



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

JAN 28 2009

**CERTIFIED MAIL**  
**RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED**

Thomas Fitton  
President  
Judicial Watch, Inc.  
501 School Street, S.W.  
Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20024

RE: MUR 6035  
Northern Trust Company  
Barack Obama  
Obama 2010, Inc. and  
Harvey S. Wineberg, in his official  
capacity as treasurer  
Obama for Illinois, Inc. and  
Harvey S. Wineberg, in his official  
capacity as treasurer (terminated)

Dear Mr. Fitton:

On January 22, 2009, the Federal Election Commission reviewed the allegations in your complaint dated July 9, 2008, and found that on the basis of the information provided in your complaint, and information provided by the respondents, there is no reason to believe Northern Trust Company and Barack Obama violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a) and no reason to believe Obama 2010, Inc. and Harvey S. Weinberg, in his official capacity as treasurer, and Obama for Illinois, Inc. and Harvey S. Weinberg, in his official capacity as treasurer, (terminated) violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 441b(a) and 434(b)(2). Accordingly, on January 22, 2009, the Commission closed the file in this matter.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. *See* Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003). The Factual and Legal Analyses, which more fully explain the Commission's findings are enclosed.

Mr. Fitton  
Page 2

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Susan L. Lebeaux".

Susan L. Lebeaux  
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosures  
Factual and Legal Analyses

1  
2 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**  
3  
4 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**  
5

6  
7  
8 **RESPONDENTS:** Northern Trust Company

**MUR 6035**  
9

10 **I. GENERATION OF MATTER**

11 This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election  
12 Commission by Thomas Fitton, on behalf of Judicial Watch, Inc. *See* 2 U.S.C.  
13 § 437g(a)(1).

14 **II. FACTUAL SUMMARY**

15 The complaint alleges, based on an article in *The Washington Post*, that then-  
16 Senator Barack Obama and his wife Michelle Obama obtained a mortgage from Northern  
17 Trust Company (“Northern Trust”) at a discounted interest rate, which resulted in a  
18 “disguised campaign contribution to [then-]Senator Obama of at least \$108,000.” The  
19 complaint further alleges that the contribution was a prohibited corporate contribution  
20 and that neither of then-Senator Obama’s campaigns nor Northern Trust reported the  
21 contribution. On July 2, 2008, *The Washington Post* published an article stating that  
22 then-Senator Barack Obama and Michelle Obama obtained a mortgage from Northern  
23 Trust on June 15, 2005, for \$1.32 million at a 5.67 percent interest rate, for the purchase  
24 of a \$1.65 million home on Chicago’s south side. Joe Stephens, *Obama Got Discount on*  
25 *Home Loan*, Wash. Post, July 2, 2008, at A03 (“Stephens article”). According to the  
26 article, the Obamas received a mortgage from Northern Trust at a discounted rate, lower  
27 than “the average offered at the time in Chicago for similarly structured jumbo loans.” *Id.*  
28 Rates for similar loans during the same week averaged 5.93 percent to 6.0 percent,

1 according to the story, and may have saved the then-Senator more than \$300 a month. *Id.*  
2 A spokesman for then-Senator Obama, quoted in the article, said that the interest rate was  
3 adjusted to account for a competing offer from another lender and other factors. *Id.* The  
4 article quoted the Obama spokesman as saying “[t]he Obamas have since had as much as  
5 \$3 million invested through Northern Trust.” *Id.* The article noted that when the  
6 Obamas secured the loan, their income had risen dramatically, because Barack Obama  
7 assumed his Senate seat and received a \$2.27 million book deal from Random House, and  
8 Michelle Obama received a promotion to vice president at the University of Chicago  
9 Hospitals. *Id.* It stated, however, that the Obamas had no prior relationship with  
10 Northern Trust when they applied for the loan. *Id.* The article also quoted a Northern  
11 Trust official as stating that Northern Trust has no formal program to provide discounts to  
12 public officials, but that a person’s salary and occupation are two factors they take into  
13 consideration when anyone is seeking a mortgage at Northern Trust. *Id.* The official  
14 further stated that “[t]he bottom line is, this was a business proposition for us” and “our  
15 business model is to service and pursue successful individuals, families and institutions.”  
16 *Id.*<sup>1</sup>

17 Based on the Stephens article, Judicial Watch filed a complaint with the  
18 Commission. The complaint states that the Stephens article reports that “the favorable  
19 interest rate would save [then-]Sen. Obama over \$300 a month, which over the life of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Stephens article was criticized by a later article in *The Washington Post* which stated that the Stephens article “had a negative cast to it and lacked the important context that other wealthy and savvy borrowers could have done as well under similar circumstances.” Deborah Howell, *More Story Than a Loan Merited*, Wash. Post, July 13, 2008 at B06. The Stephens article was also criticized by an article in the Columbia Journalism Review, which questioned why *The Washington Post* ran the Stephens article because Stephens left the question of whether Obama’s political position affected the details of his loan unanswered and “all that’s left are a bunch of weak correlations.” Justin Peters, *Behind Barack’s “Suspicious” Mortgage*, Colum. Journalism Rev., July 2, 2008.

1 30-year loan, would be at least \$108,000.” In further quoting the article, the complaint  
2 states that “[t]he Obamas had no prior relationship with Northern Trust when they  
3 applied for the loan. They received an oral commitment on Feb. 4, 2005, and locked in  
4 the rate of 5.625 percent, the campaign said. On that date, HSH [HSH Associates,  
5 Financial Publishers] data show, the average rate in Chicago for a 30-year fixed-rate  
6 jumbo loan with no points was about 5.94 percent.” *Id.*

7 The complaint asserts that the Stephens article suggests that then-Senator Obama  
8 received special treatment because he was a U.S. Senator, based on a quote in the article  
9 from Northern Trust Vice President John O’Connell reportedly stating that among the  
10 factors he would expect Northern Trust would consider in setting a mortgage rate is “a  
11 person’s occupation.” *Id.* at 2-3. The complaint further quotes the Stephens article as  
12 reportedly stating that since 1990, Northern Trust employees contributed \$71,000 to then-  
13 Senator Obama’s political campaigns, including a \$1,250 contribution to Senator  
14 Obama’s 2004 campaign for U.S. Senate. *Id.* at 3.

15 The complaint then alleges that, based on the information in the Stephens article,  
16 Northern Trust’s discounted mortgage is actually a disguised campaign contribution to  
17 then-Senator Obama because at the time he secured his mortgage, it appears that he was  
18 raising funds for his 2004 and 2010 Senate campaigns. *Id.* It further alleges the  
19 \$108,000 contribution by Northern Trust, a \$300 a month “savings” over the life of the  
20 Obamas’ 30-year mortgage loan based on the discounted rate, would violate federal laws  
21 because it is a corporate contribution and should have been disclosed. *Id.*

22 The response from Northern Trust states that there was no connection between the  
23 mortgage and an election, and that even if there were a connection, the mortgage was not

1 a contribution from Northern Trust. Northern Trust is a “financial services institution  
2 that focuses on, among other things, integrated personal wealth management solutions for  
3 successful individuals, families, foundations, etc., and looks to establish long-term  
4 financial relationships with these clients.” Mortgage loans are “commonly provided as a  
5 service to our existing customers and as a way to introduce new and potential clients to  
6 the institution and familiarize them with the other services that the institution can  
7 provide.” During discussions about the mortgage, Northern Trust discussed the  
8 possibility of providing investment services to then-Senator and Ms. Obama. In light of  
9 the investment business Northern Trust anticipated receiving from then-Senator and Ms.  
10 Obama, Northern Trust approved a discount from the rate on Northern Trust’s internal  
11 rate sheet. Northern Trust provides discounts off its internal rate sheet in the ordinary  
12 course of its business. Then-Senator and Ms. Obama entered into a mortgage loan  
13 agreement and also opened a brokerage account at Northern Trust’s brokerage affiliate,  
14 Northern Trust Securities, Inc.

15 According to the response, Northern Trust searched its records to locate all of the  
16 \$1 million or more loans that had a 30-year term and a fixed interest rate, which were  
17 closed and funded during the period from January 1, 2005 to August 1, 2005. Fourteen  
18 mortgage loans fit that criteria, and “of these 14, eight [including the Obamas’ loan] were  
19 locked in at a ‘discount’ in the form of a reduction in the interest rate indicated on  
20 Northern Trust’s internally produced ‘rate sheet.’ This rate sheet, which is published  
21 internally at Northern Trust at least daily, is the starting point used by Northern Trust  
22 staff for determining the interest rate for a mortgage.”

23

1

2 **III. LEGAL ANALYSIS**

3       The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (“the Act”), prohibits  
4 corporations from making a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election  
5 to any political office. 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a). Candidates and political committees are also  
6 prohibited from knowingly accepting contributions from corporations. *Id.* The Obamas’  
7 loan from Northern Trust Company was procured for the purchase of the Obamas’ new  
8 home in Chicago, as evidenced by the mortgage and closing documents attached to the  
9 complaint. There is no factual information from the complaint, the responses, or the  
10 Stephens article, that funds from the mortgage were used “in connection with any  
11 election to any political office,” a nexus required for a corporate contribution or  
12 expenditure to be prohibited under the Act. 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a). This analysis is  
13 consistent with MUR 4944 (Hillary Clinton), where the Commission found no reason to  
14 believe that Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, her Senate campaign committee, and  
15 Washington Mutual Home Loans, Inc. violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a) in relation to a  
16 mortgage Hillary Rodham Clinton and former President Bill Clinton obtained for their  
17 home in Chappaqua, New York.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The MUR 4944 Statement of Reasons of Commissioners McDonald, Mason, Sandstrom, Smith and Thomas states “[i]t is undisputed that the money that PNC lent to the Clintons was used solely for the purchase of their new home. There is no indication that this loan “freed up” funds then used by Mrs. Clinton for campaign expenses.” The SOR further draws an analogy between the mortgage and the Commission’s personal use regulations, which classify mortgage payments as personal use, and notes that payments made to a candidate, irrespective of the candidacy, are not treated as a contribution. 11 C.F.R. § 113(g) (1) and (6). Further, it states that treating bank loans “for a candidate’s home purchase or other personal living expenses as not “in connection with the campaign” and as made “irrespective of the candidacy” is well founded, in our view.”

1           In addition, the loan is not considered a prohibited corporate contribution. The  
2 Act states that the term “contribution” includes “any...loan...made by any person for the  
3 purpose of influencing any election for federal office.” 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(A)(i). An  
4 exception to this definition is a loan of money by a bank that is made in accordance with  
5 applicable law and in the ordinary course of business. 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(B)(vii). A loan  
6 is considered in the ordinary course of business if it (1) bears the usual and customary  
7 interest rate of the lending institution for the category of loan involved; (2) is made on a  
8 basis that assures repayment; (3) is evidenced by a written instrument; and (4) is subject  
9 to a due date or amortization schedule. 11 C.F.R. § 100.82(a)(1)-(4). The Commission’s  
10 regulations define “made on a basis that assures repayment” as, *inter alia*, when the  
11 lending institution making the loan has perfected a security interest in collateral owned  
12 by the candidate, the fair market value of the collateral is equal to or greater than the loan  
13 amount and the candidate provides documentation of the perfected security interest.  
14 11 C.F.R. § 100.82(e)(1)(ii).

15           Information provided in Northern Trust’s response and the complaint shows the  
16 loan was made in accordance with applicable law and in the ordinary course of business.  
17 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(A)(i). Northern Trust’s response and the loan documentation  
18 adequately address each of the four criteria for a loan to be made in the ordinary course  
19 of business, set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 100.82(a). First, the Obamas’ loan bears the usual  
20 and customary interest rate of Northern Trust because the Obamas were afforded a  
21 discount comparable to discounts given to other similarly situated borrowers. Eight of  
22 the 14 mortgage loans comparable to the Obamas’ loan at Northern Trust received  
23 discounts. The Obamas’ loan was one of a majority of the comparable mortgages that



1 received a discount, and it was within the range of the other mortgage discounts. *See*  
2 MUR 5198 (Cantwell) (interest rate for loan was usual and customary because 36 of 38  
3 comparable lines of credit in a two-year period were at or below the rate offered to  
4 candidate) and MUR 5421 (Kerry) (interest rate was usual and customary because 48 of  
5 52 comparable loans granted during a five-month period had the same interest rate as  
6 offered to candidate).

7 Further, Northern Trust uses mortgage loans as a way to introduce new and  
8 potential clients to the institution and familiarize them with the other services that the  
9 institution provides. The Obamas were offered a discounted rate because Northern Trust  
10 anticipated receiving investment business from the Obamas.

11 Second, the Obamas' mortgage was made on a basis that assures repayment  
12 because Northern Trust had a perfected security interest in the Obamas' \$1.65 million  
13 home as collateral for the \$1.32 million loan, according to the mortgage documents and  
14 response from Northern Trust. Finally, the Obamas' mortgage was evidenced by written  
15 instruments, the mortgage documents, and is subject to a due date of July 1, 2035, which  
16 fulfills the third and fourth requirements of 11 C.F.R. § 100.82(a). Thus, the mortgage  
17 loan is not a prohibited corporate contribution because it falls under the exception for  
18 loans made in accordance with applicable law and in the ordinary course of business. For  
19 all of these reasons, the Commission finds no reason to believe that Northern Trust  
20 violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a).

1  
2 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**  
3  
4 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**  
5

6  
7  
8 **RESPONDENTS:** Barack Obama **MUR 6035**  
9 Obama 2010, Inc., and Harvey S. Wineberg,  
10 in his official capacity as treasurer  
11 Obama for Illinois, Inc., and Harvey S. Wineberg,  
12 in his official capacity as treasurer (terminated)  
13

14 **I. GENERATION OF MATTER**

15 This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election  
16 Commission by Thomas Fitton, on behalf of Judicial Watch, Inc. *See* 2 U.S.C.  
17 § 437g(a)(1).

18 **II. FACTUAL SUMMARY**

19 The complaint alleges, based on an article in *The Washington Post*, that then-  
20 Senator Barack Obama and his wife Michelle Obama obtained a mortgage from Northern  
21 Trust Company (“Northern Trust”) at a discounted interest rate, which resulted in a  
22 “disguised campaign contribution to [then-]Senator Obama of at least \$108,000.” The  
23 complaint further alleges that the contribution was a prohibited corporate contribution  
24 and that neither of then-Senator Obama’s campaigns nor Northern Trust reported the  
25 contribution. On July 2, 2008, *The Washington Post* published an article stating that  
26 then-Senator Barack Obama and Michelle Obama obtained a mortgage from Northern  
27 Trust on June 15, 2005, for \$1.32 million at a 5.67 percent interest rate, for the purchase  
28 of a \$1.65 million home on Chicago’s south side. Joe Stephens, *Obama Got Discount on*  
29 *Home Loan*, Wash. Post, July 2, 2008, at A03 (“Stephens article”). According to the  
30 article, the Obamas received a mortgage from Northern Trust at a discounted rate, lower

1 than “the average offered at the time in Chicago for similarly structured jumbo loans.” *Id.*  
2 Rates for similar loans during the same week averaged 5.93 percent to 6.0 percent,  
3 according to the story, and may have saved the then-Senator more than \$300 a month. *Id.*  
4 A spokesman for then-Senator Obama, quoted in the article, said that the interest rate was  
5 adjusted to account for a competing offer from another lender and other factors. *Id.* The  
6 article quoted the Obama spokesman as saying “[t]he Obamas have since had as much as  
7 \$3 million invested through Northern Trust.” *Id.* The article noted that when the  
8 Obamas secured the loan, their income had risen dramatically, because Barack Obama  
9 assumed his Senate seat and received a \$2.27 million book deal from Random House, and  
10 Michelle Obama received a promotion to vice president at the University of Chicago  
11 Hospitals. *Id.* It stated, however, that the Obamas had no prior relationship with  
12 Northern Trust when they applied for the loan. *Id.* The article also quoted a Northern  
13 Trust official as stating that Northern Trust has no formal program to provide discounts to  
14 public officials, but that a person’s salary and occupation are two factors they take into  
15 consideration when anyone is seeking a mortgage at Northern Trust. *Id.* The official  
16 further stated that “[t]he bottom line is, this was a business proposition for us” and “our  
17 business model is to service and pursue successful individuals, families and institutions.”  
18 *Id.*<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Stephens article was criticized by a later article in *The Washington Post* which stated that the Stephens article “had a negative cast to it and lacked the important context that other wealthy and savvy borrowers could have done as well under similar circumstances.” Deborah Howell, *More Story Than a Loan Merited*, Wash. Post, July 13, 2008 at B06. The Stephens article was also criticized by an article in the Columbia Journalism Review, which questioned why *The Washington Post* ran the Stephens article because Stephens left the question of whether Obama’s political position affected the details of his loan unanswered and “all that’s left are a bunch of weak correlations.” Justin Peters, *Behind Barack’s “Suspicious” Mortgage*, Colum. Journalism Rev., July 2, 2008.

1           Based on the Stephens article, Judicial Watch filed a complaint with the  
2 Commission. The complaint states that the Stephens article reports that “the favorable  
3 interest rate would save [then-]Sen. Obama over \$300 a month, which over the life of the  
4 30-year loan, would be at least \$108,000.” In further quoting the article, the complaint  
5 states that “[t]he Obamas had no prior relationship with Northern Trust when they  
6 applied for the loan. They received an oral commitment on Feb. 4, 2005, and locked in  
7 the rate of 5.625 percent, the campaign said. On that date, HSH [HSH Associates,  
8 Financial Publishers] data show, the average rate in Chicago for a 30-year fixed-rate  
9 jumbo loan with no points was about 5.94 percent.” *Id.*

10           The complaint asserts that the Stephens article suggests that then-Senator Obama  
11 received special treatment because he was a U.S. Senator, based on a quote in the article  
12 from Northern Trust Vice President John O’Connell reportedly stating that among the  
13 factors he would expect Northern Trust would consider in setting a mortgage rate is “a  
14 person’s occupation.” *Id.* at 2-3. The complaint further quotes the Stephens article as  
15 reportedly stating that since 1990, Northern Trust employees contributed \$71,000 to then-  
16 Senator Obama’s political campaigns, including a \$1,250 contribution to Senator  
17 Obama’s 2004 campaign for U.S. Senate. *Id.* at 3.

18           The complaint then alleges that, based on the information in the Stephens article,  
19 Northern Trust’s discounted mortgage is actually a disguised campaign contribution to  
20 then-Senator Obama because at the time he secured his mortgage, it appears that he was  
21 raising funds for his 2004 and 2010 Senate campaigns. *Id.* It further alleges the  
22 \$108,000 contribution by Northern Trust, a \$300 a month “savings” over the life of the

1 Obamas' 30-year mortgage loan based on the discounted rate, would violate federal laws  
2 because it is a corporate contribution and should have been disclosed. *Id.*

3           The response from Northern Trust states that there was no connection between the  
4 mortgage and an election, and that even if there were a connection, the mortgage was not  
5 a contribution from Northern Trust. Northern Trust is a "financial services institution  
6 that focuses on, among other things, integrated personal wealth management solutions for  
7 successful individuals, families, foundations, etc., and looks to establish long-term  
8 financial relationships with these clients." Mortgage loans are "commonly provided as a  
9 service to our existing customers and as a way to introduce new and potential clients to  
10 the institution and familiarize them with the other services that the institution can  
11 provide." During discussions about the mortgage, Northern Trust discussed the  
12 possibility of providing investment services to then-Senator and Ms. Obama. In light of  
13 the investment business Northern Trust anticipated receiving from then-Senator and Ms.  
14 Obama, Northern Trust approved a discount from the rate on Northern Trust's internal  
15 rate sheet. Northern Trust provides discounts off its internal rate sheet in the ordinary  
16 course of its business. Then-Senator and Ms. Obama entered into a mortgage loan  
17 agreement and also opened a brokerage account at Northern Trust's brokerage affiliate,  
18 Northern Trust Securities, Inc.

19           According to the response, Northern Trust searched its records to locate all of the  
20 \$1 million or more loans that had a 30-year term and a fixed interest rate, which were  
21 closed and funded during the period from January 1, 2005 to August 1, 2005. Fourteen  
22 mortgage loans fit that criteria, and "of these 14, eight [including the Obamas' loan] were  
23 locked in at a 'discount' in the form of a reduction in the interest rate indicated on

1 Northern Trust’s internally produced ‘rate sheet.’ This rate sheet, which is published  
2 internally at Northern Trust at least daily, is the starting point used by Northern Trust  
3 staff for determining the interest rate for a mortgage.”

4 **III. LEGAL ANALYSIS**

5 The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (“the Act”), prohibits  
6 corporations from making a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election  
7 to any political office. 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a). Candidates and political committees are also  
8 prohibited from knowingly accepting contributions from corporations. *Id.* The Obamas’  
9 loan from Northern Trust Company was procured for the purchase of the Obamas’ new  
10 home in Chicago, as evidenced by the mortgage and closing documents attached to the  
11 complaint. There is no factual information from the complaint, the responses, or the  
12 Stephens article, that funds from the mortgage were used “in connection with any  
13 election to any political office,” a nexus required for a corporate contribution or  
14 expenditure to be prohibited under the Act. 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a). This analysis is  
15 consistent with MUR 4944 (Hillary Clinton), where the Commission found no reason to  
16 believe that Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, her Senate campaign committee, and  
17 Washington Mutual Home Loans, Inc. violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a) in relation to a  
18 mortgage Hillary Rodham Clinton and former President Bill Clinton obtained for their  
19 home in Chappaqua, New York.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The MUR 4944 Statement of Reasons of Commissioners McDonald, Mason, Sandstrom, Smith and Thomas states “[i]t is undisputed that the money that PNC lent to the Clintons was used solely for the purchase of their new home. There is no indication that this loan “freed up” funds then used by Mrs. Clinton for campaign expenses.” The SOR further draws an analogy between the mortgage and the Commission’s personal use regulations, which classify mortgage payments as personal use, and notes that payments made to a candidate, irrespective of the candidacy, are not treated as a contribution. 11 C.F.R. § 113(g) (1) and (6). Further, it states that treating bank loans “for a candidate’s home purchase or other

1           In addition, the loan is not considered a prohibited corporate contribution. The  
2 Act states that the term “contribution” includes “any...loan...made by any person for the  
3 purpose of influencing any election for federal office.” 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(A)(i). An  
4 exception to this definition is a loan of money by a bank that is made in accordance with  
5 applicable law and in the ordinary course of business. 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(B)(vii). A loan  
6 is considered in the ordinary course of business if it (1) bears the usual and customary  
7 interest rate of the lending institution for the category of loan involved; (2) is made on a  
8 basis that assures repayment; (3) is evidenced by a written instrument; and (4) is subject  
9 to a due date or amortization schedule. 11 C.F.R. § 100.82(a)(1)-(4). The Commission’s  
10 regulations define “made on a basis that assures repayment” as, *inter alia*, when the  
11 lending institution making the loan has perfected a security interest in collateral owned  
12 by the candidate, the fair market value of the collateral is equal to or greater than the loan  
13 amount and the candidate provides documentation of the perfected security interest.  
14 11 C.F.R. § 100.82(e)(1)(ii).

15           Information provided in Northern Trust’s response and the complaint shows the  
16 loan was made in accordance with applicable law and in the ordinary course of business.  
17 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(A)(i). Northern Trust’s response and the loan documentation  
18 adequately address each of the four criteria for a loan to be made in the ordinary course  
19 of business, set forth in 11 C.F.R. § 100.82(a). First, the Obamas’ loan bears the usual  
20 and customary interest rate of Northern Trust because the Obamas were afforded a  
21 discount comparable to discounts given to other similarly situated borrowers. Eight of

---

personal living expenses as not “in connection with the campaign” and as made “irrespective of the candidacy” is well founded, in our view.”

1 the 14 mortgage loans comparable to the Obamas' loan at Northern Trust received  
2 discounts. The Obamas' loan was one of a majority of the comparable mortgages that  
3 received a discount, and it was within the range of the other mortgage discounts. *See*  
4 MUR 5198 (Cantwell) (interest rate for loan was usual and customary because 36 of 38  
5 comparable lines of credit in a two-year period were at or below the rate offered to  
6 candidate) and MUR 5421 (Kerry) (interest rate was usual and customary because 48 of  
7 52 comparable loans granted during a five-month period had the same interest rate as  
8 offered to candidate).

9 Further, Northern Trust uses mortgage loans as a way to introduce new and  
10 potential clients to the institution and familiarize them with the other services that the  
11 institution provides. The Obamas were offered a discounted rate because Northern Trust  
12 anticipated receiving investment business from the Obamas.

13 Second, the Obamas' mortgage was made on a basis that assures repayment  
14 because Northern Trust had a perfected security interest in the Obamas' \$1.65 million  
15 home as collateral for the \$1.32 million loan, according to the mortgage documents and  
16 response from Northern Trust. Finally, the Obamas' mortgage was evidenced by written  
17 instruments, the mortgage documents, and is subject to a due date of July 1, 2035, which  
18 fulfills the third and fourth requirements of 11 C.F.R. § 100.82(a). Thus, the mortgage  
19 loan is not a prohibited corporate contribution because it falls under the exception for  
20 loans made in accordance with applicable law and in the ordinary course of business.  
21 For all of these reasons, the Commission finds no reason to believe that Barack Obama  
22 violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a) and no reason to believe that Obama 2010, Inc. and Harvey  
23 S. Wineberg, in his official capacity as treasurer, and Obama for Illinois, Inc. and Harvey



- 1 S. Wineberg, in his official capacity as treasurer, (terminated) violated 2 U.S.C.
- 2 §§ 441b(a) and 434(b)(2).