

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ETHICS AND GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY**



Office of Government Ethics



In Re: D. [REDACTED] Meadors
Case No.: 1702-001

PUBLIC NEGOTIATED DISPOSITION

Pursuant to section 221(a)(4)(A)(v)¹ of the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability Establishment and Comprehensive Ethics Reform Amendment Act of 2011 (“Ethics Act”), effective April 27, 2012 (D.C. Law 19-124; D.C. Official Code § 1-1161.01 et seq.), the Office of Government Ethics (“OGE”) hereby enters into this Public Negotiated Disposition with the Respondent, D. Meadors. Respondent agrees that the resulting disposition is a settlement of the above-titled action, detailed as follows:

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

Respondent served as the [REDACTED] for the Protective Services Division (“PSD”) of the Department of General Services (“DGS”) from April 2016 until July 2018. As such, Respondent oversaw and managed all of the financial resources regarding the agency’s security personnel.

According to the evidence, in 2017, Respondent brought her minor child into the office on five or six occasions. Respondent’s co-workers provided childcare while she attended meetings. On one occasion, Respondent asked co-workers to monitor her child and, at other times, her co-workers volunteered to provide such childcare. Respondent’s child remained in her cubicle or office, while employees monitored the child and ensured the child’s well-being. Respondent was away from her work station for periods of time ranging from one hour to 90 minutes during each of these instances.

At that time, there was an important need to balance the security budget, which required Respondent to attend several meetings regarding payments for security personnel. Respondent testified that she was experiencing childcare scheduling challenges and that there were times when it was mandatory for her to report to work, notwithstanding those issues. Respondent testified that she received permission to bring her child to work from the Associate Director of DGS. Respondent also testified that several other employees brought their children to the office and that no one was reprimanded for doing so.

II. NATURE OF VIOLATIONS

According to OGE, Respondent violated one section of the District’s Code of Conduct, as set

¹ Section 221(a)(4)(A) of the Ethics Act provides, in pertinent part, that “[i]n addition to any civil penalty imposed under this title, a violation of the Code of Conduct may result in the following: . . . Any negotiated disposition of a matter offered by the Director of Government Ethics, and accepted by the respondent, subject to approval by the Ethics Board.”

forth below:²

- **One:** District Personnel Manual (“DPM”) § 1807.1(b), which prohibits employees from “using government time or resources for other than official business, or government approved or sponsored activities.”

This section of the Code of Conduct prohibits employees from engaging in any outside employment or other activity that is incompatible with the full and proper discharge of their duties and responsibilities. Respondent used government time or resources for other than official business when she requested and allowed District employees to perform unauthorized personal services (childcare). The performance of these services for the Respondent’s child by the Respondent’s co-workers within the offices of DGS was not authorized by policy or law, nor did it support the agency’s mission. In mitigation of her conduct, Respondent accepted full responsibility for her actions and expressed remorse when meeting with OGE employees to resolve this matter.

III. TERMS OF THE NEGOTIATED DISPOSITION

Respondent acknowledges that her conduct was in violation of §1807.1(b) of the DPM and the Code of Conduct. Respondent promises not to engage in such conduct in the future. Respondent agrees to attend ethics trainings conducted by the Office of Government Ethics within six months of full execution of this agreement. In consideration of Respondent’s acknowledgement and agreement, OGE will seek no further remedy and will take no further action related to the above misconduct.

Respondent understands that if she fails to adhere to this agreement, the Office will present this matter to the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability (the “Board”) and recommend that it authorize a formal investigation, the process for which includes an open and adversarial hearing on the matter.³ Because the Office is, at this time, foregoing requesting that the Board authorize a formal investigation as a result of the agreement with the Respondent, [REDACTED] Meadors agrees to waive any statute of limitation defenses should the Board decide to proceed with a formal investigation as a result of Respondent’s breach of this agreement.

One year from the date of this Negotiated Disposition, the Respondent may apply for an expungement of this matter. Upon receipt of such an application from the Respondent, the Office will issue a letter notifying the Respondent that this informal admonition has been expunged, provided that all of the following have occurred:

- 1) Respondent has satisfactorily fulfilled the terms herein;

² According to D.C. Official Code § 1-1162.01a, the Ethics Act and “the Code of Conduct shall apply to all employees and public officials serving the District of Columbia, its instrumentalities, subordinate and independent agencies, the Council of the District of Columbia, boards and commissions, and Advisory Neighborhood Commissions, but excluding the courts.” The DPM is a part of the Code of Conduct. *See*, D.C. Official Code § 1-1161.01(7)(E).

³ D.C. Official Code § 1-1162.14(a)(1)

- 2) There are no new or pending allegations of misconduct against Respondent and she has not received any type of employee discipline during this period; and
- 3) Respondent has provided a written certification to the Office, under oath, attesting that these conditions have been met.

Accordingly, Respondent is hereby "**Admonished**".⁴

The mutual promises outlined herein constitute the entire agreement in this case. Failure to adhere to any provision of this agreement is a breach rendering the entire agreement void. By our signatures, we agree to the terms outlined herein.


D. Meadors


9.5.19
Date


Brent Wolfingbarger
Director of Government Ethics

2-6-2019
Date

This agreement shall not be deemed effective unless and until it is approved by the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability, as demonstrated by the signature of the Chairman below.

APPROVED:


Tameka Collier
Chairperson, Board of Ethics and Government

2-7-19
Date

#1702-001

⁴ In accordance with 3 DCMR 5902.15, Respondent may apply for an expungement of this matter one (1) year after the effective date of this agreement.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ETHICS AND GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY



D. [REDACTED] Meadors,
Respondent

CASE No. 1702-001

ORDER

Based upon the mutual representations and promises contained in the Negotiated Disposition approved by the Board herein on the 7th day of February, 2019, and upon the entire record in this case; it is, therefore

ORDERED that Respondent is **Admonished**.

This Order is effective upon approval by the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability, as demonstrated by the signature of the Chairperson below.

Handwritten signature of Tameka Collier in cursive.

Tameka Collier
Chairperson, Board of Ethics and Government Accountability

Handwritten date 2-7-19.

Date