processes are concluded.**

1.25.030 Values.

This code is built on a set of core values that structure ethical practice and interaction between 
City officials, employees, consultant, vendors and the Langley citizens they represent.

**Stewardship** -- As stewards of our shared commons, we honor the history, culture and future of 
the citizens who call our community home. We yield our own private interests to act 
wholeheartedly on behalf of the greater civic environment.

**Transparency** -- In pursuit of transparency we adhere to clear, accurate, honest and open 
communication principles. All opinions, views and responses are treated with a level of 
sensitivity that assures both openness and a responsible level of confidentiality.

**Fairness** -- All individuals and ideas are welcome and treated equitably and without prejudice. 
We strive to achieve a fair distribution of benefits, resources and burdens to all those that we 
represent.
Diligence -- As public servants, we employ the best skills and care in serving the citizens of our community. It is our duty to leave no stone unturned in the pursuit of actions and decisions that will produce the most desirable results for all.

Integrity -- Our daily actions are based on a solid habit of honesty. We perform our duties in an open and responsible manner. To do otherwise would be a dereliction of our duty and a breach of trust. (Ord. 1028 § 2, 2016)

1.25.040 Definitions.

Board means the Ethics Training and Advisory Board.

City Entity means the Langley city council and any department, office, agency, advisory board, commission, district, administration, division, bureau, committee, or subcommittee of the city, regardless as to whether the entity in question is permanent or temporary, whether its members are employed, contracted or volunteer, how its members were elected or appointed, and whether or not they have formal voting rights.

Confidential Information means any information which the city of Langley is entitled by law and has determined to keep confidential, subject to the provisions of the Public Records Act (Chapter 42.56 RCW), the Open Public Meetings Act (Chapter 42.30 RCW), or other applicable state or federal government law or rule.

Consultant(s) means an independent person, proprietorship, partnership, corporation or other similar entity retained by the city of Langley to perform an administrative function or to which a city function may have been outsourced, whether on a temporary or permanent basis. This includes any person advising a city official, and in a position to influence a city decision or action, or have access to confidential information.

Customer or Client means any person or entity that has been supplied goods or services during the previous 12 months by either the official, employee or consultant or his or her outside employer or business; provided, that his or her position in the outside employer or business is such that he or she can reasonably be expected to have knowledge of or influence over the transaction.

Discrimination refers to differential treatment, conduct or statements based on the protected categories including a person's sex, sexual identity, gender, race, color, disability, age, national origin, ethnicity or ancestry, religious beliefs, military status, marital status and/or appearance.

Domestic Partner means an adult, who is not married to or in a civil union with an official, employee or consultant but who lives with him or her and shares a common domestic life.

Elected Official(s) means any official who holds office as a consequence of an election and includes officials appointed to fill any vacancies in elected offices that may occur pending the next general election.

Employee(s) means any person employed by the city and subject to the personnel policies of the city, whether temporary or permanent and whether full-time or part-time.
Family means the spouse, child or stepchild, brother or sister, parent or stepparent, niece or nephew, uncle or aunt, and grandparent or grandchild of an official, employee or consultant or their spouse. “Family” includes a domestic partner and any person claimed as a dependent on their latest federal income tax return.

Financial Benefit means any money, service, license, permit, contract, authorization, loan, discount, travel, entertainment, hospitality, gratuity, or any promise of any of these, or anything else of value. Financial interest is a relationship to something such that a direct or indirect financial benefit has been, will be, or might be received as a result. Financial benefit does not include a campaign contribution to a candidate equal to or less than $100.00 to that candidate in any election cycle.

Gift means anything that any person transfers to an official, employee or consultant on any basis other than a legal obligation to do so. It includes, but is not limited to, cash, gifts of any kind, paid outings, paid travel, tickets to concerts and sporting events, and any other forms of gifts, gratuities, honoraria or favors. Exceptions include:

1. The gift is based upon a pre-existing personal or family relationship with the government employee, so long as the gift is motivated by the relationship (like a birthday present to your sister).
2. The gift is valued at $20 or less, so long as the gift is not cash, and the employee accepts no more than $50 in gifts, in the aggregate, from the same outside source in a calendar year.
3. The gift consists of modest refreshments, such as juice and bagels at a seminar, and not as part of a meal.

Harassment consists of patterns of behavior— including but not limited to actions, gestures, jokes, innuendoes, symbols, unwanted and unwelcomed deeds— that demean, humiliate or insult others. One’s elected office or position of employment can give one authority or power over another, and harassment may include leveraging this power on behalf of one’s own desires, views or intentions. Harassment may also refer to calling out the subtle power of the majority to insist that “this is the way we do it.” While bullying and intimidation constitute obvious, large scale harassing conduct, harassment also includes micro-aggressive actions, like teasing, undermining the credibility of another or repeatedly using metaphors or colloquialisms that call unnecessary attention to and may demean another’s physical bearing or sexual, racial or gender identity. Refusal to accommodate may not only relate to an employer, who does not make workspace adjustments, but to co-workers who gather in an inaccessible, thus exclusionary space.

Harassment can take place not only in the physical presence of each other but via phone and email as well as in the creation of one’s work space— e.g., the visual display of derogatory posters, slogans.

Ministerial Acts means an action performed in a prescribed manner without the exercise of substantial judgment or substantial discretion as to the propriety of the act. Non-exhaustive examples of ministerial acts include the issuance of a dog license by a city clerk, the reading of water meters, and the issuing of related invoices.
Official(s) means elected officials and any other official of the city other than an employee or consultant, whether paid or unpaid and whether temporary or permanent. It includes all the members of every city entity including volunteers.

Outside Employer or Business means a corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship, or other employer other than the city, whether for profit or nonprofit, public sector or private sector, to which an official, employee or consultant is related in one or more of the following ways: (1) he or she receives compensation, whether actual or deferred, for services rendered or goods sold or produced, and (2) he or she has an ownership interest, whether direct or indirect including options or contingent rights of any kind excluding, in the case of a public corporation, an ownership interest of less than one percent of the outstanding stock. For the purposes of this definition, “compensation” does not include reimbursement for approved out-of-pocket expenses such as travel expenses.

Person means any individual, corporation, firm, association or other form of business association, regardless of status as for profit or nonprofit.

Personal Benefit means benefits other than those that are directly financially advantageous. A “personal interest” means a relationship to something such that a personal benefit has been, will be, or might be obtained by certain action or inaction with respect to it.

Public Domain means property and information that is available and/or accessible to the public.

Related Party means, in relation to an official, employee or consultant, the following persons:

1. A member of his or her family;
2. Any person with whom he or she has a regular and close personal relationship;
3. Any person with whom he or she has a financial or business relationship, including but not limited to:
   a. An outside employer or business of his or hers, or of his or her spouse or domestic partner;
   b. An employee of his or her outside employer or business;
   c. A customer or client of his or her outside employer or business; or
   d. A debtor or creditor of himself or herself, or of his or her spouse or domestic partner;
4. A person or entity from whom an elected official has received an election campaign contribution during the past election cycle, either directly or indirectly through a campaign committee of any kind that, in the aggregate, exceeds $100.00. For the purpose of this clause, donations from a person or entity include donations from any related family member or business;
5. A nongovernmental civic group, union, social, charitable, or religious organization of which he or she or his or her spouse or domestic partner is an officer or director.

Retaliatory Action means:

1. Any adverse change in a city employee’s employment status, or the terms and conditions of employment including denial of adequate staff to perform duties, frequent staff changes, frequent and undesirable office changes, refusal to assign meaningful work, unwarranted and unsubstantiated letters of reprimand, unsatisfactory performance
evaluations, demotion, transfer, reassignment, reduction in pay, denial of promotion, suspension, dismissal, or any other disciplinary action; or

2. Hostile actions by another employee towards an employee that are condoned or encouraged by a supervisor or senior manager or official. (Ord. 1028 § 2, 2016)

Vendor means any person or business supplying products or services to the City as part of an approved contract or purchase order.

1.25.050 Principles of Conduct.

Consistent with the Purpose and Values set forth in this Code of Ethics, the following Principles of Conduct are established for all City of Langley officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors.

A. Conflicts of Interest
Conflicts of interest, in which a person has a duty to more than one person or organization, could bring about actions or decisions by City of Langley officials, employees, consultants, volunteers, and vendors that are not in the best interests of the City, its residents and entities. It is thus imperative that any party governed by this Code declare immediately any situation in which they, or persons or entities closely related to them, stand to receive personal or financial gain. It is particularly important to earn and keep the trust of city residents by preventing conflicts from occurring, disclosing conflicts when they do arise. Specifically:

1. Officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors shall avoid all actual or perceived conflicts of interest. These arise when they use their official position or office to take or fail to take any action, or influence others to take or fail to take any action, in a manner which they know, or have reason to believe, will result in a personal or financial benefit to himself or herself or to a related party as distinct from general benefits that are shared with all or a substantial segment of the city’s population.

2. Officials, employees, consultants, volunteers shall not hire or appoint; attempt to influence the hiring or appointment; or supervise any person who is a member of their family.

3. Officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors are obliged to withdraw from any involvement in a matter where there is a conflict or perceived conflict, even if they feel certain they can act impartially.

4. The performance of purely ministerial acts does not give rise to conflicts of interest.

5. Specific actions regarding actual or perceived conflict of interests that must be taken by City Officials governed by this code are as follows:
   a. Officials shall declare, at the first public meeting when the matter is being considered, any actual or apparent personal or financial conflict of interest, pertaining to any ordinance, resolution, contract, proceeding or other action pending before a city entity in which they participate. The disclosure shall be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.
   b. Officials who have disclosed a conflict of interest that may result in a personal or financial benefit for themselves or a related party shall withdraw from the meeting for the duration of the discussion of the issue that has given rise to the conflict of interest.
c. Officials may be challenged and requested to withdraw from participation in a matter, for the reason that he or she has a conflict of interest, by:
   1) Another member of a city entity,
   2) A party to the current matter, or
   3) Anyone else who may be affected by a decision relating to the matter.

d. If, following a request, an official decides not to withdraw, a decision as to whether or not to require withdrawal shall be taken by:
   1) A vote of the unchallenged members of a city entity where he or she is a member of, or scheduled to appear before, the entity;
   2) A vote of the unchallenged members of the city council where a council member is the person who is requested to withdraw;
   3) A vote of the city council where the mayor is the person who is requested to withdraw; or
   4) A decision of the mayor in all other cases.

e. If withdrawal as a result of a declaration of a conflict of interest or of a challenge and request for withdrawal results in the lack of a quorum or the failure to obtain a majority vote in a city entity, the situation will be resolved as follows:
   1) Postponement of the decision until a sufficient number of non-conflicted members can attend or the mayor appoints additional non-conflicted members.
   2) Replacement of the conflicted member by an alternate member if available.

f. Officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors, who are in positions requiring judgment and discretionary decision-making and who experience a conflict of interest in a matter before them, shall report that conflict of interest to their supervisor immediately, in writing, and shall not take any action on the matter. The supervisor shall make arrangements for another employee or consultant to address the matter at hand. The employee or consultant with the conflict of interest shall not provide information, hold conversations, participate in meetings or portions of meetings about the matter or in any way participate in its resolution.

g. An official, employee, consultant, volunteers or vendor who has withdrawn or has been required to withdraw from a matter shall not be replaced by a related party or by any other official, employee or consultant over whom he or she is in a position to exercise any supervisory authority.

B. Confidentiality
Other than those areas which are proscribed by state (or federal) law to be considered confidential, all information coming to the City of Langley and its employees will be considered to be in the public domain and available to all citizens. Ethical considerations regarding confidentiality for all City of Langley officials, employees, consultants, volunteers or vendors are extremely critical to maintain public trust. Those governed by the Code shall not:

1. Make use of information acquired through his or her official position for the personal or financial benefit of himself or herself or of a related party.
2. Disclose confidential information; or
3. Refuse to disclose, or obstruct the disclosure of information, which the city is required to
disclose pursuant to its own laws and rules or those of the state.

Even though most information coming before the City is within the public domain and
employee's management of information coming before them, in all respects, is of concern to the
City of Langley and must be handled with extreme sensitivity.

1. Courtesy and consideration in dealing with the public must be shown by all governed by
this Code in carrying out official responsibilities; and

2. Actions which deny the dignity of individuals or conduct which is disrespectful to others
must be avoided.

C. Improper Influence

Officials, employees and consultants are entrusted with and responsible for the property,
resources and reputation of the city. They are obligated to make decisions and implement
policies free of coercive or other improper influence. Any exchange of gifts or favors may be
interpreted as exerting improper influence on the behavior of representatives of the City of
Langley and shall be governed by the following guidelines:

1. To avoid the appearance of improper influence, an official, employee, consultant,
volunteers or vendor and his or her spouse or domestic partner shall not, directly or
indirectly, solicit or accept a gift from any person or entity that has any of the following
relationships with a city entity where he or she is in a position to exert any influence:

   a. Has sought a financial benefit from the city entity within the past 12 months;
   b. Is currently seeking a financial benefit from the city entity; or
   c. Seeks a financial benefit from the city entity within 12 months of the date of a gift.

2. A person or entity may not give or seek to give a gift to any official, employee or
consultant or to his or her spouse or domestic partner who is in a position to exert any
influence over a city entity with which they have any of the following relationships:

   a. Have sought a financial benefit from the city entity within the past 12 months;
   b. Is currently seeking a financial benefit from the city entity; or
   c. Seeks a financial benefit from the city entity within 12 months of the date of a gift.

3. This section is not intended to prohibit officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and
vendors from exchanging minor gifts with their personal friends or family in the course
of ordinary social interaction; provided, that those persons do not have business before
the city, or their business is with a city entity where the official, employee or consultant is
not advising on or participating in the decision-making process, or has previously
withdrawn from participation in the matter.

4. This section is not intended to prevent any person from making gifts of property, money,
or services to the city as a whole; provided, that such gifts are unconditional in nature and
further provided that gifts to the city valued in excess of $20.00 must be approved by the
city council.

D. Misuse of Public Resources
Employees, elected officials, consultants and contracted vendors recognize their responsibility to conserve and/or judiciously deploy public resources, making every effort to use official time and city property for and on behalf of the city alone.

1. An official, employee, consultant, volunteer or vendor shall not use or lend, or permit others to use or lend, any city funds, property, or staff for the personal or financial benefit of himself or herself or of a related party. This includes, but is not limited to, city funds, office space, supplies, stationery, postage, telephones, equipment and vehicles.

2. Travel and other expense reimbursements shall be for official business only and only for the employee or official directly involved.

3. The work hours of a city employee should not be requisitioned for an official’s electoral or personal life.

4. Persons employed by or elected to city governance consequently will not use or lend, or permit others to use or lend, any public resource. Public resources include, but are not limited to, city funds, office space and supplies, telephones, computers and internet access, equipment and vehicles as well as one’s own or another city employee’s work hours.

5. Officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors may use any city resources that are generally available to the public provided this use is on the same terms and conditions as those applicable to the public.

6. Officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors may use city resources when, in the conduct of official business, they are used in a minor way for personal convenience; provided, that this use is according to the city’s written policies or has been authorized by the mayor.

7. The use of nonpublic information gained by working for the city—e.g., property sales, redrawing of city boundaries, etc.—should not be used to further one’s own personal financial or business ventures or shared with another, who could gain fiscal benefit.

8. A public employee, elected official or contracted consultant or vendor may not use his or her signature solely to validate any contract, financial disbursement or any other legal, financial or legislative documents where two signatures are required for validation.

9. Computers and internet access will not be used for political and/or charitable activities or for anything other than de minimis personal use. A de minimis use policy authorizes minimal personal (not business) usage (in terms of frequency and/or duration of occasion), which has little or no impact on public expenses and does not impinge upon human work hours. In the same way that phones can be used by an employee, elected official or contracted individual for a short personal message, so may computers. However, use of internet access for dating services, pornography, on-line line education, gambling or religious devotions would constitute misuse of not only public equipment but of work hours.

E. Representation of Private Interests

Officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors must exercise caution when representing the interests of the City and/or themselves. Specifically:

1. Officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors shall not represent any private interests in matters before any city entity. They may however, appear before a city entity on their own behalf or on behalf of the city.
2. Officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors who appear before the meeting of any city entity as a private citizen, and not in an official capacity, must comply with Section 1.25.050(A).

3. Officials, employees, consultants, volunteers will not use his or her official title or office stationary outside of the necessary work of the city.

4. A public employee, elected official or contracted consultant or vendor will not attempt to persuade any citizen to use a personally preferred vendor or contractor.

5. Officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors who write a letter to the editor or other publicly distributed writing, is required to disclose that he or she is acting only as a private citizen, unless authorized by the mayor to act on behalf of the city. If the speech or writing is in response to criticism or other communication directed at or regarding his or her official role, the official, employee or consultant shall respond only in his or her official role.

6. An elected official may always represent his or her constituents in matters of public advocacy provided no element of additional compensation from the constituent is involved.

7. Unpaid volunteer members of a city entity may represent persons and entities before, and appear before, any city entity other than their own, subject to compliance with Section 1.25.050(A).

F. Disclosure

1. An official and/or employee or agents of the City have a duty to disclose information on request and in accordance with current rules and guidelines pursuant to its own laws and rules or those of any state or federal government including those set forth in the Freedom of Information Act. They must do so in reasonable and timely manner.

G. Workplace Harassment and Discrimination

The City of Langley flourishes when its elected officials, employees, contractors and/or vendors can anticipate and do comparably offer civil dignity in our human-to-human exchanges. The city seeks to be a workplace, a political organism and civic arena in which persons can appropriately expect to work and to live free from discrimination and unlawful harassment. As such:

1. Officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors shall not use their position to harass, intimidate or discriminate against any co-worker or member of the public based upon a person’s sex, sexual identity, race, nationality, age, appearance, religious or ideological beliefs.

2. It is unethical for an official, employee, consultant, volunteer or vendor to disregard any complaints of harassment or discrimination that may have been reported to them, unless they have promptly and in writing referred such complaints to a more appropriate investigatory body.

3. No official, employee, consultant, volunteer or vendor shall take any kind of retaliatory action against any employee because that employee has made a complaint of harassment. (Ord. 1028 § 2, 2016)

1.25.060 Administrative Provisions.

A. Ethics Training and Advisory Board.
1. An ethics training and advisory board of not less than three members, appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the city council, is hereby created. Each member shall serve for a three-year term which shall be staggered so that at least one member is appointed each year. A simple majority of the members of the board shall constitute a quorum.

2. All members of the board shall have their primary residence on Whidbey Island south of Classic Road and a majority shall be residents of the city of Langley. No member of the board shall be an official, employee or consultant of the city in any other capacity. Board members shall not receive any remuneration from the city but may be entitled to reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses on the same basis as volunteer members of other city agencies.

3. Selection of members to the City of Langley Ethics Training and Advisory Board members and Chair appointment shall be in accordance with provisions of Section 2.34 of the Langley Municipal Code.

4. As an added provision to Section 2.34, an Ethics Training and Advisory Board selection committee shall be appointed by the Mayor and include the Mayor, the Chief of Police and one City Council member. Candidates must be able to pass a background check requested by the Langley Police Department. Automatic disqualifiers include:
   a. Any prior felony convictions.
   b. Any crime committed that would require someone to register as a sex offender.
   c. Any crime of moral turpitude.
   d. Anyone currently under court ordered supervision for any crime.
   e. Any misdemeanor committed within the previous five years.
   f. Anyone who is currently the respondent in any domestic violence related court order.
   g. Anyone who is currently prohibited by federal or state law from possessing a firearm.

5. The functions of the board shall be to:
   a. Provide an ethics orientation and training program for officials related to this ethics code;
   b. To the extent requested by the mayor, provide such educational and training resources as may be necessary so that officials, employees, consultants, volunteers and vendors understand their responsibilities and required conduct under this ethics code;
   c. Provide advisory opinions about the application of the code at the request of officials, employees, consultants, volunteers, vendors and citizens.

B. Advisory Opinions

If an official, employee, consultant, volunteer, vendor or citizen has any doubt as to whether or not a proposed course of action is in opposition to this Code of Ethics, they may ask the
Ethics Training and Advisory Board for an advisory opinion on the matter. Advisory opinions are non-legally binding opinions and educational in nature only. They may not be used as defense against a legal challenge to the situations described in the advisory opinion. The process for requesting an advisory opinion of the Ethics Training and Advisory Board follows:

1. Informal discussions with members of the Ethics Board regarding ethical dilemmas will not be entertained.

2. Advisory opinions will only be rendered after a written request complete Advisory Request form as provided on the City’s website is sent to the City Clerk. The request must not only cite the activity in question, but specific provisions in the Principles of Conduct (Section 1.24.050) which are relevant to the ethical dilemma in question.

3. All requests for advisory opinions will be forwarded by the City Clerk to the Ethics and Training Advisory Board for their review and opinion.

4. For each request, a draft opinion will be rendered in less than 30 days and will be based on the circumstance of the ethical dilemma in relation to the current Code of Ethics (Sec. 1.25 of the City of Langley Municipal Code).

5. All draft advisory opinions rendered by the Ethics Board will be forwarded to the City Council for review, comment, and final acceptance.

6. All advisory opinions will become a matter of public record and may be used as instructional case studies to emphasize various principles of the Code of Ethics.

1.25.70 Review of Ethics Training and Advisory Board and the Current Code of Ethics.
The ethics training and advisory board and this Code of Ethics shall come under review annually for effectiveness and prevalence. (Ord. 1028 § 2, 2016)

Section 2. Severability. If any section, paragraph, subsection, clause or phrase of this ordinance is held invalid for any reason, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance.

Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect five (5) days after publication and posting of an approved summary thereof, consisting of the title.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LANGLEY, WASHINGTON, and approved by the Mayor at a regular meeting held this ___ day of ________, 2017.

TIM CALLISON, Mayor
ATTEST:

DEBBIE L. MAHLER, Clerk-Treasurer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

MICHAEL R. KENYON, City Attorney
Memo

To: Langley City Council
From: Debbie Matter, Director of Finance/Clerk
Date: March 30, 2017
Re: Business License Revocation hearing

Langley Municipal Code (Chapter 5.04) requires a City Business license to do business within the City. Section 5.04.080 provides that the City Council can revoke a license when a business does not conform to City ordinances. The Sundance Bakery has not paid for or been issued a business license for either 2016 or 2017. They have been sent several reminders and in February were sent a letter giving them until March 20, 2017 (attached) to pay their license renewals. They have not even replied to that letter. They owe the City $331.35 and the penalty will go up again, if they do not take care of it.

They are the only business in the City that has not paid for their 2016 license. The Bakery is making no effort to comply with City Code and regulations and continue to operate while all other businesses comply and pay their fees. They have not asked for a payment plan or even replied to the notices and letter. I am therefore recommending that the Council set a hearing to revoke or suspend their license and order them to cease doing business within the city.
Sundance Bakery
630 2nd St Unit 400
Langley, WA. 98260

Dear Sundance Bakery,

Please review the City of Langley ordinance regarding business licenses below. You have reported sales & use tax activity within city limits and, therefore, you are required to obtain a business license.

5.04.080 Revocation or suspension.

The city council may, at any time, suspend or revoke any license issued hereunder whenever the licensee or an officer or partner thereof has been convicted in any court of competent jurisdiction of violating any criminal statute of the United States or the state of Washington or of any ordinance of the city of Langley upon the business premises stated in the license of connection with the business stated in the license, or where the place of business does not conform to the ordinances of the city of Langley; provided a hearing thereon shall be had before such revocation or suspension. The licensee shall be notified in writing by sending notice to the mailing address stated in the license. Said notice shall state the intension of the city council to revoke or suspend said license, the reason for such suspension or revocation, of the licensee to appear at said meeting and to be heard in opposition to such revocation or suspension. Such notice shall be given by certified mail to the licensee at least 14 days prior to the date of said hearing.
(Ord. 1015 1, 2015; Ord. 977 1, 2012; Ord. 745, 1997)

Our records show you did not pay your license fee for 2016 and are now delinquent for 2017. You have been sent two renewal notices as of today’s date for 2017. If the 2016 and 2017 fees are not paid by March 15, we will be forced to take this matter to council for revocation of your license to do business in the City of Langley.

Amount due to the city for 2016 = $187.50 and 2017 = $143.75 Total owed $331.35

If you have any questions, please give me a call.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Debbie Mahler, Clerk
City of Langley
360-221-4208
CITY COUNCIL  
OF LANGLEY, WASHINGTON 

RESOLUTION NO. 787 FOR INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT  
HOME CONSORTIUM 

A RESOLUTION of the City Council of Langley, Washington to reauthorize an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with other municipalities in Skagit County, Whatcom County and Island County, agreeing to participate as a Member of a regional Consortium that has qualified the area for additional funding to address homelessness and the shortage of homes affordable to lower-wage workers and others.  

WHEREAS, the region has a shortage of homes that lower-wage workers and other low-income people can afford; and  

WHEREAS, cooperation among local governments supports existing local efforts aimed at reducing homelessness and increasing the supply of homes lower-wage workers and others can afford to lease or own; and  

WHEREAS, the federal government offers funding and technical assistance aimed at increasing the supply of decent, safe and affordable housing available to low-income and very low-income families, including offers from the HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME Program) created in the National Affordable Housing Act of 1990; and  

WHEREAS, Skagit, Whatcom and Island counties and the participating cities and town therein established the Skagit HOME Consortium in order to obtain grant funds under the HOME Program guidelines for eligibility; and
WHEREAS, eligible Members of the Skagit HOME Consortium have cooperated in establishing the Consortium to increase the level of matching funds available for use within the region and, thereby, assist in meeting the housing affordability needs of the region; and

WHEREAS, the Interlocal Cooperation Act in Chapter 39.34 of the Revised Code of Washington authorizes units of general local government to enter into interlocal agreements to cooperate for public benefit purposes;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of Langley, Washington authorizes its Mayor (or other authorized official) to sign an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement that allows the City of Langley to participate as a Member of a Consortium for additional periods that will be automatically renewed every three (3) years.

Adopted this _____ day of ______________, 2017.

City Council of Langley, Washington

Tim Callison, Mayor

ATTEST:

Debbie Mahler, Clerk/Treasurer