



State of Washington
PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION

711 Capitol Way Rm. 206, PO Box 40908 • Olympia, Washington 98504-0908
(360) 753-1111 • FAX (360) 753-1112
Toll Free 1-877-601-2828 • E-mail: pdcc@pdcc.wa.gov • Website: www.pdcc.wa.gov

Memorandum

To: Public Disclosure Commission

From: Jennifer Hansen, Compliance Officer

Date: January 18, 2023

Subject: Ozzie Knezovich; PDC Case #105472; Reconsideration Hearing

Matter for Reconsideration:

During a Brief Enforcement Hearing held on November 17, 2022, Ozzie Knezovich, was found to have violated: (1) RCW 42.17A.555 by using the public facilities of the Spokane County Sheriff's Office to oppose Amber Waldref, a candidate for Spokane County Commissioner in the 2022 election; and (2) RCW 42.17A.635(2) for engaging in prohibited indirect lobbying by encouraging members of the public to contact legislators regarding legislative changes. At the November 17, 2022 Brief Enforcement Hearing, an Order imposing a \$300 penalty, with \$100 suspended, was entered, which Mr. Knezovich now requests the Commission reconsider.

Background:

- Ozzie Knezovich was the Spokane County Sheriff, did not seek re-election in the 2022 election, and left his position December 31, 2022.
- On March 7, 2022, PDC staff received a complaint filed by Paul Dillon alleging that Ozzie Knezovich had violated RCW 42.17A.555 by using the public facilities of the Spokane County Sheriff's Office to oppose Amber Waldref, a candidate for Spokane County Commissioner in the 2022 election. During the investigation, PDC staff added an additional violation of RCW 42.17A.635(2) for engaging in prohibited indirect lobbying by encouraging members of the public to contact legislators regarding legislative changes.
- PDC staff sent notice of the original complaint to Sheriff Knezovich on March 15, 2022 and requested a response by March 29, 2022. **[Exhibit A]**
- On March 17, 2022, Sheriff Knezovich submitted a written response for PDC Case #105472. **[Exhibit B]**

- After conducting a preliminary review and assessment of the complaint filed by Paul Dillon on March 7, 2022, PDC staff opened a formal investigation and held an Initial Hearing (Case Status Review Hearing) on June 2, 2022, pursuant to RCW 42.17A.755, and WACs 390-37-060 and 390-37-071. Sheriff Knezovich participated by telephone in the Initial Hearing. **[Exhibit C]**
- PDC staff sent notice of the allegation added by staff to Sheriff Knezovich on June 29, 2022 and requested a response by July 14, 2022. The response date was extended to August 18, 2022. **[Exhibit D]**
- On August 18, 2022, Sheriff Knezovich submitted a written response to the second allegation added by staff for PDC Case #105472. **[Exhibit E]**
- On September 30, 2022, PDC staff sent Sheriff Knezovich a Statement of Understanding (SOU) for his review and possible signature. The SOU included a \$200 penalty which, if paid along with the signed SOU, would be used to resolve the allegations in PDC Case #105472.
- On October 27, 2022, PDC staff served Ozzie Knezovich, by electronic mail, with a hearing notice for a Brief Adjudicative Proceeding to be held on November 17, 2022, concerning alleged violations of: (1) RCW 42.17A.555 by using the public facilities of the Spokane County Sheriff's Office to oppose Amber Waldref, a candidate for Spokane County Commissioner in the 2022 election; and (2) RCW 42.17A.635(2) for engaging in prohibited indirect lobbying by encouraging members of the public to contact legislators regarding legislative changes. A copy of the Statement of Understanding sent on September 30, 2022 was included with the hearing notice and would be used in lieu of the November 17, 2022 hearing. **[Exhibit F]**
- At the Brief Enforcement Hearing held on November 17, 2022, the Respondent was found to have violated: (1) RCW 42.17A.555 by using the public facilities of the Spokane County Sheriff's Office to oppose Amber Waldref, a candidate for Spokane County Commissioner in the 2022 election; and (2) RCW 42.17A.635(2) for engaging in prohibited indirect lobbying by encouraging members of the public to contact legislators regarding legislative changes and was assessed a \$300 penalty, consistent with WAC 390-37-143, the Brief Enforcement Penalty Schedule adopted by the Commission. The Presiding Officer suspended \$100 of the \$300 penalty conditioned upon the Respondent submitting the Statement of Understanding (SOU) acknowledging violations of RCW 42.17A.555 and RCW 42.17A.635(2) and paying the \$200 non-suspended portion of the penalty within 30 days of the December 15, 2022 Initial Order.
- On December 15, 2022, PDC staff served the Initial Order in case #105472 memorializing the Commission's ruling, by electronic mail, to the email address-of-record. **{Exhibit G}**

Request for Reconsideration:

- On December 21, 2022, the Respondent sent an email to PDC staff asking if he had missed his appeal timeframe. Staff responded to the email later the same day, reminding Mr. Knezovich that he had not missed the deadline and that if he sent a request for appeal, staff would pause the invoicing process for collection of the penalty until after the Commission heard his request.
- On January 6, 2023, the Respondent sent a second message stating he had not received any information on the date of his hearing appeal. Staff responded to the email later the same day, confirming that his request for appeal had been added to the Commission's January 26, 2023, regular meeting. Staff requested that Mr. Knezovich send an official written request for appeal.
- Per PDC staff's request, the Respondent provided his reasons for requesting an appeal, in writing, on January 12, 2023. In his written request, Mr. Knezovich stated that he believed there was no evidence of a violation of RCW 42.17A.555 or RCW 42.17A.635(2) and explained his intent regarding the creation of the YouTube video and his responsibility to respond to the public. **[Exhibit H]**
- On January 13, 2023, PDC staff served the Respondent, by email and US Postal mail, with a hearing notice for a January 26, 2023 Reconsideration before the Public Disclosure Commission, along with instructions on how to participate in the hearing remotely. The notice was sent to the Respondent's email address-of-record and mailed to the current postal mailing address provided by the Respondent on January 6, 2023. **[Exhibit I]**

///

///

///

Exhibit List:

- **Exhibit A** – PDC Case #105472; Ozzie Knezovich Complaint; received March 7, 2022
- **Exhibit B** – Response Provided by Ozzie Knezovich; received March 17, 2022
- **Exhibit C** – Initial Hearing Notice (Case Status Review Hearing) After Opening a Formal Investigation, Ozzie Knezovich, PDC Case #105472
- **Exhibit D** – PDC Case #105472; PDC Staff Allegation; sent June 29, 2022
- **Exhibit E** – Response to Staff Allegation Provided by Ozzie Knezovich; received August 18, 2022
- **Exhibit F** – Brief Adjudicative Proceeding (Brief Enforcement Hearing) Notice; dated October 27, 2022
- **Exhibit G** – Initial Order Imposing Fine; PDC Case #105472; served December 15, 2022
- **Exhibit H** – Request for Appeal Provided by Ozzie Knezovich; received January 12, 2023
- **Exhibit I** – Reconsideration Hearing Notice; dated January 13, 2023

EXHIBIT A

Respondent Names
Spokane County Sherriff Ozzie Knezovich
Complainant Name
Paul Dillon
Complaint Description
<p>Jamespauldillon 7 Mar 2022 at 3:57 PM</p> <p>Sheriff Ozzie Knezovich has used public facilities to assist a candidate's campaign for Spokane County Commission in violation of RCW 42.17A.555 by posting a YouTube video (available here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5UgxCoH6fsU) which amounts to an independent expenditure opposing the candidacy of a candidate for County Commission. As there is only one other candidate for that district at the time the video was made, negative comments and attacks directed at one candidate is assistance to the other candidate.</p> <p>From 7:30 to 8:50 of this video, Sheriff Knezovich attacks Amber Waldref, a candidate for Spokane County Commission, clearly using official County facilities. As the video shows, Sheriff Knezovich is in his official uniform, and the video plainly uses both his elected title and the logo of the Spokane County Sheriffs office in the opening shot. Presumably, another person - likely a county employee - is operating the camera, and used official staff time and resources to edit the video and post it to YouTube on Friday, February 18, 2022.</p> <p>RCW 42.17A.555 prohibits the use by any elective official of public resources to, directly or indirectly, assist a campaign for election of any person to any office. Official resources includes, without limitation, the use of funds, facilities, personnel, or other official resources, such as the use of equipment, the use of employees of the office or agency during working hours, office space, and publications of the office or agency.</p> <p>Amber Waldref is a Democrat running for Spokane County Commission. Michael Cathcart is a Republican also running for Spokane County Commission. Both candidacies are shown on the PDC's candidate filing website: https://www.pdc.wa.gov/browse/more-ways-to-follow-the-money/candidates/county?category=Candidates</p> <p>Waldref and Cathcart are the only candidates for Spokane County Commission's district 2.</p> <p>The video attacks 9 Democrats and three African American members of the public who are working for police reforms in Spokane. No Republicans are mentioned in the video.</p> <p>This video and its attacks targeted at candidate Waldref are an effort by Sheriff Knezovich to assist Mr. Cathcart in his election to County Commission, and are essentially an independent expenditure using County facilities, and therefore constitutes a violation of RCW 42.17A.555.</p>

There are no valid exceptions to the prohibition on the use of public facilities for campaign purposes here - this is not an action taken at an open public meeting by members of an elected legislative body or by an elected board, council, or commission; it is not a statement by an elected official in support of or in opposition to any ballot proposition at an open press conference or in response to a specific inquiry; and it is not an activity which is a part of the normal or regular conduct of the office or agency, as the term is defined in the PDC's regulations. See WAC 390-05-273.

What impact does the alleged violation(s) have on the public?

This video and its attacks targeted against Spokane County Commissioner candidate Amber Waldref are an effort by Sheriff Knezovich to assist Michael Cathcart in his election to Spokane County Commission and are essentially an independent expenditure using County facilities, and therefore constitutes a violation of RCW 42.17A.555.

List of attached evidence or contact information where evidence may be found

Here is the video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5UgxCoH6fsU>

From 7:30 to 8:50 of this video, Sheriff Knezovich attacks Amber Waldref, a candidate for Spokane County Commission, clearly using official County facilities.

I have also attached the relevant section of video as well as an image from the video.

List of potential witnesses with contact information to reach them

Sheriff Ozzie Knezovich OKnezovich@spokanesherriff.org

Spokane County Commissioner candidate Amber Waldref amber.spokane@gmail.com

Certification (Complainant)

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that information provided with this complaint is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.



(Part 2/2) Sheriff Knezovich addresses Shootings/Violent Crime in our Community & what You can do. ✓

1.3K views · 2 weeks ago



49



Dislike



Share



Save



Report



SpokaneSheriff

1.3K subscribers

SUBSCRIBE

EXHIBIT B

Sheriff Ozzie Knezovich's Response to allegations listed in PDC Case Number 105472.

Complainant: Paul Dillon

Date of Complaint: 7 March 2022

Allegation: Violation of RCW 42.17A.555 for misuse of public resources to support or oppose of a candidate for office.

Response:

In his complaint Mr. Dillon alleges: "Sheriff Ozzie Knezovich has used public facilities to assist a candidate's campaign for Spokane County Commission in violation of RCW 42.17A.555 by posting a YouTube video (available here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5UgxCoH6fsU>) which amounts to an independent expenditure opposing the candidacy of a candidate for County Commission. Mr. Dillon's allegation is false on its face and Mr. Dillon has committed perjury in making this allegation. Mr. Dillon knowingly only mentions part 2 of a two-part YouTube video presentation. Part 1 can be located at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XfMYTEVYiqU>.

Mr. Dillon knowing filed a false allegation knowing this presentation contained two parts. He also knew the focus of the video was the rising number of violent shootings in our community. The Spokane County Sheriff's Office has used our YouTube Channel to communicate with the citizens of Spokane County for years. RCW 42.17A.555 Use of public office or agency facilities in campaigns subsection (3) clearly states "Activities which are part of the normal and regular conduct of the office or agency." is an exemption relating to this RCW. Mr. Dillon knew or should have known this at the time he filed his false complaint.

Mr. Dillon also knew, or should have known, that in order for there to be a violation of RCW 42.17A.555, he would have to show evidence that I created the video, "... for the purpose of assisting a campaign for election of any person to any office...". Mr. Dillon knew, or should have known, based on the content of the entire video series that the message behind the videos was the rise of violent shootings in the Spokane County area and providing information to the citizens of Spokane County as to whom they should talk to concerning this increase in violent shootings.

Mr. Dillon knew, or should have known, that WAC 390-05-273: "Normal and regular conduct of a public office or agency, as that term is used in the proviso to RCW 42.17A.555, means conduct which is (1) **lawful**, i.e., specifically authorized, either expressly or by necessary implication, in an appropriate enactment, and (2) **usual**, i.e., not effected or authorized in or by some extraordinary means or manner. No local office or agency may authorize a use of public facilities for the purpose of assisting a candidate's campaign or promoting or opposing a ballot proposition, in the absence of a constitutional, charter, or statutory provision separately authorizing such use." is not a prohibition to using YouTube to communicate with the public. The use of YouTube to communicate to our citizens is **lawful**, as noted in subsection (1) of the WAC and there is no prohibition to using said means to communicate with the public through YouTube or any other social media source. This means of communication with the public meets

the definition of **usual** under subsection (2) of the WAC in that governmental agencies have been using such means of communication to address and communicate with the public for years. The Spokane County Sheriff's Office has used YouTube as a means to inform our community since approximately 2012. Once again, Mr. Dillon knew, or should have known, based on the content of the YouTube presentations in question were not made for the "... purpose of assisting a candidate's campaign..." per the above-mentioned RCW or WAC.

Mr. Dillon falsely alleges, "Sheriff Ozzie Knezovich has used public facilities to assist a candidate's campaign for Spokane County Commission in violation of RCW 42.17A.555 by posting a YouTube video (available here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5UgxCoH6fsU>)... As there is only one other candidate for that district at the time the video was made, negative comments and attacks directed at one candidate is assistance to the other candidate." Mr. Dillon provides no evidence concerning this allegation other than the video was made, and there is only one other candidate running for the district in question at this time. I would point out that it is currently March of 2022 and the official filing date for this district does not take place until May of 2022. Giving ample time for other candidates to enter this race.

Mr. Dillon states: "Amber Waldref is a Democrat running for Spokane County Commission. Michael Cathcart is a Republican also running for Spokane County Commission. Both candidacies are shown on the PDC's candidate filing website... Waldref and Cathcart are the only candidates for Spokane County Commission's district 2." As stated above the official filing date of this district is not until May 2022. At no time in the video is Ms. Waldref's opponent mentioned nor do I tell people to vote for her opponent or against her.

Mr. Dillon states: "The video attacks 9 Democrats and three African American members of the public who are working for police reforms in Spokane. No Republicans are mentioned in the video." Mr. Dillon is correct that the individuals listed in the videos support police reforms. What Mr. Dillon fails to point out is that I also support police reforms and have lead police reform efforts within the state of Washington. I do not support the "police reforms" advocated by those in this video which make our communities less safe and have led to an increase in violent crime in Spokane County and the state of Washington. As to Mr. Dillon's assertion that no Republicans are listed in the videos, he is correct. No Republican elected officials that I know of support these unsafe reforms.

Mr. Dillon falsely asserts and provides no evidence to said assertion: "This video and its attacks targeted at candidate Waldref are an effort by Sheriff Knezovich to assist Mr. Cathcart in his election to County Commission...". As stated above Mr. Cathcart is not mentioned in the videos nor are any statements made pro or con in support or opposition to either candidate in the videos.

As stated above the purpose for this video was to inform the public as to the rising number of violent shootings in our community. In the last nearly year and a half we have lost several young people to this senseless violence. In March of 2021, the Police Chief of the City of Spokane held a press conference due to this violence. At that time four young people had lost their lives due to this senseless violence. The Chief and I held the press conference to inform the public and ask for their help in stopping this violence. My agency also posted a video of that press conference on our YouTube channel: <https://youtu.be/KAbuOwFIbzQ>. In August of the same year, I held a

press conference with leaders in the African American community in order to inform the public concerning this issue and to gain their support in stopping the deaths of our young people, <https://youtu.be/7U4YAUyNaFA>. I saw no PDC complaints filed by Mr. Dillon concerning these videos, however the Chief and I were labeled racists and white supremacist for using the word gangs during the press conference. As mentioned above RCW 42.17A.555 Use of public office or agency facilities in campaigns subsection (3) clearly states “Activities which are part of the normal and regular conduct of the office or agency” is an exemption relating to this RCW. As you can see, I use YouTube and other social media sources to communicate with the citizens of Spokane County on a regular basis. One can find just how often by going to the Spokane County Sheriff’s Office YouTube channel, <https://www.youtube.com/user/SpokaneSheriff>.

It should be noted, Ms. Waldref is a former councilwoman for the City of Spokane, which makes her a public figure. The fact that she is running for office also makes her a public figure. With that said all of the individuals in the video are either elected officials, governmental appointees or leaders of organizations within the Spokane County area and the state of Washington which also makes them public figures. They support or have created policies which have led to an increase in violent and non-violent crimes in the Spokane County area. Pointing these facts out in a video does not constitute attacking or attempting to campaign for any would-be opponent.

If this were the case, then Mr. Dillon’s complaint is incomplete, since two other individuals listed in the videos, Rep. Marcus Riccelli (D), and Rep. Timm Ormsby (D), are also running for office this year. Mr. Dillon would have you believe that I only listed democrats in the videos out of partisan politics, knowing full well I have the reputation of endorsing local democrats much to the chagrin of my own party. I have had a good working relationship with the two representatives for years even though we disagree on items from time to time.

On November 3, 2021, Ms. Waldref made false and disparaging comments concerning myself and the Sheriff’s Office via Twitter: “Replying to @lisa4progress @SheriffOzzie Wow. @spokanecounty had to do some financial gymnastics to close a \$6 million budget deficit last year. And this how our limited public dollars are being spent? Where is the budget accountability?” As Sheriff, I have an obligation to my agency and the community to set the record straight concerning such comments made by a former elected official regardless of her status as a candidate. Ms. Waldref made these comments knowing that she intended to run for the open commissioner position. See attached screenshot of said Twitter post. It was this post to which I was referring in the video subject to Mr. Dillon’s complaint.

Lastly, if this video was made to further Ms. Waldref’s opponent’s campaign, why would I invite her, and all the others listed in the video, to meet with me every Friday at 9 a.m., in order to find a solution to the violence ravaging our community. Had any of the above-mentioned community leaders taken me up on this offer they would have been seen in a very positive light and would have been recognized as being willing to work with me to solve this issue. An issue which is killing our young people. Meeting with me would have actually been a boost to her campaign. Under Mr. Dillon’s logic perhaps her opponent would have had grounds to file a PDC complaint against me for assisting her campaign as she would have been seen as being willing to work with me in saving the lives of our young people.

Mr. Dillon has attempted to use one of the oldest and most used campaign tools there is to benefit his candidate, Ms. Waldref, and bully me into silence, which is to file this type of PDC compliant. These videos were not created to aid Ms. Waldref's opponent, they were created to inform the public as to the rise in violent shootings in our community, to give them the names of those who they need to talk with in order to express their concerns regarding this issue, and to give those listed a chance to come to the table and work with their law enforcement leaders to stop the deaths of young people within our community, many of which are young people of color.

These videos were made because I am just bone tired of watching young people die, of having our law enforcement officers watch these kids being put into body bags, of knowing that our law enforcement officers will have to once again watch another autopsy performed on a young person, of having them hear the screams of mothers when they learn their child will never come home again, of watching the families of victims plead for justice and an end to this violence, of young people fearing that they may be next. These videos were made to draw attention to this issue and to hopefully shame our community leaders into listening to the public at large and work towards fixing a broken criminal justice system and end policies which are killing our children. My motivation has been consistent in this matter since the press conference with the Spokane City Police Chief last March and the subsequent video's since. All of which are posted on the Sheriff's Office YouTube Channel. Parisian politics never crossed my mind in creating them. Ms. Waldref and her opponent will win or lose their race on based on their own action or inaction.

Mr. Dillon has falsely filed this complaint for his own political means in an effort to help his candidate and to silence me in our community. He has attempted to use the PDC process as a weapon and in doing so he has committed perjury. This fact is evidenced in his March 7, 2022 Facebook post, bragging about filling said complaint: "Today, I filed a PDC complaint against Sheriff Knezovich. In a recent video, he attacked members of the 3rd LD, Spokane City Council, Spokane County Commissioner candidate Amber Waldref and singled out individuals in Spokane's Black community – Pastor Walter Kendricks, Sandy Williams and Kurtis Robinson. The video is full of falsehoods - but when he named Waldref, he was using his elected office against a candidate which appears to be violation of RCW 42.17A.555. This isn't the first the time he's done this but it's escalating. Enough is enough. My whole life, I have never tolerated bullying of any kind. That's why we need accountability – especially for those who abuse power. We should follow facts, not fear. I hope this action helps." See attached screenshot.

Sheriff Ozzie Knezovich

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that information provided with this complaint is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.



Paul Dillon

March 7 at 4:05 PM · 🌐



Today, I filed a PDC complaint against Sheriff Knezovich.

In a recent video, he attacked members of the 3rd LD, Spokane City Council, Spokane County Commissioner candidate Amber Waldref and singled out individuals in Spokane's Black community – Pastor Walter Kendricks, Sandy Williams and Kurtis Robinson.

The video is full of falsehoods - but when he named Waldref, he was using his elected office against a candidate which appears to be violation of RCW 42.17A.555.

This isn't the first the time he's done this but it's escalating. Enough is enough. My whole life, I have never tolerated bullying of any kind. That's why we need accountability – especially for those who abuse power.

We should follow facts, not fear.

I hope this action helps.



95

17 Comments 10 Shares

Like

Comment

Share



Amber Waldref

@amberwaldref

Replying to @lisa4progress @SheriffOzzie

Wow. @spokanecounty had to do some financial gymnastics to close a \$6 million budget deficit last year. And this how our limited public dollars are being spent? Where is the budget accountability?

10:57pm · 3 Nov 2021 · Twitter for Android

📍 Spokane, WA, United States

1 Reply 2 Retweets 35 Likes



EXHIBIT C



State of Washington

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION

711 Capitol Way Rm. 206, PO Box 40908 • Olympia, Washington 98504-0908

(360) 753-1111 • FAX (360) 753-1112

Toll Free 1-877-601-2828 • E-mail: pdcc@pdcc.wa.gov • Website: www.pdca.wa.gov

May 25, 2022

PDC Case: 105472

Sent electronically to Ozzie Knezovich at ozzieknezovich@gmail.com

Notice for Initial Hearing (Case Status Review Hearing)

Respondent: Ozzie Knezovich
Hearing/meeting date: June 2, 2022
Time: 4:00 p.m.
Place: Remotely via Teams
Live Audio/Online Transmission

PDC Staff: Peter Lavalley, Executive Director, Public Disclosure Commission
Authority: RCW 42.17A.755(3) & WAC 390-37-071

This is to notify you that the Public Disclosure Commission (PDC) has opened a formal investigation, and on the above date, PDC Staff will conduct an Initial Hearing (Case Status Review Hearing) concerning a complaint filed March 7, 2022 by Paul Dillon. The complaint alleges that you may have violated RCW 42.17A.555 for misuse of public resources to support or oppose a candidate for public office.

The Case Status Review Hearing is not an adjudicative proceeding. It is conducted in accordance with WAC 390-37-071, and is intended to provide you with information concerning the investigative process, including possible alternatives to resolve the matter.

Ozzie Knezovich
Initial Hearing Notice (Case Status Review Hearing Notice)
Page 2

You are not required to participate in the hearing. Further, your failure to participate will not prejudice your rights concerning the investigative process, or any potential future adjudicative proceeding in the matter.

If you wish to participate by telephone, please contact Jennifer Hansen, Compliance Officer at pdc@pdc.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

Electronically signed
Peter Lavalley
PDC Executive Director

EXHIBIT D

[Jennifer Hansen](#) replied

Wed, 29 Jun 2022

To:ozzieknezovich@gmail.com
Cc:jgrasso@spokanecounty.org

Sheriff Knezovich,

Thank you again for speaking to me yesterday. As discussed, I am adding a second allegation to this complaint and am requesting your review and a response. Also, as discussed, feel free to add any supplemental information regarding the original allegation if you find it necessary. Both allegations are listed below for your convenience followed by a brief explanation of the second allegation.

The Public Disclosure Commission received a complaint from James Paul Dillon on March 7, 2022, which has been assigned PDC Case Number 105472. The Complaint alleges the following:

- Allegation One: Violation of RCW 42.17A.555 for misuse of public resources to support or oppose of a candidate for office.

Upon further review of the evidence, PDC staff has added a second allegation.

- Allegation Two: Violation of RCW 42.17A.635(2) for indirect lobbying.

Please review the additional allegation, detailed below, and provide your response by **Thursday, July 14, 2022**.

In Part 2 of the video provided as evidence in the complaint, you begin by discussing the increase in crime and violence in your community and then share the question that you state you are receiving. The question is "Sheriff, who should we be talking to about getting you the tools and the ability to take care of these issues?"

The remainder of the video appears to be the answer to this question.

The first group of individuals you discuss are five Spokane City Council members. Any potential lobbying, even if indirect, is not regulated by the PDC.

The next three individuals, Senator Andy Billig, Representative Marcus Riccelli and Representative Timm Ormsby, are identified as sitting legislators who "passed, sponsored reforms...that damaged our ability to keep you safe."

It is the connection between the community's question about who to talk to about the issues you highlight in your video and your answer, in this instance, the three legislators who passed and sponsored a bill that adversely affected your job as a law enforcement professional that is potentially problematic.

I hope this is helpful. I appreciate your time and attention.

If you have any questions, please reply to this email.

Thank you and please stay safe.

Jennifer Hansen (she/her)
Compliance Officer
Public Disclosure Commission
pdc@pdc.wa.gov
1.360.586.4560

Please click **Reply when responding to this email

EXHIBIT E

Response Regarding PDC Case Number 105472

Allegation Two: Violation of RCW 42.17A.635(2) for indirect lobbying. (See attached RCW)

This allegation is in reference to portions of the video in question in which I state:

1. "Sheriff, who should we be talking to about getting you the tools and the ability to take care of these issues?"
2. "passed, sponsored reforms... that damaged our ability to keep you safe."

It is alleged that quote number one is "potentially problematic", because the answer I give highlights "the three legislators who passed and sponsored a bill that adversely affected your job as a law enforcement professional".

I would first point out that while I am a law enforcement professional, I am also an elected official in the State of Washington. As the elected Sheriff I have a duty and responsibility to communicate with the public. In this video I simply state a question that I am often asked by citizens. This is no different than if I had been asked the same question during a press conference. I might add, I have been asked these same questions during press conferences and have given the same answers. The Sheriff's Office uses social media as an information link to the public just the same as we do when conducting a press conference. We tape the majority of our press conferences and post them on social media in the same manner as this public address to the public was posted.

The next portion of the alleged violation concerns my identification of those responsible for the current policies and laws being set and passed which are destroying the quality of life for my constituents and killing young people within our community. At no time in the video do I request, nor was it my direct or indirect intent, for anyone to contact those identified as being responsible for the current crime cataclysm facing the State of Washington.

As stated above I did not request anyone to contact those identified in the video and this is evidenced not only by the lack of such request, but also by the fact that I invited those listed in the video to meet with me so we could work together in order to find common ground to resolve these issues. To this date only Senator Billig and Representative Riccelli have taken the time to meet with me. The nature of the meeting was to ask me for an apology and to inform me that my mentioning members of the African American community in the video was akin to a white supremacist tactic used to divide the black community. Neither of these State officials have taken the time to meet with me and the citizens group which has formed as a result of my challenge to those listed to meet with me every Friday at 9AM.

Readdressing the alleged violation of RCW 42.17A.555:

RCW 42.17A.555 is very clear in its language:

No elective official nor any employee of his or her office nor any person appointed to or employed by any public office or agency may use or authorize the use of any of the facilities of a public office or agency, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of assisting a campaign for election of any person to any office or for the promotion of or opposition to any ballot proposition. This video was not produced to aid any campaign, directly or indirectly. RCW 42.17A.555 clearly

states that one must have intent to: “use or authorize the use of any of the facilities of a public office or agency, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of assisting a campaign for election of any person to any office or for the promotion of or opposition to any ballot proposition.”

RCW. 42.17A.555 also states: (See attached RCW)

“However, this does not apply to the following activities:

(3) Activities which are part of the normal and regular conduct of the office or agency.”. This video was produced to inform the public about the extreme increase of violence within our community. Violence that has taken the lives of several young people. It was done as part of my responsibility and duty to inform the public as to the cause of this increase in crime and educate them as to why their law enforcement agencies can no longer keep them safe. It was not done to help any candidate nor was it done to lobby anyone. It was done to invite those listed to come to the table before another young person dies. All of this falls within the confines of subsection (3) “Activities which are part of the normal and regular conduct of the of or agency.”.

As stated before we have used this method of communication with the public for these purposes for nearly a decade. The only difference now is that Mr. Dillion wants to silence any voice that points out the truth of why young people are being shot down on our streets and in their homes. Why young people are dying from drug overdoses and why crime has hit historic levels within our community. Despite Mr. Dillion’s objections, it is my responsibility to inform the public concerning these matters.

Mr. Dillion’s candidate Ms. Waldref made false comments concerning the Sheriff’s Office budget, comments that were made publicly on social media. As Sheriff, I have a duty to defend the practices of my agency and set the record straight concerning such matters in order to maintain public confidence in the Office of the Sheriff. Ms. Waldref’s comments were such that left unaddressed could have led to the public believing that we were reckless in our expenditure of public funds, and as such her comments became fair game in my explaining to the public the false nature of her comments and her extreme record of supporting policies and laws that weaken the public’s safety.

This was in no way an effort to promote her opponent nor hurt her campaign. It was simply a statement of fact. In sum, there was no intent to aid her opponent nor hurt her campaign. This matter would have faded quickly from the public’s view, however now due to Mr. Dillion’s attempt to silence an elected official on Ms. Waldref’s behalf, this matter will see several more news cycles based on the public disclosure requests this investigation will surly spawn. Public disclosure request which will result in more press conferences concerning this investigation and its findings. All of which, in my opinion, was Mr. Dillion’s overall intent in filing this erroneous complaint.

RCW 42.17A.555

Use of public office or agency facilities in campaigns—Prohibition—Exceptions.

No elective official nor any employee of his or her office nor any person appointed to or employed by any public office or agency may use or authorize the use of any of the facilities of a public office or agency, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of assisting a campaign for election of any person to any office or for the promotion of or opposition to any ballot proposition.

Facilities of a public office or agency include, but are not limited to, use of stationery, postage,

machines, and equipment, use of employees of the office or agency during working hours, vehicles, office space, publications of the office or agency, and clientele lists of persons served by the office or agency. **However, this does not apply to the following activities:**

(1) Action taken at an open public meeting by members of an elected legislative body or by an elected board, council, or commission of a special purpose district including, but not limited to, fire districts, public hospital districts, library districts, park districts, port districts, public utility districts, school districts, sewer districts, and water districts, to express a collective decision, or to actually vote upon a motion, proposal, resolution, order, or ordinance, or to support or oppose a ballot proposition so long as (a) any required notice of the meeting includes the title and number of the ballot proposition, and (b) members of the legislative body, members of the board, council, or commission of the special purpose district, or members of the public are afforded an approximately equal opportunity for the expression of an opposing view;

(2) A statement by an elected official in support of or in opposition to any ballot proposition at an open press conference or in response to a specific inquiry;

(3) Activities which are part of the normal and regular conduct of the office or agency.

(4) This section does not apply to any person who is a state officer or state employee as defined in RCW [42.52.010](#).

RCW [42.17A.635](#)

Legislative activities of state agencies, other units of government, elective officials, employees.

(1) The house of representatives and the senate shall report annually: The total budget; the portion of the total attributed to staff; and the number of full-time and part-time staff positions by assignment, with dollar figures as well as number of positions.

(2) Unless authorized by subsection (3) of this section or otherwise expressly authorized by law, no public funds may be used directly or indirectly for lobbying. However, this does not prevent officers or employees of an agency from communicating with a member of the legislature on the request of that member; or communicating to the legislature, through the proper official channels, requests for legislative action or appropriations that are deemed necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business or actually made in the proper performance of their official duties. This subsection does not apply to the legislative branch.

(3) Any agency, not otherwise expressly authorized by law, may expend public funds for lobbying, but such lobbying activity shall be limited to (a) providing information or communicating on matters pertaining to official agency business to any elected official or officer or employee of any agency or (b) advocating the official position or interests of the agency to any elected official or officer or employee of any agency. Public funds may not be expended as a direct or indirect gift or campaign contribution to any elected official or officer or employee of any agency. For the purposes of this subsection, "gift" means a voluntary transfer of any thing of value without consideration of equal or greater value, but does not include informational material transferred for the sole purpose of informing the recipient about matters pertaining to official agency business. This section does not permit the printing of a state publication that has been otherwise prohibited by law.

(4) No elective official or any employee of his or her office or any person appointed to or employed by any public office or agency may use or authorize the use of any of the facilities of a public office or agency, directly or indirectly, in any effort to support or oppose an initiative to

the legislature. "Facilities of a public office or agency" has the same meaning as in RCW [42.17A.555](#) and [42.52.180](#). The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to the following activities:

(a) Action taken at an open public meeting by members of an elected legislative body to express a collective decision, or to actually vote upon a motion, proposal, resolution, order, or ordinance, or to support or oppose an initiative to the legislature so long as (i) any required notice of the meeting includes the title and number of the initiative to the legislature, and (ii) members of the legislative body or members of the public are afforded an approximately equal opportunity for the expression of an opposing view;

(b) A statement by an elected official in support of or in opposition to any initiative to the legislature at an open press conference or in response to a specific inquiry;

(c) Activities that are part of the normal and regular conduct of the office or agency;

(d) Activities conducted regarding an initiative to the legislature that would be permitted under RCW [42.17A.555](#) and [42.52.180](#) if conducted regarding other ballot measures.

(5) Each state agency, county, city, town, municipal corporation, quasi-municipal corporation, or special purpose district that expends public funds for lobbying shall file with the commission, except as exempted by (d) of this subsection, quarterly statements providing the following information for the quarter just completed:

(a) The name of the agency filing the statement;

(b) The name, title, and job description and salary of each elected official, officer, or employee who lobbied, a general description of the nature of the lobbying, and the proportionate amount of time spent on the lobbying;

(c) A listing of expenditures incurred by the agency for lobbying including but not limited to travel, consultant or other special contractual services, and brochures and other publications, the principal purpose of which is to influence legislation;

(d) For purposes of this subsection, "lobbying" does not include:

(i) Requests for appropriations by a state agency to the office of financial management pursuant to chapter [43.88](#) RCW nor requests by the office of financial management to the legislature for appropriations other than its own agency budget requests;

(ii) Recommendations or reports to the legislature in response to a legislative request expressly requesting or directing a specific study, recommendation, or report by an agency on a particular subject;

(iii) Official reports including recommendations submitted to the legislature on an annual or biennial basis by a state agency as required by law;

(iv) Requests, recommendations, or other communication between or within state agencies or between or within local agencies;

(v) Any other lobbying to the extent that it includes:

(A) Telephone conversations or preparation of written correspondence;

(B) In-person lobbying on behalf of an agency of no more than four days or parts thereof during any three-month period by officers or employees of that agency and in-person lobbying by any elected official of such agency on behalf of such agency or in connection with the powers, duties, or compensation of such official. The total expenditures of nonpublic funds made in connection with such lobbying for or on behalf of any one or more members of the legislature or state elected officials or public officers or employees of the state of Washington may not exceed fifteen dollars for any three-month period. The exemption under this subsection

(5)(d)(v)(B) is in addition to the exemption provided in (d)(v)(A) of this subsection;

(C) Preparation or adoption of policy positions.

The statements shall be in the form and the manner prescribed by the commission and shall be filed within one month after the end of the quarter covered by the report.

(6) In lieu of reporting under subsection (5) of this section, any county, city, town, municipal corporation, quasi municipal corporation, or special purpose district may determine and so notify the public disclosure commission that elected officials, officers, or employees who, on behalf of any such local agency, engage in lobbying reportable under subsection (5) of this section shall register and report such reportable lobbying in the same manner as a lobbyist who is required to register and report under RCW [42.17A.600](#) and [42.17A.615](#). Each such local agency shall report as a lobbyist employer pursuant to RCW [42.17A.630](#).

(7) The provisions of this section do not relieve any elected official or officer or employee of an agency from complying with other provisions of this chapter, if such elected official, officer, or employee is not otherwise exempted.

(8) The purpose of this section is to require each state agency and certain local agencies to report the identities of those persons who lobby on behalf of the agency for compensation, together with certain separately identifiable and measurable expenditures of an agency's funds for that purpose. This section shall be reasonably construed to accomplish that purpose and not to require any agency to report any of its general overhead cost or any other costs that relate only indirectly or incidentally to lobbying or that are equally attributable to or inseparable from nonlobbying activities of the agency.

The public disclosure commission may adopt rules clarifying and implementing this legislative interpretation and policy.

EXHIBIT F



PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION

711 Capitol Way Rm. 206, PO Box 40908 • Olympia, Washington 98504-0908 • (360) 753-1111 • FAX (360) 753-1112

Toll Free 1-877-601-2828 • E-mail: pdcc@pdcc.wa.gov • Website: www.pdcc.wa.gov

October 27, 2022

Delivered electronically to Ozzie Knezovich at “ozzieknezovich@gmail.com”

Subject: Brief Enforcement Hearing Notice; PDC Case Number 105472

Dear Sheriff Knezovich:

The Public Disclosure Commission (PDC) is investigating a complaint filed on March 7, 2022 by Paul Dillon. The original complaint and additional information added by PDC staff, alleges that you violated: (1) RCW 42.17A.555 by using the public facilities of the Spokane County Sheriff's Office to oppose Amber Waldref, a candidate for Spokane County Commissioner in the 2022 election; and (2) RCW 42.17A.635(2) for engaging in prohibited indirect lobbying by encouraging members of the public to contact legislators regarding legislative changes.

In accordance with RCW 42.17A.110 and RCW 42.17A.755, a Brief Adjudicative Proceeding (Brief Enforcement Hearing) has been scheduled to determine if you violated RCW 42.17A.555 and RCW 42.17A.635(2). Under the Brief Enforcement Hearing rules, the Presiding Officer has the authority to assess a civil penalty in accordance with WAC 390-37-143, a penalty schedule adopted by the Commission (see enclosed copy).

HEARING INFORMATION

Date and time:	Thursday, November 17, 2022 at 1:00 p.m.
Place:	Remotely from Olympia Live Audio and Online Transmission
Presiding Officer:	Fred Jarrett, Chair, Public Disclosure Commission
Authority:	RCW 42.17A and WAC 390

HOW TO AVOID THE HEARING

To avoid the Brief Enforcement Hearing, please take all the following steps:

Mail the following items to the PDC so they are postmarked on or before **November 11, 2022**:

- A signed *Statement of Understanding* (blank form enclosed); and
- A check or money order in the amount of \$200 for the late-filed report, made payable to “Washington State Treasurer”

Please mail the signed *Statement of Understanding* and \$200 payment to the following address:

**Public Disclosure Commission
PO Box 40908
Olympia, WA 98504-0908**

PARTICIPATING IN THE HEARING VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

The Brief Enforcement Hearing will be audio and video recorded. The Presiding Officer and PDC Staff will attend in-person or remotely via Microsoft Teams videoconferencing platform.

➤ **PLEASE READ the entire instructions below *prior* to the day of the hearing if you plan to participate via MS Teams.**

Please note that you may be prompted to download the MS Teams app or use a supported browser (Microsoft Edge or Google Chrome) for best performance.

Anyone wishing to participate in the hearing remotely must follow the instructions below and join the meeting on a computer or mobile app **promptly at 1:00 p.m. on November 17, 2022**. Please remain in the meeting until the Presiding Officer calls your name and case number. After your case has been heard, you may leave or stay in the meeting.

Please note that you must stay muted at all times except while your case is being heard.

Join on your computer or mobile app:

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

If you are unable to use Teams or experience technical difficulties, please call the PDC’s main number 1-360-753-1111 to obtain information regarding alternate participation by telephone. you.

If you have any questions about the hearing process prior to the hearing date, please contact Jennifer Hansen by email at pdcc@pdcc.wa.gov – and be sure to reference your case number in the subject line of the email.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hansen
Compliance Officer



Enclosures

- Statement of Understanding
- PDC Penalty Schedule

EXHIBIT G



State of Washington
PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION
711 Capitol Way Rm. 206, PO Box 40908 • Olympia, Washington 98504-0908
(360) 753-1111 • FAX (360) 753-1112
Toll Free 1-877-601-2828 • E-mail: pdcc@pdcc.wa.gov • Website: www.pdcc.wa.gov

BEFORE THE PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

In Re: Compliance with RCW 42.17A

KNEZOVICH, OZZIE

Respondent.

PDC Case 105472

Findings of Fact,
Conclusions of Law, and
Order Imposing Fine

Pursuant to the notice of brief enforcement hearing (brief adjudicative proceeding) sent to Ozzie Knezovich on October 27, 2022, a brief adjudicative proceeding was held on November 17, 2022, remotely from Olympia, WA by live audio and online transmission. The purpose of the hearing was to consider whether the Respondent violated: (1) RCW 42.17A.555 by using the public facilities of the Spokane County Sheriff's Office to oppose Amber Waldref, a candidate for Spokane County Commissioner in the 2022 election; and (2) RCW 42.17A.635(2) for engaging in prohibited indirect lobbying by encouraging members of the public to contact legislators regarding legislative changes.

The hearing was held in accordance with Chapters 34.05 RCW, 42.17A RCW and Chapter 390-37 WAC. Commissioner Fred Jarrett was the Presiding Officer. The Commission staff was represented by Compliance Officer Jennifer Hansen. The Respondent did not participate in the hearing or submit any written materials.

Having considered the evidence, the Presiding Officer finds as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Respondent is the current Spokane County Sheriff and did not seek re-election in the 2022 election.
2. On March 7, 2022, PDC staff received a complaint filed by Paul Dillon alleging that Ozzie Knezovich had violated RCW 42.17A.555 by using the public facilities of the Spokane County Sheriff's Office to oppose Amber Waldref, a candidate for Spokane County Commissioner in the 2022 election. During the investigation, PDC staff added an additional violation of RCW 42.17A.635(2) for engaging in prohibited indirect lobbying by encouraging members of the public to contact legislators regarding legislative changes.

3. On March 17, 2022, Sheriff Knezovich submitted a written response to the original complaint filed by Paul Dillon alleging a violation of RCW 42.17A.555.
4. On August 18, 2022, Sheriff Knezovich submitted a written response to the second allegation added by PDC staff alleging a violation of RCW 42.17A.635(2).
5. The Respondent has no prior violations.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the above facts, as a matter of law, the Presiding Officer concludes as follows:

1. This matter was duly and properly convened, and all jurisdictional, substantive, and procedural requirements have been satisfied.
2. The Respondent violated: (1) RCW 42.17A.555 by using the public facilities of the Spokane County Sheriff's Office to oppose Amber Waldref, a candidate for Spokane County Commissioner in the 2022 election; and (2) RCW 42.17A.635(2) for engaging in prohibited indirect lobbying by encouraging members of the public to contact legislators regarding legislative changes.

ORDER

ON the basis of the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law,

1. **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Respondent is assessed a total civil penalty of \$300, in accordance with the Brief Enforcement penalty schedule set forth in WAC 390-37-143.**
2. **It is further ordered that \$100 of the \$300 penalty is suspended on the following conditions:**
 - a. **The Respondent submits the signed Statement of Understanding (SOU) acknowledging violations of RCW 42.17A.555 and RCW 42.17A.635(2) within 30 days of the date of this Order.**
 - b. **The Respondent pays the \$200 non-suspended civil penalty within 30 days of the date of this Order.**
 - a. **It is further ordered that, if the Respondent fails to comply with any of the above conditions the full \$300 penalty shall immediately become due without further action by the Commission and PDC Staff is directed to refer the matter to collections and/or commence other legal proceedings as authorized by RCW 42.17A and 390 WAC.**

Finding, Conclusions & Order
Knezovich, Ozzie
PDC Case 105472
Page - 3 –

This is an **Initial Order** of the Public Disclosure Commission.

Entered this 15th of December, 2022.

Public Disclosure Commission

Electronically signed by Peter Lavallee
Peter Lavallee
Executive Director

I, Jennifer Hansen, certify that I emailed a copy of this order to the Respondent at their email address of record, on the date entered above.

Electronically Signed Jennifer Hansen

12/15/2022

APPEALS OF INITIAL ORDER

REVIEW OF INITIAL ORDER - BY THE COMMISSION

You may request that the full Commission review this initial order. To seek review, you must:

- Make the request by email, stating the reason for review, and identifying what alleged errors are contained in the initial order. *See* WAC 390-37-144(1).
- All requests for review must be submitted electronically to pdc@pdc.wa.gov **REQUESTS FOR REVIEW MUST BE RECEIVED BY THE COMMISSION WITHIN TWENTY-ONE (21) CALENDAR DAYS AFTER THE THIS INITIAL ORDER WAS ELECTRONICALLY DISTRIBUTED TO YOU.**

If review of this initial order is timely requested, the full Commission will hear the matter. If the Commission is unable to schedule a meeting to consider the request within twenty (20) calendar days, this initial order becomes a final order, and any request for review will automatically be considered a request for reconsideration of a final order. *See* WAC 390-37-144(4). The matter would then be scheduled for consideration and disposition at the next Commission meeting at which it is practicable to do so.

A Respondent does not need to pay a penalty until after the Commission rules on a request for review of an initial order.

FURTHER APPEAL RIGHTS – SUPERIOR COURT

If the Commission does not receive a request for review of this initial order within twenty-one (21) calendar days, the initial order shall be the FINAL ORDER. *See* WAC 390-37-142(7).

YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO APPEAL A FINAL ORDER TO SUPERIOR COURT, PURSUANT TO THE PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW PROVISIONS OF RCW 34.05.542.

EXHIBIT H

Ms. Hansen,

I would like to officially request an appeal of the PDC's decision concerning PDC case number 105472. The commission found I violated RCW's 42.17A.555 and RCW 42.17A.635(2). The violation concerning RCW 42.17A.555 involved Paul Dillion's complaint against me alleging: "Sheriff Ozzie Knezovich has used public facilities to assist a candidate's campaign for Spokane County Commission in violation of RCW 42.17A.555 by posting a YouTube video (available here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5UgxCoH6fsU>) which amounts to an independent expenditure opposing the candidacy of a candidate for County Commission. The violation concerning **RCW 42.17A.635(2)** found that I indirectly lobbied the state legislators mentioned in a two-part video series I made concerning the rise of violent crime in the Spokane County area.

Regarding violation of **RCW 42.17A.555**, the video in which the alleged violation occurred was part 2 of a two-part series of videos which were a total of 24 minutes and 13 seconds in length. The focus of this video series was the rising number of violent shootings in our community. The Spokane County Sheriff's Office has used our YouTube Channel to communicate with the citizens of Spokane County for years. **RCW 42.17A.555 Use of public office or agency facilities in campaigns subsection (3)** clearly states "Activities which are part of the normal and regular conduct of the office or agency." is an exemption relating to this RCW.

In order for there to be a violation of **RCW 42.17A.555**, there must be evidence that I created the video, "... for the purpose of assisting a campaign for election of any person to any office...". There is no evidence that the video was created for the purpose of assisting anyone's campaign. This is evidenced based on the content of the entire video series, which was the rise of violent shootings in the Spokane County area and providing information to the citizens of Spokane County as to those responsible for the policies enabling those committing these crimes. The fact the portion of the video mentioning Ms. Waldref was 1 minute and 20 seconds long compared to the total length of the video series, 24 minutes and 13 seconds, clearly shows that neither Ms. Waldref nor her campaign were the main subjects of the videos.

It should be noted, Ms. Waldref is a former councilwoman for the City of Spokane, which makes her a public figure. The fact that she is running for office also makes her a public figure. With that said all of the individuals in the video are either elected officials, governmental appointees or leaders of organizations within the Spokane County area and the state of Washington which also makes them public figures. They support or have created policies which have led to an increase in violent and non-violent crimes in the Spokane County area. Pointing these facts out in a video does not constitute attacking or attempting to campaign for any would-be opponent.

On November 3, 2021, Ms. Waldref made false and disparaging comments concerning myself and the Sheriff's Office via Twitter: "Replying to @lisa4progress @SheriffOzzie Wow. @spokanecounty had to do some financial gymnastics to close a \$6 million budget deficit last year. And this how our limited public dollars are being spent? Where is the budget accountability?" As Sheriff, I have an obligation to my agency and the community to set the

record straight concerning such comments made by a former elected official regardless of her status as a candidate. Ms. Waldref made these comments knowing that she intended to run for the open commissioner position. See attached screenshot of said Twitter post.

Regarding violation of **RCW 42.17A.635(2) Legislative activities of state agencies, other units of government, elective officials, employees**, this allegation is in reference to portions of the videos in question in which I state:

1. "Sheriff, who should we be talking to about getting you the tools and the ability to take care of these issues?"
2. "passed, sponsored reforms... that damaged our ability to keep you safe."

It is alleged that quote number one, "Sheriff, who should we be talking to about getting you the tools and the ability to take care of these issues?" is "potentially problematic", because the answer I give highlights "the three legislators who passed and sponsored a bill that adversely affected your job as a law enforcement professional". I would point out, at no time in the video series do I request anyone to contact these legislators nor do I ask anyone to lobby these legislators for "tools" or any other action to increase my "ability to take care of these issues".

I would first point out that while I am a law enforcement professional, I am also an elected official in the State of Washington. As the elected Sheriff I have a duty and responsibility to communicate with the public. In this video I simply state a question that I am often asked by citizens. This is no different than if I had been asked the same question during a press conference. I might add, I have been asked these same questions during press conferences and have given the same answers. The Sheriff's Office uses social media as an information link to the public just the same as we do when conducting a press conference. We tape the majority of our press conferences and post them on social media in the same manner as this public address to the public was posted.

The next portion of the alleged violation concerns my identification of those responsible for the current policies and laws being set and passed which are destroying the quality of life for my constituents and killing young people within our community. Again, no time in the video do I request, nor was it my direct or indirect intent, for anyone to contact those identified as being responsible for the current crime cataclysm facing the State of Washington.

As stated above I did not request anyone to contact those identified in the video and this is evidenced not only by the lack of such request, but also by the fact that I invited those listed in the video to meet with me so we could work together in order to find common ground to resolve these issues. To this date only Senator Billig and Representative Riccelli have taken the time to meet with me. The nature of the meeting was to ask me for an apology and to inform me that my mentioning members of the African American community in the video was akin to a white supremacist tactic used to divide the black community. Neither of these State officials have taken the time to meet with me and the citizens group which has formed as a result of my challenge to those listed to meet with me every Friday at 9AM.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ozzie Knezovich

EXHIBIT I



STATE OF WASHINGTON

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE COMMISSION

711 Capitol Way Rm. 206, PO Box 40908 • Olympia, Washington 98504-0908 • (360) 753-1111 • FAX (360) 753-1112 Toll Free 1-877-601-2828 • E-mail: pdcc@pdc.wa.gov • Website: www.pdc.wa.gov

January 13, 2023

OZZIE KNEZOVICH
PO BOX 2954
ROCK SPRINGS WY 89902

Also delivered electronically to Ozzie Knezovich at "ozzieknezovich@gmail.com"

Subject: Initial Order Reconsideration Hearing Notice, PDC Case Number 105472

RECONSIDERATION REQUEST HEARING NOTICE

Date and time: Thursday, January 26, 2023 at 1:45 p.m.
Place: Remotely from Olympia
Live Audio and Online Transmission
Presiding Officer: Public Disclosure Commission
Authority: RCW 42.17A and WAC 390

On the above date, the Public Disclosure Commission (PDC) will hold an Initial Order Reconsideration Hearing pursuant to RCW 42.17A and Chapter 390-28 WAC, concerning your request to reconsider the Initial Order entered on December 15, 2022, in PDC Case 105472.

The PDC received your request for an appeal of the Initial Order issued in PDC Case 105472. However, because the Commission was not scheduled to meet within twenty days after the date of your request for review, it is considered a request for Reconsideration under WAC 390-37-144.



Your participation in the hearing is not required, but the PDC recommends participation whenever possible. This will provide you the opportunity to provide testimony or answer any questions the Commission may have regarding your request that were not included in your written materials.

PARTICIPATING VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

The Enforcement Hearing will be audio and video recorded. Some Commission members and staff will be in-person at the PDC office in Olympia and some will join the meeting remotely.

PLEASE READ THE ENTIRE INSTRUCTION Prior to joining the meeting

How to participate remotely in the Washington State Public Disclosure Commission Meeting on January 26, 2023:

Please note you may be prompted to download MS TEAMS App or use a supported browser: Microsoft Edge  or Chrome  for best performance.

Participation Remote via MS Teams

On the date of the meeting and at the designated agenda time you will Join:

Microsoft Teams meeting info for (January 26, 2023)

Join on your computer or mobile app [Click here to join the meeting](#)

Please remember to **Mute** yourself and turn your **camera off** when you are not talking.

Or call in (audio only)

+1 564-999-2000 United States, Olympia

Phone Conference ID: 392 988 995#

If you experience technical difficulties with the MS Teams participation after the meeting has started at 1:45 p.m., call the PDC's main number 1-360-753-1111 and staff will try to assist you.

If you have any questions about the hearing process prior to the hearing date, please contact Jennifer Hansen by email at pdcc@pdc.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hansen
PDC Compliance Officer