RECEIVED
AUG 2 4 2026
BY:

CODE OF ETHICS COMPLAINT FORM

Name of Official alleged to have violated the Code of Ethics: Melissa Lopez

Specific section (i.e., 2-279 or 2-280) of the Code of Ethics alleged to have been violated: 2-279(1), 2-279(2), 2-279(8), 2-280(F) 2-281 Sections 2-279(5)(6)

Dated filed with the City Secretary: August 24.2026

In the Affidavit below, please describe in detail the act or acts which are the factual basis for your complaint that the above-named City officer has violated the section(s) of the Code of Ethics identified above. If you believe multiple violations have occurred, please describe in detail the act or acts which support each violation set out in your complaint:

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF TEXAS §
COUNTY OF DALLAS §

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared _____, who, being by me first duly sworn, stated under oath the following:

See Attached

*If additional space is needed, please attach continuation forms numbered in sequence as necessary.

CODE OF ETHICS COMPLAINT FORM (CONTINUATION SHEETS)

Loretta Almanza Loretta Almanza
COMPLAINANT (AFFIANT)
Address: 2564 Wasina Dr.
Farmers Branch, TX 75234
Telephone #: 972-533-5741

STATE OF TEXAS §
COUNTY OF DALLAS §

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN BEFORE ME on the 24th day of Aug, 2026.

JUNAID BALOCH
Notary Public, State of Texas
Comm. Expires 11-09-2029
Notary ID 133439288

Notary Public, State of Texas
Printed Name: JUNAID BALOCH
My Commission Expires: 11-09-2029

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FARMERS BRANCH, TEXAS

IN RE: ETHICS COMPLAINT AGAINST MELISSA LOPEZ

PETITION AND SWORN CODE OF ETHICS COMPLAINT

Complainant	**Loretta Almanza**
Respondent	**Melissa Lopez**
Respondent positions	Farmers Branch Local Government Corporation (Place 3) and Animal Shelter Advisory Committee
Appointment date alleged	July 21, 2026 (City Council confirmation; public appointment records should be attached/verified)
Primary firsthand evidence	August 5, 2026 conversation between Loretta Almanza and Melissa Lopez
Code provisions alleged	Sections 2-279(1), 2-279(2), 2-279(8), 2-280(f), and 2-281; Sections 2-279(5) and (6) to the extent investigation establishes use of office or preferential treatment

TO THE CITY SECRETARY, CITY ATTORNEY, AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL:

Loretta Almanza ("Complainant") files this sworn complaint against Melissa Lopez ("Respondent") under Section 2-284 of the Farmers Branch Code of Ordinances. The allegations based on Complainant's August 5, 2026 conversation with Respondent are made from personal knowledge.

I. COMPLAINANT AND RESPONDENT

1. Complainant is Loretta Almanza. Her contact information for filing and service is:

Mailing Address	*2564 WASINA DR.*
City, State ZIP	*FARMERS BRANCH, TX 75234*
Telephone	*972-533-5741*
Email	[redacted]

2. Respondent Melissa Lopez currently serves, according to Complainant and public City records, as an appointed member/director of the Farmers Branch Local Government Corporation ("LGC"). The City's public LGC roster lists Lopez in Place 3 for a partial term beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027. Complainant further alleges that Lopez currently serves on the Animal Shelter Advisory Committee.

3. Under Section 2-278, appointed members of the Animal Shelter Advisory Committee and members of local government corporation boards to which the City appoints directors are included within the definition of a City "officer" or "official." The Code of Ethics therefore applies to Respondent while she holds either appointment.

4. The Animal Shelter Advisory Committee does not itself appear to administer the Builders of Hope housing programs. Its relevance to this complaint is that Respondent's appointment independently places her within the Code's definition of an officer. The direct transactional conflict alleged below arises principally from Respondent's simultaneous service on the LGC.

II. NATURE OF THE COMPLAINT

5. This complaint concerns Respondent's alleged simultaneous status as (a) a City-appointed LGC director and City officer, (b) a confirmed participant or prospective beneficiary in a Builders of Hope Community Development Corporation ("Builders of Hope" or "BOH") housing program connected to City/LGC property transactions, and (c) the daughter of parents who, according to Respondent's own statement to Complainant, are participating in a separate Builders of Hope housing program.

6. The City's Resolution No. 2025-153 establishes a direct City-LGC-Builders of Hope transaction structure for attainable housing. The resolution authorizes the City to sell City-owned residential lots to the LGC for resale or conveyance to Builders of Hope. It also establishes multiple development options, including attainable for-sale homes and a Dallas County Home Replacement Project option under which a qualified participant receives a replacement housing unit and the participant's original home is ultimately conveyed to the City through the transaction structure.

7. Because the LGC is the City-created entity through which City lots are sold or conveyed to Builders of Hope, the LGC's official acts, approvals, documents, and decisions concerning those transactions are directly connected to the same housing programs from which Respondent and her parents are alleged to receive substantial economic benefits.

III. CODE PROVISIONS ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN VIOLATED

8. Section 2-279(1) prohibits a City officer or relative from having a direct or indirect financial interest in a contract with the City or a direct or indirect financial interest in certain sales of land, interests in land, materials, supplies, or services to the City when the person receives an actual financial benefit from the City transaction. ***Complainant alleges that the City-LGC-BOH transaction structure and the benefits reportedly flowing to Respondent and her parents warrant investigation under this subsection.***

9. Section 2-279(2) prohibits an officer from participating in a vote or decision on a matter in which the officer has a substantial interest. Section 2-278 further provides that a substantial interest in qualifying real property held by a relative within the second degree may be attributed to the officer. ***Parents are expressly included within the Code's definition of "relative."***

10. Section 2-281 requires an officer who has a substantial interest in a matter pending before the body, board, commission, corporation, or committee of which the officer is a member to file an affidavit stating the nature and extent of the substantial interest before the vote or decision and to abstain from further participation in the matter.

11. Section 2-279(8) prohibits an officer from engaging in outside activities that conflict with or are incompatible with the officer's official position or duties.

12. Section 2-280(f) incorporates the City Ethics Handbook. The Handbook directs elected officials and advisory board members to guard against conflicts and self-dealing and states, in substance, that an official should not discuss or decide an issue within the official's jurisdiction when the issue may financially affect the official or the official's family. It also emphasizes disclosure of possible conflicts to avoid even the appearance of impropriety.

13. Sections 2-279(5) and 2-279(6) prohibit, respectively, using an official position to secure special privileges or benefits and granting special consideration, treatment, or advantage beyond that normally available to others. Complainant does not presently possess the nonpublic records necessary to determine whether Respondent used her appointment, influence, or access to obtain preferential selection or terms. These subsections are alleged to the extent the investigation establishes such conduct.

IV. DETAILED FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

14. On or about July 21, 2026, according to Complainant, the Farmers Branch City Council confirmed Respondent's appointments to the LGC and the Animal Shelter Advisory Committee. The current public LGC roster identifies Respondent as a Place 3 director serving a partial term in 2026-2027. The official minutes, appointment applications, oath/certification documents, and related Council records should be obtained and attached to the investigative record.

15. On August 5, 2026, Complainant Loretta Almanza personally spoke with Respondent Melissa Lopez.

16. During that conversation, Respondent told Complainant, in substance, that Respondent's parents were getting a home through Builders of Hope.

17. Respondent also told Complainant, in substance, that Respondent herself was on the confirmed list of people who were getting a home through Builders of Hope, but through a separate program from the program in which her parents were participating.

18. Complainant understood Respondent's statement to mean that both Respondent and her parents had been selected or confirmed to receive economically valuable housing benefits associated with Builders of Hope programs. The parent's home in question is on Squire Pl.

19. Public City records establish that Builders of Hope housing in Farmers Branch is not unrelated to the LGC. Resolution No. 2025-153 authorizes the City's sale of up to 22 City-owned lots to the LGC for resale to Builders of Hope for attainable housing, with specified maximum initial home-sale prices, and provides a separate replacement-housing structure for qualified participants.

20. Respondent's parents are "relatives" within Section 2-278. To the extent they have or acquire an equitable, legal, beneficial, or other qualifying interest in real property through a BOH transaction, their interests may constitute a "substantial interest" attributable to Respondent if the Code's monetary and special-economic-effect requirements are met.

21. Respondent's own confirmed participation likewise creates a personal economic interest in the operation, terms, property conveyances, and implementation of a housing program involving City-owned lots, the LGC, and Builders of Hope. A home sold below market, a subsidized lot, a replacement residence, or other favorable housing transaction can constitute a significant economic benefit.

22. The public record describes the LGC as existing to aid and act on behalf of the City to accomplish governmental purposes. Its role in the BOH program includes receiving City property and reselling or conveying it to Builders of Hope. Thus, BOH-related contracts, lot conveyances, transaction approvals, program changes, or other LGC decisions may have a special economic effect on Respondent or her parents distinguishable from the public generally.

23. The investigation should determine whether Respondent filed the affidavit required by Section 2-281 before any BOH-related matter in which she had a substantial interest was discussed or decided, whether she left the discussion and abstained from all participation, and whether she filed the Code-of-Ethics certification required upon taking office under Section 2-282.

24. Complainant further understands, on information and belief, that City employees may be restricted from participating in some City-connected housing programs because of conflict-of-interest concerns even when the employee works outside the department administering the program. The same standard should apply in this case.

25. Regardless of employee rules, Respondent is independently subject to the Code of Ethics as a City officer, and her LGC position has a direct connection to the BOH property transactions at issue.

V. COUNT ONE - SECTION 2-280(f): SELF-DEALING / FINANCIAL CONFLICT

26. Complainant incorporates the preceding allegations. Respondent's alleged status as a confirmed BOH beneficiary, together with her parents' alleged participation in a separate BOH housing program, creates a substantial and specific personal/family financial interest in a City-connected housing initiative.

27. At the same time, Respondent serves as a director of the LGC, the City-created corporation used to receive City-owned lots and resell or convey them to Builders of Hope. The overlap between private financial benefit and official jurisdiction presents the type of self-dealing conflict and appearance of impropriety the Ethics Handbook incorporated through Section 2-280(f) directs City officers to avoid.

VI. COUNT TWO - SECTIONS 2-279(1) AND 2-279(8): FINANCIAL INTEREST / INCOMPATIBLE PRIVATE ACTIVITY

28. Complainant incorporates the preceding allegations. The investigation should determine whether Respondent or her parents have a direct or indirect financial interest in a contract, land transaction, participation agreement, property conveyance, subsidy, or related transaction with the City or LGC within the meaning of Section 2-279(1).

29. If the BOH transactions alleged by Respondent result in actual financial benefits derived from the City-LGC property transaction structure, Respondent's simultaneous participation as a private program beneficiary and LGC officer may violate Section 2-279(1) and, independently, may constitute an outside activity incompatible with her LGC duties under Section 2-279(8).

VII. COUNT THREE - SECTION 2-279(2) AND SECTION 2-281: PARTICIPATION, DISCLOSURE, AND RECUSAL

30. Complainant incorporates the preceding allegations. If Respondent participated in any vote, decision, discussion, recommendation, approval, or other official LGC action concerning a matter in which Respondent or her parents had a substantial interest, Section 2-279(2) prohibits that participation.

31. If such a matter was pending before the LGC, Section 2-281 required Respondent, before the vote or decision, to file an affidavit stating the nature and extent of the substantial interest and to abstain from further participation. The City Secretary's records and LGC meeting records should establish whether Respondent complied.

VIII. COUNT FOUR - SECTIONS 2-279(5) AND 2-279(6): SPECIAL PRIVILEGES OR PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT, IF ESTABLISHED

32. Complainant incorporates the preceding allegations. Respondent's statement that she was on a "confirmed" list shortly after assuming City-appointed positions warrants review of the timing and process by which she applied, qualified, was ranked, and was selected for the BOH program.

33. If records show that Respondent used her official title, access, influence, relationships, nonpublic information, or LGC authority to secure program admission, a particular lot, pricing, subsidy, priority, waiver, or other benefit for herself or her relatives, such conduct may violate Section 2-279(5). If records show that she used official authority to cause special treatment or an advantage beyond what was normally available to similarly situated applicants, such conduct may violate Section 2-279(6).

IX. SUPPORTING EVIDENCE AND WITNESSES

34. The principal firsthand witness is Loretta Almanza, who can testify about her August 5, 2026 conversation with Respondent and the statements Respondent made concerning her parents' BOH home and Respondent's own confirmed status in a separate BOH program.

35. Public records that include the current LGC roster, Council appointment records and minutes, Resolution No. 2025-153 and its attachments, and all LGC agendas, minutes, packets, recordings, and transaction records involving Builders of Hope after Respondent's appointment.

X. REQUESTED ACTION AND RELIEF

36. Complainant respectfully requests that the City Secretary accept and file this sworn complaint under Section 2-284 and distribute it as required by the Code.

37. Complainant requests that the City Attorney determine that the complaint contains sufficient detail and alleges potential violations of the Code of Ethics warranting an independent investigation.

38. Pending resolution, Complainant requests that appropriate safeguards be used so Respondent does not participate in any LGC discussion, communication, recommendation, vote, decision, contract, conveyance, or other action concerning Builders of Hope or any transaction that may financially affect Respondent or her relatives, to the extent required by Sections 2-279 and 2-281.

39. Following investigation and any hearing required by Section 2-284, Complainant requests findings as to each alleged violation and any action authorized by Section 2-285 that the City Council determines appropriate based on the evidence.

40. Complainant requests all other relief consistent with the Code of Ethics and the public interest.