



STATE OF NEVADA

BEFORE THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS

In re **Britton Griffith-Douglass**,
Member, Planning Commission, City of
Reno, State of Nevada,

Ethics Complaint
Case No. **18-114C**

Subject. /

REVIEW PANEL DETERMINATION NRS 281A.730; NAC 281A.440

The Nevada Commission on Ethics ("Commission") received Ethics Complaint No. 18-114C ("Complaint") on October 2, 2018, regarding the alleged conduct of Britton Griffith-Douglass ("Griffith-Douglass") a member of the City of Reno Planning Commission. The Commission issued its *Order on Jurisdiction and Investigation* on November 19, 2018, which instructed the Executive Director to conduct an investigation regarding Griffith-Douglass' alleged violations of NRS 281A.420(1) and (3).

Griffith-Douglass is a public officer as defined in NRS 281A.160, and the Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to NRS 281A.280 because the allegations contained in the Complaint relate to Griffith-Douglass' conduct as a public officer and have associated implications under the Ethics Law.

On February 19, 2020, a Review Panel consisting of Chair Cheryl A. Lau, Esq. (Presiding Officer) and Commissioners Philip K. O'Neill and Damian Sheets, Esq. reviewed the following: 1) Ethics Complaint No. 18-114C; 2) Order on Jurisdiction and Investigation; 3) Griffith-Douglass' Response to the Complaint; 4) Investigatory Exhibits; and 5) Executive Director's Recommendation to the Review Panel.¹

Under NAC 281A.430, the Review Panel unanimously finds and concludes that the facts do not establish credible evidence to support a determination that just and sufficient cause exists for the Commission to render an opinion in the matter regarding the allegations pertaining to NRS 281A.420(1) and (3).

Specifically, the investigation did not produce evidence that that the relationship between Griffith-Douglass and Mark Thierman ("Thierman") constitutes any of the identified relationships in NRS 281A.065 to create a commitment in a private capacity. Although Thierman may have a substantial and continuing business relationship with Griffith-Douglass' father, that does not mean that Thierman's interests are imputed to Griffith-Douglass. Instead, Griffith-Douglass has a commitment in a private capacity to the interests of her father. To the extent her father's interests come before the Planning Commission, Griffith-Douglass would have been required to disclose and/or abstain. Here, Thierman appeared before the Planning Commission on behalf of a client other than Griffith-Douglass' father on a matter completely unrelated to her father's interests.

¹ All materials provided to the Review Panel, except the Ethics Complaint and the Order on Jurisdiction and Investigation, represent portions of the investigatory file and remain confidential pursuant to NRS 281A.750.

Accordingly, Griffith-Douglass had no duty to disclose or abstain from taking action on Agenda Item 7.1 at the meeting of the City of Reno Planning Commission on December 20, 2017.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

The Review Panel dismisses the Complaint for lack of sufficient credible evidence of violations of NRS 281A.420(1) and (3).

Dated this 24th day of February, 2020.

REVIEW PANEL OF THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS

By: /s/ Cheryl A. Lau
Cheryl A. Lau, Esq.
Chair/Presiding Officer

By: /s/ Philip K. O'Neill
Philip K. O'Neill
Commissioner

By: /s/ Damian R. Sheets
Damian R. Sheets, Esq.
Commissioner

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that I am an employee of the Nevada Commission on Ethics and that on this day in Carson City, Nevada, I transmitted a true and correct copy of the foregoing **REVIEW PANEL DETERMINATION** via U.S. Certified Mail and electronic mail addressed as follows:

Britton Griffith-Douglass
c/o Jonathan D. Shipman, Esq.
City Attorney's Office
City of Reno
P.O. Box 1900
Reno, NV 89505-1900

Certified Mail No.: 9171 9690 0935 0037 6386 62

Email: shipmanj@reno.gov

Dated: 2/24/20



Employee, Nevada Commission on Ethics