VOL. 73 – NO. 14 APRIL 3, 2026

District of Columbia REGISTER

HIGHLIGHTS

- D.C. Council passes Law 26-101, Institution of Higher Education Sexual Misconduct Reporting and Resource Accessibility Act of 2025
- D.C. Council passes Law 26-104 to require the Department of Human Services to issue electronic benefit transfer cards with theft prevention technology and restore stolen public benefits
- Office of Employee Appeals publishes employee appeals
- Department of Energy and Environment increases the Battery Stewardship Organization administrative fee
- Department of Health announces funding availability for the Pharmacy Wellness Hub: Diabetes Prevention, Management and Self Measured Blood Pressure (SMBP) Programs
- Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection and Metropolitan Police Department update requirements for appointment of special police
- Office of Neighborhood Safety and Engagement announces funding availability for the FY 2026 Group Violence Reduction Strategy Grant
- District Department of Transportation solicits detailed proposals from organizations to manage the District of Columbia State Nursery

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REGISTER

Publication Authority and Policy

The District of Columbia Office of Documents and Administrative Issuances publishes the *District of Columbia Register* (ISSN 0419-439X) every Friday under the authority of the *District of Columbia Documents Act*, D.C. Law 2-153, effective March 6, 1979, D.C. Official Code § 2-611 *et seq*. (2016 Repl.). The policies which govern the publication of the *Register* are set forth in the Rules of the Office of Documents and Administrative· Issuances (1 DCMR §§300, et seq.). The Rules of the Office of Documents and Administrative Issuances are available online at dcregs.dc.gov. Rulemaking documents are also subject to the requirements of the *District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act*, D.C. Official Code §§2-50l *et seq*. (2016 Repl.).

All documents published in the *District of Columbia Register* must be submitted in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Rules of the Office of Documents and Administrative Issuances. Documents which are published in the *District of Columbia Register* include (1) Acts and resolutions of the Council of the District of Columbia; (2) Notices of proposed Council legislation, Council hearings, and other Council actions; (3) Notices of public hearings; (4) Notices of final, proposed, and emergency rulemaking; (5) Mayor's Orders and information on changes in the structure of the District government (6) Notices, Opinions, and Orders of District government Boards, Commissions and Agencies; (7) Documents having general applicability and notices and information of general public interest.

Deadlines for Submission of Documents for Publication

The Office of Documents and Administrative Issuances accepts electronic documents for publication using a Web-based portal. To submit documents for publication, agency heads, or their representatives, may obtain a username and password by email at dcdocuments@dc.gov. For guidelines on how to format and submit documents for publication, please email dcdocuments@dc.gov.

The deadline for filing documents for publication for District of Columbia Agencies, Boards, Commissions, and Public Charter schools is THURSDAY, NOON of the previous week before publication. The deadline for filing documents for publication for the Council of the District of Columbia is WEDNESDAY, NOON of the week of publication. If an official District of Columbia government holiday falls on Thursday, the deadline for filing documents is Wednesday. Email the Office of Documents and Administrative Issuances at dcdocuments@dc.gov to request the *District of Columbia Register* publication schedule.

Viewing the *District of Columbia Register*

The Office of Documents and Administrative Issuances publishes the *District of Columbia Register* ONLINE every Friday at www.dcregs.dc.gov. The Office of Documents does not offer paid subscriptions to the *District of Columbia Register*. Copies of the *District of Columbia Register* from October 2, 2009 to present are available at www.dcregs.dc.gov. Copies of the *District of Columbia Register* from April 2003 through July 2010 are available online in the *D.C. Register* Archive on the website for the Office of the Secretary at www.os.dc.gov. Hardcopies of the *Register* from 1954 to September 2009 are available at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Library's Washingtoniana Division, 901 G Street, NW, Washington, DC 20001. There are no restrictions on the republication of any portion of the *District of Columbia Register*. News services are encouraged to publish all or part of the *District of Columbia Register*.

Legal Effect of Publication - Certification

Except in the case of emergency rules, no rule or document of general applicability and legal effect shall become effective until it is published in the *District of Columbia Register*. Publication creates a rebuttable legal presumption that a document has been duly issued, prescribed, adopted, or enacted and that the document complies with the requirements of the *District of Columbia Documents Act* and the *District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act*. The Administrator of the Office of Documents and Administrative Issuances hereby certifies that this issue of the *District of Columbia Register* contains all documents required to be published under the provisions of the *District of Columbia Documents Act*.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
OFFICE OF DOCUMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUANCES

SUITE 8700 - 899 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NE - UNION SQUARE - WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002 - (202) 727-5090

MURIEL E. BOWSER
MAYOR

VICTOR L. REID, ESQ.
ADMINISTRATOR

CONTENTS

ACTIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

D.C. LAWS

L26-101 Institution of Higher Education Sexual Misconduct Reporting and Resource Accessibility Act of 2025 005735

L26-102 Petition Administration Clarification Amendment Act of 2026 005736

L26-103 Philip Reed Memorial Park Designation Act of 2026 005737

L26-104 Public Benefits Security Amendment Act of 2026 005738

L26-105 Community Health Amendment Act of 2026 005739

L26-106 Energy Efficiency Financing Debt Cap Temporary Amendment Act of 2026 005740

D.C. ACTS

A26-284 Gardner Bishop Elementary School Redesignation Act of 2026 (B26-364) ..... 005741 - 005742

A26-285 Friends of Wangari Gardens Grant Temporary Amendment Act of 2026 (B26-576) ..... 005743 - 005744

A26-286 Residential Building Permit Classification Temporary Amendment Act of 2026 (B26-578) ..... 005745 - 005748

A26-287 Parking Enforcement Modernization Technical Correction Temporary Amendment Act of 2026 (B26-580) ..... 005749 - 005750

A26-288 Archdiocese of Washington Parish Real Property, Deed Recordation, and Transfer Tax Exemption Emergency Amendment Act of 2026 (B26-612) ..... 005751 - 005757

BILLS INTRODUCED AND PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

Notice of Intent to Act on New Legislation -
Bills B26-0639, B26-0641 through B26-0648,
Proposed Resolutions PR26-0592 through PR26-0612,
PR26-0614 through PR26-0617, and PR26-0619 ..... 005758 - 005763

ACTIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONT'D

OTHER COUNCIL ACTIONS

Notice of Contract Disapproval Resolution -

PR 26-618 Proposed Contract No. CW128791 with HME, Inc.
Disapproval Resolution of 2026 005764

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Alcoholic Beverage and Cannabis Administration -
Claudio's Table - ANC 3D - Summer Garden Endorsement..... 005765
Dance Place - ANC 5F - Change of Hours 005766
Dixie Liquor - ANC 2E -Transfer to New Location - CORRECTION 005767
Dixie Liquor - ANC 2E - Transfer to New Location - RESCIND..... 005768
Hall Pass - ANC 2C - New 005769
Taste of History, LLC - ANC 4D - New..... 005770
Transmission - ANC 6A - Expansion 005771

FINAL RULEMAKING

Police Department, Metropolitan / Licensing and Consumer Protection, Department of -
Amend 6 DCMR (Personnel),
Subtitle A (Police Personnel),
Ch. 11 (Special Police),
Sec. 1100 (Appointment: General Provisions),
to clarify the requirements applicable to the appointment of special privates without pay for duty in connection with any emergency of riot, pestilence, invasion, insurrection, or during any day of public election, ceremony, or celebration, and to make technical and conforming revisions ..... 005772 - 005775

Zoning Commission - Z.C. Case No. 12-08E -
Amend 11 DCMR (Zoning Regulations of 2016),
Subtitle K (Special Purpose Zones),
Ch. 6 (Saint Elizabeths East Campus Zones StE-1 through StE-19),
Sec. 605 (Front Setback (StE),
to amend the Zoning Regulations to remove the ten-foot front setback requirement for buildings within the St. Elizabeth's East Campus 18 zone .....005776 - 005781

PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Public Service Commission - RM49-2026-01
Amend 15 DCMR (Public Utilities and Cable Television),
Ch. 49 (Public Utility Tariff Filing Regulations),
Sec. 4901 (Tariff Applications),
to specify when a proposed tariff or tariff amendment may take effect and work papers utilities must submit with their tariff filings ..... 005782 - 005783

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES CONT'D

PROPOSED RULEMAKING CONT'D

Rental Housing Commission, DC -
Amend 14 DCMR (Housing),
Ch. 43 (Evictions, Retaliation, and Tenant Rights),
Sec. 4300 (Nonpayment of Rent and Other Grounds for Eviction Generally) and
Sec. 4302 (Notices to Vacate for Other Reasons),
to amend rules to conform with the Rebalancing Expectations for Neighbors, Tenants, and Landlords Amendment Act of 2025, to "provide for expedited review of eviction proceedings stemming from a dangerous crime or crime of violence, . . . to reduce the pre-filing notice period in cases seeking eviction for nonpayment, and to update procedures for pre-filing notice to tenants in eviction cases." ..... 005784 - 005790

NOTICES, OPINIONS, AND ORDERS
MAYOR'S ORDERS

2026-043 Reappointment and Appointments — Opioid Fatality Review Board (Dr. Richard Schottenfeld, Erin Sibel Sezgin, Dr. Sonal Batra, Julian Purdy, and Dr. Chimene Liburd) ..... 005791 - 005792

NOTICES, OPINIONS, AND ORDERS CONT'D
BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND AGENCIES

Alcoholic Beverage and Cannabis Administration -
ABC Board's Calendar for April 8, 2026 ..... 005793 - 005795
ABC Board's Cancellation Agenda for April 8, 2026 005796

Breakthrough Montessori Public Charter School -
Request for Proposals - Multiple Services (Extended) 005797

Clemency Board, Office of the District of Columbia -
Notice of Closed Meeting - April 10, 2026 005798
Notice of Public Meeting - April 10, 2026 005799

D.C. Bilingual Public Charter School -
Request for Proposals - Tutoring Services 005800

DC Scholars Public Charter School -
Request for Proposals - Tutoring Services 005801

E.L. Haynes Public Charter School -
Request for Proposals - Student Chromebooks and Staff Laptops 005802

Elections, Board of -
Certification of ANC Vacancy in ANC-SMD - 2B04 005803
Certification of ANC-SMD (3) Vacancies - 3E07, 7C06, 8D04 005804

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES CONT'D

NOTICES, OPINIONS, AND ORDERS CONT'D
BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND AGENCIES CONT'D

Elections, Board of - cont'd
Certification of Filling Vacancies -
2A02 Rob Gifford 005805
4E04 Hal Gordon 005805

Employee Appeals, Office of -
OEA Matter No. 1601-0029-24, Employee v. DC Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, Initial Decision (Upheld) ..... 005806 - 005826

OEA Matter No. 1601-0057-25, Employee v. DC Public Schools, Initial Decision (Dismissed & Granted) ..... 005827 - 005835

OEA Matter No. 1601-0058-25, Employee v. DC Public Schools, Initial Decision (Dismissed) ..... 005836 - 005842

OEA Matter No. J-0018-26, Employee v. DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education, Initial Decision (Dismissed) ..... 005843 - 005846

Energy and Environment, Department of -
Notice of Increase to the Battery Stewardship Organization Administrative Fee 005847

Notice of Intent to Issue Air Quality Permit -
#7421 CBNA Halmar Clean Rivers JV, 1601 Ohio Drive SW ..... 005848 - 005849

Global Citizens Public Charter School -
Request for Proposals - Facility Cleaning & Maintenance Services 005850

Health, Department of (DC Health) -
Notice of Funding Availability -
Pharmacy Wellness Hub: Diabetes Prevention, Management and Self Measured Blood Pressure (SMBP) Programs ..... 005851 - 005852

LEARN DC Public Charter School -
Request for Proposals -
Construction Manager at Risk 005853
Owners Representation 005854

Lee Montessori Public Charter School -
Request for Proposals - Landscape Build Services for School Playspace 005855

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES CONT'D

NOTICES, OPINIONS, AND ORDERS CONT'D
BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND AGENCIES CONT'D

Licensing and Consumer Protection, Department of -
Board of Architecture, Interior Design and
Landscape Architecture Meeting - April 10, 2026 005856
Board of Barber and Cosmetology Meeting - April 6, 2026 005857
Combat Sports Commission Meeting - April 8, 2026 005858

Neighborhood Safety and Engagement, DC Office of -
Notice of Funding Availability -
FY 26 Group Violence Reduction Strategy - Ward 1 005859

Public Charter School Board, DC -
Notice of Charter Reviews - Multiple Schools:
Amendment of Meeting Time -
Washington Latin Public Charter School,
KIPP DC Public Charter School,
Richard Wright Public Charter School -
Open for Public Comment Accepted Until March 23, 2026 ..... 005860 - 005861

Notice of Petition to Amend Charter, Facility -
Academy of Hope Public Charter School -
Amendment of Meeting Time -
Open for Public Comment Accepted Until March 23, 2026 005862

Notice of Special Board Meeting -
Sector Planning Roundtable - April 8, 2026 005863

Public Service Commission -
RM29-2025-01, RM40-2025-02, RM42-2025-01,
RM43-2025-01, and RM48-2022-01 - Supplemental
Comments on Second Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ..... 005864 - 005865

Shining Stars Montessori Academy Public Charter School -
Request for Proposals - Elevator Service 005866

Transportation, District Department of -
Notice of Funding Availability -
District of Columbia State Nursery 005867

Water and Sewer Authority, DC -
Board of Directors Meeting - April 7, 2026 005868
Environmental Quality and Operations Committee Meeting -
April 15, 2026 005869
Governance Committee Meeting - April 10, 2026 005870

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES CONT'D

NOTICES, OPINIONS, AND ORDERS CONT'D
BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND AGENCIES CONT'D

Zoning Adjustment, Board of - Cases
21400 Aidan Montessori School - ANC 3C - Order ..... 005871 - 005874
21432 Hasan Dossal - ANC 3D - Order ..... 005875 - 005877

Zoning Commission -
Notice of Closed Meeting - March 26, 2026 005878

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOTICE

D.C. LAW 26-101

"Institution of Higher Education Sexual Misconduct Reporting and Resource Accessibility Act of 2025"

Pursuant to Section 412 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, P.L. 93-198 (the Charter), the Council of the District of Columbia adopted Bill 26-29 on First Reading and Final Reading, on March 4, 2025, and April 1, 2025, respectively. Pursuant to Section 404(e) of the Charter, the bill became Act 26-59 and was published in the May 2, 2025 edition of the D.C. Register (Vol. 72, page 005314). Act 26-59 was transmitted to Congress on February 4, 2026 for a 30-day review, in accordance with Section 602(c)(1) of the Home Rule Act.

The Council of the District of Columbia hereby gives notice that the 30-day Congressional review period has ended, and Act 26-59 is now D.C. Law 26-101, effective March 19, 2026.

Phil Mendelson
Chairman of the Council

Days Counted During the 30-day Congressional Review Period:

Month	Dates Counted
February	4,5,6,9,10,11,12,13,17,18,19,20,23,24,25,26,27
March	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,11,12,13,16,17,18

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOTICE

D.C. LAW 26-102

"Petition Administration Clarification Amendment Act of 2026"

Pursuant to Section 412 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, P.L. 93-198 (the Charter), the Council of the District of Columbia adopted Bill 26-233 on First Reading and Final Reading, on December 16, 2025, and January 6, 2026, respectively. Following the signature of the Mayor on January 27, 2026, pursuant to Section 404(e) of the Charter, the bill became Act 26-247 and was published in the February 6, 2026 edition of the D.C. Register (Vol. 73, page 001062). Act 26-247 was transmitted to Congress on February 9, 2026 for a 30-day review, in accordance with Section 602(c)(1) of the Home Rule Act.

The Council of the District of Columbia hereby gives notice that the 30-day Congressional review period has ended, and Act 26-247 is now D.C. Law 26-102, effective March 24, 2026.

Phil Mendelson
Chairman of the Council

Days Counted During the 30-day Congressional Review Period:

Month	Dates Counted
February	9,10,11,12,13,17,18,19,20,23,24,25,26,27
March	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,11,12,13,16,17,18,19,20,23

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOTICE

D.C. LAW 26-103

"Philip Reed Memorial Park Designation Act of 2026"

Pursuant to Section 412 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, P.L. 93-198 (the Charter), the Council of the District of Columbia adopted Bill 26-248 on First Reading and Final Reading, on December 16, 2025, and January 6, 2026, respectively. Following the signature of the Mayor on January 22, 2026, pursuant to Section 404(e) of the Charter, the bill became Act 26-248 and was published in the February 6, 2026 edition of the D.C. Register (Vol. 73, page 001065). Act 26-248 was transmitted to Congress on February 9, 2026 for a 30-day review, in accordance with Section 602(c)(1) of the Home Rule Act.

The Council of the District of Columbia hereby gives notice that the 30-day Congressional review period has ended, and Act 26-248 is now D.C. Law 26-103, effective March 24, 2026.

Phil Mendelson
Chairman of the Council

Days Counted During the 30-day Congressional Review Period:

Month	Dates Counted
February	9,10,11,12,13,17,18,19,20,23,24,25,26,27
March	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,11,12,13,16,17,18,19,20,23

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOTICE

D.C. LAW 26-104

"Public Benefits Security Amendment Act of 2026"

Pursuant to Section 412 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, P.L. 93-198 (the Charter), the Council of the District of Columbia adopted Bill 26-367 on First Reading and Final Reading, on December 16, 2025, and January 6, 2026, respectively. Following the signature of the Mayor on January 22, 2026, pursuant to Section 404(e) of the Charter, the bill became Act 26-250 and was published in the February 6, 2026 edition of the D.C. Register (Vol. 73, page 001069). Act 26-250 was transmitted to Congress on February 9, 2026 for a 30-day review, in accordance with Section 602(c)(1) of the Home Rule Act.

The Council of the District of Columbia hereby gives notice that the 30-day Congressional review period has ended, and Act 26-250 is now D.C. Law 26-104, effective March 24, 2026.

Phil Mendelson
Chairman of the Council

Days Counted During the 30-day Congressional Review Period:

Month	Dates Counted
February	9,10,11,12,13,17,18,19,20,23,24,25,26,27
March	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,11,12,13,16,17,18,19,20,23

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOTICE

D.C. LAW 26-105

"Community Health Amendment Act of 2026"

Pursuant to Section 412 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, P.L. 93-198 (the Charter), the Council of the District of Columbia adopted Bill 26-414 on First Reading and Final Reading, on December 16, 2025, and January 6, 2026, respectively. Following the signature of the Mayor on January 27, 2026, pursuant to Section 404(e) of the Charter, the bill became Act 26-251 and was published in the February 6, 2026 edition of the D.C. Register (Vol. 73, page 001074). Act 26-251 was transmitted to Congress on February 9, 2026 for a 30-day review, in accordance with Section 602(c)(1) of the Home Rule Act.

The Council of the District of Columbia hereby gives notice that the 30-day Congressional review period has ended, and Act 26-251 is now D.C. Law 26-105, effective March 24, 2026.

Phil Mendelson
Chairman of the Council

Days Counted During the 30-day Congressional Review Period:

Month	Dates Counted
February	9,10,11,12,13,17,18,19,20,23,24,25,26,27
March	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,11,12,13,16,17,18,19,20,23

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOTICE

D.C. LAW 26-106

"Energy Efficiency Financing Debt Cap Temporary Amendment Act of 2026"

Pursuant to Section 412 of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, P.L. 93-198 (the Charter), the Council of the District of Columbia adopted Bill 26-536 on First Reading and Final Reading, on December 16, 2025, and January 6, 2026, respectively. Following the signature of the Mayor on January 27, 2026, pursuant to Section 404(e) of the Charter, the bill became Act 26-252 and was published in the February 6, 2026 edition of the D.C. Register (Vol. 73, page 001076). Act 26-252 was transmitted to Congress on February 9, 2026 for a 30-day review, in accordance with Section 602(c)(1) of the Home Rule Act.

The Council of the District of Columbia hereby gives notice that the 30-day Congressional review period has ended, and Act 26-252 is now D.C. Law 26-106, effective March 24, 2026.

Phil Mendelson
Chairman of the Council

Days Counted During the 30-day Congressional Review Period:

Month	Dates Counted
February	9,10,11,12,13,17,18,19,20,23,24,25,26,27
March	2,3,4,5,6,9,10,11,12,13,16,17,18,19,20,23

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

AN ACT

D.C. ACT 26-284

IN THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MARCH 30, 2026

To officially designate the school in Lot 33 in Square 792, located at 301 North Carolina Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20003, bounded by North Carolina Avenue, SE, 4th Street, SE, D Street, SE, and 3rd Street, SE in Ward 6, as Gardner Bishop Elementary School.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, That this act may be cited as the "Gardner Bishop Elementary School Redesignation Act of 2026".

Sec. 2. Pursuant to sections 401 and 422(b) through (e) of the Street and Alley Closing and Acquisition Procedures Act of 1982, effective March 10, 1983 (D.C. Law 4-201; D.C. Official Code §§ 9-204.01 and 9-204.22(b) through (e)) ("Act"), and notwithstanding section 422(a) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 9-204.22(a)), the Council designates the school in Lot 33 in Square 792, located at 301 North Carolina Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20003, bounded by North Carolina Avenue, SE, 4th Street, SE, D Street, SE, and 3rd Street, SE in Ward 6, as "Gardner Bishop Elementary School".

Sec. 3. Fiscal impact statement.

The Council adopts the fiscal impact statement in the committee report as the fiscal impact statement required by section 4a of the General Legislative Procedures Act of 1975, approved October 16, 2006 (120 Stat. 2038; D.C. Official Code § 1-301.47a).

Sec. 4. Effective date.

This act shall take effect following approval by the Mayor (or in the event of veto by the

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

Mayor, action by the Council to override the veto) and a 30-day period of congressional review as provided in section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 813; D.C. Official Code § 1-206.02(c)(1)).

Chairman
Council of the District of Columbia

Mayor
District of Columbia
APPROVED
MARCH 30, 2026

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

AN ACT

D.C. ACT 26-285

IN THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MARCH 30, 2026

To amend, on a temporary basis, the Department of Transportation Establishment Act of 2022 to authorize the Director to issue a grant to Friends of Wangari Gardens for the assessment, design, and installation of a water meter and potable water source directly on the Wangari Gardens property with a spigot for gardeners' free use.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, That this act may be cited as the "Friends of Wangari Gardens Grant Temporary Amendment Act of 2026".

Sec. 2. Section 3(c) of the Department of Transportation Establishment Act of 2022, effective May 21, 2002 (D.C. Law 14-137; D.C. Official Code § 50-921.02(c)) is amended by adding a new paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"(5) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Director may issue a grant to the Friends of Wangari Gardens for the purpose of assessing, designing, and installing a water meter and potable water source directly on the Wangari Gardens property with a spigot for gardeners' free use."

Sec. 3. Fiscal impact statement.

The Council adopts the fiscal impact statement of the Budget Director as the fiscal impact statement required by section 4a of the General Legislative Procedures Act of 1975, approved October 16, 2006 (120 Stat. 2038; D.C. Official Code § 1-301.47a).

Sec. 4. Effective date.

(a) This act shall take effect following approval by the Mayor (or in the event of veto by the Mayor, action by the Council to override the veto) and a 30-day period of congressional

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

review as provided in section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 813; D.C. Official Code § 1-206.02(c)(1)).

(b) This act shall expire after 225 days of its having taken effect.

Chairman
Council of the District of Columbia

Mayor
District of Columbia
APPROVED
MARCH 30, 2026

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

AN ACT

D.C. ACT 26-286

IN THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MARCH 30, 2026

To amend, on a temporary basis, section 47-813 of the District of Columbia Official Code to provide for more timely classification changes for commercial properties that are to be put to residential use, to provide for an application process to make classification changes, to provide for appeal rights if such application is denied, and to provide for a claw back in the event the real property is not timely put to residential use.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, That this act may be cited as the "Residential Building Permit Classification Temporary Amendment Act of 2026".

Sec. 2. Section 47-813 of the District of Columbia Official Code is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (c-9)(2) is amended as follows:

(1) Subparagraph (A) is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph and subject to paragraphs (4) and (5) of this subsection, Class 1A Property shall be comprised of:

"(i) Residential real property that is improved and its legal use is for nontransient residential dwelling purposes, and that is not Class 1B Property; provided, that such property may be used to host transient guests pursuant to an unexpired short-term rental license endorsement issued pursuant to § 30-201.04; or

"(ii) Real property or a portion of real property for which a building permit has been issued:

"(I) To construct a new improvement for predominantly nontransient residential dwelling purpose; or

"(II) To substantially rehabilitate that portion or all of an existing improvement for exclusively nontransient residential dwelling purposes.".

(2) Subparagraph (C) is amended by striking the phrase "designated as" and inserting the phrase "designated solely as" in its place.

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

(b) The lead-in language of subsection (d-2) is amended by striking the phrase "Class 3 Property or Class 4 Property," and inserting the phrase "Class 2 Property, Class 3 Property, or Class 4 Property," in its place.

(c) A new subsection (d-4) is added to read as follows:

"(d-4)(1) If real property changes classification to Class 1A Property as defined in subsection (c-9)(2)(A)(ii) of this section during the period:

"(A) October 1 through March 31 of the tax year, the newly reclassified Class 1A Property, or the portion thereof used exclusively for residential purposes if already improved or assessed under § 47-829, shall be taxed at the Class 1A Property tax rate for the entire tax year; or

"(B) April 1 through September 30 of the tax year, the newly reclassified Class 1A Property, or the portion thereof used exclusively for residential purposes if already improved or assessed under § 47-829, shall be taxed at the Class 1A Property tax rate for the second installment only.

"(2) The owner shall apply for a change of classification to Class 1A Property as defined in subsection (c-9)(2)(A)(ii) of this section and shall promptly provide complete documentation in a manner prescribed by the Chief Financial Officer to substantiate any such classification change before it shall be effective.

"(3) A change in classification to Class 1A Property as defined in subsection (c-9)(2)(A)(ii) of this section shall be effective beginning in the half tax year for which application is made under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(4) If change in classification to Class 1A Property as defined in subsection (c-9)(2)(A)(ii) of this section is determined to be erroneous because the real property was not put to predominantly residential use by the earlier of either the issuance of any new or amended certificate of occupancy (temporary or permanent) for any part of the improvement thereon, or 3 years from issuance of the building permit, or the building permit expired and was not renewed within one year, the Chief Financial Officer shall reclassify and tax the real property without limitation for each tax year or half tax year in which the real property was improperly classified as Class 1A Property, subject only to subsection (d-1)(5)(A-i) of this section, if the property is determined to be Class 3 Property or Class 4 Property, or subsection (d-2) of this section. In the event of such reclassification, penalty and interest shall be added beginning from the day the correct amount of tax should have been due but not paid if the property had been properly classified.

"(5) Within 45 days from the date of the notice of denial of Class 1A Property reclassification under this subsection, the owner may petition for an administrative review of the rescission or denial and appeal from a final determination thereof to the same extent as if the appeal were filed under § 47-825.01a(d)(2).

"(6) Notwithstanding the time limitations in paragraphs (4) and (5) of this subsection, the Chief Financial Officer, in his or her discretion, may grant an extension of time to

comply or waive penalty and interest assessed pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection to prevent an undue hardship to the owner.

"(7) The provisions of this subsection, subsection (c-9)(2)(A)(ii) of this section, and § 47-829 shall not supersede the requirement to timely file for mixed-use classification for the upcoming tax year pursuant to subsection (f) of this section, when the annual assessment for such upcoming tax year is made under § 47-824 and the certificate of occupancy (final or temporary) was issued.".

Sec. 3. Section 2(a) of the Avanti Real Estate Services, LLC Real Property Tax Relief Emergency Act of 2025, effective December 3, 2025 (D.C. Act 26-213; 72 DCR 13682), is amended by striking the phrase "Avanti Real Estate Services, LLC; provided, that the Property is occupied by Avanti Real Estate Services, LLC and is used to further the purposes of providing real estate and brokerage services, specializing in creating generational wealth through homeownership, employing District residents, and providing education and training for employment opportunities and careers within the real estate industry" and inserting the phrase "Avanti Real Estate Services, LLC" in its place.

Sec. 4. Section 2(a) of the Avanti Real Estate Services, LLC Real Property Tax Relief Temporary Act of 2025, effective February 12, 2026 (D.C. Law 26-93; 73 DCR 68), is amended by striking the phrase "Avanti Real Estate Services, LLC; provided, that the Property is occupied by Avanti Real Estate Services, LLC and is used to further the purposes of providing real estate and brokerage services, specializing in creating generational wealth through homeownership, employing District residents, and providing education and training for employment opportunities and careers within the real estate industry" and inserting the phrase "Avanti Real Estate Services, LLC" in its place.

Sec. 5. Fiscal impact statement.

The Council adopts the fiscal impact statement of the Budget Director as the fiscal impact statement required by section 4a of the General Legislative Procedures Act of 1975, approved October 16, 2006 (120 Stat. 2038; D.C. Official Code § 1-301.47a).

Sec. 6. Effective date.

(a) This act shall take effect following approval by the Mayor (or in the event of veto by the Mayor, action by the Council to override the veto) and a 30-day period of congressional

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

review as provided in section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 813; D.C. Official Code § 1-206.02(c)(1)).

(b) This act shall expire after 225 days of its having taken effect.

Chairman
Council of the District of Columbia

Mayor
District of Columbia
APPROVED
MARCH 30, 2026

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

AN ACT

D.C. ACT 26-287

IN THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MARCH 30, 2026

To amend, on a temporary basis, the Fraudulent Vehicle Tag and Parking Enforcement Modernization Amendment Act of 2024 to amend the subject to appropriations provision.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, That this act may be cited as the "Parking Enforcement Modernization Technical Correction Temporary Amendment Act of 2026".

Sec. 2. Section 401(a) of the Fraudulent Vehicle Tag and Parking Enforcement Modernization Amendment Act of 2024, effective May 2, 2025 (D.C. Law 25-325, 72 DCR 1284), is amended by striking the phrase "Sections 113, 114(b) and 201(c)(2) shall apply" and inserting the phrase "Section 201(c)(2) shall apply" in its place.

Sec. 3. Fiscal impact statement.

The Council adopts the fiscal impact statement of the Budget Director as the fiscal impact statement required by section 4a of the General Legislative Procedures Act of 1975, approved October 16, 2006 (120 Stat. 2038; D.C. Official Code § 1-301.47a).

Sec. 4. Effective date.

(a) This act shall take effect following approval by the Mayor (or in the event of veto by the Mayor, action by the Council to override the veto) and a 30-day period of congressional

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

review as provided in section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 813; D.C. Official Code § 1-206.02(c)(1)).

(b) This act shall expire after 225 days of its having taken effect.

Chairman
Council of the District of Columbia

Mayor
District of Columbia
APPROVED
MARCH 30, 2026

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

AN ACT

D.C. ACT 26-288

IN THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MARCH 30,2026

To amend, on an emergency basis, Chapter 10 of Title 47 of the District of Columba Official Code to provide real property, deed recordation, and deed transfer tax exemptions for properties held under the ownership of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or the respective parishes of the Archdiocese of Washington.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, That this Act may be cited as the "Archdiocese of Washington Parish Real Property, Deed Recordation, and Transfer Tax Exemption Emergency Amendment Act of 2026".

Sec. 2. Chapter 10 of Title 47 of the District of Columbia Official Code is amended as follows:

(a) The table of contents is amended by adding a new section designation to read as follows:

"47-1099.16. Archdiocese of Washington Parish real property, deed recordation, and deed transfer tax exemptions.".

(b) A new section 47-1099.16 is added to read as follows:

"§ 47-1099.16. Archdiocese of Washington Parish real property, deed recordation, and deed transfer tax exemptions.

"(a) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 159, Lots 861 and 827, shall be exempt from the taxes imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Cathedral of St. Matthew the Apostle Catholic Church, Inc.

"(b) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 1800, Lots 1, 20, and 802; and Square 1815, Lot 101, shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Annunciation Catholic Church, Inc.

"(c) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 3880, Lots 1, 2, 13, 17, 18, 19, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, and 805 shall be exempt from the tax

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Anthony of Padua Catholic Church, Inc.

"(d) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 6005, Lots 802 and 803 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary Catholic Church, Inc.

"(e) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 4558, Lot 33, shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Benedict the Moor Catholic Church, Inc.

"(f) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 1862, Lot 802; and Square 1863, Lots 47, 824, 825, and 826, shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Shrine of the Most Blessed Sacrament Catholic Church, Inc.

"(g) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 1263, Lot 163 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned and used by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Epiphany Catholic Church, Inc.

"(h) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 4217, Lot 802; and Square 4217N, Lot 808 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Francis de Sales Catholic Church, Inc.

"(i) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 5550, Lot 808; and Square 5552, Lot 832 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Francis Xavier Catholic Church, Inc.

"(j) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 3224, Lot 800 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Gabriel Catholic Church, Inc.

"(k) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 1036, Lots 114, 804, and 805; and Square 1071, Lot 805 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Holy Comforter - St. Cyprian Catholic Church, Inc.

"(l) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 957,

Lot 814; and Square 4065, Lot 819 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Holy Name of Jesus Catholic Church, Inc.

"(m) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 557, Lot 140 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Holy Redeemer Catholic Church, Inc.

"(n) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 566, Lots 857, 859, 860, and 865, shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Holy Rosary Catholic Church, Inc.

"(o) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 1227, Lot 95 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Holy Trinity Catholic Church, Inc.

"(p) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 423, Lots 2, 801, and 802 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Immaculate Conception Catholic Church, Inc.

"(q) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 5204, Lot 37 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Church of the Incarnation Catholic Church, Inc.

"(r) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 756, Lots 47, 52, 827, and 828 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42, so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Joseph's on Capitol Hill Catholic Church, Inc.

"(s) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 5330, Lots 24 and 31 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Luke Catholic Church, Inc.

"(t) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 3111, Lot 806; and Square 3531, Lots 116 and 117 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Martin of Tours Catholic Church, Inc.

"(u) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 518, Lots 911 and 912, shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Mary, Mother of God, Catholic Church, Inc.

"(v) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 2939, Lots 802, 808, and 811 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Nativity Catholic Church, Inc.

"(w) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 5817, Lot 803, and PAR-0226-0037 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Our Lady of Perpetual Help Catholic Church, Inc.

"(x) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in PAR- 0198-0065 and PAR-0199-0049 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Our Lady Queen of Peace Catholic Church, Inc.

"(y) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 1374, Lots 859 and 860 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Our Lady of Victory Catholic Church, Inc.

"(z) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 376, Lots 820, 821, 822, and 827 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Patrick Catholic Church, Inc.

"(aa) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 203 Lot 93; and Square 189 and Lot 45 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Augustine Catholic Church, Inc.

"(bb) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 733, Lot 50; and Square 793, Lot 25 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Peter Catholic Church, Inc.

"(cc) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 2675, Lot 826; and Square 2609, Lot 857, shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Shrine of the Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Inc.

"(dd) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 27,

Lot 30 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Stephen the Martyr Catholic Church, Inc.

"(ee) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 5773, Lot 835; Square 5605, Lot 110; and Square 5780, Lot 821, shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Teresa of Avila Catholic Church, Inc.

"(ff) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 1739, Lot 57 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Louis de France Catholic Church, Inc.

"(gg) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 2529, Lot 305 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Our Lady Queen of the Americas Catholic Church, Inc.

"(hh) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 1729, Lot 0007 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Ann Catholic Church, Inc.

"(ii) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 2108, Lot 806, shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Thomas Apostle Catholic Church, Inc.

"(jj) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 6242, Lot 834 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Thomas More Catholic Church, Inc.

"(kk) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 698, Lot 818 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42 so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Vincent de Paul Catholic Church, Inc.

"(ll) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 159, Lot 860 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42, so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Cathedral of St. Matthew the Apostle Catholic Church, Inc.

"(mm) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 1863, Lot 1 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42, so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and

his successors in office, a corporation sole, or Shrine of the Most Blessed Sacrament Catholic Church, Inc.

"(nn) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 4217N, Lot 805 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42, so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Francis de Sales Catholic Church, Inc.

"(oo) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 376, Lot 828 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42, so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Patrick Catholic Church, Inc.

"(pp) The real properties, and any improvements on the properties, located in Square 203, Lot 806 shall be exempt from the tax imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42, so long as the properties are owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or St. Augustine Catholic Church, Inc.

"(qq) The tax exemptions provided pursuant to this section shall be in addition to, and not lieu of, any other tax relief or assistance from any other source applicable to the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, and the respective parishes of the Archdiocese of Washington as named in subsections (a) through (pp).

"(rr) The properties listed in subsections (a) through (pp) may be transferred through supplemental deeds, for no additional consideration, from the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, as the record owner, to the respective parishes of the Archdiocese of Washington as named in subsections (a) through (pp), and any such supplemental deed transfers shall be exempt from the taxes imposed by Chapter 9 of this title and Chapter 11 of Title 42, and shall not require the submission of real property tax exemption applications.

"(ss)" Each of the real properties listed in subsections (a) through (kk) shall remain exempt from taxation imposed by Chapter 8 of this title under § 47-1002 so long as the property is owned by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or the respective parishes of the Archdiocese of Washington as named in subsections (a) through (kk), and provided that such owner, or any lessee, continues to use the property as listed in subsections (a) through (kk) to provide religious, charitable, educational, or related services, subject to any applicable provisions of § 47-1005 for any taxable portion of the property. If any or all of the properties listed in subsections (a) through (kk) are transferred through supplemental deed pursuant to subsection (rr), for no additional consideration, from the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, as the record owner, to the respective parishes of the Archdiocese of Washington as named in subsections (a) through (kk), the properties in question shall remain exempt from taxation under § 47-1002, subject to any applicable provisions of § 47-1005 for any taxable portion of the property.

"(tt) Annually the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and his successors in office, a corporation sole, or the respective parishes of the Archdiocese of Washington as named in subsections (a) through (kk), shall make the reports required by § 47-1007, as applicable, and

ENROLLED ORIGINAL

shall have the appeal rights provided by § 47-1009.

Sec. 3. Fiscal impact statement.

The Council adopts the fiscal impact statement in the committee report as the fiscal impact statement required by section 4a of the General Legislative Procedures Act of 1975, approved October 16, 2006 (120 Stat. 2038; D.C. Official Code § 1-301.47a).

Sec. 4. Effective date.

This act shall take effect following approval by the Mayor (or in the event of veto by the Mayor, action by the Council to override the veto), and shall remain in effect for no longer than 90 days, as provided for emergency acts of the Council of the District of Columbia in section 412(a) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 813; D.C. Official Code § 1-204.12(a)).

Chairman
Council of the District of Columbia

Mayor
District of Columbia
APPROVED
MARCH 30, 2026

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ACT ON NEW LEGISLATION

The Council of the District of Columbia hereby gives notice of its intention to consider the following legislative matters for final Council action in not less than 15 days. Referrals of legislation to various committees of the Council are listed below and are subject to change at the legislative meeting immediately following or coinciding with the date of introduction. It is also noted that legislation may be co-sponsored by other Councilmembers after its introduction.

Interested persons wishing to comment may do so in writing addressed to Nyasha Smith, Secretary to the Council, 1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Room 5, Washington, D.C. 20004. Copies of bills and proposed resolutions are available in the Legislative Services Division, 1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Room 10, Washington, D.C. 20004, Telephone: 724-8050 or online at http://www.dccouncil.gov.

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PROPOSED LEGISLATION

B26-0639 Convention Center Dedicated Employee Amendment Act of 2026

Intro. 03-23-2026 by Councilmembers Allen, and Henderson and referred to the Committee on Executive Administration and Labor

---

B26-0641 Archdiocese of Washington Parish Real Property, Deed Recordation, and Transfer Tax Exemption Amendment Act of 2026

Intro. 03-24-2026 by Councilmembers Parker, and Allen and referred to the Committee of the Whole

---

B26-0642 Closing of Portions of a Public Alley in Square 571, S.O. 25-01939, Act of 2026

Intro. 03-27-2026 by Councilmember Allen and referred to the Committee of the Whole

---

B26-0643 Community Service Debt Repayment Program Amendment Act of 2026

Intro. 03-30-2026 by Councilmember T. White, and Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Transportation and the Environment

---

B26-0644 Targeted ANC 8A Moratorium Zone Amendment Act of 2026

Intro. 03-30-2026 by Councilmember T. White and referred to the Committee on Public Works and Operations

---

B26-0645 Fiscal Accountability and Homeownership Opportunity Act of 2026

Intro. 03-30-2026 by Councilmembers Crawford, Parker, Felder, Bonds, and Nadeau and referred to the Committee of the Whole

---

B26-0646 Balancing Educational Investments Amendment Act of 2026

Intro. 03-30-2026 by Councilmembers Henderson, Frumin, Parker, Allen, Nadeau, and Lewis George and referred to the Committee of the Whole

---

B26-0647 Short-Term Rental Regulation Amendment Act of 2026

Intro. 03-13-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred sequentially to the Committee on Public Works and Operations, and Committee of the Whole

---

B26-0648 DC Hospitality Amendment Act of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Public Works and Operations

---

PR26-0592 Real Estate Commission David Bediz Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Housing

---

PR26-0593 Real Estate Commission Elizabeth Blakeslee Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Housing

---

PR26-0594 Real Estate Commission Carol Calomiris Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Housing

---

PR26-0595 Real Estate Commission Anthony Graham Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Housing

---

PR26-0596 Real Estate Commission Damayra Moses Perez Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Housing

---

PR26-0597 Real Estate Commission Patrice Richardson Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Housing

---

PR26-0598 Green Finance Authority Board Jennifer Wade Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Transportation and the Environment

---

PR26-0599 Rent Administrator Lauren Pair Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Housing

---

PR26-0600 Board of Nursing Brianna Jones Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Health

---

PR26-0601 Board of Barber and Cosmetology Korie Booker Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Public Works and Operations

---

PR26-0602 Board of Barber and Cosmetology David Cavalcante Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Public Works and Operations

---

PR26-0603 Board of Barber and Cosmetology Kimberley Grimes Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Public Works and Operations

---

PR26-0604 Board of Barber and Cosmetology Vernon Martin Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Public Works and Operations

---

PR26-0605 Board of Barber and Cosmetology Ajia Minnis Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Public Works and Operations

---

PR26-0606 Board of Barber and Cosmetology Anwar Saleem Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Public Works and Operations

---

PR26-0607 Board of Barber and Cosmetology Dennis Smith Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Public Works and Operations

---

PR26-0608 Multiyear Contract Number 2026-LRSP-01A with 2229 M Street NE Owner LLC Approval Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-20-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Retained by the Council with comments from the Committee on Housing

---

PR26-0609 Violence Fatality Review Committee Kenyatta Hazlewood Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-23-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety

---

PR26-0610 Violence Fatality Review Committee Juanita Price Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-23-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety

---

PR26-0611 Violence Fatality Review Committee Helaina Roisman Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-23-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety

---

PR26-0612 Violence Fatality Review Committee Dr. Joseph Richardson Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-23-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety

---

PR26-0614 Board of Professional Engineering Michael J. Jelen Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-23-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Public Works and Operations

---

PR26-0615 Multiyear Contract Number 2026-LRSP-02A with 950 Eastern Avenue TM L.L.C. Approval Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-24-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Retained by the Council with comments from the Committee on Housing

---

PR26-0616 Public Employee Relations Board Lee Clark Confirmation Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-26-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Committee on Executive Administration and Labor

---

PR26-0617 Contract No. CFOPD-20-C-014, Extension Approval and Payment Authorization Approval Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-27-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Retained by the Council with comments from the Committee of the Whole

---

PR26-0619 Contract No. CFOPD-17-C-009, Extension Approval and Payment Authorization Approval Resolution of 2026

Intro. 03-27-2026 by Chairman Mendelson and referred to the Retained by the Council with comments from the Committee of the Whole

---

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
The Wilson Building

NOTICE OF CONTRACT DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION

The Council of the District of Columbia gives notice that the resolution listed below to disapprove CA 26-646, proposed Contract No. CW128791 with HME, Inc., in the not-to-exceed amount of $32,502,456 will provide a minimum of one and a maximum of twenty-four pumpers for the Apparatus division of the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department was filed in the Office of the Secretary on March 17, 2026.

A copy of the approval resolution or the proposed contract is available in the Council's Legislative Services, Room 10, John A. Wilson Building. Telephone: 724-8050. Comments on the proposed contract can be addressed to the Secretary to the Council, Room 5.

PR 26-618: Proposed Contract No. CW128791 with HME, Inc. Disapproval Resolution of 2026

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE AND CANNABIS ADMINISTRATION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Placard Posting Date:	April 3, 2026
Protest Petition Deadline:	May18, 2026
Roll Call Hearing Date:	June 8, 2026

License No.:	ABRA-123532
Licensee:	Collevecchio, LLC
Trade Name:	Claudio's Table
License Class:	Retailer's Class "C" Restaurant
Address:	5441-5443 MacArthur Boulevard, N.W.
Contact:	Matthew Minora: (202) 625-7700, mminora@malliosobrien.com

WARD 3 ANC 3D SMD 3D04

Notice is hereby given that this licensee has requested a Substantial Change to their license under the D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and that the objectors are entitled to be heard before the granting of such on the **Roll Call Hearing date on June 8, 2026, at 10 a.m., Suite 4200-B, 899 North Capitol Street N.E., Washington, DC, 20002**. Petitions and/or requests to appear before the ABC Board must be filed electronically to abca.legal@dc.gov on or before the Petition deadline.

NATURE OF SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE
Request for a Summer Garden endorsement with 45 seats.

HOURS OPERATION AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE SALES. SERVICE. AND CONSUMPTION INSIDE PREMISES
Monday through Thursday 10am – 11pm, Friday and Saturday 10am – 12am

PROPOSED HOURS OF OPERATION AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE SALES. SERVICE. AND CONSUMPTION FOR THE SUMMER GARDEN
Monday through Thursday 10am – 11pm, Friday and Saturday 10am – 12am

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE AND CANNABIS ADMINISTRATION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Placard Posting Date:	April 3, 2026
Protest Petition Deadline:	May 18, 2026
Roll Call Hearing Date:	June 8, 2026
License No.:	ABRA-125838
Licensee:	Dance Place, Inc.
Trade Name:	Dance Place
License Class:	Retailer's Class "CX" Multipurpose Facility
Address:	3225 8th Street, N.E.
Contact:	André Mazelin: (202) 269-1600, andre@danceplace.org

WARD 5 ANC 5F SMD 5F02

Notice is hereby given that this licensee has requested a Substantial Change to their license under the D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and that the objectors are entitled to be heard before the granting of such on the **Roll Call Hearing date on June 8, 2026 at 10 a.m., Suite 4200-B, 899 North Capitol Street N.E., Washington, DC, 20002**. Petitions and/or requests to appear before the ABC Board must be filed electronically to abca.legal@dc.gov on or before the Petition deadline.

NATURE OF SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE
Change of Hours of Operation, Alcoholic Beverage Sales, and Live Entertainment.

CURRENT HOURS OF OPERATION
Sunday 5pm – 10pm, Monday through Wednesday 10am – 6pm, Thursday through Sunday 10am – 11pm

CURRENT HOURS OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE SALES, SERVICE, AND CONSUMPTION AND LIVE ENTERTAINMENT
Sunday 5pm – 10pm, No alcohol sales/entertainment Monday through Wednesday, Thursday through Saturday 5pm – 11pm

PROPOSED HOURS OF OPERATION
Sunday through Saturday 10am – 2am

PROPOSED HOURS OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE SALES, SERVICE, AND CONSUMPTION
Sunday through Saturday 10am – 1am

PROPOSED HOURS OF ENTERTAINMENT
Sunday 10am – 1am, Monday through Thursday 6pm – 1am, Friday and Saturday 10am – 1am

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE AND CANNABIS ADMINISTRATION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

****CORRECTION**

Placard Posting Date:	March 27, 2026
Protest Petition Deadline:	May 11, 2026
Roll Call Hearing Date:	June 1, 2026
License No.:	ABRA-112906
Licensee:	Dixie, Inc.
Trade Name:	Dixie Liquor
License Class:	Retailer's Class "A" Liquor Store
Address:	4418 MacArthur Blvd., N.W.
Contact:	Kevin Lee: (703) 941-3133, kevinleelaw@gmail.com

WARD 2 ANC 2E SMD 2E05

Notice is hereby given that this licensee has requested to transfer their license to a new location under the D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and that the objectors are entitled to be heard before the granting of such on the **Roll Call Hearing date on June 1, 2026 at 10 a.m., Suite 4200-B, 899 North Capitol Street N.E., Washington, DC, 20002**. Petitions and/or requests to appear before the ABC Board must be filed electronically to abca.legal@dc.gov on or before the Petition deadline.

NATURE OF OPERATION

Applicant requests to Transfer License from 3429 M Street, N.W. to a new location at 4418 MacArthur Blvd., N.W. Licensee is a Class "A" Liquor Store.

****HOURS OF OPERATION AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE SALES**

Sunday through Saturday 8am – 11pm

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE AND CANNABIS ADMINISTRATION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

****RESCIND**

Placard Posting Date:	March 27, 2026
Protest Petition Deadline:	May 11, 2026
Roll Call Hearing Date:	June 1, 2026
License No.:	ABRA-112906
Licensee:	Dixie, Inc.
Trade Name:	Dixie Liquor
License Class:	Retailer's Class "A" Liquor Store
Address:	4418 MacArthur Blvd., N.W.
Contact:	Kevin Lee: (703) 941-3133, kevinleelaw@gmail.com

WARD 2 ANC 2E SMD 2E05

Notice is hereby given that this licensee has requested to transfer their license to a new location under the D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and that the objectors are entitled to be heard before the granting of such on the **Roll Call Hearing date on June 1, 2026 at 10 a.m., Suite 4200-B, 899 North Capitol Street N.E., Washington, DC, 20002**. Petitions and/or requests to appear before the ABC Board must be filed electronically to abca.legal@dc.gov on or before the Petition deadline.

NATURE OF OPERATION

Applicant requests to Transfer License from 3429 M Street, N.W. to a new location at 4418 MacArthur Blvd., N.W. Licensee is a Class "A" Liquor Store.

****HOURS OF OPERATION AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE SALES**

Sunday through Saturday 9am – 10pm

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE AND CANNABIS ADMINISTRATION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Placard Posting Date:	April 3, 2026
Protest Petition Deadline:	May 18, 2026
Roll Call Hearing Date:	June 8, 2026

License No.:	ABRA-135192
Licensee:	Hall Pass DC LLC
Trade Name:	Hall Pass
License Class:	Retailer's Class "C" Tavern
Address:	704 7th Street, N.W.
Contact:	Manalle Mahmoud: (202) 625-7700, mmahmoud@malliosobrien.com

WARD 2 ANC 2C SMD 2C01

Notice is hereby given that this licensee has requested a Substantial Change to their license under the D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and that the objectors are entitled to be heard before the granting of such on the **Roll Call Hearing date on June 8, 2026 at 10 a.m., Suite 4200-B, 899 North Capitol Street N.E., Washington, DC, 20002**. Petitions and/or requests to appear before the ABC Board must be filed electronically to abca.legal@dc.gov on or before the Petition deadline.

NATURE OF SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE

A Retailers Class "C" Tavern with 85 seats and a Total Occupancy Load of 100. Entertainment Endorsement.

HOURS OF OPERATION, ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE SALES, SERVICE, AND CONSUMPTION, AND LIVE ENTERTAINMENT

Sunday through Saturday 10am – 2am

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE AND CANNABIS ADMINISTRATION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Placard Posting Date:	April 3, 2026
Protest Petition Deadline:	May 18, 2026
Roll Call Hearing Date:	June 8, 2026
Protest Hearing Date:	July 22, 2026

License No.:	ABRA-135581
Licensee:	Taste of History, LLC
Trade Name:	Taste of History, LLC
License Class:	Retailer's Class "C" Tavern
Address:	511 Jefferson Drive, S.W.
Contact:	Peter Nolan: (310) 691-0515, nolan@nolancap.com

WARD 4 ANC 4D SMD 4D02

Notice is hereby given that this licensee has applied for a new license under the D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and that the objectors are entitled to be heard before the granting of such on the **Roll Call Hearing date on June 8, 2026 at 10 a.m., Suite 4200-B, 899 North Capitol Street N.E., Washington, DC, 20002**. Petitions and/or requests to appear before the ABC Board must be filed electronically to abca.legal@dc.gov on or before the Petition deadline. The **Protest Hearing date** is scheduled on **July 22, 2026 at 1:30 p.m.**

NATURE OF OPERATION

New Retailer's Class "C" Tavern with eight (8) Kiosks offering no indoor seating for consumption. Each Kiosk has outside, summer garden-style seating for controlled sales, service, and consumption.

HOURS OF OPERATION AND ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE SALES, SERVICE, AND CONSUMPTION

Sunday through Saturday 9:30am – 6pm

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE AND CANNABIS ADMINISTRATION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Placard Posting Date:	April 3, 2026
Protest Petition Deadline:	May 18, 2026
Roll Call Hearing Date:	June 8, 2026
License No.:	ABRA-133331
Licensee:	618 Productions, LLC
Trade Name:	Transmission
License Class:	Retailer's Class "C" Tavern
Address:	1353 H Street, N.E.
Contact:	Jeff Jackson: (202) 251-1566, jjharlem112@gmail.com

WARD 6 ANC 6A SMD 6A06

Notice is hereby given that this licensee has requested a Substantial Change to their license under the D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and that the objectors are entitled to be heard before the granting of such on the **Roll Call Hearing date on June 8, 2026 at 10 a.m., Suite 4200-B, 899 North Capitol Street N.E., Washington, DC, 20002**. Petitions and/or requests to appear before the ABC Board must be filed electronically to abca.legal@dc.gov on or before the Petition deadline.

NATURE OF SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE

Request to expand the licensed premises, increasing the Total Occupancy Load of the Establishment from 495 to 1000.

HOURS OF OPERATION AND HOURS OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE SALES, SERVICE, AND CONSUMPTION FOR INSIDE PREMISES, SIDEWALK CAFÉ, AND SUMMER GARDEN

Sunday through Thursday 5pm – 2am, Friday and Saturday 5pm – 3am

HOURS OF LIVE ENTERTAINMENT FOR INSIDE PREMISES

Sunday through Thursday 5pm – 2am, Friday and Saturday 5pm – 3am

DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND CONSUMER PROTECTON
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

NOTICE OF FINAL RULEMAKING

as transmitted to the Council for its review and approval pursuant to An Act Making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1057; D.C. Official Code § 5-129.02)

The Director of the Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection ("DLCP"), pursuant to authority set forth in An Act Making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1057; D.C. Official Code § 5-129.02), Mayor's Order 2022-024, dated February 9, 2022, and Mayor's Order 2022-149, dated September 29, 2022, and the Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department ("Chief of Police"), pursuant to the authority set forth in Section 1 of An Act Relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia, approved February 28, 1901 (31 Stat. 819; D.C. Official Code § 5-105.05), Sections 378 and 379 of the Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia (D.C. Official Code § 5-129.03), Mayor's Order 2009-4, dated January 16, 2009, Mayor's Order 2012-28, dated February 21, 2012, and Mayor's Order 2015-167, dated June 16, 2015, hereby give notice of their adoption of the following amendments to Chapter 11 (Special Police) of Title 6 (Personnel), Subtitle A (Police Personnel), of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations ("DCMR").

The rulemaking clarifies the requirements applicable to the appointment of special privates without pay for duty in connection with any emergency of riot, pestilence, invasion, insurrection, or during any day of public election, ceremony, or celebration, and to make technical and conforming revisions to existing provisions concerning special police officers.

An initial Notice of Emergency Rulemaking was published in the *District of Columbia Register on* November 15, 2024, at 71 DCR 013997, and expired on March 1, 2025. A Notice of Second Emergency and Proposed Rulemaking was published in the *District of Columbia Register* on May 9, 2025, at 72 DCR 005755. No public comments were received in response to the Notice of Second Emergency and Proposed Rulemaking during the thirty (30)-day comment period.

The Director of DLCP and Chief of Police thereafter approved a proposed Notice of Final Rulemaking for submission to the Council for its review and approval pursuant to the Act (D.C. Official Code § 5-129.02). No changes were made in the proposed final rules to the text of the rules set forth in the Notice of Second Emergency and Proposed Rulemaking. A proposed resolution to approve the proposed final rules was transmitted by the Mayor to the Council of the District of Columbia on November 20, 2025 for a forty-five (45) day period of review pursuant to the Act (D.C. Official Code § 5-129.02). *See* Police Personnel Regulations Rulemaking Approval Resolution of 2025, as introduced on November 20, 2025 (P.R. 26-408). The 45-day period of review having expired on February 18, 2026 with no Council action to approve or disapprove the proposed resolution, the proposed final rulemaking was deemed approved.

The rules were adopted as final by the Director and Chief on March 11, 2026 and shall become effective upon publication of this notice in the District of Columbia Register.

The final rules include a technical correction to the amended 6A DCMR § 1100.8 to clarify that pre-assignment training is among the required training programs for special police officers, as required by the Act (D.C. Code § 5-129.02(b)). Otherwise, no substantive changes have been made to the text of the proposed final rules submitted to the Council.

Section 1100, APPOINTMENT: GENERAL PROVISIONS, of Chapter 11, SPECIAL POLICE, of Title 6-A, POLICE PERSONNEL, of the DCMR is amended as follows:

Subsection 1100.3 is amended to read as follows:

1100.3 Commissions issued to special police officers appointed pursuant to § 1100.1 shall specify the following information:

(a) The particular place or property they are commissioned to protect;

(b) Any waiver of the uniform requirement; and

(c) Any requirement for storage or special provisions for transportation of firearms or other dangerous weapons.

Subsection 1100.5 is amended to read as follows:

1100.5 Each appointment of a special police officer appointed pursuant to § 1100.1 shall be made for a specified time, and no person appointed shall legally exercise any authority conferred by that appointment after the date of expiration of that appointment.

Subsection 1100.6 is amended to read as follows:

1100.6 Special police officers appointed pursuant to § 1100.1 and special privates appointed pursuant to § 1100.4 shall be subject to the rules laid down for the government of the Metropolitan Police Department insofar as those rules are applicable.

Subsection 1100.7 is amended to read as follows:

1100.7 No person shall be appointed as a special police officer pursuant to § 1100.1 unless the person:

(a) Is twenty-one (21) years of age or older;

(b) Is a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States;

(c) Is of good moral character;

(d) Is approved for appointment by the Chief of Police;

(e) Possesses a high school diploma or a general equivalency diploma, or one year of experience as a special police officer in the District of Columbia;

(f) Can read, write, and speak the English language;

(g) Has been certified by a licensed physician as physically and psychologically fit to perform the duties of a special police officer; and

(h) Has not been dishonorably discharged from the military.

New Subsections 1100.8, 1100.9, 1100.10, 1100.11, 1100.12, 1100.13, 1100.14, and 1100.15 are added to read as follows:

1100.8 Each special police officer appointed pursuant to § 1100.1 shall complete pre-assignment, on-the-job, and in-service training programs which have been prescribed or approved by the Chief of Police.

1100.9 (a) The pre-assignment training required by § 1100.8 shall include at least sixteen (16) hours of training on arrest powers, search and seizure laws, the District of Columbia Official Code, and the use of force.

(b) The pre-assignment training required by § 1100.8 shall also include an additional twenty-four (24) hours of training generally relating to the special police officer's duties and specifically including:

(1) Terrorism awareness, including building evacuation, unattended packages, and unknown substances;

(2) Emergency procedures, including evacuation and first aid; and

(3) Customer service and interaction with the public.

(c) The pre-assignment training required by §1100.8 shall be satisfactorily completed by each special police officer appointed pursuant to § 1100.1 before the special police officer's employment.

1100.10 The on-the-job training required by § 1100.8 shall include at least sixteen (16) hours and shall be satisfactorily completed by each special police officer appointed pursuant to § 1100.1 within ninety (90) working days after their first day of employment.

1100.11 The in-service training required by § 1100.8 shall include an eight (8)-hour in-service training course and shall be satisfactorily completed by each special police officer appointed pursuant to § 1100.1 during each year of the special police officer's employment.

1100.12 Each special police officer appointed pursuant to § 1100.1 shall satisfy all additional initial and re-qualification training standards for firearms and other equipment, as applicable.

1100.13 Upon satisfactory completion of a required training course, a special police officer shall obtain from his or her employer a certificate evidencing satisfactory completion thereof.

1100.14 Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a security agency from voluntarily providing training programs and courses that exceed the minimum requirements of this chapter.

1100.15 No person shall be appointed as a special private under § 1100.4 unless the applicant:

(a) Has reached the age of twenty-one (21) years;

(b) Is a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States;

(c) Is of good moral character; and

(d) Is approved for appointment by the Chief of Police.

ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NOTICE OF FINAL RULEMAKING[1]
Z.C. Case No. 12-08E
Office of Planning
(Text Amendment – Subtitle K § 605.1 of St. Elizabeth's East Campus Zones)
February 19, 2026

The Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia (Commission), pursuant to its authority under § 1 of the Zoning Act of 1938, approved June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 797, as amended; D.C. Official Code § 6-641.01 (2018 Rep1.)) and pursuant to § 6 of the District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act, approved October 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 1206, as amended; D.C. Official Code § 2-505 (2016 Repl.)), hereby gives notice of its amendment of Subtitle K § 605.1 of the Zoning Regulations (Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations, Zoning Regulations of 2016, to which all references are made unless otherwise specified) to remove the ten-foot (10 ft.) front setback requirement for buildings within the St. Elizabeth's East Campus 18 (StE-18) zone with the specific text at the end of this notice.

Petition

On November 20, 2025, the Office of Planning (OP) filed a petition (Petition/Setdown Report) with the Commission proposing an amendment to the Zoning Regulations to remove the ten-foot (10 ft.) front setback requirement for buildings within the St. Elizabeth's East Campus 18 (StE-18) zone. The Petition states the proposed amendment is necessary on an emergency basis to allow construction of a new replacement District of Columbia library to commence before the end of 2025 on the southwest portion of Parcel 18 of the St. Elizabeth East Campus (located at 1547 Alabama Avenue, S.E., the Property) because:

- A new library to replace an existing one, which is considered operationally deficient, is funded and fully designed, but while in the permitting process it was discovered that the design did not include the front setback requirement in the zoning;
- At this juncture of the permitting process, in order to meet the front setback requirement, the building would require a significant redesign, which, because of the constraints on the site, could:
  - Result in a smaller building footprint;
  - Result in not being able to accommodate all the programs and services that are now planned with significant input from the community; and
  - Result in the library construction not being completed by the 2027 planned delivery date; and
- Construction is anticipated to begin at the end of 2025 to allow coordination with the construction of 13th Street by the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development (DMPED), coordination with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) because the library will be directly above the Congress Heights Metro, and coordination of geothermal wells for the first District of Columbia Public Library (DCPL) net-zero energy

[1] This Notice of Final Rulemaking shall also be known as Z.C. Order No. 12-08E only for Office of Zoning tracking purposes.

library. The proposed amendment would only be applicable to that portion of 13th Street which abuts Parcel 18 (Exhibit [Ex.] 2).

Comprehensive Plan

The Office of Planning (OP) submitted a Setdown Report on November 11, 2025, and a Hearing Report on February 9, 2026 (hereinafter collectively, the OP Reports) (Ex. 2, 11). Below is a summary of the Comprehensive Plan consistency analysis provided in the OP Reports. The OP Reports stated that the proposed amendment would not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including with the Property's designations of Mixed-Use Medium Density Residential and Medium Density Commercial on the Future Land Use Map and the Property's designations as Neighborhood Enhancement Area, Multi-Neighborhood Center, Future Planning Analysis Area, and Land Use Change Area on the Generalized Policy Map; would advance policies of the Land Use, Community Services and Facilities, and the Far Southeast and Southwest Area Element; and would further racial equity goals by providing a library use at a transit accessible location on the St. Elizabeth's East Campus thereby fulfilling the St. Elizabeth's East Master Plan (Ex. 2, 11). The OP Hearing Report noted that the text amendment is inconsistent with Community Services and Facilities Policy CSF-3.2.5: Libraries and Mixed Uses because it would facilitate a stand-alone library. However, OP noted that limited space and other constraints of the Property site preclude any further mix of uses on the site (Ex. 11).

Community Outreach and Engagement – The OP Reports state that the District of Columbia Public Library (DCPL), which operates twenty-six (26) libraries throughout the District, published a Master Plan for 2021-2030 to inform its growth decisions that was recently updated for Winter 2025. The OP Reports state that the recommendation to build a new placement library on the Property was included in the Master Plan and retained in the update. The OP Reports explain that during the development of the Master Plan, the update, and the design process for the replacement library, DCPL undertook substantial community outreach and engagement including workshops, focus groups, and online survey resulting in contact with four hundred fifty (450) stakeholders and neighbors. Further, ANC 8C, in which the Property is located, and ANC 8E, which is across the street from the Property, were both part of the community outreach efforts (Ex. 2, 11).

Disaggregated Race and Ethnicity Data – The OP Setdown Report provided disaggregated race and ethnicity data for the Far Southeast and Southwest Planning Area, in which the Property is located. The data shows that Black residents continue to make up the largest portion of the population for the 2019-2023 period though the population decreased slightly; the median income is significantly lower than Districtwide for both the 2012-2016 and 2019-2023 periods, although all groups in the Planning Area saw increases in median income for the latter period; and the percentage of owner occupancy in the Planning Area significantly increased from eighteen to twenty-two and three-tenths percent (18%-22.3%) between the 2012-2016 and 2019-2023 periods. OP concluded that collectively the data indicates that the services a public library can provide, including a range of print and online resources, public space, and training, education, and career development opportunities, would be beneficial to residents of the area and particularly helpful to lower income and vulnerable populations (Ex. 2).

Setdown and Emergency & Proposed Action

At its November 20, 2025 public meeting, the Commission heard testimony from OP in favor of the proposed amendment. OP reiterated the conclusions in its Setdown Report and stated that taking emergency action to immediately adopt the amendments would allow construction of a new replacement library on the Property to commence before the end of 2025 and avoid the delay associated with redesigning the library to comply with the 10-foot front setback requirement. At the public meeting, the Commission voted to grant the Petition to:

- Take emergency action to adopt the Petition;
- Set the Petition down for a public hearing; and
- Authorize an immediate publication of proposed rulemaking for the Petition.

The Commission concluded that taking emergency action to adopt the Petition is necessary for the "immediate preservation of the public … welfare," as authorized by § 6(c) of the District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act, approved October 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 1206; D.C. Official Code § 2-505(c) (2016 Repl.)), to avoid delaying the construction of the new replacement library.

VOTE (November 20, 2025): 4-0-1 (Anthony J. Hood, Robert E. Miller, Tammy Stidham, and Gwen Wright to **APPROVE;** Joseph S. Imamura, not present, not voting)

Emergency Action

The emergency rule was effective as of the Commission's November 20, 2025 vote, and will expire on March 20, 2026, which is the one hundred-twentieth (120th) day after the adoption of this rule, or upon publication of a Notice of Final Rulemaking in the *District of Columbia Register* that supersedes this emergency rule, whichever occurs first.

National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) Referral and Report

The Commission referred the proposed text amendment to the NCPC on November 25, 2025 for the thirty (30)-day review period required by Section 492(b)(2) of the District Charter (Dec. 24, 1973, Pub. L. 93-198, title IV, § 492(b)(2)); D.C. Official Code 6-641.05 (2018 Repl.)); Ex. 7).

NCPC filed a report dated December 31, 2025, stating that the proposed text amendment would not be inconsistent with the federal elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital nor would it adversely impact any other identified federal interests (Ex. 8).

Notice of Emergency and Proposed Rulemaking

The Commission published a Notice of Emergency and Proposed Rulemaking (NOEPR) in the December 5, 2025 *District of Columbia Register* (72 DCR 013759 *et seq.*) (Ex. 3, 4).

Notice of Public Hearing

Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 502, on November 25, 2025, the Office of Zoning (OZ) sent notice of the February 19, 2026 public hearing, and published notice of the public hearing in the December 5, 2025, *District of Columbia Register* (72 DCR 013715 *et seq*.) as well as on the calendar on OZ's website (Ex. 3, 5, 6).

Comments in Response to NOEPR

On February 3, 2026, Andrew Scott of WMATA submitted a letter in support of the amendment removing the ten-foot (10 ft.) setback requirement stating that it is necessary to accommodate construction of the new library on WMATA-owned property and requiring adherence to the ten-foot (10 ft.) setback requirement would necessitate substantial redesign of the library (Ex. 9).

On February 10, 2026, Brenda Lee Richardson, a Ward 8 resident, submitted a letter in support of the amendment stating that requiring the ten-foot (10 ft.) setback would result in a reduction of the library's footprint diminishing key community functions while removing the requirement would allow the library project to move forward without sacrificing the spaces and services the community has helped define (Ex. 12).

OP Hearing Report

On February 9, 2026, OP submitted a Hearing Report largely reiterating its findings and conclusions from its Setdown Report and recommending that the Commission take final action to permanently approve the text amendment as published in the NOEPR (Ex. 11). OP noted that since the Commission allowed the text amendment on an emergency basis, construction is now anticipated to begin in summer 2026 to allow varied coordination with DMPED and WMATA and coordination of geothermal wells and delivery of the new library by second quarter 2028.

District Department of Transportation (DDOT) Report

On February 6, 2026, DDOT submitted a report stating that it has no transportation concerns related to the removal of the setback requirement and has no objection to approval of the text amendment (Ex. 10).

Public Hearing

At the February 19, 2026 public hearing, OP presented testimony in support of the Petition reiterating that adoption of the text amendment will allow construction of the new library on the Property to proceed without delay. The Commission commented favorably on the library design and questioned OP about the implications of removing the setback requirement, noting that they will be minimal. No government agencies other than OP and a DCPL representative appeared to testify, and no entities or persons appeared to testify.

Final Action

At the February 19, 2026 public hearing, the Commission reiterated its support for the text amendment as stated at emergency and proposed action.

Authority and Evaluation Standard

Pursuant to the authority granted by the Zoning Act, approved June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 797, as amended; D.C. Official Code § 6-641.01 (2018 Repl.)), the Commission may amend the Zoning Regulations consistent with the standards of Subtitle X § 1300.2.

Subtitle X § 1300.2 requires the Commission to find that the text amendment petition is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with other adopted public policies and active programs related to the subject text.

"Great Weight" to the Recommendations of OP

The Commission must give "great weight" to the recommendations of OP pursuant to § 5 of the Office of Zoning Independence Act of 1990, effective September 20, 1990 (D.C. Law 8-163; D.C. Official Code § 6-623.04 (2018 Repl.)) and Subtitle Z § 504.6 (*Metropole Condo. Ass'n v. D.C. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 141 A.3d 1079, 1087 (D.C. 2016)).

The Commission finds persuasive the analyses in the OP Reports and OP's recommendation that the Commission take final action to permanently adopt the text amendment, as published in the NOEPR, and concurs in OP's judgment. The Commission finds that the text amendment is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, on the whole, and finds any Comprehensive Plan inconsistencies to be outweighed by the goals and objectives that would be advanced by allowing construction of the new library to proceed as originally designed.

"Great Weight" to the Written Report of the ANCs

The Commission must give great weight to the issues and concerns raised in the written report of an affected ANC that was approved by the full ANC at a properly noticed public meeting pursuant to § 13(d) of the Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Act of 1975, effective March 26, 1976 (D.C. Law 1-21; D.C. Official Code § 1-309.10(d) (2012 Repl.)) and Subtitle Z § 505.1. To satisfy the great weight requirement, the Commission must articulate with particularity and precision the reasons why an affected ANC does or does not offer persuasive advice under the circumstances (*Metropole Condo. Ass'n v. D.C. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 141 A.3d 1079, 1087 (D.C. 2016)). The District of Columbia Court of Appeals has interpreted the phrase "issues and concerns" to "encompass only legally relevant issues and concerns." (*Wheeler v. District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 395 A.2d 85, 91 n.10 (1978)) (citation omitted).

The Commission notes that no ANC[2] submitted a report in response to the text amendment.

At the close of its February 19, 2026 public hearing, the Commission voted to take **FINAL ACTION** to permanently adopt the text amendment and to authorize the publication of a Notice of Final Rulemaking.

VOTE (February 19, 2026): 5-0-0 (Anthony J. Hood, Robert E. Miller, Joseph S. Imamura, Tammy Stidham, and Gwen Wright to **APPROVE**)

In accordance with the provisions of Subtitle Z § 604.9, this Order No. 12-08E shall become final and effective upon publication in the *District of Columbia Register*; that is, on March 13, 2026.

The Zoning Map and the text of the Zoning Regulations are amended as stated below.

[2] The Commission notes that notice of the public hearing was referred to all ANCs citywide; however, the affected ANCs per Subtitle Z § 101.8 are ANC 8C, in which the Property is located and ANC 8E, which is located directly across the street (Ex. 5, 6).

TEXT AMENDMENT

The following amendments to the text of the Zoning Regulations are adopted:

I. Amendment to Subsection 605.1, FRONT SETBACKS (StE), of Chapter 6, ST. ELIZABETHS EAST CAMPUS ZONES StE-1 to StE-19, of Subtitle K, SPECIAL PURPOSE ZONES, is amended to read as follows:

605.1 Buildings within the StE-17 zone shall be setback not less than ten feet (10 ft.) from the property line that abuts Alabama Avenue and 13th Street.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

RM49-2026-01, PUBLIC UTILITY TARIFF FILING REQUIREMENTS AND REGULATIONS,

1. The Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia (Commission), pursuant to its authority under D.C. Official Code Sections 2-505 (2016 Repl.) and 34-802 (2019 Repl.) gives notice of its intent to amend Section 4901 (Tariff Applications) of Chapter 49 (Public Utility Tariff Filing Regulations) of Title 15 (Public Utilities and Cable Television), of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (DCMR) in not less than thirty (30) days following the publication of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NOPR) in the *District of Columbia Register*.

2. Changes to Chapter 49 include language specifying when a proposed tariff or tariff amendment may take effect as provided in new Subsection 4901.2 (b) (1) and (2). In addition, revised Subsection 4901.2 (f) provides increased specificity on work papers utilities must submit with their tariff filings.

3. The proposed amendments to Section 4901, are shown by **bold underline** and the deletions by ~~strikethrough~~.

Chapter 49, PUBLIC UTILITY TARIFF FILING REGULATIONS, is amended as follows:

Section 4901, TARIFF APPLICATIONS, is amended as follows:

…

4901.2 A public utility submitting an application for approval of a new tariff or tariff amendment, except that which is a compliance tariff, must also submit a proposed draft notice of proposed tariff and a proposed draft notice of final tariff for the proposed tariff or tariff amendment. The notice shall include the following details:

…

(b) The effective date of the proposed tariff or tariff amendment;

(1) The effective date of the proposed tariff or tariff amendment shall not be fewer than thirty (30) days from the date of the proposed tariff or tariff amendment filing;

(2) If final Commission action on a proposed tariff or tariff amendment occurs subsequent to the effective date of the proposed tariff or tariff amendment, the proposed tariff or tariff amendment shall not take effect until the date of publication of a notice of final tariff in the *District of Columbia Register*.

…

(f) ~~Any~~**All** relevant supporting documentation and work papers. **The supporting documentation shall include a link in the tariff filing to supporting workbooks, with formulas intact in their native file format.**

4. Any person interested in commenting on the subject matter of this proposed rulemaking may submit written comments no later than thirty (30) days after publication of this Notice in the *District of Columbia Register* addressed to Brinda Westbrook-Sedgwick, Commission Secretary, Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia, 1325 G Street, N.W., Suite 800, Washington, D.C., 20005, and sent electronically on the Commission's website at https://edocket.dcpsc.org/public/public_comments. Copies of the proposed amended rules may be obtained by visiting the Commission's website at www.dcpsc.org. Once at the website, open the "eDocket" tab, click on "Search Current Dockets," and input "RM49" as the case number. Copies may also be purchased at cost by contacting the Commission Secretary at the address provided above. Persons with questions concerning this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking should call (202) 626-5150 or send an email to psc-commissionsecretary@dc.gov. After the comment period has expired, the Commission will take final action on this rulemaking.

A TRUE COPY: **BY DIRECTION OF THE COMMISSION:**

CHIEF CLERK: **BRINDA WESTBROOK-SEDGWICK**
COMMISSION SECRETARY

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENTAL HOUSING COMMISSION

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Pursuant to the authority set forth in § 202(a)(1) of the Rental Housing Act of 1985, effective July 17, 1985 (D.C. Law 6-10; D.C. Official Code § 42-3502.02(a)(1)) ("Act" or "Rental Housing Act"), the Rental Housing Commission ("Commission") hereby gives notice of the adoption of the following amendments to Chapter 43 (Evictions, Retaliation, and Tenant Rights) of Title 14 (Housing) of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations ("DCMR").

The rules relate to § 101 of the Rebalancing Expectations for Neighbors, Tenants, and Landlords (RENTAL) Amendment Act of 2025, effective December 31, 2025 (D.C. Law 26-80; 73 D.C.R. 000613) ("RENTAL Act"). In relevant part, the RENTAL Act amends § 501 of the Rental Housing Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01) to "provide for expedited review of eviction proceedings stemming from a dangerous crime or crime of violence, . . . to reduce the pre-filing notice period in cases seeking eviction for nonpayment, and to update procedures for pre-filing notice to tenants in eviction cases." These provisions affect the Commission's existing rules in 14 DCMR §§ 4300 & 4302. The Commission accordingly proposes the following rules to conform those sections with the amended Act.

The Commission's reasoning for significant changes to the existing rules is as follows:

- The RENTAL Act reduces the pre-filing notice period for non-payment cases from 30 days to 10 days by amending § 501(a-1)(1) of the Rental Housing Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(a-1)(1)). However, it does not amend paragraph (2) of that subsection, which requires a notice of intent to file a claim to state that a claim may be filed if the tenant does not "pay the balance of unpaid rent in full within 30 days of this notice." D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(a-1)(2). The Commission interprets the substantive change to paragraph (1) as implicitly superseding the notice contents prescribed in paragraph (2). Accordingly, the Commission proposed to amend its corresponding rule in 14 DCMR § 4300.7(c) to require a notice of intent to file a claim to state that the balance must be paid in 10 days.

- The RENTAL Act changes the service requirements for notices to vacate for non-payment of rent (referred to as "notices of intent to file a claim"). As explained in a prior Commission rulemaking, the Eviction Record Sealing Authority and Fairness in Renting Amendment Act of 2022, effective May 18, 2022 (D.C. Law 24-115; 69 D.C.R. 002683) incorporated the service of process rules for summons to court into the notice process. *See* 69 D.C.R. 015208, 015214 (Dec. 16, 2022) (notice of proposed rulemaking). That requirement is now codified in 14 DCMR § 4300.25, using language from D.C. Official Code § 16-1502. The revised requirement for non-payment notices is found in § 501(a-1)(3) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(a-1)(3)) and is substantially similar to the posting-with-mailing option for service of process. However, the new provision does not contain the requirement that service by posting-with-mailing may only be done "[i]f the defendant has left the District, or cannot be found." *See also* 14 DCMR § 4300.26 (describing the "diligent and conscientious efforts" to locate a tenant that are required by D.C. Court of Appeals case law).

The Commission's proposed rules create a new § 4300.27 regarding service of notices of intent to file a claim for non-payment of rent. This rule tracks the statutory language in § 501(a-1)(3) of the Act, and the Commission has also added the requirement found in § 501(a)(2) of the Act, which applies to all notices, that a housing provider must retain timestamped, photographic evidence of posting.

The amended Act is silent on the timing of mailing relative to delivery or posting. Given that the amended statutory provision is mostly analogous to the service of process requirements in D.C. Official Code § 16-1502, in which the completion of service is the delivery or posting at the premises, and the required mailing is merely a backup method to better assure delivery. The Commission interprets the Act's non-payment specific service rules as operating in the same manner. Accordingly, the proposed rules expressly adopt, in § 4300.28(a), the requirement that mailing be done within three (3) days of service by posting, consistent with D.C. Official Code § 16-1502 and 14 DCMR § 4300.25(b)(2) for all other notices to vacate. The proposed rules also expressly adopt, in § 4300.6, the requirement that the ten- (10-) day period before a claim for possession may be filed begins to run from the date the notice is delivered or posted, rather than the mailing date, again consistent with the standards for all other notices.

- Section 501(c) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(c)), provides that "A housing provider may recover possession of a rental unit where a court of competent jurisdiction has determined that the tenant, or a person occupying the premises with or in addition to the tenant, has performed an illegal act within the rental unit or the housing accommodation. Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2)([A]) of this subsection [allowing 10-day notice for dangerous or violent crimes], the housing provider shall serve on the tenant a 30-day notice to vacate." The statute does not expressly require that the court's determination occur before the notice to vacate is issued. However, the Commission's long-standing interpretation, found in 14 DCMR § 4300.11 & 4302.3, has been that a "final determination" by a court, with no appeal pending, is a prerequisite to a housing provider issuing a notice to vacate.

  The RENTAL Act modifies § 501(c) by adding a new paragraph (2) to provide expedited procedures and court determination by the "preponderance of the evidence" standard for an eviction based on dangerous or violent crimes. Those expedited procedures in paragraph (2) appear to rely on the existing notice to vacate requirements in paragraph (1), only changing the number of days' notice required, stating that such evictions can occur "[i]n each case pursuant to paragraph (1) . . . in which the alleged illegal act . . . would constitute a dangerous [or violent] crime." It does not appear, however, that expedited procedures would be compatible with the existing rules' requirement of final judgment before issuing a notice to vacate.

  Indeed, the full text of § 501(c)(2) indicates that there need not be any prior judicial determination of illegal conduct before a housing provider may serve a notice to vacate. First, subparagraph (A) provides that an "alleged" illegal act can serve as a trigger for a notice to vacate, on an abbreviated timeframe, and that a court must then hold an expedited hearing on the housing provider's complaint for possession. That phrasing suggests that no prior adjudication is necessary and that a court will consider the housing provider's

allegations at the time it hears the complaint. Second, subparagraph (B) expressly states that, "[i]f the Court determines by a preponderance of evidence that the tenant or occupant engaged in a dangerous crime as defined in § 23-1331(3) or a crime of violence as defined in § 23-1331(4), the Court shall enter a final judgment for possession and issue a writ of restitution that mandates the eviction of the tenant or occupant." The provision, which sets out an evidentiary standard, confirms that the court will conduct factfinding on the housing provider's allegations of criminal acts as part of its hearing on the complaint.

The legislative history of the RENTAL Act supports this interpretation. The Report of the Committee on Housing on Bill 26-164, the [RENTAL Act]" (July 9, 2025) ("Committee Report") at 10-11, which was based on an earlier version of the legislation, cites the Commission rules regarding a "final determination," but goes on to state that "a formal criminal charge for a qualifying violent offense provides sufficient cause to initiate expedited proceedings." The Committee Report further states that dangerous or violent crimes are not a "new standalone eviction cause of action," *id.*, suggesting some initial judicial determination might be required. However, following the Committee's action and before the first reading by the entire Council, an amendment in the nature of a substitute ("ANS") was approved that removed the Committee's language from § 501(c)(2) that required a indictment obtained by a prosecutor be attached to a housing provider's notice to vacate, citing concerns of undue delay, and allowing eviction cases to proceed on the mere allegation of a dangerous or violent crime by a housing provider. *See* Memorandum from Robert C. White, Jr., Chair, Committee on Housing, Notice of Intent to Move an ANS on July 28 (July 24, 2025) ("ANS Memo") at 1. The ANS Memo explains that, under its revisions, "housing providers would allege a crime of violence to qualify for an expedited hearing, but a judge would have to determine the act occurred by a preponderance of evidence to evict a tenant." *Id.*

Accordingly, it appears to the Commission that the Council's intent in the final, enacted version of the RENTAL Act was to create a separate notice-to-vacate process for dangerous or violent crimes that does not require a prior judicial determination, while leaving the existing notice to vacate for illegal acts in general unchanged. A 10-day notice to vacate may therefore be issued based solely on a housing provider's allegation of a dangerous or violent crime, and the Superior Court's Landlord-Tenant Branch will be required to conduct an expedited hearing on the allegation and applicable defenses using a preponderance of the evidence standard. A housing provider may choose, in some cases, to wait for prosecution and conviction or other civil judgment and then proceed with an eviction under § 501(c)(1) of the Act, but it is not necessary to wait if the alleged act qualifies under § 501(c)(2).

- The proposed rules in 14 DCMR § 4302.4 add specific content requirements for 10-day notices to vacate for dangerous or violent crimes under § 501(c)(2) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(c)(2)), including the specific crime alleged to have occurred, certification that options to preserve non-offending occupants' housing were considered, and notice of available defenses. The proposed rules also add a requirement to give tenants notice of the right against self-incrimination, since evictions under paragraph (c)(2) specifically involve criminal acts and could proceed to a hearing faster than a criminal case yet do not confer the right to counsel like a criminal case. Because a tenant's choice of

whether and how to defend an eviction case could have significant implications for criminal liability, the Commission believes that notice of those implications is an essential matter of fairness and limits the risk that a criminal prosecution could be tainted by compelled testimony.

Title 14, HOUSING, of the DCMR is amended as follows:

Chapter 43, EVICTIONS, RETALIATION, AND TENANT RIGHTS, is amended as follows:

Section 4300, NONPAYMENT OF RENT AND OTHER GROUNDS FOR EVICTION GENERALLY, is amended as follows:

Subsection 4300.6 is amended to read as follows:

4300.6 A housing provider shall not file an action in court to evict a tenant for nonpayment of rent until at least ten (10) days after the date of service of a Notice of Intent to File a Claim that complies with § 4300.7, counted from the date notice is delivered or posted in accordance with § 4300.28(b).

Subsection 4300.7(c) is amended to read as follows:

(c) That the housing provider may file a case in court to evict the tenant ten (10) days after the service of the notice if the balance of unpaid rent remains $600 or more;

Subsection 4300.11 is amended to read as follows:

4300.11 A housing provider shall not serve a notice pursuant to § 501(c)(1) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(c)(1)) (illegal act within premises) until a court of competent jurisdiction has made a final determination that a tenant has performed an illegal act within the rental unit or housing accommodation occupied by the tenant, no appeal is pending, and the time for appeal has expired.

Existing Subsections 4300.12 through 4300.26 are renumbered as Subsections 4300.13 through 4300.27.

A new Subsection 4300.12 is added to read as follows:

4300.12 A housing provider shall not serve a notice pursuant to § 501(c)(2) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(c)(2)) (dangerous or violent crime within premises) until the housing provider has considered in good faith all reasonable available means to preserve the housing of non-offending occupants, such as barring the offending individual from the property or assessing whether the lease can be transferred to an eligible occupant.

The lead-in language of subsection 4300.25 is amended to read as follows:

4300.25 For the purposes of §§ 4301 and § 4302, service of a required notice upon any person (other than the Rent Administrator) shall be completed:

A new Subsection 4300.28 is added to read as follows:

4300.28 For the purposes of a Notice of Intent to File a Claim under this section, service upon any person (other than the Rent Administrator) shall be completed both:

(a) By certified mail or delivery service providing delivery tracking confirmation, return receipt request, sent within three (3) calendar days of service under paragraph (b); and

(b) By either:

(1) Hand delivery to the rental unit; or

(2) By posting on the front door of the rental unit and capturing timestamped, photographic evidence of the posting for the housing provider's records.

Section 4302, NOTICES TO VACATE FOR OTHER REASONS, is amended as follows:

Subsection 4302.2 is amended to read as follows:

4302.2 A housing provider shall not file an action in court to evict a tenant until the expiration of the following time periods, counted from the date of service of a Notice to Vacate:

(a) If the Notice to Vacate is served pursuant to § 501(c)(1) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(c)(1)) (illegal act within premises), no less than thirty (30) days;

(b) If the Notice to Vacate is served pursuant to § 501(c)(2) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(c)(2)) (dangerous or violent crime within premises), no less than ten (10) days;

(c) If the Notice to Vacate is served pursuant to § 501(d) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(d)) (housing provider's personal use and occupancy), no less than ninety (90) days;

(d) If the Notice to Vacate is served pursuant to § 501(e) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(e)) (contract purchaser's personal use and occupancy), no less than ninety (90) days;

(e) If the Notice to Vacate is served pursuant to an approved application under § 501(f) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(f) (unsafe alterations

or renovations), no less than one hundred twenty (120) days before the date set forth in the timetable approved by the Rent Administrator;

(f) If the Notice to Vacate is served pursuant to § 501(g) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(g)) (demolition), no less than one hundred eighty (180) days;

(g) If the Notice to Vacate is served pursuant to an approved application under § 501(h) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(h)) and § 4212 of this title (substantial rehabilitation), no less than one hundred twenty (120) days; provided, that the expiration of this time shall be no earlier than the time set forth in the timetable approved by the Office of Administrative Hearings; or

(h) If the Notice to Vacate is served pursuant to § 501(i) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(i)) (discontinuance of use), no less than one hundred eighty (180) days.

The lead-in language of Subsection 4302.3 is amended to read as follows:

4302.3 If a Notice to Vacate is served pursuant to § 501(c)(1) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(c)(1)) (illegal act within premises), it shall also contain the following:

Existing Subsections 4302.4 through 4302.8 are renumbered as 4302.5 through 4302.9.

A new Subsection 4302.4 is added to read as follows:

4302.4 If a Notice to Vacate is served pursuant to § 501(c)(2) of the Act (D.C. Official Code § 42-3505.01(c)(2)) (dangerous or violent crime within premises), it shall also contain the following:

(a) The dangerous crime, as defined in D.C. Official Code § 23-1331(3), or the crime of violence, as defined in D.C. Official Code § 23-1331(4), that the housing provider alleges occurred;

(b) Certification that the housing provider has considered in good faith whether there are means to preserve the housing of any non-offending occupants and found no means reasonably available;

(c) Statements that:

(1) The tenant may not have to vacate the unit if the illegal act set forth pursuant to § 4302.1(a) is related to a criminal offense committed or threatened against the tenant or the minor child that is an intrafamily offense by D.C. Official Code § 16-1001(8), which may include violence by a partner, relative, roommate, or other person with a close relationship to the victim; and

(2) The D.C. Office of Human Rights may be able to assist a tenant described in subparagraph (1) and shall include contact information for that agency;

(d) Notice that the tenant may defend against the eviction at a hearing in court but has the right to remain silent and that any statements made in defense against the eviction may be used against the tenant in a criminal case; and

(e) Statements that the tenant shall not be evicted if the court finds that:

(1) The tenant or person occupying the rental unit with or in addition to the tenant did not commit the alleged act;

(2) The alleged crime was committed in self-defense or defense of another;

(3) The tenant did not know or did not have reason to know that criminal activity was occurring or would likely occur on the premises;

(4) The tenant took reasonable steps to prevent the commission of violent criminal activity, such as requesting the housing provider remove the offending household member's name from the lease, reporting prior criminal activity to the police, seeking assistance from social services or counseling agencies, or denying permission, if feasible, for the offending household member to reside in the dwelling unit; or

(5) The tenant was a victim or intended victim of the criminal activity.

All persons desiring to comment on these proposed regulations should submit comments in writing to:

Daniel Mayer, General Counsel
Rental Housing Commission
441 Fourth Street, N.W., Suite 1140-B North
Washington, D.C. 20001

Or, via email to: daniel.mayer@dc.gov.

Prospective commenters are strongly encouraged to submit comments via email. Persons with questions concerning this notice of proposed rulemaking should call (202) 442-8949. To be considered, all comments must be received or postmarked no later than Monday, May 4, 2026. Copies of the proposed rules may be obtained at the address above and online at https://rhc.dc.gov/page/rental-housing-act-and-regulations.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUANCE SYSTEM

Mayor's Order 2026-043
March 30, 2026

SUBJECT: Reappointment and Appointments — Opioid Fatality Review Board

ORIGINATING AGENCY: Office of the Mayor

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Mayor of the District of Columbia by section 422(2) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act of 1973, approved December 24, 1973, 87 Stat. 790, Pub. L. 93-198, D.C. Official Code§ 1-204.22(2), and in accordance with Mayor's Order 2019-024, dated May 2, 2019, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. **DR. RICHARD SCHOTTENFELD** is reappointed as a representative of a hospital in the District member of the Opioid Fatality Review Board ("Board"), for a term to end December 31, 2026.

2. **ERIN SIBEL SEZGIN** is appointed as a District resident who is not an employee of the District, who has been affected by a drug overdose death of an immediate family member or has been a direct recipient of drug treatment services in the District member of the Board, filling a vacant seat formerly held by Kevin Petty, for the remainder of an unexpired term to end December 31, 2026.

3. **DR. SONAL BATRA** is appointed as a community-based service provider to District residents member of the Board, filling a vacant seat formerly held by Elisha Peterson, for the remainder of an unexpired term to end December 31, 2026.

4. The following persons are appointed as members of the Board, to serve at the pleasure of the Mayor:

    a. **JULIAN PURDY,** filling a vacant seat formerly held by Elliot Tommingo, as the representative from the Mayor's Office of Veterans Affairs; and

    b. **DR. CHIMENE LIBURD,** replacing Dr. Pamela Riley, as the representative from the Department of Health Care Finance.

5. **EFFECTIVE DATE:** This Order shall become effective immediately.

MURIEL BOWSER
MAYOR

ATTEST: Kimberly A. Bassett
KIMBERLY A. BASSETT
SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE AND CANNABIS ADMINISTRATION
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE AND CANNABIS BOARD

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS
CALENDAR

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 2026
899 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NE, SUITE 4200 A-B
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002

Donovan W. Anderson, Chairperson
Members: Silas Grant, Jr., Teri Janine Quinn, Ryan Jones and David Meadows

Protest Hearing (Status) **10:30 AM**

Case # 25-PRO-00080
Solo Entertainment, LLC, t/a SOST
1901 9th Street NW
License #126215
Retailer CT
ANC 1B
Substantial Change (Summer Garden with 9 seats)

Show Cause Hearing **10:30 AM**

Case # 25-251-00022
Evana Lounge, LLC t/a Medusa Lounge
2632 Georgia Ave NW
License #129227
Retailer CT
ANC 1E
Failed to Provide Video Footage within 48 Hours, Failed to Maintain Video Footage of a Violent Crime for 30 days, Possession of a Firearm Inside of the Establishment

Board's Calendar
April 8, 2026

Show Cause Hearing **10:30 AM**

Case # 25-CC-00011
Virginia Market, LLC, t/a Virginia Market
1776 U Street NW
License #119980
Retailer A
ANC 2B
Sale to Minor Violation

BOARD RECESS AT 12:00 PM

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA AT 1:00 PM

Show Cause Hearing **1:30 AM**

Case # 26-CC-00001
Natanem II, Inc, t/a District Cure Dispensary
2626 Georgia Ave NW
License #127161
Retailer MC
ANC 1E
Dispensed Medical Marijuana to customer other than a qualifying patient or caregiver, Dispensed Medical Marijuana to customer who failed to produce a vailed identification card, Failed to Take Steps Necessary to Ascertain whether a person is a qualifying patient or caregiver, Entered False Information into METRC

Board's Calendar
April 8, 2026

Protest Hearing **1:30 PM**

Case # 25-PRO-00128
Yolo DC, Inc. Yolo Restaurant & Lounge
2005 14th Street NW
License #126819
Retailer CT
ANC 1B
Application to Renew the License

All of the ABC Board's public hearings are conducted virtually and are livestreamed on ABCA's YouTube channel which can be found here: *https://www.youtube.com/@alcoholicbeverageregulatio5683.*

This meeting is governed by the Open Meetings Act. Please address any questions or complaints arising under this meeting to the Office of Open Government at *opengovoffice@dc.gov*

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE AND CANNABIS ADMINISTRATION
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE AND CANNABIS BOARD

NOTICE OF MEETING
CANCELLATION AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 2026
899 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, N.E., SUITE 4200-B, WASHINGTON, DC 20002

The ABC Board will be Cancelling the following licenses for the reasons outlined below:

1) ABRA-123033 – **Johnny's All American –** Retail – C – Tavern – 3226 11th Street NW
[Licensee did not pay the Safekeeping fee within 30 days)

---

2) ABRA-127066 – **PX Tacos –** Retail – D **–** Restaurant – 2905 Sherman Avenue NW
[Licensee requested Cancellation.]

---

3) ABRA-118085 – **Immigrant Food –** Retail – D **–** Restaurant – 1309 5th Street NE
[Licensee requested Cancellation.]

In accordance with the Open Meetings Act (D.C. Official Code §2-571 *et. seq*.) this meeting may be closed to consult with an attorney to obtain legal advice pursuant to §2-575(b)(4)(A). The Board's vote will be held in an open session and the public is permitted to attend. This meeting is governed by the Open Meetings Act. Please address any questions or concerns arising under this meeting to the Office of Open Government at opengovoffice@dc.gov.

BREAKTHROUGH MONTESSORI PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Multiple Services (Extended)

Breakthrough Montessori PCS invites all interested and qualified vendors to submit proposals for the following services: Tutoring Services (Math and ELA), General Contracting, SPED Services, Cleaning Services, Data Dashboard Services, HR Services, OST Services, Office Supplies and Furniture

The RFP with bidding requirements and supporting documentation can be obtained by emailing procurement@breakthroughmontessori.org. Vendors are requested to provide the following items in response to the proposals: an organizational capability statement, resumes of key personnel, three references, quote, and a detailed scope of work. Please submit all documents as PDF files via email by noon on May 1, 2026. When sending your response to the RFP, ensure that the email subject line includes the service type you are responding to. Please no calls, all questions should be directed to procurement@breakthroughmontessori.org.

THE CLEMENCY BOARD OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOTICE OF CLOSED MEETING

On Friday, April 10, 2026, at 10:30 a.m., the Clemency Board of the District of Columbia will hold a closed meeting to discuss confidential applications (Open Meetings Act, D.C. Official Code Section 2-575(b)(1)), pursuant to the Open Meetings Act, D.C. Code Section 2-575(b).

The meeting will be virtual via Webex. This meeting is governed by the Open Meetings Act. Please address any questions or complaints arising under this meeting to the Office of Open Government at opengovoffice@dc.gov.

For additional information or accommodation requests, please contact Kimberly Ulan, Staff Director and Associate General Counsel, at (202) 727-2292 or kimberly.ulan@dc.gov.

THE CLEMENCY BOARD OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

The Clemency Board of the District of Columbia will hold a meeting on Friday, April 10, 2026, at 10:30 a.m. The meeting will be held via Webex. Below are the draft agenda, meeting link, and log-in numbers for this meeting. The final agenda will be posted on the Clemency Board's website at https://clemency.dc.gov/.

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Call to Order
2. Old Business
3. New Business
4. Public Comments
5. Closed Session
6. Adjournment

Meeting Link:

https://dcnet.webex.com/dcnet/j.php?MTID=m2d62d6128cfc553efe3363da2464f7bc

Registration: Please press Ctrl and click the link above to pre-register for the meeting.

Registration password: This meeting does not require a password for registration.

Webinar number (access code)**:** 2316 709 9134

Webinar password: iTJtP5Y5Aj3 (48587595 when dialing from a phone or video system)

Join by phone: +1-202-860-2110 United States Toll (Washington D.C.) or

+1-650-479-3208 Call-in number (US/Canada)

Access code: 2316 709 9134

This meeting is governed by the Open Meetings Act. Please address any questions or complaints arising under this meeting to the Office of Open Government at opengovoffice@dc.gov.

For additional information or accommodation requests, please contact Kimberly Ulan, Staff Director and Associate General Counsel, at (202) 727-2292 or kimberly.ulan@dc.gov.

D.C. BILINGUAL PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL

NOTICE: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

D.C. Bilingual Public Charter School in accordance with section 2204(c) of the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995 solicits proposals for vendors to provide the following services for FY 2026-2027:

- Tutoring services

Proposal Submission

A Portable Document Format (pdf) election version of your proposal must be received by the school no later than **4:00 p.m. EST on Tuesday, April 14, 2026.** Questions, proposals, and full RFP request should be emailed to bids@dcbilingual.org.

No phone call submission or late responses please. Interviews, samples, and demonstrations will be scheduled at our request after the review of the proposals only.

DC SCHOLARS PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Tutoring Services RFP

DC Scholars Public Charter School seeks qualified tutoring providers to deliver **high-impact, small-group academic tutoring** designed to accelerate student learning and close achievement gaps. Tutoring services must align with DC Scholars' instructional priorities, support grade-level mastery, and demonstrate measurable impact on student outcomes. Tutoring will serve students in **grades K–8** who require additional academic support in **literacy and/or mathematics**. These services will occur during the school year 2026-27.

To obtain the specifications for the Request for Proposals (RFP), including responsibilities and bidding requirements, contact finance@dcscholars.org on/after Friday, April 3, 2026.

Qualified providers must submit proposals no later than Friday, April 10, 2026 at 5:00 PM to finance@dcscholars.org. The RFP will remain open until a vendor is selected.

All questions should be in writing by email. Please put "Tutoring Services RFP" in the subject heading. No phone calls regarding this RFP will be accepted.

E.L. HAYNES PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Student Chromebooks and Staff Laptops

E.L. Haynes Public Charter School is seeking proposals for the purchase of student Chromebooks and staff laptops. For more information and to request the full specifications, email contracts@elhaynes.org. For best consideration, proposals must be received by ELH before 5:00 pm on April 17, 2026. Proposals received later than the date and time specified may not be considered. Proposals will be accepted by email only, submitted to contracts@elhaynes.org.

BOARD OF ELECTIONS

CERTIFICATION OF ANC/SMD VACANCY

The District of Columbia Board of Elections hereby gives notice that there is a vacancy in (1) one Advisory Neighborhood Commission office, certified pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 1-309.06(d)(2).

VACANT: 2B04

Petition Circulation Period: **Monday, April 6, 2026, through Monday, April 27, 2026**
Petition Challenge Period: **Thursday, April 30, 2026, through Wednesday, May 6, 2026**

Note: The deadline to file petitions or challenges is **4:45 p.m.** on the date listed above.

Candidates seeking the Office of Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner, or their representatives, may pick up nominating petitions by email at candidate@dcboe.org or in-person during office hours at the following location:

D.C. Board of Elections
1015 Half Street, SE, Suite 750
Washington, DC 20003

For more information, the public may call **202-727-2525**.

BOARD OF ELECTIONS

CERTIFICATION OF ANC-SMD VACANCY

The District of Columbia Board of Elections hereby gives notice that there are vacancies in (3) three Advisory Neighborhood Commission offices, certified pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 1-309.06(d)(2).

VACANT: 3E07, 7C06, 8D04

Petition Circulation Period: **Monday, April 6, 2026, through Monday, April 27, 2026**
Petition Challenge Period: **Thursday, April 30, 2026, through Wednesday, May 6, 2026**

Note: The deadline to file petitions or challenges is **4:45 p.m.** on the date listed above.

Candidates seeking the Office of Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner, or their representatives, may pick up nominating petitions by email at candidate@dcboe.org or in-person during office hours at the following location:

D.C. Board of Elections
1015 Half Street, SE, Suite 750
Washington, DC 20003

For more information, the public may call **202-727-2525**.

BOARD OF ELECTIONS

Certification of Filling a Vacancy
In Advisory Neighborhood Commission

Pursuant to D.C. Official Code §1-309.06(d)(6)(D), if there is only one person qualified to fill the vacancy within the affected single-member district, the vacancy shall be deemed filled by the qualified person. As such, the Board hereby certifies that vacancies have been filled in the following single-member districts by the individuals listed below:

Rob Gifford
Single-Member District **2A02**

Hal Gordon
Single-Member District **4E04**

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the *District of Columbia Register* and the Office of Employee Appeals' website. Parties should promptly notify the Office Manager of any formal errors so that this Office can correct them before publishing the decision. This notice is not intended to provide an opportunity for a substantive challenge to the decision.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS

In the Matter of:	
	OEA Matter No.: 1601-0029-24
EMPLOYEE,[1]	
Employee	
	Date of Issuance: February 20, 2026
v.	
D.C. OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER,	NATIYA CURTIS, Esq.
Agency	Administrative Judge

Briana Hinton, Esq., Employee Representative
Michele McGee, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On February 13, 2024, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals ("OEA" or "Office") contesting the D.C. Office of the Chief Medical Examiner's ("Agency" or "OCME") decision to terminate her from her position as a Forensic Autopsy Transport Technician, effective January 16, 2024. OEA issued a letter dated February 14, 2024, requesting Agency file an Answer on or before March 15, 2024. Agency filed its Answer to Employee's Petition for Appeal on March 6, 2024. This matter was assigned to the undersigned Administrative Judge ("AJ") on March 6, 2024. On March 8, 2024, I issued an Order Convening a Prehearing Conference for April 9, 2024. Prehearing Statements were due by April 2, 2024. On April 3, 2024, the parties filed a Joint Motion to Continue the Prehearing Conference and Extend Deadlines. In an Order dated April 5, 2024, the undersigned granted the motion in part, and converted the Prehearing Conference scheduled for April 9, 2024, to a Status/Discovery Conference. Both parties appeared for the Status Conference as required.

On April 9, 2024, the undersigned issued a Post-Status/Discovery Conference Order, which scheduled the submission of briefs in this matter. Agency's brief was due by July 2, 2024, Employee's brief was due by July 30, 2024, and Agency's optional sur-reply was due by August 13, 2024. Agency did not submit its brief as required. Accordingly, on July 11, 2024, the undersigned issued an Order for Post-Prehearing Brief and Statement of Good Cause, which

[1] Employee's name was removed from this decision for the purposes of publication on the Office of Employee Appeals' website.

required Agency to submit its brief and a statement of good cause by July 22, 2024. On July 23, 2024, Agency submitted a Consent Motion to Amend the Briefing Schedule *Nunc Pro Tunc* and contemporaneously submitted its brief. In an Order dated July 26, 2024, I granted Agency's consent motion and extended the deadlines for submission of briefs. Employee's brief was due August 26, 2024, and Agency's optional sur-reply was due by September 9, 2024. Employee submitted her brief, as required. On September 9, 2024, Agency filed a Consent Motion for Enlargement of Time to file its reply, which I granted in an Order dated September 11, 2024. Agency's sur-reply was due by September 17, 2024, which Agency submitted, as required.

Upon review of the record, I determined that an Evidentiary Hearing was warranted in this matter. Accordingly, on November 20, 2024, I issued an Order for Status Conference, scheduling a Status Conference for December 5, 2024. The parties failed to appear for the Status Conference.[2] Thereafter, I issued an Order on December 6, 2024, rescheduling the Status Conference for December 13, 2024. At the Status Conference, the parties discussed significant scheduling conflicts and limitations in selecting a date for the Evidentiary Hearing. On December 19, 2024, I held an additional Status Conference to further address the scheduling limitations discussed at the December 13, 2024, Status Conference, and to finalize dates for the Evidentiary Hearing.

On December 19, 2024, the undersigned issued an Order Convening an Evidentiary Hearing for April 29, 2025, and April 30, 2025.[3] The Evidentiary Hearing was held as scheduled. On June 13, 2025, following the receipt and review of the transcript, I issued an Order requiring the parties to submit their written closing arguments by July 16, 2025. On July 15, 2025, Agency filed a Consent Motion to Extend Deadline of the Closing Argument. I granted the Motion in an Order dated July 18, 2025, and the parties' written closing arguments were now due by August 7, 2025. Both parties submitted their closing arguments as required. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

The Office has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 1-606.03 (2001).

ISSUES

1. Whether Agency had cause for adverse action against Employee; and
2. Whether all applicable laws, rules, and regulations were followed in the administration of the termination; and
3. If so, whether termination was an appropriate penalty under the circumstances.

BURDEN OF PROOF

OEA Rule 631.1, 6-B DCMR Ch. 600 (December 27, 2021) states:

[2] The parties noted by email that they had not received the Webex invitation.
[3] The parties agreed to these dates at the Prehearing Conferences held on December 13th and December 19th.

> The burden of proof for material issues of fact shall be by a preponderance of the evidence.

Preponderance of the evidence shall mean: That degree of relevant evidence which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find a contested fact more probably true than untrue.

OEA Rule 631.2 *id.* states:

> For Appeals filed under § 604.1, the employee shall have the burden of proof as to issues of jurisdiction, including timeliness of filing. The agency shall have the burden of proof as to all other issues.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

On April 29, 2025, and April 30, 2025, an Evidentiary Hearing was held virtually before this Office through Webex. The following represents a summary of the relevant testimony given during the hearing as provided in the transcript (hereinafter denoted as "Tr.") which was generated following the conclusion of the proceedings. Both Employee and Agency presented testimonial and documentary evidence during the Evidentiary Hearing to support their positions.

Agency's Case in Chief

Brian Snowden ("Snowden) Tr.15- 111

Snowden testified that he has worked for the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner ("OCME") since December 28, 2015, and indicated that he was first hired as a Medical Examiner's Transport Team ("METT" or "MET Team") member and cross-trained as an autopsy assistant and transport. Tr. 15. Snowden stated that his current position is Supervisory Forensic Mortuary Technician and he manages the MET Team. He further testified that he supervised Employee. Tr. 17. Snowden noted that prior to being promoted to a manager, he worked as Employee's colleague for approximately one (1) year prior to becoming her supervisor. Tr. 22.

Snowden testified that MET Team members are dispatched out to a scene through a paging system called 'Everbridge' that notifies MET Team members of the case number and scene location through their work-issued cell phone. Tr. 23-24. Snowden testified that the expectation is to respond to the notification within fifteen (15) minutes and respond to the scene within one (1) hour. Tr. 24. Snowden indicated that MET Team members drive together if they are going to pick up a decedent and are permitted to drive alone only if they are picking up specimens or records or going to the Department of Public Works ("DPW") to fuel or wash a vehicle. Tr. 25. Snowden affirmed that the MET Team members mostly work together in teams of two (2) and testified that only in very rare circumstances would a MET Team member be sent to a scene alone. Tr. 25.

Snowden identified Agency's Exhibit H as the METT Vehicle Accountability and Activity Log Sheet. He indicated that this log is used to note information including the date and time of the shift, the vehicle being used, the mileage for each destination and the signatures of the MET Team

members using the vehicle. Tr. 27-28. Snowden affirmed that the METT Vehicle Accountability Log states that OCME vehicles are to be used for official business only. Tr. 29. Snowden affirmed that the second (2nd) page of the METT Vehicle Accountability Log is the METT Vehicle Daily checklist. Tr. 29. He affirmed that the METT vehicle daily checklist is part of the documentation that a MET Team member completes prior to taking out a vehicle. Tr. 30. He further testified that every time a vehicle is used it must be logged on a vehicle activity accountability log sheet and that an employee should not take a vehicle without signing the vehicle out and logging it. Tr. 30-31.

Snowden affirmed that he and Employee were of equal status on the MET Team before he was promoted to manager. Tr. 33-34. He testified he instructed Employee that she could not use vehicles for personal use but could not remember if he explained why. He indicated that he remembered a conversation approximately two (2) months after Employee was hired when he instructed Employee that she could not take her vehicle home because the vehicle was not for personal use. Tr. 34-35.

Snowden identified Agency's Exhibit D as the OCME Vehicles Operations and Accountability Policy and described this policy as the rules and procedures that govern how an employee should use official OCME vehicles. Snowden affirmed that these rules and procedures were in effect in 2017 when Employee began working for Agency, and in 2023, at the time of the incident in question. Tr. 36. Snowden then identified Agency's Exhibit E as Employee's Acknowledgment of Receipt of the Vehicle Operations and Accountability Policy. He affirmed that employees sign this document to affirm that they have received this manual on use of OCME vehicles. Tr. 37-38.

Snowden affirmed that he was Employee's supervisor on August 30, 2023, going into August 31, 2023, when the incident in question occurred. Snowden testified that his work hours were technically 7:00a.m. to 3:30p.m. but he is also on call when at home. Tr. 42-43. When asked how many supervisors are physically on-site during shift three (3), which starts at 10:00 p.m., he testified that none are on site. He indicated that on August 30, 2023, into August 31, 2023, Employee was assigned to shift 3. Tr. 43. He affirmed that Employee was assigned a partner during this tour. Tr. 43-45. Snowden affirmed that Employee was involved in a motor vehicle accident during her tour and testified that she called him after the accident. Tr. 45-46. He explained that Employee noted that another vehicle hit her and that the driver had fled. Tr. 46. He further cited that Employee told him that she was not doing a decedent transport at the time of the accident. Snowden testified that he did not ask her what she was doing at the time of the accident on the initial phone call. Tr. 47. Snowden noted that the vehicle was not drivable and the vehicle was out of service for approximately three (3) months after the accident, and the MET Team operated with one (1) vehicle down. Tr. 48. Snowden affirmed that the vehicle operated by Employee required a Vehicle Accountability and Activity Log Sheet. Tr. 49.

Snowden testified that he assumed Employee was traveling with her partner at the time of the accident and affirmed that MET staff almost always travel together. He testified that the reason for this is for accountability and safety. He further clarified that if on transport, most people could not move bodies alone. Tr. 50. Snowden testified that Employee's partner informed him by phone that he was going to pick up Employee from the scene of the accident. Tr. 51.

Snowden testified that when he arrived at work the next day, he checked for a Vehicle Accountability and Activity Log sheet. Snowden identified Agency's Exhibit J as the vehicle log for the shift starting on August 30, 2023. Tr. 55. Snowden affirmed that Employee did not complete a log sheet for August 31, 2023, which was a violation of OCME policy. Tr. 55-56. Snowden testified that Employee confirmed that she did not complete a Vehicle Accountability and Activity Log Sheet. Snowden further indicated that he checked the GPS system on the vehicle involved in the accident to determine whether there were any scenes that had been paged and indicated that there were none. Tr. 56.

Snowden noted that as part of his investigation he spoke with the Deputy Medical Chief at that time, Dr. Breland, who informed him to write an incident report. Snowden testified that he then followed up with Employee to determine where she was traveling when she was involved in the accident. Snowden cited that Employee informed him that she was traveling to CVS to purchase feminine products. Tr. 61. Snowden testified that after he completed his investigation, he lost trust in Employee because he had already spoken to her about using the vehicle while not on official business. Tr. 62-63. Snowden further testified that he told Employee quite a few times that she could not take the vehicle for personal use. Tr. 63. He further affirmed that he told staff during meetings that OCME vehicles cannot be used for personal use. Tr. 64. Snowden testified that he considered Employee's conduct to be serious because she used Agency's vehicle in violation of the District's rules at the time of the accident. Tr. 73. He affirmed that night shift employees are allowed to take breaks but should use their own vehicle or walk. Tr. 73-74.

Snowden affirmed that on June 23, 2023, Employee was disciplined for neglect of duty. Tr. 75. He testified that Employee failed to respond to an Everbridge page, as well as attempts to reach her by phone, which resulted in the investigator and a single MET Team member responding to the scene alone. When they returned to the building, they found Employee asleep under another employee's desk. Tr. 76. Snowden testified that Employee received a ten (10) day suspension without pay and was put on a Performance Improvement Plan ("PIP"). Tr. 78. Snowden indicated that one of the expectations noted in the PIP was that Employee comply with OCME rules and procedures. He affirmed that Employee violated OCME rules and procedures by using an OCME vehicle for personal use on the date in question. Tr. 80. Snowden further affirmed that the PIP specified that Employee shall operate as a two-person team and complete her quality assurance logs and all other tasks. Tr. 81. Snowden affirmed that he has not had to discipline another employee for using an OCME vehicle for personal use. Tr. 85. Snowden further affirmed that he proposed termination for Employee because he felt that there was no room for improvement. Tr. 88.

On cross-examination, Snowden testified that he never had a discussion with Employee about using an Agency vehicle for lunch, but he told Employee Agency vehicles could not be used for personal reasons. Tr. 93. Snowden testified that when he became supervisor in 2023, he did not retrain staff on vehicle policy use but reiterated in meetings what the policy was. He further noted that the MET Team completed an annual driver's authorization where employees electronically acknowledge the vehicle policy. Tr. 98. Snowden affirmed that there are no supervisors that work Tour three (3), and Employee was usually assigned to Tour three (3) because she preferred that schedule. Tr. 100.

Snowden affirmed that he had spoken to Employee several times about her vehicle use but could not confirm if there was any documentation of these conversations. Snowden affirmed that MET Team members were allowed to operate Agency vehicles alone at times, and Employee's operation of a vehicle alone was not necessarily a violation of Agency's policy. Tr. 105. Snowden testified that Employee failed to comply with the PIP because she violated the vehicle Operations and Accountability policy. Tr. 105.

On redirect examination, Snowden affirmed that the Vehicle Accountability and Operations Manual has not changed substantively during the time that Employee worked for Agency and the policy was that OCME vehicles are for official business use only. Tr. 106. Snowden affirmed that OCME staff are not permitted to take OCME vehicles to run an errand but can take their personal vehicles. Snowden testified that Employee was terminated because she violated the OCME use policy, not because she was involved in accident that was out of her control Tr. 107. Snowden affirmed that he has never taken an OCME vehicle for personal use. Tr. 108.

When asked by the undersigned what the protocol is if a MET Team Member receives an Everbridge notification while in their personal vehicle, Snowden testified that the employee would contact their partner and Snowden, depending on the location of the scene, and return back to the building. He noted that employees are not permitted to take their personal vehicles to a scene.

On redirect, Snowden affirmed that the MET Team members have one (1) hour to get to a scene, and the expectation is if paged, they will return and ride to the scene with their partner. He further testified that it is his expectation that Employee's stay in an area that is close enough for them to respond. Tr. 109-110.

Kimberly Lassiter ("Lassiter")-Tr 112-152

Lassiter testified that she has worked as an OCME employee for 27 years. Tr. 112. She further testified that she was a lead Autopsy Technician for six (6) years, and also served as Met Team Manager, the position now occupied by Snowden. Tr. 112-115. Lassiter noted that her current position is Manager of Mortuary and Forensics. Tr. 15. Lassiter indicated that she supervised Employee from approximately 2018 until April 2023. She affirmed that she had issues regarding Employee's work performance and specified that she issued informal verbal reprimands to Employee. Tr. 116. She specifically noted issues including sleeping on the job, not reporting to scenes, and unauthorized use of vehicles. Tr. 116-117. Lassiter noted that initially, she only issued informal, unofficial reprimands because she saw potential in Employee. Tr. 117.

Lassiter testified that Employee received approximately three (3) reckless driving complaints through the public complaint hotline.[4] Lassiter noted that she addressed Employee's use of personal vehicles at least five (5) times. Tr. 118-119. Lassiter reviewed Agency's Exhibit I as a calendar note Lassiter wrote on February 10, 2021, regarding a verbal reprimand she gave to Employee for taking an OCME vehicle to attend a doctor's appointment. Lassiter indicated that she gave Employee permission to attend the doctor's appointment but did not give her permission

[4] Lassiter did not specify the year(s) these complaints were received.

to use an OCME vehicle to drive to the appointment. She cited that she made Employee aware that she was taking notes. Lassiter stated that she also reiterated in a staff meeting that vehicles could not be taken for personal use. Tr. 120-123.

Lassiter further testified that she provided a formal verbal reprimand to Employee in July 2021 for refusing to follow an investigator to the next scene and noted that it is a Standard Operating Procedure to go from one scene to the other. Tr. 127. Lassiter further noted that Employee was also suspended in October 2021 for five (5) days due to traffic violations. Tr. 130. Lassiter affirmed that the OCME Vehicle Use policy has remained the same throughout her employment with OCME. She noted that employees are not allowed to take OCME vehicles to run errands or to take lunch. Tr. 137.

On cross-examination, Lassiter testified that she did not have Employee sign an acknowledgement regarding their conversations about Employee's vehicle use and noted that there were no witnesses to these meetings. Tr. 143. Lassiter testified that she was not aware of employees running lunch errands for one another using OCME vehicles. On redirect, Lassiter affirmed that once a MET Team employee is paged to a scene, the staff member logs the starting mileage when they enter a vehicle and the arriving mileage when they arrive to a scene, and when they return to OCME log the ending mileage. Lassiter further affirmed that once a MET Team member returns to OCME, and the decedent's remains have been processed, that Team members can go to lunch in their own vehicles.

When questioned by this Administrative Judge, Lassiter testified that the February 10, 2021, calendar entry was not made an official part of Employee's record. She further testified that the incident where Employee took a work vehicle to attend a doctor's appointment was also not made an official part of her record. Tr. 151.

Sasha Breland ("Breland")-Tr. 152-176

Sasha Breland testified that she worked for OCME as a Deputy Medical Examiner, for six (6) years, and in June 2021 became the Deputy Chief Medical Examiner and Medical Director. Tr. 153-155. She testified that in this role, she was second in command at OCME. Breland noted that Snowden informed her of the accident involving Employee. Tr. 155-156. Breland testified that she told Snowden to find out the details of the incident, and make sure Employee reported it in 'E-Risk' Breland further testified that she advised Snowden to find out where Employee was going at the time of the accident and whether she was transporting a decedent. Tr. 157.

Breland testified that in forming her final decision on this matter, she reviewed the proposed notice of separation and the documents attached to it, Employee's responses and the hearing officer's findings. Tr. 159-160. Breland affirmed that in the final agency decision recommending separation, she found that Employee had violated the District's and Agency's regulations and engaged in conduct prejudicial to the District government. Tr. 161. Breland testified that she determined that termination was appropriate because Employee was already on a PIP, which included a goal that she abide by the OCME Vehicle Operations and Accountability Policy and this incident was a direct violation of that policy and of the PIP. Breland further testified that Employee had been disciplined several times previously related to inappropriate operations of

the vehicle, and neglect of duty and safety hazards. Tr. 162. Breland testified that she was not aware of any other staff that were taking Agency vehicles for personal use. Tr. 167.

On cross-examination, Breland testified that it was her recollection that in 2021, Employee received a reprimand because of multiple instances of Employee driving a vehicle recklessly. Breland testified that Employee received a documented corrective action for misusing OCME vehicles. Tr. 168-169. Breland affirmed that there was no documentation in Employee's formal record for using Agency vehicles for personal use. Breland affirmed that when she issued the final determination of removal, there was nothing in Employee's record noting that she violated Agency's policy by taking a vehicle for personal use. Tr. 174.

On redirect examination, Breland testified that Employee's PIP explicitly stated that she was expected to abide by Agency's policy, and the incident in question was a direct violation of her PIP. Tr. 176.

Employee's Case-In-Chief

Employee ("Employee")-Tr.182-235

Employee testified that on August 31, 2023, she was employed at OCME as a Forensic Autopsy Assistant. She noted that her role was to transport decedents from hospitals, scenes around the District, perform intake, and record the times from the scene and back to the building. Tr. 183. Employee indicated that she was terminated for taking an Agency vehicle for personal use, which she noted was a common practice. Employee testified that employees were not allowed to respond to a scene in their personal vehicle and there was no way considering DC traffic that one could get back to the job, respond, get their truck, and get to a scene on time. Tr. 184.

Employee testified that on August 31, 2023, she was working the midnight shift, and had just finished logging the logbook, when she started her cycle. She testified that she told her partner she would be right back and drove on 295 North to go to the CVS, when she was hit by another vehicle between 1:00a.m. and 2:00a.m. Tr. 185. Employee indicated that she reported the accident to her supervisor immediately. Tr. 186. Employee explained that everyone used their OCME vehicles to get lunch. She noted that this practice went into effect during the Covid-19 pandemic because during that period, there was no extra time to get lunch. Employee indicated that Snowden went with her to get food prior to becoming a supervisor. Tr. 187

Employee testified that when she first started working at OCME, she was not trained on Agency's policies and practices, she just signed the paper. Tr. 187. Employee indicated that if one of them needed to run an errand, "they just used the truck and went." Employee noted that if an employee has their OCME vehicle, they can respond to a scene on time. She noted it would be difficult to come all the way back to Agency if an employee is not in an OCME vehicle because they only have one hour to get to a scene. Tr. 188-190. Employee affirmed that MET Team members do not have an official lunch hour. She testified that an employee would have to respond to a scene first and then go to lunch. Tr. 190.

Employee affirmed that she signed an acknowledgment of receipt of the OCME Vehicle Operations and Accountability policy on August 3, 2017. Tr. 191. Employee testified that she did not receive annual training on the vehicle policy. Employee affirmed that she had personal knowledge that other MET Team employees were using their OCME vehicles for personal use daily. 192, 194. Employee testified that she used her work vehicle for personal use daily and did not try to hide it. Tr. 194-195. She noted that if asked by her supervisor what her location was, she let them know that she was at the store or going to get food. Employee iterated that she never lied about her use of OCME vehicles. Employee noted that on the night of the incident, she told the truth because she did not think she was doing anything wrong, as it was common practice. Tr. 195. Employee stated that she was shocked to be terminated for her vehicle use because her managers were aware that she used OCME vehicles for personal use. Tr. 195.

When asked if she had ever been counseled on using a vehicle for personal use, Employee responded in the negative. Tr. 197. Employee testified that the meeting that Lassiter testified occurred on February 10, 2021, regarding her use of a vehicle to attend a doctor's appointment did not occur. Employee testified that Lassiter and Snowden never counseled her for using an OCME vehicle for personal use. Tr. 197. Employee indicated that when she worked with Snowden, they took lunch together and ran errands in OCME vehicles. Tr. 197-198. Employee identified Employee's Exhibit 11 as Cashapp transactions from Snowden to Employee for her to get lunch for him. Tr. 199-200.

On cross-examination, Employee testified that the MET Team took OCME vehicles for personal use from the time that she started working there in 2017 and did not utilize their personal vehicles while working. Tr. 206-212. Employee noted that Lassiter was aware of this practice. Tr. 213- 214. Employee indicated that she asked Lassiter if she could use an OCME vehicle to attend a doctor's appointment because she did not have a personal vehicle at the time, and Lassiter gave her permission to do so. Employee affirmed that OCME's vehicle use policy states that vehicles are for official use only. Tr. 215. Employee affirmed that from the time she started with OCME in 2017 until her termination that the OCME vehicle use policy had not changed. Tr. 216.

Employee testified that on the evening in question, she told her partner that she would be right back but did not specifically indicate that she was leaving the building or taking an OCME vehicle. Tr. 217. Employee indicated that the Cashapp transactions between her and Snowden are times when he paid her. Employee noted that she did not have proof that Snowden knew she was taking an OCME vehicle for lunch when the Cashapp transactions occurred. Tr. 218. Employee also explained that the person who was her manager at the time she was hired was aware that the MET Team was taking OCME vehicles for personal use and knew that the MET Team could not use their personal vehicles. Employee testified that this manager was fine with the Team using OCME vehicles as long as they responded to scenes on time. Tr. 220-221.

Employee testified that she did not create a vehicle log when she went to CVS because she never made it there, so there was no information to log. Employee noted that normally, the vehicle is logged upon return to the building. Tr. 221-222. Employee noted that at the time she worked at OCME there was one log sheet for information regarding the scenes and another to log information about the vehicle. Employee cited that she did not log her trip information when she returned to work because she was terminated. Tr. 223-226. Employee affirmed that she drove her personal

vehicle to work on the evening of August 30, 2023, but did not take her personal vehicle to run the errand to CVS because she could not respond to a scene in her personal vehicle. Tr. 227-228. Employee affirmed that she had been suspended before for violating OCME policy and put on a PIP. Employee indicated that she was aware that her PIP required that she comply with all OCME rules and policies. Tr. 229-230. Employee noted that the managers who put her on a PIP also witnessed her take OCME vehicles for personal use while she was on a PIP. Tr. 230.

On redirect examination, Employee testified that she went alone to CVS because she did not need assistance to buy personal products. She affirmed that sharing the reason why she was traveling to CVS to her male partner would have been embarrassing. Tr. 232. When questioned by the undersigned Administrative Judge, Employee testified that there was no log-sheet for when employees took OCME vehicles for lunch or personal errands. Tr. 234-235

Day Two (2): April 30, 2025

Latisha Robinson Porter ("Porter") Tr. 5-60

Porter testified that she is a Forensic Mortuary Transport Technician at OCME. She further noted that she is the Vice President of NAGE R311. Porter noted that she and Employee were coworkers on the MET Team. Tr. 5-6. Porter testified that OCME's vehicle use policy states that an employee cannot use a vehicle for personal use unless there are other circumstances created and a supervisor provides approval. Tr. 7. Porter testified that MET Team Employees do not have a designated lunch time. She noted that while they are entitled to lunch, they take their lunch when they can, or whenever there is a down time. Tr. 11.

Porter indicated that sometimes employees have to grab lunch prior to or after completing the scene but not while they are on the scene. Tr. 11. Porter stated that there are times when they have to retrieve lunch while in an OCME vehicle because they may be paged to multiple scenes. Tr. 12. Porter noted that employees do not go back to the building to retrieve their personal vehicle because they operate as a two-man team and they cannot use their personal vehicle to respond. She also explained that once they are paged to a scene, they have fifteen (15) minutes to respond to the page and an hour to respond to the scene. She added that there is only one transport team on a scene. Tr. 12.

Porter noted that when she first started working for OCME in 2017, her supervisor at that time allowed them to grab lunch in between scenes as long as employees stayed within the District. Tr. 14. Porter testified that while the Vehicle Accountability form that OCME employees are required to sign states employees will not use OCME vehicles for personal use, that policy does not align with Agency's common practice. Tr. 18. Porter testified that MET Team employees use OCME vehicles for personal use in extenuating circumstances and to get lunch. Tr. 19. Porter testified that she is aware of one other employee who was reprimanded for using an OCME vehicle for personal use, but that matter was dismissed. Tr. 36-37. She affirmed that she is aware that Employee had prior discipline. Tr. 37.

Porter testified that she has not taken an OCME vehicle for personal use but has been in a vehicle with other employees while they were on a personal errand. Tr. 40. She affirmed that she

was partners with the person running the personal errand. Tr. 42. Porter confirmed that other employees have left their partner alone while working the overnight shift and taken an OCME vehicle to go somewhere. Tr. 42-43. Porter noted that she has been given a ride home in an OCME vehicle and affirmed that the OCME policy prohibits this. Tr. 44-45. Porter noted that like Fire and EMS, the MET Team do not stop operations to get lunch, they just grab lunch when they can. Tr. 59.

When questioned by the undersigned Administrative Judge, Porter testified that when an employee used an OCME vehicle to get lunch, that use was not logged on a log sheet. Tr. 59-60.

Snowden (Snowden was recalled as Employee's Witness) Tr. 61-102

Snowden testified that he became supervisor of the MT Team in April of 2023, and prior to that he was a MET Team member. Tr. 63. Snowden testified that he was trained by a senior staff member on when to use the vehicles and how to document when they transported decedents. Snowden testified that vehicle training for him included training on how to drive the vehicle, and how to fill out vehicle logs. He noted that they were not allowed to use OCME vehicles for personal errands. Tr. 66. Snowden testified that when employees took lunch, they would bring their own lunch or go to a nearby restaurant. He testified that he never used an OCME vehicle to get lunch and never went with Employee to get lunch. Tr. 67-68. Snowden noted that Employee was very giving and she would often bring him food, but he never asked her to bring him lunch. Tr. 68.

When asked about Cashapp transactions between him and Employee, Snowden indicated that Employee would ask if he had cash. He noted that he would give her cash, and Employee would Cashapp that amount back to him. Tr. 70. Snowden further indicated that he also had a friend that cooked meals, and employees would order those meals and pay him via Cashapp. Tr. 70. When asked specifically about a deposit made from him to Employee through Cashapp in 2019, he testified that he did not remember what that transaction was for. Tr. 72.

Snowden testified that he had discussions with Employee regarding her use of OCME vehicles and also sent emails to her about this issue. Tr. 74. He noted that he did not have formal discussions with Employee regarding her use of OCME vehicles. Tr. 76. Snowden affirmed that he put Employee on a PIP because she was suspended in June 2023 for ten (10) days. Tr. 78-79. Snowden affirmed that he has had to discipline one other MET Team employee for personal use of an OCME vehicle. He noted that this employee received a ticket, and after conducting an investigation determined that this employee was not on official Agency business. Tr. 80-81. Snowden affirmed that taking an OCME vehicle for lunch qualifies as personal use. Tr. 84. Snowden testified that the expectation is that an employee will get lunch on his or her own time. He noted that some hospitals have cafeterias and coffee shops, so employees may stop there while picking up records, but noted that employees should not be using OCME vehicles to go to their favorite restaurant. Tr. 85-86.

On cross-examination, Snowden affirmed that another employee was suspended for fifteen (15) days for using an OCME vehicle for personal use. Tr. 91-92. He noted that he proposed termination for Employee because she had prior disciplinary actions. Tr. 92. When asked about

Cashapp transactions between he and Employee, Snowden affirmed that those transactions occurred prior to him becoming her supervisor. Tr. 95.

Snowden affirmed that every time an employee takes out a transport van, a Vehicle Accountability and Activity Log sheet is to be completed. Tr. 97. Snowden testified that there is a checklist on the back of the vehicle log sheet that is completed before the run, and the vehicle log itself is completed during the run. He affirmed that the log has a depart time that has to be logged. He affirmed that Employee did not log her vehicle use on August 31, 2023, the date she was involved in an accident. Tr. 98.

On redirect examination, Snowden testified that he did not recall if any of Employee's prior disciplinary actions were for taking a vehicle for personal use. Tr. 99.

When questioned by the undersigned Administrative Judge, Snowden testified that he could not recall a time when OCME's vehicle use policy was ever relaxed. Snowden affirmed that there are days that are too busy to take an allotted lunch period. Tr. 101.

Robert Kidwell ("Kidwell") Tr. 103-118

Kidwell testified that he worked for Agency from 2017 until 2022, as a MET Team member Tr. 104. He affirmed that as part of his duties he operated an OCME vehicle. Kidwell testified that he and Employee were partners on the same shift. Tr. 105. Kidwell testified that OCME employees were advised not to use the vehicles for personal use, such as grocery shopping, and other miscellaneous tasks. He noted that he did not consider getting lunch as personal use. Tr. 107. Kidwell testified that he would use the OCME vehicle or his personal vehicles to get lunch. He also testified that it was difficult to get lunch in a personal vehicle because they did not have a conventional schedule and had to be ready to deploy to a scene within thirty minutes. He testified that if he took his personal vehicle and went to the store and got stuck in traffic, he would be delayed getting to the scene. Tr. 109. Kidwell testified that he would use his personal vehicle when they had overlapping coverage, so he was an extra person. Tr. 109. He noted that in those instances he would quickly grab lunch and come right back. Tr. 109-110. Kidwell testified that he did not have personal knowledge of an employee getting reprimanded for personal use of an OCME vehicle. Tr. 110. Kidwell affirmed that he and Employee took lunch together in OCME vehicles. 112-113.

On cross-examination, Kidwell explained that management did not remind them of the policy unless an employee was involved in an accident. Tr. 114. Kidwell affirmed that Snowden was not his supervisor during his employment on the MET Team. Tr. 115. When asked if he was disciplined for driving dangerously, Kidwell testified that the specific charges were never brought to his attention. Tr. 116-117. He noted that he was suspended but was not told why. Tr. 117. He affirmed that he received a notice of suspension which stated that he was accused of driving dangerously. He also affirmed that he was disciplined for bringing his children in his personal car to a death scene in violation of OCME policy. Tr. 117.

Agency's Rebuttal Witness

Ronald Morris ("Morris") Tr. 134-141

Morris testified that he works for OCME as a Transport Technician. Tr. 134. He testified that he worked with Employee from 2022 to 2023. Tr. 137. He stated that his supervisor at the time instructed him that OCME vehicles were for official use only. Tr. 137-138. He indicated that Snowden told him in 2024 that the vehicles were not for personal use. Tr. 138. Morris affirmed that from 2022 to 2023 he did not take a vehicle for personal use and did not know of any staff members that used OCME vehicles for personal use. Tr. 138. He further testified that he never saw Employee take a vehicle for personal use or leave in an OCME vehicle. He affirmed that that he was never told by a supervisor that despite the vehicle use policy, it was ok to use OCME vehicles for personal use. Tr. 139.

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Employee was hired as a Forensic Autopsy Transport Technician on July 24, 2017, which is a position in the Medical Examiner Transport Team ("METT" or "MET Team"). On August 3, 2017, Employee signed an acknowledgement that she received a copy of Agency's Vehicle Operations and Accountability Policy.[5] On August 31, 2023, at approximately 1:15 a.m. while traveling to CVS in an OCME vehicle, Employee was struck by another vehicle.[6]

Agency determined that Employee's use of an OCME vehicle to travel to CVS violated the Vehicle Operations and Accountability Policy. Thus, Agency issued an Advance Notice of Proposed Removal on October 4, 2023, which noted that removal was being proposed for conduct prejudicial to the District Government for taking a vehicle for use other than official business.[7] Agency cited to 6B DCMR § 1605.4(a)(3)(d)(i)(m)(n).[8] This matter was assigned to a Hearing Officer who issued his recommendation on January 4, 2024, upholding Agency's decision to terminate Employee.[9] In a Notice of Final Agency Decision dated January 16, 2024, Employee was terminated from her position as a Forensic Autopsy Support Technician effective January 16, 2024.[10] The action was proposed in accordance with Chapter 16 of the DPM and based on the specific cause of action of "Conduct Prejudicial to the District Government", pursuant to DPM § 1605.4, as cited above.

Summary of Agency's Position

On August 31, 2023, while working the overnight shift, Employee was involved in an accident while operating a District-owned Agency vehicle. Agency maintains that employee was not conducting official OCME business but instead was on a personal errand in violation of Agency's policy, which prohibits the unauthorized use of OCME vehicles. Agency maintains that

[5] Agency's Answer, p. 16 (March 6, 2024) (page numbers not in the original but included for ease of reference).
[6] *Id*. at p. 4
[7] *Id*. at p. 12
[8] DCMR §1605.4(a)(3)-conduct that employee should know is a violation of law or regulation; 1605.4: (d) Failure or refusal to follow instructions; (i) health and safety violations; (m) failure to meet performance standards; (n) inability to carry out assigned responsibilities or duties
[9] Employee's Petition for Appeal at p. 19 (February 13, 2024) (page numbers not in the original but included for ease of reference).
[10] *Id*. at p. 7.

Employee was aware of Agency's policy on the unauthorized use of OCME vehicles and signed an acknowledgement in August 2017 that she received a copy of the OCME Vehicle Operations and Accountability Policy. Agency further asserts that Employee was trained regarding the use of District Government vehicles. Agency maintains that OCME policy also required that OCME technicians operate as a team, but Employee went out alone the night in question and left her partner alone at Agency.[11]

Agency asserts that Employee was placed on a PIP in June 2023, and that one of her S.M.A.R.T. goals was to comply with OCME's Vehicle Operations and Accountability Policy. Agency avers that OCME's policy requires employees to log all vehicle use, and state the purpose, mileage, and other information about the trip; however, no entry existed for Employee's travel on August 31, 2023. Agency asserts that Employee "freely admits that she was driving the agency vehicle solely for personal use…" despite knowing that such use was against Agency's policy and procedures. [12]

Summary of Employee's Position

Employee maintains that Agency did not have cause for adverse action against her because Agency accepted and encouraged employees to use work vehicles for personal errands..[13] Employee asserts that on August 31, 2023, she took an OCME vehicle to CVS to procure necessary personal care items.[14] Employee notes that it was customary for OCME employees to use vehicles during downtime for personal errands such as getting lunch and snacks for each other, as long as they were on time to a scene when paged. Employee maintains that other employees have not been fired for similar conduct.[15] Employee avers that even her supervisor Brian Snowden would send her cash payments for lunch runs. Employee asserts that while she signed the OCME Vehicle Operations and Accountability Policy Acknowledgment Form in 2017, she did not reasonably know that her actions were improper because Agency has accepted and encouraged employees to utilize work vehicles for personal errands. Employee argues that because Agency had a practice that contravened its own policy, and her actions aligned with this common practice, that Agency did not have cause to discipline her.[16]

Employee further maintains that she was never counseled about using a vehicle to attend a doctor's appointment, despite Lassiter's assertion that she received a prior verbal warning about similar conduct.[17] She further asserts that Agency considered a prior offense that occurred in March 2019 in assessing the *Douglas* factors, which was beyond the three (3) year look back period permitted in assessing prior misconduct.[18]

[11]Agency's Answer, p. 1, 3 (March 6, 2024)
[12] *Id*. at pp. 2-3; 4-5
[13] Employee's Brief p. 4 (August 26, 2024)
[14] Tr. 184.
[15] Prehearing Statement, p. 2 (May 28, 2024)
[16] Employee's Brief, pp 4-5 (August 26, 2024)
[17] Tr. 197; 215
[18] Employee's Brief, pp. 7-8 (August 26, 2024)

ANALYSIS[19]

Whether Agency had cause for adverse action

Title 1, Chapter 6, Subchapter VI of the D.C. Official Code (2001), a portion of the Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act, sets forth the law governing this Office. D.C. Official Code § 1-606.03 reads in pertinent part as follows:

> (a) An employee may appeal a final agency decision affecting a performance rating which results in removal of the employee (pursuant to subchapter XIII-A of this chapter), an adverse action for cause that results in removal, reduction in force (pursuant to subchapter XXIV of this chapter), reduction in grade, placement on enforced leave, *or suspension for 10 days or more* (pursuant to subchapter XVI-A of this chapter) to the Office upon the record and pursuant to other rules and regulations which the Office may issue. *(Emphasis added).*

Pursuant to OEA Rule 631.1, 6-B DCMR Ch. 600 (December 27, 2021) Agency has the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence that the proposed disciplinary action was taken for cause. Additionally, DPM § 1601.7 provides that "Each agency head and personnel authority has the obligation to and shall ensure that corrective and adverse actions are only taken when an employee does not meet or violates established performance or conduct standards…."[20] Accordingly, disciplinary actions may only be taken for cause.

OCME's policy regarding use of its vehicles is clearly noted in its General Vehicle Operations and Accountability Policy. The policy states: "Government vehicles may only be utilized for the official government business of the District and agency." It further states that "Vehicle operators must record vehicle usage on a Vehicle Utilization Report… The most direct route to any assignment will be used. Employees will not deviate from the shortest route for any personal errands, including meal breaks."[21] This Policy further incorporates Mayor's Order 2009-210-Government and Personal Vehicle Operators Accountability Policy, which outlines the appropriate use of District-owned vehicles. Employee signed an Acknowledgement of Receipt of the OCME FY2016 Vehicle Operations and Accountability Policy on August 3, 2017.[22] Agency noted that this policy has not changed since Employee signed the Acknowledgement in 2017.[23]

Employee does not dispute that Agency's written policy prohibits personal use of OCME transport vehicles.[24] Employee also acknowledged that she used an OCME vehicle in the early

[19] Although I may not discuss every aspect of the evidence in the analysis of this case, I have carefully considered the entire record. *See Antelope Coal Co./Rio Tino Energy America v. Goodin*, 743 F.3d 1331, 1350 (10th Cir. 2014) (citing *Clifton v. Chater*, 79 F.3d 1007, 1009-10 (10th Cir. 1996)) ("The record must demonstrate that the ALJ considered all of the evidence, but an ALJ is not required to discuss every piece of evidence").
[20] DPM §1601.7(2019).
[21] Agency's Answer to Petition for Appeal, p. 62 (March 6, 2024) (page numbers included for ease of reference).
[22] *Id*. at p. 75
[23] Agency's Brief p. 2 (July 23, 2024).
[24] Employee's Brief, p. 4 (August 26, 2024)

morning on August 31, 2023, to run a personal errand, which was against Agency's written vehicle use policy.[25] Thus, based on Employee's own admission I find that Employee used an OCME vehicle to run a personal errand, in violation of OCME's written General Vehicle Operations and Accountability Policy. Employee, however, asserts that despite the established written policy, Agency had a common practice of allowing the MET Team to use vehicles for personal use because the nature of their job required them to be on call. Employee maintains that if she used her personal vehicle to run errands or take lunch, for example, she might not have time to return to OCME, get a transport vehicle, and arrive on time to the scene where paged.[26]

In support of her argument that OCME had a practice of allowing the MET Team to take vehicles for personal use, Employee testified that she used her work vehicle for personal use daily and did not try to hide it. She noted that if her supervisors asked for her location, she would let them know if she was at the store or getting food. Employee testified that at the time of the accident, she called her supervisor and told the truth regarding the accident because she did not think she was doing anything wrong considering Agency's common practice of letting employees take vehicles for personal use. [27]

Employee further testified that her manager at the time she was hired did not give her express permission to use OCME vehicles for personal use, but was aware of that practice and allowed it as long as the MET Team responded to scenes on time.[28] Employee further asserted that while she signed the vehicle policy acknowledgement in 2017, she did not receive yearly training on the vehicle use policy and was never reprimanded by Lassiter or Snowden for taking a vehicle for personal use, despite both Snowden and Lassiter's testimony that she was counseled not to take vehicles for personal use.[29]

In further support of her assertions, Employee elicited testimony from two OCME employees, Porter and Kidwell. Both Porter and Kidwell testified that employees were allowed to take OCME vehicles to get lunch, the rationale being that they could be called to a scene at any moment.[30]

Agency maintains that there was no practice of circumventing OCME's and the District's established policy regarding vehicle use. In support of its assertions, Agency elicited testimony from Employee's most recent supervisor Snowden and a past supervisor, Lassiter, both of whom testified that Agency did not have a policy of circumventing its vehicle use policy.[31] Snowden testified that employees were not authorized to use the vehicles to run personal errands.[32] Snowden noted that the only time MET Team members are permitted to get lunch while in an OCME vehicle is if they are on official business at a hospital, and they use the hospital's facilities to get lunch.[33]

[25] Tr. 227-228
[26] Tr. 184
[27] Tr. 194-195
[28] Tr. 220-221
[29] Tr. 191-192; 197
[30] Tr. 12, 109
[31] Tr. 34
[32] Tr. 66
[33] Tr. 85-86

Snowden testified that night shift employees are allowed to take breaks but should use their own vehicle or walk.[34]

Lassiter testified that she verbally reprimanded Employee on February 10, 2021, for using an OCME vehicle, but noted she did not formally document this reprimand. Agency presented Exhibit I, a printed Outlook daily calendar page from February 21, 2021, with Lassiter's handwritten notes, which expressly mentioned that she counseled Employee regarding use of an OCME vehicle to attend a doctor's appointment.[35] Employee denied that this meeting ever happened. Employee asserted that she did not have a personal vehicle and noted that Lassiter gave her permission to attend the doctor's appointment.[36] I find Lassiter's testimony regarding this calendar entry to be lacking in credibility. Lassiter testified that she did not officially document the verbal reprimand in writing and did not make it an official part of Employee's record. Further, I find it difficult to substantiate that Lassiter, who is Employee's former supervisor, kept a handwritten calendar entry from February 2021, if it was not a part of Employee's official file.

While Employee asserts that the MET Team management allowed the MET Team to use OCME vehicles for personal use, the evidence as a whole does not support this assertion. Employee and Employee's witnesses Porter and Kidwell provided contradicting testimony on whether a personal errand, such as the one Employee engaged in on August 31, 2023, was permitted use of OCME vehicles. Porter stated that she witnessed OCME employees using OCME vehicles for personal errands, and that management was aware of this practice.[37] She further testified that she had knowledge of an employee that was suspended for driving a work vehicle home, although to her recollection, the matter was later dismissed.[38] Kidwell testified that OCME employees were advised *not* to use the vehicles for personal use, such as grocery shopping, and other miscellaneous tasks, contradicting both Porters' and Employee's testimony.[39]

Further, while Employee and these witnesses testified that a former supervisor allowed them to take OCME vehicles for personal use, their testimony suggests that retrieving lunch, and not running errands was the permitted exception to the Vehicle Use Policy. Porter testified, "So when I came on duty, when I first came on to OCME, my supervisor was Mr.[supervisor]. If you stayed within DC, he allowed you to do specific things. We didn't run like a lot of personal errands, it was mainly like if we needed to grab lunch in between scenes or something like that."[40] Porter further testified, "So there may be times [when] you might go from scene to scene to scene to scene. And you have to hurry up and grab something, or the investigator that you know, we've got triple scenes or double scenes coming out. You know, go ahead and grab your food now."[41] Employee testified regarding vehicle use during the pandemic, "[t]he vehicle was being used - everyone used the vehicle to get lunch, especially during Corona. During Corona, we had no time. We had no time to get any food, so that's when it really went into effect, like, you can use your

[34] Tr. 73-74
[35] Tr. 120-123; *See also*, Agency's Brief, Exhibit A p. 59 (July 23, 2024).
[36] Tr. 197; 215
[37] Tr. 43; 59
[38] Tr. 35, 57
[39] Tr. 107
[40] Tr. 14
[41] Tr. 12

vehicle to get lunch."[42] Kidwell testified that he did not count taking a vehicle for lunch as personal use..[43] Thus, the undersigned finds that while there may have been *passive* acceptance by a past supervisor of the MET Team members getting lunch, the record does contain evidence of consistent and widespread misuse of OCME vehicles.

Further, the evidence as a whole supports that the written policy remained in effect, even in practice. Snowden indicated that as supervisor, he instructed OCME employees on the appropriate use of vehicles, and Employee's PIP included a statement that she would comply with Agency's Vehicle Use Policy.[44] Both Snowden and Employee testified that each trip had to be logged at the beginning and end of each trip, including mileage and start and end times.[45] Yet, Porter and Employee testified that there was no way to log lunch trips or personal errands, thus the mileage and vehicle use for these trips could not be documented.[46] Further, the logbook that the MET Team used contained an explicit statement that the vehicles would be used for official use only.[47] Additionally, Lassiter and Snowden both testified that the OCME Vehicle Use Policy was enforced. Notably, while Employee and Porter asserted that a past supervisor allowed such use, he nor any other supervisor was called to testify that personal use was permitted.

Moreover, the instant facts do not comport with Employee's rationale for why Agency would circumvent its written policy. Employee, Porter, and Kidwell testified that the rationale for allowing employees to take an OCME vehicle is to ensure that they can respond to a scene within an hour, once paged.[48] Employee testified that considering DC traffic, there would be no way that one could get back to the job, respond, get their truck, and get a scene on time.[49] Tr. 184. However, in the instant matter, Employee was not on a lunch run or personal errand during a busy day or officially engaged in OCME business. Employee was working the overnight shift and running a personal errand around 1:00a.m. when daytime factors like traffic were not a hindrance. Further, if Employee were called to a scene while she was traveling to or from CVS on the date in question, she would have to return to OCME to retrieve her partner, because as noted by Snowden and Employee, the MET Team must travel as a Team, with limited exceptions.[50] Further, Porter testified that from 11:30p.m. until 8:30a.m. there is only one transport team, again suggesting that Employee would have had to travel back to OCME and retrieve her partner if she was paged to a scene while running a personal errand, since they were the sole team working. Thus, Employee's rationale for why she could not use her personal vehicle to travel to CVS and return to OCME if paged do not apply to the instant facts.

While I do not doubt that the nature of the MET Teams' work is imbued with a degree of unpredictability such that set lunch times and breaks are not possible, these factors do not justify

[42] Tr. 187
[43] Tr. 107
[44] Agency's Answer, p. 47 (March 6, 2024)(page numbers included for ease of reference).
[45] Tr. 27-28; 224
[46] Tr. 60, 234
[47] Agency's Answer, Appendix B (March 6, 2024)
[48] Tr. 12, 109, 184, 188-189
[49] Tr. 184.
[50] Tr. 25, 184.

a break from Agency's policy regarding use of Agency vehicles. Thus, the undersigned finds that Agency had just cause to discipline Employee for her actions.

Whether Agency followed all applicable laws, rules and regulations

The undersigned finds that Agency had cause to discipline Employee based on 1605.4(a) Conduct Prejudicial to the Government, including (3) conduct that an employee should reasonably know is a violation of law or regulation and 1605.4 (d) Failure or refusal to follow instructions."[51] The undersigned further finds that based on the analysis and facts above, Employee did not follow instructions to adhere to Agency's Vehicle Use Policy and engaged in conduct that she knew or should have reasonably known is a violation of law or regulation.

The undersigned finds that the evidence does not support the remaining charges against Employee, and thus they cannot be sustained. In The Final Notice to Employee, Agency cited to 6B of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations ("DCMR") and charged Employee with 1605.4(a)-Conduct that is Prejudicial to the District Government in support of its termination of Employee. Agency specifically cited to §1605.4(a)(3) "Conduct that employee should know is a violation of law or regulation"; §1605.4(d) Failure or refusal to follow instructions; (i) Health and safety violations; (m) Failure to meet performance standards; and (n) Inability to carry out assigned responsibilities or duties. The undersigned finds that Agency has not presented substantial evidence that Employee was terminated for her failure to meet performance standards, safety and health violations, or an inability to carry out assigned responsibilities or duties. While Agency considered the individual requirements of Employee's PIP in supporting this adverse action, Agency has not asserted or provided evidence that Employee was terminated for her failure to meet the performance standards, consistent with Chapter 14 of the District Personnel Manual ("DPM"). In fact, Employee was still on a PIP at the time of termination.[52] Similarly, Agency has not presented any evidence of safety and health violations or an inability to carry out assigned duties. Thus, the undersigned will not consider DPM §1605.4 (i), (m), or (n) in assessing this matter.[53] Accordingly, I find that Agency has not met its burden as related to the aforementioned charges under DPM §§1605.4 (i) (m) or (n).

Whether the Penalty of Termination was appropriate

In determining the appropriateness of an agency's penalty, OEA has consistently relied on *Stokes v. District of* Columbia, 502 A.2d 1006 (D.C. 1985).[54] Therefore when assessing the appropriateness of a penalty, this Office is not to substitute its judgment for that of the Agency but is simply to ensure that "managerial discretion has been legitimately invoked and properly exercised." Specifically, OEA held in *Love v. Department of Corrections*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0034-08R11 (August 10, 2011), that selection of a penalty is a management prerogative that is not

[51] DPM §1607.2(d)(1)
[52] Agency Answer, p. 44 (March 6, 2024)
[53] The Hearing Officer similarly noted that he would not make factual findings regarding 6B 1605.4(d)(l)(m)(n) because these charges were not developed by the record. (Agency's Answer, p. 130)(page numbers not in the original but included for ease of reference).
[54] *See also. Anthony Payne v. D.C. Metropolitan Police Department,* OEA Matter No. 1601-0054-01, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (May 23, 2008); *Dana Washington v. D.C. Department of Corrections,* OEA Matter No. 1601-0006-06, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (April 3, 2009)

subject to the exercise of discretionary disagreement by this Office. As further noted in *Love*, "…[T]he [OEA's] review of an agency-imposed penalty is essentially to assure that the agency did conscientiously consider the relevant factors and did strike a responsible balance within tolerable limits of reasonableness. Only if the [OEA] finds that the agency failed to weigh the relevant factors, or that the agency's judgment clearly exceeded the limits of reasonableness, it is appropriate for the [OEA] then to specify how the agency's decision should be corrected to bring the penalty within the parameters of reasonableness."[55] Accordingly, when an Agency charge is upheld, this Office will "leave Agency's penalty undisturbed when the penalty is within the range allowed by law regulation or guidelines, is based on consideration of the relevant factors and is clearly not an error of judgement."[56]

Here, the Table of Illustrative action notes a first occurrence for each of the supported charges noted above can include removal.[57] Thus, Agency's action of terminating Employee was within the range allowed by the DPM.

Employee asserts that Agency considered a past disciplinary action that was beyond the three (3) year look back period[58] in assessing *Douglas* Factor 3.[59] The undersigned finds that even without this specific instance of discipline, Agency provided a thorough *Douglas* Factor analysis, and noted two additional past disciplinary actions, which were more recent. Thus, the undersigned finds that Agency's consideration of the *Douglas* factors and resulting penalty did not exceed the limits of reasonableness. Thus, the undersigned must leave Agency's penalty undisturbed.

ORDER

[55] *Love* (Citing *Douglas v. Veterans Administration,* 5 M.S.P.R. 313, 5 M.S.P.R. 280 (1981)).
[56] *Id. See also Sarah Guarin v Metropolitan Police Department*, 1601-0299-13 (May 24, 2013) citing *Stokes supra*.
[57] DPM§ 1607.2(a)(4) and 1607.2(d)(1).
[58] Agency's Answer, p. 30 (March 6, 2024).
[59] *Douglas v. Veterans Administration,* 5 M.S.P.R. 313 (1981). The *Douglas* factors provide that an agency should consider the following when determining the penalty of adverse action matters:

1) the nature and seriousness of the offense, and its relation to the employee's duties, position, and responsibilities including whether the offense was intentional or technical or inadvertent, or was committed maliciously or for gain, or was frequently repeated;
2) the employee's job level and type of employment, including supervisory or fiduciary role, contacts with the public, and prominence of the position;
3) the employee's past disciplinary record;
4) the employee's past work record, including length of service, performance on the job, ability to get along with fellow workers, and dependability;
5) the effect of the offense upon the employee's ability to perform at a satisfactory level and its effect upon supervisors' confidence in employee's ability to perform assigned duties;
6) consistency of the penalty with those imposed upon other employees for the same or similar offenses;
7) consistency of the penalty with any applicable agency table of penalties;
8) the notoriety of the offense or its impact upon the reputation of the agency;
9) the clarity with which the employee was on notice of any rules that were violated in committing the offense, or had been warned about the conduct in question;
10) potential for the employee's rehabilitation;
11) mitigating circumstances surrounding the offense such as unusual job tensions, personality problems, mental impairment, harassment, or bad faith, malice or provocation on the part of others involved in the matter; and

the adequacy and effectiveness of alternative sanctions to deter such conduct in the future by the employee or others.

Based on the foregoing, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Agency's action of terminating Employee is **UPHELD.**

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Natiya Curtis
Natiya Curtis Esq.
Administrative Judge

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the District of Columbia Register and the Office of Employee Appeals' website. Parties should promptly notify the Office Manager of any formal errors so that this Office can correct them before publishing the decision. This notice is not intended to provide an opportunity for a substantive challenge to the decision.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
EMPLOYEE[1],	)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0057-25
Employee	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: February 2, 2026
	)	
D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS,	)	MONICA DOHNJI, ESQ.
Agency	)	Senior Administrative Judge
	)	

Employee, *Pro Se*
Lynette Collins, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On July 29, 2025, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals ("OEA" or "Office") contesting the District of Columbia Public Schools' ("Agency" or "DCPS") decision to terminate her from her position as a Teacher, effective June 20, 2025. OEA issued a Request for Agency Answer to Petition for Appeal on July 29, 2025. Thereafter, on August 05, 2025, Agency filed its Motion to Dismiss stating that OEA lacked jurisdiction over this matter because Employee's Petition for Appeal with OEA was untimely; that Employee filed a grievance with her Union on or about July 11, 2025, before filing her Petition for Appeal with this Office on July 29, 2025; and that Employee was an at-will employee at the time of her termination.

I was assigned this matter on August 5, 2025. Thereafter, on August 6, 2025, Employee filed an Opposition to Agency's Motion to Dismiss. On August 12, 2025, Agency filed a Sur Reply to Employee's Opposition. On August 18, 2025, Employee filed a Rebuttal to Agency's Sur Reply. Subsequently on September 19, 2025, Employee filed a Motion for Extension of Time to Retain Counsel. On September 23, 2025, the undersigned issued an Order Granting Employee's Motion for Extension of Time to Retain Counsel and convened a Status Conference for October 30, 2025. Employee filed a Second Motion for Extension of Time to Retain Counsel on October 20, 2025. Agency submitted an Objection to Employee's Motion on October 27, 2025. Thereafter, on October 27, 2025, Employee filed a Reply to Agency's Objection Motion and requested that this matter be held in abeyance pending a related arbitration outcome. On

[1] Employee's name was removed from this decision for the purposes of publication on the Office of Employee Appeals' website.

November 25, 2025, the undersigned issued an Order denying all pending motions and notifying the parties that no further proceedings and/or documentation were required in this matter. Because I determined this matter could be decided on the basis of the documents of record, no proceedings were conducted. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Office, pursuant to *D.C. Official Code, § 1-606.03 (2001)*, has not been established.

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

BURDEN OF PROOF

OEA Rule § 631.1, 6-B District of Columbia Municipal Regulations ("DCMR") Ch. 600, et seq (December 27, 2021) states:

> The burden of proof for material issues of fact shall be by a preponderance of the evidence. "Preponderance of the evidence" shall mean:
>
> > that degree of relevant evidence that a reasonable person, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find that a contested fact is more likely to be true than untrue.[2]

OEA Rule § 631.2 *id.* states:

> For appeals filed under § 604.1, the employee shall have the burden of proof as to issues of jurisdiction, including timeliness of filing. The agency shall have the burden of proof as to all other issues.

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Employee's Position

Employee asserts in her Petition for Appeal that her termination "constitutes unlawful retaliation for a severe work-related injury I sustained … and my subsequent workers' compensation claim."[3] Employee also asserts that her status as a permanent teacher "was impermissibly switched to temporary without my informed consent or knowledge under deceptive pretense involving fraudulent handling of licensure documents."[4] Employee maintains that Agency's action of terminating her was wrong as it involved unlawful discrimination

[2] OEA Rule § 699.1.
[3] Petition for Appeal (July 29, 2025).
[4] *Id.*

because of a work-related injury she sustained in 2023. Employee affirmed that her union, Washington Teachers' Union ("WTU") filed a grievance regarding her termination.[5]

Employee asserts in her Opposition to Agency's Motion to Dismiss that her Petition for Appeal is not untimely due to the application of equitable tolling.[6] She states that her termination was effective June 20, 2025, and she filed her Petition for Appeal on July 29, 2025. Employee explains that the doctrine of equitable tolling should be applied here due to extraordinary circumstances that were beyond her control. Employee avers that this doctrine empowers OEA to extend a filing deadline when a litigant, despite acting with reasonable diligence, was prevented from timely filing due to circumstances beyond their control. Employee states that following receipt of the April 2025, termination notice, she immediately initiated communication with DCPS representative, Ms. Nancy Wright ("Ms. Wright"), to seek clarification and reconsideration. She avers that Ms. Wright repeatedly delayed providing a response and this created a reasonable expectation of ongoing dialog and potential internal resolution which influenced her decision regarding filing a formal appeal with OEA. Employee cites that it was not until July 1, 2025, that she became aware that the delay would impact her grievance timeline. She contends that this supports the application of equitable tolling in this matter because Agency's conduct lured her into a false sense of security regarding the filing deadlines.[7]

Employee avers that her union, WTU, filed a grievance on July 11, 2025, on her behalf, which was rejected as untimely on July 14, 2025. She explains that the rejection of her grievance left her without a remedy through that avenue, making an appeal with OEA a necessary path to pursue a fair hearing on the merit of the case.[8]

Employee also contends that she was a permanent employee and not an "at-will" employee. She asserts that her termination for alleged licensure noncompliance was directly linked to the principal's obstruction of her licensure renewal. Employee notes that she was unable to renew her license because she was not assigned to a school following her reinstatement in 2024, therefore, a principal could not file the necessary forms required to renew her license.[9]

Employee asserts that DCPS is estopped from terminating her for lack of licensure. She explains that "DCPS's actions are in direct contradiction to the principles of estoppel and the "just cause" standard required for the termination of a permanent public sector employee."[10] Employee states that Agency, through its own repeated actions, forfeited any rights to terminate her based on licensure noncompliance. She cites that DCPS knowingly hired her without a license in October 2023; terminated her for not having a license; then reinstated her without a license in September 2024; and later terminated her again for not having a license. Employee argues that the "doctrine of equitable estoppel prevents a party from asserting a position that is inconsistent with a previous position or act upon which another party has reasonably relied." She states that Agency's conduct in this matter meets the criteria for estoppel and bars Agency from

[5] *Id*.
[6] Petitioner's Opposition to Agency's Motion to Dismiss (August 6, 2025).
[7] *Id*.
[8] *Id*.
[9] *Id*.
[10] *See.* Petitioner's Rebuttal to Agency's Sur Reply (August 18, 2025).

using the lack of a license as a basis for her termination. Employee explains that she reasonably relied on Agency's repeated assurance of permanent employment and has been harmed by Agency's inconsistent actions. Employee also notes that her status as a permanent employee is protected by the Collective Bargaining Agreement ("CBA") between her union and Agency, as well as DC laws.[11]

Agency's Position

Agency states in its Motion to Dismiss that Employee was terminated for failing to obtain an active Office of the State Superintendent of Education ("OSSE") issued license by March 1, 2025. Agency asserts that Employee's Petition for Appeal is untimely and must be dismissed. Agency explains that Employee was terminated effective June 20, 2025, and she filed her appeal with OEA on July 29, 2025, beyond the thirty (30) days established for filing appeals with OEA.[12] Agency asserts that Employee's claim of equitable tolling is misplaced. It cites that the April 8, 2025, termination notice to Employee complied with OEA Rule 605, therefore, Employee's untimely Petition for Appeal does not fall within the exception to the thirty (30) days mandatory filing requirement.[13]

Agency also cites that in response to the termination notice, on July 11, 2025, WTU filed a Step 1, Stage 3 Grievance on Employee's behalf. Agency avers that D.C. Official Code § 1-616.52 limits employees to one method of appealing an adverse action. Agency avers that, pursuant to that D.C. Official Code § 1-616.52(f), the first appeal initiated by the employee will be the one to proceed. It explains that the July 11, 2025, grievance filed by WTU on Employee's behalf predates Employee's July 29, 2025, Petition for Appeal with OEA. Agency asserts that Employee chose to file a grievance to challenge this matter before filing a Petition for Appeal with OEA, therefore, OEA lacks jurisdiction over this matter as Employee has already grieved this matter.[14]

Additionally, Agency asserts that OEA does not have jurisdiction over Employee because Employee is an "at-will" employee and has no job tenure or protection. It highlights that this Office has consistently held that it lacks jurisdiction to hear appeals from employees terminated for failure to meet mandatory licensing or certification requirements. Agency explains that "although the position description does not designate the incumbent as holding "at-will" status, since permanent status can only be achieved if requirements are met, an employee who lacks the requirements but is given a stated period to complete them, becomes at-will, if the employee fails to complete the requirements by the deadline." Agency further explains that this Office "has determined it lacks jurisdiction to hear challenges of teachers … who held positions that required licenses or certifications, and who lacked the licenses or certifications at the time of termination, concluding that these individuals, because they did not meet the requirements, had no vested rights in the position." As such, Agency argues that Employee's appeal should be dismissed.[15]

---

[11] *Id*.
[12] Agency's Motion to Dismiss (August 5, 2025).
[13] Agency's Sur Reply (August 12, 2025).
[14] Agency's Motion to Dismiss, *supra*.
[15] *Id*.

Agency also claims that there is no document to support Employee's contention that the Agency is responsible for her failure to obtain her OSSE issued licensure.[16]

Analysis[17]

The threshold issue in this matter is one of jurisdiction. This Office's jurisdiction is conferred upon it by law and was initially established by the District of Columbia Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 ("CMPA"), D.C. Official Code §1-601-01, *et seq.* (2001). It was amended by the Omnibus Personnel Reform Amendment Act of 1998 ("OPRAA"), D.C. Law 12-124, which took effect on October 21, 1998. Both the CMPA and OPRAA confer jurisdiction on this Office to hear appeals, with some exceptions. According to 6-B of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulation ("DCMR") § 604.1[18], this Office has jurisdiction in matters involving District government employees appealing a final agency decision affecting:

(a) A performance rating which results in removal of the employee;
(b) An adverse action for cause which results in removal;
(c) A reduction in grade;
(d) A suspension for ten (10) days or more (Emphasis added);
(e) A reduction-in-force; or
(f) A placement on enforced leave for ten (10) days or more.

This Office has no authority to review issues beyond its jurisdiction.[19] Therefore, issues regarding jurisdiction may be raised at any time during the proceeding.[20]

Untimeliness

Agency asserts that Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed as untimely because she filed her appeal with OEA more than thirty (30) days from the effective date of her termination. A "[d]istrict government employee shall initiate an appeal by filing a petition for appeal with the OEA. The petition for appeal must be filed within *thirty (30) calendar days of the effective date of the action being appealed*."[21] (Emphasis added). Here, Employee was terminated effective June 20, 2025, and she filed her Petition for Appeal with OEA on July 29, 2025. I find that June 20, 2025, to July 29, 2025, is more than thirty (30) days. However, the

[16] Agency's Sur Reply, *supra*.
[17] Although I may not discuss every aspect of the evidence in the analysis of this case, I have carefully considered the entire record. *See Antelope Coal Co./Rio Tino Energy America v. Goodin*, 743 F.3d 1331, 1350 (10th Cir. 2014) (citing *Clifton v. Chater*, 79 F.3d 1007, 1009-10 (10th Cir. 1996)) ("The record must demonstrate that the ALJ considered all of the evidence, but an ALJ is not required to discuss every piece of evidence").
[18] *See also*, Chapter 6, §604.1 of the District Personnel Manual ("DPM") and OEA Rules.
[19] *See Banks v. District of Columbia Public Schools*, OEA Matter No. 1602-0030-90, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (September 30, 1992).
[20] *See Brown v. District of Columbia Public Schools*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0027-87, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (July 29, 1993); *Jordan v. Department of Human Services*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0110-90, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (January 22, 1993); *Maradi v. District of Columbia Gen. Hosp.*, OEA Matter No. J-0371-94, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (July 7, 1995).
[21] DC Official Code §1-606.03.

D.C. Court of Appeals in *Yordanos Sium v. Office of State Superintendent of Education*, 218 A.3d 228 (D.C. 2019), held that the presumption regarding filing deadlines is that they are not jurisdictional but waivable claims-processing rules. In support of this position, the Court relied heavily on the ruling in *Mathis v. D.C. Housing Authority* 124 A.3d 1089 (D.C. 2015) that filing deadlines in particular are quintessential claim-processing rules, which seek only to promote the orderly progress of litigation, and generally do not have jurisdictional force. (citing *Wong,* 135 S.Ct. at 1632 (quoting *Henderson, 562 U.S.* at 435, 131 S.Ct. 1197). In *Sium*, the Court reasoned that even procedural rules codified in statutes are non-jurisdictional in character. It found that if a deadline is contained in a statute **and** its language is mandatory, it *may* be jurisdictional (emphasis added). The Court held that D.C. Code § 1-606.03(a), which provides that any appeal shall be filed within 30 days of the effective date of the appealed action, meets both requirements. However, it opined that more is required.

Relying on *Mathis*, the D.C. Court of Appeals held that for a filing deadline to be deemed a jurisdictional bar, the traditional tools of statutory construction must also make clear that the legislature intended it to serve this purpose. The D.C. Court of Appeals saw no indication that the D.C. City Council affirmatively sought to curtail OEA's jurisdiction; therefore, it ruled that the 30-day deadline to file appeals at OEA is not jurisdictional. As a result, OEA cannot dismiss a late-filed appeal outright. However, OEA can dismiss the appeal if the Agency seasonably objects to the untimeliness of Employee's filing as a defense, as held in *Brewer v. D.C. Office of Employee Appeals*, 163 A.3d 799 (D.C. 2017).

In *Brewer*, the D.C. Court of Appeals held that as a claims-processing rule, a 30-day deadline is subject to equitable tolling. However, in accordance with the *Mathis* holding, claims-processing rules may be tolled (or relaxed or waived) if equity compels such a result (*See Neill v. District of Columbia Public Employee Relations Bd.,* 93 A.3d 229, 238 (D.C.2014), (explaining that claim-processing rules "may be relaxed or waived"). The Court in *Brewer* reasoned that equitable tolling turns on balancing the fairness to both parties and that equity aids the vigilant. Therefore, where a timing rule should be tolled turns on (1) whether there was unexplained or undue delay and (2) whether tolling would work an injustice to the other party (*See Simpson v. District of Columbia Office of Human Rights,* 597 A.2d 392 (D.C.1991) and *Mathis v. D.C. Housing Authority* 124 A.3d 1089 (D.C. 2015)). Furthermore, the Court held that consideration of the importance of ultimate finality in legal proceedings can also be considered when making a determination on tolling a deadline.

In the instant matter, Employee filed the instant Petition for Appeal thirty-nine (39) days from the effective date of the adverse action, which is nine (9) days overdue. In consideration of the aforementioned D.C. Court of Appeals determinations regarding processing deadlines both in *Sium and Baldwin*, and recent OEA rulings in this regard, I find that this nine (9) day delay was not significant or egregious to amount to any prejudice or injustice upon the other party. As a result, I conclude that Agency's request to dismiss Employee's Petition for Appeal for being untimely is DENIED.

Selection of Forum

Agency also argues that OEA lacks jurisdiction over this appeal because Employee's Union filed a grievance after her termination, and prior to Employee filing the current adverse action. Employee does not dispute this assertion. Employee asserts that her union, WTU, filed a grievance on July 11, 2025, on her behalf, which was rejected on July 14, 2025, for being untimely. Employee contends that the rejection of her grievance left her without a remedy through that avenue, making an appeal with OEA a necessary path to pursue a fair hearing on the merit of the case.

According to the record, the WTU filed a 'Step 1 Stage 3' grievance on Employee's behalf on July 11, 2025, pursuant to the Collective Bargaining Agreement ("CBA") between Employee's Union and DCPS, disputing her termination.[22]

D.C. Official Code (2001) §1-616.52 reads in pertinent part as follows:

> (d) Any system of grievance resolution or review of adverse actions negotiated between the District and a labor organization shall take precedence over the procedures of this subchapter [providing appeal rights to OEA] for employees in a bargaining unit represented by a labor organization.
>
> (e) Matters covered under this subchapter that also fall within the coverage of a negotiated grievance procedure may, in the discretion of the aggrieved employee, be raised either pursuant to Section 1-606.03, or the negotiated grievance procedure, **but not both**. (Emphasis added).
>
> (f) An employee shall be deemed to have exercised their option *(sic)* pursuant to subsection (e) of this section to raise a matter either under the applicable statutory procedures or under the negotiated grievance in writing in accordance with the provision of the negotiated grievance procedure applicable to the parties, **whichever occurs first** (emphasis added).

Additionally, the April 8, 2025, Notice of Termination informed Employee that she could appeal her termination with either OEA or through her Union, but not both.[23] According to the record, Employee was a member of WTU. Employee's termination was effective on June 20, 2025. On July 11, 2025, Employee's Union filed a 'Step 1 Stage 3' grievance disputing her termination. Subsequently, on July 29, 2025, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with OEA. Pursuant to the above-mentioned code, Employee had the option to appeal her termination with either OEA or through her Union, **but not both**. (Emphasis added). By electing to appeal her termination by filing a grievance under the CBA between Agency several days before she filed her Petition for Appeal with OEA, I find that Employee waived her rights to be heard by this Office. Therefore, I conclude that this Office does not have jurisdiction over Employee's appeal.

[22] *See.* Agency's Motion to Dismiss, *supra*, at Agency's Exhibit Two.
[23] *See.* Agency's Motion to Dismiss, *supra*, at Agency's Exhibit One.

Lack of Licensure/At-Will Status

Agency asserts that OEA does not have jurisdiction over Employee because Employee is an "at-will" employee and has no job tenure or protection. Agency explains that Employee did not possess the required OSSE issued license by the March 1, 2025, deadline and at the time of her termination. Employee on the other hand argues that she was a permanent employee and not an "at-will" employee. She contends that her termination for alleged licensure noncompliance was directly linked to the principal's obstruction of her licensure renewal. Employee explains that she was unable to renew her license because she was not assigned to a school following her reinstatement in 2024, therefore, the principal could not file the necessary forms required to renew her license. Employee also argues that DCPS is estopped from terminating her for lack of licensure because its actions are in direct contradiction to the principles of estoppel and the "just cause" standard required for the termination of a permanent public sector employee.

Employee admits that she lacks the required OSSE issued license. However, she contends that Agency is responsible for her failure to obtain the required license and that because she was hired and reinstated without having the required license, Agency is estopped from using this issue as reason for termination. This Office and the District of Columbia Superior Court have consistently held that an employee who fails to meet the agency's licensing or certification requirement becomes an "at-will" employee and therefore has no right to an OEA appeal.[24]

In Gizachew Wubishet v. District of Columbia Public Schools, supra, the employee's provisional teachers license had expired, and he was unable to obtain a permanent teachers license prior to his removal from service. The OEA AJ in this matter found that because "the Employee did not fully complete the certification requirements [of his position] and [failed to] obtain his license by June 30, 2006 … once his provisional license expired, he served solely in an "at will" capacity, subject to Agency's determinations with regard to whether he qualified for continued employment" *Wubishet* was upheld by the Board of the OEA in an Opinion and Order on Petition for Review[25] wherein the OEA Board held that because of his lack of proper licensure, *Wubishet* was in an "at-will" employment status with no attendant appeal rights to the OEA. I find that the current matter is similar to *Wubishet* in that, here, Employee was terminated for her failure to obtain the required OSSE issued license for her position as a teacher by the March 1, 2025 deadline, and she has admitted that she did not possess such license by the effective date of her termination from service. Accordingly, I find that Employee served solely in

[24] *See*. *Gizachew Wubishet v. District of Columbia Public Schools,* OEA Matter No. 1601-0106-06, (March 23, 2007; *Robin Suber v. D.C. Public Schools,* OEA Matter No. 1601-0107-07R10 (January 22, 2010); *Tricia Bowling-Bryant v. D.C. Public Schools*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0090-16 (May 30, 2017); *Michael E. Brown et al v. D.C. Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs*, OEA Matter Nos. 1601-0012-09, 1601-0027-09, 1601-0052-09, 1601-0054-09 (June 26, 2009); *Michael E. Brown et al. v. D.C. Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs,* OEA Matter Nos. 1601-0012-09-1601-0027-09 & 1601-0052-09-1601-0054-09, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (January 26, 2011); *Jennifer Broadwater v. D.C. Public Schools*, OEA Matter Nos. 1601-0099-15 (December 21, 2016); *Linda Ellis, et al. v. D.C. Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs,* 2011 CA 001529 P(MPA), 2011 CA 001533 P(MPA), 2011 CA 001534 P(MPA), 2011 CA 001557 P(MPA), 2011 CA 001560 P(MPA), 2011 CA 001561 P(MPA), 2011 CA 001562 P(MPA), and 2011 CA 001567 P(MPA) (November 28 2011).

[25] *Gizachew Wubishet v. District of Columbia Public Schools*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0106-06, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (June 23, 2009).

an "at-will" capacity, subject to Agency's discretion with regard to whether she qualified for continued employment. The D.C. Official Code § 1-606.03 states that an "at-will" employee of the District of Columbia Government, serves "at the pleasure of the appointment authority and can be terminated by the employee at any time, with or without cause." It is well established that in the District of Columbia, an employer may discharge an "at-will" employee "at any time and for any reason, or for no reason at all".[26] As an "at will" employee, Employee did not have any job tenure or protection.[27] Further, as an "at will" employee, Employee has no appeal rights with this Office.[28]

As previously noted, this Office has consistently held that it lacks jurisdiction to hear appeals of a terminated employee who failed to meet mandatory licensing or certification requirements, reasoning that the employee was "at-will" because he or she lacked mandatory qualifications. Although an employee's position description may not designate them as holding "at will" status, since permanent status can only be achieved if requirements are met, an employee who lacks the requirements but is given a stated period of time to complete them, becomes "at-will", if the employee fails to complete the requirements by the deadline. This Office has ruled that by failing to meet the licensure requirements, such employees have no vested right in the positions. Therefore, I find that because Employee failed to meet the licensure requirement by the March 1, 2025, deadline, she was an "at-will" employee at the time of her termination, as such, OEA does not have jurisdiction over this matter.

Employee has the burden of proof on issues of jurisdiction, pursuant to OEA Rule 631.2. Employee must meet this burden by a "preponderance of the evidence" which is defined in OEA Rule 631.1, *id*, as that "degree of relevant evidence, which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find a contested fact more probably true than untrue." Employee filed a grievance with her union prior to filing an appeal with OEA. Additionally, Employee admitted that she did not have the required OSSE issued license at the time she was terminated, making her an "at-will" employee with no appeal rights to OEA. Based on the foregoing, I conclude that Employee did not meet the required burden of proof, and that this matter must be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Consequently, I am unable to address the factual merits, if any, of this matter.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Petition for Appeal is **DISMISSED** for lack of jurisdiction and Agency's Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Monica N. Dohnji
MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge

[26] *Adams v. George W. Cochran & Co.,* 597 A.2d 28, 30 (D.C. 1991). *See also Bowie v. Gonzalez*, 433 F.Supp.2d 24 (DCDC 2006).
[27] *See.* D.C. Official Code § 1-609.05 (2001).
[28] *Davis v. Lambert,* MPA No. 17-89, 119 DWLR 204 (February 13, 1991).

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the District of Columbia Register and the Office of Employee Appeals' website. Parties should promptly notify the Office Manager of any formal errors so that this Office can correct them before publishing the decision. This notice is not intended to provide an opportunity for a substantive challenge to the decision.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
EMPLOYEE[1],	)	
Employee	)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0058-25
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: February 24, 2026
	)	
D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS,	)	Michelle R. Harris, Esq.
Agency	)	Senior Administrative Judge
	)	

Employee, *Pro Se*
Lynette Collins, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On July 30, 2025, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals ("OEA" or "Office") contesting the District of Columbia Public Schools' ("Agency" or "DCPS") decision to terminate her from her position as a Teacher, effective June 20, 2025. On July 30, 2025, OEA issued a Request for Agency Answer to Petition. On August 12, 2025, Agency filed its Motion to Dismiss stating that OEA lacked jurisdiction over this matter because Employee's Petition for Appeal with OEA was untimely filed and that Employee was an at-will employee at the time of her termination due to a failure to sustain her required licensure. This matter was assigned to the undersigned on August 13, 2025. On August 20, 2025, I issued an Order Convening a Prehearing Conference for September 24, 2025. Prehearing Statements were due by or before September 17, 2025. Agency filed its Prehearing Statement as required. Both parties appeared for the Prehearing Conference as required. Because Agency raised a jurisdiction issue, the parties were required to submit briefs addressing whether OEA has jurisdiction over this matter. I issued a Post Prehearing Conference Order on September 25, 2025, requiring Employee to submit her brief by or before October 20, 2025, and Agency's reply was due by or before November 7, 2025.

Employee submitted her brief by the required deadline. Agency's response was not received by the required deadline. However, the undersigned determined that Agency's copy of the September 25, 2025, Order was returned as undeliverable to OEA. Accordingly, on

[1] Employee's name was removed from this decision for the purposes of publication on the Office of Employee Appeals' website.

November 13, 2025, I issued an Order requiring Agency to submit its response by or before November 24, 2024. Agency complied with this Order. Upon review of the record and the submissions from the parties, the undersigned determined that Agency had not provided copies of the SF-50s as required by the September 25, 2025 Order. Accordingly, on December 11, 2025, I issued an Order requiring Agency to supplement the record and provided all the applicable SF-50s. Agency's response to this Order was due by or before December 29, 2025. Agency complied with this Order. Upon consideration of the record, I determined that an Evidentiary Hearing in this matter was not warranted. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Office, pursuant to D.C. Code, § 1-606.03 (2001), has not been established.

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

BURDEN OF PROOF

OEA Rule § 631.1, 6-B District of Columbia Municipal Regulations ("DCMR") Ch. 600, et seq (December 27, 2021) states:

> The burden of proof for material issues of fact shall be by a preponderance of the evidence. "Preponderance of the evidence" shall mean:
>
> > that degree of relevant evidence that a reasonable person, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find that a contested fact is more likely to be true than untrue.[2]

OEA Rule § 631.2 *id.* states:

> For appeals filed under § 604.1, the employee shall have the burden of proof as to issues of jurisdiction, including timeliness of filing. The agency shall have the burden of proof as to all other issues.

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Employee's Position

Employee asserts in her Petition for Appeal that she was appealing her termination due to the recent change in her license being "inactive."[3] Employee avers that in March 2025, she received an email indicating that she needed to renew her "DC license by June 23, 2025." She asserts that she met several of the requirements for testing within a very tight timeline and also

[2] OEA Rule § 699.1.
[3] Employee's Petition for Appeal at Attachment "Information for Appeal." (July 30, 2025).

successfully renewed her Principal's License. Employee cited that she understands the importance of maintaining a license, but notes that she was currently licensed in New Jersey and that "DC recognizes reciprocity for valid out-of-states licenses."[4] Employee argued that given her seven (7) years of service to DCPS and her additional 15 years of experience, she believed that her situation merited reconsideration.

Employee also avers that OEA should retain jurisdiction over this matter because her continuing work as a substitute teacher "falls within the Educational Service of the District government and demonstrates a relationship sufficient to invoke OEA jurisdiction."[5] Employee asserts that as of June 24 2025, at the request of the Principal of Payne Elementary, she reported for work and provided instruction under the supervision of the school's administrative team. As a result, Employee contends that because "her appointment and ongoing substitute service reflect an active employment relationship with DCPS, the OEA has subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate this appeal." Employee further asserts that "[d]ismissal for lack of jurisdiction would be inconsistent with OEA precedent and with the statutory purpose of ensuring fair review of District government employment disputes."[6] As such, Employee avers that OEA should retain jurisdiction and deny Agency's Motion to Dismiss and address the merits of her appeal.

Agency's Position

Agency states in its Motion to Dismiss that Employee was terminated for failing to obtain an active Office of the State Superintendent of Education ("OSSE") issued license by March 1, 2025.[7] Agency also asserts that Employee's Petition for Appeal is untimely and must be dismissed. Agency explains that Employee was terminated effective June 20, 2025, and she filed her appeal with OEA on July 30, 2025, "beyond the thirty-day period established for appealing the Agency's decision."[8]

Additionally, Agency asserts that OEA does not have jurisdiction over Employee because Employee is an "at-will" employee given the failure to maintain her license and as such, has no job tenure or protection. Agency contends that Employee failed to obtain her license by March 1, 2025, as required for her position. Agency further avers that this Office "has long maintained that in addition to lacking jurisdiction to hear appeals of a terminated employee who failed to meet mandatory licensing or certification requirements, reasoning that the employe was at-will because he or she lacked mandatory qualifications."[9] Agency further explains that this Office "has determined it lacks jurisdiction to hear challenges of teachers… and other District of Columbia employees who held positions that required licenses or certifications, and who lacked the licenses or certifications at the time of termination, concluding that these individuals, because they did not meet the requirements, had no vested rights in the position." As such, Agency argues that Employee's appeal should be dismissed.[10]

Agency asserts that on April 4, 2025, Employee was duly notified that she was being terminated from service due to the failure to obtain an active OSSE-issued license by March 1,

[4] *Id.*
[5] Employee's Brief on Jurisdiction (October 20, 2025).
[6] *Id.*
[7] Agency's Motion to Dismiss (August 12, 2025). *See also*. Agency's Prehearing Statement (September 15, 2025).
[8] Agency's Motion to Dismiss (August 12, 2025).
[9] *Id.*
[10] *Id*.

2025.[11] Agency avers that Employee's termination was effective June 20, 2025. Agency cites that on or around September 7, 2025, Employee "was hired as substitute teacher."[12] Agency also notes that on or around October 1, 2025, Employee obtained the requisite OSSE certification and "in response was rehired on or about October 24, 2025." Agency avers that "at the time Employee was terminated she was not licensed to teach."[13]

ANALYSIS[14]

The threshold issue in this matter is one of jurisdiction. This Office's jurisdiction is conferred upon it by law and was initially established by the District of Columbia Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 ("CMPA"), D.C. Official Code §1-601-01, *et seq.* (2001). It was amended by the Omnibus Personnel Reform Amendment Act of 1998 ("OPRAA"), D.C. Law 12-124, which took effect on October 21, 1998. Both the CMPA and OPRAA confer jurisdiction on this Office to hear appeals, with some exceptions. According to 6-B of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulation ("DCMR") § 604.1[15], this Office has jurisdiction in matters involving District government employees appealing a final agency decision affecting:

(a) A performance rating which results in removal of the employee;
(b) An adverse action for cause which results in removal;
(c) A reduction in grade;
(d) A suspension for ten (10) days or more (Emphasis added);
(e) A reduction-in-force; or
(f) A placement on enforced leave for ten (10) days or more.

This Office has no authority to review issues beyond its jurisdiction.[16] Therefore, issues regarding jurisdiction may be raised at any time during the proceeding.[17]

Untimely Filing of Petition for Appeal

Agency asserts that Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed as untimely because she filed her appeal with OEA more than thirty (30) days from the effective date of her termination. A "[d]istrict government employee shall initiate an appeal by filing a petition for appeal with the OEA. The petition for appeal must be filed within *thirty (30) calendar days of*

[11] Agency's Sur-Reply (November 24, 2025).
[12] *Id*.
[13] *Id.*
[14] Although I may not discuss every aspect of the evidence in the analysis of this case, I have carefully considered the entire record. *See Antelope Coal Co./Rio Tino Energy America v. Goodin*, 743 F.3d 1331, 1350 (10th Cir. 2014) (citing *Clifton v. Chater*, 79 F.3d 1007, 1009-10 (10th Cir. 1996)) ("The record must demonstrate that the ALJ considered all of the evidence, but an ALJ is not required to discuss every piece of evidence").
[15] *See also*, Chapter 6, §604.1 of the District Personnel Manual ("DPM") and OEA Rules.
[16] *See. Banks v. District of Columbia Public Schools*, OEA Matter No. 1602-0030-90, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (September 30, 1992).
[17] *See. Brown v. District of Columbia Public Schools*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0027-87, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (July 29, 1993); *Jordan v. Department of Human Services*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0110-90, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (January 22, 1993); *Maradi v. District of Columbia Gen. Hosp.*, OEA Matter No. J-0371-94, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (July 7, 1995).

the effective date of the action being appealed."[18] (Emphasis added). Here, Employee was terminated effective June 20, 2025, and she filed her Petition for Appeal with OEA on July 30, 2025. In review, the undersigned finds that the timeframe between June 20, 2025, to July 30, 2025, is more than thirty (30) days. However, the D.C. Court of Appeals in *Yordanos Sium v. Office of State Superintendent of Education*, 218 A.3d 228 (D.C. 2019), held that the presumption regarding filing deadlines is that they are not jurisdictional but waivable claims-processing rules. In support of this position, the Court relied heavily on the ruling in *Mathis v. D.C. Housing Authority* 124 A.3d 1089 (D.C. 2015) that filing deadlines in particular are quintessential claim-processing rules, which seek only to promote the orderly progress of litigation, and generally do not have jurisdictional force. (citing *Wong,* 135 S.Ct. at 1632 (quoting *Henderson, 562 U.S.* at 435, 131 S.Ct. 1197). In *Sium*, the Court reasoned that even procedural rules codified in statutes are non-jurisdictional in character. It found that if a deadline is contained in a statute **and** its language is mandatory, it *may* be jurisdictional (emphasis added). The Court held that D.C. Code § 1-606.03(a), which provides that any appeal shall be filed within 30 days of the effective date of the appealed action, meets both requirements. However, it opined that more is required.

Relying on *Mathis*, the D.C. Court of Appeals held that for a filing deadline to be deemed a jurisdictional bar, the traditional tools of statutory construction must also make clear that the legislature intended it to serve this purpose. The D.C. Court of Appeals saw no indication that the D.C. City Council affirmatively sought to curtail OEA's jurisdiction; therefore, it ruled that the 30-day deadline to file appeals at OEA is not jurisdictional. As a result, OEA cannot dismiss a late-filed appeal outright. However, OEA can dismiss the appeal if the Agency seasonably objects to the untimeliness of Employee's filing as a defense, as held in *Brewer v. D.C. Office of Employee Appeals*, 163 A.3d 799 (D.C. 2017).

In *Brewer*, the D.C. Court of Appeals held that as a claims-processing rule, a 30-day deadline is subject to equitable tolling. However, in accordance with the *Mathis* holding, claims-processing rules may be tolled (or relaxed or waived) if equity compels such a result (*See Neill v. District of Columbia Public Employee Relations Bd.,* 93 A.3d 229, 238 (D.C.2014), (explaining that claim-processing rules "may be relaxed or waived"). The Court in *Brewer* reasoned that equitable tolling turns on balancing the fairness to both parties and that equity aids the vigilant. Therefore, where a timing rule should be tolled turns on (1) whether there was unexplained or undue delay and (2) whether tolling would work an injustice to the other party (*See Simpson v. District of Columbia Office of Human Rights,* 597 A.2d 392 (D.C.1991) and *Mathis v. D.C. Housing Authority* 124 A.3d 1089 (D.C. 2015)). Furthermore, the Court held that consideration of the importance of ultimate finality in legal proceedings can also be considered when making a determination on tolling a deadline.

In the instant matter, Employee filed the instant Petition for Appeal forty (40) days from the effective date of the adverse action, which is ten (10) days past due. In consideration of the aforementioned D.C. Court of Appeals determinations regarding processing deadlines both in *Sium and Baldwin*, and recent OEA rulings in this regard, I find that this ten (10) delay was not significant or egregious to amount to any prejudice or injustice upon the other party. As a result,

[18] D.C. Code §1-606.03.

I conclude that Agency's request to dismiss Employee's Petition for Appeal for being untimely is DENIED.

Lack of Licensure/At-Will Status

Agency asserts that OEA does not have jurisdiction over Employee because Employee is an 'at-will' employee and has no job tenure or protection. Agency avers that Employee did not possess the required OSSE-issued license by the March 1, 2025, deadline and at the time of her termination. Employee does not deny that she lacked the required licensures. Instead, Employee avers that DC recognizes reciprocity between her active New Jersey license and also that she was taking steps to acquire the required certification. Further, Employee asserts that because she was a substitute teacher following her separation, this is representative of an employment relationship for which OEA should exercise jurisdiction.

This Office, pursuant to the rulings of the District of Columbia Superior Court, has consistently held that an employee who fails to meet the agency's licensing or certification requirement becomes an 'at-will' employee and therefore has no right to an OEA appeal.[19] *In Gizachew Wubishet v. District of Columbia Public Schools,* the employee's provisional teachers license had expired, and he was unable to obtain a permanent teachers license prior to his removal from service. The OEA AJ in this matter found that because "the Employee did not fully complete the certification requirements [of his position] and [failed to] obtain his license by June 30, 2006 … once his provisional license expired, he served solely in an "at will" capacity, subject to Agency's determinations with regard to whether he qualified for continued employment." *Wubishet* was upheld by the Board of the OEA in an Opinion and Order on Petition for Review[20] wherein the OEA Board held that because of his lack of proper licensure, *Wubishet* was in an "at-will" employment status with no attendant appeal rights to the OEA.

In the instant matter, I find that similar to *Wubishet*, Employee was terminated for her failure to obtain the required OSSE-issued license for her position as a teacher by the March 1, 2025 deadline. Further, Employee has not denied that she failed to obtain the OSSE-issued license by the effective date of her termination from service. As a result, I find that Employee served solely in an "at-will" capacity, subject to Agency's discretion with regard to whether she qualified for continued employment. Moreover, I also find that Employee's substitute teaching status after the termination is irrelevant to OEA's jurisdiction over this appeal. D.C. Code § 1-606.03 states that an "at-will" employee of the District of Columbia Government, serves "at the pleasure of the appointment authority and can be terminated by the employee at any time, with or without cause." It is well established that in the District of Columbia, an employer may discharge

[19] *See*. *Gizachew Wubishet v. District of Columbia Public Schools,* OEA Matter No. 1601-0106-06, (March 23, 2007; *Robin Suber v. D.C. Public Schools,* OEA Matter No. 1601-0107-07R10 (January 22, 2010); *Tricia Bowling-Bryant v. D.C. Public Schools*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0090-16 (May 30, 2017); *Michael E. Brown et al v. D.C. Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs*, OEA Matter Nos. 1601-0012-09, 1601-0027-09, 1601-0052-09, 1601-0054-09 (June 26, 2009); *Michael E. Brown et al. v. D.C. Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs,* OEA Matter Nos. 1601-0012-09-1601-0027-09 & 1601-0052-09-1601-0054-09, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (January 26, 2011); *Jennifer Broadwater v. D.C. Public Schools*, OEA Matter Nos. 1601-0099-15 (December 21, 2016); *Linda Ellis, et al. v. D.C. Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs,* 2011 CA 001529 P(MPA), 2011 CA 001533 P(MPA), 2011 CA 001534 P(MPA), 2011 CA 001557 P(MPA), 2011 CA 001560 P(MPA), 2011 CA 001561 P(MPA), 2011 CA 001562 P(MPA), and 2011 CA 001567 P(MPA) (November 28 2011).

[20] *Gizachew Wubishet v. District of Columbia Public Schools*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0106-06, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (June 23, 2009).

an "at-will" employee "at any time and for any reason, or for no reason at all".[21] As an "at will" employee, Employee did not have any job tenure or protection.[22] OEA has consistently held that "at will" employees have no appeal rights to this Office.[23]

As previously noted, this Office has consistently held that it lacks jurisdiction to hear appeals of a terminated employee who failed to meet mandatory licensing or certification requirements, reasoning that the employee was "at-will" because he or she lacked mandatory qualifications. Although an employee's position description may not designate them as holding "at will" status, since permanent status can only be achieved if requirements are met, an employee who lacks the requirements but is given a stated period of time to complete them, becomes "at-will", if the employee fails to complete the requirements by the deadline. This Office has ruled that by failing to meet the licensure requirements, such employees have no vested right in the positions. Therefore, I find that because Employee failed to meet the licensure requirement by the March 1, 2025, deadline, she was an "at-will" employee at the time of her termination, as such, OEA does not have jurisdiction over this matter.

Employee has the burden of proof on issues of jurisdiction, pursuant to OEA Rule 631.2. Employee must meet this burden by a "preponderance of the evidence" which is defined in OEA Rule 631.1, *id*, as that "degree of relevant evidence, which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find a contested fact more probably true than untrue." Based on the aforementioned, I find that Employee did not meet the required burden of proof, and that this matter must be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Consequently, I am unable to address the factual merits, if any, of this matter.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Petition for Appeal is **DISMISSED** for lack of jurisdiction and Agency's Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Michelle R. Harris
Michelle R. Harris, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge

[21] *Adams v. George W. Cochran & Co.,* 597 A.2d 28, 30 (D.C. 1991). *See also Bowie v. Gonzalez*, 433 F.Supp.2d 24 (DCDC 2006).
[22] *See.* D.C. Code § 1-609.05 (2001).
[23] *Employee v DCPS,* OEA Matter No. 1601-0057-25 (February 2, 2026).

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the *District of Columbia Register* and the Office of Employee Appeals' website. Parties should promptly notify the Office Manager of any formal errors so that this Office can correct them before publishing the decision. This notice is not intended to provide an opportunity for a substantive challenge to the decision.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
EMPLOYEE[1],	)	
Employee	)	OEA Matter No. J-0018-26
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: February 24, 2026
	)	
OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION,	)	Michelle R. Harris, Esq.
Agency	)	Senior Administrative Judge
	)	

Employee, *Pro Se*
Danielle Ragofsky, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On December 11, 2025, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the D.C. Office of Employee Appeals ("Office" or "OEA") contesting the Office of the State Superintendent of Education's ("Agency" or "OSSE") decision to suspend him from service for five (5) days. On December 12, 2025, OEA sent a letter requesting Agency submit its Answer to Employee's Petition for Appeal. Agency filed its Answer on January 13, 2026.[2] Agency cited therein that OEA lacked jurisdiction over this matter since Employee's suspension was less than 10 (ten) days. This matter was assigned to the undersigned Senior Administrative Judge on January 13, 2026. On January 15, 2026, I issued an Order requiring the parties to address the jurisdiction issue raised by Agency in its Answer. Employee's brief was due by or before February 2, 2026, and Agency's response was due by or before February 17, 2026.

[1] Employee's name was removed from this decision for the purposes of publication on the Office of Employee Appeals' website.

[2] On December 16, 2025, Agency filed a redacted version of the Petition for Appeal. Agency asserted therein that Employee had included students' Personal Identifying Information ("PII") and that it had redacted it from the previously submitted documents. Employee did not make any arguments against Agency's actions in this regard. Upon review, the undersigned determined that Employee's Petition had indeed included students' PII and that Agency's submission did not change the substantive matter of the Petition but only redacted the necessary information to ensure the students' information was appropriately protected. Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the attachments to Employee's Petition for Appeal which included the students' PII shall be stricken from the record.

On February 2, 2026, Employee emailed the undersigned citing that he had learned from Agency's representative that he had a brief due by February 2, 2026. He noted that he had not received the January 15, 2026 Order regarding the submission of his brief. I responded via email and provided a courtesy copy of the January 15, 2026 Order that same day. Employee responded via email and confirmed his receipt of the courtesy copy. Further, Employee asserted that in review, he did "not have a rebuttal argument for jurisdiction and now see[s] that OEA would not have jurisdiction over the matter based on the circumstances." Employee also inquired as to how to withdraw his appeal. The undersigned advised that he should submit a written statement indicating his wish to withdraw his Petition for Appeal. On February 9, 2026, Agency filed its Brief regarding jurisdiction. Agency reiterated that this Office lacks jurisdiction over Employee's five-day (5) suspension and also referenced Employee's email regarding his lack of a rebuttal argument. As of the date of this initial decision, Employee has not submitted any additional filings. I have decided that an Evidentiary Hearing is not required. The record is now closed.

ISSUE

Whether Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

BURDEN OF PROOF

OEA Rule § 631.1, 6-B District of Columbia Municipal Regulations ("DCMR") Ch. 600, et seq (December 27, 2021) states:

> The burden of proof for material issues of fact shall be by a preponderance of the evidence. "Preponderance of the evidence" shall mean:
>
> > the degree of relevant evidence that a reasonable person, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find that a contested fact is more likely to be true than untrue.[3]

OEA Rule § 631.2 *id.* states:

For appeals filed under § 604.1, the employee shall have the burden of proof as to issues of jurisdiction, including timeliness of filing. The agency shall have the burden of proof as to all other issues. (Emphasis added).

JURISDICTION

For the reasons that will be outlined below, the jurisdiction of this Office has not been established in this matter.

[3] OEA Rule § 699.1.

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Employee works at Agency as a Management Analyst and EEO Counselor. On December 11, 2025, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal contesting Agency's action for suspending him from service for five (5) days.[4]

This Office's jurisdiction is conferred upon it by law, and was initially established by the District of Columbia Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 ("CMPA"), D.C. Official Code §1-601-01, *et seq.* (2001). It was amended by the Omnibus Personnel Reform Amendment Act of 1998 ("OPRAA"), D.C. Law 12-124, which took effect on October 21, 1998. Both the CMPA and OPRAA confer jurisdiction on this Office to hear appeals, with some exceptions. According to 6-B of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulation ("DCMR") § 604.1[5], this Office has jurisdiction in matters involving District government employees appealing a final agency decision affecting:

(a) A performance rating resulting in removal;
(b) An adverse action for cause that results in removal, reduction in grade, or *suspension for 10 days or more*; or
(c) A reduction-in-force; or
(d) A placement on enforced leave for ten (10) days or more. (Emphasis Added)

OEA Rule § 631.2., 6-B DCMR Ch. 600 (December 27, 2021), states that "[t]he employee shall have the burden of proof as to issues of jurisdiction..." Pursuant to 631.1, the burden of proof is by a preponderance of the evidence which is defined as "[t]hat degree of relevant evidence which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find a contested fact more probably true than untrue." This Office has no authority to review issues beyond its jurisdiction. Therefore, issues regarding jurisdiction may be raised at any time during the course of the proceeding.

In the instant matter, Agency asserts that OEA lacks jurisdiction over this matter because the suspension levied against Employee did not result in a suspension of ten (10) days or more since Employee was only suspended for five days (5) days.[6] Employee does not dispute this Office's jurisdiction in this matter nor deny that he was suspended for five (5) days. In an email dated February 2, 2026, Employee noted therein that he did "not have a rebuttal argument for jurisdiction and now see[s] that OEA would not have jurisdiction over the matter based on the circumstances."[7]

The jurisdiction of this Office is promulgated by the D.C. Code §1-606.03(a), which explicitly sets the limits of the jurisdiction of this Office to adverse actions that result in a suspension of ten (10) days or more. This Office has consistently held that it lacks jurisdiction

[4] The suspension was sustained in an email dated December 11, 2025. See. Employee's Petition for Appeal.
[5] *See also.* Chapter 6, §604.1 of the District Personnel Manual ("DPM").
[6] Agency's Answer (January 13, 2026). *See also*. Agency's Brief Regarding Jurisdiction (February 9, 2026).
[7] Employee's Email to the Undersigned (February 2, 2026).

over suspensions that result in less than ten (10) days.[8] In *Jordan v. D.C. Metropolitan Police Department*[9], the OEA Board concluded that suspensions which fall short of the ten (10) day requirement found in the D.C. Official Code and OEA Rules are not appealable to this Office for adjudication. In the instant matter, Employee was suspended for only five (5) days. Consequently, I find that Employee has not been subject to a suspension that resulted in ten (10) days or more. Accordingly, I further find that OEA lacks the jurisdictional authority to adjudicate this appeal.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that Employee's Petition for Appeal is **DISMISSED** for lack of jurisdiction.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Michelle R. Harris
Michelle R. Harris, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge

[8] *Keith Slaughter v. D.C. Metropolitan Police Department*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0001-14 (September 11, 2015). *See also. Calligaro v. Metropolitan Police Department*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0019-14 (May 8, 2015); *Brian Jordan v. D.C. Metropolitan Police Department*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0003-06 *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (July 23, 2008).
[9] *Brian Jordan v. D.C. Metropolitan Police Department*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0003-06 *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (July 23, 2008).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

NOTICE OF INCREASE TO THE BATTERY STEWARDSHIP ORGANIZATION ADMINISTRATIVE FEE

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to 20 DCMR § 3907, the Department of Energy and Environment (DOEE), located at 1200 First Street NE, 5th Floor, Washington, DC, intends to adjust the annual administrative fee for a Battery Stewardship Organization (BSO) implementing an approved battery stewardship plan. D.C. Official Code § 8-771.10(b)(1) requires the Mayor to charge an annual administrative fee to BSOs implementing an approved battery stewardship plan. This authority was delegated to DOEE in Mayor's Order 2022-028. 20 DCMR § 3907.2 requires DOEE to annually adjust the BSO administrative fee for inflation based on the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. To perform this adjustment, DOEE is required to increase the fee by the percentage, if any, by which the CPI-U for February of the calendar year exceeds the CPI-U for February of the previous calendar year.

The annual administrative BSO fee in 2025 was $42,435.84. The CPI-U for February 2026 exceeded the CPI-U for February 2025 by 2.4%, so the 2026 annual administrative BSO fee due from DC's BSO on May 1, 2026, is $43,454.30.

The contact person for DOEE's battery stewardship program is Rafiq Jennings, Rafiq.Jennings@dc.gov.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

PUBLIC NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to 20 DCMR § 210, the Air Quality Division (AQD) of the Department of Energy and Environment (DDOE), located at 1200 First Street NE, 5th Floor, Washington DC, is proposing to issue an air quality permit (No. 7421) to CBNA Halmar Clean Rivers JV, to construct and operate one (1) 430 kWe diesel-fired non-emergency generator set, powered by a 700 hp diesel-fired Volvo Penta engine, to be located at 1601 Ohio Drive SW, Washington, DC 20024. The contact person for the facility is Anouar Azizi, Deputy Construction Manager at a.azizi@cbna-construction.us or by telephone (401) 919-8547.

The proposed emission limits are as follows:

a. Emissions from this generator shall not exceed those in the following table as tested pursuant to the applicable test methods in 40 CFR 1039, Subpart F [40 CFR 60.4200(a)(1)(i), 40 CFR 60.4200(a)(2)(i), 40 CFR 60.4201(a), 40 CFR 60.4204(b), 40 CFR 1039.101(a), (b), (d), and (e)]:

	Pollutant Emission Limits (g/kW-hr)			
Emission Standard Type	NOx	CO	NMHC	PM
Transient and Steady State	0.40	3.5	0.19	0.03†
Not-to-Exceed	0.60	4.4	0.29	0.05

† A family emission limit (FEL) has been granted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for this unit pursuant to 40 CFR 1039.101(d) as noted on the Certificate of Conformity for this engine.

b. Visible emissions shall not be emitted into the outdoor atmosphere from the engine, except that discharges shall be permitted for two (2) minutes during any start-up, cleaning, adjustment of combustion or operational controls, or regeneration of emissions control equipment; provided, that such discharges shall not exceed twenty-seven percent (27%) opacity (unaveraged). [20 DCMR 606.1 and 606.2(d)]

c. An emission into the atmosphere of odorous or other air pollutants from any source in any quantity and of any characteristic, and duration which is, or is likely to be injurious to the public health or welfare, or which interferes with the reasonable enjoyment of life or property is prohibited. [20 DCMR 903.1]

Violation of the requirements of this condition that occur as a result of unavoidable malfunction, despite the conscientious employment of control practices, shall be an affirmative defense for which the owner or operator shall bear the burden of proof. A malfunction shall not be considered unavoidable if the owner or operator could have taken, but did not take, appropriate steps to eliminate the malfunction within a reasonable time, as determined by the Department. [20 DCMR 903.13(b)]

This condition is District enforceable only.

d. The Permittee shall comply with the requirements for crankcase emissions, adjustable parameters, prohibited controls, and defeat devices specified in 40 CFR 1039.115. [40 CFR 60.4201(a), 40 CFR 60.4204(b)]

The estimated maximum potential emissions from the generator set are as follows:

Pollutant	Potential Emissions (tons per year)
Total Particulate Matter (PM Total)	0.04
Oxides of Sulfur (SO_x)	0.04
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x)	0.81
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	0.03
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	0.25

The permit application and supporting documentation, along with the draft permit are available for public inspection at AQD and copies may be made available between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. Monday through Friday. Interested parties wishing to view these documents should provide their names, addresses, telephone numbers and affiliation, if any, to Stephen S. Ours at (202) 498-8143 or stephen.ours@dc.gov. Copies of the draft permit and related technical support memorandum are also available at: https://doee.dc.gov/service/public-notices-hearings.

Interested persons may submit written comments or may request a hearing on this subject within 30 days of publication of this notice. The written comments must also include the person's name, telephone number, affiliation, if any, mailing address and a statement outlining the air quality issues in dispute and any facts underscoring those air quality issues. All relevant comments will be considered before taking final action on the permit application.

Comments on the proposed permit and any request for a public hearing should be addressed to:

Stephen S. Ours
Chief, Permitting Branch
Air Quality Division
Department of Energy and Environment
1200 First Street NE, 5th Floor
Washington DC 20002
stephen.ours@dc.gov

No comments or hearing requests submitted after May 4, 2026 will be accepted.

For more information, please contact Stephen S. Ours at (202) 498-8143 or stephen.ours@dc.gov.

GLOBAL CITIZENS PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Facility Cleaning & Maintenance Services

Global Citizens Public Charter School ("Global Citizens") is requesting Facility Cleaning & Maintenance Services for the 2026-2027 school year, with the option to extend for up to seven (7) option years post this school year.

To retrieve a full copy of the Request for Proposal (RFP), please email Sean Flora (Chief of Staff) at sflora@globalcitizensschool.org. All proposal submissions are due by 5:00 pm on Friday, April 17, 2026, via email to Sean Flora (sflora@globalcitizensschool.org) with a copy to: Natalie Smith, Ph.D. (natalie@globalcitizensschool.org)

Questions and Site Visit coordination regarding this RFP should be requested (via email) to Sean Flora (sflora@globalcitizensschool.org).

DC DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Community Health Administration

NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY (NOFA)

FO# CHA-PWH-4.17.26

Pharmacy Wellness Hub: Diabetes Prevention, Management and Self Measured Blood Pressure (SMBP) Programs

The District of Columbia, Department of Health (DC Health) is requesting proposals from qualified applicants to provide services in the program and service areas described in this Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA). This announcement is to provide public notice of DC Health's intent to make funds available for the purpose described herein. The applicable Request for Applications (RFA) will be released under a separate announcement with guidelines for submitting the application, review criteria and DC Health terms and conditions for applying for and receiving funding.

Funding Opportunity Title:	Pharmacy Wellness Hub: Diabetes Prevention, Management and Self Measured Blood Pressure (SMBP) Programs
Funding Opportunity Number:	CHA-PWH-4.17.26
DC Health Administrative Unit:	Chronic Disease Division
DC Health Program Bureau	Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Bureau
Funding Opportunity Contact:	Latrice Hughes, Public Health Analyst dccancer.chronic@dc.gov
Funding Opportunity Description:	This funding opportunity supports pharmacies who are implementing and evaluating evidence-based and evidence-informed strategies to prevent and manage diabetes and cardiovascular disease (CVD) in the District of Columbia. Specific emphasis is placed on the prevention and control of hypertension and diabetes.
Eligible Applicants	Non-profit and for-profit pharmacies located in the District of Columbia serving patients in priority wards 5, 7, and 8
Anticipated # of Awards:	3
Anticipated Amount Available:	$75,000
Annual Floor Award Amount:	$15,000
Annual Ceiling Award Amount:	$75,000

Legislative Authorization	Section 30l(a) of the Public Health Service Act [42] U.S.C. Section 241(a) 93.426
Associated CFDA#	93.426
Associated Federal Award ID#	NU58DP007589; NU58DP007348
Cost Sharing/Match Required?	No
RFA Release Date:	April 17, 2026
Letter of Intent Due date:	Not applicable
Application Deadline Date:	May 19, 2026
Application Deadline Time:	3:00 p.m.
Links to Additional Information about this Funding Opportunity	DC Grants Clearinghouse https://communityaffairs.dc.gov/content/community-grant-program#4 DC Health EGMS https://egrantsdchealth.my.site.com/sitesigninpage

Notes:

1. DC Health reserves the right to issue addenda and/or amendments subsequent to the issuance of the NOFA or RFA, or to rescind the NOFA or RFA.
2. Awards are contingent upon the availability of funds.
3. Individuals are not eligible for DC Health grant funding.
4. Applicants must have a Tax ID#, and be registered in the federal Systems for Award Management (SAM) with an active UEI# to be registered in DC Health's Enterprise Grants Management System.

LEARN DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Construction Manager at Risk

LEARN DC Public Charter School, located in Washington DC, is requesting an RFP to procure a fee-based Construction manager at risk to provide construction and post-construction services (the "services") for a new campus for LEARN DC Public Charter School ("LEARN"). LEARN intends to build a permanent elementary and middle school facility of up to 50,000 sf, located on leased land at 100 Duncan Ave SW, Washington, DC 20032, and within the Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling ("JBAB") installation. LEARN currently leases 5.7 acres from JBAB and is operating out of +/-18 modular units. LEARN has engaged Level Field Partners ("LFP") to provide pre-development real estate advisory services and Studio27 Architecture to provide design services, and a copy of the conceptual design is attached. As part of this scope, LFP has led the RFP process for design and is now coordinating the selection process for pre-construction services. The project timeline is for the design to continue through the end of the year, with construction slated to start in Q1 of 2027.

The RFP will be distributed to construction specialists with experience in providing cost estimation, general contracting, and construction management services, with a preference for firms with experience building public charter schools. It is the intention of LEARN to use the AIA's Contract form AIA A133-2019, Construction Manager-At Risk delivery method.

The full RFP can be found under the "RFP" section at Learncharter.org or requested via email by contacting Level Field Partners at anna@levelfieldpartners.com and jose@levelfieldpartners.com. Proposals will be accepted until **5:00pm EDT on Friday, April 17th, 2026**. Submissions should be sent to anna@levelfieldpartners.com and Jose@levelfieldpartners.com.

LEARN DC PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Owners Representation

LEARN DC Public Charter School, located in Washington DC, is requesting an RFP for Owners Representation Services (the "services") for a new campus for LEARN DC Public Charter School ("LEARN"). LEARN intends to build a permanent elementary and middle school facility of up to 50,000 sf, located on leased land at 100 Duncan Ave SW, Washington, DC 20032 and within the Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling ("JBAB") installation. LEARN currently leases 5.7 acres from JBAB and is operating out of +/-18 modular units. The schools is expected to be open for the 2028-2029 school year LEARN has engaged several parts of the project team listed below already and is now seeking an Owners Representative to guide and manage the project to completion.

Studio Twenty Seven Architecture has been engaged and is developing plans, a copy of the current set is available Here.

This RFP will be publicly available and distributed to established individuals and firms with experience in providing overall project management from conceptual design to turnover and occupancy, with a preference for firms with experience building public charter schools. Proposals will be evaluated by LEARN's leadership and its representatives.

The full RFP can be found under the "RFP" section at Learncharter.org or requested via email by contacting Kastenholz Construction Services, LLC at jim@thservices.com. Proposals will be accepted until **5:00pm EDT on Monday, April 20th, 2026**. Submissions should be sent to jim@thservices.com.

LEE MONTESSORI PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Landscape Build Services for School Playspace

Lee Montessori Public Charter School is seeking proposals of qualified vendors to provide playspace build services at their East End campus, located at 2345 R Street SE. Design documents have been developed and selected vendor will contribute to development of a CD Permit set.

Proposals are due no later than Monday, April 27 at 4pm ET. Applications must be submitted electronically to joshua@leemontessori.org.

For a full copy of the RFP, additional information, or questions, please contact:

Joshua McComas
Managing Director of Operations
2345 R Street SE, Washington DC 20020
202-779-9740 / joshua@leemontessori.org

DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

District of Columbia Board of Architecture, Interior Design and Landscape Architecture

The District of Columbia Board of Architecture, Interior Design and Landscape Architecture ("Board") hereby gives notice of its regular meeting, pursuant to the section 406 of the Open Meetings Act of 2010, effective January 19, 2011 (D.C. Law 18-350; D.C. Official Code § 2-576). The proposed agenda for each meeting will be posted on the Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection's website at www.dlcp.dc.gov and the Office of Open Government's website at https://www.open-dc.gov/public-bodies/meetings, not less than forty-eight (48) hours before the meeting.

The Board will hold its next meeting on Friday, April 10, 2026, at 9:30 a.m.

The Board holds its meetings every month at 9:30 a.m. The meetings are open to members of the public virtually through Zoom. For additional information, please contact Ms. Avis B. Pearson, Board Administrator, at (202) 615-2331 or avis.pearson@dc.gov.

Draft Agenda

1. Call to Order – 9:30 am
2. Attendance
3. Comments from the Public
4. Approval of Minutes
5. Old Business
6. New Business
   Motion - Executive Session (Closed to the Public) Pursuant D.C. Official Code § 2-575(b) (4) (A); D.C. Official Code § 2-575(b) (9) and (13) to discuss complaints/legal matters, applications, and legal counsel report. We will resume the public portion of the meeting at the conclusion of the executive session. Please stand by for our return if you are participating online.
7. Adjourn
8. The next regularly scheduled meeting will take place on May 15, 2026, via Zoom.

Join the meeting:
https://dc-gov.zoom.us/j/82172920244?pwd=3Jg6OYgLhyIoQmdWICYDPI8uX9LCxy.1
Webinar ID: 821 7292 0244; Passcode: 041026

This meeting is governed by the Open Meetings Act. Please address any questions or complaints arising under this meeting to the Office of Open Government at open.govoffice@dc.gov.

DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

District of Columbia Board of Barber and Cosmetology

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

The District of Columbia Board of Barber and Cosmetology ("Board") hereby gives notice of its upcoming meeting, pursuant to section 406 of the Open Meetings Act of 2010, effective January 19, 2011 (D.C. Law 18-350; D.C. Official Code § 2-576). The proposed agenda for each meeting will be posted on the Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection's website at www.dlcp.dc.gov and the Office of Open Government's website at https://www.open-dc.gov/public-bodies/meetings, not less than forty-eight (48) hours before the meeting.

The Board will hold its upcoming meeting on Monday, April 6, 2026, at 10 a.m.

The Board holds its meetings on the first Monday of each month at 10:00 a.m. The meetings are open to members of the public virtually via Zoom. Please direct all inquiries and questions for public comment to Ms. Kimberly Troxler, Board Administrator, at (202) 805-8239 or kimberly.troxler@dc.gov.

DRAFT AGENDA

1. Call to order - 10 a.m.
2. Attendance
3. Comments from the public
4. Motion - Executive Session, which is closed to the public, in order to consult with our attorneys to seek legal advice; to discuss disciplinary matters; and to deliberate upon decisions in adjudication actions and proceedings, as provided by D.C. Code § 2-575(b)(4)(A), § 2-575(b)(9), and § 2-575(b)(13). We will resume the public portion of the meeting at the conclusion of the executive session. Please stand by for our return if you are participating online.
5. Approval of the minutes – March 2, 2026
6. Correspondence
7. Board committees
8. Old business
9. New business
10. Recommendations/Actions
11. Adjourn
12. Next scheduled board meeting – May 4, 2026, via Zoom.

Meeting Login Information:
https://dc-gov.zoom.us/j/85483777017?pwd=tSmkC5gOPkBJhNmIIsGxL8ob6wbooC.1
Webinar ID: 854 8377 7017; **Passcode:** 04062026

*****This meeting is governed by the Open Meetings Act. Please address any questions or complaints arising under this meeting to the Office of Open Government at opengovoffice@dc.gov.***

DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

District of Columbia Combat Sports Commission

The District of Columbia Combat Sports Commission ("Commission") hereby gives notice of its upcoming meeting, pursuant to section 406 of the Open Meetings Act of 2010, effective January 19, 2011 (D.C. Law 18-350; D.C. Official Code § 2-576). The proposed agenda for each meeting will be posted on the Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection's website at www.dlcp.dc.gov and the Office of Open Government's website at https://www.open-dc.gov/public-bodies/meetings, not less than forty-eight (48) hours before the meeting.

The Commission will hold its upcoming meeting on Wednesday, April 8, 2026, at 12:00 p.m.

DRAFT AGENDA

1. Call to Order – 12:00 pm
2. Attendance
3. Comments from the Public
4. Approval of Minutes
5. Old Business
6. New Business
   Motion - Executive Session, which is closed to the public, in order to consult with our attorneys to seek legal advice; to discuss disciplinary matters; and to deliberate upon decisions in adjudication actions and proceedings, as provided by D.C. Code § 2-575(b)(4)(A), § 2-575(b)(9), and § 2-575(b)(13). We will resume the public portion of the meeting at the conclusion of the executive session. Please stand by for our return if you are participating online.
7. Adjourn
8. Next Scheduled Commission Meeting – May 13, 2026, via Zoom.

Meeting Login Information:
https://dc-gov.zoom.us/j/85888231877?pwd=fxieEsaERjXNXnbOvwmIZgaclsQesg.1
Webinar ID: 858 8823 1877**; Password:** Combat2024

This meeting is governed by the Open Meetings Act. Please address any questions or complaints arising under this meeting to the Office of Open Government at open.govoffice@dc.gov.

OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY AND ENGAGEMENT

NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY (NOFA)

Group Violence Reduction Strategy Grant – Ward 1

RELEASE DATE: Thursday, March 26, 2026

DUE: Friday, April 10, 2026

The Office of Neighborhood Safety and Engagement's (ONSE) mission is to foster community-based strategies to help prevent violence and increase public safety. The ONSE is accepting applications for FY (Fiscal Year) 2026. The Group Violence Reduction Strategy – Ward 1 grant will fund established organizations that will work to reduce gun violence in Washington, D.C. by implementing anti-violence strategies that provide intervention and prevention support while strengthening local partnerships among community members and stakeholders, and interact with residents and community members by providing violence intervention services.

ONSE anticipates awarding the organization approximately $225,000 for Ward 1 through this RFA.

The ONSE reserves the right to, without notice, reduce, cancel, or increase funding based on availability.

GENERAL INFORMATION

FUNDING: Local, Competitive
AWARD AMOUNT: $225,000
APPLICATION DEADLINE: Friday, April 10, 2026, 8:00 pm EST
AWARD PERIOD: May 1 – September 30, 2026
SUBMISSION:

https://www.zoomgrants.com/zgf/Office_of_Neighborhood_Safety_and_Engagement/Group_Violence_Reduction_Strategy_Grant

PROGRAM CONTACT EMAIL ADDRESS: onse.grants@d.c.gov

TARGET POPULATION: This funding is targeted for individuals between the ages of 18 – 35 who are at the highest risk of violence and are often resistant and/or not eligible for other services.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS: Community-based non-profit organizations, clergy groups, individuals, or small businesses in the District of Columbia are eligible to apply. Applicants must have a District of Columbia business license and a history of providing services in the District of Columbia. For-profit organizations are eligible but may not include profit in their grant application. For-profit organizations may also participate as subcontractors to eligible applicants.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

NOTIFICATION OF CHARTER REVIEW

SUMMARY: The District of Columbia Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) announces an opportunity for the public to submit comments on the DC public charter schools listed below which are up for a charter review or renewal on March 23, 2026. Pending DC PCSB staff's analysis, the Board may elect to do one of the following for schools up for review: 1) continue the school's charter without conditions, 2) conditionally continue the school's charter by imposing annual or interim targets or requirements it must meet, or 3) initiate charter revocation proceedings. For schools up for renewal, the Board may elect to do one of the following for each school: 1) renew the school's charter or 2) not renew the school's charter.

Washington Latin Public Charter School (Washington Latin PCS)
Washington Latin PCS is up for its 20-year charter review. The school operates four campuses in Wards 4 and 5. It serves students in grades 5 – 12. Its mission is "to provide a challenging, classical education that is accessible to students throughout the District of Columbia."

KIPP DC Public Charter School (KIPP DC PCS)
KIPP DC PCS is up for its 25-year charter review. The school operates 20 campuses in Wards 5, 6, 7, and 8. It serves students in grades pre-kindergarten 3 (PK3) – 12. Its mission is: "KIPP DC is a non-profit network of high-performing, college-preparatory public charter schools in Washington, DC. All KIPP DC schools are tuition-free, open enrollment schools, and actively recruit and serve students in the city's most educationally underserved communities. At KIPP DC, there are no shortcuts. Highly skilled teachers and leaders, more time in school, a rigorous college preparatory-curriculum, and a strong culture of high expectations and support help our students make significant academic gains and continue to excel in high school and college."

Richard Wright Public Charter School for Journalism and Media Arts Public Charter School (Richard Wright PCS)
Richard Wright PCS is up for its 15-year charter renewal. The school operates one campus in Ward 6. It serves students in grades 8 – 12. Its mission is "to transform students in grades 8 – 12 into well-versed media contributors by providing a student-centered environment that connects them to the classics and modern languages and a curriculum focused on strong writing skills and vocabulary."

Pursuant to the School Reform Act, D.C. Code 38-1802 et seq., DC PCSB is required to review each DC public charter school's performance at least once every five years.

PUBLIC MEETING: DC PCSB will discuss and vote on Washington Latin, KIPP DC PCS and Richard Wright PCS on March 23, 2026, at 5:00 pm. **[The March 23 meeting time has been updated to 5:00pm.]** Please check www.dcpcsb.org to register to attend the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT INSTRUCTIONS: Comments must be submitted on or before March

23, 2026.[1] You may submit comments by any one of the methods listed below.

Sign up to testify during the public hearing by going to https://dcpcsb.org/public-comment. Click on the "Sign up to Testify at the Meeting" tab to fill out the form. The deadline to sign up to testify is noon on March 23, 2026.

Submit a written comment identified via
Online form at https://dcpcsb.org/public-comment
Postal Mail, Hand Delivery, or Courier: Attn: Public Comment, DC Public Charter School Board, 100 M Street SE, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20003.

Submit audio testimony by phone: Call (202) 328-2660 and select option 2. You will have up to five minutes to record your testimony. Please note that all comments will be transcribed and made available to the public upon receipt.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Kirsten James, Director of School Quality and Accountability, at kjames@dcpcsb.org.

[1] DC PCSB reserves the right, but shall have no obligation, to review, pre-screen, filter, redact, refuse or remove any or all your submission that it may deem to be inappropriate for publication, such as obscene language.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

NOTICE OF PETITION TO AMEND

FACILITY – ACADEMY OF HOPE PCS

SUMMARY: The District of Columbia Public Charter School Board (DC PCSB) announces an opportunity for the public to submit comment on a request from Academy of Hope Adult Public Charter School (Academy of Hope PCS) to amend its charter agreement to relocate to a new facility. The school submitted its request on February 2, 2026.[1]

The school proposes opening an additional facility in Ward 8 at 1201 Sycamore Drive SE beginning in school year (SY) 2026 – 27. Founded in 2014, Academy of Hope PCS educates 997 adult learners at two facilities across Wards 5 and 8.

PUBLIC MEETINGS: The public hearing will be on March 23, 2026, at 5 p.m. [The March 23 meeting time has been updated to 5:00pm.] The vote will be on April 27, 2026, at 5 p.m. [The April 27 meeting time has been updated to 5:00pm.] Please visit https://dcpcsb.org/events to register to attend the meeting.

HOW TO SUBMIT PUBLIC COMMENTS: To ensure your comment is processed and reviewed,[2] please use one of the methods below:

1. Sign up to testify during the public hearing by going to https://dcpcsb.org/public-comment. Click on the "Sign up to Testify at the Meeting" tab to fill out the form. The deadline to sign up to testify is noon on March 23, 2026.
2. Submit a written comment identified via
    a. Online form at https://dcpcsb.org/public-comment
    b. Postal Mail, Hand Delivery, or Courier: Attn: Public Comment, DC Public Charter School Board, 100 M Street SE, Suite 400 Washington, DC 20003

    Please note DC PCSB accepts written comments on or before 11:59 p.m. March 23, 2026.
3. Submit audio testimony by phone: Call (202) 328-2660 and select option 2. You will have up to five minutes to record your testimony. Please note that all comments will be transcribed and made available to the public upon receipt.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION OR QUESTIONS, CONTACT Bijon Lane, Specialist, School Performance Department, blane@dcpcsb.org.

---

[1] Pursuant to the School Reform Act, D.C. Code 38-1802 et seq., a charter school must submit a petition to revise its charter.

[2] DC PCSB reserves the right, but shall have no obligation, to review, pre-screen, filter, redact, refuse or remove any or all your submission that it may deem to be inappropriate for publication, such as obscene language.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

NOTIFICATION OF SPECIAL BOARD MEETING:

SECTOR PLANNING ROUNDTABLE

Wednesday, April 8, 2026
5:30 PM

Theme: Need, Demand, and Governance in DC: Using Data, ASPIRE, and Board Capacity to Navigate Expansion

We welcome the public's participation in DC PCSB Board meetings. To join, please access the Board meeting Zoom at the below registration link. Due to enhanced security features, participants will need a Zoom account to receive access to either a Zoom link or a dial-in number.

Webinar Registration:
https://dcpcsb.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_s_gEySGsSS-AsGuoSQCWbw

Special Board Meeting Agenda

Public Hearing
Item
Opening Remarks
Public Comment
Sector Planning Roundtable
Adjournment

Interpretation Services
To request interpretation services for a board meeting, contact public.comment@dcpcsb.org or 202-330-4050. We ask all inquiries are made by 4:00 pm three business days before the board meeting service is requested.

Submitting Public Testimony
Community members may sign up to testify or submit written or audio comments on an item on the agenda by visiting the following link: https://dcpcsb.org/public-comment.

Questions
Direct questions to public.comment@dcpcsb.org.

Open Meetings Act
This meeting is governed by the Open Meetings Act. Please address any questions or complaints arising under this meeting to the Office of Open Government at opengovoffice@dc.gov.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOTICE

RM29-2025-01, IN THE MATTER OF 15 DCMR CHAPTER 29 — RENEWABLE ENERGY PORTFOLIO STANDARD,

RM40-2025-02, IN THE MATTER OF 15 DCMR CHAPTER 40 — DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SMALL GENERATOR INTERCONNECTION RULES,

RM42-2025-01, IN THE MATTER OF 15 DCMR CHAPTER 42 — FUEL MIX AND EMISSIONS DISCLOSURE REPORTS,

RM43-2025-01, IN THE MATTER OF 15 DCMR CHAPTER 43 — RULES FOR THE PURCHASE OF LIQUID-IMMERSED DISTRIBUTION TRANSFORMERS BY THE ELECTRIC UTILITY, and

RM48-2022-01, IN THE MATTER OF 15 DCMR CHAPTER 48 — MULTIPLE CUSTOMER MICROGRIDS,

1. The Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia (Commission) informs interested persons of the opportunity to file supplemental comments in response to the Notice of Second Proposed Rulemaking (Second NOPR) published in the *D.C. Register* on September 26, 2025.[1] By Order No. 22734, the Commission allowed for a supplemental comment period of thirty (30) days after the Potomac Electric Power Company (Pepco) files the *Formal Case No. 1163* Standby Service Technical Conference Report for parties to either supplement their existing comments or file new comments in response to the Second NOPR.[2] On March 23, 2026, Pepco filed the *Formal Case No. 1163* Standby Service Technical Conference Report.[3]

2. Any person interested in supplementing their existing comments or filing new comments on this proposed rulemaking action may submit written comments not later than thirty (30) days after publication of this Notice in the *D.C. Register*. Comments are to be addressed to

---

[1] 72 *D.C. Reg.* 010422-010438 (September 26, 2025).

[2] *Formal Case No. 1163, In the Matter of the Investigation into the Regulatory Framework for Microgrids in the District of Columbia* (*Formal Case No. 1163*), and *Electric Tariff 2025-02, In the Matter of the Potomac Electric Power Company's Proposed Modifications to Standby Service* (*ET2025-02*), and *RM48-2022-01, In the Matter of 15 DCMR Chapter 48 – Multiple Customer Microgrids*, Order No. 22734, ¶ 5, rel. November 5, 2025.

[3] *Formal Case No. 1163,* and *ET2025-02*, Potomac Electric Power Company Standby Service Technical Conference Report, filed March 23, 2026.

Brinda Westbrook-Sedgwick, Commission Secretary, Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia, 1325 G Street, N.W., Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20005, and are to be submitted electronically through the Commission's website at https://edocket.dcpsc.org/public/public_comments. Copies of the proposed rules may be obtained by visiting the Commission's website at www.dcpsc.org. Persons with questions concerning this Notice should call (202) 626-5150 or send an email to psccommissionsecretary@dc.gov.

A TRUE COPY: **BY DIRECTION OF THE COMMISSION:**

CHIEF CLERK: **BRINDA WESTBROOK-SEDGWICK**
COMMISSION SECRETARY

SHINING STARS MONTESSORI ACADEMY PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
SY2025-2026

Shining Stars Montessori Academy Public Charter School is seeking bids from prospective vendors to provide:

- **Elevator Service:** Shining Stars Montessori Academy seeks proposals from qualified elevator service contractors to repair and upgrade or replace an existing elevator system.

Bidders can bid on the aforementioned service by providing the following: company profile and relevant experience, an organizational capability statement, resume of principals, three (3) references from comparable schools or public charter entities, evidence of prior work with private and/or public charter schools, scope of services and pricing, and licensure/certification, in their proposal. All proposals must be submitted in PDF format and emailed to procurement@shiningstarspcs.org no later than **5:00 PM** on **April 20, 2026**.

DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY (NOFA)

District of Columbia State Nursery Fiscal Year 2026 Grant

Request for Application Release Date: April 17, 2026
Application Submission Deadline: May 8, 2026

The Urban Forestry Division (UFD) within the District of Columbia Department of Transportation (DDOT) is soliciting detailed proposals from organizations to manage the District of Columbia State Nursery. The District of Columbia State Nursery is a way to prepare the District of Columbia's tree inventory for the impacts of climate change, ensure that new street trees are adapted to the regional climate, and nurture species of trees that will thrive in the District of Columbia's urban environment now and in the future.

The goal of the program will be to provide locally grown nursery stock for installation on public space and District-owned lands within the District of Columbia. Applicant will own and maintain a facility capable of producing a minimum of two thousand trees for installation on DC public lands; will deliver the nursery stock from its facility to the facilities of DDOT's planting partners or, alternatively, liaise with DDOT Urban Foresters to plant the trees directly on public lands; will confer with DDOT personnel to ensure that an adequate diversity of nursery stock is prepared for translocation; and will follow the best practices within the arboricultural and horticultural industries for growing nursery stock. The applicant will water and warranty trees planted on District streets through the State Nursery program and will develop a workflow through which the State Nursery grows trees desired by the District of Columbia Urban Forestry Division.

Local non-profit organizations are eligible to apply for Fiscal Year 2026 District of Columbia State Nursery grant funds. Individual proposals should not exceed $1,000,000.

Please refer to the full Request for Applications (RFA) for this funding opportunity for a detailed list of requirements. The RFA will be available on **April 17, 2026** and will be available at the District Grants Clearinghouse on the Mayor's Office of Community Affairs website: https://communityaffairs.dc.gov/content/community-grant-program - 4. **The deadline for application submissions is May 8, 2026.**

For additional information, or to receive the full RFA by email, please contact:

John O'Neill
Lead Forester
Urban Forestry Division
250 M Street SE, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20003
Phone: (202) 527 - 5633
Email: john.oneill@dc.gov

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

The Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority (DC Water) will be holding a meeting by Microsoft Teams on Tuesday, April 7, 2026, at 9:30 a.m. The meeting will be held in the boardroom (2nd floor) at 1385 Canal Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003. The Chief Executive Officer and General Manager invite the public to attend the meeting via livestream. Please see the website for remote access information for this meeting. Below is the draft agenda for this meeting. A final agenda will be posted to DC Water's website at www.dcwater.com that will also contain a link to the livestream.

For additional information, please contact Michelle Rhodd, Board Secretary at (202) 787-2331 or Michelle.Rhodd@dcwater.com.

DRAFT AGENDA

1.	Call to Order	Board Chairman
2.	Roll Call	Board Secretary
3.	Approval of March 5, Meeting Minutes	Board Chairman
4.	Committee Report(s)	Committee Chairperson(s)
5.	Chief Executive Officer's Report	Chief Executive Officer and General Manager
6.	Action Items Joint-Use Non-Joint-Use	Board Chairman
7.	Other Business	Board Chairman
8.	Adjournment	Board Chairman

This meeting is governed by the Open Meetings Act. Please address any questions or complaints arising under this meeting to the Office of Open Government at opengovoffice@dc.gov.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Environmental Quality and Operations Committee

The Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority (DC Water) Environmental Quality and Operations Committee will hold a meeting via Microsoft Teams on Wednesday, April 15, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. This meeting will not be held in the Board Room (2nd floor) at 1385 Canal Street, S.E. The Chief Executive Officer and General Manager invites the public to attend the meeting via Microsoft Teams. Below is the draft agenda for this meeting. Please see the final agenda to DC Water's website at www.dcwater.com, which will include remote access information for this meeting.

For additional information, please contact Michelle Rhodd, Board Secretary at (202) 787-2331 or Michelle.Rhodd@dcwater.com.

DRAFT AGENDA

1. Call to Order	Committee Chairperson
2. Roll Call	Board Secretary
3. AWTP Status Updates - BPAWTP Performance	Vice-President, Wastewater Ops
4. Project Status Updates	Vice-President of Engineering & Technical Services
5. Water Quality Monitoring	Vice-President, Water Ops
6. Action Items - Joint Use - Non-Joint Use	 Chief Operating Officer and EVP Vice President of Procurement
7. Emerging Items/Other Business	Committee Chairperson
8. Executive Session	Committee Chairperson
9. Adjournment	Committee Chairperson

This meeting is governed by the Open Meetings Act. Please address any questions or complaints arising under this meeting to the Office of Open Government at opengovoffice@dc.gov.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Governance Committee

The Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority (DC Water) Governance Committee will hold a meeting via Microsoft Teams on Friday, April 10, 2026, at 9:30 a.m. This meeting will **not** be held in the Board Room (2nd floor) at 1385 Canal Street, S.E. The Chief Executive Officer and General Manager invites the public to attend the meeting via Microsoft Teams. Below is the draft agenda for this meeting. Please see the final agenda posted to DC Water's website at www.dcwater.com, which will include remote access information for this meeting.

For additional information, please contact Michelle Rhodd, Board Secretary at (202) 787-2331 or Michelle.Rhodd@dcwater.com.

DRAFT AGENDA

1. Call to Order	Committee Chairperson
2. Emerging Issues	Committee Chairperson
3. Agenda for Upcoming Committee Meeting	Committee Chairperson
4. Executive Session	Committee Chairperson
5. Adjournment	Committee Chairperson

This meeting is governed by the Open Meetings Act. Please address any questions or complaints arising under this meeting to the Office of Open Government at opengovoffice@dc.gov.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

BZA Application No. 21400
Aidan Montessori School
2700 27th Street, NW (Square 2109, Lot 92)

HEARING DATES: February 11 and February 25, 2026[1]
DECISION DATES: February 25 and March 11, 2026

SUMMARY ORDER

RELIEF REQUESTED. The application requests the following relief in order to construct a two-story front addition, to an existing, detached, four-story plus penthouse, private school building in the R-3 zone:

- Special Exception under the private school use requirements of Subtitle U § 203.1(m), pursuant to Subtitle X § 901.2
- Area Variance from the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle D § 210.1, pursuant to Subtitle X § 1002 (*40% maximum permitted; 44% existing; 47% proposed*)

The zoning relief requested in this case was self-certified. (Exhibit 38 (Final Revised).)[2]

PRIOR APPLICATION. In Order No. 7184, issued in 1963, the Board of Zoning Adjustment (the "**Board**") approved a private school use at the subject property, subject to a maximum enrollment of 240 students. (Exhibit 6, Tab B.)

PARTIES. The parties to this case were the Applicant and Advisory Neighborhood Commission ("**ANC**") 3C, the "affected ANC" pursuant to Subtitle Y §§ 101.8 and 403.5(b) of the Zoning Regulations (Title 11 of the DCMR, Zoning Regulations of 2016, to which all references are made unless otherwise specified).

NOTICE OF THE APPLICATION AND PUBLIC HEARING. The Board referred the application to the appropriate agencies and provided proper and timely notice of the public hearing in accordance with Subtitle Y § 402.1.

ANC REPORT. The ANC's report indicated that at a regularly scheduled, properly noticed public meeting on December 15, 2025, at which a quorum was present, the ANC voted to support the application. (Exhibit 15.) The ANC report raised no issues or concerns.

[1] The public hearing was administratively rescheduled from the original hearing date of February 4, 2026.
[2] The application was amended to add special exception relief under the private school use requirements of Subtitle U § 203.1(m).

OFFICE OF PLANNING ("OP") REPORT. OP submitted a supplemental report recommending approval of the application. (Exhibit 41.)

OP's first report, dated January 22, 2026, recommended approval of the originally requested relief. (Exhibit 24.)

DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ("DDOT") REPORT. DDOT submitted a report indicating that it had no objection to the application because it concluded that the relief would not result in any adverse impacts to the District's transportation network. (Exhibit 26.)

PERSONS IN SUPPORT. The Board received four letters in support of the application. (Exhibits 27, 30, 31, 33.)

Daniel Widome testified at the February 25, 2026 public hearing in support of the application.

PERSONS IN OPPOSITION. The Board received six letters in opposition to the application. (Exhibits 17, 20-22, 28, 36.)

Jennifer Jessup testified at the February 25, 2026 public hearing regarding her concerns about the application.

CONCLUSIONS

Pursuant to Subtitle Y § 604.3, the order of the Board may be in summary form where granting an application when there was no party in opposition. As a summary order, it does not constitute binding legal precedent on the Board and shall not be considered by the Board in evaluating future applications.

Based upon the record before the Board, and having given great weight to the appropriate reports and recommendations filed in this case, the Board concludes that the Applicant has met the burden of proof that the requested special exception and variance relief can be granted because:

- It is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Map;
- It will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property;
- Pursuant to Subtitle X § 901.2(c), the relief satisfies the specified conditions for special exception relief;
- There exists an exceptional or extraordinary situation or condition related to the property;
- The exceptional condition creates a practical difficulty, in the case of an area variance, or an undue hardship, in the case of a use variance, in complying with the Zoning Regulations;
- The relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good; and
- The relief can be granted without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map.

DECISION

Based on the case record and the testimony at the hearing, the Board concludes that the applicant has satisfied the burden of proof for the requested relief:

- Special Exception under the private school use requirements of Subtitle U § 203.1(m), pursuant to Subtitle X § 901.2
- Area Variance from the lot occupancy requirements of Subtitle D § 210.1, pursuant to Subtitle X § 1002 (*40% maximum permitted; 44% existing; 47% proposed*)

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the application is **GRANTED** consistent with the plans shown in Exhibits 19A1, 19A2 of the record, as required under Subtitle Y §§ 604.9 and 604.10, subject to the following **CONDITION**:

1. The number of students shall not exceed a maximum enrollment of 180.

VOTE: **3-0-2** (Carl H. Blake, Brittney Drakeford, and Robert E. Miller to APPROVE; two Board seats vacant)

BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
A majority of the Board members approved the issuance of this order.

FINAL DATE OF ORDER: March 17, 2026

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR SUBTITLE Y § 604.11, NO ORDER OF THE BOARD SHALL TAKE EFFECT UNTIL TEN (10) DAYS AFTER IT BECOMES FINAL PURSUANT TO SUBTITLE Y § 604.7.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR SUBTITLE Y § 702.1, THIS ORDER SHALL NOT BE VALID FOR MORE THAN TWO YEARS, UNLESS, WITHIN SUCH TWO-YEAR PERIOD, AN APPLICATION FOR A BUILDING PERMIT FOR THE ERECTION OR ALTERATION APPROVED IS FILED WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS FOR THE PURPOSE OF SECURING A BUILDING PERMIT, OR A REQUEST FOR A TIME EXTENSION PURSUANT TO SUBTITLE Y § 705 IS FILED PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION OF THE TWO-YEAR PERIOD AND THE REQUEST IS GRANTED. PURSUANT TO SUBTITLE Y § 703.10, NO OTHER ACTION, INCLUDING THE FILING OR GRANTING OF AN APPLICATION FOR A MODIFICATION PURSUANT TO SUBTITLE Y §§ 703 OR 704, SHALL TOLL OR EXTEND THE TIME PERIOD.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR SUBTITLE Y § 604, APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION SHALL INCLUDE APPROVAL OF THE PLANS SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BUILDING OR STRUCTURE (OR ADDITION THERETO) OR THE

RENOVATION OR ALTERATION OF AN EXISTING BUILDING OR STRUCTURE. AN APPLICANT SHALL CARRY OUT THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION, OR ALTERATION ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS APPROVED BY THE BOARD AS THE SAME MAY BE AMENDED AND/OR MODIFIED FROM TIME TO TIME BY THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR SUBTITLE A § 303, THE PERSON WHO OWNS, CONTROLS, OCCUPIES, MAINTAINS, OR USES THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, OR ANY PART THERETO, SHALL COMPLY WITH THE CONDITIONS IN THIS ORDER, AS THE SAME MAY BE AMENDED AND/OR MODIFIED FROM TIME TO TIME BY THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT. FAILURE TO ABIDE BY THE CONDITIONS IN THIS ORDER, IN WHOLE OR IN PART SHALL BE GROUNDS FOR THE REVOCATION OF ANY BUILDING PERMIT OR CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY ISSUED PURSUANT TO THIS ORDER.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE D.C. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, AS AMENDED, D.C. OFFICIAL CODE § 2-1401.01 *ET SEQ.* (ACT), THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED: RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, SEX, AGE, MARITAL STATUS, PERSONAL APPEARANCE, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY OR EXPRESSION, FAMILIAL STATUS, FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES, MATRICULATION, POLITICAL AFFILIATION, GENETIC INFORMATION, DISABILITY, SOURCE OF INCOME, OR PLACE OF RESIDENCE OR BUSINESS. SEXUAL HARASSMENT IS A FORM OF SEX DISCRIMINATION WHICH IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. IN ADDITION, HARASSMENT BASED ON ANY OF THE ABOVE PROTECTED CATEGORIES IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE ACT WILL NOT BE TOLERATED. VIOLATORS WILL BE SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY ACTION.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

BZA Application No. 21432
Hasan Dossal
2900 Glover Drive, NW (Square 1620, Lot 77)

HEARING DATE: Applicant waived the right to a public hearing
DECISION DATE: March 11, 2026 (Expedited Review Calendar)[1]

SUMMARY ORDER

RELIEF REQUESTED. The application requests the following relief in order to enclose the rear porch of an existing, detached, three-story plus cellar, principal dwelling unit in the R-1A/WH zone:

- Special Exception from the side yard requirements of Subtitle D § 208.2, pursuant to Subtitle D § 5201 and Subtitle X § 901.2 (*8 feet minimum required; 7.1 feet existing; 7.1 feet proposed*)

The zoning relief requested in this case was self-certified. (Exhibit 12.)

PARTIES. The parties to this case were the Applicant and Advisory Neighborhood Commission ("**ANC**") 3D, the "affected ANC" pursuant to Subtitle Y §§ 101.8 and 403.5(b) of the Zoning Regulations (Title 11 of the DCMR, Zoning Regulations of 2016, to which all references are made unless otherwise specified).

EXPEDITED REVIEW. Pursuant to 11 DCMR Subtitle Y § 401, this application was tentatively placed on the Board of Zoning Adjustment (the "**Board**" or "**BZA**") expedited review calendar for decision as a result of the Applicant's waiver of its right to a hearing. No objections to expedited review consideration were made by any person or entity entitled to do so under Subtitle Y §§ 401.7 and 401.8.

NOTICE OF THE APPLICATION AND PUBLIC HEARING. The Board referred the application to the appropriate agencies and provided proper and timely notice of the public hearing in accordance with Subtitle Y § 402.1.

ANC REPORT. The ANC's report indicated that at a regularly scheduled, properly noticed public meeting on January 7, 2026, at which a quorum was present, the ANC voted to support the application. (Exhibit 18.) The ANC report raised no issues or concerns.

[1] The application was administratively rescheduled from the meeting date of March 4, 2026.

OFFICE OF PLANNING ("OP") REPORT. OP submitted a report recommending approval of the application. (Exhibit 19.)

DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ("DDOT") REPORT. DDOT submitted a report indicating that it had no objection to the application because it concluded that the relief would not result in any adverse impacts to the District's transportation network. (Exhibit 20.)

PERSONS IN SUPPORT. The Board received three letters from neighbors in support of the application. (Exhibit 16.)

CONCLUSIONS

Pursuant to Subtitle Y § 604.3, the order of the Board may be in summary form where granting an application when there was no party in opposition. As a summary order, it does not constitute binding legal precedent on the Board and shall not be considered by the Board in evaluating future applications.

Based upon the record before the Board, and having given great weight to the appropriate reports and recommendations filed in this case, the Board concludes that the Applicant has met the burden of proof that the requested special exception relief can be granted because:

- It is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Map;
- It will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property; and
- Pursuant to Subtitle X § 901.2(c), the relief satisfies the specified conditions for special exception relief.

DECISION

Based on the case record and the testimony at the hearing, the Board concludes that the applicant has satisfied the burden of proof for the requested relief:

- Special Exception from the side yard requirements of Subtitle D § 208.2, pursuant to Subtitle D § 5201 and Subtitle X § 901.2 (*8 feet minimum required; 7.1 feet existing; 7.1 feet proposed*)

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the application is **GRANTED** consistent with the plans shown in Exhibit 5 of the record, as required under Subtitle Y §§ 604.9 and 604.10.

VOTE: **3-0-2** (Carl H. Blake, Brittney Drakeford, and Robert E. Miller to APPROVE; two Board seats vacant)

BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
A majority of the Board members approved the issuance of this order.

FINAL DATE OF ORDER: March 17, 2026

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR SUBTITLE Y § 604.11, NO ORDER OF THE BOARD SHALL TAKE EFFECT UNTIL TEN (10) DAYS AFTER IT BECOMES FINAL PURSUANT TO SUBTITLE Y § 604.7.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR SUBTITLE Y § 702.1, THIS ORDER SHALL NOT BE VALID FOR MORE THAN TWO YEARS, UNLESS, WITHIN SUCH TWO-YEAR PERIOD, AN APPLICATION FOR A BUILDING PERMIT FOR THE ERECTION OR ALTERATION APPROVED IS FILED WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS FOR THE PURPOSE OF SECURING A BUILDING PERMIT, OR A REQUEST FOR A TIME EXTENSION PURSUANT TO SUBTITLE Y § 705 IS FILED PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION OF THE TWO-YEAR PERIOD AND THE REQUEST IS GRANTED. PURSUANT TO SUBTITLE Y § 703.14, NO OTHER ACTION, INCLUDING THE FILING OR GRANTING OF AN APPLICATION FOR A MODIFICATION PURSUANT TO SUBTITLE Y §§ 703 OR 704, SHALL TOLL OR EXTEND THE TIME PERIOD.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR SUBTITLE Y § 604, APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION SHALL INCLUDE APPROVAL OF THE PLANS SUBMITTED WITH THE APPLICATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BUILDING OR STRUCTURE (OR ADDITION THERETO) OR THE RENOVATION OR ALTERATION OF AN EXISTING BUILDING OR STRUCTURE. AN APPLICANT SHALL CARRY OUT THE CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION, OR ALTERATION ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLANS APPROVED BY THE BOARD AS THE SAME MAY BE AMENDED AND/OR MODIFIED FROM TIME TO TIME BY THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE D.C. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, AS AMENDED, D.C. OFFICIAL CODE § 2-1401.01 *ET SEQ.* (ACT), THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED: RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, SEX, AGE, MARITAL STATUS, PERSONAL APPEARANCE, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY OR EXPRESSION, FAMILIAL STATUS, FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES, MATRICULATION, POLITICAL AFFILIATION, GENETIC INFORMATION, DISABILITY, SOURCE OF INCOME, OR PLACE OF RESIDENCE OR BUSINESS. SEXUAL HARASSMENT IS A FORM OF SEX DISCRIMINATION WHICH IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. IN ADDITION, HARASSMENT BASED ON ANY OF THE ABOVE PROTECTED CATEGORIES IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE ACT WILL NOT BE TOLERATED. VIOLATORS WILL BE SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY ACTION.

ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NOTICE OF CLOSED MEETING

TIME AND PLACE: **Thursday, March 26, 2026 @ 3:15 p.m.**
Virtually via WebEx

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING THE FOLLOWING:

The Zoning Commission, in accordance with § 406 of the District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act ("Act")(D.C. Official Code § 2-576), hereby provides notice it will hold a closed meeting virtually at the time noted above, in order to receive legal advice from its counsel, per § 405(b)(4). This is regarding the following Z.C. Cases:

- Z.C. Case No. 08-06S (Office of Planning – Court Regulations);
- Z.C. Case No. 15-21G (DCHA – Two Year PUD Time Extension @ Squares 5113, 5114, & 5116);
- Z.C. Case No. 15-27H (350 Morse CPK Owner C2, LLC – Two-Year Time Extension to Modification of Significance to First and Second Stage PUD @ Square 3587); and
- Z.C. Case No. 25-20 (D.C. General Services – Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment @ Square 5728)

ANTHONY J. HOOD, ROBERT E. MILLER, GWEN MARCUS WRIGHT, TAMMY STIDHAM, AND JOSEPH S. IMAMURA -------- ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, BY SARA A. BARDIN, DIRECTOR, AND BY SHARON S. SCHELLIN, SECRETARY TO THE ZONING COMMISSION.

OFFICE OF DOCUMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUANCES

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REGISTER
2026 AGENCY SUBMISSION DEADLINE SCHEDULE

The *District of Columbia Register* is published weekly on Fridays including on public holidays that fall on a Friday. The deadline for submitting notices for publication by District agencies, boards, commissions, and public charter schools is **THURSDAY**, noon of the **PREVIOUS** week. For example, the deadline for the January 16, 2026 *District of Columbia Register* is noon on Thursday January 8, 2026.

The deadline for a Register to be published during a week that has an official District of Columbia holiday is WEDNESDAY noon of the PREVIOUS week. For example, Monday, January 19, 2026 (Martin Luther King Jr. Day) is an official District of Columbia holiday therefore, the deadline for the January 23, 2026 *District of Columbia Register* is noon on Wednesday, January 14, 2026.

If an official government holiday falls on a Thursday, the deadline for submitting documents is WEDNESDAY. Because Thursday, January 1, 2026 is New Years Day, the deadline for the January 9, 2026 *District of Columbia Register* is noon on Wednesday, December 31, 2025.

Because Thursday, November 26, 2026 is Thanksgiving Day, the deadline for submitting documents for the December 4, 2026 *District of Columbia Register* is noon on Wednesday, November 25, 2026.

Documents that are uploaded after the noon deadline will be published in the next edition of the Register.

The DC Register Submission Deadline Schedule is published at the end of each Register.

The Office of Documents also publishes the Submission Deadline Schedule on the DCRegs Home page at https://dcregs.dc.gov:



Since the deadline changes for a Register to be published during a week that has an official District of Columbia Government holiday, the 2026 holiday schedule is provided here for your convenience.

2026 District of Columbia Government Holiday Schedule	
New Year's Day	Thursday, January 1, 2026
Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Birthday	Monday, January 19, 2026
Washington's Birthday	Monday, February 16, 2026
DC Emancipation Day	Thursday, April 16, 2026
Memorial Day	Monday, May 25, 2026
Juneteenth National Independence Day	Friday, June 19, 2026
Independence Day (Observed)	Friday, July 3, 2026
Labor Day	Monday, September 7, 2026
Indigenous Peoples' Day	Monday, October 12, 2026
Veterans Day	Wednesday, November 11, 2026
Thanksgiving Day	Thursday, November 26, 2026
Christmas Day	Friday, December 25, 2026

Below is the 2026 District of Columbia Register Submission Deadline schedule.

OFFICE OF DOCUMENTS AND ADMINSTRATIVE ISSUANCES
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REGISTER
2026 AGENCY SUBMISSION DEADLINE SCHEDULE

D.C. Register Issue		Submission Deadline	
Vol. 73/1	January 2, 2026*	Wednesday	December 24, 2025
Vol. 73/2	January 9, 2026	Wednesday	December 31, 2025
Vol. 73/3	January 16, 2026	Thursday	January 8, 2026
Vol. 73/4	January 23, 2026*	Wednesday	January 14, 2026
Vol. 73/5	January 30, 2026	Thursday	January 22, 2026
Vol. 73/6	February 6, 2026	Thursday	January 29, 2026
Vol. 73/7	February 13, 2026	Thursday	February 5, 2026
Vol. 73/8	February 20, 2026*	Wednesday	February 11, 2026
Vol. 73/9	February 27, 2026	Thursday	February 19, 2026
Vol. 73/10	March 6, 2026	Thursday	February 26, 2026
Vol. 73/11	March 13, 2026	Thursday	March 5, 2026
Vol. 73/12	March 20, 2026	Thursday	March 12, 2026
Vol. 73/13	March 27, 2026	Thursday	March 19, 2026
Vol. 73/14	April 3, 2026	Thursday	March 26, 2026
Vol. 73/15	April 10, 2026	Thursday	April 2, 2026
Vol. 73/16	April 17, 2026*	Wednesday	April 8, 2026
Vol. 73/17	April 24, 2026	Wednesday	April 15, 2026
Vol. 73/18	May 1, 2026	Thursday	April 23, 2026
Vol. 73/19	May 8, 2026	Thursday	April 30, 2026
Vol. 73/20	May 15, 2026	Thursday	May 7, 2026
Vol. 73/21	May 22, 2026	Thursday	May 14, 2026
Vol. 73/22	May 29, 2026 *	Wednesday	May 20, 2026
Vol. 73/23	June 5, 2026	Thursday	May 28, 2026
Vol. 73/24	June 12, 2026	Thursday	June 4, 2026
Vol. 73/25	June 19, 2026*	Wednesday	June 10, 2026
Vol. 73/26	June 26, 2026	Thursday	June 18, 2026
Vol. 73/27	July 3, 2026 *	Wednesday	June 24, 2026
Vol. 73/28	July 10, 2026	Thursday	July 2, 2026
Vol. 73/29	July 17, 2026	Thursday	July 9, 2026
Vol. 73/30	July 24, 2026	Thursday	July 16, 2026
Vol. 73/31	July 31, 2026	Thursday	July 23, 2026
Vol. 73/32	August 7, 2026	Thursday	July 30, 2026
Vol. 73/33	August 14, 2026	Thursday	August 6, 2026
Vol. 73/34	August 21, 2026	Thursday	August 13, 2026
Vol. 73/35	August 28, 2026	Thursday	August 20, 2026
Vol. 73/36	September 4, 2026	Thursday	August 27, 2026
Vol. 73/37	September 11, 2026*	Wednesday	September 2, 2026
Vol. 73/38	September 18, 2026	Thursday	September 10, 2026
Vol. 73/39	September 25, 2026	Thursday	September 17, 2026
Vol. 73/40	October 2, 2026	Thursday	September 24, 2026
Vol. 73/41	October 9, 2026	Thursday	October 1, 2026
Vol. 73/42	October 16, 2026*	Wednesday	October 7, 2026
Vol. 73/43	October 23, 2026	Thursday	October 15, 2026
Vol. 73/44	October 30, 2026	Thursday	October 22, 2026
Vol. 73/45	November 6, 2026	Thursday	October 29, 2026
Vol. 73/46	November 13, 2026*	Wednesday	November 4, 2026
Vol. 73/47	November 20, 2026	Thursday	November 12, 2026
Vol. 73/48	November 27, 2026*	Wednesday	November 18, 2026
Vol. 73/49	December 4, 2026	Wednesday	November 25, 2026
Vol. 73/50	December 11, 2026	Thursday	December 3, 2026
Vol. 73/51	December 18, 2026	Thursday	December 10, 2026
Vol. 73/52	December 25, 2026*	Wednesday	December 16, 2026
Vol. 74/1	January 1, 2027*	Wednesday	December 23, 2026

*Weeks with District of Columbia Government public holidays. Last Updated December 5, 2025