- § 3-305(b)(1), which allows a public body to meet in closed session to discuss "the appointment, employment, assignment, promotion, discipline, demotion, compensation, removal, resignation, or performance evaluation of an appointee, employee, or official over whom it has jurisdiction," or "any other personnel matter that affects one or more specific individuals"; and

- § 3-305(b)(7), which allows a body to convene in closed session to "consult with counsel to obtain legal advice."

Regarding topics of discussion, we think the description of the matter for which the Board sought legal advice—"canvass procedures"—was also sufficient to satisfy the Act. But we do find that the description of the personnel matter—"Board members and staff"—was too vague. We have said that "a closing statement claiming the personnel matters exception should provide enough information to inform the public that the discussion does indeed fall within the exception." 7 *OMCB Opinions* 225, 228 (2011). "The topic to be discussed or reason for closing should thus show that the discussion will involve the personal attributes or performance of specific individuals and will not instead involve broader policy, which would be implicated when anyone in the position would be affected by the action being considered and which would therefore not fall within the exception." *Id.* More than once we have said that simply "specifying the category of personnel matter listed in the § 3-305(b)(1) exception" would suffice. 13 *OMCB Opinions* 1, 3 (2019); *see also* 12 *OMCB Opinions* 28, 31 (2018). But the closing statement here failed to do that, leaving the public to guess as to whether the discussion regarding "Board members and staff" involved, for example, promotions, discipline, compensation, or simply "general personnel issues," the last of which do not fall within the exception. 3 *OMCB Opinions* 335, 337 (2003). We thus find a violation of § 3-305(d)(2).

Finally, regarding the reason for discussing these matters in closed session, the written closing statement said, "protect personnel" and "protect election." From these phrases, we assume that the Board meant that it thought that these discussions should take place behind closed doors in order to protect the privacy of Board personnel and the integrity of an election. Although we think that the Board of Elections could have been a little more detailed, we think that these phrases satisfy the Act's bare requirements regarding disclosures of the reason for meeting in closed session.

Turning to the August 12, 2025, written closing statement, we reiterate that it is not clear to us whether the closed session was administrative in nature and, thus, whether the Board of Elections was required to prepare a written closing statement. But we see no problems with respect to the closing statement's citation to statutory authority (the personnel matters exception of § 3-305(b)(1)) and listed topic of discussion ("personnel conduct and investigation"). As for the reason for discussing this topic in closed session,