

**MIAMI-DADE COMMISSION ON ETHICS AND PUBLIC TRUST
MEETING SUMMARY
SEPTEMBER 27, 2006
FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT ROBERT MEYERS @ (305) 350-0613**

Opinions

06-46: The Commission on Ethics opined that the county's Conflict of Interest and Code of Ethics ordinance does not apply to physicians from the University of Miami School of Medicine except in limited circumstances. These physicians are governed by the Conflict of Interest ordinance to the extent that the provisions are incorporated into Trust rules and policies.

06-48: The Commission opined that a single piece of residential property, such as a duplex, does not constitute outside employment, but employees would have to report rental or sale of multiple properties as a business venture.

06-49: The Commission on Ethics opined that a Public Health Trust employee who owns a registry which receives community based (CBO) funding from the Public Health Trust is not in violation of the county's Conflict of Interest and Code of Ethics ordinance if the CBO funding pays salaries to family members as long as the employee does not appear before the Public Health Trust or any county board or committee on behalf of her agency seeking these funds.

06-51: The Commission on Ethics opined that a loan processor for the Miami-Dade Affordable Housing Foundation is not covered by the county's ethics ordinance. Therefore, the Ethics Commission cannot issue an opinion on this matter.

06-53: The Commission opined that the Chief Financial Officer for the Miami-Dade Department of Fire Rescue may sit on the Board of Directors of the Wellness Center in an ex-officio capacity due to the fact his participation on the board is an extension of his official duties.

06-54: The Commission on Ethics opined that a former Public Health Trust employee may contract with a Public Health Trust contractor to provide lobbying services to the Trust but may not lobby Trust officials regarding the pending selection of a firm to provide lobbying services on behalf of the Trust.

Complaints

04-44: The Commission on Ethics approved the proposed settlement that Respondent Feliu would plead no contest to one count of a four count complaint and would pay fines and costs to the Ethics Commission of \$2,071. The remaining three counts of the complaint would be dismissed. This settlement agreement is unofficial until Respondent Feliu approves it and then goes back to the Ethics Commission for final ratification.

06-17: The Commission on Ethics found no probable cause and dismissed the complaint.

06-22: The Commission on Ethics granted the Respondent's motion for a continuance.

06-30: The Commission on Ethics granted the Respondent's motion for a continuance.

06-31: The Commission on Ethics granted the Respondent's motion for a continuance.

06-32: The Commission on Ethics granted the Respondent's motion for a continuance.

06-33: The Commission on Ethics granted the Respondent's motion for a continuance.

06-35: The Commission on Ethics dismissed the complaint for lack of legal sufficiency.

06-37: The Commission on Ethics granted the Respondent's motion for a continuance.

06-38: The Commission on Ethics dismissed the complaint for lack of legal sufficiency.

06-40: The Commission on Ethics dismissed the complaint for lack of legal sufficiency.

06-41: The Commission on Ethics dismissed the complaint for lack of legal sufficiency.