

State of  
Washington  
House of  
Representatives



***Delivered via E-mail***

March 25, 2022

Representative Robert Sutherland  
House of Representatives  
470 John L. O'Brien Building  
PO Box 40600  
Olympia, WA 98504

Dear Representative Sutherland:

This letter is a formal reprimand for your inappropriate behavior toward a legislative employee on the morning of Saturday, March 5, 2022. Additionally, your subsequent action of filing a counter complaint and speaking in a disparaging way about the legislative employee to the media is retaliatory in nature and is also prohibited. These actions violate the House of Representatives' Policy related to Retaliation and a Respectful Workplace as well as the Legislative Code of Conduct. Additionally, because your behavior potentially violates RCW 42.52.070, Special Privileges, we will be forwarding this matter to the Legislative Ethics Board for further consideration.

You have been a member of the House of Representatives since January 2019. As a member, you attended the New Member Orientation and received a copy of the House Policy and Procedure Manual, which you are expected to abide by. Specific reference is given to Chapter 1.E. Retaliation is Prohibited (Enclosure A) and Chapter 3. Respectful Workplace (Enclosure B). Additionally, you attended a respectful workplace training as part of the orientation which addressed responsibilities related to conduct. Furthermore, you are bound to the Washington State Legislature's Code of Conduct.

On March 4, 2022, you entered House facilities and worked in your office at the John L. O'Brien Building. You failed to adhere to the House testing protocols by failing to test for COVID-19. Your inability to follow the testing protocol resulted in your being escorted out of the John L. O'Brien building later that evening.

Subsequently, the following morning you again attempted to enter the John L. O'Brien Building at 9:57:01 AM and 9:57:07 AM. However, in accordance with the House testing protocols, your

Representative Robert Sutherland

March 25, 2022

Page 2 of 5

access to House facilities was denied. A security officer came out to inquire how he might assist you. He went to your office a couple of times to retrieve several items from your office at your request. You left the area but returned later and asked if he could get you into the Legislative Building. He said he did not have access to the Legislative Building but would call someone to see who might be able to assist you. At approximately 11:07 AM, the Sergeant at Arms arrived asking how he could help you.

The allegation at hand is that upon the Sergeant at Arms' arrival to assist you proceeded to yell "Fuck You Sergeant" as he tried to explain that he could not provide you access to either building. You continued swearing and behaving inappropriately toward him until he walked away a few minutes later.

All members and staff have been reminded several times regarding the testing protocols and what is required to gain building access during session. Emails outlining these protocols were sent on January 7, January 11, and most recently February 24, 2022. All three emails provided the time for testing and stated that the testing would be provided until 3:00 PM. You stated in your interview that on Friday, March 4, 2022, you arrived in Olympia after the Covid testing vendor had left for the day and that you were unaware of when you were allowed to test and had therefore missed your opportunity. However, review of keycard logs shows that you were on the capitol campus at least 45 minutes before testing was concluded, with your first keycard swipe recorded at 2:12:59 PM.

During the investigation, you have provided multiple contradictory statements regarding the events that occurred on March 5, 2022. In your first written statement (that you admitted was authored by somebody other than yourself), you claim that the Sergeant at Arms was threatening you through intimidation of violence and that you remained calm and professional throughout the ordeal, and that you eventually displayed a poor demeanor as well, being drawn into a shouting match.

Initially, you stated during the investigative interview held on March 8, 2022, that you could not quite remember what you said to him, but that he initiated the cursing. However, on the rally podium you shared with those present that you told the Sergeant at Arms, "Fuck You." Upon being reminded of that during the interview, you then admitted that you did say that to him. However, you stated that it was only in response to him first using the language toward you and because you were fearful of his intimidating approach, demeanor, and mannerisms. You stated that you thought you were going to be thrown to the ground and arrested. You also stated during the investigative interview that technically you did not violate House policy because you did not know who the Sergeant at Arms was at the time you told him "Fuck You." These two statements are contradictory, and both cannot be true. Furthermore, whether you knew you were talking to the Sergeant at Arms, or another staff member does not change the inappropriateness of your comment as our Code of Conduct requires that you "treat **all** others with respect, dignity, and civility, regardless of status or position."

You further claim that the Sergeant at Arms rushed up to you from his car, suddenly and unexpectedly, while acting unprofessionally and yelling at you in an agitated state. You claim that he continued his conversation with you in that manner causing you fear of harm. However, your claims are not corroborated by the security video of his approach, photos of your short conversation, or the statement from other witnesses on site.

You provided a media interview on March 9, 2022, sharing your version of the events that occurred on Friday afternoon and the morning in question. You subsequently submitted another revised written statement on March 10, 2022. Your revised written statement appears to soften the words you admitted during the investigative interview that you used toward him, "listen buddy, your [sic] wrong" rather than "listen idiot,...I'll educate you on something." While your revised written statement does include the foul language you used toward this employee, it leaves out the part you previously stated about him talking to you in a threatening manner, but adds information about him rushing toward you from his car.

Your multiple contradictory versions (statements on the rally podium, two written statements, investigative interview, media statement, and media interview) of the sequence of the interaction appear to be continually refined to reflect your actions in a way to absolve you of your conduct. Such changes in your story in quick succession so soon after the event are questionable. Additionally, the story of what occurred from the witness's perspective was unwavering and corroborated by video and other witnesses. This is concerning and contributes to a lack of credibility on your part. You did admit during the investigative interview that your actions did not align with our Respectful Workplace policy or our Code of Conduct. The Sergeant at Arms admittedly responded with similar language as he walked away from the conversation and his behavior has been addressed.

You stated during the investigative interview that you were immediately remorseful for your behavior, yet you bragged about your behavior approximately an hour after the incident while speaking at a rally on campus (as captured on Twitter). Calling out the staff position with whom you had recently interacted in an inciteful way on the podium, claiming that you had almost been arrested, potentially could have brought harm to the individual or to other security on site that day.

Furthermore, in addition to the statements to press discussed above where you have attempted to portray the Sergeant at Arms as the instigator in this incident, you have also filed a complaint against the Sergeant at Arms. However, the investigation, which includes video footage and witness statements, does not corroborate your allegations, and your complaint is deemed unfounded. Additionally, your filing of the complaint and media statements against staff who participated in protected activity is retaliatory in nature and is prohibited.

House Policy Chapter 3, *Respectful Workplace*, states in pertinent parts:

- “The House is committed to creating and maintaining a diverse work environment that is free from discrimination and harassment, and where all people are treated, and are expected to treat others, with dignity and respect. The House does not condone or tolerate discriminatory, harassing, retaliatory, intimidating, offensive, or disrespectful conduct prohibited by this policy.”
- Part B, *Prohibited Conduct*, “Prohibited conduct exists in the workplace when: ...(3) the conduct unreasonably interferes with the individual’s job performance or creates a work environment that is hostile, intimidating, or offensive.”

The Legislative Code of Conduct states in part,

“As stewards of the public trust, each member of the legislative community is expected to:

- Conduct themselves with self-awareness, self-respect, and professionalism;
- Treat **all** others with respect, dignity, and civility, regardless of status or position; and
- Refrain from engaging in hostile, intimidating, offensive, or unlawful activities or behaviors that may amount to discrimination, harassment, sexual harassment, or bullying.

This Code of Conduct applies **equally and at all times to all members** of the legislative community, both on and off the capitol campus.” (**emphasis added**)

The House of Representatives takes violations of policy, procedure, and expectations regarding a respectful workplace seriously. We have put considerable energy in developing a culture that supports respect and we do not tolerate or perpetuate harassment or inappropriate comments to our members or employees regardless of how they treat us. We are each accountable for our own behavior.

House Policy Chapter 1.E., *Retaliation is Prohibited*, states:

Employees should report violations of any policy contained in this manual, or of any other policy of the House, to their staff director or the Chief Clerk. No retaliation shall be permitted against any legislative employee for reporting in good faith the violation of any policy or law.

You filed your counterclaim against the Sergeant at Arms following your investigative interview, which appears to be in direct response to your recognizing that he had reported in good faith your violation of House policy.

Your response to date reflects a lack of accountability as you continue to blame others for your actions. As an elected Member, in a position of power, you are expected to model respectful behavior. Additionally, your caucus leadership has previously provided you verbal counseling on similar inappropriate behavior with staff. We expect you to contribute to our culture of

Representative Robert Sutherland

March 25, 2022

Page 5 of 5

excellence in a healthy and appropriate manner. Therefore, we believe this reprimand is necessary to impress upon you the serious nature of your actions.

We are directing you to attend a refresher course of respectful workplace expectations as well as to attend House approved constructive conflict coaching. Specifically, you will be required to attend these activities at House cost at the first available opportunity, but no later than June 30, 2022. If not completed by the required date, your access to staff will be restricted.

We have concerns that your actions may violate RCW 42.52.070. Therefore, this matter is also being forwarded to the Legislative Ethics Board for further consideration.

Any future occurrence of inappropriate behavior may subject you to immediate loss of access to House staff and/or revocation of building access privileges.

You have the right to appeal this reprimand. You may do so by submitting a written appeal, signed by yourself, to the Executive Rules Committee within 30 calendar days of today. Your appeal must state the nature of the appeal and be filed with my office.

It is important that you understand that retaliation is prohibited per House Policy and Procedure Manual, Chapter 1.E. Retaliation.

If there are other methods you feel would be important for you to be successful in meeting these expectations, please let us know. We stand ready to support your success moving forward.

Sincerely,



Bernard Dean, Chief Clerk  
House of Representatives

Enclosures:

A – House Policy and Procedure Manual, Chapter 1.E. Retaliation is Prohibited

B – House Policy and Procedure Manual, Chapter 3. Respectful Workplace

cc: House Counsel

---

# **CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION**

---

## **A. DISCLAIMER**

---

The policies and statements contained in this manual are presented as a matter of information only and do not constitute a promise of any kind. While the House believes wholeheartedly in the policies and procedures in this manual, they are not designed to be, nor do they create, an employment contract.

The House may change or revoke any or all of the provisions of this manual at any time without notice and may act apart from these described procedures when considered appropriate in its sole discretion. All employment with the House is to be considered employment that is terminable-at-will and, therefore, may be terminated at any time, without liability, without notice, and without cause, except a cause that violates law or public policy, by either the House or the employee. No representative or House employee has any authority to enter into an agreement contrary to at-will employment.

The House is committed to maintaining a work environment where all people are treated, and expected to treat others, with dignity and respect. Communicating policies and expectations by means of this manual is one of the ways we work toward that goal. This manual is intended to be a source of information on current policies and procedures of the House and the procedures available to employees when they feel they are being treated in a manner inconsistent with House policy. All forms referenced in this manual are included in the Appendix.

## **B. CIVIL SERVICE EXEMPT**

---

All legislative employees are exempt from state civil service law (RCW 41.06.070 (1) (a.)) and Washington State Merit System Rules. The House is not subject to the customary governmental employee tenure regulations, and there are no guarantees of permanent status providing job security from summary termination, reassignment of responsibilities, or change in working conditions. References in this manual to the RCW or the WAC do not, in any way, negate the civil service exemption of employees of the House.

The Chief Clerk is the employment authority for the House. Only the Chief Clerk has authority to hire and terminate an employee's employment with the House.

## **C. AMENDMENTS & IMPLEMENTATION**

---

It is the responsibility of the House Executive Rules Committee to adopt and, when necessary, modify this manual.

## **D. HOUSE RULES**

---

In addition to guidance on parliamentary procedure, the House Rules regulate some aspects of employee behavior including: prohibiting employee lobbying, limiting access to the House Floor, detailing procedures for the distribution of materials to members on the Floor, prohibiting smoking in House facilities, and mandating strict adherence to the liquor laws for consumption of alcohol in House facilities. The House Rules are incorporated herein by reference. If a provision of this manual is inconsistent with the House Rules, the House Rules shall prevail. The House Rules are posted on the House Internet web site.

## **E. RETALIATION IS PROHIBITED**

---

Employees should report violations of any policy contained in this manual, or of any other policy of the House, to their staff director or the Chief Clerk. No retaliation shall be permitted against any legislative employee for reporting in good faith the violation of any policy or law.

---

## **CHAPTER 3: RESPECTFUL WORKPLACE**

---

The House of Representatives respects the dignity and value of each employee and member. The House is committed to creating and maintaining a diverse work environment that is free from discrimination and harassment, and where all people are treated, and are expected to treat others, with dignity and respect. The House does not condone or tolerate discriminatory, harassing, retaliatory, intimidating, offensive, or disrespectful conduct prohibited by this policy.

The House seeks to foster a safe environment to report potential violations of this policy and considers such reporting to be a benefit to the organization. Recognizing the unique power dynamics of the legislative environment, the House will use the process in this chapter to address allegations of violations of this policy. The House will handle complaints in a manner that is apolitical, impartial, prompt, thorough, and respectful. The process will be as discrete and transparent as practical. To prevent inappropriate conduct from occurring, the House will provide regular mandatory training to employees and members.

### **A. APPLICATION OF POLICY**

---

This policy covers and protects all employees and members of the House participating in the legislative community and engaging in the business of the House, both on and off the capitol campus. Behavior that does not rise to the level of unlawful conduct under federal, or state law may still violate this policy.

### **B. PROHIBITED CONDUCT**

---

The House prohibits discrimination and harassment based on a person's protected status, abusive behavior and bullying regardless of the basis for the conduct, and retaliation. Prohibited conduct is described in more detail in this part B.

Prohibited conduct exists in the workplace when: (1) submission to the conduct is either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of current and future employment; (2) submission to or rejection of the conduct is used as the basis of an employment decision affecting an individual; or (3) the conduct unreasonably interferes with the individual's job performance or creates a work environment that is hostile, intimidating, or offensive.

Violations of this policy will result in appropriate disciplinary action as specified in part F of this chapter.

#### **1. DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT**

The House prohibits discrimination or harassment based on a person's race, creed, color, national origin, gender, gender expression or identity, sexual orientation, religion, marital status, family status, pregnancy, military or veteran status, age, genetic status, and/or physical, mental, or sensory disability, use of a service animal, and any other status protected by federal or state law.

Prohibited discrimination may take many forms. One type of prohibited discrimination is harassment, which is conduct that is unwelcome and is based on a person's protected status. Harassment itself can take many forms. It can include:

- Comments, jokes, innuendoes, questions, stories, conversations, cartoons, or pranks
- Physical, mental, and emotional intimidation, touching, ostracizing, or blocking or impeding someone's freedom of movement
- Slurs, epithets, or displayed symbols

In addition to the examples listed above, sexual harassment can also include:

- Unsolicited and unwelcome sexual advances or propositions

## CHAPTER 3: RESPECTFUL WORKPLACE

- Requests for “dates” or other social encounters that may be inappropriate because of past rejections, power dynamic, or other circumstances
- Comments about a person’s appearance of a sexual or suggestive nature or at unacceptable times or frequency
- Unwelcome or unacceptable conduct such as touching or invasions of personal space
- Repeated and unwelcome electronic communication of a sexual, suggestive, or personal nature

### **2. ABUSIVE BEHAVIOR AND BULLYING**

Abusive behavior and bullying are also prohibited, regardless of the basis for the conduct. Bullying is repeated and unreasonable actions of one or more persons that are threatening, humiliating, degrading, or intimidating. Bullying can take many forms and may include intimidation, isolation, verbal abuse, undermining, sabotage, unreasonable work expectations, inappropriate use of staff, or psychological mistreatment such as humiliating, manipulating, or instilling fear.

### **3. RETALIATION**

Retaliation against any person who reports or participates in an investigation or proceeding relating to a potential violation of this policy is prohibited. Examples of retaliation include adverse employment actions or retaliatory harassment, such as ostracism or threat of an adverse employment action.

## **C. MAKING A COMPLAINT**

Employees or members who experience, witness, or learn of what may be discrimination, harassment, bullying, or retaliation are strongly encouraged to come forward. This may be done in person or in writing, including email. The employee or member may report the behavior to any of the following individuals:

1. The employee’s own supervisor
2. Any other supervisor
3. The Chief Clerk or Deputy Chief Clerk
4. The House Counsel

If a situation involves immediate threats to safety or violent behavior, an employee or member is encouraged to contact House Security or law enforcement directly. Such contact does not preclude the House from taking action pursuant to this policy.

When an employee or member comes forward with a complaint, the House cannot promise complete confidentiality, due to the need to investigate the issue properly. However, the identity of the complainant and other witnesses and the details of the allegations will be kept as confidential as practical as described in part E of this chapter.

If it is determined that a complaint is malicious in nature, the complainant may be subject to disciplinary action. This does not apply to complaints that are made in good faith, regardless of whether a decision is made that the alleged behavior violates this policy.

### D. HOUSE RESPONSE TO COMPLAINTS

---

All supervisors have a responsibility to take employee concerns and complaints seriously. When a supervisor learns of, witnesses, or receives a complaint regarding a potential violation of this policy, the supervisor should talk with the complainant or the affected employee to determine if further investigation is warranted.

Supervisors should provide information about the House's process of addressing violations of this policy and ask what the employee wants to happen next. If the nature of the concerns and the wishes of the affected employee warrant a simple intervention, a supervisor may handle a matter informally. The supervisor may explain to the offender the impact of their actions and require the conduct not reoccur.

If further investigation is warranted, the supervisor will notify the House Counsel or Chief Clerk. If a supervisor is in doubt as to whether a particular situation warrants investigation, they should consult with the House Counsel. The supervisor must document the initial report and any actions taken. Either the supervisor or House Counsel will keep the complainant updated throughout the process.

If an employee chooses, the employee may communicate directly with the person who is engaging in unwelcome conduct. If practical, the employee should bring a witness for this discussion. While nothing prohibits an employee from addressing a matter directly, it is not a prerequisite to making a complaint.

### E. INVESTIGATIONS

---

The House will investigate all allegations that may constitute a violation of this policy. The House may pursue an investigation on its own accord based on information from any person regardless of whether there is a complaint.

Investigations will be conducted as promptly as possible. The promptness of the investigation is mainly dependent on the complexity of the facts and the number and availability of witnesses.

When an employee comes forward with a complaint, the House cannot promise complete confidentiality, due to the need to investigate the allegations properly. However, the identity of the complainant and other witnesses and the details of the allegations will be kept as confidential as practical and only shared on a "need to know" basis.

**Step 1.** The person alleging the violation will be interviewed. The person may have someone of their choosing present during the interview. Typically, the investigator will obtain a description of the incident(s) and, if available, will request:

- Corroborating evidence;
- A list of witnesses; and
- Identification of the alleged policy violator.

**Step 2.** In most cases, as soon as practical after receiving the complaint, the alleged policy violator will be informed that an allegation has been made against them. An alleged policy violator will have an opportunity to answer questions and respond to the specific allegations. The investigator will also request, if available, corroborating evidence and a list of witnesses from the alleged policy violator.

Pending completion of the investigation, the Chief Clerk or a supervisor may take appropriate precautionary actions to protect the complainant, other employees or members, or members of the public.

**Step 3.** After adequate investigation and consultation with the appropriate personnel, the Chief Clerk or

## CHAPTER 3: RESPECTFUL WORKPLACE

supervisor will make a decision regarding whether or not disciplinary action will be taken.

**Step 4.** The alleged policy violator and complainant will be advised of the disposition of the complaint and additional steps that will be taken to address it. If the policy violation involves a lobbyist, agency employee, or contractor, the policy violator's employer or clients will be informed of the disposition of the complaint and any actions taken. If a House member is the respondent and a memorandum containing conclusions, sanctions or findings is written, unless otherwise privileged, it will be released at the conclusion of the appeal period or if the memorandum is provided to a member, whichever occurs first. If an appeal is filed, the memorandum will be released at either at the conclusion of the appeal process, or when the memorandum is provided to any member, whichever occurs first. In order to protect the confidentiality of those involved, identifying information of complainants and witnesses will be redacted. This policy does not require the creation of a memorandum where one would not ordinarily be created under normal House business practices.

### **Special Investigatory Circumstances**

In some circumstances, it might be appropriate for the House to contract with an outside investigator to conduct the investigation. Examples of this might include a complaint that involves a particularly complicated set of facts or requires outside expertise, a large number of complainants or witnesses, the House employees that would normally conduct the investigation are either witnesses, complainants, or alleged policy violators, or any situation that would cause an internal investigation to not be viewed as objective. Whether an outside investigator is contracted will be determined by the Chief Clerk after consultation with House Counsel.

Where an outside investigator conducts an investigation regarding a violation of the respectful workplace policy, and a House member is a respondent, and the Chief Clerk or investigator finds a violation of prohibited conduct, the investigation is in the public interest and investigatory report will be released. The investigatory report will be released at the conclusion of the appeal period or if the investigatory report is provided to a member, whichever occurs first. If an appeal is filed, the investigatory report will be released at either at the conclusion of the appeal process, or when the investigatory report is provided to any member, whichever occurs first. In order to protect the confidentiality of those involved, identifying information of complainants and witnesses will be redacted.

Where an outside investigator conducts an investigation regarding a violation of the respectful workplace policy, and a House Member is a respondent, and the Chief Clerk or investigator does not find a violation of prohibited conduct, the investigatory report will only be released with the consent of the member, unless the investigatory report is provided to any member. In order to protect the confidentiality of those involved, identifying information of complainants and witnesses will be redacted.

## **F. DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS**

Disciplinary actions taken will be proportionate to the seriousness of the offense and any prior violations of the policy and will vary depending on the role of the policy violator. For employees this may include verbal or written reprimands, demotion, suspension, or termination.

Supervisors who fail to take appropriate action as outlined in part D when they know of conduct that violates this policy may face similar consequences.

For a House member there are actions that the Chief Clerk, the Executive Rules Committee, the member's caucus, and the chamber as a whole may take. For example, the Chief Clerk has authority over the member's access to House resources and may place limits on a member's access to staff, including a legislative assistant, or requiring that the member work only through specified supervisors.

## CHAPTER 3: RESPECTFUL WORKPLACE

The member's caucus may remove the member from leadership positions within the caucus or a committee. The caucus may also remove the member's committee assignments altogether. Although House Administration and the member's caucus do not have authority to expel a member, the chamber as a whole may vote to censure or expel a member from the body.

Conduct by visitors, including lobbyists, that is in violation of the House policy may also result in restrictions, including prohibiting their access to certain areas and people, requiring that House Security accompany them as they do business on the premises, or reporting their conduct to their employers or clients.

If there is reason to believe a violation of a criminal law may have occurred, the matter will be referred to the appropriate law enforcement authority. Such a referral does not preclude the House from taking action pursuant to this policy.

### G. APPEALS

---

If a complainant or alleged policy violator is not satisfied with the disposition of the complaint, the person may appeal to the Executive Rules Committee (the "Committee") within thirty calendar days of being advised of the final determinations. Any appeal to the Committee must be in writing, signed by the appellant, and state the nature of the appeal. The appeal must be filed with the Chief Clerk, or if the Chief Clerk is the alleged policy violator, with the House Counsel.

If a member of the Committee is the alleged policy violator, that member will be prohibited from participating in consideration of the appeal. To assure the objectivity and fairness of all deliberations by the Committee, all participants in an appeal, including witnesses, must refrain from communicating with Committee members individually regarding the matter.

The Committee will review the appeal by examination of the information submitted by the appellant, and the written record assembled in the investigation. The Committee may seek additional information beyond the written record. All participants will be afforded an equal opportunity to augment the record. Additionally, all participants shall have an opportunity to view or listen to each other's supplementary information.

The Committee will either uphold the decision or send the decision back to the Chief Clerk for modification. All decisions of the Committee are final and shall be in writing addressed to the appellant and a copy should be provided to all other participants in the appeal.

### H. SPECIAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

---

**Pages and Interns.** With limited exceptions, there should be no business need for adults to be alone in non-public circumstances with pages and interns, including having private communications within or outside of the legislative workplace. All employees and members should immediately report any inappropriate conduct involving pages and interns to a staff director, the Chief Clerk, or the House Counsel.

**Temporary staff.** The House employs a large number of temporary staff during the legislative session. These employees are less likely to be familiar with reporting processes, may have weaker connections to their supervisors and other staff, and may face other barriers to reporting. All employees and members are encouraged to support these employees and assist them with reporting potential violations of this policy.

**Members.** Members have supervisory duties in regards to their legislative assistants so, for purposes of this policy, are considered supervisors. Given the unique nature of their supervisory duties, they have distinct reporting duties from other supervisors in the House. If a member learns of, witnesses, or receives a complaint regarding a violation of this policy, the member must promptly consult with the Chief Clerk, House Counsel, or a staff director.

## CHAPTER 3: RESPECTFUL WORKPLACE

**Complaints by non-employees.** If a supervisor receives a complaint about a potential violation of this policy by a House member or employee from a member of the public engaging in business with the House, such as a lobbyist, agency employee, constituent, or contractor, the supervisor should consult with the House Counsel or Chief Clerk as to the appropriate action.

### **COMPLAINTS ABOUT CERTAIN HOUSE EMPLOYEES.**

1. If an employee's supervisor is perceived to be the cause of conduct that violates this policy, a report or complaint should be made to another supervisor, the House Counsel, or Chief Clerk.
2. If the Chief Clerk is perceived to be the cause of conduct that violates this policy, a report or complaint should be made to the House Counsel who will confer with the Executive Rules Committee regarding appropriate investigation and action.
3. If the House Counsel is perceived to be the cause of conduct that violates this policy, a report or complaint should be made to the Chief Clerk.

## **I. LEGISLATIVE CODE OF CONDUCT**

The Legislature is committed to maintaining a professional and respectful environment for all members of the legislative community.

As stewards of the public trust, each member of the legislative community is expected to:

- Conduct themselves with self-awareness, self-respect, and professionalism;
- Treat all others with respect, dignity, and civility, regardless of status or position; and
- Refrain from engaging in hostile, intimidating, offensive, or unlawful activities or behaviors that may amount to discrimination, harassment, sexual harassment, or bullying.

This Code of Conduct applies equally and at all times to all members of the legislative community, both on and off the capitol campus.

## **J. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES**

**Employee Assistance Program** - <https://des.wa.gov/services/hr-finance-lean/employee-assistance-program-eap>

**Equal Employment Opportunity Commission** - <https://www.eeoc.gov/employees/index.cfm>

**Human Rights Commission** - <https://www.hum.wa.gov/employment>

**Dispute Resolution Center of Thurston County** - <http://www.mediatethurston.org>

**SafePlace** - <https://www.safeplaceolympia.org>

**Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs** - <http://www.wcsap.org>

**Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN)** - <https://www.rainn.org>