

RECEIVED

MAR 23 2011

Public Disclosure Commission

Formal Complaint to the Washington State Public Disclosure Commission  
For Complaints Relating to Elected Official or Candidate for Public Office  
(If the Sample Complaint Form is Not Used)

Name of Official or Candidate: Mike Hope  
Address of Official or Candidate: Building C-203 P.O. Box 40600  
Official's or Candidate's Olympia Wa 98504-0600  
City State Zip Code  
Official's or Candidate's Telephone: 360-786-7892  
(Include Area Code)  
Official's or Candidate's E-Mail Address: Mike.Hope@leg.wa.gov  
(If known)

Your signature: [Signature]

Your printed name: John Chambers

Street address: 103 Roy St

City, state and zip code: Seattle WA

Telephone number: 352-535-0049 98109

E-Mail Address: (Optional) JakeScout10@gmail.com #preferred contact

Date Signed: 3/22/11

Place Signed (City and County): Seattle King  
City County

Complaint: Attach Complaint and Certification

RECEIVED

MAR 23 2011

Public Disclosure Commission

**Certification for a  
Complaint to the Washington State Public Disclosure Commission Relating to  
Elected Official or Candidate for Public Office  
(Notary Not Required)**

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the facts set forth in this attached complaint are true and correct.

Your signature: John

Your printed name: John Chambers

Street address: 103 Roy St Seattle WA 98109

City, state and zip code: Seattle, Wa

Telephone number: 352-535-0049

E-Mail Address: (Optional) jakescout10@gmail.com

Date Signed: 3/22/11

Place Signed (City and County): Seattle King  
City County

\*RCW 9A.72.040 provides that: "(1) A person is guilty of false swearing if he makes a false statement which he knows to be false, under an oath required or authorized by law. (2) False swearing is a misdemeanor."

COMPLAINT ATTACHED

RECEIVED

Tony Perkins

MAR 23 2011

**From:** John Chambers [jakescout10@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 22, 2011 5:20 PM  
**To:** PDC  
**Subject:** Formal ethics complaint Rep Mike Hope  
**Attachments:** HopeDocs - Copy.rar; certification - Copy.pdf; Kevin Raymond Reichert Uniform Letter - Copy.pdf

Public Disclosure Commission

Attn: Washington State Public Disclosure Commission, Compliance Department

I am writing to lodge an official complaint (see attached certification form) and to request a ruling with regard to State Representative Mike Hope and his use of public resources related to his position as a Seattle Police officer in campaign material. I'd like to bring to your attention his repeated use of police uniform and honoraria in campaign materials, on which I request a ruling.

Per RCW 42.17.130, public facilities e.g. agency personnel during work hours, their uniforms, agency vehicles, buildings and grounds) should not be included in photos that are staged for a campaign purpose. RCW 42.17.130.

Further, there are guidelines with regard to the use of law enforcement uniforms in campaigning.

As I understand it, if a candidate is photographed while on-duty and in uniform (e.g. as a law enforcement officer), provided that the photo was taken for a legitimate purpose related to official agency business and not for any campaign, it may be accessed on an equal-access, nondiscriminatory basis (e.g. through a public records request, or "lifted" from the agency's public web site) and used for a campaign purpose. WAC 390-05-271(2).

Similarly, if a candidate is photographed in uniform while off-duty, the photo may be used for a campaign purpose provided that:

- 1) The uniform, including accessories such as service weapons, radios, and badges, is completely privately owned, and displays no recognizable agency name or insignia; and
- 2) No other public facilities were involved in the taking of the photo.

I feel that Rep. Mike Hope is in multiple violation of both the spirit and the letter of the aforementioned laws, and request a ruling on the following instances:

1. A photo (attachment 1) from [www.hopeforexec.com/about.htm](http://www.hopeforexec.com/about.htm) as posted on 3/15/11. Under the heading "Launching a career in law enforcement", Hope has posted a picture of himself in uniform holding his daughter while apparently off duty. The uniform features a badge and insignia, which is blurred out in the photo. Further, Hope is wearing a firearm, handcuffs and a utility belt. It is my understanding that a candidate may only wear a uniform if it is entirely privately owned and if it bears no insignia. Despite the blurring of the insignia on his shoulder, the crest is still easily recognizable as the Seattle PD uniform patch. Iconic items are still easily recognizable after slight blurring, much in the same way that the NY on a Yankees cap would be recognizable by shape even if blurred, the shape, color and design of the Seattle PD insignia is clearly recognizable (see attached 2 from SPD website). If anything, the blurring catches the eye and reinforces that this is in fact a Seattle PD uniform.

Further, it seems that blurring the logo does not address the legal obligation of the candidate to remove all insignia and to only display privately owned materials. With that said, I would like the ruling to determine whether the firearm, the utility belt, the items on the utility belt, the Seattle PD insignia and the uniform as a whole are public resources. Certainly, the image implies that the uniform is a Seattle PD uniform and not a privately held non-descript uniform with private gear. Further, it is my understanding that Seattle PD provides a \$550 yearly stipend for the purchase of uniform. Even if the candidate provides payment info showing he paid for the items privately, I feel that if he accepted the \$550 stipend, then the items are in fact a public resource.

2. On the same page, under the heading “A Statewide Leader on Public Safety”, the candidate posts another photo of himself in uniform (attachment 3). This photo presents several problems. In addition to all of the previously mentioned issues – including the full utility belt, service weapon, police uniform and SPD insignia visible on the shoulder (stipulating that the badge on the front may be fake), the candidate posts a clear reproduction of the Lakewood Police Department badge in silhouette next to him. Compare the photo to the attached photo (Lakewood badge) and there is little doubt that this is a photo of a Lakewood Police badge. Not only does this imply the endorsement of the Lakewood Police, it is a question once again of a public resource used for campaign purposes. Please consider these factors in your ruling.

3. On the main page ( [www.hopeforexec.com](http://www.hopeforexec.com) ), there is a photo (attachment 4) of the candidate apparently doorbelling in full police uniform. Again, the uniform is recognizable as a SPD uniform, and he is wearing a weapon, utility belt and radio. I feel that he has the burden of proof once again to prove that none of these items are department issue and that he did not accept the stipend of \$550 yearly to reimburse himself of personal costs. None of this takes into account the ethical dilemma provided by an elected official appearing at a constituent’s door in full police uniform and wearing a sidearm. If the candidate states that this is not a campaign photo but instead an on duty photo, please rule on whether it fits the criteria for such photos as delineated above.

4. On the media page of his website ( [www.hopeforexec.com/media.htm](http://www.hopeforexec.com/media.htm) ), the candidate posts a [youtube video](#) of himself in uniform. At the 14 second mark, the angle switches, and the SPD logo is clearly visible and recognizable on the candidate’s right shoulder (attachments 5 and 6). As above, we would like a ruling on the public resources aspect of all items including the uniform, insignia, and all aforementioned gear. This, again, sets aside the ethical dilemma of an officer in uniform advocating on behalf of a campaign or a legislative agenda, which I ask you to review at your discretion.

Please see attached certified complaint form. I have included a zipped file to help limit the size, let me know if the attachments need to be sent individually. I have seperately attached the certification and cover to be safe, as well as an earlier ruling you issued that helped me to write this complaint. Please contact me if you have questions.

Respectfully,

Cc: Seattle Police Department, Legislative Ethics Board

RECEIVED

MAR 23 2011

Public Disclosure Commission