

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ETHICS AND GOVERNMENT
ACCOUNTABILITY
MEETING MINUTES – April 2, 2026**

The District of Columbia Board of Ethics and Government Accountability held a hybrid meeting at the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability, 1030 15th Street, NW, Suite 700 West, and virtually on April 2, 2026 at 10:00 a.m. Chairperson Norma Hutcheson and Board members Charles Nottingham, Felice Smith, Darrin Sobin, and Melissa Tucker attended the meeting in person.

Members of the public were welcome to attend, and a recording of the meeting is available on open-dc.gov and [BEGA's YouTube channel](#).

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

II. Ascertainment of Quorum

Chairperson Hutcheson and Board Members Nottingham, Smith, and Tucker were present at the start of the meeting. Board Member Sobin joined the meeting during the presentation from the Director of Open Government.

III. Adoption of the Agenda/Approval of Minutes

The Board unanimously approved the Agenda for the meeting. Chairperson Hutcheson and Board Members Nottingham and Smith approved the minutes for the March 2026 meeting.

IV. Report by the Director of Open Government

Good morning, Chairperson Hutcheson, and Members of the Board. I am Niquelle Allen, Director of Open Government. I am pleased to present this report on the activities of the Office of Open Government (“OOG”). Our mission is to ensure that all persons receive full and complete information concerning the affairs of the District of Columbia government and the actions of its officials. Since the last Board meeting, OOG has continued its work to ensure that the District of Columbia government’s operations are transparent, open to the public, and promote civic engagement. To that end, OOG has enforced the Open Meetings Act, advised on the Freedom of Information Act’s requirements, and provided training on those transparency laws. OOG has proudly served as advocates for an open and transparent government.

A. Open Meetings Act (“OMA”) and Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) Advice

1. Advisory Opinions

a. OMA Advisory Opinion – Board of Trustees for Creative Minds International Public Charter School, #OOG-2025-0014

On March 30, 2026, I issued an Advisory Opinion #OOG-2025-0014, in response to a complaint which alleged that Creative Minds International Public Charter School Board (“Creative Minds PCSB,” or the “Board”) failed to publish the location and times of its meetings.

I found that Creative Minds PCSB did not violate the OMA. OOG’s investigation revealed that the Board’s complete meeting notices for upcoming meetings were posted on the Public Charter School’s website. The Board also stated the location of its in-person meetings on the Board’s designated webpage of the Public Charter School’s website and in the meeting notices linked to the webpage. As such, the Board was found in compliance with the OMA. I dismissed this matter pursuant to 3 DCMR §10403.1(b) and 3 DCMR §10403.1(f), respectively, because the allegation of unpublished times of the Board’s meetings was not substantiated and the Board did not violate the OMA.

I also advised the Board to post its annual schedule (with no other school events) on the Creative Minds Public Charter Schools’ webpage designated for the Board’s information. Creative Minds Public Charter Schools’ general calendar has the dates and times of the Board’s scheduled meetings, which is helpful but does not constitute “an annual schedule” of the Board’s meetings as required by the OMA.

A copy of the Complaint and Advisory Opinion have been added to Dropbox.

b. OMA Advisory Opinion – Community Review Panel, #OOG-2025-0055

On April 1, 2026, I issued an Advisory Opinion #OOG-2025-0055, in this matter. On August 1, 2025, I received a request to advise the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (“OSSE”) on whether its Community Review Panel (“CRP,” the “Panel”) is subject to the OMA. I issued the opinion *sua sponte*, since the request did not come from a public body and was not an OMA Complaint. My advice concluded that based on the statute establishing the Panel and how the OMA defines a covered “public body,” the Panel is a time-limited advisory review mechanism to OSSE, not an independent deliberative public body, and therefore is not subject to the OMA.

D.C. Official Code § 38-2572.02 establishes the statutory framework for special-education due-process hearing independence. The operative

provisions require OSSE to: (1) submit potential hearing-officer candidates to a 7-member community review panel for evaluation; (2) ensure the panel is composed of specified stakeholder categories (attorneys, educators, LEA/DCPS representatives, and parents); (3) prohibit members from being OSSE employees; and (4) have the panel forward recommendations to the State Superintendent of Education after reviewing candidates. The statute does not require OSSE to grant the Panel delegated decision-making authority. The Panel does not function as an advisory body to the OSSE; and it does not take official action by the votes of its members convened to recommend candidates (or submit scored candidates) for hearing officer positions to OSSE. For the reasons stated in the advisory opinion, OSSE was advised that the Community Review Panel is not subject to the OMA. A copy of the Request for OMA Advice and the Advisory Opinion are in Dropbox.

2. Informal Advice

Since the last Board meeting, OOG has responded informally, via e-mail, telephone, or teleconference to requests for assistance as follows:

- 10 requests for OMA advice;
- 11 requests for FOIA advice; and
- 14 requests for technical assistance with open-dc.gov.

B. Meeting Monitoring

OOG's staff attends public bodies' meetings, in person and remotely, to ensure compliance with the OMA. They also inspect public bodies' websites and OOG's Central Meeting Calendar for public meeting notices and records. OOG's attorneys provide legal advice on OMA compliance and take corrective action, if necessary.

Since the last Board meeting, OOG's legal staff have attended fifteen (15) public body meetings. As a result of the monitoring, four (4) corrective measures were communicated. The public body failed to (1) publish a meeting notice on its website; (2) publish an annual schedule of its meetings; (3) publish a complete meeting notice on Central Meeting Calendar, which includes the OMA citation on the agenda for entering closed or executive session; and (4) publish its meeting minutes.

C. Training/Outreach

1. Mandatory Responsible AI Training for DC Government Employees and Contractors

OOG's staff has completed the following mandatory responsible AI training for DC government employees and contractors: "Using Generative AI in Government;" and "Understanding Risks and Building Resilience." The District of Columbia has partnered with InnovateUS to provide the online training, which supports Washington, DC's citywide approach to responsible artificial intelligence, established under Mayor's Order 2024-028. The Order requires agencies to demonstrate public benefit, protect privacy and equity, and preserve human accountability before deploying AI tools.

2. District of Columbia Bar Paralegal and Legal Assistant Training Program, 2026 - Parts I, II, & III

On March 9, 16, & 30, 2026, Paralegal Specialist Kimberly Brown attended the three part series of DC Bar Paralegal and Legal Assistant Training Program, held at the DC Bar Conference Center. This expert-led training was designed to strengthen the effectiveness of paralegals and legal assistants across practice settings by delivering practical instruction. The program included a variety of learning sessions on legal writing, research, discovery, ethics, guidance on effective attorney collaboration, and an introduction to responsible use of legal technology, including AI. A list of the courses is in Dropbox.

3. Open Meetings Act ("OMA") Training for DC Public School Local School Advisory Teams ("LSAT")

On March 11, 2026, Attorney Advisor Joan Lelma facilitated an OMA training for DC Public School Local School Advisory Teams. The training was the first in OOG's 2026 training series for the LSATs. I attended this training virtually.

4. "DC FOIA Basic Training for New FOIA Officers"

On March 19, 2026, Trial Attorney Brandon Lewis facilitated a FOIA training for new FOIA Officers. The session provided a basic overview of DC Freedom of Information Act. I, along with Chief Counsel Neal, Attorney Advisor Anthony J Scerbo and Paralegal Specialist Brown attended the training.

5. Digital Government Institute ("DGI"), 23rd Annual E-Discovery, Records and Information Management Conference

On March 19, 2026, Attorney Lelma attended DGI Annual E-Discovery, Records and Information Management Conference, hosted at Ronald Reagan Building. The ten sessions presented at this immersive event explored practical strategies for preserving, collecting, and reviewing digital information, with a focus on transparency, data reliability, and operational resilience. Among the presenters were The Honorable Tanya R. Kennedy,

Associate Justice, Appellate Division, First Judicial Department, Supreme Court of the State of New York. Justice Kennedy provided an appellate perspective on Generative AI with a focus on ethical duties and disciplinary consequences and discussed the future of digital evidence.

D. Litigation and Legislative Update

1. Litigation

a. Council of the District of Columbia v. Muriel Bowser (Case No. 2026-CAB-001463 (D.C. Super Ct.))

On March 5, 2026, the Council of the District of Columbia (the “Council”) filed a Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief against Mayor Muriel Bowser, in her official capacity as Mayor of the District of Columbia (the “Mayor”). The Complaint alleges that the Mayor unlawfully refused to provide the Council with certain agency budget enhancement requests for FY 2025 and FY 2026 that had been requested by Council Committees as part of the Council’s ongoing performance oversight process. The Complaint further alleges that the Council anticipates the Mayor’s refusal to provide any agency budget enhancement requests for FY 2027.

The Mayor filed an Opposition to the Council’s Motion on March 16, 2026, and the Council filed a Response on March 17, 2026. A Motion Hearing was held on March 17, 2026, at which the Court denied the Council’s request for a Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”). I, along with OOG’s staff attended the hearing virtually. The Motion for Preliminary Injunction remains pending.

The Court issued an Order on March 20, 2026, denying the Motion for TRO and setting an expedited summary judgment briefing schedule. The Council was ordered to file its Motion for Summary Judgment on or before March 31, 2026. The Mayor’s Combined Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment are to be filed on or before April 17, 2026. The Council’s Combined Reply and Cross-Opposition are due on or before April 24, 2026, and the Mayor’s Reply must be filed on or before May 1, 2026. Copies of the documents have been added to Dropbox. OOG’s staff will continue to monitor this case.

b. Terris, Pravlik & Millian, LLP v. District (Case No. 2020-CA-003087-B (D.C. Super. Ct.))

This is an update on the lawsuit filed by Travis, Pravlik & Millian, LLP (TPM) against the District under D.C. FOIA, alleging that the District failed to produce and post online various budget-related documents related

to the Office of the State Superintendent of Education and the District of Columbia Public Schools. At the last Board meeting, I provided details on the Plaintiff's Motion for Contempt and for Further Injunctive Relief. The Court ruled on this motion on February 11, 2026, and issued an order granting it, in part. On February 26, 2026, the Court heard arguments on the Motion for Contempt. The Court set a deadline of March 4, 2026, for the District to produce the records.

A status hearing was held on March 17, 2026. I, along with OOG's staff attended the status hearing virtually. The Plaintiff represented that it was satisfied with the District's production in response to the Court's February 11, 2026, contempt order. The Court ordered the contempt sanctions issued against the District vacated, finding that the District had purged its contempt. The Court ordered that Plaintiff's request for further injunctive relief remain held in abeyance until further order. A status hearing has been set for June 5, 2026. A copy of the Court's Order has been added to Dropbox. OOG's staff will continue to monitor this case.

2. Legislation

- a. Legislative Action regarding the OMA: D.C. Law 26-24, "the Open Meetings Temporary Amendment Act of 2026" expired on March 29, 2026. The following Council measures will prevent a gap between the expired temporary measure and the Committee of the Whole's markup of the permanent bill.

On March 30, 2026, Chairman Mendelson introduced PR26-0584, the "Open Meetings Clarification Emergency Declaration Resolution of 2026;" B26-0632, the "Open Meetings Clarification Emergency Amendment Act of 2026;" and B26-0633, the "Open Meetings Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2026."

- i. PR26-0584, the "Open Meetings Clarification Emergency Declaration Resolution of 2026": The resolution reads as follows to "declare the existence of an emergency with respect to the need to amend the Open Meetings Act of 2010 to clarify the definition of "meeting"; to provide for a public body's ability to be briefed about potential terrorist or public health threats so long as no official action is taken; to exempt from the act meetings between the Council and the Mayor provided that no official action is taken at such meetings; and to provide that a meeting shall be deemed open to the public if the public body takes steps reasonably calculated to allow the public to view or hear the meeting while the meeting is taking place, or, if doing so is not technologically

feasible, as soon thereafter as reasonably practicable.” On March 31, 2026, the resolution passed by a vote of 11-2 and became effective immediately.

- ii. B26-0632, the “Open Meetings Clarification Emergency Amendment Act of 2026;” and B26-0633, the “Open Meetings Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2026: On March 31, 2026, BR26-0632, passed by a vote of 9-3, with one member voting as present. It became effective as of March 29, 2026, and is effective for no more than 90 days.

B26-0633, passed the Council by a vote of 8 members voting yes, three members voting no, and two members voting present. The second reading is tentatively scheduled to be voted upon on May 5, 2026, before the recess. If passed, the bill will become effective retroactively as of March 29, 2026, and will be effective for no more than 225 days. Copies of the resolution and bills are in Dropbox.

In addition to the Open Meetings Act, Section 2 of the District of Columbia Boards and Commissions Financial Reporting Temporary Amendment Act of 2025 (D.C. Law 26-98; 73 DCR 4484) was added to the OMA bill by striking the phrase “April 3, 2026” and inserting the phrase “October 17, 2026” in its place. Chairman Mendelson indicated that he will likely move a permanent measure regarding the Open Meetings Act and Financial Reporting, possibly before the recess.

- b. Legislative Action regarding the “Body Worn Camera Regulation and Reporting Requirements Act of 2015” (FOIA-related): I reported on these Council measures at the last Board meeting. The measures expand the Body-Worn Camera (BWC) law to require faster, automatic public release of key footage in serious incidents, going beyond the slower and more limited disclosure normally available through FOIA. The resolution makes transparency the default, not something only available after a FOIA request, and the bills temporarily expand the law so BWC footage must be released whenever an MPD officer is present during a serious use-of-force incident, even if the force was used by another agency (like a federal officer). They also require the release of all names of law enforcement officers involved. Mayor Bowser sent a letter to the Council before the legislative meeting opposing the legislation and expressing her view that these are federal matters appropriately handled by Congress.
- i. B26-0614, the “Full Accountability in Arrest Reporting Emergency Amendment Act of 2026” and PR26-0562, the “Full Accountability in Arrest Reporting Emergency Declaration Resolution of 2026.”: On

March 3, 2026, the Council voted unanimously to pass the resolution, PR26-0562, which declared the sense of the Council relative to an emergency with regard to the need to require MPD officers to document identifying information for all law enforcement officers present at an arrest and any use of force supporting an arrest, as well as the companion bill, B26-0614, which required, on an emergency basis, MPD officers to document identifying information. However, the Mayor vetoed the bill, number B26-0614, on March 23. On March 31, 2026, Councilmember Robert White made a motion and the Council voted unanimously to override the veto. The Council then voted unanimously to approve the measure. Copies of the resolution and bill are in Dropbox.

- ii. B26-0615, the “Full Accountability in Arrest Reporting Temporary Amendment Act of 2026”: On March 3, 2026, the bill passed unanimously after its first reading. The next step will be the second reading.
- c. PR26-0563, the “Body-Worn Camera Transparency for Use of Force Emergency Declaration Resolution of 2026,” B26-0616, the “Body-Worn Camera Transparency for Use of Force Emergency Amendment Act of 2026,” B26-0617, the “Body-Worn Camera Transparency for Use of Force Temporary Amendment Act of 2026”: Of the measures introduced by Councilmember Pinto regarding body-worn cameras, the emergency resolution, PR26-0563, declaring the existence of an emergency with respect to the need to amend legislation and regulations “to require the release of body-worn camera recordings of Metropolitan Police Department Officers present in the event of an officer-involved death or serious use of force by a law enforcement officer other than a Metropolitan Police Department officer,” and applies retroactively to August 1, 2025. The resolution passed unanimously with amendment, and became effective immediately. It was published in the DC Register on March 13, 2026.

On March 23, 2026, The Mayor signed the emergency B26-0616, as Act A26-0282, which will be in effect until June 21, due to it being emergency legislation; by law it is only in effect for 90 days.

On March 3, 2026, B26-0617 passed unanimously on its first reading. The next step is second reading. Copies of the signed law, as well as passed bills and resolutions, are available in Dropbox.

- d. FY2025 FOIA Reports to the Council: The Mayor of the District of Columbia (“EOM”) and the Attorney General of the District of Columbia (“OAG”) are required to provide annual FOIA reports to the Council of the District of Columbia (the “Council”). The Metropolitan Police Department (“MPD”) is

required to submit a Body Worn Camera (“BWC”) report to the Council, every six months. The Executive Office of the Mayor of the District of Columbia transmitted the District’s Annual FOIA Report to the Council, on March 4, 2026. The Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia released its FY2025 Annual FOIA Litigation Report on January 29, 2026. Copies of the reports are in Dropbox.

E. Administrative

FY 2027 Budget Proposal: On March 18, 2026, the D.C. Council issued a Notice of Public Hearing for the FY2027 Budget. Council Committees’ fiscal oversight hearings on the FY2027 budget proposal were announced for April 6, 2026, to April 30, 2026. The Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety did not provide a hearing date for the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability. The Mayor was due to submit the Local Budget Act (the District’s appropriations bill) and Budget Support Act for the FY2027 Budget on April 1, 2026, but the Chief Financial Officer continues to work on the FY2027 Budget submission.

This concludes the Office of Open Government’s April 2, 2026, report. I am happy to answer any questions the Board may have.

V. Report by the Director of Government Ethics

Good morning, Chairperson Hutcheson and Members of the Board. I am Ashley Cooks, the Director of Government Ethics. I am pleased to present this report on the activities of the Office of Government Ethics (“OGE”).

A. Update on Status of OGE Investigations

The information reported today regarding OGE’s cases will not reflect any status changes that may occur because of actions taken by the Board during today’s meeting.

OPEN INVESTIGATIONS BY STATUS	
Open	64
Open - Negotiations	0
Open - Show Cause Hearing	0
Grand Total	64

OPEN "UNDOCKETED MATTERS"	
Grand Total	1

PENDING/STAYED INVESTIGATIONS BY STATUS	
Closed - Pending Collection	33

Stayed - Pending DC Superior Court Case	3
Stayed - OAG False Claims Act Case	0
Stayed - OIG Investigation	3
Stayed - US District Court Case	2
Grand Total	41

REGULATORY MATTERS BY STATUS	
Closed - Pending Collection	67
Open	633
Grand Total	700

	Current	Last month	February
Investigations Open	64	83	93
Investigations Stayed	8	8	8

The number of open preliminary and formal investigations includes 12 new matters. The investigative team resolved 31 investigations since the Board last met. This total does not reflect the number of complaints that were dismissed for a lack of jurisdiction.

B. Training/Outreach

1. Professional Development Trainings Attended by Staff

Since the last board meeting, Administrative Officer, Naquita Titus completed two Peoplesoft courses entitled “Contract Administrator” and “FMLA Coordinator Training”, and a course entitled “Finance and Budgeting Essentials” and Auditor Courtney Walker completed Peoplesoft courses “Effective Interpersonal Communication” and “Conscious Leadership”. Chief of Staff Christina Mitchell took two Peoplesoft courses entitled “Giving and Receiving Feedback” and “HR Law” and two other courses entitled “Understanding Burn-out and Causes” and “Responsible AI for Public Professionals: Using Generative AI in Government”. HR Specialist Megan Stoutamire took a course entitled “Disability Awareness Training: Ask It Basket”. Lastly, myself, Senior Counsel, Lynn Tran, General Counsel Asia Stewart-Mitchell, and Supervisor Attorney Advisor Amber Anderson attended a COGEL Connect session entitled “Public Corruption Post-McDonnell: Considerations for the Present and Future”.

2. Conducted by staff

Since the last Board meeting, OGE conducted 7 training sessions: the March Monthly Ethics Training, the March Monthly Hatch Act training, two New Employee Orientation Ethics segments, an ethics training for the Department of

General Services (“DGS”), a monthly Virtual Brown Bag session for Ethics Counselors, and the quarterly Lobbyist Registration and Reporting training.

In March, 1,231 people took ethics training via Peoplesoft, and 61 users accessed the LMS and completed courses. One hundred and twenty new employees attended New Employee Orientation and received information on the District’s ethics rules in March.

C. Advisory Opinions/Advice

1. Informal Advice

OGE’s legal staff provided advice for approximately 34 ethics inquiries, which is 8 more than the 26 reported at the March Board meeting. This number does not include responses we have provided to questions regarding the Lobbyist and FDS e-filing systems.

2. Formal Advisory Opinion

OGE has not issued any formal advisory opinions since the last Board meeting.

D. Legislation and Rulemaking Updates

1. Council Legislation Affecting Financial Disclosure

B26-0325 - Board of Ethics and Government Accountability Authority Clarification Amendment Act of 2025 is still pending. This legislation is in response to BEGA’s rulemaking which designated 43 boards and commissions as public financial disclosure statement filers and would repeal BEGA’s authority to make such designations in the future. Chairperson Hutcheson and I testified at the public hearing regarding the legislation on January 13, 2026. Council Chairman Mendelson has indicated that he will amend this legislation with the intent that it passes before the Council’s recess.

This past Tuesday, the Council passed B26-0633 and B26-0632 which are emergency and temporary legislation that halt the applicability of BEGA’s rulemaking until October 17, 2026. This is the third time that the Council has passed this same type of emergency and temporary legislation thereby relieving certain public officials of their obligation to file a financial disclosure statement since the rulemaking was finalized. None of the designated boards or commissions have filed a statement with BEGA. Given that financial disclosure is key to promoting public trust and transparency within the District government, any legislation that hinders that process does not serve the interests of the government and the residents of this city. Nonetheless, BEGA will continue its efforts to promote an ethical and transparent government by

educating and advising employees on the ethics rules and holding accountable those public officials who violate the ethics rules.

E. OGE Administrative Matters

1. Staffing

OGE welcomes our new Supervisory Attorney, Amber Anderson. Supervisory Attorney Anderson went to Tulane University – School of Law and she joins us from the Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”) where she worked as an Attorney Advisor in the Office of Chief Counsel for Ethics and Compliance. Amber has worked as a Designated Agency Ethics Official and has ten years of government ethics experience.

OGE also welcomes Investigator Iyana Talley. Investigator Talley obtained a Masters in Crime Science Investigation from Stevenson University. She joins us from the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (“DYRS”), where she was an Investigator.

F. Financial Disclosure Statement (FDS)

Pursuant to D.C. Official Code §§ 1-1162.24 and 1-1162.25, public officials and certain government employees must file a financial disclosure statement as a means of transparency and to prevent engaging in conduct that violates the financial conflicts of interest statute. BEGA is responsible for ensuring that employees and public officials, who meet the statutory requirement, file their annual financial disclosure statement.

We are excited to kick off FDS Season 2026! The FDS team sent out the 2026 Agency Head Memo, which is OGE’s initial request for information and instructions that launches the Financial Disclosure season. The agencies’ filer lists were due to OGE on March 2, 2026, and OGE has now received all lists. This year, 9,236 filers are required to file by statute or were designated to file by their agency. We are coordinating the paper mailing notice of the initial Public Financial Disclosure Statement notification and will send notification to this year’s filers on April 15, 2026.

G. Lobbying Registration and Reporting (LRR)

Pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 1-1162.27(a), a person who receives compensation or expends funds in an amount of \$250 or more in any 3-consecutive-calendar-month period for lobbying shall register with the Director of Government Ethics and pay the required registration fee. According to D.C. Official Code § 1-1162.30, each registrant shall file a quarterly report concerning the registrant’s lobbying activities during the previous quarter.

On March 13, 2026, fine notices were sent to lobbyists who failed to file timely. Attorney Advisor Echols and Program Coordinator Kosick hosted the quarterly lobbyist training March 18, 2026, and 24 lobbyists attended. A notice announcing that the 2026 Quarter 1 Activity Reports are due April 15, 2026, was sent to all current registrants and clients.

Thank you. This concludes the Office of Government Ethics' April 2, 2026, report.

Board member Sobin noted that the Board has received several lobbyist fine waiver requests and asked whether there was a benefit to require lobbyists to attend training before registering as a lobbyist, noting that the DC Bar requires new attorneys to attend training during their first year of practice. Director Cooks agreed that a mandatory training requirement would be beneficial and noted that BEGA has recommended requiring annual training for lobbyists and that other jurisdictions require lobbyist training. Board member Sobin suggested it would be more beneficial to attend mandatory training at registration instead of annual training which may be burdensome.

VI. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

VII. Executive Session

The Board voted unanimously to enter into Executive Session to discuss ongoing, confidential investigations pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 2-575(b)(14), to consult with an attorney to obtain legal advice and to preserve the attorney-client privilege between an attorney and a public body pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 2-575(b)(4)(A), to discuss personnel matters including the appointment, employment, assignment, promotion, performance evaluation, compensation, discipline, demotion, removal, or resignation of government appointees, employees, or officials pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 2-575(b)(10), and to deliberate on a decision in which the Ethics Board will exercise quasi-judicial functions pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 2-575(b)(13).

VIII. Resumption of Public Meeting

The meeting resumed at 11:22. There were no matters to report.

The Board will meet next for its monthly board meeting on May 7, 2026.

The meeting adjourned at 11:22 a.m.