



**OFFICE OF STATE ETHICS**

**DOCKET NUMBER 2019-09** :  
: **18-20 TRINITY STREET**  
**IN THE MATTER OF A** :  
: **HARTFORD, CT 06106**  
**COMPLAINT AGAINST** :  
: **SEPTEMBER 3, 2019**  
**ANDREA LOMBARD** :

**STIPULATION AND CONSENT ORDER**

Pursuant to the Code of Ethics, General Statutes §§ 1-79, *et seq.*, Mark Wasielewski, Ethics Enforcement Officer, filed a Complaint against Andrea Lombard (hereinafter “Lombard” or “Respondent”), alleging violations of the Code of Ethics for Public Officials. Based on the investigation by the Enforcement Division of the Office of State Ethics (hereinafter “OSE”), the OSE finds that there is probable cause to believe that Respondent violated the Code of Ethics as further set forth herein.

The Parties have entered into this Consent Order following the issuance of the Complaint, but without any adjudication of any issue of fact or law herein.

**I. STIPULATION**

The Ethics Enforcement Officer and the Respondent stipulate to the following facts:

1. At all times relevant hereto, the Respondent was employed as an Epidemiologist 3

in the Hepatitis C Program for the TB, STD, HIV, and Hepatitis Section at the state Department of Public Health (hereinafter “DPH”).

2. At all times relevant hereto, the Respondent was a “State Employee” as that term is defined in General Statutes § 1-79 (13).

3. At all times relevant hereto, as a part of her duties for the state, the Respondent performed tasks related to the hiring of DPH contractors for the Hepatitis C Program through approved DPH vendors.

4. In or around May of 2018, DPH sought to hire four (4) temporary contractors to fill administrative assistant positions for the Hepatitis C Program (hereinafter “Administrative Assistant(s)”).

5. As a part of the process to fill the open Administrative Assistant positions, DPH hired an outside vendor (hereinafter the “outside vendor”) to direct the Administrative Assistants to their state assignments, pay the Administrative Assistants, and perform other tasks related to these positions.

6. In May of 2018, the Respondent’s daughter became a candidate for an Administrative Assistant position.

7. In May of 2018, the Respondent took multiple actions in the selection process for the open Administrative Assistant positions for which her daughter was a candidate, including, but not limited to:

- a. Administering the selection process for the Administrative Assistant positions;
- b. Communicating with supervisors, human resources personnel and fiscal office personnel about the Administrative Assistant positions;
- c. Communicating with the outside vendor about her daughter’s candidacy; and
- d. Personally selecting her daughter to fill the Administrative Assistant Position.

8. From on or around May of 2018 through August of 2018, the Respondent directly

supervised her daughter, including but not limited to:

- a. Assigning and evaluating work;
- b. Approving time cards; and
- c. Approving overtime performed.

9. General Statutes § 1-84 (c) states in pertinent part:

No public official or state employee...shall use his public office or position...to obtain financial gain for himself, his [ ] child . . .

10. The Respondent, by acting on behalf of her daughter to secure the Administrative Assistant position, and/or thereafter by exercising supervisory authority over her daughter's DPH activities as described above, used her position to obtain financial gain for her daughter, in violation of General Statutes § 1-84 (c).

11. The Respondent had reason to believe or expect that her daughter would derive a direct monetary gain as a result of her official state actions, as set forth herein.

12. Pursuant to General Statutes § 1-86 (a):

Any public official or state employee...who, in the discharge of [her] official duties, would be required to take an action that would affect a financial interest of such official or employee, such official's... child or the spouse of a child...has a potential conflict of interest. Under such circumstances, such official or employee shall, in the case of either a substantial or potential conflict, prepare a written statement signed under penalty of false statement describing the matter requiring action and the nature of the conflict and deliver a copy of the statement to such official's or employee's immediate superior, if any, who shall assign the matter to another employee, or if such official or employee has no immediate superior, such official or employee shall take such steps as the Office of State Ethics shall prescribe or advise.

13. Beginning no later than May of 2018 and continuing through on or about August of 2018, the Respondent was, in the discharge of her official duties, required to take various actions that would affect the financial interest of her daughter.

14. Each time Respondent was required to take action affecting the financial interest

of her daughter, the Respondent was required to 1) prepare a written statement, signed under penalty of false statement, describing the matter requiring action and the nature of the conflict, and 2) deliver a copy of the statement to her immediate supervisor.

15. Beginning no later than May of 2018 and continuing through on or about August of 2018, the Respondent, when required to take action affecting the financial interest of her daughter, did not prepare a written statement and deliver it to her immediate supervisor.

16. By failing to prepare and deliver a written statement to her immediate supervisor as set forth herein, the Respondent violated General Statutes § 1-86 (a).

17. The Respondent admits to the facts set forth herein and admits such facts constitute violations of the Code of Ethics as set forth herein.

## II. RESPONDENT'S POSITION

1. The Respondent states that, at the time of the aforesaid actions, she did not believe that her conduct raised any issues under the Code of Ethics, and did not act intentionally. Further, the Respondent states that she now understands the restrictions set forth in the Code of Ethics regarding this matter.

2. The Respondent states that, had she been advised that her conduct violated the Code, she would have changed her actions.

3. The Respondent states that she believes that she would have benefited through more Ethics training.

4. The Respondent states that she believes that she acted with approval of her supervisor, and that her actions were transparent.

5. The Respondent states that this matter is the only matter where she has had any disciplinary actions in more than nineteen years of state service.

### **III. JURISDICTION**

1. The Ethics Enforcement Officer is authorized to investigate the Respondent's acts as set forth herein, and to enter into this Stipulation and Consent Order.

2. The provisions of this Stipulation and Consent Order apply to and are binding upon the Respondent.

3. The Respondent hereby waives all objections and defenses to the jurisdiction of the Ethics Enforcement Officer over matters addressed in this Stipulation and Consent Order.

4. The Respondent waives any rights she may have under General Statutes §§ 1-80, 1-82, 1-82a, 1-87 and 1-88, including the right to a hearing or appeal in this case, and agrees with the Ethics Enforcement Officer to an informal disposition of this matter as authorized by General Statutes § 4-177 (c).

5. The Respondent consents to jurisdiction and venue in the Connecticut Superior Court, Judicial District of Hartford, in the event that the State of Connecticut seeks to enforce this Stipulation and Consent Order. The Respondent recognizes that the Connecticut Superior Court has the authority to specifically enforce the provisions of this Stipulation and Consent Order, including the authority to award equitable relief.

6. The terms set forth herein are in addition to, and not in lieu of, any other existing or future statutory, regulatory, or other legal obligation that may be applicable to the Respondent.

7. The Respondent understands that she has a right to counsel and has been represented by counsel during the OSE's investigation and in connection with this Stipulation and Consent Order.

**IV. ORDER**

NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to General Statutes § 4-177 (c), the Office of State Ethics hereby ORDERS, and Ms. Lombard agrees, that:

1. Pursuant to General Statutes § 1-88 (a) (1), Ms. Lombard will cease and desist from any future violation of General Statutes § 1-84 (c).
2. Pursuant to General Statutes § 1-88 (a) (1), Ms. Lombard will cease and desist from any future violation of General Statutes § 1-86 (a).
3. Pursuant to General Statutes § 1-88 (a) (3), Ms. Lombard will pay civil penalties to the State in the amount of one thousand two hundred fifty dollars (\$1,250.00) for her violation of General Statutes § 1-84 (c) as set forth in the Complaint and herein.
4. Pursuant to General Statutes § 1-88 (a) (3), Ms. Lombard will pay civil penalties to the State in the amount of one thousand two hundred fifty dollars (\$1,250.00) for her violation of General Statutes § 1-86 (a) as set forth in the Complaint and herein.

WHEREFORE, the Ethics Enforcement Officer and Ms. Lombard hereby execute this Stipulation and Consent Order dated September 3, 2019.

Dated: 9/3/2019

Andrea Lombard  
Andrea Lombard

Dated: 9/5/19

Mark E. Wasielewski  
Mark E. Wasielewski, Esq.  
Ethics Enforcement Officer  
Connecticut Office of State Ethics  
18-20 Trinity Street  
Hartford, CT 06106  
(860) 263-2398