

MEH



August 23, 1990

City of Chicago
Richard M. Daley, Mayor

C O N F I D E N T I A L

**ADVISORY OPINION
CASE NO. 90029.A**

Board of Ethics

J. B. DeWilde
Executive Director

Albert F. Hofeld
Chair

Angeles L. Eames
Vice Chair

Margaret Carter
Russell Hardin
Mariene O. Rankin
Catherine M. Ryan

Suite 530
205 West Randolph Street
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 744-9660

Since the beginning of April, 1990, the Board of Ethics has received several requests from individuals seeking advisory opinions as to the propriety of their continued participation in the Urban Homestead Program and the Section 312 Rehabilitation Loan Program. On May 8, 1990, the Board received a request from INDIVIDUAL A. Until April the Board of Ethics was neither familiar with these programs nor had it reviewed these programs in light of the Governmental Ethics Ordinance. Once brought to the Board's attention, an investigation was initiated and extensive research was conducted in each of these cases.

These requests raised two distinct issues: (1) Whether City employees can receive property from the City through its Urban Homestead Program; and (2) Whether City employees can receive loans from programs administered or funded by the City, including funds from the Section 312 Loan Program.

On August 10, 1990 the Board concluded that, as a general matter, the Governmental Ethics Ordinance prohibits City employees from participating in the Urban Homestead Program. However, based on the totality of the circumstances in this particular case, it is the Board's opinion that equity and justice require it to conclude that INDIVIDUAL A should be allowed to continue to participate in the Program. With regard to the issue of related loan programs, the Board concluded that INDIVIDUAL A may not receive loans for \$5,000 or more from loan programs administered by the City, including Section 312 Rehabilitation loans.

The Board of Ethics is the agency charged with the responsibility of faithfully interpreting the Governmental Ethics Ordinance. It renders advisory opinions which are consistent with the language, purpose and goals of the Ordinance. When appropriate, the Board makes recommendations



90029-A

August 23, 1990
Page 2

for further action. Recommendations reflecting the Board's opinion in this case shall be forwarded to the Department of Housing.

In coming to its decisions, the Board made a thorough review of the Urban Homestead Program and the Section 312 Rehabilitation Loan Program and conducted extensive research of the facts surrounding INDIVIDUAL A'S particular situation. Our review of the Urban Homestead Program indicates it was designed to provide homes to low and moderate income families that reside in the City of Chicago. The Program is administered by the City's Department of Housing. Homes needing substantial rehabilitation are made available to qualified winners of a random public drawing (the Housing Lottery). Eligible winners purchase their selected property for \$1.00 and they promise to fulfill obligations stipulated in the Homesteader's Purchase Agreement, which among other things requires the Homesteader to bring the property into City code compliance. Prior to the conveyance of conditional title, the property involved belongs to the City.

The Board's review of INDIVIDUAL A'S circumstances revealed the following:

INDIVIDUAL A submitted an application to participate in the Urban Homestead Housing Lottery INDIVIDUAL A paying the required \$25.00 application fee. In that application, she clearly stated that she INDIVIDUAL A was employed by the City of Chicago INDIVIDUAL A. In addition, INDIVIDUAL A attached to the application her Wage and Tax Statements showing the City as her employer.

Her application to participate in the lottery was approved and, at the INDIVIDUAL A lottery, her name was randomly chosen. This entitled INDIVIDUAL A to participate in the Urban Homestead Program, provided she fulfilled the necessary eligibility requirements. One requirement, verification of her employment and income, was met when the Department of Housing received confirmation that she was employed with the City of Chicago INDIVIDUAL A. Other requirements which she met included the completion of a House Verification Report, which again verified her employment with the City, INDIVIDUAL A, a City inspector's determination of the rehabilitation work needed INDIVIDUAL A, an estimation of the cost of the work, and INDIVIDUAL A'S payment of approximately \$125.00 to obtain an appraisal on the property.

INDIVIDUAL A after fulfilling the eligibility requirements under the program, INDIVIDUAL A entered into the Homesteader's Purchase Agreement with the City. A signed quit claim deed from the City was recorded on INDIVIDUAL A

90029.A

August 23, 1990
Page 3

granting her conditional title to the property awarded under the program. At that time, **INDIVIDUAL A** was advised by the Department of Housing that she would be moving into her home in January.

In addition to meeting the requirements imposed by the Homestead Program, **INDIVIDUAL A** worked with the Department of Housing to obtain financing for the necessary rehabilitation work. She completed a Neighborhood Home Improvement Loan Program Application and applied for a Section 312 loan for \$22,350. On both of these applications, **INDIVIDUAL A** listed the City of Chicago as her employer. On October 5, 1989, she was notified that the 312 loan had been approved and a settlement date was scheduled. At that point **INDIVIDUAL A's** eligibility in the Urban Homestead Program had not been questioned.

However, **INDIVIDUAL A** was notified that her 312 loan funds would be cancelled because of her status as a City employee. In addition, her receipt of property itself under the Homestead Program was called into question. Since that time, all further action regarding the property she was to receive has ceased.

When our staff spoke with **INDIVIDUAL A** over the telephone, she stated that she still desired to have the home, and believe that she could locate other sources of funding for the rehabilitation work. In addition, if she had not been given a January move-in date, she would have made other living arrangements, since the home she presently rents is being sold.

ISSUE I: Whether City employees can receive property from the City through its Urban Homestead Program.

The Board has concluded that City employees are prohibited by the Governmental Ethics Ordinance from receiving property through the Urban Homestead Program. The Board, in coming to this determination, looked to Section 26.2-11 of the Ordinance. This section contains two provisions which prohibit City employees from receiving property under the Urban Homestead Program. The first provision that the Board reviewed prohibits an employee from having a financial interest in a contract of the City when the consideration of the contract is paid with funds which belong to or are administered by the City or when the consideration of the contract is authorized by ordinance. The exact language of Section 26.2-11 is as follows:

No elected official or employee shall have a financial interest in his own name or in the name of any other person in any contract, work or business of the City or in the sale of any article, whenever the expense, price or consideration of the contract, work, business or

90029.A

August 23, 1990

Page 4

sale is paid with funds belonging to or administered by the City, or is authorized by ordinance. Compensation for property taken pursuant to the City's eminent domain power shall not constitute a financial interest within the meaning of this section. Unless sold pursuant to a process of competitive bidding following public notice, no elected official or employee shall have a financial interest in the purchase of any property that (i) belongs to the City, or (ii) is sold for taxes or assessments, or (iii) is sold by virtue of legal process at the suit of the City. No appointed official shall engage in a transaction described in this section unless the matter is wholly unrelated to the official's City duties and responsibilities.

One definition of financial interest in the Ethics Ordinance is: "any interest with a cost or present value of \$5,000.00 or more." Section 26.2-1(1)(ii). Our research indicates that the property which one would receive under the Homesteader's Purchase Agreement will have a value of more than \$5,000.00.

The term "consideration" of a contract is defined as the benefit which one gives up in exchange for some other benefit. The City's consideration of the contract in this case is the Homestead property, and the contract in question is the Homesteader's Purchase Agreement. Moreover, the transfer of the property to the Homesteader is made pursuant to City Council ordinance. Consequently, the Board was compelled to conclude that any employee who enters into the Homesteader's Purchase Agreement with the City would have a financial interest in a contract, the consideration of which is authorized by ordinance. This conduct is clearly prohibited by the Ethics Ordinance.

Additionally, on this same issue, the Board looked to the provision of Section 26.2-11 which prohibits an employee from having a financial interest in the purchase of property which belongs to the City. Our research shows the Homestead Program involves a purchase of City property because the Homesteader receives property by quit claim deed from the City in exchange for \$1 and the promise to fulfill obligations stipulated in the Homesteader's Purchase Agreement. An exception to this part of the provision exists for property sold by the City pursuant to a process of competitive bidding. However, since the Homestead Program does not involve competitive bidding at any point of the process, this exception does not apply. The Board's analysis of this provision required it to conclude that an employee would have a financial interest in the purchase of property which belongs to the City if they entered into the Homesteader's Purchase Agreement with the City. Accordingly, it is the opinion

August 23, 1990
Page 5

of the Board that Section 26.2-11 of the Ordinance prohibits City employees from receiving property through the Homestead Program.

Our investigation reveals that INDIVIDUAL A entered into the Homesteader's Agreement on [REDACTED]. Under Section 26.2-41, penalties may be imposed on employees for a violation of the Ethics Ordinance. Based on the opinion stated above, the question with which the Board was necessarily confronted was whether INDIVIDUAL A should be allowed to continue to participate in the Urban Homestead Program.

This case presented a very unique and difficult situation to the Board. The uniqueness of the case in the first instance centers on the fact that considerable luck is required before one can become a Homesteader. Under this Program, INDIVIDUAL A'S name had to be randomly chosen at the public drawing known as the Housing Lottery. This "luck of the draw" requirement distinguishes the Homestead Program from all other programs previously analyzed under Section 26.2-11 of the Ethics Ordinance. This unique feature, viewed in light of the totality of INDIVIDUAL A'S circumstances, gave the Board much to consider in coming to its decision.

In reviewing the facts, it became obvious to this Board that throughout her participation in the Program INDIVIDUAL A acted in good faith and in reliance on the affirmative actions of others to her detriment. She did not conceal the fact that she was a City employee. The initial application filed on [REDACTED] clearly states her employer as the City of Chicago. Subsequent documents which she was required to complete also verify this fact. Yet, until recently INDIVIDUAL A was allowed to participate in the Program.

Moreover, since winning the Lottery both INDIVIDUAL A and the City have expended substantial sums of time, effort and money. The Board concluded that it would be a great loss to everyone concerned, should INDIVIDUAL A not be permitted to continue in the Program. Among other things, contracts have been entered into, credit checks run, inspections and appraisals completed, and a quit claim deed for the property awarded to INDIVIDUAL A has been recorded. Under these circumstances, for the Board to negate what has already been done would be unconscionable. Therefore, in coming to our decision on this matter, we considered not just the letter of the Ordinance but the principles of equity, good conscience and justice.

For the foregoing reasons the Board cannot in this case make the recommendation that INDIVIDUAL A be prohibited from further participation in the Program. We have concluded that to do so would be highly inequitable and unjust.

90029.A

August 23, 1990

Page 6

ISSUE II: Whether City employees can receive loans from programs administered or funded by the City, including funds from the Section 312 Loan Program.

The Board also reviewed Section 26.2-11 to determine whether City employees are eligible to participate in Section 312 and other loan programs. As previously discussed, no City employee may have a financial interest in any contract when the price or consideration of the contract is paid with funds administered by the City. It is our understanding, based upon our review of the Section 312 Loan Program, that HUD provides loan funds which the City Department of Housing administers. In past decisions of the Board, it has been determined that the Ethics Ordinance prohibits City employees from receiving loans of \$5,000 or more from programs administered by the Department of Housing (e.g. Case No. 89121.A). In that case, the Board of Ethics determined that the loans fell within Section 26.2-11 of the Ordinance because: (1) loan agreements are contracts; and (2) the loans in question were administered by the City. For these reasons, it is the Board's opinion in this case that City employees are prohibited from receiving loans of \$5,000 or more from loan programs administered by the City. This opinion allows INDIVIDUAL A to receive loan funds of less than \$5,000 through loan programs administered by the City. Loans for \$5,000 or more would constitute a violation of the Ordinance.

CONCLUSION:

The Board's determination and recommendations to the Housing Department based upon the totality of circumstances in this case are as follows: (1) that INDIVIDUAL A be allowed to continue her participation in the Urban Homestead Program, so long as she can meet the conditions of the Program; (2) that INDIVIDUAL A may not receive funds of \$5,000 or more from loan programs administered by the City.

RELIANCE:

An advisory opinion issued for one case is not a sufficient basis for inferring legal permissibility or impermissibility of conduct in other cases, even though cases may be similar in some respects. This advisory opinion is based on the specific set of circumstances described above. It should be relied upon for legal guidance only by the following persons: (1) persons involved in specific transaction or activity with respect to which an advisory opinion is rendered, or (2) persons involved in a specific transaction or activity which is indistinguishable in all its material aspects from the transaction or activity with respect to which an advisory opinion is rendered.

90029.A

August 23, 1990
Page 7

cc: Michael Schubert, Commissioner
Department of Housing

Kelly Welsh, Corporation Counsel
Department of Law

90029.L2