

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL STATE OF ILLINOIS

Kwame Raoul ATTORNEY GENERAL

June 6, 2019

Via electronic mail Mr. Kirk Allen P.O. Box 593 Kansas, Illinois 61933 kirk@illinoisleaks.com

Via electronic mail
Mr. James P. Kelly
Matuszewich & Kelly, LLP
101 North Virginia Street, Suite 150
Crystal Lake, Illinois 60014
jpkelly@mkm-law.com

RE: OMA Request for Review – 2018 PAC 51317

Dear Mr. Allen and Mr. Kelly:

This determination is issued pursuant to section 3.5(e) of the Open Meetings Act (OMA) (5 ILCS 120/3.5(e) (West 2016)). For the reasons explained below, the Public Access Bureau concludes that the Algonquin Township Board (Board) did not violate OMA's website posting requirements, but did violate OMA by refusing to provide certain records to the Public Access Counselor for confidential review. The Public Access Bureau further concludes that no additional action is warranted with respect to the allegation that the Board's January 19, 2018, closed session discussions violated the requirements of OMA.

On January 21, 2018, Mr. Kirk Allen submitted this Request for Review alleging that: (1) the Board failed to post notice and an agenda for its January 19, 2018, special meeting on the Township's website; (2) the Board had failed to post on the Township's website a schedule of its regular meetings for 2018, and that the posted schedule of its 2017 regular meetings did not inform the public of the meeting location(s); and (3) the Board improperly discussed a former employee during closed session at that meeting.

On February 1, 2018, this office sent a copy of the Request for Review to the Board and requested that the Board or its representative provide a written response to the allegations, together with copies of the notice, agenda, minutes (both open and closed), and closed session verbatim recording of the January 19, 2018, special meeting. On February 23, 2018, Township Attorney James Kelly provided, on the Board's behalf, both a non-confidential explanation for this office to forward to Mr. Allen and an additional explanation for this office's confidential review. The Board, however, refused to provide either the closed session minutes or closed session verbatim recording of the meeting in question. Mr. Kelly claimed that doing so would waive the attorney-client privilege as to the discussions that took place during the closed session. On March 2, 2018, this office forwarded a copy of the Board's answer to Allen; he did not reply.

DETERMINATION

"The Open Meetings Act provides that public agencies exist to aid in the conduct of the people's business, and that the intent of the Act is to assure that agency actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly." *Gosnell v. Hogan*, 179 Ill. App. 3d 161, 171 (5th Dist. 1989).

Website Posting of Notice and Agenda for January 19, 2018, Meeting

Section 2.02(a) of OMA (5 ILCS 120/2.02(a) (West 2016)) requires, in pertinent part, that a public body provide "[p]ublic notice of any special meeting * * * at least 48 hours before such meeting, which notice shall also include the agenda for the special * * * meeting." Section 2.02(b) of OMA (5 ILCS 120/2.02(b) (West 2016)) adds that "a public body that has a website that the **full-time staff of the public body** maintains shall post notice on its website of all meetings of the governing body of the public body." (Emphasis added.)

The plain language of section 2.02(b) of OMA requires a public body to post notice of a special meeting on its website at least 48 hours before the meeting, if its full-time staff maintains the website. The Board's response to this office asserted that its website was not maintained by full-time staff of the Township. In a February 11, 2019, e-mail to a Supervising Attorney in the Public Access Bureau concerning unrelated matters, Mr. Kelly specified that the website is maintained by IT Connections Inc. of Crystal Lake, Illinois. This office has not

¹⁵ ILCS 120/3.5(b) (West 2016) ("[T]he public body may also furnish the Public Access Counselor with a redacted copy of the answer excluding specific references to any matters at issue. The Public Access Counselor shall forward a copy of the answer or redacted answer, if furnished, to the person submitting the request for review.").

received any evidence to the contrary. Because full-time Township staff did not maintain the Township's website as of the January 19, 2018, special meeting, the Board was not required to post notice or an agenda for the special meeting on the website.

Schedule of Regular Meetings

Section 2.03 of OMA (5 ILCS 120/2.03 (West 2016)) provides, in pertinent part, that "[i]n addition to the notice required by Section 2.02, each body subject to this Act must, at the beginning of each calendar or fiscal year, prepare and make available a schedule of all its regular meetings for such calendar or fiscal year, listing the times and places of such meetings." (Emphasis added.) The Board's response to this office did not address Mr. Allen's allegations concerning the Board's annual meetings schedules. For the reasons discussed above, however, the Board was not required to post its schedule of regular meetings on its website. This office reminds the Board that an annual meetings schedule must include the place(s) where the meetings will be held.

Closed Session Discussions

Finally, we address Mr. Allen's allegation that if the Board discussed a former employee of the Township in closed session at its January 19, 2018, meeting, then those discussions violated OMA. Under OMA, when forwarding to the public body a copy of a Request for Review, the Public Access Bureau "shall specify the records or other documents that the public body shall furnish to facilitate the review." (Emphasis added.) 5 ILCS 120/3.5(b) (West 2016). Section 3.5(b) of OMA further states that "[w]ithin 7 working days after receipt of the request for review, the public body shall provide copies of the records requested and shall otherwise fully cooperate with the Public Access Counselor." (Emphasis added.) Moreover, section 3.5(b) adds: "For purposes of conducting a thorough review, the Public Access Counselor has the same right to examine a verbatim recording of a meeting closed to the public or the minutes of a closed meeting as does a court in a civil action brought to enforce this Act."

Despite this office's express request to review the closed session materials from the Board's January 19, 2018, special meeting, the Board did not provide this office with those materials. This office does not agree with Mr. Kelly's unsupported assertion that disclosure of the requested closed session materials to this office would waive the attorney-client privilege, any more than would an *in camera* review by a court. The Board's refusal precluded this office from fully reviewing this matter and violated section 3.5(b) of OMA.

In the Board's non-confidential response, Mr. Kelly stated:

The closed session was entered into to discuss personnel matters, pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/2(c) (1) and to discuss pending and threatened litigation against the Township pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/2(c) (11). During the closed session I advised the board of threatened litigation and updated the board on pending litigation, as well as discussed the strategy concerning the same.^[3]

Section 2(a) of OMA (5 ILCS 120/2(a) (West 2017 Supp.)) provides that all meetings of a public body shall be open to the public unless the subject of the meeting falls within one of the exceptions set out in section 2(c) of OMA (5 ILCS 120/2(c) (West 2017 Supp.)). Section 2(c)(1) of OMA (5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1) (West 2017 Supp.)) permits a public body to discuss in closed session "[t]he appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the public body or legal counsel for the public body[.]" Section 2(c)(11) of OMA (5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11) (West 2017 Supp.)) provides an exception for the discussion of pending or probable or imminent litigation; Mr. Allen does not allege improper closed session discussion under this exception.

The Board's non-confidential response in this matter was insufficient to demonstrate the extent of what the Board considered to be its discussions under section 2(c)(1). However, the Board also provided this office with a confidential answer concerning the context of discussions that occurred in closed session which indicates that most if not all of the closed session discussion fell within the scope of the section 2(c)(11) exception. Further, because discussion of the dismissal of a specific employee is allowed under section 2(c)(1), Mr. Allen's specific allegation, even if true, might not constitute a violation of OMA, depending upon the nature of the matters discussed. In other words, matters related to the dismissal of an employee will not necessarily be resolved during a single meeting, and the ramifications thereof might well be a topic of discussion on multiple occasions.

Had the Board provided the verbatim recording as required by OMA, such speculation would not be necessary. Its refusal to do so precluded this office from fully reviewing this matter and violated section 3.5(b) of OMA. Nonetheless, under the particular circumstances presented in this Request for Review, action to compel disclosure of the verbatim recording is not warranted.

³Letter from James P. Kelly, Matuszewich & Kelly, LLP, to Christopher R. Boggs, Assistant Attorney General, Public Access Bureau (February 23, 2018), at 1.

The Public Access Counselor has determined that resolution of this matter does not require the issuance of a binding opinion. If you have any questions, please contact me at (217) 785-7438 or cboggs@atg.state.il.us. This letter serves to close this file.

Very truly yours,

CHRISTOPHER R. BOGGS

Supervising Attorney Public Access Bureau

51317 o 202 notice proper 203 improper mun