



AGENDA

Queen Anne's County Board of Elections
110 Vincit Street-Conference Room
Centreville Maryland 21617

- I. Call Meeting to Order/Declaration of Quorum Present-Attendees
- II. Approval of Minutes -September 2025
- III. Additions to the Agenda
- IV. Correspondence/Public Comment
- V. Reports
 - A. Directors Report
 - B. Board Counsel Report
- VI. Old Business
- VII. New Business
 - A. Open Meetings Act Complaint
 - B. 2026 Polling Places/Drop Boxes
- VIII. Disclosures
- IX. Confirmation of Next Meeting
- X. Closed Session*
- XI. Adjournment

*Closed Session: Part of the meeting may be closed in accordance with Maryland's Open Meetings Act procedures.

Public Participation: Members of the public may address the Board. Pursuant to §3.2B of the Board's bylaws, public participation at a meeting must be pre-scheduled and pre-approved by the President. To request approval to speak in person at a board meeting, contact christine.jones@maryland.gov no later than 4 pm the day before the meeting.



Queen Anne's County Board of Elections
Board Meeting Minutes
September 25, 2025

Present:

	Chrissy Jones, Director
Mary Walker, President	Kim Spence, Deputy Director
Dorotheann Sadusky, Secretary	Erin Fee, Staff
Marion Grier, Board Member	Kelly Eichelberger, Staff
Jane Sparks, Board Member	Jena Anthony, Staff
	Colby Martin, Staff

Absent: Bill Stoops, Vice President
Jeff Thompson, Attorney

Public

None

Opening:

Mrs. Walker declared a quorum to be present and called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.

Additions/Changes to the agenda

No additions to the agenda.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Dorotheann Sadusky to approve the minutes from the last meeting. Jane Sparks seconded the motion. The motion passed and the minutes were approved.

Directors Report

- MAEO held a de escalation training on how to handle things that gets out of control. Staff attended the training online.
- Kelly and Kim went over what they learned from attending classes at the Election Center conference.
- We have some voter registrations trainings scheduled,
- We have had several people come in for candidate filing.

Board Counsel Report

- Jeff was not able to attend meeting, however asked Mary to share his report. Mary advised that the board received complaint from open meetings act and Jeff is reviewing and will handle how we proceed.

Legislative Update

- No update

Old Business

- No old business.
-

New Business

- Dorotheann Sadusky inquired about Annapolis town having to do a recount. Chrissy advised we have not heard anything about that.

Correspondence

Registration figures

Voter registration:

Total: 43703

DEM- 11649	REP- 21578	NLM 51	LIB	WCP- 30	UNA- 9754	OTHER- 641
---------------	---------------	-----------	-----	------------	--------------	---------------

Confirmation of Next Meeting

Next scheduled meeting is October 23, 2025.

Guest Comments

None

Adjournment

Jane Sparks made a motion to adjourn. Marion Grier seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:12am.

Closed Session

No closed session.

Board Secretary,

Laethan J. Gochis



**Queen Anne's County Board of Elections
Directors Report
October 23, 2025**

- Training
 - Voter Registration Volunteer Training
 - 8 Volunteers
- Candidate Filing
 - 1 filed
- Voter Outreach
 - SBE Statewide Voter Registration Contest
 - Queen Anne's County High School

WES MOORE
Governor

ARUNA MILLER
Lt. Governor



RUNAKO KUMBULA ALLSOPP, ESQ.,
CHAIR
KAREN R. CALMEISE, ESQ.
ANDREW G. WHITE, ESQ.

STATE OF MARYLAND
OPEN MEETINGS COMPLIANCE
BOARD

19 Official Opinions of the Compliance Board 285 (2025)

October 10, 2025

Queen Anne's County Board of Elections

The Complainant alleges that the Queen Anne's County Board of Elections (the "Board of Elections" or "Board") has violated the Open Meetings Act (the "Act") by failing to make sufficiently detailed disclosures about closed sessions in meeting minutes.¹ The Board of Elections acknowledges these shortcomings. Although we commend the Board on its pledge to ensure that "minutes will be brought into compliance immediately," we find that the body violated the Act by failing to include necessary details in past meeting minutes. We also find that the Board violated the Act by failing to respond timely to the complaint.

Discussion

A. Minutes

Section 3-306(c)(2)² states that:

[i]f a public body meets in closed session, the minutes for its next open session shall include:

- (i) a statement of the time, place, and purpose of the closed session;

¹ The complaint also references a "lack of detailed written closing statements," which a presiding officer is required to prepare before a public body meets in closed session. See Md. Code Ann., Gen. Prov. § 3-305(d)(2)(ii). But the Complainant provides no further details, such as the dates on which the Board's presiding officer allegedly prepared deficient written closing statements. See Md. Code Ann., Gen. Prov. § 3-205(b) (stating that the complaint shall, among other things, "describe the action of the public body, *the date of the action*, and the circumstances of the action" (emphasis added)). Thus, we do not address the matter of the Board's written closing statements, other than to say that a template of a proper written closing statement is available on the Attorney General's website. See https://oag.maryland.gov/resources-info/Documents/pdfs/PO_Closing%20Statement_Inst_sample.pdf (last visited Oct. 10, 2025).

² Statutory references are to the General Provisions Article of the Maryland Annotated Code.

- (ii) a record of the vote of each member as to closing the
- (iii) a citation of the authority under § 3-305 of this subtitle for closing the session; and
- (iv) a listing of the topics of discussion, persons present, and each action taken during the session.

The Complainant alleges that the Board of Elections violated this requirement because meeting minutes from 2024 and the first half of 2025 failed to include all the necessary details. We agree. Numerous sets of minutes indicate that the Board of Elections met in closed sessions, but they do not include records of the votes of each member as to the closures, any citation of the authority for closing the meetings, who was present for the closed sessions, any actions taken (if any), or the topics of discussion or purpose of the closed sessions.

The sets of minutes for the meetings on June 27, August 22, September 26, and October 8, 2024, and on January 16 and June 26, 2025, indicate that closed sessions concerned “personnel,” presumably a reference to § 3-305(b)(1), which allows a public body to meet in closed session to discuss:

- (i) 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
- (ii) any other personnel matter that affects one or more specific individuals

§ 3-305(b)(1). But a topic description must be “described in enough detail to satisfy a member of the public that the claimed exception” for the closed session actually applied. 8 *OMCB Opinions* 182, 187 (2013); accord 7 *OMCB Opinions* 131, 135 (2011). For example, the description should make clear that a body’s discussion of a personnel matter “involved ‘the personal attributes or performance of special individuals’ rather than broader policies or entire classes of employees.” 17 *OMCB Opinions* 83, 89 (2023). Merely listing “personnel” or even “personnel actions” is not sufficient. *See, e.g.*, 1 *OMCB Opinions* 63, 65 (1994) (finding that “personnel actions” was an insufficient topic description). We have thus said:

A public body must find a way to inform the public of the “topic of discussion” beyond the label “personnel matter.” For example, the body might say (assuming this were the situation), “Consideration of disciplinary

action for alleged violations of municipal policy.” As this example indicates, there is a middle ground between identifying the individual whose personnel matter is involved, which is not required, and saying nothing more than the formulaic “personnel matter,” which is impermissible.

4 *OMCB Opinions 76, 78 (2004)*.

In sum, we conclude that the Board of Elections violated § 3-306(c)(2) by failing to include all the details required of closed-session summaries for the meetings on June 27, August 22, September 26, and October 8, 2024, and on January 16 and June 26, 2025.³

The Board of Elections further violated § 3-306(c)(2) when it indicated that it held a closed session “if needed” in its minutes for the meeting on February 27, 2025. Such a statement neither properly identifies if a closed session occurred nor complies with the requirements of § 3-306(c)(2).

To ensure that its closed-session summaries contain all of the information required by the Act, the Board of Elections might find it helpful to refer to the template posted on the Attorney General’s website. See <https://oag.maryland.gov/resources-info/Documents/pdfs/OMCB%20Opinions/15OMCB005.pdf> (last visited Oct. 10, 2025).

B. Untimely response

Finally, we address the untimeliness of the Board’s response to the complaint here. The Act requires a public body to “file a written response to the complaint within 30 days after it receives the complaint.” § 3-206(b)(1). The Board of Elections failed to do that here, submitting the response past the deadline and only after our staff reached out to inquire about the response. The Board acknowledges the delay but asserts that the body was not scheduled to meet before the response was due. That may be, but the Board did not request an extension. A public body violates the Act by failing to respond to a complaint, *see, e.g.*, 10 *OMCB Opinions 74, 76 (2016)*, or by failing to respond in a timely manner, *see, e.g.*, 6 *OMCB Opinions 203, 205 (2009)*. We thus find a violation of § 3-206(b)(1).

³ The Complainant asserts that § 3-302.1(a)(1)(i) “requires agendas and minutes to include meaningful information about what was discussed” in closed session. Section 3-302.1 governs agendas but expressly provides that “[a] public body is *not* required to make available any information in the agenda regarding the subject matter of the portion of the meeting that is closed.” § 3-302.1(c) (emphasis added). As for minutes, the relevant provision is, § 3-306(c)(2), as noted above.

Conclusion

We conclude that the Board of Elections violated § 3-306(c)(2) by failing to include all the details required of closed-session summaries. We also conclude that the Board violated § 3-206(b)(1) by failing to timely respond to the complaint here.

This Opinion is subject to the acknowledgment and announcement requirements of § 3-211.

Open Meetings Compliance Board

Runako Kumbula Allsopp, Esq.

Karen R. Calmeise, Esq.

Andrew G. White, Esq.

Mary E. Walker

William C. Miller

Merton Greer

Jane S. Sparks

Dorothea J. Ladusky