

BOARD OF ETHICS
OPEN SESSION MINUTES
MEETING OF DECEMBER 12, 2022- 3:03 P.M.
740 North Sedgwick, Suite 500

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

William F. Conlon, Chair
Ryan Cortazar
Dr. Stephanie Cox-Batson
David L. Daskal
Hon. Barbara McDonald

STAFF PRESENT

Steven I. Berlin, Executive Director
Lisa S. Eilers, Deputy Director
Richard J. Superfine, Legal Counsel
Lauren Maniatis, Investigator/Attorney
Pully Casillas, Staff Assistant

BOARD MEMBER ABSENT

Norma Manjarrez

GUESTS ATTENDING

Heather Cherone, WTTW
Pete Czosnyka, Citizen
Edgar Pal, Citizen

The meeting was convened and conducted through the use of the Zoom remote video and audio meeting platform.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Board VOTED 5-0 (Norma Manjarrez, absent) to approve the Open Session Minutes of the November 14, 2022 meeting.

II. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair again thanked the staff for its efforts during the pandemic, and commented that this has been a fine year for the Board of Ethics. Our working relationship with the Office of Inspector General ("OIG") has never been better, our work with the City Council led to important amendments to the City's ethics laws over the Summer, and our Board members have contributed greatly. He also thanked the Mayor's Staff for their assistance, and recognized our newest Board members, Norma Manjarrez and Ryan Cortazar, and expressed his hope that our vacancy, left from the service of Zaid Abdul-Aleem, will be filled soon.

III. MEMBERS' REPORTS

None

IV. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A. Education

On-line Training

For all employees and aldermen

To date, approximately 31,175 employees and 45 City Council members have completed the mandatory 2022 employees/elected officials' training. This represents ~98% of the expected City-wide total. This program must be completed before January 1, 2023; those who fail to complete it will be subject to daily fines of \$250 until they do, and to having their names and violations being made public. We are sending out regular reminders to all non-trainers.

We are grateful to our colleagues at the Department of Human Resources for their invaluable assistance in migrating the training programs to the City's e-learning management platform, as well as assisting us with the sexual harassment portions of each year's training program. The migration enables users to take the training from *any* computer, including their home computers, and also saves the City \$5,000 in annual software licensing fees. Previous training programs were intentionally designed to be taken only from City computers, for security reasons.

For lobbyists

All lobbyists completed the 2021-2022 mandatory annual training, which was also posted on the City-wide e-learning system. The deadline was before July 1, 2022. We will post the all-new 2022-2023 lobbyist training we hope in the next few weeks. The deadline for completing it will be before July 1, 2023.

For appointed officials

To date, 359 appointed officials have completed their training, which is ~63% of the total. They also have until the end of the year to complete it. As with the all-employee/elected official and lobbyist training programs, it is hosted on the City's e-learning platform. We are sending out weekly reminders to all non-trainers.

Classes and Other Presentations

We cancelled all in-person classes from March 2020 on, given the course of the pandemic. We are extending all training deadlines accordingly. All Board classes and educational programs cover sexual harassment. We will resume these classes as soon as it's feasible to do so.

Since the last meeting, staff met with a delegation of government officials from Libya, on December 5. On December 16, we will present to incoming laborers from the Department of Streets & Sanitation. In January, we will conduct a review class for Mayor's Office personnel (rescheduled from this month), and on February 16, 2023, we will conduct a class for the Department of Aviation.

B. Advisory Opinions

Since the Board's last meeting, we have issued 331 informal advisory opinions—another busy period. The leading categories for informal opinions were, in descending order: Campaign Financing; Gifts; Travel; Political Activity; Statements of Financial Interests; Lobbying; and Post-employment. The focus on campaign financing is unsurprising, given that the Consolidated Municipal Elections occur on February 28, 2023.

The leading City departments from which requesters came in this period were, in descending order: City Council; Police Department/Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA)/Community Commission for Public Safety and Accountability (CCPSA); Mayor's Office; Department of Planning & Development;

Aviation; and Office of Inspector General (“IG”). About 80% of these inquiries came from City employees or elected officials, another 10% from lobbyists or potential lobbyists, and the rest from attorneys, vendors, candidates for elected City office, or campaign contributors. We also had a record number of inquiries from the media over the last month: 25.

Informal opinions are not made public, but are logged, kept, and used for training and future advisory purposes. This same practice occurs with our colleagues at the New York City Conflicts of Interest Board, who issue roughly the same number of informal opinions. They form the basis for much of our annual and periodic educational programs. Formal opinions are made public, in full text, with names and other identifying information redacted out.

In the past five (5) years, the Board has issued 67 formal opinions.

C. Summary Index of Formal Advisory Opinions/Text of all Formal Advisory Opinions

The full text of every formal Board opinion issued since 1986 is posted on the Board’s website (more than 920), redacted in accordance with the Ordinance’s confidentiality provisions, here: https://www.chicago.gov/city/en/depts/ethics/auto_generated/reg_archives.html.

Redacted formal opinions are posted once issued or approved by the Board. Summaries and keywords for each of these opinions—and a link to each opinion’s text, which we added since the August Board meeting—are available on the Board’s searchable index of opinions, here: <https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/dam/city/depts/ethics/general/Publications/AOindex.docx>.

Only a few other ethics agencies have comparable research tools. We are unaware of jurisdictions that make their *informal* opinions public—though others issue them confidentially and enable requesters to rely on them in the event of an investigation or enforcement.

D. COGEL (Council on Governmental Ethics Laws) Conference

Last week, I and our Deputy Lisa Eilers attended the annual COGEL Conference in Montréal, together with more than 430 attendees from ethics, lobbying, campaign financing, freedom of information and election regulators and private practitioners from all over North America. It was the first in-person conference since December 2019, when we co-hosted it here in Chicago. There were informative sessions on campaign financing, ethics, and lobbyist law updates throughout the U.S., in particular in our peer cities.

E. 2022 Statements of Financial Interests

On February 28/March 1, as required by law, we notified 3,641 City employees and officials required to file 2022 Statements of Financial Interests (“FIS forms”) of their requirement to file and provided the link to file electronically. Since then, 159 individuals were added as filers by their departments: new hires, and those whose positions were re-classified into titles requiring them to file. Note: as new filers are added by each department as new hires or promotions are made, these newly added filers receive their notice to file within 24 hours of being added to the system.

The filing deadline for the original 3,641 was May 2. We found 102 officials and employees in violation of the Ordinance, and fined them a total of \$40,600. There remains just one (1) employee who has not yet

filed. We have sent letters to the Department Heads and City Council members for whom those found in violation work, and to the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, and they have reported back to us on what disciplinary action they have taken.

F. Statements of Financial Interests filed by Candidates for Elected City Office

The Ordinance requires that all candidates for elected City office file a Statement within five (5) days of qualifying as a candidate. Note that all currently serving elected officials running for re-election or for different offices from those they currently hold have filed. As soon as staff learns of new candidates, we inform them via certified and first-class mail of their filing requirement. We post all candidates' forms on our website upon receipt, at this link: https://www.chicago.gov/content/city/en/depts/ethics/supp_info/CandidateFIS2023.html

All current employees or officials who have already filed in 2022 and who are candidates have their forms posted here: <https://webapps1.chicago.gov/efis/search>

G. Lobbyists Filings

Currently there are 824 registered lobbyists, and we have collected \$423,600 in registration fees for 2022. This represents 46% of our 2022 budget and 46.2% of our 2023 budget. We post updated lists of all lobbyists and their clients and contact information about once each month, at this link: <https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/ethics/general/LobbyistStuff/LISTS/LobbyistList.xls>

3rd Quarter Lobbying Activity Reports were due before 11:59:59 p.m. on October 20. As of November 29, as provided by law, we determined that four (4) lobbyists were in violation of the Ordinance for failing to timely file their reports. One (1) was fined \$2,000; another's fines continue at \$1,000 per day until he files.

H. Personnel Rules Revisions

In conjunction with the Mayor's Office, Departments of Human Resources, Law, Buildings, Business Affairs and Consumer Protection, and others, we worked on updating the City Personnel Rules, which were last revised in 2014. In particular, we are assisting on revisions to Rule XXIX, entitled "Conflict of Interest," with respect to: (i) conforming the Rules to the current version of the Governmental Ethics Ordinance; and (ii) expanding that Rule to prohibit City employees from making certain recommendations as to the hiring of other City employees and to recommending vendors or tradespeople to persons who are subject to inspections, permit reviews, etc.

I. Department Consultations

In the last ten (10) months, we assisted the Department of Streets & Sanitation in revising its conflicts of interests policies with respect to recommending outside business to residents, at the request of the Mayor's Office and the Department's Commissioner. We also are still working with the Commission on Human Relations to formulate a policy governing its employees' service on non-profit and other boards. We also consulted with the Budget Office as to applicable ethics restrictions on the new Community Microgrants Program. And, at the Mayor's directive, we issued an ethics guide to evaluating and awarding CRP grants

and contracts and as mentioned above, have offered each department a training session on the ethics guidelines.

J. Chicago Casino

As to the development of the Casino, we issued guidance on lobbying to all elected officials, at the Mayor's request, and we issued guidance on the restrictions in the Ordinance for the ~80 City employees and officials who worked on the process of selecting the Casino operator, also at the Mayor's request. We have worked closely with the Law Department, Mayor's Office, and the City's outside counsel (Taft, Stettinius and Hollister) to ensure that City personnel are informed of all reporting (and eventually, substantive ethics) requirements and prohibitions under the Illinois Gambling Act, 230 ILCS 10/1 et seq. Penalties for violating this law are severe: it is a Class 4 Felony under Illinois law, subjecting violators to fines up to \$25,000 and 1-3 years in prison. Note that the Gambling Act's reporting requirements are in addition to the restrictions in the Ethics Ordinance that would apply to those "applicants" who "communicate" with City officials or employees, such as the Ordinance's gifts restrictions and lobbyist registration requirements.

K. Waivers

Since July 1, 2013, the Board has had authority to grant waivers from certain provisions in the Ethics Ordinance. The Board has granted seven (7) and denied two (2). By law, we make all granted waivers public on our website.

L. Summary Index of Board-Initiated Regulatory Actions/Adjudications/Pre-2013 Investigations

We post a summary index of all investigations, enforcement and regulatory actions undertaken by the Board since its inception in 1986 (other than those for violations of filing or training requirements or campaign financing matters). It includes an ongoing summary of all regulatory actions the Board undertook without an IG investigation, based on probable cause findings the Board makes as a result of its review of publicly available information, where no factual investigation by the IG is necessary. See <https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/ethics/general/EnforcementMatters/Invest-Index.pdf>

The Board makes public the names of all violators and penalties it assesses when authorized by law to do so. There have been, to date, 133 such matters. But only in those that occurred after July 1, 2013, can the Board release the names of those found to have violated the Ordinance. Since July 1, 2013, there have been 66 such matters.

M. Summary Index of Ongoing IG/LIG Investigations/Adjudications

There are currently no completed IG ethics investigations awaiting adjudication.

We post on our website and continually update an ongoing investigative record showing the status of every completed investigation brought to the Board by both the Office of Inspector General (13 since July 1, 2013) and the former Office of the Legislative Inspector General ("LIG"), since January 1, 2012, and the status of all 50 petitions to commence investigations presented to the Board by the LIG. We update it as appropriate,

consistent with the Ordinance's confidentiality provisions. See <https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/ethics/general/EnforcementMatters/PulbicScorecard.pdf>

Whenever the IG presents the Board with a completed ethics investigation in which the IG believes there have been violations of the Governmental Ethics Ordinance, the procedure that follows is governed by §2-156-385(3) and (4) of the Ordinance: the Board reviews the IG's report, recommendations, and the entirety of the evidence submitted in its completed ethics investigation, including a review to ensure that the IG conformed with the requirement that it complete ethics investigations within two (2) years of commencing them (unless there is evidence that the subject took affirmative action to conceal evidence or delay the investigation), and that ethics investigations were commenced within five (5) years of the last alleged act of misconduct.

Then, if the Board finds that the evidence presented warrants a *prima facie* finding of probable cause to believe the subject violated the Ordinance, it notifies the subject of the allegations and affords the subject the opportunity to present written submissions and meet with the Board, together with an attorney or other representative present. The Ordinance provides that this meeting is *ex parte* – no one from the City's Law Department or IG is present. Note that the Board may request clarification from the IG as to any evidence adduced in its investigation before making a probable cause finding (and has done so). The Board cannot administer oaths at this meeting but can and does assess the subject's credibility and the validity and weight of any evidence the subject provides.

If the subject does not rebut the Board's *prima facie* probable cause finding, the Board may enter into a public settlement agreement—or the Board or subject may decide to proceed to a merits hearing that is not open to the public. That hearing is held before an administrative law judge (ALJ) appointed by the Department of Administrative Hearings. The City would be represented by the Law Department (or a specially hired Assistant Corporation Counsel for that purpose), and the subject by their attorney. At the conclusion of the hearing, the ALJ submits findings of fact and law to the Board, which can accept or reject them, based solely on the written record of the hearing. The Board will then issue a public opinion in which it may find violations of the Ethics Ordinance and impose appropriate fine, or find none and dismiss the matter.

The process may seem cumbersome. However, it was added to the Ordinance on July 1, 2013, based on specific recommendations of then-Mayor Emanuel's Ethics Reform Task Force in Part II of its 2012 Report—the primary purposes being to: (i) guarantee due process for all those investigated by the IG (or former LIG); (ii) ensure that only the Board of Ethics could make determinations as to whether a person investigated by the IG violated the Ordinance, given the Board's extensive jurisprudence and unique expertise in ethics matters; and (iii) balance due process for those investigated by the IG with an accurate adjudication by the Board and the public's right to know of ethics violations.

On our website, we have a publication describing this process in detail: <https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/ethics/general/Publications/EnforceProcedures.pdf>

Note: fines range from \$500-\$2,000 per violation for non-lobbying or non-campaign financing violations that occurred before September 29, 2019, and \$1,000-\$5,000 per violation for such violations occurring between September 29, 2019 and September 30, 2022. For violations occurring on or after October 1, 2022, the fine range is between \$500 and \$20,000 per violation, and the Board may also assess a fine equal to any ill-gotten financial gains as a result of any Ordinance violation. Fines for unregistered lobbying violations remain at \$1,000 per day beginning on the fifth day after the individual first engaged in lobbying and continuing until the individual registers as a lobbyist.

Please note finally that, in all matters adjudicated or settled on or after July 1, 2013, the Board makes public the names of all violators and penalties assessed, or a complete copy of the settlement agreement. All settlement agreements are posted here: <https://www.chicago.gov/city/en/depts/ethics/provdrs/reg/svcs/SettlementAgreements.html>

N. Disclosures of Past Violations

July 2013 amendments to the Ordinance provide that, when a person seeks advice from the Board about past conduct and discloses to the Board facts leading it to conclude that they committed a past violation of the Ordinance, the Board must determine whether that violation was minor or non-minor. If it was minor, the Board, by law, sends the person a confidential letter of admonition. If it was non-minor, then, under current law, the person is advised that they may self-report to the IG or, if he or she fails to do so within two (2) weeks, the Board must make that report. In 11 matters, the Board has determined that minor violations occurred, and the Board sent confidential letters of admonition, as required by the Ordinance. These letters are posted on the Board's website, with confidential information redacted out.

O. Litigation

Lee v. City of Chicago. In June 2020, the City was sued in Cook County Circuit Court, Chancery Division, by a former City employee of the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA). The case is *Jason W. Lee v. City of Chicago*, 2020 CH 04524. The plaintiff left City employment on February 28, 2020, and works as an attorney for the Policemen's Benevolent and Protective Association ("PBPA"). His suit alleges that the post-employment provisions of the Ordinance are unconstitutionally vague, and that the City is improperly attempting to regulate the practice of law by Illinois attorneys. It asked for a declaratory judgment and permanent injunction prohibiting the City from enforcing these restrictions against him. After the matter was briefed by both sides, on July 31, 2020, the Honorable Anna Demacopoulos denied the plaintiff's request for a temporary restraining order. The plaintiff was granted leave to file an amended complaint, and filed one, adding an as-applied constitutional challenge. The City moved to dismiss the entire matter. On February 25, 2021, Judge Demacopoulos granted the City's motion to dismiss concerning the facial challenge to sections 100(a) and (b) and also the as-applied challenge to section 100(a). The court, however, denied the motion concerning the as-applied challenge to section 100(b), but expressed concern that this claim may be moot. Count III was also dismissed; it asked for a declaratory judgment that, by enforcing the Ordinance, the City is violating PBPA members' right to "counsel of their choice." However, the court granted plaintiff leave to amend the complaint for all of the dismissed counts. Instead, he decided to move forward on the as-applied vagueness challenge to section 100(b) of the Ordinance. This is the only claim that survived the motion to dismiss. Judge Demacopoulos questioned whether this claim was moot in light of the expiration of the one (1) year ban that applied to the plaintiff but left it up to the plaintiff whether he wanted to pursue the claim. Plaintiff may seek compensatory damages if he can prove that he suffered damage. The City filed its answer and affirmative defenses to the amended complaint on April 26, 2021. The plaintiff filed discovery requests. Board legal staff met with our attorneys in the Law Department and forwarded materials necessary to respond to these requests. There have been discussions regarding possible settlement of the matter as well, but the offer made by plaintiff to settle the matter was rejected. We had a settlement conference with the Plaintiff and Judge Demacopoulos and our respective attorneys on October 18. Settlement discussions continue.

Note: several PBPA members filed grievances under their collective bargaining agreement, alleging that their right "to counsel of their choice" was violated by COPA. These were settled on terms that do not affect the Ethics Ordinance's post-employment provisions.

Brookins v. Board of Ethics, et al. This matter is assigned to the Honorable David Atkins in the Chancery Division of Cook County Circuit Court. Alderman Brookins has sued the Board, alleging the Board violated his due process rights and improperly proceeded with an enforcement action against him (due to his practice of criminal defense law in cases involving the Chicago Police Department) without a factual investigation by the IG, and he sued me personally for defamation *per se*. The Board's and my attorneys have moved to dismiss the entire lawsuit and have submitted briefs. We await a decision. Alderman Brookins is not running for re-election in 2023.

Czosnyka et al. v. Gardiner et al., docket number is 21-cv-3240. We and the City of Chicago are now dismissed out of this case. On June 17, six (6) individuals residing in the 45th Ward filed a lawsuit in United States District Court against 45th Ward Ald. James Gardiner and the City, alleging that their 1st Amendment rights were violated by the Ald.'s improper blocking of them on his "official" City social media accounts. The plaintiffs sought certification of a class of all those improperly blocked by the Ald. The suit also alleged that more than 20 complaints of improper blocking were filed with the Board and the IG, but the City "failed to take any action to reprimand Alderman Gardiner, although it has the power to do so," and thus "acquiesced in [the Alderman's] constitutional violations." It seeks to have the plaintiffs reinstated as full participants in these social media accounts and unspecified damages. The case is before the Honorable Judge Sharon J. Coleman.

On October 26, 2021, Judge Coleman granted the City's motion to dismiss it from the suit, and on January 12, 2022, denied the plaintiffs' motion to reconsider her decision. Plaintiffs could appeal this decision to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. The residents sought to hold the City liable under the "failure to discipline" *Monell* theory of municipal liability. Specifically, they argued that the City should be held liable for failing to investigate Ald. Gardiner through the IG and also for failing to fine him through the Board of Ethics.

Note that Ald. Gardiner retained independent counsel and moved to dismiss the suit on the basis that the social media site does not constitute an "official City site." On February 10, 2022, Judge Coleman denied that motion, writing that:

"plaintiffs have plausibly alleged that Alderman Gardiner restricted their access to a public forum in violation of the First Amendment by barring them or deleting their comments from the interactive portions of his Facebook Page that designates Alderman Gardiner as a government official. These facts raise a reasonable inference that plaintiffs are not alone in suffering constitutional injuries resulting from Alderman Gardiner's practices. Moreover, plaintiffs have set forth sufficiently detailed allegations that Alderman Gardiner knowingly banned constituents and engaged in content-based regulation of speech on his Facebook Page. Further, he did so unilaterally while seeking out engagement from users."

On June 1, 2022, both the Board and IG received subpoenas from the plaintiff for internal records on this matter. We coordinated our response with the Law Department.

P. Open Meetings Act Challenges

The Board is now involved in two (2) challenges recently filed with the Illinois Attorney General by the same objector regarding its discussions in Executive Session. The Board is working with the Law Department on each.

Q. Freedom of Information Act Challenge

We have been challenged for withholding documents relating to Board Case No. 22033.Q, concerning an advisory opinion the Board approved at the November 2022 meeting. We are working with the Law Department on this matter as well. The challenger is the same individual who brought the two (2) OMA challenges noted above. This matter is also pending before the Public Access Counselor at the Illinois Attorney General's Office.

R. Freedom of Information Act

Since the last Board meeting, the Board has received three (3) requests.

The first was for executive session minutes from the November 14, 2022 meeting that were released to the public; we advised the requester we had no responsive records.

The second was for records related to an official's amendment of statements of financial interests; we responded that we had one record and provided the link to search filed statements of financial interests.

The third (as noted above) was for documents related to Board Case 22033.Q; we responded that the records could not be produced as they were covered by the deliberative process exemption in the Act.

S. Employee Vaccination Status

I'm pleased to report that all seven (7) staff members are fully vaccinated for Covid-19, and in compliance with the City's policy on vaccinations.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Citizen Peter Czosnyka commented that the Board's staff has indeed been very responsive, but he is dismayed that it advised that he could be blocked from an elected official's social media page. He also asked what the Board is going to do with a new complaint he will file regarding discipline handed down to employees of the Chicago Fire Department by that Department.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

None

VII. NEW BUSINESS

None

VIII. PRIOR BOARD MEETING'S EXECUTIVE SESSION MINUTES

This matter shall be discussed in Executive Session.

At 3:21 p.m., the Board VOTED 5-0 (Norma Manjarrez, absent) to adjourn into Executive Session under: (i) 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1) to discuss the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees, specific individuals who serve as independent contractors in a park, recreational, or educational setting, or specific volunteers of the public body or legal counsel for the public body, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee, a specific individual who serves as an independent contractor in a park, recreational, or educational setting, or a volunteer of the public body or against legal counsel for the public body to determine its validity. However, a meeting to consider an increase in compensation to a specific employee of a public body that is subject to the Local Government Wage Increase Transparency Act may not be closed and shall be open to the public and posted and held in accordance with this Act; (ii) 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(4) to hear and discuss evidence or testimony in closed hearing as specifically authorized pursuant to Governmental Ethics Ordinance Sections 2-156-385 and -392, and the Board's Rules and Regulations, as amended, effective January 5, 2017, presented to a quasi-adjudicative body, as defined in the Illinois Open Meetings Act, provided that the body prepares and makes available for public inspection a written decision setting forth its determinative reasoning; and (iii) 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(21) to discuss minutes of meetings lawfully closed under this Act, whether for purposes of approval by the body of the minutes or semi-annual review of the minutes as mandated by Section 2.06.

At 4:38 p.m. the Board VOTED 5-0 (Norma Manjarrez, absent) to reconvene in Open Session.

IX. MATTERS CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

I. APPROVAL OF THE EXECUTIVE SESSION MINUTES

The Board confirmed its discussion in Executive Session, and VOTED 5-0 (Norma Manjarrez, absent) in Open Session, to approve the Executive Session Minutes of the November 14, 2022 meeting.

II. OLD BUSINESS

None

III. NEW BUSINESS

None

IV. CASEWORK

A. Advisory Opinion

1. Case No. 22035.A, Unregistered lobbying

2. Case No. 22034.C, Failure to Register as a lobbyist

The Board VOTED 5-0 (Norma Manjarrez, absent) to consolidate these cases, as having facts in common, and to continue them to the Board's January 2023 meeting.

B. Received or Referred Complaint Reports

3. Case Nos. 22036.01.IG-12, Limitation of contributing to candidates and elected officials; prohibited political contributions

The Board VOTED 5-0 (Norma Manjarrez, absent) to: 1) refer these matters, with the exception of one such matter, involving political contributions that may be in violation of relevant laws, to the OIG for a full factual investigation; and 2) pursuant to §2-156-390, to issue a 10-day notice to an individual explaining that the Board will await a response from the individual explaining why there was not unregistered lobbying, and if there is no response, or response that does not satisfactorily explain why the Board should dismiss the matter, the Board could make a probable cause finding that the individual engaged in unregistered lobbying.

4. Case No. 22037.IG, Solicitation or acceptance of political contributions and membership on political fundraising committees; Offering, receiving and soliciting of gifts or favors

The Board VOTED 5-0 (Norma Manjarrez, absent) to acknowledge that it heard staff's report on this matter, and that, as a complaint was filed with the OIG, the Board will await the results of any OIG investigation before beginning any adjudication procedures

5. Case Nos. 22038.01.IG, Fiduciary Duty; Aspirational Code of Conduct; and 22038.02.C, Unauthorized use of City property, Prohibited political activity

The Board VOTED 5-0 (Norma Manjarrez, absent) to acknowledge that it heard staff's report on these two matters, and that the complaints were also filed with the OIG, and that it will await the results of any OIG investigation before beginning any adjudication procedures.

At 4:50 p.m., the Board VOTED 5-0 (Norma Manjarrez, absent) to adjourn the meeting.