

CITY OF LANSING - BOARD OF ETHICS

REGULAR MEETING

March 10, 2026, 5:30 P.M.

Lansing Elections Office (LEO)

701 W Jolly Rd Lansing

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jim DeLine, Chairperson | <input type="checkbox"/> Jim Cavanagh |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rachelle Franklin, Vice Chairperson | <input type="checkbox"/> Charles Filice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Luna Brown | <input type="checkbox"/> Janielle Houston |
| <input type="checkbox"/> R Cole Bouck | <input type="checkbox"/> Ryan Wier |

A Quorum is: Present Not Present

Others Present:

PUBLIC COMMENT (TIME LIMIT OF 5 MINUTES PER SPEAKER)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA As Submitted With Changes Noted

SECRETARY'S REPORT Approval of Minutes: Feb 10, 2026

Welcome of New Board Member Ryan Wier

NEW BUSINESS

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

CHAIR'S REPORT

TABLED ITEMS

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Deya Nevarez Martinez Statement of Financial Interests City Council

Continued Review of [Ethics Ordinance Chapter 290](#)

ADJOURNMENT

Persons with disabilities who need accommodation to fully participate in this meeting can complete a request form available online at <https://www.lansingmi.gov/1369/Request-for-Reasonable-Accommodations> or call the City Clerk's Office at (517) 483-4133 (TTY 711). Advance notice may be needed for certain accommodations. An attempt will be made to grant all reasonable accommodation request.

**MINUTES
LANSING CITY BOARD OF ETHICS
REGULAR MEETING
February 10, 2026, 5:30 PM**

Meeting Room
Lansing Elections Office
701 W Jolly Rd Lansing

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jim DeLine, Chairperson
Rachelle Franklin, Vice Chairperson
Charles Filice
Jim Cavanagh
Luna Brown
Keith Kris

ABSENT: Janielle Houston, Excused
R Cole Bouck, Excused

A QUORUM WAS PRESENT

Moved by Keith Kris to excuse the absence of Janielle Houston and Cole Bouck

MOTION CARRIED

OTHERS PRESENT:

Madeline Jump, member of the public
Brian P Jackson, City Clerk's Office
Patrick Abood, City Attorney's Office

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Moved by Charles Filice to approve the agenda

MOTION CARRIED

SECRETARY'S REPORT:

Approval of Minutes

Moved by Keith Kris to approve the Minutes of January 13, 2026 as submitted.

MOTION CARRIED

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Affidavit of Disclosure, William Tervo, Lansing Police Department

Moved by Rachelle Franklin to place William Tervo's Affidavit of Disclosure on file, having found no violation of the Ethics Ordinance at this time

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT:

Review of [Ethics Ordinance Chapter 290](#)

Moved by Keith Kris that the Board of Ethics will draft a memo to send to Lansing City Council about the Ethics Ordinance.

Motion Carried

Attorney Abood recommended that the Board of Ethics Members send individual suggestions or proposed edits to the Board Secretary. Those communications would be included in the next packet so members could review but not deliberate in violation of the Open Meeting Act.

Chief Deputy City Clerk Jackson asked that any communications be sent to him by Thursday, March 5th so Board members and the public will be able to review them in the published packet before the March 10th meeting.

Chairperson DeLine requested that Chief Deputy City Clerk Jackson reach out to the two absent members to make sure they are aware of the motion and procedure.

Closed Session

Moved by Jim Cavanagh, pursuant to MCL 15.268(h) of the Open Meetings Act, that the Board recess into closed session to consult with the City Attorney to consider material exempt from discussion or disclosure by state statute. Specifically, to discuss written legal opinions from the City Attorney provided under attorney-client privilege and attorney work-product, and which is also exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act pursuant to MCL 15.243(1) (g).

For this session, the topic is Complaint 2026-01.

Motion Carried Unanimously

The Board entered closed session at approximately 6:00 PM

The Board rise into open session at approximately 6:15 PM

Moved by Jim Cavanagh that the Board of Ethics has reviewed Complaint 2026-01 and the Analysis and Conclusion of Complaint 2026-01 provided by the City Attorney.

After careful deliberation, we accept the conclusion that there was no violation of the Ethics Ordinance and the complaint fell outside the jurisdiction of the Board of Ethics.

Motion Carried

CHAIR'S REPORT: None.

TABLED ITEMS: None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Statement of Financial Interests, Deya Nevarez Martinez, City Council

No response received.

Statement of Financial Interests, Clara Martinez, City Council

Response received.

Moved by Keith Kris to place Clara Martinez's Statements of Financial Interests on file, having found no violation of the Ethics Ordinance at this time.

MOTION CARRIED

ADJOURNED 6:20 p.m.

Moved by Jim Cavanagh to adjourned.

Motion Carried.

From: Martinez, Deyanira <
Sent: Wednesday, February 18, 2026 2:30 PM
To: Jackson, Brian <
Cc: Swope, Chris <>; Abood, Patrick <>; Venker, Gregory <Hagen-Lawrence, Lisa <
Subject: RE: Reminder - Board of Ethics Request a response for CM Nevarez Martinez

Dear Mr. Jackson,

Thank you for the reminder and clarification regarding the Board of Ethics request.

I previously listed the Lansing School District because I served on the Lansing School District Board of Trustees prior to being elected to City Council. I no longer hold that position.

With respect to Michigan State University, I am employed as a tenure track faculty member. However, I do not receive funding from the City of Lansing. My active research grants are funded by the State of Michigan. Prior grants have been supported by the National Science Foundation and university-based institutes, including the University of Wisconsin–Madison Institute for Research on Poverty and UCLA’s Latino Policy and Politics Institute. I do not have direct involvement in any contracts or agreements between Michigan State University and the City of Lansing.

At this time, I am not aware of any contractual or other agreements between the City and the Lansing School District or Michigan State University in which I have direct involvement.

Please let me know if the Board requires any additional information.

Sincerely,
Deyanira Nevarez Martinez, PhD
Council Member, Ward 2

City of Lansing Ethics Ordinance, Chapter 290
 Recommendation for Consideration of Changes

Submitted by: R Cole Bouck

In All Cases...

RECOMMENDATION: Unless a reference applies only to a specific ‘official’ (title/position), and not their office in general, change references to an ‘official’ to references of their ‘office’.

Example: Change ‘City Clerk’ to ‘Office of the City Clerk’; Change ‘City Attorney’ to ‘Office of the City Attorney’.

RECOMMENDATION: In all instances where delivery and/or acceptance of a communication can satisfactorily be documented and verified electronically (by way of a digital record), vs. paper being sent by U.S. Mail, ordinance language should clearly state that electronic delivery is permitted.

RECOMMENDATION: Review all references to City offices and departments to ensure they are current and stated accurately within the ordinance (e.g., Department of Personnel Services to Department of Human Resources).

290.02 – Definitions

Gift – “Gift does not include a gift received from one or more of the following:

(1) & (2) – ...fifth degree of consanguinity...”

General Definition: The fifth degree of consanguinity refers to a blood relationship five generations removed from a common ancestor, often including relatives like first cousins once removed, great-great-great-grandparents, or great-great-aunts/uncles. It measures kinship distance by counting generations up to a shared ancestor and down to the relative.

Common Relatives: These include great-great-great-grandparents, great-great-aunts/uncles, and first cousins once removed.

Method of Calculation: To find the degree, count steps in a family tree: One step for each birth (e.g., You to Parent = 1, Parent to Grandparent = 2, Grandparent to Aunt = 3, Aunt to Cousin = 4, Cousin to First Cousin Once Removed = 5).

While I believe I understand the intent behind a stipulation such as this, the use of this term is so confusing so as to be completely incomprehensible to the average person, and is therefore useless.

RECOMMENDATION: Come up with a clearer more reader-friendly standard and terminology to articulate the intent of this stipulation. Why not the often-used immediate family standard:

“spouses and domestic partners; children, siblings, parent or grandparents – in all cases, regardless of by marriage or adoption”? If there is desire to lengthen the reach to ‘extended family’, then also include: “aunts, uncles and first cousins”.

I believe anything like that would be easier for the average person to reliably interpret.

290.03 – Complaints

(a) (6) – “Take other such action which the Board deems necessary...”

QUESTION: What are some examples of ‘other action’ the Board could or might consider taking? Are there any?

RECOMMENDATION: If not really, then I would suggest removing (6).

290.04 – Prohibitions

(c) – “... having a value of less than \$50.00...”

COMMENT: I recall a Board member raising the issue that, as it is stated, a person would not be prohibited from receiving multiple gifts of \$49.99 from the same person, perhaps on a recurring basis (e.g., monthly, weekly, daily, etc.). The language offers no context for what may (or perhaps should) be a broader goal of not allowing a total amount to exceed \$X.XX in (say) a calendar year.

RECOMMENDATION: Unless the frequency, timing, and the cumulative amount of gifts received from a single gifter DO NOT matter, this language should specify limits regarding how often and/or how much a person can receive from the same gifter within a set period of time.

290.09 – Lobbyist and contractor disclosure

(b) – “All contractors or vendors having contractual relationships...”

RECOMMENDATION: Include applicants as well. “All contractors, ~~or~~ vendors AND APPLICANTS having OR SEEKING contractual relationships...”

290.11 – Education

“The Board of Ethics shall develop a plan...”

COMMENT: As the Board has discussed many times, it does not currently have a role in this, and it is instead handled (I believe) by the Department of Human Resources.

RECOMMENDATION: Make the appropriate correction to this section.

Board of Ethics

Notes on Ordinance Chapter 290 - Ethics

Jim Deline

January 13, 2026

290.03 Complaints

- o Change references to "City Attorney" to "Office of City Attorney"

- o Instead of "At any time after such review ..." to state a specific deadline for this

290.07 Distribution of copies of chapter

- o Include allowance for electronic reference

290.08 Statements of financial interests

- o (d) update "Department of Personnel Services"

- o (i) (1) (2) allow other forms of notification other than "by certified mail"

290.09 Lobbyist and contractor disclosure

- o (b) add applicants for contractual agreements

290.11 Education

- o After "The Board of Ethics" add "in conjunction with the Department of Human Resources"