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Subchapter XV-A. Whistleblower Protection.

§ 1-615.51. Findings and declaration of purpose.

The Council finds and declares that the public interest is served when employees of the District government are free to report waste, fraud, abuse of authority, violations of law, or threats to public health or safety without fear of retaliation or reprisal. Accordingly, the Council declares as its policy to:

1. Enhance the rights of District employees to challenge the actions or failures of their agencies and to express their views without fear of retaliation through appropriate channels within the agency, complete and frank reports to Council inquiries, free access to law enforcement officials, oversight of both the executive and legislative branches of government, and appropriate action with the public;

2. Enact laws and regulations to protect individuals who report waste, fraud, abuse of authority, violations of law, or threats to public health or safety.

Legislative history of Law 2-139. — For legislative history, see 1973 D.C. Laws, p. 616.5.


Historical and Statutory Notes following § 1-601.01.
Executive Summary

Why ODCA Did This Audit

The mission of the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability (BEGA) is to investigate ethics violations by, and provide ethics advice and training to, D.C. government employees and elected officials. The Director of Government Ethics serves as the District’s ethics prosecutor and is authorized to bring civil enforcement proceedings against D.C. employees and elected officials who have engaged in violations of the District’s Code of Conduct. BEGA’s mission and authority are meant to give the public confidence in its government and inspire the trust of District government employees.

This report is the result of a request by Councilmember Charles Allen, Chair of the Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety, that the Office of the D.C. Auditor (ODCA) review BEGA’s handling of a June 2018 whistleblower complaint related to the Department of Housing and Community Development.

What ODCA Found

A limited review conducted by ODCA revealed that in the last year, BEGA has failed to live up to its mission. Starting in June 2018, a then-District government employee submitted to BEGA, twice, a serious ethics allegation, which BEGA failed to investigate, and failed to assign a number for tracking purposes. No action was taken for an entire year despite a referral by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and an inquiry by a legislative staff member. In addition, the Director of Government Ethics mispresented to the BEGA Board, at two regular Board meetings, the status of the complaint and the fact that the complaint had been referred to BEGA for investigation by the OIG shortly after it came in to both agencies.

ODCA’s review reveals that this was not an isolated instance. ODCA found other examples of requests for investigations and advice requests that went unanswered by BEGA in 2018 and 2019.

What ODCA Recommends

ODCA recommends that the Council of the District of Columbia Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety take sworn testimony from any BEGA personnel as it sees fit and recommend appropriate action.
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October 2, 2019

The Hon. Charles Allen
Chairperson, Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety
Council of the District of Columbia
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Letter Report: BEGA Mishandled Whistleblower Complaint on Housing Procurement

Dear Councilmember Allen:

This responds to your letter dated July 5, 2019, in which you requested that the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor (ODCA) conduct a very focused review of the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability's (BEGA) “handling of the June 2018 complaint related to the Housing Production Trust Fund and the Department of Housing and Community Development” (DHCD) (hereinafter referred to as the DHCD complaint), included as Appendix A. We hope that this letter report summarizing ODCA’s focused review is helpful to the Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety and the BEGA Board.

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

ODCA’s focused review involved obtaining and reading emails from and to BEGA Director of Government Ethics Brentton Wolfgbarger, then-BEGA General Counsel Brian Flowers, and the BEGA general mailbox for pertinent periods during 2018 and 2019. This period includes when the complainant–then a District government employee–submitted his complaint to BEGA in 2018, and when I contacted BEGA in 2019 to find out what BEGA did with the complainant’s complaint.

Summary of Our Review

Our review revealed that the DHCD complaint did not just slip through one crack at BEGA, but a series of cracks, involving more than one staff member. BEGA received the DHCD complaint not only twice from the whistleblower through its email and hotline, but also from the Office of the Inspector General (OIG), and later was reminded about it by a Council staffer. Nevertheless, the complaint did not prompt any action until a year later after our office contacted BEGA regarding the complaint. We saw signs that this case was not unique and identified other instances in which BEGA’s failure to act appeared to interfere with it meeting its mission. In addition, we saw indications that Mr. Wolfgbarger’s communications to the BEGA
Board were neither forthcoming nor accurate.

After receiving the complaint in June 2018, Mr. Wolfgingbarger wrote an email to Mr. Flowers directing that they keep it as an “undocketed matter” for now. Less than two weeks later, the OIG formally referred the same matter to BEGA. From June 2018 until shortly after I contacted BEGA about this matter in June 2019, BEGA did not assign the matter an undocketed number, open an investigation, or discuss the matter with the OIG at the BEGA-OIG monthly meetings.

In June 2019, approximately one year after the District employee submitted his initial complaint to BEGA, Mr. Wolfgingbarger briefed the BEGA Board in a closed session of its monthly Board meeting, stating that he could not find the DHCD complaint in BEGA’s case management system, but that he found emails he had exchanged with Mr. Flowers indicating that they were to discuss the matter with the OIG at a meeting on June 25, 2018. Mr. Wolfgingbarger informed the Board that the matter was not discussed with the OIG, stating that BEGA likely was waiting for the OIG to complete its review of the matter before opening its own investigation. This clearly was a misrepresentation to the BEGA Board in that the OIG had referred the matter to BEGA on June 25, 2018. Clearly, the OIG was not reviewing or investigating the matter and had made that decision shortly after the complaint was submitted.

Mr. Wolfgingbarger then compounded his misrepresentation to the BEGA Board when he reported at a closed session of its next Board meeting in July 2019 that he had discussed the matter with the OIG on June 20, 2019, and stated that the OIG was “no longer” investigating the matter. This second report to the BEGA Board not only failed to set the record straight by informing the Board that the OIG had, in fact, referred the matter to BEGA a year earlier, but gave the false impression that the OIG may have been considering or investigating the matter until approximately June 2019 by stating that he confirmed at that time that the OIG was no longer investigating the matter.

Our conclusion, therefore, with respect to the DHCD complaint is that BEGA mishandled it by: (1) setting it aside as an undocketed matter; (2) failing to assign it a number for tracking purposes; (3) not opening an investigation; and (4) by failing to locate it and remedy these errors despite repeated contacts by the complainant and others, as detailed below.

In addition, our review of BEGA emails also reveals that this is not an isolated instance of mishandling and losing track of matters submitted to BEGA, both for investigation and for ethics advice. Although our email review was limited, we saw evidence of people contacting BEGA to ask about matters they previously had submitted to BEGA and for which they had received no response. Information on those matters is provided below as well.
Details of the DHCD Complaint

June 14, 2018
The complainant, a DHCD employee, first submitted his complaint to BEGA by email to the BEGA General Mailbox, mentioning that he also was referring the matter to the OIG.

June 15, 2018
Mr. Flowers retrieved the complaint from the BEGA General Mailbox and forwarded it to Mr. Wolfingbarger.

June 20, 2018
Mr. Wolfingbarger responded to Mr. Flowers’ email directing that the matter should be undocketed for now, should be added as an agenda item for their meeting with the OIG on Monday [June 25], and that they will decide how to proceed after that discussion.

In an email unrelated to this complaint, Mr. Wolfingbarger explains to another BEGA employee what the term “undocketed matter” means. He writes, “[w]e typically classify incoming complaints as “undocketed matters” if, at first glance, we suspect they may not warrant opening an investigation for some reason.” In addition, in an email to another BEGA employee on August 7, 2018, Mr. Wolfingbarger attached a flow chart entitled “New Complaint Intake Process.” That flow chart, included as Appendix B, shows that even new complaints that are to be closed without conducting an investigation should be docketed in BEGA’s case management system.

June 25, 2018
The OIG formally referred the matter to BEGA by email stating in its letter, “Our analysis determined that BEGA is in the best position to address the issues raised.”

August 8, 2018
The complainant contacted BEGA to request confirmation that his complaint was received and was under review, noting that he did not see his complaint summarized on the BEGA Quarterly Report. He also resubmitted his complaint using the BEGA Complaint Form submission process.

August 10, 2018
Mr. Flowers confirmed both receipts of the complaint by email to the complainant.

June—August 2018
Our review of BEGA emails from this time period reveals no evidence that this matter was assigned an undocketed number or initiated as an investigation and given an investigation number. In addition, although it appears that BEGA and the OIG had monthly meetings for which agendas usually were provided, our review reveals no evidence that this matter was on an agenda for an OIG-BEGA meeting in that time period.

February 20, 2019
Sonia Weil from the D.C. Council Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety contacted Mr. [Rest of the sentence is missing in the original text.]
Wolfingbarger by email to ask that BEGA reach out to the complainant about the status of this complaint. Mr. Wolfingbarger responded on the same day writing, “Will do.” We saw no evidence that anyone from BEGA ever reached out to the complainant at that time.

**February 22, 2019**

The complainant first contacted ODCA by email to discuss “ODCA’s ongoing oversight of DHCD and HPTF [Housing Production Trust Fund].”

**February 25, 2019**

In a telephone conversation with two ODCA auditors, the complainant stated that he filed both an ethics complaint to BEGA and a complaint to the OIG and had not heard anything from either of those bodies in seven months.

**May 30, 2019**

I reached out to Mr. Wolfingbarger by telephone, leaving a voicemail message that I was calling to give him a heads up about a report my office was about to release concerning the HPTF and informing him that it referenced a complaint made to BEGA approximately one year earlier.

**May 30, 2019**

ODCA issued an audit report entitled Low-Ranked Projects Secure Affordable Housing Funds. The report references the receipt of “confidential information regarding the discrepancies between DFD’s [DHCD’s Development Finance Division] and the proposals that were selected by the DHCD Director.”

**June 2, 2019**

As I had not heard back from Mr. Wolfingbarger, I emailed him, sending him the report I had mentioned previously, which I attached. I also wrote that I assumed BEGA did not initiate a review because the complainant had not heard back from BEGA.

**June 4–5, 2019**

Not having received any acknowledgment from BEGA, on June 4 I emailed and asked to speak with BEGA Board member and former Director of Government Ethics Darrin Sobin. We spoke June 5 and I alerted him to the report that had referenced the BEGA complaint. He indicated he would follow up.

**June 5, 2019**

I received a voicemail message from Mr. Wolfingbarger asking for information about the complaint. I emailed Mr. Wolfingbarger the requested information. Mr. Wolfingbarger responded that BEGA would review the information.

**June 6, 2019**

A BEGA Board meeting was held and ODCA’s review of the notes summarizing the meeting reveals that the DHCD complaint was discussed in closed session. According to that summary, Mr. Wolfingbarger told the BEGA Board that ODCA had released an audit report, which I had indicated was related to a complaint filed with BEGA and the OIG by a whistleblower last summer, but that Mr. Wolfingbarger could not find it in BEGA’s case management system. Mr. Wolfingbarger reported to the BEGA Board that he did find emails he had exchanged with Mr. Flowers indicating that they were to discuss the matter with the OIG at a meeting on June 25, 2018, but that the matter was not discussed. The draft notes state that
Mr. Wolfingbarger said, “I think it is likely we decided to wait until the OIG completed its review of the allegations before opening an ethics investigation, but I will obtain a status report from the OIG at our next meeting on June 20 [2019]...”

**July 11, 2019**

A BEGA Board meeting was held and ODCA’s review of the notes summarizing the meeting refer to the briefing on the DHCD complaint at the previous month’s [June] Board meeting. According to the draft notes, Mr. Wolfingbarger told the BEGA Board, again in closed session, “I discussed this matter with the OIG at our meeting on June 20 and confirm the OIG is no longer investigating the matter, so I created a new preliminary investigation (Case #19-0010-P) related to this Complaint in CMTS and assigned it to [investigators].” The BEGA Complaint Report for the period April 1, 2019–June 30, 2019, includes BEGA Case #19-0010P, with the description, “Allegations that senior staff in a District agency directed District employees to manipulate a procurement process for improper purposes.” The date initiated is listed as June 26, 2019.

**Details on Unrelated Matters Submitted to BEGA**

In September 2018, the Child and Family Services Agency contacted BEGA to follow up on an investigative referral it had made to BEGA in May 2017, because the agency had not heard back from BEGA. Mr. Flowers, who was the BEGA General Counsel at the time of the May 2017 referral, wrote in a September 12, 2018, email to Mr. Wolfingbarger that the referral “seemed to have fallen through the cracks” and that he doesn’t see anything indicating what BEGA did with it. Mr. Flowers also included a comment that “it is somewhat stale now.”

It also appears that there was an unrelated matter for which BEGA was working with a Respondent’s attorneys to negotiate a disposition that needed some prodding from the attorneys. Email exchanges show that a BEGA attorney emailed the Respondent’s attorneys on June 7, 2019, writing that he would review the document they had provided and would get back to them. On June 20, 2019, one of Respondent’s attorneys contacted the BEGA attorney to follow up on the matter. Mr. Wolfingbarger was copied on these email exchanges.

In addition, our email review revealed five instances where District government employees contacted BEGA for ethics advice and did not hear back from BEGA.

1. Email exchange between Mr. Flowers and Mr. Wolfingbarger on March 5, 2019, regarding a February 22, 2019, advice request made by an employee of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development (DMPED). No one from BEGA had responded to the requestor. In a subsequent email on March 5, 2019, Mr. Flowers wrote to Mr. Wolfingbarger that the request is now moot.
2. Email chain showing that a DHCD employee made an advice request to BEGA on March 6, 2019, and followed up on March 14, 2019, in an email to Mr. Flowers because the employee hadn’t heard anything.
3. Email chain from a DMPED employee asking for advice about working on a specific project. The DMPED employee first made the advice request on April 24, 2019, and followed up asking for a response on May 6, 2019, and May 13, 2019.
4. Email chain showing that another DHCD employee made an advice request on May 30, 2019. The requestor followed up by email on June 5, 2019, stating that the requestor had not received an acknowledgement or response and so is assuming there is no cause for concern or need for advice on the matter.

5. Email chain showing that the Department of Forensic Sciences (DFS) emailed BEGA on June 12, 2019, for advice relating to the agency’s conflict of interest policy. DFS followed up on June 19, 2019, asking if there is any resolution on the matter.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As I stated in my initial memorandum to you on June 14, 2019, BEGA was created by the D.C. Council to assure the public that District officials are performing to the highest ethical standards and that “legislative oversight is the critical control framework that can address the risk of unethical behavior and provide that assurance.” The agency was created also to serve as a safe harbor for District employees troubled by what they believe to be unethical practices. Clearly BEGA’s handling of the DHCD complaint, as well as the other matters noted above, shows that BEGA itself is not performing to the highest ethical standards nor fulfilling its safe harbor role. Most troubling are Mr. Wolfingbarger’s misrepresentations to the BEGA Board in June and July 2019, but its repeated mishandling of investigatory and advice requests also is of deep concern.

Accordingly, ODCA recommends that the Committee take sworn testimony from Mr. Wolfingbarger, Mr. Flowers, Mr. Sobin, and any other BEGA personnel as it sees fit, and recommend appropriate action. My staff and I are available to assist the Committee.

Sincerely yours,

Kathy Patterson
District of Columbia Auditor

cc: Councilmembers
    Betsy Cavendish, EOM
    Norma B. Hutcheson, BEGA Chairperson
    Brentton Wolfingbarger, Director of Government Ethics, BEGA
    Brian Flowers, OAG
Agency Comments

On September 24, 2019, we sent a draft copy of this report to BEGA Director of Government Ethics Brentton Wolfgabarger for review and written comment. ODCA is publishing Mr. Wolfgabarger’s October 1, 2019, response letter with identifying information about the whistleblower redacted and without Mr. Wolfgabarger’s exhibits.
October 1, 2019

Kathy Patterson
District of Columbia Auditor
717 14th Street NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC  20005

RE: Draft BEGA Mishandled Whistleblower Complaint on Housing Procurement report

Dear Ms. Patterson,

Thank you for providing me and Chairperson Hutcheson with the draft letter report entitled Draft BEGA Mishandled Whistleblower Complaint on Housing Procurement. I am writing to provide you with additional information to demonstrate that the representations I made to the Board on June 6, 2019 and July 11, 2019 regarding the status of the Complaint in question were accurate to the best of my knowledge at the time and did not constitute any “misrepresentations” whatsoever. I am also providing you with additional information regarding BEGA’s handling of the Complaint at issue.

June 6, 2019 BEGA Meeting

On June 6, 2019, I provided the Board with all the information I had been able to uncover during the 21 hours and 35 minutes between the time you sent me your June 5, 2019 email with the whistleblower’s Complaint and the start of the Board’s meeting at 10:00 a.m. on June 6. As I explained to the Board at that time, I had searched both our old case management system (ProLaw) and the case management system we acquired at the end of FY18 that we currently use (CMTS) but was unable to find any cases related to the whistleblower’s Complaint or name. Additionally, I informed the Board that I searched my email inbox for the whistleblower’s name and successfully identified emails I exchanged with Mr. Flowers between June 15, 2018 and June 20, 2018 in which we indicated we planned to classify the whistleblower’s Complaint as an “undocketed matter” that we would discuss with the OIG during our next monthly meeting, which was scheduled for June 25, 2018.

As I further explained to the Board, I then reviewed my notes from the June 25, 2018 OIG meeting and found no reference to the whistleblower’s Complaint. A copy of my notes written on a printout of the agenda from that meeting are enclosed herewith for your review. Please note that the meeting agenda itself did not include the whistleblower’s Complaint as an item for us to discuss with the OIG, nor do my handwritten notes include any reference to a discussion on that subject.

After reviewing your draft report, I again searched my email inbox for the Complainant’s name and confirmed that the email referral sent to me by the Inspector General’s Hotline inbox on June 25, 2018 at 1:51 pm does not appear in the search results for the whistleblower’s name, although it does appear when I search for the phrase “Inspector General.” Screen snips reflecting the search results for the terms, and “Inspector General” related to messages I received between April 2018 and August 2018 are attached for your review.
Please note that the June 25, 2018 email from the Inspector General’s Hotline inbox was sent at 1:51 pm, only nine minutes before my 2:00 pm meeting, as reflected by the attached PDF printout of my Outlook calendar for Monday, June 25, 2018. Given that the email likely arrived while I was reviewing our caseload and preparing for the OIG meeting, I do not believe that I saw that email until sometime after my meeting with the OIG ended, and as indicated by the meeting agenda itself and my handwritten notes from that meeting, I do not believe that we discussed the whistleblower’s Complaint during the meeting. Most importantly, when I briefed the Board on this subject at its June 6, 2019 meeting, I had no recollection whatsoever of receiving that email referral almost a year previously and, as described above, that message was not included in the search results when I searched my email inbox for the whistleblower’s name in preparation for the Board meeting.

As your draft report noted, there is “no evidence that (the whistleblower’s Complaint) was on the agenda for an OIG-BEGA meeting” between June 2018 and August 2018. In fact, I do not believe we discussed the whistleblower’s Complaint during any of our subsequent OIG/BEGA meetings between September 2018 and May 2019.

On June 20, 2019, now that I had learned of our oversight regarding the whistleblower’s Complaint, I met with staff from the OIG and asked for information regarding the status of their investigation into the whistleblower’s Complaint and learned that they had decided to close it out shortly after receiving it. I subsequently created a new matter in CMTS for the whistleblower’s Complaint on June 26, 2019 (Case No. 19-0075-C), converted it into a preliminary investigation (Case No. 19-0010-P) and assigned it to one of our investigative teams to work up. I also assigned our Auditor to assist the investigative team due to the complicated fact pattern and financial elements of the case.

**July 11, 2019 BEGA Meeting**

Between Monday July 8, 2019 and Wednesday July 10, 2019, I began assembling documents and preparing my notes for the Board’s meeting on Thursday July 11, 2019. As is my typical practice, I used the Microsoft Word version of my notes from the previous Board meeting on June 6, 2019, as the starting point for my notes for the upcoming meeting and edited the document to reflect the changes and developments that had occurred during the preceding month.

The Microsoft Word version of my notes for the June 6, 2019 Board meeting regarding the whistleblower’s Complaint contained the following sentences: “I will obtain a status report from the OIG at our next meeting on June 20 to confirm that A) they actually opened an investigation, and B) that it is still open. *If the OIG is no longer investigating the matter, I will create a new matter related to this Complaint in CMTS and add it to our agenda for an upcoming OGE staff meeting to discuss the merits of opening an investigation on our end.*” (emphasis added).

As stated above, that is what I did.

The Microsoft Word version of my draft notes for the July 11, 2019 Board meeting regarding the whistleblower’s Complaint contained the following sentence: “I discussed this matter with the OIG at our meeting on June 20 and confirm (sic) the OIG is no longer investigating the matter, so I created a new preliminary investigation (Case #19-0010-P) related to this Complaint in CMTS and assigned it to Ralph, Sonya and Amaneul.” (emphasis added).
My statement to the Board on July 11, 2019 regarding the whistleblower’s Complaint is factually accurate and contains no misrepresentations whatsoever. I learned the OIG had closed its matter related to the whistleblower’s Complaint, and I opened a preliminary investigation on our end, assigning those three staff members to work on the case, which was assigned Case #19-0010-P by our CMTS case management system. I used the same language (“the OIG is no longer investigating the matter”) during both the June 6, 2019 Board meeting and the July 11, 2019 Board meeting, which is also the same language set forth in the Microsoft Word version of my draft notes for both meetings.

Whistleblower Complaint Status

When we originally received the whistleblower’s Complaint in June 2018, we were still using our old ProLaw case management system and a new matter should have been created in ProLaw when we received the Complaint. I simply do not know why we did not do so in this instance, but I have done my best to explain what transpired to both you and the Board as honestly and objectively as possible, and I have accepted responsibility for the oversight because it happened on my watch as the Director of the Office.

Although we cannot make amends for the lengthy delay between the time we originally received the whistleblower’s Complaint and when we actually opened an investigation into allegations, we have begun to investigate this matter to determine what actually took place and whether any violations of the Code of Conduct occurred in the course of those events. Our team interviewed the whistleblower on August 22, 2019, and provided them with valuable information they are continuing to explore in the course of their investigation. Once we conclude our investigation, we will provide the whistleblower with an update on the results of our investigation.

Quotation from Confidential Email Protected by the Attorney-Client Privilege

Lastly, I respectfully request that you remove from your report any quotations from my June 20, 2016 email to Mr. Flowers reflecting my initial assessment of the whistleblower’s Complaint. As noted at the bottom of my message, the language I used in that email was confidential and protected by the attorney-client privilege. As the Director of Government Ethics, I need to be able to speak freely to our General Counsel and receive his/her unvarnished advice. Perhaps I could have expressed myself differently, but I think it is fair to say that the fact pattern sketched by the whistleblower in Complaint was fairly complex and somewhat challenging to follow. I do not believe it is necessary to include any such quotations in your report, when the most germane aspect of the email is that BEGA decided to classify the whistleblower’s Complaint as an “undocketed matter” on June 20, 2018, subject to possible reclassification as a preliminary investigation after our June 25, 2018 meeting with the OIG.

Regards,

Brent Wolfinbarger
Director of Government Ethics
Appendix A

Letter From the Honorable Charles Allen Requesting a Focused Review
July 5, 2019

Kathy Patterson
Auditor
Office of the District of Columbia Auditor
717 14th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Auditor Patterson:

This follows up on our conversation today and your earlier memo. It would be useful to the Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety and our oversight of the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability (“BEGA”) for the Office of the D.C. Auditor to pursue a very focused review of BEGA’s handling of the June 2018 complaint related to the Housing Production Trust Fund and the Department of Housing and Community Development. A letter report with your findings would be helpful to the Committee and to BEGA’s Board itself as it oversees the agency’s operations.

Charles Allen, Ward 6 Councilmember
Chairperson, Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety
Appendix B

New Complaint Intake Process at BEGA
OGE Receives New Complaint

1. Code of Conduct violation?
   - Yes: End of Intake, Go to Initiate Investigation Stage
   - No: Is it related to another investigation?

2. Is it related to another investigation?
   - Yes: Is it related to a closed investigation?
   - No: Docket in case management system and close complaint

3. Is it related to a closed investigation?
   - Yes: Docket in case management system and consolidate with existing investigation
   - No: Docket in case management system and assign to an investigative team

4. Docket in case management system and close complaint

5. Docket in case management system and consolidate with existing investigation

6. End of Intake, Go to Initiate Investigation Stage
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