



OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE INSPECTOR GENERAL

---

**CAROL POPE**

P.O. Box 381  
Petersburg, IL 62675  
(217) 558-1560 (Office)  
(217) 341-9124 (Mobile)  
[carol.pope@ilga.gov](mailto:carol.pope@ilga.gov)

**\*\* FOUNDED SUMMARY REPORT – CONFIDENTIAL \*\***

August 29, 2019

Honorable Michael J. Madigan  
Speaker of the House  
300 Capitol Building  
Springfield, IL 62706

Speaker Madigan:

This summary report is issued pursuant to Section 25-50(a) of the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act (Ethics Act), 5 ILCS 430.

On or about June 12, 2018, the Office of the Legislative Inspector General (LIG) received a case initiation form from Sherri Garrett. During her audio-recorded interview on May 28, 2019, Garrett waived her right to confidentiality under Section 25-90(a) of the Ethics Act. At the time of her complaint, Garrett was employed by Speaker Michael Madigan's office and the Clerk of the House of Representatives as an Account Technician and Minutes Clerk, respectively. Ms. Garrett worked for the Speaker and Clerk for a total of 13 years. Tim Mapes was the Clerk of the House since 2011. Mapes also served as Chief of Staff to the Speaker during this time. (Mapes served as Chief of Staff from 1992-2018.) Garrett alleged that for several years she both endured and witnessed bullying and repeated harassment by Tim Mapes in her workplace that was often sexual and sexist in nature.

My predecessor, Julie Porter, interviewed Ms. Garrett in August of 2018. The investigation was not completed prior to the end of Ms. Porter's term as Acting Legislative Inspector General. Ms. Garrett's first interview was not audio-recorded and she agreed to sit for a recorded interview on May 28, 2019.

## 1. Jurisdiction

Pursuant to Section 25-10(c) of the Ethics Act, the LIG has jurisdiction over former State employees regarding events occurring during any period of employment where the State employee's ultimate jurisdictional authority is a legislative leader. Pursuant to Section 1-5 of the Ethics Act, "employee" means "any person employed full time ... whose employment duties are subject to the direction and control of an employer with regard to the material details of how the work is to be performed."

The LIG has jurisdiction to investigate allegations of fraud, waste, abuse, mismanagement, misconduct, nonfeasance, misfeasance, malfeasance, or violations of the Ethics Act or violations of other related laws or rules. 5 ILCS 430/25-10(c).

Speaker Madigan, a legislative leader, was Mr. Mapes' ultimate jurisdiction authority.

## 2. Evidence Obtained

In addition to Ms. Garrett, three other staffers were interviewed. Mr. Mapes, through his attorney, declined to be interviewed. Having interviewed Ms. Garrett, and having found her entirely credible, once Mr. Mapes declined to be interviewed, my office focused on people in a position to have witnessed the events described by Ms. Garrett. These witnesses corroborated Ms. Garrett's recollection of events.

In chronological order, Ms. Garrett stated the following. In 2013, while she was very busy in the well of the House, trying to keep track of roll call votes, Representative Ken Dunkin walked up to her and another female employee who was assisting Garrett, and said, "I want to take both of you home tonight and see which one will be the naughtiest." Ms. Garrett was very busy and needed to get her work done. She did not address his comment at that time. After Ms. Garrett finished work, she became angry because she was trying to do her job and she was forced to deal with this kind of nonsense. She reported it to her supervisor who was the Reading Clerk at the time. She did not ask her supervisor to pursue it because she did not think anything would ever come of a complaint by her. She worked late that night, arriving home at 11:00 p.m. That night, she told her husband about the incident, which was very unusual for her. She usually did not complain to him about her job. Her husband said he wanted her to file a complaint. She told him that if she filed a complaint, it would not go anywhere anyway and it was just going to end up causing her trouble. So, in her mind, it was not worth it to her to file a complaint.

Unbeknownst to Ms. Garrett at the time, her husband called the Speaker's office and talked with Witness No. 1. Mr. Garrett told her that he wanted something done about this incident. Witness No. 1 in turn sought out Mr. Mapes and told him that Ms. Garrett's husband had called in and had complained about what Representative Dunkin had said to her. She told Mr. Mapes that he needed to handle it. Mapes, at that time, told Witness No. 1 that the situation would blow over and it was not that big of a deal. Witness No. 1 said, "No, it is a big deal when we have somebody saying something like that and a husband is calling in, it is a big deal and you need to handle it."

She also said that if he did not handle it, she would go to the Speaker. It is Ms. Garrett's understanding that after Witness No. 1 talked to Mapes, Mapes talked to Dunkin. Garrett surmised this because Mapes told Ms. Garrett that she did not need to worry about Representative Dunkin anymore. In fact, Ms. Garrett did not find out until a year or two later that Witness No. 1 had to insist that Mapes handle the situation.

In 2014, Ms. Garrett was working in the Speaker's office and trying to help organize the inauguration ceremonies. In a discussion in that office where Tim Mapes was present, she was trying to figure out how to get the judge who was going to be conducting the ceremony onto the stage. This judge was elderly and somewhat disabled and she was trying to work the logistics out so that things would run smoothly. Other people were present for this conversation and during this conversation Mapes, out of nowhere, looked at Ms. Garrett and said, "Well one thing I want to be sure of is that you're not going to show your pink bra to the judge." Ms. Garrett was stunned when Mapes made that comment and said to him, "Why would you say that? I don't show my bra to anybody. I don't walk around here with my bra showing." Mapes responded, "Well you know how you girls on the second floor are, you leave little to the imagination." Garrett was very embarrassed because of all of the other people who were standing around. She worked with them and it was embarrassing for her to have to sit there and have somebody make that type of comment to her. When Ms. Garrett said to Mapes, "Why are you saying this to me?" he just turned around and walked off.

In 2015, Ms. Garrett was trying to help a former State employee who was being harassed by a State Representative. This young woman, who had previously worked in the Capitol, called Ms. Garrett to see if she could help her with this situation. Ms. Garrett told her that they had just had a sexual harassment training a couple of weeks prior and that she would go to Mapes to see if he could assist her. When she met with Mapes and talked to him about the situation, she said something sounded off to her and that this young lady was very concerned about what this Representative wanted from her. Mapes then said to Ms. Garrett, "So are you upset because this Representative isn't paying attention to you?" Ms. Garrett stated she was so upset when he made that statement to her, she was just in shock. She could not believe that he would say something like that to her and she said to Mapes, "I don't want him to pay any attention to me," (talking about the Representative) "I find him to be disgusting and I've watched him do this to a few different girls now." She also told Mapes, "I can't even believe you would say that to me." She also said, "You know what Tim, all I want you to do is handle it" and she said, "because now you know and you know that I know you know." Ms. Garrett stated she could not believe that Mapes turned the whole situation around to make it look like she was only reporting this because she was upset that she was not getting any attention from the Representative. This left Garrett feeling like she could not report anything to Mapes and that nothing would ever get done about her complaint. Ms. Garrett never found out if Mapes talked to the Representative or not. She advised the young lady to block the calls from this Representative and explained to her how to do that.

In another incident that Ms. Garrett described, in April of 2018, the State of the State address was going to be made and all the staff and Representatives and Senators were dressed in black to support the #MeToo movement. Mapes came on the floor wearing navy blue. Garrett related that she would not have thought anything about it because some people might not have realized there was this arrangement for everyone to wear black, they might not have gotten the

memo. She said it would not have been a big deal for anyone to wear something other than black. But when Mapes came on the Floor he said, "Well, I see everybody's wearing black today" and then said, "I'm wearing navy blue because there's not a woman on this floor that would want me to tell them what to wear. So nobody's telling me what to wear." Garrett thought to herself, "Was that really necessary?" Nobody was really paying attention to the fact that Mapes had on navy blue, but yet he came in and had to make a "snide" comment. Later, when they had their sexual harassment training, Garrett reported that Mapes sat in the front of the room the whole time and was smiling and laughing and just acting ridiculous. When it was time for the Republicans to have their training, Mapes was on the House floor asking people, "Are you going to sex training today?" and "Have you had your sex training today?" In Garrett's opinion, the way it was said was meant to demean the seriousness of sexual harassment training.

In May of 2018, in the well of the House, Mr. Mapes approached Ms. Garrett and was staring at her and would not take his eyes off her. There was another person present. Mapes started talking about someone who had been in his office and how they said they would not do something because they were married. Ms. Garrett was thinking to herself, "Why are you even telling me this?" She thought that it was a very weird statement. Mapes said to Ms. Garrett, "But Sherri, we know around here that doesn't matter, does it?" Ms. Garrett responded, "Well this place does have a reputation, I guess," but thinking to herself, "I don't know why we're having this conversation." Mapes said something like, "It's not that I'm implying that you're running around on [your husband]." The other person present tried to defuse the situation and Mapes then said to that person, "So, now you're implying that she's running around on her husband." All the time, he was staring at Ms. Garrett. The other person present said, "I'm not implying that, no, I'm not." It was very awkward and embarrassing for Ms. Garrett. She became very shook up and found it very unsettling the way Mapes was staring at her. It was following this incident that Ms. Garrett decided she would have to go public with her experiences.

Ms. Garrett stated when she was training new employees, she would tell them if they heard Tim Mapes yelling or screaming at anybody, not to turn around because if they did so, they would become the subject of his wrath. She, in training people, would tell them not to talk to Mr. Mapes. If he came up and talked to them, it would be fine, but they should never go out of their way to talk to him because it could end up being a bad deal.

Witness No. 1, who worked in the Speaker's office, stated that she talked to Mr. Mapes about Mr. Garrett's complaint. She talked to Mr. Garrett after he had placed more than one call to Mr. Mapes and Mr. Mapes had not returned his calls. In speaking to Mapes about it, Witness No.1 asked, "Is this true, did this happen?" and Mapes said to her, "Don't worry about it." She told Mr. Mapes this is wrong and he said, "It's none of your business." She told him it was her business and that he could not let this incident go. Mapes told her it would blow over, or something to that effect. Witness No. 1 said, "No, it won't." She indicated the Speaker would not allow any staff member to be treated like this by one of his Members. She told Mapes, "Either you take care of it or I take it to the Speaker." Mapes indicated he was frustrated with Witness No. 1 and then said, "I'll handle it" or something along those lines. Witness No. 1 did not tell Ms. Garrett about her conversation with Mapes until a year or two afterwards. She did not follow through with any other reporting, but Ms. Garrett told Witness No. 1 later that she did not know that Witness No. 1 had intervened on her behalf. Witness No. 1 said, "I just did what needed to be done." Because Ms.

Garrett reported that Representative Dunkin would not make eye contact with her and did not bother her anymore, Witness No. 1 figured Mapes did intervene.

Witness No. 1 was also present when Mapes made the comment to Ms. Garrett about not showing her pink bra when discussing arrangements for a judge who was going to be present at the inauguration. Witness No. 1, who had known Ms. Garrett for many years and is familiar with her reputation for honesty, indicated that she believes Ms. Garrett to be an honest person. Witness No. 1 indicated that when Mapes made the pink bra comment to Sherri Garrett that Ms. Garrett was upset by it.

Witness No. 1 also heard Mapes talk about the way women over on the second floor of the Stratton Building dressed provocatively. Witness No. 1 said she did not think that Mapes acted in a sexually provocative way with the women staff members.

Witness No. 2 confirmed that Mapes, in April of 2018, called anti-sexual harassment training "sex training" and was joking about it. Witness No. 2 was also present when Mapes talked about people running around on their spouses and said something to Garrett like, "You wouldn't do that to your husband, would you?". Witness No. 2 said this was a very awkward conversation and made Ms. Garrett uncomfortable.

Following Ms. Garrett's press conference in June 2018, Witness No. 2 said he read about her statements at the press conference on Capitol Fax. He recalls that her statements as reported there were accurate accounts of what happened when he was present.

Witness No. 3 also worked in the Speaker's office. Witness No. 3 was present when Ms. Garrett was discussing the logistics of getting the judge onstage for the inauguration ceremonies. Witness No. 1 was also present, as was Mr. Mapes. She recalled Mapes referring to the secretaries on the second floor of the Stratton Building as wearing street walker clothes. She did not specifically recall the "pink bra" comment, but said she could have been on the phone or working on something when that comment was made. Witness No. 3 thinks Ms. Garrett told her about this comment after the inauguration ceremonies. Witness No. 3 said Mapes was notorious for saying these types of things.

Witness No. 3 also reported that Ms. Garrett came to the Speaker's office to tell Mapes that a certain Representative had called a former Speaker's office employee and invited her to a fundraiser at an apartment in Chicago. The fundraiser purportedly was for a downstate legislator. Ms. Garrett found this suspicious and was concerned that the young woman would show up in Chicago to an empty apartment. Witness No. 3 recalls Mapes saying, "Well, she doesn't work for me anymore, so that's not my problem." She also recalled Ms. Garrett saying to Mapes, "You know, [Legislator A] is a Member. Can you talk to him and tell him not to contact her?" Witness No. 3 heard Mapes say to Ms. Garrett, "Well, are you jealous that he's not reaching out to you? Is that the problem? Are you jealous he doesn't want you to go?" Witness No. 3 stated Ms. Garrett was very taken aback. Witness No. 3 was flabbergasted by Mapes' response. Witness No. 3 said she had no idea whether Mapes ever contacted Legislator A to tell him to leave the young woman alone.

Witness No. 3 also stated she heard Mapes talk about sex training when referring to anti-sexual harassment training. She felt he was very flippant about it and did not take it seriously, even in light of the #Me Too movement. Witness No. 3 found that Mapes acted very differently when the Speaker was around. She believes if Mapes talked flippantly about “sex training” in front of the Speaker, the Speaker would have reprimanded him. Witness No. 3 stated the Speaker never talks the way Mapes talked.

Witness No. 3 agreed with a statement Ms. Garrett made at a news conference, i.e. that there was never an avenue to make complaints. According to her, Mapes created that problem because everyone was afraid of him. Inappropriate comments by Mapes were better than him yelling and screaming at them, in her opinion. Witness No. 3 thought Mapes felt free to act inappropriately because he was the boss. She felt if the Speaker had heard the way Mapes talked to people, he would not have tolerated it. “Tim knew what he could get away with and when he could get away with it.” Witness No.3 said people were terrified of Mapes. People would not bring their complaints about Mapes to the Speaker’s office because Mapes seemed all powerful and all-encompassing. Witness No. 3 watched the press conference where Sherri Garrett took her complaints public. She was flabbergasted when the camera showed Ms. Garrett, but everything Garrett said was true. Shortly after the press conference, after Mapes talked to the Speaker, he handed in his keys and his letter of resignation. Witness No. 3 felt like the Speaker trusted Mapes to do the right thing, but Mapes failed to do so.

### 3. Factual Findings

While preparing this report, Maggie Hickey’s comprehensive report following her investigation of the culture in the Speaker’s Office was released. That report covers Ms. Garrett’s allegations concerning Mr. Mapes. Ms. Hickey’s findings are consistent with the evidence my office uncovered.

I found Ms. Garrett to be entirely credible. It was clear to me that Ms. Garrett is still traumatized by Mr. Mapes’ inappropriate conduct over many years. Even though Ms. Garrett is now retired, when recounting the events described above, Ms. Garrett was trembling and emotionally wrought.

Not only was Ms. Garrett entirely credible, her statements were corroborated by the other witnesses interviewed by my office. Two of these witnesses worked closely with Mapes and generally had good relationships with him. Nevertheless, they were forthright in their corroboration of Ms. Garrett.

I find Mr. Mapes had a long history of making inappropriate sexual comments and I also find these comments created an intimidating, hostile and offensive work environment. I further find Mr. Mapes declined to cooperate with my investigation.

### 4. Analysis

Based on the above facts, I have sought to determine whether:

(a) Tim Mapes engaged in misconduct, namely sexual harassment, during a period of employment when he reported to Speaker Madigan;

(b) Tim Mapes' refusal to cooperate with the investigation constitutes a violation of the Ethics Act.

Sexual Harassment Under the Ethics Act

The Ethics Act defines "sexual harassment" as follows:

For purposes of this Act, "sexual harassment" means any unwelcome sexual advances or requests for sexual favors or any conduct of a sexual nature when: (i) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment; (ii) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual; or (iii) such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment. For purposes of this definition, the phrase "working environment" is not limited to a physical location an employee is assigned to perform his or her duties and does not require an employment relationship.

5 ILCS 430/5-65(b).

This provision of the Ethics Act became effective November 16, 2017. Because the sexual harassment provision is a substantive change to the law, it applies prospectively only. Nevertheless, Mr. Mapes continued to engage in inappropriate conduct after the effective date of this provision, as outlined above. Mr. Mapes acted with the purpose and effect of creating an intimidating, hostile and offensive working environment. As the Ethics Act states, and this bears repeating, "All persons have a right to work in an environment free from sexual harassment." Mr. Mapes ignored that right.

Refusal to Cooperate

Although Mr. Mapes was no longer a State employee at the time of the investigation, the Ethics Act nevertheless obligates him to cooperate with the LIG's investigations. Specifically, the Ethics Act provides:

It is the duty of every officer and employee under the jurisdiction of the Legislative Inspector General...to cooperate with the Legislative Inspector General and the Attorney General in any investigation undertaken pursuant to this Act. Failure to cooperate includes, but is not limited to, intentional omissions and knowing false statements. Failure to cooperate with an investigation of the Legislative Inspector General or the Attorney General is grounds for disciplinary action, including dismissal. Nothing in this section limits or alters a person's existing rights or privileges under State or federal law.

5 ILCS 430/25-70. Because, under 5 ILCS 430/25-10(c), I have jurisdiction over "current and former State employees regarding events occurring during any period of employment," I have jurisdiction over Mr. Mapes, and his failure to cooperate is a violation of the Ethics Act.

#### 5. Conclusions and Recommendations

I conclude Tim Mapes violated the Ethics Act by engaging in conduct of a sexual nature with the purpose and effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, and offensive working environment. I also find Mapes violated the Ethics Act by refusing to cooperate with this investigation. My recommendation would have been termination of Mapes' employment. Because Mapes is no longer a State employee, he cannot be disciplined. I recommend that a memo from the Speaker be placed in Tim Mapes' official State personnel file, stating that he violated Sections 5-65 and 25-70 of the Ethics Act and that he never be rehired as a State employee or contractor.

Finally, since this is a founded summary report, it should be published, together with the response of the ultimate jurisdictional authority. Since my recommendation was termination, the Ethics Act mandates publication of the report, in my opinion. 5 ILCS 430/25-52(a). Transparency concerning the LIG's findings of misconduct is crucial to the sound functioning of the Office of the Legislative Inspector General. Public reporting of founded summary reports is critical to achieving accountability.

This is a founded summary report concerning Tim Mapes and should be published.

Pursuant to Section 25-50 of the Ethics Act, you are required to respond to this summary report in writing within 20 days. Your response is to include a description of the corrective action to be taken, including whether you agree with my recommendations.

Sincerely,



Carol Pope  
Legislative Inspector General

CP/cdc

cc: Justin Cox, Counsel to the Speaker (by email)