



FILE COPY

CLERK OF THE BOARD

2011 MAY 12 PM 1:38

CLERK, CIRCUIT & COUNTY COURTS
DADE COUNTY, FLA.
#1

**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
COMMISSION ON ETHICS & PUBLIC TRUST**

In re: SUSAN E. TRENCH
_____ /

C 11-03

PUBLIC REPORT AND FINAL ORDER

The ASSISTANT ADVOCATE for the Commission on Ethics filed the above-referenced COMPLAINT against RESPONDENT Susan E. Trench for allegedly violating the City of Miami Lobbying Ordinance at Sec. 2-645 (a). Specifically, the COMPLAINT claimed that RESPONDENT lobbied the City of Miami without registering as a lobbyist, without taking the prerequisite "Professionalism and Ethics Seminar," and without paying the appropriate registration fees.

Pursuant to the Code of Miami-Dade County at Sec. 2-1068, the jurisdiction of the Ethics Commission extends "to any person required to comply with the County or municipal Code of Ethics Ordinances...."

On April 28, 2011, in public session, the ASSISTANT ADVOCATE reported to the Ethics Commission that RESPONDENT had complied with all of the above-referenced lobbying requirements. Consequently, the Ethics Commission found that the public interest would not be served by proceeding further in this matter and granted the ASSISTANT ADVOCATE'S VOLUNTARY MOTION TO DISMISS.¹ However, noting that a large amount of resources had been expended by both the City of Miami Clerk's Office and the Commission on Ethics in

¹ The Ethics Commission may, at its discretion, discharge a COMPLAINT at any stage of disposition, as per the County Code at Sec. 2-1074 (s).

obtaining compliance, the Ethics Commission assessed costs against RESPONDENT in the amount of \$250.00.²

Therefore it is:

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED THAT COMPLAINT C 11-03 is hereby DISMISSED
and costs are assessed at \$250.00.

DONE AND ORDERED by the Miami-Dade County Commission on Ethics & Public Trust in public session on April 28, 2011.

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY COMMISSION ON
ETHICS & PUBLIC TRUST

By:



Dawn E. Addy
Chair

Signed on this date: 5/6/11

² Dating back to June 2010, numerous notices were sent to RESPONDENT's own law firm and were consistently ignored.