

# CITY OF CHICAGO BOARD OF ETHICS REPORT

## February 12, 2021

### SUMMARY INDEX OF BOARD-INITIATED INVESTIGATIONS (1986-2012) AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS (2012-Present)

This index summarizes every investigation and enforcement action undertaken by the Board of Ethics since its establishment in 1986 (other than full campaign financing investigations, which the Board conducted from 1989 through 2012; but this index **does** include campaign financing enforcement actions commenced *after* that date).

The Board has been a robust investigative and enforcement authority through the years, and will continue to commence enforcement actions based on public records that warrant a *prima facie* Board finding of probable cause to conclude that a violation of the City's Governmental Ethics Ordinance (the "Ordinance") has occurred – *where no factual investigation by the Office of Inspector General ("IG") is necessary*. [The purpose of an IG ethics investigation is to enable the Board to consider or make a probable cause finding; where the Board *already* has the facts it needs from public record or other materials presented to the Board, then an IG investigation is unnecessary.]

After a Board finding of probable cause, subjects are afforded an opportunity to present their case to the Board in a confidential meeting and explain why there was no violation. If they are unable to, the Board may make a final determination of a violation, and impose fines as provided in the Ordinance. The subject may then appeal the Board's final determination to the Circuit Court of Cook County on a petition for a writ of *certiorari*.

The Board updates this index regularly.

Please note that:

- ▶ Before July 1, 2013, all complaints to the Board, as well as all investigations the Board commenced and concluded (whether based on complaints the Board received or commenced on the Board's own initiative) were and must remain confidential. However, the Board may comment publicly on the disposition of its requests and recommendations based on those investigations and publish summary opinions about them. (See §2-156-400 prior to the date it was amended on July 1, 2013.)
- ▶ Since July 1, 2013, the Board no longer has authority to conduct investigations. Instead, the Board makes public: (i) all settlements and final determinations of Ordinance violations (or final determinations of no violation) based on enforcement actions it begins and concludes, including the names of City officials, employees, or lobbyists who have violated the Ordinance (names of those who are determined not to have violated the Ordinance are not made public unless the subject directs the Board to make them public), and the penalties the Board has imposed; and (ii) cases based on investigations conducted by the IG (or, from 2011-2015 the former Legislative Inspector General) where the Board, after considering all the evidence, has made a finding that there were violations of the Government Ethics Ordinance. In these cases, the Board will make public the names of persons found to have violated the Ordinance and the penalties imposed, or a final determination that the Ordinance was not violated (though in cases where there the Board makes a final determination of no violation, the subjects may opt to have their names omitted from the Board's public report), or where the Board has settled the case with the subject. A table summarizing *those* matters is posted on the Board's website, at: <https://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/ethics/provdrs/reg/svcs/ongoing-summary-of-enforcement-matters.html>

- ▶ From January 1998 through May 2010, the Board had authority to investigate signed and sworn complaints alleging violations of the Ordinance by City Council members, but never had the authority to initiate its own investigations in matters involving City Council members. This table does *not* include complaints against City Council members received that were, by law, referred to the City Council's Committee on Committees, Rules and Ethics. The Board was required to refer complaints it had no authority to investigate to that Committee. This index *does* include Board investigations of signed and sworn complaints alleging ethics violations by City Council members.
- ▶ This index does not include the numerous complaints received by the Board which it referred to other investigative agencies, such as the City's Inspector General.
- ▶ The Board also regularly posts the names and fines it assesses on City personnel or registered lobbyists it determines have violated the Ordinance by failing to complete ethics training, or make required lobbyists' disclosures, as required, or others who have failed to register as lobbyists as required, and of City personnel who have failed to file Statements of Financial Interests as required.

**BOARD MEMBERS**

WILLIAM F. CONLON, ESQ., CHAIR  
ZAID ABDUL-ALEEM  
STEPHANIE COX-BATSON, M.D.  
DAVID DASKAL, ESQ.  
DR. DAISY S. LEZAMA  
HON. BARBARA MCDONALD, ESQ.

**BOARD STAFF**

Steven I. Berlin, Executive Director  
Lisa S. Eilers, Deputy Director  
Richard J. Superfine, Legal Counsel  
Ana Collazo, Attorney-Investigator  
Pully Casillas, Staff Assistant  
Doretha Jackson, Assistant to the Director  
Jef Johnson, Special Projects Coordinator  
Ed Primer, Program Director

<b>CASE NUMBER</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF FACTS AND DISPOSITION</b> <b><u>ONGOING CASES ARE IN GREEN</u></b>
86031.I	<b>Gifts</b>	A Board investigation of gifts received by a high-level Executive Branch employee was terminated, because it showed insufficient evidence from which the Board could conclude that the gifts were given in return for advice or assistance on matters concerning the operation of City business.
86060.I and 87001.I	<b>Post-employment</b>	A Board investigation led to the conclusion that there was no violation or basis for further legal action where a former City employee received a City contract 11 months after leaving City service. The contract was awarded through the competitive bidding process; the former employee had not worked on the contract specifications. The Ordinance in effect at the time allowed former employees to have City contracts 6 months after leaving City service.
87002.I	<b>Gifts</b>	<p>After a Board investigation, the Board recommended that two (2) City employees who had won \$500 in cash prizes through a lottery held at a party hosted by a City contractor return the money. While winning cash gifts/prizes through a lottery hosted by a City contractor is not, <i>per se</i>, a violation of the Ordinance, the Board concluded that it raised a serious appearance of impropriety.</p> <p>Note: a revised version of the Ordinance that became effective two months after this lottery prohibited City contractors or others with business before the City from giving cash in any amount to City employees or officials who may affect the givers' transactions with the City.</p>
87006.I	<b>Prohibited political activity</b>	A Board investigation led to the conclusion that allegations that a City employee coerced a City contractor into advertising in a political newspaper were unsubstantiated.
87009.I	<b>Unauthorized use of City property</b>	A Board investigation led to the conclusion that allegations that two (2) City employees were using City resources to run their private business on City time were unsubstantiated. However, the Board reminded the employees that they were prohibited from having a financial interest in City business or in any City contracts while employed by the City.

<b>87013.I</b>	<b>Fiduciary duty; Conflict of interests</b>	A Board investigation led to the conclusion that there was insufficient evidence to substantiate allegations that a high-level Executive Branch City employee illegally extended concession contracts to individuals to individuals known to him.
<b>87024.I</b>	<b>Prohibited political activity</b>	A Board investigation based on allegations made in a media report led to the conclusion that there was insufficient evidence to substantiate allegations that a City employee was selling tickets to a Mayoral fundraiser while she was on City time.
<b>87041.I</b>	<b>Financial interest in City business</b>	A Board investigation led to the conclusion that there was no evidence to substantiate allegations that a City employee had a financial interest in City business where his ownership of a the vendor's stock was, at fair market value, less than 1% of the company's outstanding shares (the shares were registered on the National Securities Exchange).
<b>87042.I</b>	<b>Unauthorized use of City property</b>	A Board investigation led to the conclusion that there was no evidence to substantiate allegations that a City employee answered questions regarding an advertisement for a private business while he was on City time.
<b>87054.I</b>	<b>Gifts</b>	A Board investigation led to the conclusion that offerings by various HMOs of a 50% savings to employees and officials who would enroll in their health plans did not constitute a prohibited gift for purposes of the Ordinance, but, rather, were part of a package of incentives and benefits offered to prospective clients.
<b>87071.I</b>	<b>Unauthorized use of City property</b>	A Board investigation found insufficient evidence to substantiate allegations that a City employee was using City time to conduct union business while he was on City time.
<b>88015.I</b>	<b>Unauthorized use of City property</b>	The Board received a complaint that a City employee was conducting a private business while on City time and referred it to the Office of Municipal Investigations ("OMI") for investigation. After receiving the OMI's investigative report, in which the OMI found that allegations were unfounded, the Board dismissed the matter.
<b>88049.I</b>	<b>Lobbying</b>	Pursuant to a news article questioning the propriety of a sale of City property to a partnership whose lawyer was a state elected official, the Board contacted the official to inquire if his activities on behalf of his

		client were such that he should file a lobbyist registration form with the Board. The official subsequently registered as a lobbyist with the City.
<b>88075.I</b>	<b>Improper Influence Employment of Relatives</b>	The Board received an anonymous complaint that a City employee attempted to influence a City contractor over which he had contract management authority to give work to his wife's business. The matter was referred to the Office of Municipal Investigations which found the allegations unsubstantiated. The Board determined there were no violations of the Ethics Ordinance.
<b>88115.I</b>	<b>No Jurisdiction</b>	The Board received a complaint alleging harassment on the part of a City employee. The matter was referred to the Office of Municipal Investigations ("OMI") as the matter did not involve the Ethics Ordinance.
<b>88120.I</b>	<b>No Jurisdiction</b>	The Board referred a complaint to the Office of Municipal Investigations ("OMI") for investigation; the complaint alleged harassment and unfair work treatment by a supervisor in a City department. After the OMI completed its investigations, it referred its report back to the Board, and recommended that the matter be handled as a union grievance. The Board concurred and dismissed the matter.
<b>88130.I and 88109.I (consolidated cases)</b>	<b>Political Activity</b>	An anonymous complainant alleging that certain City employees coerced others into buying tickets to a fundraiser was initially referred to the Office of Municipal Investigations ("OMI") for investigation. The OMI then referred the investigation to its successor, the Inspector General ("IG"). The IG reported to the Board that its investigation failed to identify any employee who had been coerced into buying tickets. As no foundation for the allegation was found, the Board dismissed the case.
<b>88155.I</b>	<b>Unauthorized use of City property</b>	The Board closed a case involving allegations that a City department head had acted improperly with respect to a City contractor, upon being informed that the department head was under investigation by other agencies.
<b>89140.I</b>	<b>Fiduciary duty Conflict of interests</b>	A Board investigation led to the conclusion that there was insufficient evidence to substantiate allegations that a high-ranking Executive Branch City employee improperly influenced the award of City contracts to a particular outside business.
<b>89089.I</b>	<b>Fiduciary duty Conflict of</b>	A Board investigation led to the conclusion that there was insufficient evidence to substantiate allegations that a high ranking City official derived an improper benefit when he purchased a garage from the City, subsequently resold it to another person, then used his position in City government to get the property

	<b>interests</b>	rezoned.  The Governmental Ethics Ordinance was not in effect when the alleged violations occurred, but, the Board concluded, even if it had been, there was no evidence that the official represented the purchaser of the garage before any City agencies that deal with zoning.
<b>89123.I</b>	<b>Representation; Improper Influence; No Jurisdiction</b>	The Board closed a case involving allegations that a City appointed official had improperly profited from the purchase and re-sale of a City garage, as the contract in question had been entered into before the Ethics Ordinance took effect.
<b>90015.I</b>	<b>Outside Employment; Fiduciary Duty</b>	The Board closed a case involving allegations that a City employee had accepted City pay for two (2) days during which he was working for his outside employer. The employee was no longer employed by the City at the time the Board reviewed the allegations and had made restitution to the City, so the Board did not impose sanctions.
<b>90026.I</b>	<b>Post-employment</b>	A Board investigation substantiated allegations that a former City high ranking employee who was working as a consultant for a real estate investment firm was actually working on a large development project over which the former employee had exercised contract management authority while with the City. The Board determined that the former employee was in violation of the Ordinance's permanent post-employment prohibition and recommended that the City's Law Department take appropriate legal or equitable action against the former employee.
<b>90030.I</b>	<b>Improper Influence; Conflict of Interests</b>	A Board investigation led to the determination that there was insufficient evidence to substantiate an allegation that a City employee who had hired a City contractor to do personal work for him was improperly denying bids to the City because of a dispute arising from the personal contract.
<b>90031.I</b>	<b>Post-employment</b>	A Board investigation revealed no evidence that a former City employee helped her new employer obtain a City contract over which she had exercised contract management authority while she was a City employee.
<b>90032.I</b>	<b>Post-</b>	A Board investigation substantiated allegations that a former employee in the Mayor's Office, who was a

	<b>employment</b>	lawyer, had been personally and substantially involved, while with the City, with companies that his current law firm represented then, and on an ongoing basis, but was not in violation of the Ordinance's post-employment restrictions, as he had no involvement with the companies (clients) while a City employee.
<b>90037.I</b>	<b>Lobbying</b>	A Board investigation led to the conclusion allegations that an individual had failed to register as a lobbyist were unfounded, as the individual's conduct did not amount to lobbying, The investigation uncovered no evidence of an attempt to influence any City legislative or administrative action.
<b>90072.I</b>	<b>Outside employment;  Financial interest in City business</b>	A Board investigation found no evidence to substantiate allegations that a City appointed official, who represented tort clients in actions against the City, was thereby in violation of the Ordinance, as his legal work was wholly unrelated to his official City duties and responsibilities. Further, the Board determined, his interest in his clients' potential recovery against the City did not amount to a financial interest in City business within the intended meaning of that term in the Ordinance.
<b>90085.I</b>	<b>Improper Influence;  Conflict of Interests</b>	The Board referred an investigation to the Office of the Inspector General investigation of allegations that two (2) City employees solicited golf outing expenses from City contractors in exchange for continued City business, but dismissed the matter after the IG's investigation shows that the allegations were unfounded.
<b>91032.I</b>	<b>Prohibited political activity  Unauthorized use of City property</b>	A Board investigation found no evidence substantiating allegations that a City employee used City equipment for his private benefit, engaged in prohibited political activity, coerced fellow employees to join his union, and received kickbacks from a City contractor.
<b>91088.I</b>	<b>Employment of Relatives or Domestic Partners</b>	<p>The Board investigated an anonymous complaint with three (3) allegations: (1) that a supervising City employee promoted his brother the year before; (2) that this supervisor was planning to promote his brother again; and (3) that this supervisor had previously promoted another relative.</p> <p>The Board's investigation found no evidence to substantiate the latter two charges and they were dismissed.</p> <p>However, the Board determined that the supervising employee committed two violations of Ordinance's anti-nepotism provisions by signing both an order that promoted his brother to a new position and signing his brother's salary increase approval form.</p>

		<p>However, the evidence also showed that the supervising employee had attempted to comply with the Ordinance by recusing himself from making any decisions with regard to his brother, and that signing of these documents involved standard departmental procedures.</p> <p>The Board recommended no sanctions in the matter, but it established that City employees must recuse themselves fully from any employment-related decisions involving their relatives.</p>
<b>92011.I</b>	<b>Campaign Financing</b>	A Board investigation found no evidence that managerial employees of a private company coerced subordinate employees of the company into making contributions to the Mayor’s political fund. and the Board dismissed the case.
<b>92019.I</b>	<b>Gifts</b>	In preparing a position paper on whether City employees may accept honoraria, the Board conducted an investigation. The Board did not reach consensus on the issue, and thus advised that Board staff continue to permit the acceptance of honoraria while also recommending a legislative change that would limit the amount of honoraria.
<b>92023.I</b>	<b>Fiduciary duty; Conflict of interests Minor violations</b>	A Board investigation substantiated allegations that a City employee who made decisions in her City position that minimally affected a City contractor, with which she was also employed, violated the Ordinance. However, the Board did not recommend sanctions, as the nature of the violations was minor.
<b>92028.I</b>	<b>Unauthorized use of City property</b>	A Board investigation showed that allegations that a City employee used his City title to obtain information for political purposes were unsubstantiated. However, the investigation did reveal that the City employee made inquiries outside of the workplace but provided his City telephone number for those who had responsive information. While the Board found no violation, it did conclude that the employee’s conduct caused needless confusion.
<b>93002.I</b>	<b>Unauthorized use of City property</b>	A Board investigation substantiated allegations that a City employee violated the unauthorized use of City property and fiduciary duty provisions of the Ordinance by using City letterhead stationery and official City envelopes in communications to his landlord concerning problems in his building. The Board recommended that the subject’s department head impose appropriate employment sanctions.
<b>93022.I</b>	<b>Unauthorized</b>	The Board referred a complaint to the Inspector General (“IG”) for investigation; the complaint alleged that



	<b>use of City property</b>	a City employee was taking City-owned supplies for use at his private business. The IG's investigation found no facts to support the allegations. The Board found the complaint unsubstantiated and dismissed the case.
<b>93040.I</b>	<b>Conflict of Interests</b>	<p>The Board received a complaint alleging that a City employee who reviewed and approved plans for certain construction contractors doing business with the City had solicited one of the contractors to provide services for his private residence. The complaint further alleged that the services had been provided at below the market rate, and that the City employee had implied to the contractor that did the work that, unless the contractor provided these services at below-market rates, the contractor would have difficulty processing future City permits.</p> <p>The matter was referred to the Inspector General ("IG") in November 1993 for investigation.</p> <p>In August 1996, the IG presented its investigative report. The Board voted to close the matter based upon the investigative report's conclusion that the allegations were unsubstantiated.</p>
<b>94041.I</b>	<b>Financial interest in City business</b>	A Board investigation based on a filed Statement of Financial Interests showed that a City employee had a 25% interest in a partnership that leased real estate to the City for use by a City department, and was in violation of the Ordinance by having a prohibited financial interest in a City contract. The employee was advised to dilute his interest in the partnership, and the Board recommended that his department impose appropriate employment sanctions. The Board also referred the matter to the City's Law Department to address whether the City should discontinue the lease.
<b>95003.I</b>	<b>Campaign financing</b>	A Board investigation found that a contributor to the Mayor's campaign committee, who was then reimbursed by his company for the amount of his contribution, was in violation of the City's Campaign Financing Ordinance, as he had made a pseudonymous contribution. The contributor brought himself into the compliance with the Ordinance by paying back his company for its reimbursement of his contribution
<b>95059.I</b>	<b>Employment of Relatives or Domestic Partners</b>	<p>A Board investigation found evidence to substantiate allegations made in an anonymous complaint that a high-ranking City employee had hired eight (8) of his relatives and awarded departmental subcontracts to his brother's company. Specifically, the evidence showed that the employee recommended that his relatives be hired and then signed their personnel forms. The evidence further showed that he signed off on payment authorization forms for his brother's company, which did work for the department.</p> <p>The Board recommended that the employee's department apply appropriate employment sanctions, which were imposed by the employee's department.</p>

<p><b>97002.I</b></p>	<p><b>Financial interest in City business</b></p> <p><b>Statements of financial interests</b></p>	<p>A Board investigation found evidence to substantiate allegations that a high ranking employee had a financial interest in City business by virtue of his ownership interest in a company that did business with the City, and also failed to disclose this on his annual Statements of Financial Interests over the course of several years, and also had sought but disregarded Board advice on the same topic (the advice was sought several years prior to this case).</p> <p>The Board recommended that the employee's department impose the most severe disciplinary sanctions available, including immediate discharge from his City employment. Charges were filed with a disciplinary board, and the employee was terminated.</p>
<p><b>97003.I</b></p>	<p><b>Financial interest in City business</b></p> <p><b>Statements of financial interests</b></p>	<p>In a companion case to 97002.I, a Board investigation found evidence to substantiate allegations that a high ranking employee had a financial interest in City business by virtue of his ownership interest in a company that did business with the City, and also failed to disclose this on his annual Statements of Financial Interests over the course of several years, and also had sought but disregarded Board advice on the same topic (the advice was sought several years prior to this case).</p> <p>The Board recommended that the employee be terminated immediately from his City employment. Charges were filed with a disciplinary board, and the employee was terminated.</p>
<p><b>98025.01-06.I</b></p>	<p><b>Prohibited political activity</b></p> <p><b>Unauthorized use of City property</b></p>	<p>Upon receiving a complaint that an elected City official and five (5) members of the official's staff were being coerced into doing political work on City time and on City property, and that they were soliciting political contributions from entities doing business with the City, and threatening the entities with negative consequences for failing to contribute, the Board's initial investigation found evidence that criminal conduct had occurred. The Board suspended its investigation and referred the matter to the U.S. Attorney's Office, which, after a thorough investigation in conjunction with other law enforcement agencies, found numerous federal criminal violations and tried the matter in U.S. District Court.</p> <p>Once the criminal case was completed, the Board reopened its investigation into violations of the Governmental Ethics Ordinance. The Board's investigation substantiated allegations that several employees had violated the Ordinance's prohibitions with respect to engaging in political activity while on City compensated time and on City-owned property, and coercing subordinates into engaging in political activity, and the Board recommended employment sanctions (which were implemented) for each such employee, including terminations and suspensions.</p>
<p><b>98058.I</b></p>	<p><b>Employment of</b></p>	<p>A Board investigation found evidence to substantiate allegations that a City supervisor who assigned job duties to his brother and approved his brother's requests to accrue and use compensatory and vacation</p>

	<b>relatives</b>	<p>time, violated the Employment of Relatives section of the Ordinance.</p> <p>The Board did not recommend employment sanctions or discipline, but instead recommended that the employees' City department take immediate corrective action.</p>
<b>99036.I</b>	<b>Post-employment</b>	<p>A Board investigation found evidence to substantiate allegations that a former City employee who took an Executive Director position with a non-profit organization upon leaving City service had violated the Ordinance's post-employment provisions. The investigation revealed that the former City employee had exercised contract management authority during his City service over a contract that the non-profit had with the City. The Board determined that the former City employee had violated both the one (1) year and permanent prohibitions of the Ordinance, he must recuse himself immediately from all work related to the contract in question. The Board also recommended that the Law Department and operating department with the contract determine whether the contract should be voided by the City.</p>
<b>99045.I</b>	<b>Fiduciary duty</b> <b>Unauthorized use of City property</b>	<p>A Board investigation found that allegations that a City employee misused his City position to harass a neighbor by subjecting her to repeated inspections of her property were not sustained.</p> <p>The Board recommended that the City department for which the employee worked track all complaints received from the property in question, especially the source of any future complaints.</p>
<b>99047.I</b>	<b>Fiduciary duty</b> <b>Conflicts of interest</b>	<p>The Board conducted an investigation of a signed and sworn complaint alleging that: (i) an elected official disregarded his fiduciary duty by adding language to a proposed ordinance regarding a real estate development; (ii) a City department head violated his fiduciary duty to the City by informing the employer of a private citizen who had expressed opposition to the project at a public meeting with unfavorable future City action; and (iii) that appointed official had a conflict of interest by asking questions in a public City hearing on the project despite the fact that the developer was represented by a law firm in which the commission chair was a partner.</p> <p>The Board: (i) dismissed the allegation against the elected official, finding that there was no probable cause to conclude that it could be violation of the Ordinance and referred it to the standing committee of the City elected body with jurisdiction to investigate such complaints; (ii) there were insufficient facts to substantiate the allegation against the department head; and (iii) found that the appointed official had indeed participated in the proceeding, but recused himself from the final vote. The Board considered whether to further investigate the nature of the official's fee relationship with the law firm (did the official agree to forego all compensation from this matter?) and the firm's fee relationship with its client (was it a contingent fee?) but voted to exercise its discretion not to pursue the investigation further and instead, directed that the Board issue an advisory opinion discussing what it means to "participate in the making of a governmental decision" within the meaning of the Ordinance's conflict of interests and improper influence provisions, and what constitutes a proper recusal.</p>

		<p>The Board also determined: (i) a City employee or official who sits as a member of a City agency, board or commission and examines a witness at a hearing before that body, then recuses from a vote, but the vote results in a decision or action, has participated in the decision or action, despite recusal; and (ii) a City official who chairs a City board or commission presides over a hearing before the body, but does not examine witness, and recuses from a vote, has also participated in the decision or action. See <i>also</i> Case No. 00008.A, an advisory opinion, listed under Conflicts of Interest and Appointed Officials.</p>
<b>00004.I</b>	<b>Employment of relatives</b>	<p>A Board investigation found insufficient evidence to substantiate allegations that a City employee who served a general foreman, and whose brother worked for the same City department, had violated the Ordinance's Employment of Relatives provisions. The investigation showed that he did not assign his brother daily work tasks, or review his brother's work performance, or play any role in his brother's hiring.</p>
<b>00007.I</b>	<b>Prohibited conduct;  Statements of Financial Interests</b>	<p>The Board investigated a complaint alleging violations of the Ordinance's Prohibited Conduct provisions, which prohibits City employees from receiving loans from certain persons doing business with the City or from lobbyists. The investigation revealed that a City employee had solicited a loan for another employee from a person affiliated with business operating at various City facilities regulated by the loan recipient's City department. However, the investigation found, the loans were solicited and received prior to the time that the recipient became a City employee, hence, the Board determined that there was no violation of the Prohibited Conduct provisions. The investigation further showed that neither employee was involved in the regulating the businesses operating at various facilities.</p> <p>The Board also investigated whether the employee who received the loans had violated the Ordinance for failing to disclose them on the annual Statements of Financial Interests, but determined that there had been no violation, since the loans did not originate with a person doing work for or business with the City.</p>
<b>01013.I</b>	<b>Post-Employment</b>	<p>The Board initiated its own investigation into whether a former high-ranking employee who had taken a position as a partner and lobbyist with a law firm upon leaving City service had violated the post-employment provisions of the Ordinance by assisting or representing a firm client in connection with a City contract. At issue was whether, during his City tenure, the former employee had participated personally and substantially in the subject matter of the transaction, exercised contract management authority over the City contract.</p> <p>The Board's investigation revealed no evidence that the former employee had violated either the one-year prohibition or the permanent prohibitions of the Ordinance's post-employment provisions by taking on this work, because, during his employment with the City, he had not participated personally and substantially in the subject matter of transaction at issue, nor had he exercised contract management authority over the contract.</p>

<b>01034.01.LOB</b>	<b>Lobbying contingent fees</b>	The Board informed a lobbyist that it had probable cause to conclude that a portion of a lobbying retainer agreement appeared violate the prohibition against contingent fees. In response, the lobbyist and client modified the agreement to conform with the Ordinance
<b>01034.02.LOB</b>	<b>Lobbying agreements</b>	The Board informed a lobbyist that its retainer agreements appeared to be for five (5) clients, and required that the lobbyist provide a written agreement for two (2) clients and provide an oral statement of the substance of the lobbying agreement for the remaining three (3) clients.
<b>01034.03.LOB</b>	<b>Lobbying agreements</b>	The Board informed a lobbyist that its registration required an oral statement of the substance of the lobbying agreement between the lobbyist and the client; the lobbyist provided this.
<b>01034.04.LOB</b>	<b>Lobbying contingent fees</b>	The Board informed a lobbyist that it had probable cause to conclude that a portion of a lobbying retainer agreement appeared violate the prohibition against contingent fees. In response, the lobbyist and client modified the agreement to conform to the Ordinance, and the lobbyist agreed to inform the Board of all compensation it received from this client to ensure these were in accord with the Ordinance.
<b>02002.11.LOB</b>	<b>Lobbying agreements</b>	The Board sought a proper copy or summary of a lobbyist's retainer agreement but closed the matter after the lobbyist informed the Board that its client's project giving rise to the lobbying initiative had been terminated.
<b>02002.12.LOB</b>	<b>Lobbying agreements</b>	The Board required that a lobbyist provide a current written lobbying agreement or a written summary of an oral agreement, not a prior one, and required the lobbyist to state the basis of compensation clearly so as to assure the Board that the arrangement did not constitute a prohibited contingency fee.
<b>03064.I</b>	<b>Post-Employment</b>	The Board investigated an anonymous complaint that one (1) current and two (2) former City employees had violated the Ordinance's post-employment provisions. Following its investigation, the Board determined that one of the former employees had violated the Ordinance by assisting the current City employee in providing services related to the work he during his City employment, within one year of leaving City service.

		<p>The Board requested that the City department confirm in writing that corrective action had been taken to ensure that this assistance was no longer occurring. The Board also recommended that the department issue a written memorandum to all department employees with authority to retain contractors/consultants on behalf of the Department, instructing them of the post-employment restrictions and that the Ordinance provides that any City contract negotiated, entered into or performed in violation of the Ethics Ordinance is voidable as to the City.</p> <p>The Board advised the former employee's department of its authority to void the City contract.</p>
<b>04069.LOB</b>	<b>Lobbying contingent fees</b>	The Board informed a lobbyist that it had probable cause to conclude that a portion of a lobbying retainer agreement appeared violate the prohibition against contingent fees. In response, the lobbyist and client modified the agreement to conform to the Ordinance, and the lobbyist agreed to inform the Board of all compensation it received from this client to ensure these were in accord with the Ordinance.
<b>05014.LOB</b>	<b>Lobbying contingent fees</b>	The Board found probable cause to conclude that a portion of a lobbying retainer agreement appeared to violate the prohibition against contingent lobbying fees, but, after receiving information from the lobbyist and client, closed the matter and advised the lobbyist of the prohibition against contingent lobbying fees.
<b>05015.LOB</b>	<b>Lobbying contingent fees</b>	The Board found probable cause to conclude that a portion of a lobbying retainer agreement appeared to violate the prohibition against contingent lobbying fees, but after further investigation, the Board determined that the individual did not fall within the Ordinance's definition of lobbying and dismissed the matter.
<b>05018.LOB</b>	<b>Lobbying contingent fees</b>	The Board found probable cause to conclude that a portion of two (2) lobbying retainer agreements violated the prohibition against contingent fees, but closed the matter after the lobbyist provided information showing that it had mistakenly registered for the first clients, and that the other was no longer a client.
<b>05019.LOB</b>	<b>Lobbying contingent fees</b>	The Board found probable cause to conclude that a portion of a lobbying retainer agreement violated the prohibition against contingent fees. In response, the lobbyist and client modified the agreement to conform to the Ordinance, and the Board closed the matter, as no contingent fees had actually been received.
<b>05043.I</b>	<b>Financial Interest in City</b>	The Board investigated allegations received in an anonymous complaint that a City employee had received monies through the City's Low-Income Housing Trust Fund's Rental Subsidy Program in violation

	<p><b>business</b></p>	<p>of the Ethics Ordinance. The Board's investigation revealed that the City employee and his wife, in whose name the program's application was submitted, had received rent subsidy payments for a property they owned in the City.</p> <p>The Board determined that as the City employee had a prohibited financial interest in City business, by having an interest that exceeded \$5000 a rental subsidy agreement with the City's Low-Income Housing Trust Fund, and thus had violated the Ethics Ordinance. The Board recommended termination of the employee's and his spouse's participation in the program, and that his department impose appropriate disciplinary sanctions, and recommended substantial changes in the Rental Subsidy Program's application form that would clarify the severe restrictions on the participation of City employees.</p>
<p><b>05063.I</b></p>	<p><b>Fiduciary Duty</b></p> <p><b>Conflict of Interests; Improper Influence</b></p> <p><b>Financial interest in City business</b></p> <p><b>Gifts</b></p>	<p>The Board investigated a signed and sworn complaint alleging Ethics Ordinance violations in connection with the sale of two (2) real estate parcels to an alderman's Chief of Staff, pursuant to a City program for land conveyancing. The complaint alleged that: both parcels were conveyed to a developer through a City program; both conveyances required City Council approval and support from the alderman; the Chief of Staff worked for the alderman whose approval was required; the Chief of Staff was identified as the alderman's contract person for these parcels; that the terms of the redevelopment agreement between the developer and City governing these conveyances required the developer to perform certain improvements on the properties; that any re-conveyance of the properties required City approval; that the developer had not performed all required improvement and conveyed the property to the Chief of Staff for under their appraised value.</p> <p>After the Board's investigation was completed, it determined that the facts adduced in were insufficient to warrant the conclusion that the Chief of Staff had violated the Ordinance's Fiduciary Duty provision by using City property or resources for a purely personal benefit; that the facts adduced were insufficient to demonstrate that the Chief of Staff had, on behalf of the Developer, obtained the alderman's required support and did not have any economic interest or promise of any economic interest in the properties or developer at the time he obtained that support; that neither had a financial interest in City business given the purchase price from the City; and that there was insufficient evidence to warrant a conclusion that the Chief of Staff had received a prohibited gift.</p> <p>The Board forwarded its investigative report to the Chief of Staff, developer, the alderman, the City department that administered the program and the Law Department, and recommended that the alderman review the Chief of Staff's responsibilities as to this and other land conveyancing programs; that the department that administered the program perform regular property appraisals, and that the department, together with the Law Department, review the terms of the developer's sale to the Chief of Staff to determine whether either sale constituted a breach of the redevelopment agreements between the developer and the City.</p>

<b>06015.LOB</b>	<b>Unregistered lobbying</b>	The Board received a report of potential unregistered lobbying by two individuals, and commenced an investigation, and found that there was probable cause to conclude the individuals had violated the Ordinance. However, further information gathered by the Board showed that the two individuals reported to have contacted a City official had not actually had this contact. The Board dismissed the investigation but advised the individuals of the requirements of the lobbying laws.
<b>06058.I</b>	<b>Statement of Financial Interests</b>	A Board investigation found sufficient evidence to substantiate allegations that a candidate for aldermanic office violated the Campaign Finance Ordinance by failing to submit a Statement of Financial Interests as required by law. Upon being advised of this failure, the candidate submitted the form and the Board voted that in doing so, he was in compliance with the law.
<b>06059.I</b>	<b>Statement of Financial Interests</b>	A Board investigation found sufficient evidence to substantiate allegations that a candidate for aldermanic office violated the Campaign Finance Ordinance by failing to submit a Statement of Financial Interests as required by law. Upon being advised of this failure, the candidate submitted the form and the Board voted that in doing so, he was in compliance with the law.
<b>07016.I</b>	<b>Employment of relatives</b>	<p>A Board investigation found evidence to substantiate allegations that a City employee who was serving as an acting supervisor violated the Ordinance’s Employment of Relatives provisions by supervising his spouse while “acting up.”</p> <p>The Board recommended that the employee’s department pursue appropriate disciplinary sanctions, in accordance with the relevant collective bargaining agreement, and recommended policy changes to the City department so as to prevent violations in the future when employees serve as acting supervisors (“acting up”).</p>
<b>07017.I</b>	<b>Ethics training</b>	<p>A complaint was filed with both the Board of Ethics and the IG alleging that a City supervisor had taken the mandatory annual ethics training for five (5) of his employees. The Board and the IG agreed that the IG would investigate the matter.</p> <p>In 2012, the IG confirmed that it had investigated the matter. The Board amended the language on the log-in page of the annual on-line ethics training to remind City personnel clearly that taking ethics training for any other person constitutes a violation of the Ordinance and subjects the individual to fines and termination.</p>



<b>07034.C</b>	<b>Post-employment</b>	The Board received a complaint from a City department alleging that one of its former employees was in violation of the Ordinance's post-employment provisions. The Board reviewed the complaint, but determined that an investigation was not warranted, given that there were not enough facts alleged to indicate reasonable cause to investigate, and instead, in conjunction with the Department, informed the former employee and his employer in writing of the post-employment restrictions and penalties for violating them. Prior to receiving the former employee's and his employer's response, the Board learned that the Inspector General was investigating the former employee and his employer, and then submitted its information to the Inspector General pursuant to a subpoena. The Board decided to suspend any potential investigation pending the outcome of the Inspector General's investigation; that investigation subsequently showed that there had been violations of the Ordinance.
<b>09028.LOB</b>	<b>Unregistered lobbying</b>	The Board found probable cause to conclude that employees of a company had engaged in unregistered lobbying but closed the matter after receiving the firm's response regarding its agents' contacts with City officials, concluding that that contact did not constitute lobbying.
<b>09029.CNS</b>	<b>Conflict of interests</b>	At the Board's request, the Board's Executive Director and staff analyzed news reports that a City Council member had written letters of recommendation to other City employees and officials in support of projects on behalf of clients of the member's outside business. The reports also indicated that the City elected official recused from City Council consideration and voting on the projects. After hearing Board staff's report, the Board concluded that the information available to the Board did not warrant a conclusion that there was a possible violation of the Ethics Ordinance, and noted that the Board's Rules and Regulations did not allow for an investigation of the matter without a signed and sworn complaint, and that the Board was precluded from initiating an investigation into the matter.
<b>10001.LOB</b>	<b>Unregistered lobbying</b>	The Board found probable cause to conclude that an individual had engaged in unregistered lobbying, but the individual rebutted the Board's finding by showing that the organization on whose behalf the individual communicated with City personnel was a not-for-profit corporation, and the individual was a director of the organization. This rendered the question of lobbyist registration moot – "lobbying" as a director of a not-for-profit corporation is an exception to the requirement to register as a lobbyist.
<b>10023.I</b>	<b>Unauthorized use of City property</b>	The Board conducted an investigation of a signed and sworn complaint alleging that a City Council member was using City property improperly and in an unauthorized manner. The facts adduced in the Board's investigation showed that the official was using the property as authorized. The Board dismissed the matter as unsubstantiated.

<p><b>10050.C.1</b>  <b>10050.C.2</b>  <b>10051.C.1</b>  <b>10051.C.2</b>  <b>(consolidated cases)</b></p>	<p><b>Unauthorized use of City property</b></p> <p><b>Political activity</b></p>	<p>After receiving three (3) signed and sworn complaints that a City Council member was: (1) using the City seal on a privately funded website with political content; (2) advertising for a golf outing (a political fundraising event) on a City owned and maintained website; and (3) using his ward office as a campaign office and advising citizens to contact the ward office for campaign related matters, the Board conducted an investigation.</p> <p>The investigation showed that, as to the second complaint, the golf outing was not advertised on a City website and therefore there was no violation of the Ethics Ordinance.</p> <p>As to the first and third complaints, the Board advised the elected official to remove the City seal from his privately funded website, remove all political content from his ward office website, and make a concerted effort to advise both campaign workers and constituents that his campaign office is not a City office and that City business should not be transacted there.</p> <p>In a fourth signed and sworn complaint, the Board's investigation showed that an allegation that another City Council member was using the City seal on his political website had already been addressed by the City's Law Department.</p>
<p><b>12060.I</b></p>	<p><b>Fiduciary duty</b></p> <p><b>Unauthorized use of City property</b></p>	<p>After receiving a complaint, the Board conducted a full investigation into allegations that a long-time City employee had accessed departmental lists of licensed tradespeople and then photocopied the list without authorization, and that a blog with which he was affiliated then published a story about someone whose name was on that list.</p> <p>The Board's investigation substantiated allegations that the employee violated the Ordinance's fiduciary duty and use of City property provisions by printing the list of licensed tradespeople without authorization and using it for private purposes. The Board recommended that the employee be terminated, and the Department terminated the employee.</p>
<p><b>17005.LOB</b></p>	<p><b>Unregistered lobbying</b></p>	<p>Based on its examination of records released publicly for the first time, the Board commenced a regulatory action and determined that there was probable cause to conclude that David Plouffe had lobbied City officials on behalf of a company on November 20, 2015, but did not register as a lobbyist on behalf of that company, and that both the lobbyist and the person hiring or retaining him violated the Ordinance's lobbyist registration laws.</p> <p>The subjects were unable to rebut the Board's probable cause finding, and the Board made a final</p>

		<p>determination that both the individual and his lobbying client had violated the Ordinance, and assessed him a \$90,000 fine and his lobbying client a \$2,000 fine (for hiring or retaining an unregistered lobbyist). On April 18, 2017, the fines were paid.</p>
<p><b>17011.01 - .27.LOB</b></p>	<p><b>Unregistered lobbying</b></p> <p><b>Undisclosed lobbying</b></p>	<p>Based on its examination of public records released for the first time, the Board commenced 27 regulatory actions involving potential unregistered and/or unreported lobbying activity.</p> <p>As of July 25, 2017, the status of these cases is as follows:</p> <p>.01: The Board determined that an individual engaged in lobbying in 2011, and failed to register as required, and fine the individual \$1,000, which was the only fine provided in the version of the Ordinance in effect at the time of the lobbying. The Ordinance in effect at the time provided that all Board recommendations and findings must remain confidential.</p> <p>.02: The Board determined there is probable cause to conclude that an individual lobbied on behalf his company without registering. After considering the subject's written response, the Board vacated its determination of probable cause and dismissed the matter on the basis that this was a sales call only</p> <p>.03: The Board determined there is no probable cause to conclude that an individual lobbied on behalf of a non-profit entity; available information indicated that the activity was not performed for compensation.</p> <p>.04: The Board determined there is no probable cause to conclude that unregistered lobbying occurred, because the company on whose behalf the apparent lobbying occurred had several registered lobbyists at the time, who reported lobbying activity before the City department involved; it could not be determined whether the possible lobbying activity had been performed by someone other than these registered lobbyists.</p> <p>.05: The Board determined there is probable cause to conclude that an individual lobbied on behalf his company without registering. After considering the subject's written response, and meeting with the subject, the Board vacated its probable cause determination and dismissed the matter.</p> <p>.06: The Board determined that Anthony Davis lobbied the Mayor by sending an email on behalf of a business of which he was a patron, requesting a meeting regarding a request for assistance and to meet regarding a zoning change, but then failed to register as required. The Boar fined the subject \$2,500 and dismissed the case against the company. At its October 2017 meeting, the Board voted to authorize settlement of the matter, whereby the Board would vacate its determination and fine provided the subject not engage in unregistered lobbying for one (1) year and complete a lobbyist training program developed by the Board.</p>

		<p>.07: The Board determined there is probable cause to conclude that an individual lobbied on behalf his company without registering. In response, the individual provided written sufficient evidence that actions were taken on behalf of a “one-tier” non-profit, without compensation. The Board vacated its probable cause determination and dismissed the matter.</p> <p>.08: The Board determined that James Abrams lobbied the Mayor by sending an email on behalf of a friend whose company was seeking an exemption from a City ordinance, but then failed to register as required. The Board fined the subject \$2,500 and dismissed the case against the company. At its October 2017 meeting, the Board voted to authorize settlement of the matter, whereby the Board would vacate its determination and fine provided the subject not engage in unregistered lobbying for one (1) year and complete a lobbyist training program developed by the Board.</p> <p>.09: The Board determined there was no probable cause to conclude that an individual had lobbied on behalf of a non-profit entity, and information available to the Board indicated that the activity was not performed for compensation.</p> <p>.10: The Board determined that Alan King lobbied the Mayor by requesting that the Mayor assist in a matter involving the Chicago Park District and Army Corps of Engineers but failed to register as required, and that the request was made on behalf of another person, and was a request for the Mayor to act as Mayor with respect to action by another governmental entity. The Board fined the subject \$2,500 and dismissed the case against the person on whose behalf the emails were sent. At its October 2017 meeting, the Board voted to authorize settlement of the matter, whereby the Board would vacate its determination and fine provided the subject not engage in unregistered lobbying for one (1) year and complete a lobbyist training program developed by the Board.</p> <p>.11: The Board determined there is probable cause to conclude that a registered lobbying engaged in lobbying activity on behalf of a company but failed to report that on the lobbyist’s activity report. After considering the subject’s response, the Board vacated its probable cause determination and dismissed the matter because the evidence before the Board did not warrant a finding that the subject’s communications constituted lobbying.</p> <p>.12: The Board determined that Marc Andreessen lobbied on behalf a company without registering, by emailing the Mayor with respect to the direction legislation then-pending before the City Council was taking. The Board fine the subject \$2,500 and dismissed the case against the company, after hearing from the subject and the company.</p> <p>.13 The Board determined there is probable cause to conclude that an individual lobbied on behalf a company without registering. After considering the individual’s response, the Board concluded that the individual had not lobbied, vacated its probable cause finding, and dismissed the case.</p> <p>.14: The Board determined there is probable cause to conclude that the Honorable William Singer lobbied</p>
--	--	--

		<p>on behalf a company without registering, in violation of the Ordinance. The Board accepted the subject's offer to settle the matter for a \$25,000 fine, and determined that the company on whose behalf the subject lobbied also violated the Ordinance and fined the company \$2,000;</p> <p>.15. The Board determined that Greg Prather lobbied an alderman by emailing the alderman on behalf of a client, listing a number of ways in which the alderman's help was being sought with respect discussions with the owner of property nearby property owned by the client, and did not register as required. The Board fined the subject \$2,500 and dismissed the case against the client.</p> <p>.16. The Board determined that the facts available to it did not warrant a finding of probable cause that an individual had engaged in lobbying on behalf of a client.</p> <p>.17 The Board determined there is probable cause to conclude that an individual lobbied on behalf a company without registering. After considering the individual's response, the Board concluded that the individual had not lobbied, vacated its probable cause finding, and dismissed the case.</p> <p>.18: The Board determined there is probable cause to conclude that an individual lobbied without registering. After considering the individual's response, the Board concluded that the individual had not lobbied, vacated its probable cause finding, and dismissed the case.</p> <p>.19: The Board determined that the facts available to it did not warrant a finding of probable cause that an individual had engaged in lobbying on behalf of a company.</p> <p>.20: The Board determined that the facts available to it did not warrant a finding of probable cause that individuals had engaged in lobbying on behalf of a company that employed one of them and that was a client of the other.</p> <p>.21: The Board determined that the facts available to it did not warrant a finding of probable cause that an individual had engaged in lobbying on behalf of a company.</p> <p>.22: The Board determined that the facts available to it did not warrant a finding of probable cause that an individual had engaged in lobbying on behalf of a client.</p> <p>.23: The Board determined that the facts available to it did not warrant a finding of probable cause that an individual had engaged in lobbying on behalf of a company.</p> <p>.24: The Board determined that the facts available to it did not warrant a finding of probable cause that a registered lobbyist had engaged in lobbying on behalf of a client or failed to report it on a lobbyist activity report.</p> <p>.25: The Board determined that the facts available to it did not warrant a finding of probable cause that an</p>
--	--	---

		<p>individual had engaged in lobbying on behalf of a client.</p> <p>.26: The Board determined that the facts available to it did not warrant a finding of probable cause that an individual had engaged in lobbying on behalf of a client.</p> <p>.27: The Board determined not to issue a notice of probable cause in this matter, involving potential unregistered lobbying activity, on the basis that it did not have sufficient evidence to conclude that there may have been unregistered lobbying.</p>
<b>17017.CF</b>	<b>Campaign Financing</b>	<p>The Board found probable cause to conclude that a political contributor and the authorized political committee of a City elected official each violated the Ordinance's limitations on campaign or political contributions. By operation of law, any violation would be erased if the amount of the excess contributions is refunded by the committee to that contributor with the specified time. The Board issued notices of probable cause to both the contributor and committee notifying them of the apparent violation and provision and issued a companion advisory opinion in the matter. The subjects have a right to request that the Board reconsider its opinion.</p> <p>The parties argued on reconsideration that the contributor was not "seeking to do business" because it would not have an ownership in the actual "bricks and mortar" location at the City facility, but would instead be a licensor/franchisor, and thus did not have a matter involving concession agreements pending before the City Council. The rejected that argument because: (i) the contributor's affiliated businesses were still named in documents submitted to City Council as potential concessionaires; and (ii) for purposes of the campaign financing provisions of the Ordinance, the contributor was still the party-in-interest, like any franchisor, because of the degree of control it would exercise over the licensee and because good will (or bad will) would redound to the contributor, not to the licensee.</p>
<b>17026.CF</b>	<b>Campaign Financing</b>	<p>The Board found probable cause to conclude that a political contributor and the authorized political committee of a City elected official each violated the Ordinance's limitations on campaign or political contributions. By operation of law, any violation would be erased if the amount of the excess contributions is refunded by the committee to that contributor with the specified time. The Board issued notices of probable cause to both the contributor and committee notifying them of the apparent violation.</p> <p>The contributor argued on reconsideration that the contributor was not "seeking to do business" because it would not have an ownership in the actual "bricks and mortar" location at the City facility, but would instead be a licensor/franchisor, and thus did not have a matter involving concession agreements pending before the City Council. The rejected that argument because: (i) the contributor's affiliated businesses were still named in documents submitted to City Council as potential concessionaires; and (ii) for</p>

		<p>purposes of the campaign financing provisions of the Ordinance, the contributor was still the party-in-interest, like any franchisor, because of the degree of control it would exercise over the licensee and because good will (or bad will) would redound to the contributor, not to the licensee.</p> <p>The contributor received appropriate refunds, thus ending the matter.</p>
<b>17027.CF</b>	<b>Campaign Financing</b>	<p>The Board found probable cause to conclude that a political contributor and the authorized political committee of a City elected official each violated the Ordinance's limitations on campaign or political contributions. By operation of law, any violation would be erased if the amount of the excess contributions is refunded by the committee to that contributor with the specified time. The Board issued notices of probable cause to both the contributor and committee notifying them of the apparent violation.</p> <p>The contributor argued on reconsideration that the contributor was not "seeking to do business" because it would not have an ownership in the actual "bricks and mortar" location at the City facility, but would instead be a licensor/franchisor, and thus did not have a matter involving concession agreements pending before the City Council. The rejected that argument because: (i) the contributor's affiliated businesses were still named in documents submitted to City Council as potential concessionaires; and (ii) for purposes of the campaign financing provisions of the Ordinance, the contributor was still the party-in-interest, like any franchisor, because of the degree of control it would exercise over the licensee and because good will (or bad will) would redound to the contributor, not to the licensee.</p> <p>The contributor received appropriate refunds, thus ending the matter.</p>
<b>17030.LOB</b>	<b>Lobbyist disclosure;</b> <b>Lobbyist training</b>	<p>In September 2012, the Board found that a registered lobbyist violated the Ordinance for failing to file a required quarterly activity report, and to complete annual required ethics training as required. It imposed fines and referred these fines for collection. No collection was effected. The lobbyist attempted to re-register as a lobbyist in June 2017, but the Board's electronic lobbyist registration blocked that attempt. At its June 2017 meeting, the Board determined that, to re-register, the individual must pay \$3,500 in fines, which is double the amount of the fine for the training violation and double the minimum amount for the filing violation.</p>
<b>17036.CF</b>	<b>Campaign financing</b>	<p>Based on its review of lobbyists' quarterly activity reports, the Board noticed that a registered lobbyist disclosed political contributions in the calendar quarter in excess of \$1,500 to the political committee of a City elected official, in apparent violation of the Ordinance. The Board notified the lobbyist of the apparent violation, and the lobbyist confirmed that its quarterly report was incorrect and that it had mistakenly</p>

		double-reported this contribution, and that the actual amount contributed was less than \$1,500 to the political committee. The lobbyist corrected its quarterly report, and the Board dismissed the matter.
<b>17037.CF</b>	<b>Campaign financing</b>	Based on its review of lobbyists' quarterly activity reports, the Board noticed that a registered lobbyist disclosed political contributions in the calendar quarter in excess of \$1,500 to the political committee of a City elected official, in apparent violation of the Ordinance. The Board notified the lobbyist of the apparent violation, and the lobbyist confirmed that its quarterly report was incorrect and that it had mistakenly double-reported this contribution, and that the actual amount contributed was less than \$1,500 to the political committee. The lobbyist corrected its quarterly report, and the Board dismissed the matter.
<b>17038.CF</b>	<b>Campaign financing</b>	Based on its review of lobbyists' quarterly activity reports, the Board noticed that a registered lobbyist disclosed political contributions in the calendar quarter in excess of \$1,500 to the political committee of a City elected official, in apparent violation of the Ordinance. The Board notified the lobbyist of the apparent violation, and the lobbyist confirmed that its quarterly report was incorrect and that it had mistakenly double-reported this contribution, and that the actual amount contributed was less than \$1,500 to the political committee. The lobbyist corrected its quarterly report, and the Board dismissed the matter.
<b>17044.C</b>	<b>Financial interest in City business</b>	At its September 2017 meeting, the Board, based on facts presented to it, found probable cause to conclude that a full-time City employee had a prohibited financial interest in a City contract by virtue of entering into contracts with a City Council member as an independent contractor to assist with legislative services related to the operation of the Ward, and has been paid more than \$18,000 for such services, with City money, over several years. After the Board met with the employee and her attorney at its April 2018 Board meeting, the Board determined that the employee committed a minor violation of the Ordinance and sent a private letter of admonition. The Board's determination was based on the facts that the individual terminated her personal services with the alderman as soon as the Board made its probable cause finding, and neither the individual's own City department nor the alderman's office flagged the personal services contract as a problem or contacted the Board for advice. The Board will send out a reminder to all City Council members of this restriction.
<b>17048.CF</b>	<b>Campaign financing</b>	Based on materials presented to it, the Board determined at its October 2017 meeting that there is probable cause to believe that a company doing business with the City and the political committee of a City elected official violated the Ordinance due to an excess political contribution in 2015. The parties were notified of their right to dispute the finding or cure any violation by effecting a refund of the excess amount within 10 days of the notice. The elected official notified the Board that the excess amount of the contribution had in fact been refunded in 2015, though the refund was marked as an expenditure on the official's committee D-2 form filed with the State Board of Elections. After the official informed the Board of that fact, the Board closed the case.



17049.CF	<b>Campaign financing</b>	Based on materials presented to it, the Board determined at its October 2017 meeting that there is probable cause to believe that a company doing business with the City and the political committee of a City elected official violated the Ordinance due to an excess political contribution in 2015. The parties were notified of their right to dispute the finding or cure any violation by effecting a refund of the excess amount within 10 days of the notice. The elected official notified the Board that the excess amount of the contribution had in fact been refunded in 2015, though the refund was marked simply in a letter to the Illinois State of Elections and was not notated on the official's committee's D-2. After the official informed the Board of that fact, the Board closed the case.
17050.CF	<b>Campaign financing</b>	Based on materials presented to it, the Board determined at its October 2017 meeting that there is probable cause to believe that a company doing business with the City and the political committee of a City elected official violated the Ordinance due to an excess political contribution in 2015. The parties were notified of their right to dispute the finding or cure any violation by effecting a refund of the excess amount within 10 days of the notice, and the refund was effected. The Board thus closed the case.
18002.C	<b>Representation of other persons;</b> <b>Use of City property;</b> <b>Fiduciary duty</b>	Based on materials presented to it, the Board determined at its January 2018 meeting that there is probable cause to believe that elected City official violated the City property, representation of other persons and fiduciary duty provisions of the Ordinance by repeatedly contacting a City department regarding a pending matter that did not involve a constituent of the official in an apparent attempt to influence the speed and outcome of the matter. The official and the official's attorney met with the Board in June 2018. At its July 2018 meeting, the Board determined that: (i) the official did not violate the Ordinance's Representation of other persons section by contacting a department on behalf of persons who did not live in the official's ward (on behalf of colleagues) but did commit a minor violation of the Ordinance's fiduciary duty provision by informing a City department that if it did not resolve a pending matter by a particular date, the official planned to do something it would not like. The official was sent a confidential letter of admonition.
18008.LOB	<b>Unregistered lobbying</b>	A membership-based non-profit advocacy organization, operating nationwide, sent an open letter to all members of the City Council advocating that they vote against a proposed package of financial assistance being offered by the City to a business. Board staff wrote the organization that there was probable cause to believe that two employees who authored and sent the letter were lobbying on behalf of the organization's membership and required to register. In response, the organization stated that all of its members are natural persons, and none is a corporation or other entity. Staff concluded that the two employees were not required to register as lobbyists.
18036.C	<b>City-owned Property;</b> <b>Political Activity</b>	Based on a complaint filed with it, the Board determined that there was probable cause to conclude that an aldermanic candidate (who happened to be a City employee) may have violated the Ordinance by authorizing the publication and distribution of printed campaign materials or electioneering communications that displayed the City seal. After meeting with the subject and the subject's attorney on December 14, the Board determined that the violation was minor and technical, and assessed no fine, but

		<p>sent the subject a letter of admonition.</p> <p>The Board also issued an advisory opinion connected with this matter, making clear that any and all candidates for elected City office are prohibited from using the City seal in campaign materials or other electioneering communications. See</p> <p><a href="https://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/ethics/provdrs/reg/news/2018/november/cityseal.html">https://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/ethics/provdrs/reg/news/2018/november/cityseal.html</a></p>
<p><b>18044.C.1</b> <b>18044.C.2</b></p>	<p><b>Improper Influence</b></p>	<p>Based on public documents and information available to the Board, the Board determined in January 2019 that there was probable cause to conclude that Alderman Edward Burke violated the Ordinance's Improper Influence provision, §2-156-030(b), by participating in City Council discussions regarding two distinct matters involving persons from whom his law firm had received compensation in the 12 months prior to the participation or reasonably expected to receive compensation in the 12 months following the participation. Fines for violations of this section range between \$500-\$2,000 for each offense.</p> <p>The subject's attorneys met with the Board to present arguments and documents in order to rebut the Board's finding on April 26, 2019.</p> <p>Case No. 18044.C.1 involves the alderman's presiding over that portion of a Committee on Finance meeting on January 12, 2018 at which a matter involving one of his law firm's clients was heard and voted upon. The alderman had properly disclosed to the Board of Ethics that he intended to recuse from a matter involving Presence Health Care, which entity his law firm represented on an unrelated matter within the 12 months prior to the meeting but presided over that portion of the meeting at which the Presence matter was discussed, introduced witnesses, and answered procedural questions from his colleagues. He then recused himself from the vote. The Board determined by a 4-0 vote (Nancy Andrade, Stephanie Cox-Batson, and Daisy Lezama, absent) that this constituted participation in the matter, pursuant to §2-156-030(b) and Board Case No. 00008.A, <a href="https://www.chicago.gov/dam/city/depts/ethics/general/AO_ConflictOfInterest/00008-AO-redact.pdf">https://www.chicago.gov/dam/city/depts/ethics/general/AO_ConflictOfInterest/00008-AO-redact.pdf</a> in violation of §2-156-030(b) and assessed a fine of \$2,000 for the violation.</p> <p>Case No. 18044.C.2 involves the alderman's oral and written report to the Mayor and City Council regarding votes taken by the Committee on Finance in its March 26, 2018 meeting relating to General Airport Revenue Bonds. He had properly disclosed that he intended to recuse from this matter because his law firm had represented some of the financial institutions named in it and did properly recuse himself. The Board had before it no evidence that he had presided over that portion of the Committee on Finance meeting in which the airport bond matter was discussed. Hence, by the same 4-0 vote above, the matter was dismissed and closed by the Board.</p> <p>On May 20, 2019, the alderman's attorneys petitioned the Board to reconsider its determination that the alderman violated the Ordinance in Case No. 18044.C.1. At its June 14, 2019 meeting, the Board voted unanimously to deny the petition; the alderman raised no facts or information that were not before the</p>

		Board when it made its determination at its April 2019 meeting.
<b>19008.C</b>	<b>City-owned Property</b>	<p>An aldermanic candidate self-reported that electioneering mailings were sent to voters in the ward showing photographs of the candidate wearing apparel that had the official City seal emblazoned it, and also showed a person apparently in a Chicago Police uniform (but did not display CPD insignia) and a Chicago Fire Department engine with CFD insignia clearly visible.</p> <p>The Board determined that there is probable cause to conclude that the candidate violated §2-156-060 of the Ordinance, and also referred the matter to the Chicago Police and Fire Departments for action they deem appropriate. After meeting with the subject's attorney, the Board determined, by a 6-0 vote (Zaid Abdul-Aleem, absent) that: (i) considering the candidate's self-report to the Board, and the overall placement of the City seal within the campaign mailers, the use of the City seal in the mailers constituted a minor Ordinance violation, and to issue the candidate a confidential letter of admonition; and (ii) to direct Board legal staff to work with the General Counsels' office of the Chicago Police and Fire Departments and the Law Department to issue definitive guidance as to the use of CPD and CFD personnel, insignia, or equipment in political or electioneering materials or communications.</p>
<b>19018.C.1</b> <b>19018.C1.</b> <b>19018.C1.LE</b>  <b>19018.C.2</b>  <b>19018.C.3</b>  <b>19018.C4</b>	<b>Unregistered lobbying</b>	<p>Based on documentary evidence made available to the Board, the Board determined, at its May 14, 2019 meeting, that there was probable cause to believe that the three (3) individuals in Case Nos. 19018.C.1, C.2, and C.4 engaged in unregistered lobbying of a City elected official, in violation of the Ordinance. The subjects in cases 19018.C.2 and C.4 met with the Board in July 2019. After that meeting, the Board dismissed both matters, holding that in C.2, the subject's actions did not constitute lobbying because they were part of the process for applying for a permit, and in C.4 that there was insufficient evidence from which the Board could determine that there was lobbying.</p> <p>In Case No. 19018C.3, the Board determined that there is insufficient evidence for it to find probable cause that the individual engaged in unregistered lobbying and dismissed the matter.</p> <p>In Case No. 19018.C.1, the Board, at its September 13, 2019 meeting, met with Roberto Caldero and his attorney. The Board had informed Mr. Caldero in May 2019, pursuant to §2-156-245 of the Governmental Ethics Ordinance, that: (i) it had determined, based on documents made available in the media, that there was probable cause to conclude that he had engaged in several acts of unregistered lobbying in 2015, in violation of §2-156-230 of the Governmental Ethics Ordinance; (ii) he had the right to rebut the Board's finding; and (iii) if his attempt was unsuccessful, the Board could determine that he violated the Ordinance and make public his name, violation, and the sanction imposed. After this meeting, the Board determined, by a vote of 4-0 (three members absent), that: (i) Mr. Caldero engaged in unregistered lobbying in violation of §2-156-230 of the Ordinance, as he had not rebutted the finding that the facts available to the Board demonstrated he engaged in unregistered lobbying in several attempts to influence a City elected official on behalf of a client with respect to taking City action in both a legislative matter and an administrative matter; and (ii) pursuant to its authority set forth in §2-156-265(b)(3) of the Ordinance, the Board fined Mr. Caldero \$25,000 for the violation.</p>

		<p>At the Board's October 2019 meeting, the Board:</p> <p>(i) denied a request by Mr. Caldero to reconsider its determination; and</p> <p>(ii) in Case No. 19018.C.1.LE, the Board found probable cause to conclude that Elgin Sweeping, Inc., the person who retained or employed Mr. Caldero, violated to §2-156-305 of the Governmental Ethics Ordinance. At its December 6 meeting, the approved resolution of this matter, in which Elgin neither admits nor denies the allegations but nonetheless paid the \$2,000 maximum fine for this type of violation.</p> <p>At the Board's December 6, 2019 meeting, the Board voted unanimously to send the matter of the unpaid \$25,000 fine assessed as to Mr. Caldero to the Department of Law for collection proceedings.</p>
<p><b>19028.01.CF</b>  <b>19028.02.CF</b>  <b>19028.03.CF</b></p>	<p><b>Campaign Financing</b></p>	<p>Based on documents presented to the Board, and on Chicago Park District records that are publicly available, the Board determined there was probable cause to believe a company that did business with the Park District violated §2-156-445(a) of the Governmental Ethics Ordinance by contributing in excess of \$1,500 on three separate occasions to the authorized political committees of two (2) different elected City officials, in 2014 and 2018. In all the cases, the contributor successfully effected refunds of the excess amounts of the contributions. Thus, the Board dismissed each by operation of law without a finding of any violations of the Ordinance.</p>
<p><b>19030.C.1</b>  <b>19030.C.2</b>  <b>19030.C.3</b></p>	<p><b>Improper Influence; Conflicts of Interest/Appearence of Impropriety</b></p>	<p>Based on publicly available documents, the Board determined that:</p> <p>(i) in Case No. 19030.C.1, there was probable cause to conclude that an alderman violated §§2-156-030(b) and -080(b)(2) in a matter involving a client of the alderman's law firm by voting for a matter involving that client within 12 months of when his law firm represented the client. After meeting with the alderman's counsel on January 13, 2020, the Board voted to dismiss this matter. The, because the alderman successfully rebutted the Board's probable cause finding by providing evidence that he was not physically present in the Council for the vote on the matter, and subsequently had the record corrected to reflect that in the Council of Journal Proceedings.</p> <p>(ii) in Case No. 19030.C.2, the alderman, Edward Burke, did not successfully rebut the Board's probable cause finding that he violated §2-156-030(b) by writing a letter to another City official in a matter involving a client of his law firm within 12 months of when the alderman's law firm represented this client. Hence, at its meeting on January 13, 2020, the Board determined unanimously that he violated this section of the Ordinance and assessed the maximum fine of \$2,000 for this violation. While he did properly recuse himself from the matter (a Class 6(b) property tax classification application) when it came before City Council committees and the full Council, approximately one year after he wrote this letter, the record showed he failed to do a "due diligence check" before writing the letter to another City official in the matter, which involved a client of his law firm—even though his law firm did not represent the client in this matter.</p> <p>(iii) in Case No. 19030.C.3, the Board does not have sufficient factual information to determine whether there is probable cause to conclude that the alderman violated §2-156-030(b), and requested a factual investigation from the Office of Inspector General in the matter, given that a matter pending before City Council appears to have involved a client of the alderman's law firm and the client appears to have been a</p>

		client within the 12 months preceding the introduction of matter to City Council.
<b>20026.CF.1</b> <b>20026.CF.2</b>	<b>Campaign Financing</b>	<p>At its October 2020 meeting, the Board found probable cause to conclude that a company that was doing business with the City made two (2) campaign contributions to “committees of aldermen” in excess of the amount permitted by the Ordinance.</p> <p>At its October 2020 meeting, the Board found probable cause to conclude that a company that was doing business with the City made two (2) campaign contributions to “committees of aldermen” in excess of the amount permitted by the Ordinance.</p> <p>In Case 20026.CF.1, the Board and contributor attempted to resolve the matter by having the contributor receive a refund of the excessive amount contributed (\$48,500), per §2-156-445(d). At its December 2020 meeting, the Board directed that the contributor and committee must either appear before the Board at its January 2021 meeting and explain why a refund of the excess amount contributed has not been effected, or does not need to be effected (or submit written materials explaining this) or the Board could determine there was a violation of the Ordinance, which could subject both the contributor and committee to fines of up to three times (3x) the excessive amount contributed, per §2-156-465(b)(5). Because this did not occur, but the contributor did make another attempt to effect a refund, the Board, at its January 2021 meeting, voted unanimously to determine that the contributor and committee each violated the political contribution limits in §2-156-445(a). It assessed a fine of \$145,500 against the political committee, the 34<sup>th</sup> Ward Regular Democratic Committee, and assessed a \$5,000 fine against the contributor, Benchmark Construction Company, Inc. 34<sup>th</sup> Ward Alderman Austin has several political committees, two of which support candidacies for committeeperson of either her Ward or her State legislative district. One of those committees is a party-political committee, the 34<sup>th</sup> Ward Regular Democratic Committee, which, per its filings with the Illinois State Board of Elections, could support either or both of the Alderman’s candidacies for alderman or ward or legislative district committeeperson. At its February 8, 2021 meeting, the Board heard from the Committee and its attorney, and agreed to continue to matter to its March 2021 meeting in order to enable the Committee to respond fully to the Board’s determinations.</p> <p>In Case 20026.CF.2, after the parties received the Board’s probable cause letter, the excess amount (\$1,000) was properly refunded to the contributor and the case is closed by operation of law.</p>
<b>20036.C</b>	<b>Fiduciary Duty</b>	<p>Based on publicly available documents, the Board voted unanimously at its November 16, 2020 meeting to determine there is probable cause to conclude that Alderman Howard Brookins (21<sup>st</sup> Ward), a licensed Illinois attorney, may have violated the Ordinance’s fiduciary duty provision, §2-156-020, by filing an appearance on October 29, 2020 to represent a client in a criminal case pending in the Cook County Circuit Court, as the case is one in which Chicago Police Department members were the arresting officers and will be material witnesses. This is in direct contravention of an advisory opinion the Board issued in September 2019 and of the Board’s denial to change its opinion after the subject asked for reconsideration of that opinion in October 2019.*</p> <p>The Alderman was entitled to meet with the Board and/or present written arguments and materials to attempt to rebut the Board’s finding but did neither. The Board voted unanimously at its December 2020</p>

		<p>meeting that Alderman Brookins violated the Ordinance's fiduciary duty provision and imposed the maximum \$5,000 fine for this violation. At its January 2021 meeting the Board voted unanimously to send the fine to the Department of Law for collection proceedings.</p> <p>*See <a href="https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/ethics/general/AO_ElectOfficials/A19027.A.pdf">https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/ethics/general/AO_ElectOfficials/A19027.A.pdf</a> and <a href="https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/ethics/general/AO-Attorneys/19027.AReconsid.pdf">https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/ethics/general/AO-Attorneys/19027.AReconsid.pdf</a></p>
--	--	--

February 12, 2021