

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL



ATTORNEY GENERAL
BRIAN L. SCHWALB

February 4, 2026

The Honorable Brooke Pinto
Chairwoman, Committee on the Judiciary & Public Safety
Council of the District of Columbia
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

RE: OAG Responses for FY25 Performance Oversight Hearing

Dear Chairwoman Pinto,

I look forward to the Committee on the Judiciary & Public Safety's FY 25 Performance Oversight Hearing on the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) scheduled for February 9, 2026. In preparation for that hearing, please see the attached responses to the Committee's written questions.

Please let us know if you would like further information on any of these responses. We look forward to testifying next week.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Brian L. Schwalb". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Brian L. Schwalb

Governance and Personnel

- 1. Please provide a complete and current organizational chart for the agency and each division and subdivision within the agency, including:**

RESPONSE: Please see **Attachment 1**, “OAG Organizational Chart.”

- a. The names and titles of all senior personnel;**

RESPONSE: Please see **Attachment 1**, “OAG Organizational Chart.”

- b. A description of the roles and responsibilities for each division and subdivision;**

RESPONSE:

Child Support Services Division (CSSD), authorized under Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, serves families by locating absent parents, establishing paternity, establishing monetary orders, establishing medical support orders, collecting ongoing support, and enforcing delinquent support orders. This division is subject to federally mandated performance requirements.

- **Office of the Division Deputy** provides the central child-support program oversight and reporting functions that are typically housed in statewide child support offices established under Title IV-D; leads overall program planning, communication, enhancement, and similar efforts; provides or collaborates with other OAG divisions on agency-wide administrative, technological, human resources, and other support services; and, directs managers in all program functions, including the establishment and enforcement of child support obligations, accounting, staff development, quality assurance, policy and procedure development, and legislative drafting and review. Additionally, the Litigation Unit is housed under this Section and maintains responsibility for the litigation aspects of child support casework, which includes drafting and filing pleadings to establish paternity and to establish or enforce child support in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia (Superior Court) or other jurisdictions through intergovernmental processes; undertakes activities to locate parents or their assets; engages in service of process efforts to provide proper notice to noncustodial parents concerning matters before the Superior Court; and, represents the District of Columbia and other jurisdictions in Superior Court and other tribunals through all stages of child support establishment and enforcement proceedings.
- **Shared Services Section** attends to the Division’s interaction with the public at the start of customer contact and, at a general level, throughout the life of a case; manages both local and intergovernmental application intake and the associated research, document gathering, and customer engagement related to case opening determinations; assists unwed parents with the voluntary acknowledgement of paternity; performs records management and mail services; offers general customer service and outreach; and, supports noncustodial parents with employment readiness and securing other critical services to encourage responsible involvement in their children’s lives.

- **Fiscal Services Section** provides expertise to ensure that the terms of child support orders are enforced, that collections are properly received, attributed, and disbursed to the right case(s), and that coordination with noncustodial parents' employers and other asset holders is managed effectively so that sources of monetary and medical support are identified and utilized to help to meet the needs of each child for whom support has been ordered.

Civil Litigation Division (CLD) represents the District, its agencies, and its employees, in civil actions brought in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia (Superior Court) and the US District Court for the District of Columbia. The Division also represents District agencies in matters enforcing rules and regulations and in personnel matters in front of administrative bodies and the Superior Court. CLD provides counsel to the District, its agencies, and its employees, including by devising strategies to minimize liability.

- **General Litigation Sections** provide litigation defense, representation, and advice to the District government, its agencies, and employees so that liability can be minimized and risk mitigated in the numerous civil actions filed against the District and its employees every year.
- **Civil Enforcement Section** represents District government agencies to enforce permits, licenses, certifications, and other requirements; defends agency actions; seeks recovery on behalf of the District for Medicaid reimbursements and damage to District property; brings affirmative cases to enforce licensing requirements from the Department of Health and Alcoholic Cannabis Regulation Administration; and represents the Metropolitan Police Department in civil forfeiture proceedings.
- **Equity Section** defends the District government in complex actions seeking temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief.
- **Personnel and Labor Relations Section** provides litigation representation and advice services to District government agencies so that they can manage and reduce liability exposure with respect to personnel decisions and to minimize fiscal and programmatic impact.
- **Office of the Division Deputy** provides supervision of, and support to, division activities.

Commercial Division provides legal services, advice, and advocacy related to numerous core governmental functions, including the procurement of essential goods and services and acquisition of real estate, the support of economic development efforts, preservation of affordable housing, government property management, and the financing of government operations through bonds and collection of taxes.

- **Government Contracts Section** reviews proposed contracts requiring Council approval for legal sufficiency; provides legal advice to the District's Chief Procurement Officer and agency contracting officers regarding procurement laws and regulations as they apply to the award of District contracts and other related procurement issues; represents the District before the Contract Appeals Board in challenges to the terms of solicitations or proposed contract awards by District agencies and in contract disputes; and, represents the District before the Superior Court in petitions for review of protest decisions of the Contract Appeals Board.

- **Tax and Finance Section** advises the District on the issuance of bonds and notes used to finance various capital projects of the District government and nonprofit and for-profit entities located in areas specifically targeted by the District for economic and commercial development; defends real property and other tax assessment appeals; and represents the District in tax sale foreclosure actions filed in Superior Court.
- **Land Acquisition and Bankruptcy Section** provides land acquisition legal services to District agencies acquiring property through condemnation proceedings; handles judicial foreclosure of District tax liens for public purposes such as the creation of affordable housing, the construction of government office buildings, and other economic development projects; and represents District agencies in bankruptcy court in personal and commercial bankruptcies in which the District may have an interest.
- **Office of the Division Deputy** provides supervision of, and support to, division activities.

Family Services Division (FSD) protects the District's most vulnerable residents, abused and neglected children, by representing the DC Child and Family Services Agency (CFSA) in proceedings before the Family Division of Superior Court of the District of Columbia (Family Division); petitions new cases, litigates allegations of neglect, and ensures children exit the foster care system in a timely fashion through reunification with a parent, adoption, or guardianship; leads OAG's human trafficking initiative, which is designed to educate and train community members to identify, report, and stop human trafficking; FSD handles cases involving unaccompanied refugee minors and cases before the Family Treatment Court and HOPE Court; and provides legal consultation and training to CFSA for non-court involved matters to identify at-risk children and to mitigate the need for court involvement.

- **Child Protection Sections** protect the rights of children in Family Division proceedings to prevent abuse and neglect by their caretakers.
- **Office of the Division Deputy** provides supervision of, and support to, division activities.

Immediate Office of the Attorney General (IO) provides overall supervision and guidance to all the divisions within the office; pursues the public interest; and objectively and independently serves District residents through its communications and outreach programs. The Chief Labor & Employment Relations Officer and Counsel is positioned within the IO, duties include serving as OAG's chief labor negotiator for successor agreements with OAG's two labor organizations and conducting legal sufficiency reviews of collective bargaining agreements. Additionally, the Chief Learning Officer is within the IO.

- **Policy and Legislative Affairs** researches and develops policy positions on the range of legal issues affecting the District. It works with the Attorney General, Chief of Staff, Chief Deputy Attorney General, First Deputy Attorney General, and Senior Counsels to the Attorney General to develop policy priorities, works with OAG's divisions to hone policy positions, develops and reviews legislation to advance and ensure consistency with these positions, advises the Council on potential legislation, and consults with District agencies and communities to understand their needs. As part of OAG's mission to advance the public interest, it conducts extensive legal research and community outreach to ensure that OAG's policy positions and priorities address community concerns and advance racial and economic equity.

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)

OAG

- **Federal Initiatives** leads and coordinates the office's work to protect and advance the District's interests in federal matters.
- **Communications** develops and implements OAG's communication strategy by managing OAG's social media, website, and other digital platforms; responding to press inquiries; and developing remarks for public events. It proactively seeks opportunities to inform the public of the work OAG is doing on behalf of District residents.
- **Community Engagement** connects OAG resources and services with community priorities and initiatives by cultivating and maintaining active links to advocates, community-based organizations, and residents. Its goal is to create more engaged communities; greater prosperity for residents, businesses, organizations; and improved quality of life for all who live and work in the District.
- **Ethics and Compliance** serves a dual role as both an ethics advisor and the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) officer for OAG.
- **Human Resources (OAG HR)** provides human resource management services that strengthen individual and organizational performance and enable OAG to attract, develop, and retain a well-qualified, diverse workforce. OAG HR provides oversight of administrative and managerial employee performance evaluations; serves as a liaison between OAG employees and DC Human Resources (DCHR) to resolve personnel and benefits-related actions; processes all employee personnel actions such as hiring, terminations, promotions, and pay increases; provides training and professional development opportunities for all OAG employees to ensure the agency more effectively fulfills its mission; oversees payroll functions; manages FMLA/ADA/EEO requests; hires and maintains excellent and diverse staff through on-campus and virtual interviews, interviews at job fairs, and traditional acceptance of applications; and ensures fairness and diversity in the workplace.
- **Information Technology (IT)** provides a full spectrum of technology support service to all OAG divisions. Its services include support for all software and hardware used by OAG staff, IT security for all OAG applications, mobile device support, and system engineering to build and maintain a robust infrastructure including cloud-based computing and storage resources.

- **Cure the Streets**¹ is a public safety program launched by OAG aimed at reducing gun violence. It operates in certain high violence neighborhoods using a data-driven, public-health approach to gun violence, treating it as a disease that can be interrupted, treated, and stopped from spreading. OAG awards and manages grants to organizations that administer the program and monitor data regarding its efficacy. CTS is based on the Cure Violence Global model, which employs local, credible individuals who have deep ties to the neighborhoods in which they work. Specifically, the program operates primarily through CTS outreach workers and violence interrupters who de-escalate conflicts, attempt to resolve them through mediation, and avert potentially fatal shootings. They work to develop relationships with residents who are at high risk of being involved in gun violence so they can detect and mediate conflicts, prevent shootings, and improve public safety. After mediating a conflict, the violence interrupters remain engaged with the participants, in part to ensure the mediation results in a lasting peace, and to help connect the person with services and to help them live non-violent lives.

Legal Counsel Division (LCD) provides legal advice to the Mayor, the Attorney General, all District agencies, the Council of the District of Columbia, Advisory Neighborhood Commissions, and the District of Columbia Courts.

- **Legal Advice Section** responds to requests for oral and written legal advice, including by issuing confidential and published opinions, on all areas of law and from the entire District government. Such requests typically present legal issues of particular complexity and importance. LCD also reviews for legal sufficiency, and issues corresponding memos and certificates for all draft legislation and rules from the Mayor and subordinate agencies. Within the Office of the Attorney General (OAG), LCD drafts and reviews legislation and rules of the Attorney General and advises on and assists with OAG's Federal Initiatives work. LCD also conducts District-wide trainings in the areas of the Home Rule Act, administrative law and procedure, appropriations law, legislative and regulatory drafting, and other areas of importance to District government;
- **Office of Privacy and Confidentiality** advised on, among other things, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA).²
- **Office of the Division Deputy** provides supervision of and support to division activities.

Public Advocacy Division (PAD) focuses on affirmative, public interest civil litigation on behalf of District residents, including by litigating cases in the areas of preservation of safe and affordable housing, consumer protection, freedom from discrimination and financial exploitation, and fair competition. The Division also litigates to combat nonprofit, environmental, and employment abuses, as well as fraud against the government and on federal matters.

- **Office of the Division Deputy** provides supervision of and support to divisional activities.
- **Antitrust and Nonprofit Enforcement Section (ANP)** enforces the District's Nonprofit Corporation Act, federal and District antitrust laws, and other laws that protect nonprofit organizations and the marketplace from abusive and anticompetitive practices.

¹ Cure the Streets merged with ONSE, effective October 1, 2025, and is no longer within the Office of the Attorney General. Cure the Streets was part of OAG during FY 2025.

² The office dissolved in FY 2025 but was operational for a portion of this reporting period.

- **Civil Rights and Elder Justice Section (CREJS)** investigates and litigates civil rights claims, including discrimination matters related to housing, education, public accommodations, employment, and bias-motivated violence; investigates and takes civil action to protect elders and vulnerable adults from financial exploitation; and engages in significant community engagement with residents, advocacy organizations, community groups, and relevant agencies to provide resources and public education on these issues.
- **Office of Consumer Protection (OCP)** investigates and takes enforcement actions under the Consumer Protection Procedures Act and other District and federal consumer protection laws; performs public outreach and education; provides legislative support on issues that affect consumers; and receives and mediates consumer complaints.
- **Housing and Environmental Justice Section (HEJS)** engages with District residents to address properties with substandard housing conditions by investigating and litigating claims under the Consumer Protection Procedures Act and the Tenant Receivership Act and to address nuisance properties using authority under the Drug-, Firearm-, or Prostitution-Related Nuisance Abatement Act. As part of the Section, the Equitable Land Use team advocates for the public interest in the District’s zoning, planning, and land use matters. The Section also enforces the District’s environmental laws—including air pollution act, water pollution act, and other environmental protection statutes—against the District’s polluters, and participates in multistate environmental actions and investigations. The Section also represents the interests of the District in front of the Public Service Commission, to protect residents’ interest in utility rates and renewable energy initiatives.
- **Workers’ Rights and Antifraud Section (WRAS)** investigates and litigates to protect the rights of District workers to fair wages, overtime pay, sick and safe leave, wage transparency, and freedom from non-compete agreements, and enforces the District’s False Claims Act to protect the District government against fraud, including tax fraud.

Public Safety Division (PSD) prosecutes juveniles charged with criminal offenses; prosecutes adult misdemeanor criminal offenses within OAG’s jurisdiction; protects vulnerable populations, including victims of domestic violence; assists crime victims by facilitating restorative justice conferences; obtains Extreme Risk Protection Orders; initiates involuntary civil commitment proceedings for those who are likely to injure themselves or others as a result of their mental illness; and obtains court-appointed guardians for incapacitated individuals.

- **Criminal Section** prosecutes adult traffic-related offenses, possessory gun offenses, and other regulatory offenses that carry criminal penalties to enhance the safety of District residents through the appropriate resolution of cases.
- **Juvenile Section** prosecutes and resolves juvenile matters to enhance the safety of District residents.
- **Juvenile Specialty Courts Unit (JSCU)** handles truancy, runaway, and juvenile behavioral diversion program cases. JSCU administers the Addressing Truancy Through Engagement and Negotiated Dialogue (ATTEND) truancy prevention program in elementary and middle schools with the highest truancy rates in Wards 4, 5, 7 and 8.
- **Domestic Violence and Special Victims Section (DVSF)** provides specialized, victim-centered, trauma-informed assistance for domestic violence survivors, sexual assault survivors, vulnerable victims, and elderly victims in a variety of case types

handled by OAG. In the Domestic Violence Division of Superior Court, DSVS helps petitioners obtain and enforce civil protection orders and anti-stalking orders; seeks Extreme Risk Protection Orders (ERPO) to remove firearms from the possession of individuals whom law enforcement, mental health providers, or family members fear are at risk of harming themselves or others; and partners with other public and private agencies to staff the District's two Domestic Violence Intake Centers. In the Family Court division of Superior Court (Family Court), DSVS handles delinquency matters involving sexual offenses, domestic violence offenses, and offenses against vulnerable victims; and participates in a specialized service court for juveniles who have committed offenses but are themselves at risk of commercial sexual exploitation. In the Probate Division, DSVS represents Adult Protective Services in obtaining guardians and conservators for incapacitated, vulnerable adults who are being abused, neglected, exploited, or are self-neglecting.

- **Mental Health Section** represents the Department of Behavioral Health (DBH) in litigation in Family Court, Probate Court, Criminal Court, and before the Commission on Mental Health. Attorneys in the Mental Health Section represent DBH in guardianship hearings and at all phases of the civil commitment process, including probable cause hearings, commission hearings, and trials. Attorneys in this section also seek ERPOs to remove firearms from the possession of people whom mental health providers fear are at risk of harming themselves or others. Additionally, they provide extensive training on ERPO to external stakeholders.
- **Restorative Justice Section**³ offers Division prosecutors an additional tool to use in the disposition or treatment phase of a prosecution. In eligible cases—only when the victim is willing—the section brings together the victim and the respondent in facilitated restorative justice conferences to resolve the conflict, repair the harm caused, and restore the victim. In addition to the conference, the Restorative Justice Section incorporates a cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) component for each involved youth.
- **Fraud and Public Corruption Section (FPC)**⁴ prosecutes public corruption cases that have a nexus to the District of Columbia. This Section operates in partnership with the United States Attorney's Office (USAO). The Section includes a tax fraud prosecutor who prosecutes all criminal tax fraud offenses referred to OAG by the DC Office of Tax and Revenue (OTR), with an emphasis on local tax delinquency not appropriate for civil collection; manages cases where individuals fail to pay fines and comply with probationary terms, including court-ordered restitution; provides legal advice to members of the OTR Criminal Investigations Division (OTR/CID) in connection with pending investigations; consults with members of the OTR General Counsel's Office on a range of legal issues related to collection of delinquent taxes; and coordinates with the OTR/CID for the arrest of suspects, and service of warrants and/or subpoenas in connection with tax fraud investigations.

³ As noted in Response 1.c. this Section integrated into it a new Unit and was renamed the Restorative Justice and Special Victims Section. This change became effective December 22, 2025.

⁴ As noted in Response 1.c., this Section was renamed, effective September 12, 2025, from Public Corruption Section to Fraud and Public Corruption Section.

- **Office of the Division Deputy** provides supervision of and support to Division activities.

Office of the Solicitor General (OSG) manages the District’s civil and criminal appellate litigation and practices most frequently before the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and the Supreme Court of the United States. The docket includes appeals in a wide variety of civil, family, criminal, juvenile, tax, and administrative cases from trial courts and petitions for review from District agencies.

- **Appellate Services** represents the District on appeal in a wide variety of matters and advises trial and agency counsel on potential appellate issues.
- **Office of the Division Deputy** provides supervision of and support to division activities.

Support Services (SSD) – provides for administrative support in the agency, including providing investigative support to the litigation divisions of the office.

- **Office of the Division Deputy** is responsible for agency procurement, risk management, and emergency preparedness and provides supervision of and support to divisional activities.
- **Investigations** provides investigative support to the litigating divisions of the office.
- **Operations** provides centralized administrative and logistical support to OAG including mail operations, records management, fleet management, office relocations, renovations, building access, physical security, facilities requests, surplus property, and agency event support.
- **Customer Service** is responsible for first-line communication with the general public and for various agency programs including certified small business enterprise compliance and agency purchase card.

c. A narrative explanation of any changes to the organizational chart made in the last calendar year; and

RESPONSE: The below divisional changes were made to the organizational chart during the last calendar year. There were numerous personnel changes within last calendar. OAG will provide a full list of the changes upon request.

- Child Support Services Division (CSSD) underwent an internal realignment of their Sections. To improve efficiency and address personnel changes, the Legal and Integrated Services Section was disbanded. The Litigation Unit was placed under the direct supervision of the Director. The Establishment Unit and Service of Process Units are now part of the Shared Services Section to streamline daily management and system processes.
- Effective January 2025, the Equitable Land Use Section (ELU) was moved from the Commercial Division to the Public Advocacy Division as part of OAG’s new Housing Protection and Affordability Initiative. ELU was a stand-alone section within PAD until November 20, 2025, when it merged with the Housing and Environmental Justice Section (HEJS). HEJS has two attorneys on its ELU team, including a newly designated Special Counsel for Equitable Land Use.

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)

OAG

- The Office of Privacy and Confidentiality dissolved in FY 2025 and, as such, is no longer within Legal Counsel Division (LCD). The District-wide privacy official is now designated by the Mayor.
- Public Safety Division (PSD) had changes to two sections that occurred in calendar year 2025. First, The Victim Services Unit, within the Domestic Violence and Special Victims Section (DVSU), merged with the Restorative Justice Section. The merged section is now the Restorative Justice and Victim Services Section (RJVS). This change became effective as of December 22, 2025. Both DVSU and RJVS remain in PSD. Second, The Public Corruption Section was renamed the Fraud and Public Corruption Section (FPC), effective September 12, 2025. This change was done to capture the variety of matters investigated and prosecuted by the Section.

d. An indication of whether any positions in the chart are vacant.

RESPONSE: Attachment 1, OAG Organizational Chart, lists vacant positions as of November 2025.

- 2. Please provide a complete, up-to-date list of contract workers working directly for your agency, ordered by program and activity, and including the following information for each position:**
 - a. Title of position;**
 - b. Indication that the position is filled or vacant;**
 - c. Date employee began in the position;**
 - d. Whether the position must be filled to comply with federal or local law;**
 - e. If applicable, the federal or local law that requires the position be filled;**
 - f. The entity from which they are contracted; and**
 - g. The contracted annual cost.**

RESPONSE: See Attachment 2, “Contract Workers.”

- 3. Please provide, for each month of FY 2025 through FY 2026 to date, the net number of personnel separated from and hired to the agency.**

RESPONSE: See Attachment 3, “Personnel Separated from and Hired to OAG.”

- 4. Does the agency conduct annual performance evaluations of all its employees? If so, who conducts such evaluations? What steps are taken to ensure that all office employees are meeting individual job requirements?**

RESPONSE: OAG is committed to encouraging a high-performance workforce culture by creating a productive and accountable workforce and the cornerstone of that effort is Performance Management. Performance Management is a cornerstone of the Administration’s effort to create a productive and accountable workforce. OAG has an ongoing commitment to promote the continuous professional development and growth of its employees.

Performance Management provides a framework for developing the skills of our workforce, defining employee goals and objectives and supporting employee growth through meaningful performance evaluations. This is an ongoing process of communication between a supervisor and an employee that occurs throughout the year, in support of accomplishing the strategic objectives of the organization. It is a systematic process for improving organizational effectiveness through individual, department, and organizational accountability.

The main objective of Performance Management is to proactively manage an employee's performance for accomplishing organizational goals by attaining the desired level of performance. It should align with the strategic vision of the organization and departmental goals. OAG managers regularly provide performance feedback to their direct reports. This feedback is evaluated against clear goals and expectations set during the rating period, based on how well employees meet those measures.

5. Please provide the following for each collective bargaining agreement that is currently in effect for agency employees:

- a. The bargaining unit (name and local number);**
- b. The start and end date of each agreement;**
- c. The number of employees covered;**
- d. Whether the agency is currently bargaining;**
- e. If currently bargaining, anticipated completion date;**
- f. For each agreement, the union leader's name title and contact information;**
and
- g. A copy of the ratified collective bargaining agreement.**

RESPONSE: OAG has 3 collective bargaining agreements. There are 2 collective bargaining agreements that cover employees represented by AFSCME 2401: Compensation Units 1 & 2 CBA (Compensation CBA) and AFSCME Master Working Conditions CBA (Working Conditions CBA). Employees represented by AFGE 1403 have one collective bargaining agreement that covers both compensation and working conditions contracts.

The American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) District Council 20, Local 2401 represents paralegals, IT professionals, and support staff at OAG. AFSCME Local 2401 is one of the largest locals in the District of Columbia government and exists at several agencies under Mayoral control. The bargaining unit (name and local number) is AFSCME District Council 20, Local 2401 (Member of Compensation Units 1 & 2). The Compensation Units 1 and 2 Agreement runs from Fiscal Year 2022 through Fiscal Year 2025 (October 1, 2021, through September 30, 2025). The AFSCME Master Working Conditions Contract is currently active, however it was negotiated and implemented in Fiscal Year 2006 and was set to expire in Fiscal Year 2010. Working Conditions collective bargaining agreements stay in effect until either management or labor request for bargaining to commence. While the end date of the working conditions CBA for AFSCME technically was set to expire in Fiscal Year 2010, because neither party has elected to demand bargaining, this agreement remains in effect. There are 254 AFSCME bargaining unit members. To OAG's knowledge, bargaining has not commenced for compensation or working conditions.

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)
OAG

Union Leader: Roger Scott
President, AFSCME DC 20 Local 2401
Email: roger.scott@afscme2401.org
Phone: (202) 570-2948

The ratified collective bargaining agreements are maintained by the Office of Labor Relations and Collective Bargaining however, we have provided a copy of the collective bargaining agreement. See **Attachment 4**, “Compensation Units 1 & 2 FY 2022 – FY 2025 and AFSCME Master Agreement.”

The American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) Local 1403 represents OAG line attorneys and attorneys at several agencies under Mayoral control. The bargaining unit is American Federation of Government Employees, Local 1403. The Compensation and Working Conditions Collective Bargaining Agreement was ratified by the DC Council on October 16, 2025, and runs from Fiscal Year 2024 through Fiscal Year 2026, expiring on September 30, 2026. There are 240 OAG AFGE bargaining unit members. To OAG’s knowledge, bargaining has not commenced.

Union Leader: Aaron Finkenhausen
President, AFGE Local 1403
Email: afge1403president@gmail.com
Phone: (202) 579-9763

The ratified collective bargaining agreements are maintained by the Office of Labor Relations and Collective Bargaining however, we have provided a copy of the collective bargaining agreement. See **Attachment 5**, “AFGE 1403 CBA FY 24 to FY 26.”

- 6. Please list all employees currently detailed to or from your agency. For each detailed employee, include:**
 - a. The reason for the detail;**
 - b. The job duties if detailed to your agency;**
 - c. The start date of detail;**
 - d. The agency the employee is detailed to/from; and**
 - e. The projected date of return.**

RESPONSE: OAG currently has no employees detailed to or from our agency.

- 7. Please provide a copy of your agency’s Schedule A, as of the date of receipt of this questionnaire.**

RESPONSE: Please see **Attachment 6**, “OAG Schedule A.”

8. Please provide a list and description of all memorandums of understanding and memorandums of agreement in effect during FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date.

RESPONSE: For Monetary MOUs, please see **Attachment 7**, “FY 2025 and FY 2026 Monetary MOUs.” See below for Non-Monetary MOUs.

Non-Monetary MOUs:

CSSD		
FY25 and FY26	Start	End
Office of Administrative Hearings– Administrative Hearings	10/1/20	Continues each FY until terminated by one of the parties
Child and Family Services Agency – Data Sharing	10/1/21	Continues each FY until terminated by one of the parties
Department of Human Services/Department of Health Care Finance/Office of the Chief Technology Officer – Data Sharing/System Maintenance (DCAS)	6/21/16	9/30/26 with option to extend for 2 five-year periods
District of Columbia Housing Authority/Department of Employment Services/Department of Human Services/Department of Health Care Finance – Access to DCAS for DCHA’s eligibility specialists and its vendor	2/27/2025	9/30/30
Department of Human Services – Temporary Aid for Needy Families Sanctions	10/1/24	9/30/25
Department of Human Services – Temporary Aid for Needy Families Sanctions	10/1/25	9/30/26

FSD and PSD		
FY25 and FY26	Start	End
District of Columbia Memorandum of Agreement on the Multidisciplinary Response to Child Sex Abuse	1/27/95	9/30/28 The parties continue to adhere to the terms
District of Columbia Memorandum of Agreement on the Multidisciplinary Response to Child Physical Abuse, Investigation, Prosecution, and Prevention	1/27/95	9/30/28 The parties continue to adhere to the terms

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)

OAG

PAD		
FY 25 and FY 26	Start	End
MOU between OAG and Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) concerning nonresident tuition fraud enforcement	1/17/20	Continues each FY until terminated by one of the parties
MOU between OAG and OSSE for compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)	11/25/20	Continues each FY until terminated by one of the parties
MOU between OAG and D.C. State Athletic Association for compliance with FERPA	6/25/20	Continues each FY until terminated by one of the parties
MOU between OAG, Volare, Legal Counsel for the Elderly, MPD, DACL and USAO regarding engagement in the District's Collaborative Training and Response for Older Victims team	10/1/21	Continues each FY until terminated by one of the parties
MOU between the U.S. Department of Labor and OAG concerning enforcement of wage/hour laws	12/30/22	Continues each FY until 12/30/27
MOU between the Federal Communications Commission and OAG concerning telecommunications fraud and abuse	3/25/22	Continues each FY until terminated by one of the parties
MOU between the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and OAG – Information sharing	8/30/12	Continues each FY until terminated by one of the parties
MOU between the U.S. Department of Transportation and OAG – Information sharing	4/4/24	Terminates 4/4/26, unless renewed by agreement of the parties
MOU between Federal Communications Commission and OAG – Information Sharing	3/10/24	Continues each FY until terminated by one of the parties

PSD		
FY25 and FY26	Start	End
MOU between OAG and USAO concerning prosecution of Title 16 cases	6/18/21	Continues each FY until terminated
MOU between OAG and Prince George's County State's Attorney's Office for organization and implementation of the multi-	12/13/21	Continues each FY until terminated

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)

OAG

jurisdictional juvenile task force		
ATTEND Program: Operations MOU with District of Columbia Public Schools to operate in Ward 8 Elementary Schools	10/1/24	(MOU has not been resigned yet, but is expected to be resigned to cover the remainder of FY26)
MOU between OAG and USAO for Special Assistant United States Attorneys to prosecute financial crimes against vulnerable and elderly adults and public corruption cases that have a nexus to D.C. agencies	12/22/22	Continues each FY until terminated
MOU between OAG and the Department of Behavioral Health (DBH) – Program Operations for DBH Forensic Fellows to assist with court matters	1/12/23	Continues each FY until terminated
MOU with Howard University School of Social Work and OAG for Howard University to provide a student for additional case management support for the ATTEND Mediation Program	6/23/23	1/27
MOU between DBH and OAG for OAG to represent DBH in Superior Court	8/24/23	Continues each FY until terminated
MOU between Department of Forensic Science, USAO and OAG regarding disclosure of potential impeachment information in criminal cases	3/26/2024	Continues each FY until terminated
Memorandum of Understanding as to the Supervision and Operation of the Domestic Violence Intake Centers	7/24/14	Continues each FY until terminated
MOU with University of Maryland System School of Social Work and OAG for University of Maryland to	9/19/2025	1/31/2030

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)

OAG

provide students for additional case management support for the ATTEND Mediation Program		
MOU between OAG and DHS to provide funding to support the CARES Program in collaboration with Sasha Bruce Youthworks	10/1/25	9/30/26

Finance and Budget

9. Please provide a status report, including timeframe of completion, for all projects for which your agency currently has capital funds available.

RESPONSE: In FY 2003, the Council approved \$6.3 million in capital budget dollars to fund a feasibility study (Project Phase I), and ultimately, the design and development of a replacement system for the antiquated DC Child Support Enforcement System (DCCSES) (Project Phase II). In July 2005, OAG and the Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) executed an MOU to begin the DCCSES project, with OCTO managing the project. The feasibility study was completed in December 2008 and estimated the cost for the design and installation of a replacement system to be \$84.3 million. The cost of the proposed system was prohibitive; therefore, OAG and OCTO explored a different course of action for Project Phase II. OAG requested to use the remaining funds from the capital budget to enhance DCCSES by designing and developing a web-enabled and web-based system as an alternative. The request was approved, and to date, the DCCSES project has expended the original \$6.3 million capital budget. These funds were used to move the system from outmoded, unsupported software and hardware to a Microsoft-based platform and to create several internal applications, including a data warehouse containing all transaction information. This approach has resulted in fewer payment processing errors and increased visibility into CSSD operations. The funding permitted planning for and modernization of the following significant components: Electronic Court Orders/Family Court Data Exchange system and the Master Database and Data protection and Synchronization system.

In FY 2022 through FY 2023, Council approved \$4.57 million in additional funding to continue work on the project. In FY 2024, Council approved an additional \$2 million. OAG has been able to use that funding to leverage matching federal funds and achieved the following functionality milestones: processing TANF Referrals in DCCSES 2.0; the ability to automatically generate petitions; the ability to schedule hearings; the ability to refer cases to other jurisdictions; creating non-monetary obligations; reviewing and approving of income withholding orders; and referring a TANF recipient for non-cooperation. Additionally, the ability for customers to apply online has been implemented.

There is approximately \$4,516,451.14 remaining in capital funds available for the DCCSES project. In Spring 2023, OAG paused the project to reevaluate the current workplan and timeline. As part of this reevaluation, OAG has restructured contracts, identified and selected new government management personnel, and assessed the current functionality of DCCSES 2.0 to

determine if the system sufficiently meets business requirements. OAG recently onboarded a new project manager who is responsible for aiding OAG personnel with developing a new project plan and timeline.

For DCCSES full modernization, also known as the DCCSES Replacement Project (DRP), OAG has completed a Project Management Plan (PMP) and a Project Charter that outlines project management procedures for the modernization efforts. OAG has also conducted a Streamlined Feasibility Study (SFS) to identify various solution alternatives. As a part of this study, OAG met with several states to discuss various technical solutions and to discuss lessons learned from other state modernization projects. The SFS includes a comprehensive list of requirements which will help define the project scope and assist with tracking progress, a proposed budget, and a timeline. A finalized Streamlined Feasibility Study package has been submitted to the Federal Office of Child Support Services for approval. Once the SFS package is approved, OAG will proceed to finalize the budget through an Implementation Advanced Planning Document and begin the process of drafting Request for Proposals (RFP) documents. Our plan is to have a development vendor selected in the fourth quarter of FY 2026. The project, which will include implementation and federal certification, is anticipated to be completed in the summer of 2030.

10. Please provide copies of all budget enhancement requests (The Form B or similar form) submitted in the formulation of the FY 2025 and FY 2026 proposed budgets.

RESPONSE: OAG did not submit any budget enhancement requests.

11. Please list all budget enhancements in FY 2026 and provide a status report on the implementation of each enhancement.

RESPONSE: OAG did not receive any enhancements in FY 2026, but the Council restored TANF funding to support DCCSES (\$2.6M) and Litigation Support Fund (LSF) funding (\$7.6M).

12. Please fill out the attached spreadsheet titled “Question 12 Grants Received,” and list all federal and/or private grants received by your agency in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, current balances, and indicate any that lapsed during or at the end of FY 2025.

- a. Please submit the completed document in both Excel and PDF formats.
- b. Please include your Agency Code in the filename (e.g., question_12_AB0_2026.xls).

RESPONSE: Please see Attachment 8, “Question 12 CB0 FY25 and FY26 Grants Received.”

13. List all grants issued by your agency in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date in the attachment labeled “Question 13 Grants Issued”.

- a. Please submit the completed document in both Excel and PDF formats.
- b. Please include your Agency Code in the filename (e.g., Question_13_AB0_2026.xls).

RESPONSE: Please see Attachment 9, “Question 13 CB0 FY 25 and FY26 Grants Issued.”

Operations

- 14. Please provide the Committee with a list of all vehicles owned or leased by the agency; the purpose of the vehicle; the division the vehicle is assigned to, if applicable; and whether the vehicle is assigned to an individual employee.**

RESPONSE: Please see **Attachment 10**, “FY 2025 OAG Vehicle Inventory and Assignments.”

- 15. For each objective and activity in the agency’s FY 2025 Performance Plan, please list:**
- a. The measure of greatest improvement for the agency, and the actions the agency took to improve that measure’s outcome, efficiency or quantity; and**
 - b. For all measures with missed targets (if any), explain the actions the agency is taking to improve that measure’s outcome, efficiency, or quantity.**

RESPONSE: Please see **Attachment 11**, “FY 2025 Performance Initiatives Accountability Report,” that details progress on FY 2025 performance initiatives.

- 16. List all new objectives, activities and projects in the agency’s FY 2026 Performance Plan and explain why they were added.**

RESPONSE: Please see **Attachment 12**, “FY 2026 Performance Plan.”

- 17. Describe problems and challenges, including chronic maintenance issues and design flaws, in agency-owned or leased facilities.**

RESPONSE: OAG’s headquarters are in a leased facility located at 400 6th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20001. OAG has experienced continuing issues with the elevators. There have been approximately 10 instances of employees reporting being stuck in the elevator or experiencing the elevators jumping. Building management has not provided a report on what is causing the issues nor a timeframe on when these issues will be corrected.

- a. What capital or operating projects arose from these issues in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, including cost and actions taken?**

RESPONSE: None.

18. Please list each new initiative implemented by the agency during FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date. For each new initiative, please provide:

- a. A description of the initiative;**
- b. Actual start date;**
- c. Actual or anticipated end date;**
- d. The funding required to implement the initiative;**
- e. Whether the initiative was mandated by legislative action;**
- f. Problems or challenges faced in the program's implementation;**
- g. The metrics the agency is collecting to measure the initiative's success; and**
- h. An assessment of the initiative's success thus far.**

RESPONSE: OAG has three new initiatives to highlight that were implemented during FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date.

Housing Protection and Affordability Initiative: This Initiative consolidates OAG workstreams focused on housing affordability, safety, and accessibility. Its purpose is to prioritize and enhance the effectiveness of OAG's critical housing work. The establishment of the Initiative underscores the importance of preserving and expanding the supply of safe, affordable housing to OAG's public interest mission. As part of the Initiative, OAG implemented the following changes, effective January 2025:

- Created a new position of Senior Counsel to the Attorney General for Housing Protection and Affordability to lead the Initiative.
- Moved the Equitable Land Use Section from the Commercial Division to Public Advocacy Division.
- Created a new position of Special Counsel for Housing and Property Maintenance Code Enforcement to focus on partnering with the Department of Buildings (DOB) to enforce the Housing and Property Maintenance Codes.

Prior to the Initiative's formation in FY 2024 OAG also created a new position of Special Counsel for Nuisance Abatement to focus on collaborating with community members and stakeholders to identify and implement solutions for nuisance activity.

During its first year, the Housing Initiative focused on three primary goals. First, the Initiative prioritizes investigations and litigation that address housing affordability and poor housing conditions for both tenants and owners. As described in further detail in responses below, this includes antitrust litigation against landlords for illegally colluding to increase rents; civil rights litigation and investigations of landlords for illegally leasing rent-controlled apartments solely to subsidy holders and excluding other low-income renters; consumer protection investigations of landlords for illegally charging junk fees; interventions in Zoning Commission matters in support of increasing affordable housing development; consumer protection and tenant receivership claims against owners and property managers for housing code violations; enforcement of orders to correct for condominium and other ownership properties; and nuisance investigations with a community-based, problem-solving approach to achieve security improvements. This work is handled by multiple Divisions and, therefore, the Initiative also works to break down internal silos by convening meetings and working groups and conducting trainings across teams and Divisions.

Second, OAG is working to break down siloes within and between District agencies and on ensuring a whole-of-government response to poor housing conditions. DOB continues to work with OAG on its housing enforcement matters, playing a critical part in documenting the conditions at properties through Notices of Infraction and Orders to Correct and in identifying referrals for OAG enforcement through the Office of Strategic Enforcement led by Keith Parsons. The Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection similarly helps OAG document the licensing status of owners and property managers. OAG is exploring additional ways to collaborate with agencies, including working with the Office of Tenant Advocate to help OTA recoup funds that it expends housing displaced tenants, and working with the Central Collections Unit to enforce liens at the worst slum properties in the District.

Lastly, the Initiative engages with tenants, housing providers, and the Council on broader housing solutions. OAG's teams working on all aspects of housing frequently join community meetings and public safety walks, meet with and seek feedback from tenants and housing providers and their advocates, and work with Councilmembers and their staff, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioners, and other local leaders to work on broader housing solutions. In November 2025, the Attorney General and Councilmember Robert White introduced the Strengthening Tenant Receivership and Oversight for Neighborhood Growth (STRONG) Homes Amendment Act of 2025, which includes provisions to strengthen OAG's enforcement authority to address poor housing conditions and hold bad actors accountable.

Public Safety Division's Master of Social Work Internship: OAG expanded its Master of Social Work Internship Program to support the ATTEND Program to the University of Maryland System (Baltimore). The program started September 19, 2025, and is anticipated to end January 31, 2030. The initiative is a learning opportunity and did not require any funding to implement nor was it mandated by legislative action. OAG has limited number of staff that have the level of licensure required to oversee its daily operations. While this places additional tasks on an already overloaded workforce, the benefits to the consumers and MSW students make it a win-win. The metrics are outlined in the students' learning contract and university's required semester submissions by the field supervisor. Students and University staff have provided positive feedback thus far and OAG looks forward to completing the first year in May of 2026.

Operation Section's New Agency Fleet Share Program: OAG's Operations Section is deploying a new agency fleet share program that provides onsite vehicles for OAG employees to use when performing official duties that require travel to work sites. The vehicles will feature advanced keyless and fob technology to improve safety, convenience and accountability. OAG will reallocate four existing fleet vehicles, which will be retrofitted with the new technology. This initiative improves employee mobility while aligning with OAG's objective to strengthen fleet performance and usage. A pilot program will commence on March 9, 2026.

The initial annual cost for implementation is \$7,460, including \$2,180 for equipment and \$5,280 for annual maintenance. After the implementation year, the annual cost will be \$5,280 for maintenance. This initiative was not mandated by legislative action. Program implementation was initially scheduled for January 2026; however, the Department of Public Works experienced delays in receiving equipment from the vendor. Success will be measured by the number of employees who utilize fleet vehicles and whether the agency achieves a reduction in Lyft usage. The initiative has not yet been implemented.

19. Please list any legislation that impacts your agency from FY 2025 and FY 2026 and provide a status report on the agency's implementation related to each piece of legislation.

RESPONSE: OAG is the chief legal office for the District of Columbia, and as such, upholds and enforces all District laws and promotes the public interest. In fulfilling this role, OAG routinely brings affirmative litigation cases under its statutory enforcement authority provided through laws. OAG also defends the District against lawsuits and defends our laws against constitutional challenges. While there are too many pieces of legislation to point to that impacted OAG during this reporting period, below are two prime examples of legislation-specific work.

One example of legislation that directly impacts the work of OAG is the Strengthening Traffic Enforcement, Education, and Responsibility (STEER) Act, which officially became law in the District in April 2024. At the beginning of this fiscal year, CES launched enforcement under STEER. To date, OAG has filed 25 lawsuits against dangerous drivers with large numbers of unpaid tickets for speeding, reckless driving, and other traffic violations, many of which have been outstanding for over ten years. In total, these 25 drivers had 4,633 violations resulting in \$1,509,556 in outstanding fines and penalties. These suits hold drivers from Maryland and Virginia who flout District traffic laws accountable by seeking monetary judgments against them. In its first year, with the assistance of agency partner, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's Central Collection Unit, OAG successfully obtained judgments in four cases totaling \$228,782 for 828 outstanding speeding and other unsafe driving citations and obtained pre-suit resolution of an additional three cases totaling \$47,316 and implicating 205 outstanding speeding citations.

One other notable example is the Tenant Receivership Act, under which OAG brings claims against owners with a pattern of neglect involving serious health and safety violations. The TRA is a powerful tool that OAG employs only after careful consideration of the facts of the claims and the appropriate remedies.

20. Customer feedback

- a. How does the agency solicit feedback from customers (i.e., District residents served)? Please describe.**
- b. What has the agency learned from this feedback?**
- c. How has the agency changed its practices because of such feedback?**

RESPONSE: Responsiveness to District residents and stakeholders is a key component of providing world-class legal services. Soliciting feedback and learning from it is important to ensure that we are responding to the needs of the day. Below are a few examples of how the agency solicits feedback, has learned from that feedback, and has changed practices because of it.

Child Support Services Division (CSSD) has significant customer-facing work and has made customer service a division-wide priority and is committed to improving customer service. For example, during this reporting period, CSSD worked to expand Amazon Connect capabilities and accountability. Implemented in 2024, Amazon Connect enhances the effectiveness and efficiency of CSSD's customer service. This relatively new system streamlines incoming calls through central entry points, utilizes call tracking tools to reduce wait times, and enables call monitoring for quality assurance, targeted customer support, and staff training. CSSD also implemented several improvements to its Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system to further enhance the customer experience. IVR is the first point of contact for many callers. Based directly on public feedback and internal recommendations, CSSD undertook the following initiatives to enhance CSSD's interactions with various customer groups:

- Clearer prompts for faster connection to the appropriate case-processing unit;
- Expanded language access features for improved service to non-English and limited-English speakers; and
- Increased user-friendliness.

CSSD is collaborating with the District's networking team to implement these changes online and make the new features available to the public.

Family Services Division (FSD) solicits feedback from its client agency on a routine basis, by following up with the assigned social work team and management following different touch points throughout cases. FSD utilizes this feedback to promote professional development and improve customer service amongst our case carrying attorneys and management team. Overall, our client agency reports being satisfied with the representation FSD provides.

Public Safety Division (PSD) interacts with a variety of stakeholders from victims in cases or through Restorative Justice to parents in mediation in schools. Juvenile Section prosecutors and victim specialists routinely communicate with victims to provide information regarding case progress, to solicit input regarding case resolution, and to review the facts and prepare for trial or disposition. Restorative Justice Section regularly meets with youth and their parents/guardians, harmed parties and their supporters, and defense counsel to understand their needs and continuously gather feedback regarding their experience with the program. Feedback from participants has been positive, and most explain that they felt heard during the process and they feel better after the process than they did beforehand. Some parents have expressed the need for similar programs to help prevent their young person from ever becoming justice system involved. Additionally, participants often express gratitude for the referrals to services and other assistance provided by the Restorative Justice facilitators and Social Worker.

To respond to a need for education on the program, Restorative Justice Section conducted more trainings to ensure stakeholders—such as Assistant Attorneys General, Defense Counsel, the Community Engagement Team, School Resource Officers, and others – understand the Restorative Justice Program and can speak knowledgeably about the program with Defense Counsel, DC Superior Court Judges, and community members who are impacted by crime.

Through the ATTEND Program, staff conduct parent surveys after case closure to assess customer satisfaction and opportunities for growth. ATTEND has also received positive feedback regarding OAG staff from intake process to case management including linkage to community-based providers and their responsiveness. In response to feedback, the ATTEND Program changed its intake process and added a three-tiered approach to service delivery. For example, the intake team conducts an assessment and assigns a level which outlines the service model – level 1 (30 days case management); level 2 (mediation and 90 days case management), or level 3 (court intervention and coordination with Child and Family Services Agency).

The Support Services Division's (SSD) Customer Service Section serves as the first contact residents interact with when seeking assistance from OAG. This Section manages the main reception desk as well as responds to emails sent to the agency through its website. As the Customer Service Section often is not the OAG section that provides residents with the substantive response to their inquiry, it is unable to directly solicit feedback from residents. Rather, the Section focuses on process outcomes, such as recurring issues, common constituent complaints or concerns, and patterns of inefficiencies. Callers often do not understand the distinction between the District of Columbia Office of the Attorney General and the United States Attorney General and their relative jurisdiction and responsibilities. The observation-based feedback approach allows the Customer Service team to identify communication gaps between the public and the various divisions within OAG so the agency may better educate residents on the work it conducts on behalf of the District and its residents.

From its observations, the Customer Service Section learned that District residents often rely on social media to receive local news, and sometimes, OAG is alerted to hot topics through email and phone calls from residents to the OAG receptionist. The Customer Service team acts swiftly to alert the affected divisions so they may provide clear, consistent guidance. For example, there was a “plantation text” sent to many District residents, which the Customer Service team learned about through phone calls to the agency. A social media post instructed residents to contact OAG. The Customer Service team quickly alerted OAG’s Civil Rights Section who then provided helpful guidance to concerned residents.

The Customer Service Section regularly monitors government and agency press releases and follows social media accounts, like local journalists and community influencers that regularly share current events and news. This assists with early awareness of issues that may impact engagement between the agency and the public.

Laws, Audits, and Reports

21. Please identify any legislative modifications that would enable the agency to better meet its mission.

RESPONSE: We routinely work with DC Council to advance legislative amendments or new proposals that will enable OAG to better meet its mission. For example, we recently introduced reforms to the DC child support system, reforms that further advance an OAG priority to strengthen families and contribute to positive youth development. We look forward to continuing to partner with Council on legislation that would enable OAG to better meet its mission.

22. Please identify any regulatory impediments to your agency’s operations.

RESPONSE: We have not identified any regulatory impediments to OAG’s operations.

23. Please list and describe any ongoing investigations, audits, or reports on your agency or any employee of your agency, or any investigations, studies, audits, or reports on your agency or any employee of your agency that were completed during FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date.

RESPONSE:

- Child Support Family Services Division’s Federal Office of Child Support Services (OCSS) FY 2023 Data Reliability Audit was completed in FY 2025. This audit is conducted annually to assess the completeness, reliability, and security of child support data and to assess child support performance indicators. The FY 2023 final report was issued in November of 2024. The Child Support Services Division (CSSD) passed the FY23 audit with the lowest performance indicator data accuracy rate being 95%.
- The IRS completed an onsite Safeguards Review for the Child Support Services Division in February 2023. Agencies that receive and store Federal Tax Information are required to undergo a review every 3 years. The review included a physical and technical examination of CSSD offices, CSSD vendor sites, CSSD policies, and CSSD IT Infrastructure. A

Safeguards Review Report and a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) were issued in April 2023. CSSD must respond to the IRS CAP every 6 months until all findings are resolved or the next review takes place.⁵ CSSD responded to the IRS CAP twice during the reporting period.

- Child Support Family Services Division's Federal Office of Child Support Services (OCSS) FY 2024 Data Reliability Audit was completed in FY 2026. This audit is conducted annually to assess the completeness, reliability, and security of child support data and to assess child support performance indicators. The final FY 2025 draft report was issued in January of 2026. CSSD passed the FY 2024 audit with the lowest performance indicator data accuracy rate being 96%.
- In FY 2025, the Child Support Enforcement Program Grant was selected for the single audit and resulted in a clean opinion.
- Office of the D.C. Auditor (ODCA) is performing an ongoing audit into a Consent Order entered by the Office of the Attorney General in September 2020 in the case of *District of Columbia v. District of Columbia Housing Authority* (DC Superior Court), which addressed allegations of drug- and firearm-related nuisance activity at 10 public housing properties in the District. ODCA reports that the goal of the audit is to determine DCHA's compliance with the 2020 Consent Order and that the expected completion date is April 2026. OAG has met with ODCA staff and has produced relevant documents as part of the audit process.

24. Please identify and provide an update on what actions have been taken to address all recommendations made during the previous three years by:

- a. Office of the Inspector General;**
- b. D.C. Auditor;**
- c. Internal audit; and**
- d. Any other federal or local oversight entities.**

RESPONSE: The IRS completed an onsite Safeguards Review for the Child Support Services Division (CSSD) in February 2023. Agencies that receive and store Federal Tax Information are required to undergo a review every 3 years. The review included a physical and technical examination of CSSD offices, CSSD vendor sites, CSSD policies, and CSSD IT Infrastructure. A Safeguards Review Report and a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) were issued in April 2023. CSSD is obligated to respond to the IRS CAP every 6 months until all findings are resolved, or the next review takes place. Several hundred findings were identified during the 2023 Safeguards Review. Approximately 97% of those findings have been resolved. For example, the IRS recommended that passwords be expanded to 14 characters for systems that process tax information. CSSD was able to move from an 8-character password to a 14-character password in the first quarter of FY 2025.

⁵ Another IRS Safeguards Review is due to take place in the February/March of 2026 timeframe.

Additionally, the Federal Office of Child Support Services (OCSS) Data Reliability Audits are conducted annually to assess the completeness, reliability, and security of child support data and to assess child support performance indicators. The FY 2022 data reliability audit, which was completed in February of 2024, revealed that the lowest performance indicator data accuracy rate was 92%. There were several recommendations made by OCSS that centered around training and updating procedures for how information is reported on Federal reports. CSSD updated workflows and procedures to ensure information was updated correctly within main child support enforcement system (DCCSES). There were also technical improvements made by Information Technology to improve the accuracy of data reporting. By implementing the recommendations, CSSD showed improvements in the FY 2023 and FY 2024 data reliability audits. The lowest performance indicator data accuracy rate for the FY 2024 audit was 96% which is a 4% increase over FY 2022.

25. Please list all pending lawsuits in which the agency, or its officers or employees acting in their official capacities, are named as defendants, and for each case provide the following:

- a. The case name;**
- b. Court where the suit was filed;**
- c. Case docket number;**
- d. Case status; and**
- e. A brief description of the case**

RESPONSE: See below for a list of all pending lawsuits in which OAG, or its officers or employees acting in their official capacities, are named as defendants:

- ***Jackson v. District of Columbia***, 2024-CAB-007077 (D.C. Superior Court): Plaintiff sues the District and a former OAG employee under DCFMLA, DCHRA, and DCWPA. The District's motion to dismiss remains pending.
- ***Taylor v. Office of the Attorney General of DC***, 2025-CAB-000294 (D.C. Superior Court): Pro se action alleging that OAG's Child Support Services Division mishandled her child support matter. The District's motion to dismiss was granted, and the case is closed.
- ***Government Accountability & Oversight v. District of Columbia et al.***, 2025-CAB-003391 (D.C. Superior Court): Lawsuit seeking to compel the production of certain common interest agreements, purportedly entered into between or among OAG and other state attorneys general, pertaining to suits or other efforts undertaken in anticipation of, or in response to, the inauguration of Donald J. Trump as U.S. President. The District answered the Amended Complaint on December 3, 2025.
- ***Diop Kamau, et al. v. Gregory Slate, et al.***, 25-cv-02748 (DDC): Lawsuit against the District and certain OAG employees, alleging a Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) claim, a conspiracy to violate the RICO statute claim, a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim for violation of the First Amendment, abuse of process and malicious prosecution claims, and a civil conspiracy claim that arise from a case pending in the Domestic Violence Division of D.C. Superior Court. The District's motion to dismiss remains pending.
- ***Valibeigi v. District of Columbia***, 2025-CAB-001940 (D.C. Superior Court): Plaintiff challenged OAG's housing enforcement efforts as discriminatory, alleging selective

enforcement and prosecution. The District’s motion to dismiss was granted, and the case is closed.

26. Please list the total amount of money the agency or the District, on behalf of the agency, expended to settle claims against it, or its officers or employees acting in their official capacities, in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date.

RESPONSE:

Case Name	Date	Amount	Description
<i>Claudia Treadwell v. District of Columbia, 22-cv-03616 (DDC)</i>	March 18, 2025	\$65,000	Resolution of litigation alleging claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and the D.C. Human Rights Act.

27. Please list each settlement the agency or the District, on behalf of the agency, entered into in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date that involved claims against the agency, or its officers or employees in their official capacity, including any settlements covered by D.C. Code § 2-402(a)(3). For each settlement, provide:

- a. The amount of the settlement;
- b. If related to litigation, the case name and brief description; and
- c. If unrelated to litigation, please describe the underlying issue or reason for the settlement (e.g. administrative complaint, etc.)

RESPONSE:

Case Name	Date	Amount	Description
<i>Claudia Treadwell v. District of Columbia, 22-cv-03616 (DDC)</i>	March 18, 2025	\$65,000	Resolution of litigation alleging claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and the D.C. Human Rights Act.

Vendor’s Name	Dates	Amount	Description
Bowman Group	August 1 st through August 3, 2024	\$4,025.00	Resolution of Litigation cost for expert witness in the matter of Katz v. DC, 2015-CA-005304.
Jerome S. Paige and Associates	October 21 st through October 23, 2024	\$6,300.00	Resolution of Litigation cost for expert witness in the matter of White v. DC, CAB005995.

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)

OAG

Charles S. Betsey	October 1 st through October 2, 2024	\$5,700.00	Resolution of Litigation cost for expert witness in the matter of Stewart v. DC, CA-002921-B.
Giarc Consulting, LLC	October 24 th through December 18, 2024	\$1,800.00	Resolution of Litigation cost for expert witness in the matter of Crosson v. DC, 2022-CAB-001074.
TransPerfect Translations International, Inc.	January 27 th through January 30, 2025	\$6,921.70	Resolution of non-litigation cost for translation services, which were vital ensuring non-English speaking residents understood new executive orders issued by the President of the US.
The McCammon Group	December 4, 2024 through January 24, 2025	\$4,375.00	Resolution of Litigation cost for expert witness in the matter of the Appeal of Technopref Industries v. DC, CAB-D-1566.
Drs. Falik and Karim, P.A.	November 26, 2024	\$900.00	Resolution of Litigation cost for expert witness in the matter of Knight v. DC, 2022-CAB-005995.
Greenstein Delorme & Luchs, P.C.	October 3 rd through November 30, 2024	\$9,130.00	Resolution of Litigation cost for expert witness in the matter of York v. DC, 2021-CA-003977-B.
Clower and Associates	February 27 th through March 2, 2025	\$6,100.00	Resolution of Litigation cost for State of MD v. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Case No. 1:25-CV-748.
Verrill and Dana, LLP	August 4 th through August 31, 2025	\$2,362.50	Resolution of Litigation mediation cost for Anacostia River Sediment Clean-Up Project.
JS Held, LLC	January 11 th through April 4, 2024	\$7,406.73	Resolution of Litigation cost for expert witness in the matter of Burk v. DC, CAL21-03802.
Thornton Tomasetti	June 26 th through September 17, 2024	\$22,567.50	Resolution of Litigation cost for expert witness in the matter of the Appeal of Technopref Industries, Inc., CAB-D-1566.
TREC DC	June 11 th through September 10, 2025	\$4,950.00	Resolution of non-litigation cost for trauma-informed care workshop series.
		\$82,538.43	

28. Please list all administrative complaints or grievances that the agency received in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date. For each complaint, list:

- a. The source of complaint;**
- b. The process utilized to respond to the complaint or grievance;**
- c. Any changes to agency policies or procedures that resulted from the complaint or grievance; and**
- d. If resolved describe the resolution.**

RESPONSE: Listed below are the administrative complaints and grievances, none of which have resulted in any change to agency policies and procedures.

OAG first attempts to resolve grievances informally through meetings. If informal attempts at resolution are unsuccessful, OAG uses the process outlined in the applicable collective bargaining agreements for bargaining unit employees. Generally, a labor organization or employee files the grievance at the lowest managerial level where relief can be granted.

Management then has 10 to 15 working days to respond under the applicable collective bargaining agreement. If a grievance is not resolved at the lowest management level, the union or the employee may proceed to the next management level until the Attorney General issues a final decision. After the Attorney General issues a final decision, the union or employee may request arbitration, and a third-party arbitrator is selected following the process outlined in the collective bargaining agreement. Either party may seek review of an arbitrator's award by filing an appeal with the Public Employee Relations Board (PERB). Either party may seek review of PERB's decision by filing an appeal with the District of Columbia Superior Court. Lastly, either party may seek review of the Superior Court's decision by filing an appeal with the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

Under their collective bargaining agreement, attorneys may challenge the Attorney General's final decision on certain discipline by demanding non-binding arbitration. For non-bargaining unit employees, OAG follows the process outlined in the District Personnel Manual. An employee may file a grievance with the manager who has authority to grant the relief sought, usually the Attorney General. Management's decision on the grievance is final.

Administrative Complaints:

- OAG received 1 administrative complaint filed before the Office of Employee Appeals (OEA) in FY25 and the matter was resolved as a result of a settlement agreement.
- OAG received 1 administrative complaint filed before the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) in FY25 by an employee claiming discrimination based on retaliation, sex, and issues of harassment, and constructive discharge. The claim was subsequently dismissed
- OAG received 1 administrative complaint filed before the OHR matter and that matter is still pending.
- OAG received 2 administrative complaints filed before the D.C. Superior Court (DCSC) appealing two (2) OEA decisions—one denying a request for attorney fees and another requesting enforcement. Both matters are currently pending final decisions by DCSC.

Grievances:

- **AFSCME, Local 2401:** AFSCME filed five (5) grievances in FY25, all of which were denied by OAG. One (1) grievance was moot, another was resolved, and for the remaining three (3), AFSCME has invoked arbitration.
- **AFGE Local 1403:** AFGE filed one (1) grievance in FY25 that was subsequently withdrawn.
- **Non-Bargaining Unit Employees:** OAG did not receive any grievance in FY25 from a non-bargaining unit employee.

- 29. Is the agency currently party to any active non-disclosure agreements? If so, please provide all allowable information on all such agreements, including:**
- a. The number of agreements;
 - b. The department(s) within the agency associated with each agreement; and
 - c. Whether any agreements are required for specific positions (please list each position by division and program and indicate whether the position is contracted)

RESPONSE: We do not have any non-disclosure agreements in effect.

Data

- 30. In filterable and sortable spreadsheet, please list all electronic databases maintained by your agency, including the following:**
- a. A detailed description of the information tracked within each system;
 - b. The age of the system and any discussion of substantial upgrades that have been made or are planned to the system; and
 - c. Whether the public can be granted access to all or part of each system.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 13, “Agency Maintained Databases.”

- 31. Please provide a list of all studies, research papers, and analyses (“studies”) the agency or an agency’s employee requested, prepared, presented or contracted for during FY 2025. For each study please list:**
- a. The status;
 - b. The purpose; and
 - c. A link (if published) to the study, research paper or analysis.

OAG is undergoing a qualitative evaluation of its restorative justice process to gain better insight into the most effective methods for changing criminal behavior and reducing recidivism. The evaluation is being conducted by the Urban Institute (Urban), a renowned research and policy institution, and funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation (Casey Foundation), a national philanthropy dedicated to improving juvenile justice systems. The study includes surveys administered by researchers, and interviews with youth, parents and victims who participated in restorative justice to evaluate how remorse, culpability, and perceptions of fairness impact behavior change. The evaluation will also assess victim satisfaction. Results from this study were originally anticipated by the end of 2024. However, Urban needs additional time to finalize their data collection and extend their timeline to complete the study. In late December 2025, Urban shared with OAG a rough draft of its report, and at the request of OAG, Urban is working with the Casey Foundation to provide a definitive timeframe for when the report will be finalized and published.

In FY 2025, as part of the US Department of Justice’s National Public Safety Partnership, of which the District was grantee, a subject matter expert worked with OAG to assess and provide recommendations to OAG on enhancements to current delinquency data utilization practices.

32. Please list contracts and procurements awarded, entered into, extended, or for which an option year was exercised, by the agency during FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date in the attached spreadsheet titled “Contracts and Procurements”.

- a. Please include your Agency Code in the filename (e.g., AB0_2026_Contracts and Procurements.xls).
- b. You may add additional lines to the sheet but please do not change any other formatting.

RESPONSE: Please see Attachment 14, “Question 32 CB0 FY 2025 and FY 2026 Contracts and Procurements.”

AGENCY-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Civil, Family, Public Safety, Commercial, and other Topical Work

33. Please provide brief highlights of any changes to the work of each of OAG’s divisions in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date.

- a. **The Child Support Services Division;**

RESPONSE: Child Support Services Division (CSSD) assists District families with locating absent parents, establishing paternity, establishing orders for monetary and medical support, collecting ongoing support, and enforcing delinquent child-support orders. CSSD also seeks to ensure that District children receive the financial support to which they are legally entitled. In addition to collecting \$46,206,068 in child support payments in FY 2025 to help children thrive, CSSD focused on continuous improvement across all aspects of its operations. Highlights include:

- **Child Support Pass-through Increase:** CSSD worked with internal and external stakeholders to draft, pass, and fund an increase in the child support pass-through for this FY 2026. Specifically, families receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) saw an increase in child support pass-through payments from \$150 to \$200 per month. This change, enacted through the Child Support Reform Amendment Act of 2025, allows more money collected from noncustodial parents to be placed into the hands of some of the most vulnerable families in the District.
- **Alternative Solutions Center (ASC) Expansion:** ASC is a program designed to assist non-custodial parents with workforce development, child support system navigation, and emotional and interpersonal health. Through partnerships with District employment resources, the court, employers, and various community partners, this program has had a significant impact on lives and on child support payments. In FY 2025, the Workforce Services Unit staff oriented almost 100 new non-custodial parents to the various aspects of ASC’s individualized engagement and weekly group activity, bringing the total number of parents involved with the program in some way to more than 700. By fiscal year end, 128 of the active program participants were employed, and support collections tallied \$1,602,693.24, benefitting their children. Also added to this year’s offerings were custodial parent roundtables and co-parenting offerings to encourage greater understanding and collaboration between parents to improve both support compliance and community outcomes. FY 2025 also was a year dedicated to program examination. Accordingly, the team devised a program-enhancement approach to broaden impact for the participants and children. The effort has included individual-session and workshop curriculum revision, ASC referral and participation-tracking process updates, a refocus on case maintenance responsibilities, review of related-service assessments and handoffs, and a staffing strategy reconsideration—all designed to enable CSSD to expand ASC impact.
- **Language Access and Website Enhancements:** While many CSSD customers are native to the United States, others originate from other countries and have limited or no English proficiency. In collaboration with the Mayor’s Office of Human Rights, CSSD works diligently to ensure that customers can utilize services. Among the initiatives undertaken recently was the continued translation of core CSSD documents so that they are readily accessible to customers needing language support. Additionally, working with the OAG website liaisons and developers, the website area that permits customers to choose website translation now is presented using the characters of the various languages rather than solely English, making it easier for the customer to identify the language of choice for receiving information.

b. Civil Litigation Division;

RESPONSE: Civil Litigation Division (CLD) provides legal representation for the District before local and federal courts. In FY 2025, this work saved the District over \$310,000,000 in potential liability. Highlights include:

- **Victories in Court:** CLD’s General Litigation Sections had three victories in trial cases this year. One was an outright defense verdict in favor of the District and two District

employees: *Bruce v. District of Columbia, et al.*, a case brought under the District of Columbia Whistleblower Protection Act. The other two were cases where the jury awarded damages far below what the plaintiffs demanded to settle before trial: *Sharp v. District of Columbia* (a jury awarded Plaintiff \$85,000 in a car accident case where the final pretrial demand was \$1.2 million) and *Bradley v. District of Columbia* (a jury awarded Plaintiff \$163,710 in a car accident case where the final pretrial demand was \$4 million).

- **Defending Gun Laws:** CLD’s Equity Section continued to successfully defend the District’s common sense gun laws. In *Wehr-Darroca v. District of Columbia*, a challenge to the District’s ban on large-capacity magazines, the Court granted the District’s motion to dismiss, agreeing that the plaintiffs lacked standing. And in *Russell v. District of Columbia*, the Court granted summary judgment to the District and upheld its holster law, a rule promulgated by MPD over ten years ago requiring that concealed carry licensees must carry their pistols “in a holster on their person in a firmly secure manner that is reasonably designed to prevent loss, theft, or accidental discharge of the pistol.” 24 DCMR § 2344.2.
- **STEER Enforcement:** At the beginning of this fiscal year, the Civil Enforcement Section (CES) launched enforcement under the Strengthening Traffic Enforcement, Education, and Responsibility (STEER) Act. To date, OAG has filed 25 lawsuits against dangerous drivers with large numbers of unpaid tickets for speeding, reckless driving, and other traffic violations, many of which have been outstanding for over ten years. These suits hold drivers from Maryland and Virginia who flout District traffic laws accountable by seeking monetary judgments against them. In its first year, with the assistance of agency partner, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer’s Central Collection Unit, OAG successfully obtained judgments in four cases totaling \$228,782 for 828 outstanding speeding and other unsafe driving citations, and obtained pre-suit resolution of an additional three cases totaling \$47,316 and implicating 205 outstanding speeding citations.
- **Defending Disciplinary and Administrative Actions:** The Personnel and Labor Relations Section (PLRS) had a successful fiscal year, marked by several positive outcomes in defending disciplinary actions by District agencies and handling other administrative matters before the DC Superior Court. Several notable examples involved successfully defending termination appeals before the Office of Employee Appeals. In one matter, PLRS represented a client agency in a case involving the termination of a telecommunications equipment operator who seriously mishandled emergency calls and was terminated for neglect of duty and failure to follow agency procedures. After an evidentiary proceeding, the Office of Employee Appeals upheld the employee’s termination. This decision, among others, reinforces the importance of maintaining the highest standards in critical public safety roles and allows client agencies to ensure the integrity of their operations.

c. Commercial Division;

RESPONSE: Commercial Division provides legal services, advice, and advocacy related to numerous core governmental functions, including the procurement of essential goods and services, acquisition of real estate, the support of economic development efforts, and the financing of government operations through bonds and collection of taxes. The Division worked closely with the Office of General Counsel team for the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development (DMPED) over the course of several months to review, comment on, and approve for legal sufficiency: (1) a Development & Financing Agreement between the District and the Washington Commanders Team for the RFK Stadium facility; and (2) an amended and restated lease between the District and the Team. Based on the Division's review of the transaction documents, and input from the Legal Counsel Division on appropriations and legislation issues, the two Divisions were able to provide legal sufficiency signoffs on the legislation and the transaction documents, all of which required Council approval. Additional highlights include:

Government Contracts Section (GCS):

- Handled over \$11.4 billion in procurement matters in FY 2025.
- Reviewed over 145 contract actions for legal sufficiency, totaling \$2.5 billion for goods, services, and construction for the District.
- Saved the District \$11,428,792 in appeals before the Contract Appeals Board.
- Recouped over \$508,500 in grants given by the District that were misused.
- Successfully defended 16 bid protests for contracts with a total value of \$2.94 billion.

Land Acquisition and Bankruptcy Section (LAB):

- In FY 25, the Section handled nearly \$30 million in legal matters including: \$3.3 million in monetary recoveries; \$23 million in costs/liabilities avoided; and \$2.8 million in real property assets preserved.
- The Section litigated and prevented the dismissal of the East Capital Gateway eminent domain case sought by non-performing developer defendant. A dismissal would have resulted in the District's liability under a 20-year ground lease. The District avoided \$23 million in liability for rent payments.
- *In the Matter of Cynthia Warren, Bankruptcy Case No. 23-13194 (Baltimore); In the Matter of Beth Henson, Bankruptcy Case No. 23-12719 (Jointly Administered under Bankruptcy Case No. 23-13194, under a court approved Plan of Reorganization, the District will collect \$1,510,000 with each Debtor paying \$750,000.*
- The Section successfully negotiated a settlement agreement regarding a tax classification of a property located on Foxhall Road. The creditor that purchased the property on Foxhall Road will pay the District \$637,908 upon the closing on the purchase of the property.⁶

Tax and Finance Section:

- Closed 677 real property tax appeals in FY 2025. The average age for each case at disposition was less than 1.5 years.

⁶ In the Matter of ETS, Bankruptcy Case No. 20-397; DP Capital v. District of Columbia, Adversary Proceeding No. 24-10007.

- Defended challenges seeking to reduce over \$52 billion in assessed value, resulting in the retention of over \$162 million in real property taxes. Petitioners sought to reduce assessed value to over \$38 billion, which would have resulted in \$215 million in tax refunds.
- Obtained summary judgment on a transfer and recordation tax appeal involving the Old Post Office hotel, retaining more than \$27 million in taxes.
- Obtained judgment after a bench trial upholding the Office of Tax and Revenue's denial of a real property tax exemption for a fraternity.
- Advised the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development (DMPED) on nine bond issuances totaling \$1,036,220,000, resulting in District revenues of \$2,216,275 in Public Financing Administrative Program Fees.
- Advised the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) on 8 bond issuances totaling \$4,409,970,000.

d. Family Services Division;

RESPONSE: Family Services Division (FSD) supports CFSA in strengthening families and improving the safety, permanence, and well-being of abused and neglected children in DC. Highlights include:

- **Legal Representation:** Through the end of FY25, OAG provided legal representation in the exit of 147 children from the foster care system through reunification (81), adoption (53) or guardianship (13). In Quarter 1 of 2026, OAG provided legal representation in the exit of 45 children from the foster care system through reunification (14), adoption (4), or guardianship (1).
- **Legal Advice and Counsel:** In FY25, OAG managers and attorneys provided legal advice and counsel in over 1,740 permanency goal review meetings⁷ and 75 community papering consults.⁸ Child Protection Section V conducted approximately 43 clinical case consultations.⁹ Through December 31, 2025 for FY26, OAG managers and attorneys provided legal advice and counsel in 329 settings through permanency goal review meetings, community papering and case consultations.
- **Paternity Establishment:** In FY25, OAG focused on paternity establishment in its court-involved families and was successful in obtaining birth certificates in 76% of cases and ensuring legal fathers were established in 54% of cases petitioned.¹⁰ This outcome allows the District to nurture or facilitate a relationship between a child and a father which could

⁷ Permanency goal review meetings occur at the 9-month mark of a case and every 90 days thereafter. The focus is on reviewing the case plan of reunification and determining if an alternate permanency goal should be sought. For FY26 through December 31, 2025, OAG conducted 292 permanency goal review meetings.

⁸ Community papering consults focus on determining if court intervention is needed to effectuate the case plan developed by CFSA to address abuse or neglect. For FY26 through December 31, 2025, OAG conducted 23 community papering consults.

⁹ Clinical case consultations are opportunities for in-home social workers to discuss challenging cases with FSD to determine next steps for case closure or receive advice on critical steps to make the case ripe for court involvement. For FY26 through December 31, 2025, OAG conducted 14 clinical case consultations.

¹⁰ Data for FY 26 through December 31, 2025 is not yet available.

be one path to exiting foster care. In addition, this outcome creates a bigger pool of kin who can be explored for placement and/or permanency as this outcome opens the door to long term connections for a child that might not have been available without the establishment of paternity. Barriers to establishment can include reluctance on the part of the identified person to test and/or appear in court, the mother being unable or unwilling to identify the potential father, and the identified person being ruled out by testing. OAG works with CFSA and the court-appointed attorneys to address these barriers.

- **Human Trafficking:** As part of its litigation practice, OAG focused on several specialty areas, including Unaccompanied Refugee Minors, youth at risk for or victims of human trafficking, victims of serious physical abuse and child sex abuse, and families where parental substance abuse is the main behavioral issue preventing reunification. FSD also maintained its role in combatting human trafficking through community education and coordination. In FY25, FSD conducted 27 trainings, reaching over 1400 community stakeholders including middle school students, business industry professionals, government agencies, law enforcement, social workers and community-based providers, to educate them on warning signs and risk factors for trafficking. Through December 31, 2025, FSD conducted 6 trainings and reached 155 individuals. In FY25, FSD also co facilitated 6 meetings of the Citywide Human Trafficking Taskforce with the United States Attorneys' Office whose membership comprises federal and local government agencies and community-based organizations. Through December 31, 2025, FSD co-facilitated 1 meeting of that Taskforce.

e. Legal Counsel Division;

RESPONSE: LCD provided legal sufficiency reviews for approximately 760 bills and rulemakings, reviewed over 65 memoranda of understanding and similar agreements, and responded to nearly 200 confidential requests for legal advice. LCD also conducted trainings on legislative drafting, rulemaking, the Home Rule Act, and the ANC Act.

f. Public Advocacy Division;

RESPONSE: PAD unites OAG's affirmative civil enforcement litigation across antifraud, antitrust, civil rights, consumer protection, elder justice, environmental, housing, nonprofit enforcement, and workers' rights. Highlights of PAD's work investigating, litigating, and resolving numerous public interest cases include:

- **Preserving nonprofit healthcare resources for District residents:** In March 2025, OAG announced its approval of the sale of the former Providence Hospital campus in Ward 5 to developer Vision PH Associates, subject to new restrictions designed to ensure that over \$5 million in nonprofit healthcare resources remain in the community. In 2023, Providence, a DC nonprofit healthcare entity, agreed to sell the Providence campus to Vision PH for \$1 as part of a plan to redevelop the site with hundreds of new housing units. The District's State Health Planning and Development Agency, SHPDA, asked OAG to review the proposed sale under DC's Healthcare Entity Conversion Act, which requires any conversion of a nonprofit healthcare entity's charitable assets to for-profit purposes to be

adequately valued, protected, and preserved consistent with the nonprofit's stated public-interest mission. Attorneys from the Public Advocacy Division's Antitrust and Nonprofit Enforcement Section and Equitable Land Use team reviewed the proposal and negotiated to condition OAG's approval on new terms requiring the preservation of significant public health resources for the District, including \$5 million in health services funding to be placed in a charitable healthcare trust, plans for a new Ward 5 urgent care center on the Providence campus, and the transfer of millions of dollars in remaining medical equipment to the District or District-designated charitable healthcare providers.

- **Ensuring all District residents can access rent-controlled apartments:** In January 2025, attorneys from the Public Advocacy Division's Civil Rights and Elder Justice Section filed a lawsuit against Petra Management Group, LLC, its owner Rashid Salem, and entities that own three of Petra's properties at 4825-4829 North Capitol Street NE, 5616 13th Street NW, and 743 Fairmont Street NW. The lawsuit alleged that Petra had exploited a law exempting apartments from rent control when they are leased to tenants with government-funded housing vouchers or other subsidies. Petra's scheme involved illegally leasing rent-controlled apartments solely to voucher holders, which enabled it to charge significantly higher rental rates subsidized by the federal and District governments. As a result, Petra deliberately excluded low- and moderate-income tenants without subsidies, engaging in illegal discrimination based on source of income. Petra perpetuated this profit-maximization scheme by advertising its apartments exclusively at the higher subsidized rates without disclosing the rent-controlled rates it was legally required to charge. In October 2025, OAG announced a settlement under which Petra will end its discriminatory practices, publicly advertise available rent-controlled apartments at the lawful rent-controlled rates, provide fair housing training to staff, and submit to three years of compliance monitoring by OAG, in addition to paying \$700,000 in penalties.
- **Addressing poor housing conditions in rental housing:** In April 2025, attorneys in the Public Advocacy Division's Housing and Environmental Justice Section won a \$6.8 million judgment against landlord Adolphe Edwards and his company A.J. Edwards Realty for forcing tenants to live in dangerous and illegal conditions at nine apartment buildings in Wards 4 and 8. OAG sued Edwards for violating the DC Housing Code, the Consumer Protection Procedures Act, and the Lead-Hazard Prevention and Elimination Act. In 2023, the Court found Edwards to be in civil contempt for failing to make repairs by court-ordered deadlines and granted OAG's request to appoint a receiver under the Tenant Receivership Act to manage the property. Soon after, Edwards declared bankruptcy. Through bankruptcy, Edwards has sold both his Alabama Avenue and Missouri Avenue properties. In late 2024, the DC Superior Court ruled in favor of the District, finding that Edwards was liable for more than 1,400 documented violations of the DC Housing Code and more than 7,000 violations of the lead hazard law. The Court's April 2025 judgment requires Edwards to pay \$1.5 million in rent refunds to nearly 100 tenants, \$5 million in civil penalties, and \$300,247 for the District's litigation costs. The judgment will be paid as part of the bankruptcy process from the sales proceeds of Edwards' properties.
- **Protecting children and youth from tobacco products:** During the past year, attorneys in the Public Advocacy Division's Office of Consumer Protection resolved investigations

of violations of the District law that went into effect in October 2022 that bans the sale of flavored tobacco products and prohibits the sale of electronic smoking devices near schools. In December 2024, OAG announced a settlement with Swedish Match North America (SMNA), the manufacturer of Zyn flavored tobacco products. OAG's investigation found that SMNA facilitated the sale of tens of thousands of flavored tobacco products to DC consumers, in violation of the District's flavor ban. CDC data indicates that these products are increasingly popular with middle and high school students, including in the District. SMNA agreed to pay \$1.2 million in penalties, monitor Zyn distributors and take steps to ensure compliance with DC's flavor ban, and prohibit the future sale of flavored tobacco products in DC through Zyn's website. In September 2025, OAG announced a settlement with 7-Eleven to resolve allegations that 16 of its convenience stores within a quarter mile of District middle and high schools illegally sold thousands of electronic smoking devices. 7-Eleven agreed to pay \$1.2 million in penalties, stop selling and marketing vapes and e-cigarettes near DC schools, provide annual training to staff, and monitor franchise stores and take steps to ensure compliance with DC law.

- **Ensuring that delivery workers receive tips:** In February 2025, OAG announced a \$3.95 million settlement with Amazon.com, Inc. and Amazon Logistics, Inc. to resolve a lawsuit handled by attorneys in the Public Advocacy Division's Workers' Rights and Antifraud Section, alleging that the company cheated workers and misled DC consumers about its practice of diverting tips from Amazon Flex delivery drivers. Amazon launched its Flex service in 2015, offering fast delivery of Amazon products. Amazon encouraged consumers to tip their delivery drivers, offering a default tip amount and assuring consumers that 100% of tips would go to the drivers. But one year later, in 2016, Amazon changed its driver payment model so that a large portion of tips did not go towards increasing drivers' compensation but were instead used to cover a portion of the base wages Amazon already had promised to pay the drivers. The lawsuit detailed how DC consumers paid millions of dollars in tips, believing they were rewarding delivery drivers, while Amazon captured much of the tips to save on its own operating costs. Amazon reimbursed Amazon Flex drivers for the misappropriated tips as part of a previous restitution-only settlement. OAG brought its lawsuit to ensure changes in Amazon's practices and fines to disincentivize unlawful behavior. Amazon agreed to pay \$2.45 million in penalties, cover the cost of OAG's litigation at \$1.5 million, and to change its business practices to clearly disclose how tips are being used.

g. Office of the Solicitor General (OSG)

RESPONSE: The Office of the Solicitor General (OSG) defends victories and appeals losses from the office's trial divisions as well as the District's 50+ administrative agencies. As a result, funds collected or saved by OSG largely mirror those of our trial division counterparts.¹¹ However, OSG won several important victories that preserved millions of dollars in savings for the District and its taxpayers during the 2025 fiscal year and beyond.

¹¹ For this reason, OSG does not separately account for the overall exposure avoided across all of its cases. Doing so would result in "double counting" victories for the office as a whole. Hence, we have historically relied on the trial divisions to enumerate funds collected/saved.

- First, in a case raising questions about the District’s transfer and recordation tax scheme, OSG secured a major victory, preventing the taxpayers from receiving a roughly \$1 million refund. In *Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Company v. District of Columbia*, the D.C. Court of Appeals held that parties to a real estate transaction cannot avoid taxation by framing the creation of a ground lease as a retention, rather than a transfer, of a leasehold interest. The Court also held that a tax return that mentions a ground lease, but which contains no other information, does not trigger the running of the statute of limitations period for the collection of taxes on the ground lease. This case is one in a series of recent cases over the past several years where OSG has secured decisions from the Court of Appeals adopting an expansive view of the District’s transfer and recordation tax provisions, saving the District millions of dollars.
- Second, in a case brought by a former D.C. Public Schools (DCPS) teacher based on DCPS’s repeated rejection of his applications for rehire, OSG won—potentially saving the District hundreds of thousands of dollars in damages. In *McKinney v. District of Columbia*, the D.C. Circuit held that McKinney had no property interest in: (1) his original position, because he had voluntarily resigned as part of a settlement agreement; (2) positions offered to him by various principals, because they were not authorized to guarantee him a job before he passed a background check; and (3) his “eligibility” for employment because “eligibility” for a benefit is not a property interest. The Court also agreed that McKinney’s liberty interest was not infringed, and that McKinney failed to state a breach of contract claim.
- Third, OSG successfully defended a judgment in a consumer protection case involving millions of dollars in penalties to the District. In *Polymer80 v. District of Columbia*, the D.C. Court of Appeals dismissed Polymer80’s appeal of an order to pay \$4.038 million in civil penalties for unlawfully advertising and selling “ghost guns” in the District. The penalty order thus remained intact. This case exemplifies OSG’s work litigating appeals in consumer protection matters to protect consumers in the District and defend orders imposing penalties under the D.C. Consumer Protection Procedures Act.

Additional major accomplishments in FY 2025 include:

- OSG secured a major victory from the D.C. Court of Appeals in *MP PPH, LLC v. District of Columbia*, which affirmed a Superior Court decision imposing contempt sanctions on a landlord who failed to remediate serious health and safety violations at a 2,500-resident apartment complex in the District. The Superior Court’s sanctions included rent abatements beginning at 50% and escalating for continued noncompliance. The Court held that the sanctions were justified, reasoning that given the “staggering” evidence of MP PPH’s failure to remediate the property, the court was well within its discretion to impose escalating sanctions without continuing to wait and see whether MP PPH would come into compliance. This decision represents a significant victory both because it held a landlord accountable for horrendous conditions at an apartment complex, but also because it set important legal precedents for future cases holding contemnors-landlords to account.

- OSG also secured an important victory in *Yazam, Inc. v. D.C. Department of For-Hire Vehicles*, in which the Court affirmed an order requiring Empower, a company offering rideshare services in the District, to either immediately register with the Department of For-Hire Vehicles (DFHV) or cease and desist its vehicle-for-hire operations. As the Court explained, because private vehicle-for-hire operators may provide vehicle-for-hire services in the District only through a *registered* private vehicle-for-hire company, Empower’s unregistered status put its drivers at risk of adverse enforcement actions, including the impoundment of their vehicles by DFHV. This decision represents an important step forward in the District’s efforts to ensure that Empower complies with District law and keeps its customers safe.
- In the wake of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Bruen* in 2022, OSG has taken a leading role in defending reasonable gun restrictions against Second Amendment challenges both in the District and around the country. Some examples of these efforts include:
 - Achieving a significant victory in *Picon v. United States*, in which the D.C. Court of Appeals upheld the District’s requirement that a firearm registration or license applicant be at least 21 years old. The District intervened in this litigation to defend the constitutionality of the District’s scheme under the Second Amendment.
 - Successfully avoiding Supreme Court review of the D.C. Circuit’s decision in *Hanson v. DC*, which upheld a district court decision denying a preliminary injunction that would have enjoined the District’s ban on large-capacity magazines. The challengers filed a petition for certiorari with the Supreme Court, OSG filed a brief in opposition, and the Supreme Court denied certiorari.
 - Coordinating with and assisting trial divisions in litigating numerous lawsuits challenging the District’s gun regulations, including its ban on assault weapons, its holstering requirements, and its licensing and registration scheme.
 - Filing multistate amicus briefs defending a number of different states’ laws prohibiting guns in “sensitive places” like public transportation, churches, schools, parks, and bars, among other locations.

h. Public Safety Division;

RESPONSE:

- **Trained diverse District stakeholders on mental health:** In FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date, the Mental Health Section (MHS) facilitated a quarterly citywide guardianship roundtable with representatives from the Department of Disability Services, Adult Protective Services, and counsel from area hospitals to discuss shared guardianship challenges for people in need of mental and behavioral health services. MHS also provided monthly training to law enforcement officers on civil commitment law and presented a similar training twice monthly to mental health clinicians becoming certified as Department of Behavioral Health (DBH) Officer Agents. The section also trained outpatient mental health clinicians on the emergency hospitalization and civil commitment

process and hosted two doctors from DBH's forensic fellowship program who served as in-house clinical experts on OAG cases for one day a week throughout the academic year.

MHS played a pivotal role in updating the written materials used by MPD to train hundreds of officers on the involuntary hospitalization process. MHS worked with DBH on overseeing and refining the testing materials used to evaluate clinicians seeking certification as DBH Officer Agents. MHS presented at DBH's CMOP Symposium, a program geared toward educating District outpatient providers on applicable law and patient protections. A MHS attorney served as a guest lecturer at Georgetown Law, presenting for two hours on the Extreme Risk Protection Order statute and mandatory reporting scenarios. The MHS attorney served as guest lecturer for a second time this past June, presenting to law students for one hour on the topic of representing government agency clients.

- **Prosecuted Traffic and Quality of Life Crimes:** The Criminal Section prosecuted 4,874 cases during FY 2025 through the end of the first quarter of FY 2026. This is over a 35% increase compared to FY 2024 and the first quarter of FY 2025 (3601 cases), which already was a 38% increase in cases for the same period in FY 2023 through Q1 FY 2024. Furthermore, OAG continued to maintain a high charging rate for Driving Under the Influence ("DUI") and Reckless Driving cases. Throughout FY 2025 and the first quarter of FY 2026, OAG's Criminal Section charged 1,645 DUI cases and 329 Reckless Driving cases, with charging rates of 97% and 93%, respectively.
- **Utilized Specialty Courts – Drug Court:** The Criminal Section referred 140 defendants to the D.C. Superior Court's Drug Intervention Program ("Drug Court") from FY25 through Q1 FY26, which represented the majority of all Drug Court participants. Forty-one (41) participants successfully completed the intensive requirements of the program to become "Drug Court Graduates" during this time frame.
- **Successful Prosecutions/Convictions in Traffic Fatality Cases:** From FY25 through Q1 of FY26, the Criminal Section secured convictions in seven criminal traffic cases that resulted in a pedestrian death. Two convictions were secured by trial and five convictions were secured through guilty pleas. At each sentencing hearing, family members representing the respective victim provided meaningful and impactful testimony about how these cases have affected their lives. In one case, the family members were involved in the restorative justice process.
- **Other Noteworthy Achievements:** In *D.C. v. James Walker*, Criminal Section prosecutors secured convictions on over two dozen Housing, Construction, and Fire Code violations. The case involved a 2019 fire that erupted from the basement of an unlicensed boarding house. The fire killed a 40-year-old man and a 10-year-old boy, both of whom were trapped in the basement and unable to exit the building because of the various violations. Criminal Section prosecutors charged the owner of the property, James Walker, with 26 regulatory violations after they discovered that, prior to the fire, Walker had been made aware by a police officer that his unlicensed building had no exit signs or working smoke detectors, and that there were make-shift doors that made it difficult to exit the location during an

emergency. The code violations, along with the evidence of notice, formed the predicate for murder and manslaughter charges brought by the United States Attorney's Office (USAO). OAG and USAO joined their charges to form one case. Over the course of the next five years, Criminal Section prosecutors worked with the USAO Homicide prosecutor, law enforcement and several regulatory agencies to prepare the matter for trial. Following a three-week long jury trial in February of 2025, the jury found Mr. Walker guilty of all charges filed by OAG and USAO and was sentenced to a total of over 35 years in prison.

- **CARES (Community Approaches to Rapid Engagement Services) Program Pilot:** In early 2025 the CARES Program began taking referrals of youth who were at risk of being arrested or prosecuted for conduct arising from an intra-family dispute. With the collaboration between DHS, MPD, Sasha Bruce Youthworks (SBY) and OAG, the program was established to provide supportive services, including respite care, for youth involved in intra-family domestic disputes. In CY2025, according to SBY data, thirty-nine youth and families were referred to CARES by OAG and MPD. SBY and DHS provide services such as crisis response services for families, family stabilization processes, including respite care at SBY, individual and group counseling for the youth and family counseling. The program is continuing in FY2026, with hopes of securing additional funding to maintain operations beyond the fiscal year.
- **Coordinated with community partners to improve school attendance:** In FY 2025, OAG expanded its ATTEND anti-truancy program by extending mediation services and community engagement to two Ward 8 DCPS elementary schools—Garfield and Hendley. ATTEND hosted and participated in community engagement events that benefitted entire school communities. On May 8, 2025, OAG hosted an ATTEND Resource Fair for Sousa Middle School families. This fair included tables staffed by District agency partners and non-profits, offering information on programs addressing barriers to attendance such as adult education, rental assistance, housing, and mental health. OAG also collected and distributed new or gently used items, including clothing and household essentials, to students and their families. Beginning in FY 2026, OAG hosted coat drive to ensure the cold weather did not negatively impact school attendance. ATTEND distributed more than 350 clothing items collected by OAG staff to Leckie Education Campus and Garfield Elementary in Ward 8. In addition to warm weather gear, the coat drive featured food, music, games, and a raffle!
- **Provided victim support with a trained courthouse assistance dog:** OAG is fortunate to employ a victim-witness specialist who is a handler for Pepper, a NEADS trained courthouse assistance dog. Pepper provides emotional support and comfort to victims of crime and parties in OAG's Family Court proceedings, from investigation through disposition. Upon request, Pepper assisted individuals in adult criminal, juvenile delinquency, and domestic violence courts. With OAG's assistance, the Court completed standard operating procedures to allow Pepper to more readily appear in OAG's adult criminal courtrooms and the Domestic Violence Division.
- **Provided Therapy:** The Restorative Justice Section provided Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) to 53 young people, 75% of whom successfully completed CBT. The

program also referred 18 young people and their families to additional community-based resources including mentoring, community service sites, the Department of Aging and Community Living (DACL), school placement, mental health services, kinship care, mother and child programs, and parenting resources.

i. Support Services Division.

RESPONSE: In FY 2025 and FY 2026, the core work of the Support Services Division did not change: SSD strives to enhance the level of services provided to the legal divisions to better and more efficiently enable them to provide legal services to the District and its residents. For example, in FY 2025, SSD's Investigations Section partnered with the Public Safety Division to support the Department of Human Services ACE Diversion Program. The Investigations Section took on the additional responsibility of locating youth eligible for the program that the referring agency could not locate. As a result, 80 youth were located who otherwise would not have been able to participate in the ACE Diversion Program.

In FY 2026, SSD's Operations Section will implement an OAG Fleet Share Pilot Program, in collaboration with the Department of Public Works, to provide onsite vehicles for OAG employees to use when performing official duties that require travel to work sites. The vehicles will feature advanced keyless and fob technology to improve safety, convenience, and accountability. This initiative should improve employee mobility while aligning with OAG's objective to strengthen fleet performance and usage.

Elder Justice

34. Please describe OAG's work to combat elder abuse in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, including pre- or non-litigative measures, resolved matters and matters in active litigation.

RESPONSE: OAG's Civil Rights and Elder Justice Section (CREJS) works to protect District seniors and vulnerable adults from financial exploitation and civilly enforce the Abuse, Neglect and Financial Exploitation of a Vulnerable Adult or Elderly Person Act, DC Code § 22-931, et seq. OAG receives referrals from Adult Protective Services, from the public through a dedicated Elder Justice Hotline, from community partners such as Legal Counsel for the Elderly and Legal Aid DC, and from OAG's Consumer and Tenant Response. OAG received more than 800 referrals in FY 2025 and over 200 referrals in the first quarter of FY 2026.

CREJS obtains restitution for victims of financial exploitation, temporary or permanent injunctions, the revocation of professional licenses, and civil penalties. In FY 2025, OAG oversaw distribution of almost \$2.5 million in restitution and debt forgiveness for District homeowners as part of its \$7.5 million settlement with Curbio, Inc. This followed OAG's litigation against Curbio, alleging that it trapped residents—and targeted seniors—into predatory home improvement contracts.

In FY 2025, CREJS filed suit against Athena, Inc., a national bitcoin automated teller machine (BTM) company, for financially exploiting elders and other residents by charging high, undisclosed fees and failing to implement adequate safeguards to prevent its machines from being

used to scam elders. This litigation is ongoing, and CREJS remains committed to protecting elders and vulnerable adults from scams and other forms of financial exploitation.

OAG also believes that prevention is the best and most efficient tool against scams and exploitation, and CREJS serves as a community resource engaging in significant outreach and community education initiatives. In FY 2025 and the first quarter of FY 2026, CREJS conducted outreach at nine community events, engaging with approximately 365 District residents collectively.

Additionally, in FY 2025, OAG's Public Safety Division (PSD) filed 25 new petitions to obtain guardians and conservators for vulnerable adults who were being abused, neglected or exploited, or who were self-neglecting and succeeded in obtaining 27 guardians and/or conservators. PSD has filed 2 more petitions in FY 2026, through December 31, 2025, and obtained an additional 3 guardians and/or conservators for vulnerable adults. OAG dedicates a senior assistant attorney general in PSD to handle this caseload. In addition to defending elder abuse through guardianship and conservation and protection orders, PSD's relationship with the United States Attorney's Office (USAO) allows for PSD prosecutors to investigate and prosecute financial crimes against vulnerable and senior adults. Under an active MOU between PSD and the USAO, a PSD prosecutor is dually designated as a Special Assistant United States Attorney (SAUSA) and, as such, investigates and prosecutes financial crimes against vulnerable and elderly adults.

Worker Rights

35. Please describe OAG's work related to wage theft and workers' rights in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, including pre- or non-litigative measures, resolved matters, matters in active litigation, and funded initiatives.

RESPONSE: The Workers' Rights and Antifraud Section (WRAS) targets pattern-and-practice violations of the District's worker-protection laws to deter would-be offenders and maximize recovery for workers. In addition to the cases and matters listed below, OAG currently has over 120 active investigations aimed at pattern-and-practice violations related to worker misclassification, minimum wage, overtime, and paid sick leave. These investigations are also strategically targeted at industries that employ a significant number of low-income workers who are particularly vulnerable to wage theft due to issues such as language barriers or unfamiliarity with their rights under District law. OAG is focusing its investigations on industries such as construction, gig employers, and janitorial companies. In addition, WRAS is placing a special emphasis on restaurant employees and has created a system to expeditiously bring restaurants into compliance with District laws and provide restitution to workers.

During the relevant time period, OAG recovered over \$8 million in restitution for workers and penalties and costs to the District through its enforcement work. Further, WRAS' voluntary mediation program has helped workers collect thousands of dollars in missing wages from employers. To advance its enforcement goals, OAG also focuses on community outreach, enforces certain administrative orders entered by the Department of Employment Services, and collaborates with other jurisdictions seeking to protect workers. OAG also regularly partners with the labor enforcement divisions of other states' attorneys general to advance labor and wage enforcement matters with national implications.

Resolved Matters:

- ***In re American University***: Pre-suit settlement in October 2024 worth \$260,000.00, resolving OAG's allegations of unpaid wages for off-the-clock work, which includes \$210,000.00 in payments to workers and \$50,000.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Wydown***: Pre-suit settlement in October 2024 worth \$12,988.68, resolving OAG's allegations of unpaid training time, which includes \$8,470.88 in payments to workers and \$4,517.80 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Brasserie Libertie***: Pre-suit settlement in October 2024 worth \$13,658.00 in payments to workers as well as injunctive relief, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to provide sick leave and notice of pay changes.
- ***In re VIDA***: Pre-suit settlement in November 2024 worth \$425,000.00, resolving OAG's allegations of unpaid wages, which includes \$325,000.00 in payments to workers and \$100,000.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Le Mont Royal***: Pre-suit settlement for injunctive relief resolving OAG's allegations of failure to provide sick leave.
- ***In re Insomnia Cookies***: Pre-suit settlement in December 2024 worth \$59,234.20, resolving OAG's allegations of tip theft, which includes \$25,769.20 in payments to workers and \$33,466.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***DC v. Amazon.com, Inc., et al.***, 2022-CAB-005698 (DC Superior Court): Suit alleging company unlawfully pocketed money that was solicited as tips. In February 2025, OAG reached a settlement with Amazon for \$3,950,000.00 in penalties and costs to the District.
- ***In re ALA DC***: Pre-suit settlement in February 2025 for restored leave for workers and other injunctive relief resolving OAG's allegations of failure to provide paid sick leave.
- ***In re Potomac Distilling LLC d/b/a Tiki TNT***: Pre-suit settlement in February 2025 for restored leave for workers and other injunctive relief resolving OAG's allegations of failure to provide paid sick leave and proper paystubs.
- ***In re Alliance to Save Energy***: Pre-suit settlement in February 2025 for \$1,000.00 in penalties to the District, resolving OAG's allegations that a job posting did not contain requisite compensation information.
- ***In re Diverse Masonry***: Pre-suit settlement in March 2025 worth \$195,750.00, resolving OAG's allegations of misclassification of employees as independent contractors, which includes \$59,000.00 in payments to workers and \$132,750.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Brilliant LLC d/b/a Flash Night Club***: Pre-suit settlement in March 2025 worth \$47,879.80, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to pay the minimum wage and provide paid sick leave, which includes \$43,879.80 in payments to workers and \$4,000.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Chick Fil-A Tenley Town Inline***: Pre-suit settlement in April 2025 worth \$1,500.00 plus injunctive relief, resolving OAG's allegations of child labor violations.
- ***In re Equinox***: Pre-suit settlement in April 2025 worth \$99,900.00, resolving OAG's allegations of imposing non-compete agreements on employees, which includes \$56,000.00 in payments to workers and \$43,900.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.

- ***In re DCV d/b/a DC Vegan:*** Pre-suit settlement in April 2025 for restored leave for workers and other injunctive relief, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to provide paid sick leave.
- ***In re Capitol Healthcare, LLC d/b/a AllCare:*** Pre-suit settlement in April 2025 worth \$18,000.00, resolving OAG's allegations of imposing non-compete agreements on employees, which includes \$12,000.00 in payments to workers and \$6,000.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Focus DC LLC d/b/a Focus Social Club:*** Pre-suit settlement in April 2025 worth \$71,028.67, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to pay the minimum wage, to provide proper paystubs, and provide paid sick leave, which includes \$61,127.67 in payments to workers and \$9,900.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington, Inc.:*** Pre-suit settlement in May 2025 worth \$18,750.00 in payments to workers and injunctive relief, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to provide paid sick leave to some employees.
- ***In re Mai Thai of Georgetown LLC:*** Pre-suit settlement in May 2025 worth \$37,770.00, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to pay provide proper paystubs and provide paid sick leave, which includes \$33,270.00 in payments to workers and \$4,500.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Beehive, LLC d/b/a Sticky Rice:*** Pre-suit settlement in May 2025 worth \$1,741.00, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to pay employees on time, which includes \$1,500.00 in payments to workers and \$241.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re DC Pancakes LLC d/b/a IHOP:*** Pre-suit settlement in May 2025 worth \$57,973.49, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to pay provide proper paystubs and improper deductions for meals, which includes \$52,048.49 in payments to workers and \$5,925.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In FKS Programs LLC d/b/a Kidovation Stage:*** Pre-suit settlement in June 2025 for injunctive relief, resolving OAG's allegations misclassification of workers as independent contractors.
- ***In re Mardone Inc. d/b/a J&B Cleaning and Cuzco Facilities Services LLC:*** Pre-suit settlement in July 2025 worth \$290,000.00, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to pay overtime, which includes \$215,000.00 in payments to workers and \$75,000.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Treehouse 2473 LLC d/b/a Air Restaurant:*** Pre-suit settlement in July 2025 worth \$25,000.00, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to pay provide paid sick leave, which includes \$15,112.08 in payments to workers and \$9,887.92 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Zinoff & Company, LLC d/b/a DeliverThat:*** Pre-suit settlement in July 2025 worth \$100,000.00, resolving OAG's allegations of misclassification of workers as independent contractors, which includes \$70,000.00 in payments to workers and \$30,000.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re The Hill Preschool:*** Pre-suit settlement in August 2025 worth \$15,962.50, resolving OAG's allegations of illegal training and repayment programs, which includes \$11,712.50 in payments to workers and \$4,250.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.

- ***In re Ginza BBQ Lounge LLC***: Pre-suit settlement in July 2025 worth \$20,964.64, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to provide paid sick leave, which includes \$17,644.64 in payments to workers and \$3,300.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Wagshal's Family of Fine Foods***: Pre-suit settlement in August 2025 worth \$13,500.00, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to provide paid sick leave, which includes \$10,125.00 in payments to workers and \$3,375.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Ezekiel Entertainment d/b/a L'Avant Garde***: Pre-suit settlement in August 2025 worth \$1,780.00, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to provide sick leave, improper paycheck deductions, and improper disclosures of service fees for customers, which includes \$780.00 in payments to workers and \$1,000 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re United Sport Social d/b/a DC Fray***: Pre-suit settlement in August 2025 worth \$2,250.00, resolving OAG's allegations of imposing non-compete agreements on workers, which includes \$1,500 in payments to workers and \$1,050.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Unique on the Go Corporation***: Pre-suit settlement in September 2025 worth \$166,011.00, resolving OAG's allegations of misclassification of employees as independent contractors, which includes \$111,008.00 in payments to workers and \$55,003.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Howard University Hospital Corporation***: Pre-suit settlement in October 2025 worth \$137,000.00 in payments to workers and injunctive relief, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to provide paid sick leave to some employees.
- ***In re Brothers Mechanical, Inc.***: Pre-suit settlement in October 2025 worth \$1,500,000.00, resolving OAG's allegations of misclassification of employees as independent contractors, which includes \$500,000.00 in payments to workers and \$1,000,000.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief. Three general contractors also agreed to guarantee a portion of this settlement agreement.
- ***In re District Hospital Partners d/b/a George Washington Hospital***: Pre-suit settlement in November 2025 worth \$126,998.40, resolving OAG's allegations of illegal training and repayment programs, which includes \$111,998.40 in payments to workers and \$15,000.00 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re Christian Siding, LLC***: Pre-suit settlement in November 2025 worth \$725,000.00, resolving OAG's allegations of misclassification of employees as independent contractors and failure to pay prevailing wages, which includes \$364,473.13 in payments to workers and \$360,526.87 in penalties to the District, as well as injunctive relief.
- ***In re the Café-Bar at 14th d/b/a Sette Osteria***: Pre-suit settlement in November 2025 for restored leave for workers and other injunctive relief, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to provide paid sick leave.
- ***In re Irving Restaurant Group, LLC d/b/a Lou's City Bar***: Pre-suit settlement in December 2025 for \$31,610.63 in payments to workers, resolving OAG's allegations of failure to pay final wages.

Matters in Active Litigation:

- ***DC v. Jan-Pro International, Inc., et al.***, 2022-CA-003128-B (DC Superior Court): Suit alleging misclassification of janitorial employees as independent contractors.
- ***DC v. Shipt, Inc.***, 2022-CA-004909-B (DC Superior Court): Suit alleging misclassification of delivery employees as independent contractors.
- ***DC v. W.G. Welch et al.***, 2024-CA-003822-B (DC Superior Court): Suit alleging misclassification of construction workers as independent contractors.
- ***DC v. Community Response Works***, 2024-CA-007433-B (DC Superior Court): Suit alleging failure to pay final wages and nonprofit-law violations with the Antitrust and Nonprofit Enforcement Section.
- ***DC v. Rey Badajos Dacul et al***, 2025-CAB-001228 (DC Superior Court): Suit with the Civil Rights and Elder Justice Section alleging scheme of false promises of visas and jobs, failure to pay minimum wage, and unlawful housing conditions.
- ***DC v. MH Hospitality Corp. d/b/a/ Talea Ristorante, et al***, 2025-CAB-000997 (DC Superior Court); Suit alleging failure to pay minimum wage and overtime, failure to provide sick leave, and retaliation for employees discussing wages amongst each other and complaining about wage violations.
- ***DC v. 476 K LLC, et al***, 2025-CA-001455-B (DC Superior Court); Suit with the Civil Rights and Elder Justice Section alleging failure to pay tips, failure to provide paid sick leave, and a hostile work environment.
- ***DC v. Gobrandts, Inc., et al.***, 2025-CAB-001653 (DC Superior Court); Suit alleging misclassification of workers as independent contractors and violations of the False Claims Act for failure to payroll taxes on those workers.

Council Funded Initiatives:

- The Workplace Rights Grant Program Act of 2021 established the Workplace Rights Grant Program at OAG to provide grants to community-based organizations and legal providers to educate District workers about employment laws and to inform OAG’s employment-enforcement work. In October 2025, OAG awarded a total of \$750,000 in grant funds to expand education and legal services programming for District workers, divided across three community organizations: DC Jobs with Justice, First Shift Justice Project, and Many Languages One Voice (MLOV).
- The Domestic Worker Employment Rights Amendment Act of 2022 established the Domestic Worker Employment Rights Grant Program at OAG in FY 24. Thanks to the DC Council, OAG was able to grant additional funding under the Domestic Workers Employment Rights Grant Program in FY, and OAG also added two more initiatives for capacity building and employment outreach and education for Domestic Workers Organizations. In October 2025, OAG awarded a total of \$260,000 in grant funds divided across four community organizations: National Domestic Workers Alliance (NDWA), MLOV, First Shift Justice Project, and Hand in Hand – The Domestic Employers Network.

Consumer Protection

36. Please describe OAG’s work on consumer protection issues in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, including pre- or non-litigative measures, resolved matters and matters in active litigation.

RESPONSE: OAG’s Office of Consumer Protection (OCP) has been actively engaged on consumer protection issues. OCP has more than 70 active consumer protection matters ongoing, including investigations, litigation, and multistate matters. In addition, the Consumer Mediation Program receives and resolves thousands of individual consumer complaints per year. In FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, Consumer Mediation Program received over 11,400 requests for help, including 5,358 complaints and 6,049 Hotline calls. In FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, Consumer Mediation Program returned \$1.8 million to consumers and tenants. To note, Consumer Mediation Program does not monetize its tenant building conditions work in which OAG frequently secures repairs, which for the past three fiscal years (FY 23-FY 25), have represented the largest complaint category, so the overall return on investment is even greater.

The FY 2025 Consumer Mediation Program reporting data is an increase from FY 2024, which reflects the continued community need for CTR assistance. For FY 2025 alone, the Consumer Mediation Program received over 9,000 requests for help, including 4,393 complaints and 4,876 Hotline calls. In the prior year FY 2024, the Program received 3,800 complaints and answered more than 3,200 Hotline calls. The Program also conducts extensive community outreach and stakeholder engagement. For example, it conducts weekly in-person outreach at DC Department of Human Services Economic Support Centers. In FY 2025, Consumer Mediation Program also built new relationships with Martha’s Table and Bread for the City and routinely attends fresh food distribution events to offer in-person mediation services.

OCP also conducts proactive consumer outreach to learn about consumer protection issues affecting District residents and educates residents on how to protect against scams and fraud. As a way to educate District residents on common issues, OAG issues consumer and business alerts, including alerts with warnings on what to consider when buying a car from a used car dealership in DC, deepfake telemarketing scams, deceptive sales practices by third party energy companies encouraging DC residents to switch providers, high-pressure sales tactics by salespeople for the home solar systems sales and loan industry, and avoiding gift card scams, and the use of Ratio Utility Billing systems (RUBS) in rental housing.

Finally, OAG has been active on the legislative front, sponsoring and testifying in support of various bills before the Council that involve consumer protection matters, including Bill 26-174, the “Enhancing Consumer Protection Procedures Amendment Act of 2025,” Bill 26-224, the “Restricting Egregious Scalping Against Live Entertainment Amendment Act of 2025,” and Bill 26-0438, the “Medical Debt Mitigation Amendment Act of 2025.”

During FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, OAG was awarded over \$8 million on behalf of District consumers through its formal investigations and litigation matters. In addition, Consumer and Tenant Response assisted over 11,000 residents and recovered more than \$1.8 million for consumers through mediation in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date.

OCP's work spanned a wide range of subject areas and issues, with a particular focus on protecting the District's most vulnerable residents. These included: promoting public health and safety; fighting on behalf of children, low-income communities, and other vulnerable populations; addressing predatory lending practices and enforcing the District's usury laws; protecting District consumers' privacy rights; and challenging "junk fees"—confusing or inadequately disclosed fees that companies increasingly charge consumers—and other deceptive pricing practices.

A sample of OAG's work in these areas and others is highlighted below.

Resolved Matters:

- ***DC v. Marriott International, Inc.***, 2019-CA-004497-B (DC Superior Court): Lawsuit against Marriott for deceptive and misleading hotel resort fee charges, also known as "junk fees." Settlement required Marriott to pay a \$75,000 penalty to the District and included injunctive provisions to ensure proper resort fee disclosures.
- ***DC v. Capital Petroleum Group***, 2020-CA-004671-B (DC Superior Court): Lawsuit against gasoline seller for price gouging at gas stations during COVID-19 pandemic. Settlement required \$1.4 million payment to the District.
- ***DC v. RubiRides***: RubiRides Technologies, Inc. and its CEO and founder operated transportation services for children in Maryland, Virginia, and DC, but operated without required licenses, charged consumers subscription fees for inactive services, and failed to provide promised refunds. Settlement required company to fully refund affected consumers, to pay a \$50,000 penalty, and to permanently end rideshare operations unless it significantly reformed its business practices and obtained the required licenses and improved customer support systems.
- ***DC v. 7-Eleven***: 7-Eleven, a retail chain that owns and franchises convenience stores across the US and internationally, operated or franchised 16 stores within one-quarter mile of a middle or high school in the District. Those stores continued to sell electronic smoking devices despite a 2022 DC law prohibiting such sales. To resolve the allegations, 7-Eleven agreed to pay a \$1.2 million penalty, to permanently stop selling and marketing vapes and e-cigarettes near DC schools, and to take various steps to monitor franchise stores.
- ***DC v. Getaround***: Getaround, a peer-to-peer ridesharing company, misled consumers about car insurance coverage and consumers were charged large and unexpected damage fees. Settlement requires Getaround, which no longer operates in North America, to refund more than 50 DC consumers, to reform its business practices, to provide advance notice to OAG should it ever begin operating in DC again, and to pay a penalty of \$75,000.
- ***DC v. Hyundai and Kia***: Hyundai and Kia sold cars that lacked industry-standard anti-theft technology, resulting in an epidemic of car thefts and joyriding, creating serious threats to public safety. Nationwide settlement required Hyundai and Kia to offer free anti-theft hardware for all affected vehicles, provide restitution to eligible consumers whose cars were damaged by thieves, equip all future vehicles sold in the United States with industry-standard anti-theft technology, and pay a \$50,000 penalty to the District.
- ***DC v. Mercedes-Benz***: Mercedes-Benz designed and deployed software defeat devices intended to allow vehicles to effectively cheat emissions testing. Nationwide settlement

- required Mercedes to pay the District \$200,000, provide relief to impacted consumers who must have approved emissions software installed on their vehicles, and comply with other reporting requirements and reforms to its business practices.
- ***DC v. RPM***: Settlement with property management company regarding hidden junk fees charged to tenants. Settlement required company to refund nearly \$20,000 in fees to tenants, cease charging junk fees, and clearly and conspicuously disclose any fees it continues to charge.
 - ***DC v. Just Fab***: Multistate settlement with TFG Holdings, which runs online stores such as Just Fab, ShoeDazzle, and Fab Kids, related to deceptively marketing subscription programs and making it difficult for consumers to cancel memberships. Settlement resulted a \$137,500 payment to the District, restitution to consumers, and changes to the company's subscription practices.

Matters in Active Litigation:

- ***DC v. Meta Platforms, Inc.***, 2023-CAB-006559 (DC Superior Court): Lawsuit, filed in coordination with similar lawsuits filed by fellow state attorneys general, for deception and harm related to impact of social media platforms on teen mental health.
- ***DC v. Stubhub, Inc.***, 2024-CAB-004794 (DC Superior Court): Lawsuit against third-party ticket selling platform for deceptive fees and other unfair and deceptive conduct during the ticket purchasing process.
- ***DC v. TikTok, Inc.***, 2024-CAB-006377 (DC Superior Court): Lawsuit, filed in coordination with similar lawsuits filed by fellow state attorneys general, for deception and harm related to impact of social media platforms on teen mental health.
- ***DC v. ActiveHours, Inc. d/b/a/ Earnin***, 2024-CAB-007303 (DC Superior Court); Lawsuit against earned wage advance company for deceptive statements relating to fees charged for the services, as well as violation of the District's 24% usury cap.
- ***DC v. Amazon.com, Inc.***, 2024-CAB-007611 (DC Superior Court): Lawsuit with the Civil Rights and Elder Justice Section against Amazon for deceptively and secretly placing restrictions on Amazon Prime deliveries to two East of the River zip codes, leading to significantly delayed delivery times, without disclosing those restrictions to consumers.
- ***DC v. Exxon, et al.***, 2020-CA-002892-B (DC Superior Court): Litigation alleging misrepresentations and omissions by oil companies relating to risks and dangers of climate change.
- ***DC v. Facebook***, 2018-CA-008715-B and ***DC v. Mark Zuckerberg***, 2022-CA-002273-B (DC Superior Court): Lawsuit against Facebook and Mark Zuckerberg individually for misrepresentations related to the Cambridge Analytica data breach scandal.
- ***Pennsylvania, et al. v. Mariner Finance, LLC***, 2:22-cv-03253-MAK (E.D. Pa.): Multistate litigation relating to financial products, alleging that the company, without consent, charged add-ons that offered little to no value to consumers.
- ***State of Arizona, et al. v. Michael D. Lansky, L.L.C. dba Avid Telecom***, CV-23-00233-TUC-CKJ (D. Az.): Multistate litigation filed by 50+ states and jurisdictions against the company allegedly responsible for illegal robocalls across the country.
- ***FTC, et al. v. Uber Technologies, Inc.***, Case No. 4:25-cv-03477 (N.D. Cal.): Lawsuit filed in conjunction with the Federal Trade Commission and approximately 20 other

state attorneys general against Uber for enrolling consumers in Uber One subscriptions without their consent and impeding consumers' ability to cancel subscriptions.

- a. **Please describe OAG's work to protect residents and small businesses from predatory lenders in FY 2025 and FY 2026, and any legislative gaps OAG has identified that should be addressed.**

RESPONSE: Predatory lending remains a key focus for OAG, and this year we have taken action to protect consumers through enforcement, consumer education, and consumer mediation. We continue to litigate our lawsuit against EarnIn, a payday lending app that offers usurious loans to District residents struggling to meet their basic needs and targets these consumers with deceptive advertising. Additionally, this fall the Office of Consumer Protection published a consumer alert warning residents about predatory practices in the home solar industry, including predatory financing arrangements. This consumer alert was driven by trends OAG has seen in our consumer mediation program, which has assisted many consumers with complaints about home solar financing.

There are legislative actions that the Council could take to support this work. The Protecting Affordable Loans Amendment (PALs) Act was introduced in 2023 and a public hearing was held in March 2024, but the bill has not advanced. The PALs Act would help prevent out-of-state lenders from partnering with state-chartered banks outside of the District to evade the local usury cap of 24%. We encourage the Council to revisit the PALs Act, especially given that the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals recently ruled in favor of Colorado legislation that did the same.

Housing and Tenant Rights

37. **Please describe OAG's work on affordable housing and housing equity issues in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, including pre- or non-litigative measures, resolved matters and matters in active litigation.**

RESPONSE: The Commercial Division filed or continued to litigate 6 lawsuits to enforce the Affordable Dwelling Unit (ADU) or Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) Covenants against individuals who were not income eligible to own an ADU and/or who had unlawfully rented units that were certified as a principal residence. In four of these cases, the Division obtained judgments or consent orders declaring that ADU covenants were violated, awarding the District the unlawful rents collected (and in some cases additional applicable fines), and appointment of a trustee to sell or rent the ADU to a qualifying owner or tenant, and included collection of \$250,000 and preservation of ADU/IZ units valued at approximately \$3,000,000. The Commercial Division also counseled the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) on enforcement of ADU and IZ Covenants in at least three other cases leading to successful resolution without resort to litigation, preserving affordable units valued at approximately \$2,000,000. The Commercial Division also defended ADU covenants in 6 foreclosure cases, preventing these covenants from being extinguished. Finally, the Commercial Division successfully asserted the district's regulatory interests in bankruptcy matters and aided in ensuring distressed multifamily properties sold through bankruptcy were transferred to new owners with the capacity to make repairs and preserve ADUs. These matters include Marbury Plaza/Langston Views (670+ units), Adolphe

Edwards (60+ units), Minnesota Commons (83 units), and several properties owned and/or affiliated with Sam Razjooyan (100+ units).

The Public Advocacy Division also addressed affordable housing and housing equity issues during FY 2025 and FY 2026. For example:

- The Civil Rights and Elder Justice Section (CREJS) protected the right to equitable housing for District residents with disabilities by holding accountable housing providers who fail to implement reasonable accommodations in a timely manner. Notably, this includes OAG's ongoing case against the District of Columbia Housing Authority (DCHA), *District of Columbia v. District of Columbia Housing Authority*, 2022-CA-002667-B (DC Superior Court), for systematically failing to provide timely accommodations to its public housing tenants and applicants. DCHA tenants have often waited years to receive equitable, accessible housing.
- CREJS resolved and litigated cases involving discrimination based on source of income, including a lawsuit settled with Petra Management Group, LLC, Petra's owner Rashid Salem, and three related single-purpose entities controlled by Mr. Salem, *DC v. Petra Management Group, LLC, et al.*, 2025-CAB-000541 (DC Superior Court). The settlement secures systemic changes to Petra's advertising practices to ensure greater access to its rent-controlled units, prohibits Petra from exclusively leasing rent-controlled units to subsidy holders, and requires payment of \$700,000 in civil penalties. CREJS also settled an investigation into Portico Investments, LLC for imposing different income requirements for prospective tenants with different types of subsidies. As a result of the settlement, Portico was required to change its leasing policies to treat all tenants equally, without regard to the prospective tenant's source of income, and pay a civil penalty of \$10,000 to the District.
- CREJS successfully resolved *DC v. UDR, Inc.*, 24-cv-1278 (D.D.C.) related to serious, sustained racist and sexist harassment of two Black female tenants at UDR's Waterside Towers Apartments at the hands of a fellow tenant. Despite repeated outreach to UDR, the landlord failed to take effective action, thereby contributing to a hostile housing environment for those tenants. Following litigation by CREJS, UDR agreed to new training and reporting to OAG, paid damages to the two women victimized, and paid \$50,000 to the District in civil penalties.
- In addition to the housing enforcement litigation described more fully in the response to Question 38, PAD engaged community stakeholders to achieve broader affordable housing and housing equity goals. The OAG team led monthly stakeholder meetings with the legal services and tenant organizer communities, as well as with the Office of the Tenant Advocate. OAG also met monthly with the DC Department of Buildings leadership and staff to discuss housing code enforcement, and responded to requests from and frequently met with Councilmembers and staff to discuss both individual properties and broader housing enforcement and affordability issues. OAG also met with individual affordable housing providers and with industry stakeholder groups, including the Housing Association of Nonprofit Developers (HAND) and the DC Affordable Housing Providers

Group, to hear about concerns in the industry. Lastly, OAG continued its regular presence at meetings with tenants and tenants' associations.

- Under the Tenant Receivership Act and the CPPA, the Housing and Environmental Justice Section (HEJS) brought claims against owners of properties with a pattern of neglect involving serious health and safety violations. In those cases, OAG sought repairs, restitution of rent paid by tenants, and – where necessary – appointment of a receiver to bring a property back into housing code compliance. For example, in *DC v. MP PPH LLC, et al.*, 2021-CA-002209 B (DC Superior Court), HEJS concluded its litigation against the owners of the Marbury Plaza Apartments. As part of its suit, HEJS was able to secure tenants millions of dollars in rent credits and much needed repairs throughout the property. OAG sought and received the appointment of a receiver to address immediate issues at the property. In December 2024, the property was sold to a new owner through a related bankruptcy proceeding. In October 2025, HEJS achieved a final judgment that holds both the former owner Anthony Pilavas and his LLC liable for \$29.8 million in restitution to tenants and \$11.1 million in civil penalties and attorneys' fees. HEJS is now defending its victory in the DC Court of Appeals. More details about PAD's housing code enforcement work can be found in response to Question 38.
- The Equitable Land Use (ELU) team consistently advocated for increasing the number of affordable housing units in order to rectify racial and income disparities in housing access. ELU actively intervened in support of applications that proposed a significant number of affordable housing units (for example, in Z.C. Case Nos. 13-14E, 24-12, 25-01, 25-02, 25-13) and advocated for changes that would increase the number and affordability level of new units. Additionally, ELU submitted comments on draft text amendments that would increase density in certain areas, update outdated parking requirements, increase opportunities for accessory dwelling units and alley lot redevelopment, and allow additional by-right development options (Z.C. Case Nos. 25-06, 25-08, 25-12).

38. Please describe OAG's work to address rental properties with illegal housing conditions in the District in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date. For all cases, new and ongoing, brought by OAG for housing code violations or under the Tenant Receivership Act in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, please list the case, its status, and any recovery or abated conditions.

RESPONSE: PAD's Housing and Environmental Justice Section (HEJS) handles OAG's housing conditions work under several statutes, including the Tenant Receivership Act (TRA), the Consumer Protection Procedures Act (CPPA), the Lead-Hazard Prevention and Elimination Act (LHPEA), and the Drug-, Firearm- and Prostitution-Related Nuisance Abatement Act (Nuisance Act).

Under the TRA, OAG brings cases seeking injunctive relief to bring rental properties into compliance with the Housing and Property Maintenance codes, including, where necessary, appointment of a receiver to oversee repairs. The TRA requires a showing that a property has been cited for code violations involving serious health and safety issues and the owner has not timely

abated the violations *or* that the property has a pattern of neglect for more than 30 days involving serious health and safety issues for tenants.

In cases brought under the TRA, OAG also seeks restitution of rent paid by tenants, as well as civil penalties paid to the District, by including claims under the CPPA. Violations of the Housing and Property Maintenance Codes are also violations of the CPPA. In addition, the CPPA applies to landlord-tenant transactions in the District, so false or misleading statements or omissions made in the landlord tenant relationship also constitute violations of the CPPA. OAG often uses the CPPA to hold individual landlords or property managers accountable where they personally participate in creating or failing to remedy the illegal conditions or where they have knowledge of the illegal conditions and the ability to fix them but instead do nothing. Where lead paint hazards are present, we also file claims under the LHPEA.

The Nuisance Act authorizes OAG to file suit when a property is being operated as a nuisance, defined as a property being used to store firearms illegally; for the sale or manufacture of controlled substances; or to facilitate prostitution. To establish a violation of the Nuisance Act, Superior Court judges generally require OAG to present evidence of multiple illegal drug or firearm seizures by MPD at the property and ongoing criminal activity throughout the litigation.

Resolved Matters:

- ***DC v. New Bethel Baptist Church Housing Corp. et al.***, 2021 CA 000511 B (DC Superior Court): TRA, CPPA, Nonprofit Corporation Act suit against owner of a property in Ward 2. The Superior Court appointed a receiver under the TRA, and the parties reached a settlement on the eve of trial in October 2024. The settlement requires payment of \$625,000 in restitution to tenants and \$1 million in penalties to the District, as well as significant affordable housing guarantees. However, because New Bethel failed to enter into a contract to sell the property by early October 2025, the restitution requirement increased to \$800,000, the penalty amount increased to \$5.25 million, and OAG moved to force a judicial sale of the property to ensure that New Bethel satisfied those obligations. The motion for a judicial sale remains pending.
- ***Ainger RE LLC***: While litigation against the former owner of a neglected Ward 7 property is ongoing (*DC v. Vision Realty Management, et al.*, 2025-CAB-002425 (DC Superior Court)), OAG achieved a pre-suit settlement with the new owner of the property. The new owner agreed to pay DOB's outstanding fines and to bring the property into compliance with the District's Housing and Property Maintenance Codes.

Matters in Active Litigation:

- ***DC v. EADS LLC et al.***, 2018-CA-5830 B (DC Superior Court) and related bankruptcy ***In re EADS LLC***, 20-00480 (DDC Bankr.): TRA, CPPA, LHPEA case that culminated in a bench trial in February 2023, regarding a property in Ward 4. The Court awarded OAG a \$1.7 million judgment in February 2024, and the District received funds due from the bankruptcy estate in June 2025. OAG is continuing to monitor required repairs by the new owner who purchased the property out of bankruptcy, in conjunction with a Court-appointed receiver.
- ***DC v. The Bennington Corp. et al.***, 2018-CA-007253-B (Consolidated cases): Three of OAG's cases in which landlord Ali "Sam" Razjooyan is a defendant (***DC v. The***

Bennington Corp. et al., 2018 CA 007253 B, ***DC v. 1644 W St SE DE LLC, Razjooyan, et al.***, 2024-CAB-005588, and ***DC v. Padilla, Razjooyan, et al.***, 2024-CAB-005590), along with DC Water and lender receiverships at Razjooyan properties, were consolidated in front of DC Superior Court Judge Matini in 2025. In these cases, OAG has brought suit against Razjooyan, LLCs owned or managed by him, and associated individuals and entities for violations of the TRA, CPPA, False Claims Act, and Construction Code at properties in Wards 5 and 7. In the Bennington matter, OAG achieved the appointment of a receiver after the property was evacuated due to a gas leak, exacerbated by unsafe electrical wiring and a lack of working fire alarms. Two of the defendants in that case have consented to judgment on liability, and OAG has obtained an entry of default against Razjooyan and his LLC. The other LLC defendant has filed for bankruptcy, an ongoing case in which OAG represents the District's interests. In the W Street matter, discovery is ongoing, and OAG has obtained defaults against two of three defendants. In the Padilla / Minnesota Commons matter, OAG filed for a temporary restraining order (TRO) shortly after case filing to address the most emergent issues, including lack of trash collection, unsecured front doors, and a massive bathroom leak. The Court granted the TRO in September 2024 and the Defendants agreed to continue the terms of the TRO through a preliminary injunction. One of the relevant entities filed for bankruptcy, and OAG has obtained an entry of default against Razjooyan and three LLCs. The property was sold through the bankruptcy, and OAG will engage the new owner to seek abatement of the property. Litigation is ongoing in each of the consolidated cases, with OAG closely coordinating with DOB, DC Water, other DC agencies, and lender-receivers appointed at various Razjooyan properties.

- ***DC v. 76M Inc., et al.***, 2020-CA-001080-B (DC Superior Court) and related bankruptcy ***In re 76M***, 24-00003 (DDC Bankr.): TRA, CPPA, LHPEA case with \$5.4 million judgment entered in September 2022 against the owner of a property in Ward 4. The owner did not pay the judgment amount and then filed for bankruptcy after OAG sought enforcement in Superior Court. OAG is in negotiations in the bankruptcy process to satisfy the District's judgment.
- ***DC v. MP PPH, LLC et al.***, 2021-CA-002209-B (DC Superior Court) and related bankruptcy ***In re MPH PPH***, 23-00246 (DDC Bankr.): TRA, CPPA, and Human Rights Act case against the owners of Marbury Plaza, a Ward 8 property. Defendants failed to comply with a consent abatement plan, and the Superior Court held Defendants in contempt and awarded tenants rent credits in an order issued in April 2023. In February 2024, the Court appointed a receiver with the consent of the Defendants. In November 2024, OAG won summary judgment on liability. In October 2025, the court ruled on remedies, finding the former individual owner and LLC liable for \$41 million, or \$29.8 million in restitution and \$11.1 million in penalties and attorneys' fees. OAG is now defending its victory on appeal in the DC Court of Appeals. During the pendency of the Superior Court action, the owner, MP PPH, LLC, filed for bankruptcy. Following significant litigation by OAG, the owner entered into an amended plan that involved the Debtor's principal contributing an additional \$1.3M to creditors, including the District and tenants. The property sale closed on December 31, 2024.
- ***DC v. King Housing Inc., et al.***, 2022-CA-000186-B (DC Superior Court): TRA, CPPA, LHPEA and Human Rights Act case involving a property in Ward 2. Defendants consented to entry of an abatement plan in November 2022 to address the housing conditions. Most

conditions issues have been abated. The parties have concluded discovery and are in active settlement negotiations.

- ***DC v. Adolphe Edwards***, 2022-CA-002823-B (DC Superior Court), and related bankruptcy ***In re Adolphe Edwards***, 22-00283 (D.D.C. Bankr.): TRA, CPPA, and LHPEA case against Adolphe Edwards for his properties on Missouri Avenue and Alabama Avenue, in Wards 4 and 8, respectively. The Superior Court appointed a receiver in May 2023, awarded summary judgment on liability against Edwards in September 2024, and granted the District's requests for remedies in April 2025, awarding full rent refunds totaling \$1,535,199.45 to over 100 tenants and \$5,300,247 in penalties and attorneys' fees to the District. The Defendant filed for bankruptcy during the Superior Court litigation, and in November 2025, OAG reached a settlement in the Bankruptcy Court to satisfy its claims, with OAG receiving at least \$4.4 million of its \$6.8 million judgment. Both properties have since been sold by the Bankruptcy Court and OAG is continuing to monitor required repairs by the new owners, in conjunction with a Court-appointed receiver.
- ***DC v. Vision Realty Management, et al.***, 2025-CAB-002425 (DC Superior Court): CPPA, TRA, and Nuisance Abatement Act claims against owner of apartment building in Ward 7 concerning conditions issues and illegal drug and firearm activity. After filing the lawsuit, the owner sold the property, and OAG has reached an agreement with the new owner to abate the conditions and pay the outstanding fines owed to the Department of Buildings. OAG's litigation against the former owner is ongoing.
- ***DC v. Kiihomes, LLC et al.***, 2025-CAB- 2025-CAB-005705 (DC Superior Court): CPPA claims against the developers and former owners of a newly-built, 40-unit apartment building in Ward 7 for performing shoddy, illegal construction, failing to pass required safety inspections, and endangering tenants at the property. OAG alleges that the developers and former owners never properly completed construction, ignored repeated DOB orders to correct unsafe conditions, and illegally rented apartments to tenants despite knowing that the building lacked a fire alarm, had exposed wires in hallways, was full of holes and debris, was not water-tight or weather-tight, and lacked a required Certificate of Occupancy or Basic Business License.

OAG continues to engage in significant community outreach, including by attending meetings of tenants' associations and coordinating with government and non-governmental stakeholders. For example, in July 2025 OAG attended a meeting between the tenants' association and managers of Quebec House, a Ward 3 property, with Councilmember Matt Frumin, DOB, and DOEE. In November, OAG hosted a public information session for tenants at Marbury Plaza in Ward 8 and members of its tenants' association, which was attended by Councilmember Trayon White and ANC Tomora Redman.

Additionally, please provide the following data regarding these cases, with data disaggregated by fiscal year as applicable:

- a. The number of cases with a claim(s) under the Drug, Firearm, or Prostitution-Related Nuisance Amendment Act.**

RESPONSE: Prior to filing a nuisance action, the law requires OAG to provide notice to a property owner and an opportunity to abate the nuisance activity. In the vast majority of our

nuisance investigations in which we send a notice, owners abate the nuisance activity before OAG files a suit. During FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, OAG has investigated 113 nuisance complaints, filed one new case with Nuisance Act claims that is in active litigation (described above, *DC v. Vision Realty Management, et al.*, 2025-CAB-002425 (DC Superior Court)), and resolved three ongoing investigations after the property owners agreed to make various changes to abate nuisance activity. OAG also participated in public safety walks and community meetings across the District responding to nuisance-related public safety concerns and helped to lead the Minnesota Avenue Action Group, a coalition of businesses and stakeholders in Ward 7 focused on improving conditions on the Minnesota Avenue corridor. OAG is currently working with Councilmember Parker, the Metropolitan Police Department, and businesses and other stakeholders to bring this community-focused, problem-solving approach to an area in North Trinidad in Ward 5.

b. The number of cases with a claim(s) under the Tenant Receivership Act.

RESPONSE: During FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, OAG successfully moved for a new appointment of a receiver in one previously filed case and continued litigating eight additional previously filed cases with claims under the TRA, of which six also involved litigating related bankruptcy actions. Furthermore, OAG made significant strides in actively litigating 21 bankruptcies involving properties owned or affiliated with known slumlord Ali “Sam” Razjooyan.

c. The number of cases with a Consumer Protection claim(s) against a landlord.

RESPONSE: All of our pending TRA cases have a corresponding claim under the CPPA seeking restitution for rent paid by tenants, based on tenants having paid rent while living with serious housing code violations, as well as claims for penalties payable to the District.

d. The total amount in damages, restitution, or other monies recovered for tenants in FY 2025, and FY 2026 to date, disaggregated by fiscal year.

RESPONSE: In FY 2025, OAG was awarded \$2,335,199.45 in tenant restitution. For FY 2026 to date, OAG has been awarded \$29,883,249 in tenant restitution.

e. The number of rental units in which repairs were made or housing conditions were abated for tenants.

RESPONSE: Due to OAG investigations or litigation action, over 3,400 units have received repairs or abatement of illegal housing conditions across five wards. This includes units where substantial repairs were made to common areas or common elements (such as abatement of a serious building-wide rodent infestation, or a building-wide increase in electrical capacity) that affect all units. These properties include 1,502 units in Ward 8, 727 units in Ward 7, 850 units in Ward 3, 205 units in Ward 2, 137 units in Ward 4, and 36 units in Ward 5.

f. The total amount in monetary penalties paid to the District in FY 2024, FY 2025, and FY 2026 to date, disaggregated by fiscal year.

RESPONSE: In FY 2024, OAG was awarded \$1,955,000 in penalties in housing cases. In FY 2025 and Q1 FY 2026, OAG was awarded \$11,290,247 in penalties and attorneys' fees to the District.

39. Please provide an update on *District of Columbia v. RealPage, Inc. et al.*, 2023 CAB 6762 (D.C. Superior Court), OAG's lawsuit against RealPage and 14 landlord companies for alleged violations of antitrust law through artificial inflation of rent prices. Last year's responses indicated the procedural history of the case and mentioned that discovery was "ongoing."

RESPONSE: In November 2023, OAG filed a lawsuit against RealPage, Inc. and 14 of the largest residential landlords in the District for colluding to illegally raise rents for tens of thousands of DC residents by collectively delegating price-setting authority to RealPage, which used a centralized pricing algorithm to inflate prices, costing renters millions of dollars. On May 29, 2024, the Superior Court denied all motions to dismiss except one by AvalonBay, which it granted *with* prejudice. On OAG's motion for reconsideration, the Court amended the order to a dismissal *without* prejudice, permitting OAG to amend its complaint more broadly. OAG amended the complaint to include AvalonBay as a defendant, and the Court denied AvalonBay's renewed motion to dismiss. Discovery is ongoing. The District was the first government enforcer nationwide to file suit against RealPage and co-conspirator landlords, later followed by other states and the U.S. Justice Department. The District has by far the most advanced case of any of the RealPage lawsuits, and the District secured a settlement from one landlord of over \$1 million in FY 2025.

Environmental Protection

40. Please describe OAG's work on enforcing environmental protections in the District and promoting environmental justice in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date.

RESPONSE: The environmental team of OAG's Housing and Environmental Justice Section (HEJS) enforces environmental protections locally, regionally, and nationally through litigation and participation in multistate initiatives. OAG enforces the District's environmental laws through referrals from the Department of Energy and Environment (DOEE), citizen complaints, or on its own initiative. Examples of our local cases during this time include:

- ***DC v. Velsicol***, 2022 CA 004711 B (DC Superior); No. 23-12544 (DC Superior Court; U.S. Bankruptcy Court, N.D. Ill.): In 2022, OAG hired outside counsel to investigate and represent the District regarding contamination caused by per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and chlordane. Among other damages, releases of chlordane have harmed District residents, leading to fishing advisories in the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers dating back to 1989. Chlordane also contaminates the Anacostia River's sediment. In October 2022, OAG filed suit against Velsicol Chemical, LLC, the sole manufacturer of chlordane, and that litigation is ongoing. Velsicol subsequently filed

- for bankruptcy, and in 2025 OAG achieved a \$1.3 million settlement with the company, which will be paid to the District over multiple years beginning in FY 26.
- ***DC v. 3M Company and DuPont De Nemours, Inc., et al.***, 2023–CAB–004322 (DC Superior Court); then transferred to multi-district litigation: In July 2023, OAG filed suit against over 25 chemical companies, including The 3M Company (3M) and DuPont De Nemours, Inc. (DuPont), for manufacturing, marketing, distributing, and selling products containing dangerous PFAS chemicals which now pollute the District’s natural resources. The complaint alleges that, despite knowing that their products were associated with serious health effects, including increased risk of cancer and birth defects, 3M and DuPont, as well as the other Defendants, falsely maintained that their products were safe. The District opted into a settlement with 3M and two other defendants for contaminating drinking water, whereby the entities will pay a portion of DC Water’s costs to monitor and treat the water. The District’s other claims against 3M and other defendants remain pending.
 - ***DC v. Fort Myer Construction Company***, 2024-CAB-006447 (DC Superior): OAG brought this case on October 10, 2024, for violations of the Water Pollution Control Act based on illegal pollution discharges to District waters. As early as 2015, Fort Myer Construction Company began allowing petroleum-contaminated runoff from its Ward 5 storage and maintenance yard to discharge into the District’s stormwater sewer, polluting waterways including the Springhouse Run stream that flows through the National Arboretum into the Anacostia River. Over the next 8 years, DOEE conducted multiple inspections of Fort Myer’s facility where DOEE continued to observe Water Pollution Control Act violations. The case is in discovery as the parties attempt to settle through mediation.
 - ***DC Water v. Armed Forces Retirement Center***, Case No. 23-2127 (Federal Claims): On November 14, 2024, OAG filed a motion to intervene in this case, where the Armed Forces Retirement Center failed to pay about \$1,000,000 in stormwater pollution prevention fees that go to DOEE, in addition to failing to pay sewer fees that go to DC Water for improving water pollution infrastructure. This case is in the discovery process.
 - ***DC v. United States of America***, Case no. 25-cv-00065 (D.D.C.): On January 10, 2025, OAG sued the United States for its recent and historical hazardous substance releases into the Anacostia River. The District is requesting the United States pay for the costs to remedy the hazards caused by the pollution of the river and to pay natural resource damages to compensate for the loss of the use of the river. The United States and the District have entered into mediation to discuss a potential resolution to the matter.
 - ***DC v. IJS Limited, LLC, et al.***, Case No. 2025-CAB-3728 (DC Superior Court): Based on a DOEE referral, OAG brought suit against a pest control company that had applied pesticides in violation of the manufacturer’s instructions at residential properties, falsely advertised its services, and operated without required licenses. OAG succeeded in obtaining a preliminary injunction against the company, while litigation is ongoing.
 - ***DC v. DC Trails, Inc., et al.*** Case No. 2025-CAB-006282 (DC Superior Court): Based on a DOEE referral, OAG investigated and achieved a consent decree with a bus company that had idled its vehicles in violation of the District’s three-minute limit on idling and had operated without a Basic Business License. The consent decree requires

- programmatic changes to the company's practices regarding idling, as well as monetary compensation for OAG and DOEE.
- ***Residences at Kenilworth Park***: OAG reached a pre-suit settlement with the developer and owner of an assisted living apartment complex in Ward 7 for violating multiple District environmental laws during construction, including illegally draining neighboring wetlands and discharging pollutants into DC waters. The developer paid \$200,000 and will permanently protect wetlands on its property.
 - ***DC v. Washington Gas Light Company***, Case No. 2025-006309 (DC Superior Court): OAG reached a consent judgment with Washington Gas, which agreed to contain hazardous pollution actively seeping into the Anacostia River at the former site of the company's East Station. An investigation by OAG and DOEE had revealed that toxic chemicals—byproducts of gas manufacturing at the shuttered plant—were bubbling up from the contaminated riverbed and seeping into the water from polluted soil on the riverbank.

Additionally, before the Public Service Commission (PSC), HEJS is involved in six active matters. Many of these cases involve OAG representing the District's environmental interests while also protecting the District and its residents from unreasonable utility rate increases. OAG does this work in close coordination with DOEE and the Office of the People's Counsel. During FY 2025 and 2026, OAG successfully persuaded the PSC to dismiss Washington Gas Light Company's application for authorization to continue its ongoing pipe replacement program. WGL's application did not adequately consider alternatives to pipe replacement such as abandonment of gas pipelines in favor of electrification where technically and economically feasible. OAG also persuaded the PSC to require WGL to incorporate so-called Advanced Leak Detection technology into its leak management practices, which has enabled the Company for the first time to measure the "flow rate" of methane leaks on its system and identify so-called super-emitters. OAG is currently advocating for the PSC to direct WGL to prioritize leaks based not only on the safety hazard that the leak poses (as required by federal law) but also the leak's contribution to atmospheric methane levels.

OAG also has joined a coalition of states in preparing numerous rule comments and legal challenges to federal rulemaking and policy initiatives. Examples include:

- In March 2025, OAG joined multistate comments on an Interim Final Rule repealing regulations regarding the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NEPA and the implementing regulations had required federal agencies to analyze and publicly disclose environmental impacts of proposed legislation. The existence of a single set of overarching regulations has ensured transparent and informed agency decision-making, with consistency across federal agencies and actions. Later in July 2025, OAG joined comments opposing the repeal or revision of NEPA regulations at five federal agencies.
- In June 2025, OAG joined a coalition of states challenging, through litigation, a Presidential Memorandum that indefinitely halted all federal approvals necessary for the development of offshore and onshore wind energy.
- In July 2025, OAG joined a coalition of states in submitting comment letters to oppose the U.S. Department of Energy's proposals to rescind energy efficiency standards for 16

classes of common household appliances, including dehumidifiers, conventional ovens, washing machines, ice makers, and others.

- In October 2025, OAG joined a coalition of states challenging, through litigation, the Environmental Protection Agency's nationwide termination of the federal Solar For All program, under which DOE had been awarded a \$62 million grant. DOE had enrolled 11,000 low to moderate income households to deploy or benefit from zero-emission technologies, such as solar. The cancellation of the grant award would mean that far fewer District residents would have access to community solar subscriptions.

Child Support

41. Regarding child support:

- a. How many child support petitions were filed in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, disaggregated by fiscal year?**

RESPONSE: CSSD filed 954 petitions in DC Superior Court in FY 2025 and 258 petitions as of December 31, 2025, in FY 2026. CSSD filed 260 petitions with other states in FY 2025 and 37 petitions as of December 31, 2025, in FY 2026. For total petitions filed, CSSD filed 1,214 in FY 2025 and has filed 295 as of December 31, 2025, in FY 2026.

- b. How many motions to modify child support has the Child Support Services Division (CSSD) received in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, disaggregated by fiscal year? How many of these motions has CSSD opposed? How many has CSSD consented to?**

RESPONSE: CSSD does not formally consent to motions to modify child support orders; rather, it files motions of opposition or files praecipes indicating no opposition or no position. In FY 2025, CSSD received 363 motions to modify from non-custodial parents. In response, CSSD filed 224 written oppositions. In FY 2026, through December 31, 2025, CSSD received 99 motions to modify and has filed 39 written oppositions. CSSD attorneys also argue oppositions on the record if the matter arises in court.¹²

- c. How many motions for contempt has CSSD filed in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, disaggregated by fiscal year?**

RESPONSE: Motions for contempt are filed when a non-custodial parent fails to pay required child support and are based on a case-by-case evaluation of factors such as the custodial parent's need for support and evidence of the non-custodial parent's ability to pay. In FY 2025, CSSD filed 22 new motions for contempt. In FY 2026, through December 31, 2025, CSSD has filed 10 new motions for contempt.

¹² CSSD does not track oral oppositions as the number of received motions and oppositions do not correspond on a 1-to-1 basis. Not all motions to modify are met with formal motions or praecipes. Instead, some are withdrawn after filing, some are moot because the matter has already been resolved or separate relief granted by the court nullifies the request, some are responded to orally in court, and some are dismissed for want of prosecution.

42. How much in child support collections in FY 2025 and FY 2026 did OAG direct to the federal government?

RESPONSE: OAG directed \$1,894,147 to the federal government in FY 2025. OAG has directed \$358,262 in FY 2026, through December 31, 2025.

43. How much did OAG reimburse the federal government in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date for child support collections that were “passed through” to families receiving TANF with only one child?

RESPONSE: In FY 2025, OAG reimbursed the federal government \$71,135 for collections that were over the excepted portion of \$100. In FY 2026, through December 31, 2025, OAG has reimbursed the federal government \$32,517, pursuant to Section 457(a)(6)(B) of Title IV-D of the Social Security Act (the Federal act that governs Child Support Agencies).

44. In FY 2025 and in FY 2026 to date, how much is owed to the District government in TANF arrears?

RESPONSE: \$52,609,982 was owed to the District in TANF arrears in FY 2025. Currently, \$52,836,351 is owed to the District in TANF arrears.

45. Over the last five fiscal years, what percentage and dollar amount of OAG’s budget came from TANF child support collections? How were those dollars spent?

RESPONSE: The TANF Collections figures include the District’s share of overall TANF collections plus the amount of TANF collections that are passed through at the excepted portion level of \$100 or less. The collections that are passed through at the excepted portion level are considered program income. The TANF collections were used to fund some CSSD staff salaries and to cover some CSSD information technology expenses.

Fiscal Year	OAG Budget	TANF Child Support Collections (\$)	TANF Child Support Collections (% of OAG's budget)
2021	147,708,103.30	2,326,419.16	1.58%
2022	143,886,490.70	2,186,162.05	1.52%
2023	147,708,103.30	1,879,834.00	1.27%
2024	142,844,461.77	1,933,407.85	1.35%
2025	152,184,109.82	1,977,840.69	1.30%

46. In last year’s responses, OAG mentioned that in light of “community feedback and recent court decisions” that the Office was considering re-interpreting D.C. § 16-916.01(d)(6) to include Medicaid as a means-tested benefit? What is the status of this review?

RESPONSE: Although eligibility for Medicaid may be based on income, it is not substantially similar to the programs that are specified in the Child Support Guideline statute. Medicaid provides medical benefits to its recipients, while programs such as TANF, SSI, General Assistance for Families, and Program on Work, Employment, and Responsibility provide public assistance payments to recipients. *See, e.g.*, 42 USC § 1383; DC Code § 4-205.52. Thus, although eligibility for Medicaid may be based on income, under certain circumstances, receiving Medicaid alone, is not sufficient to preclude the Court from imputing income to a parent. Unlike the "means-tested public assistance benefits" listed in the Child Support Guideline statute, Medicaid does not provide a recipient with payments or cash-type benefits to assist with day-to-day needs. Notwithstanding this, when determining whether to request an order imputing income, CSSD examines cases on a case-by-case basis, and reviews evidence of the resources and statutorily enumerated circumstances that affect the parent’s ability to pay, including, but not limited to, the parent’s age, employability, disability, housing status, incarceration, inpatient substance abuse or other inpatient treatment, housing expenses, provision or receipt of in-kind resources or services, benefits received from means-tested public assistance programs, other public benefits, subsidies, tax credits, etc.

Restorative Justice

47. Please provide updated information regarding OAG’s restorative justice program:

a. A description of the program, including its structure, staffing, and policies and procedures;

RESPONSE: OAG’s Restorative Justice Program is an innovative approach to addressing crime and conflict in the juvenile justice system. Under the program, a youth prosecuted by OAG for a crime (other than homicide, sexual assault, and domestic violence) may be offered the opportunity to participate in restorative justice as part of the disposition of the case if, and only if, the victim of the crime is amenable to participating, and the youth charged is willing to take full responsibility for the crime. If those criteria are met, a trained OAG Restorative Justice Facilitator (Facilitator) works confidentially and independently with the victim and the youth and their respective supporters before bringing them together for the restorative justice conference.

Leading up to the restorative justice conference, the Facilitator works with the victim and the respondent to ensure each is adequately prepared to have a successful discussion about the harm that was caused. To do this, the Facilitator conducts separate meetings with the victim and the young person, usually on a weekly basis, to assess their needs and monitor their progress toward preparedness for conference. The goals of the Facilitator at this stage are to help the victim identify what he or she hopes to achieve at the conference and help the youth understand empathy and accountability and process his or her role in causing the harm.

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)

OAG

At the restorative justice conference, the youth takes responsibility for his or her actions, explains his or her motivations to the victim, and supporters, and offers a sincere apology. The victim and supporters describe how they were impacted by the crime and have a chance to ask questions, express concerns, and otherwise be heard. The impacted individuals and the youth develop a written agreement laying out what needs to happen to resolve the matter so that it never happens again. After the agreement is finalized, the Facilitator will monitor the agreement for compliance.

Restorative justice conferences empower victims by giving them agency throughout the process. These conferences also foster empathy and accountability in the involved youth, while seeking to resolve the conflict in a way that promotes positive behavioral changes. Additionally, as part of the restorative justice program, youth are required to complete Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) in addition to the restorative justice conference. CBT is a type of psychotherapy that helps individuals modify their thoughts and behaviors. The CBT component of the program comprises approximately 10 group sessions.

The Restorative Justice Section currently has 8 restorative justice facilitators, one program assistant, one social worker, one section chief, and one assistant section chief.

b. Any changes to the program in FY 2025 and FY 2026, including its structure, staffing, and policies and procedures;

RESPONSE: There have been no programmatic changes made in FY 2025 and FY 2026, through December 31, 2025. However, the number of restorative justice facilitators has been reduced from 11 to 8.

c. Any private funding obtained by OAG for the program in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, including the source and amount;

RESPONSE: There was no new funding obtained by OAG in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date.

d. The number and types of cases referred in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, disaggregated by fiscal year;

RESPONSE: Please see the table below.

e. The number and types of cases in which the parties involved agreed to participate in a restorative justice conference;

RESPONSE: Please see the table below.

f. The number of conferences that were considered successful;

RESPONSE: Please see the table below.

g. The number of conferences that were not considered successful;

RESPONSE: Please see the table below.

h. Please describe in detail the definitions and metrics for how OAG determines that a restorative justice conference was successful;

RESPONSE: A Restorative Justice conference is “successful” if the young person participates in the pre-conference preparation meetings, attends the conference, and the group reaches a written agreement about what is done to repair the harm.

i. The number of cases returned for prosecution;

RESPONSE: Please see the table below.

j. If any cases were not returned for prosecution, an explanation of why; and

RESPONSE: Each case was returned to the prosecuting AAG for appropriate disposition. There were no cases where a young person failed to successfully complete the restorative justice program and the case was not returned for prosecution.

k. Any additional evaluation of outcomes the agency has conducted or information about recidivism outcomes the agency has collected.

RESPONSE: OAG’s recidivism analysis for youth who completed the restorative justice program is included in the answer to question 49.

Cases referred to Restorative Justice (RJ) by category	FY25¹³	FY26Q1
Total number of cases referred ¹⁴	215	60
RJ declined by victim	28	<10
RJ pending	27	40
RJ conference held	>17	<10
RJ conferences held in FY25 that were successful	15	N/A ¹⁵
RJ conferences held in FY26 that were successful	*	<10

¹³ Results of 0-9 matters are listed as <10. Results of 10 or more that would nevertheless unveil data related to fewer than ten matters are redacted by * or by showing a minimum amount greater than 10.

¹⁴ Includes all delinquency matter referrals made through OAG.

¹⁵ Not applicable due to cases being referred in Q1 FY 2026. Therefore, the conference would not have happened in FY 2025.

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)

OAG

RJ conferences held in FY25 that were unsuccessful ¹⁶	<10	N/A
RJ conferences held in FY26 that were unsuccessful	<10	<10
Returned to prosecutor for other reasons	132	19
Respondent declined or became ineligible ¹⁷ for RJ	104	>8
Victim declined or was unresponsive and youth declined participation or became ineligible for RJ	28	<10
Other successful cases ¹⁸	<10	<10

48. Please share the results of the evaluation of the restorative justice program being conducted by the Urban Institute. In last year’s responses, OAG indicated that the Urban Institute “expect to complete the study by the summer of 2025”.

RESPONSE: OAG is undergoing a qualitative evaluation of its restorative justice process to gain better insight into the most effective methods for changing criminal behavior and reducing recidivism. The evaluation is being conducted by the Urban Institute (Urban), a renowned research and policy institution, and funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation (Casey Foundation), a national philanthropy dedicated to improving juvenile justice systems. The study includes surveys administered by researchers, and interviews with youth, parents and victims who participated in restorative justice to evaluate how remorse, culpability, and perceptions of fairness impact behavior change. The evaluation will also assess victim satisfaction. Results from this study were originally anticipated by the end of 2024. However, Urban needs additional time to finalize their data collection and extend their timeline to complete the study. In late December 2025, Urban shared with OAG a rough draft of its report, and at the request of OAG, Urban is working with the Casey Foundation to provide a definitive timeframe for when the report will be finalized and published.

49. Please provide re-arrest rates for juveniles who participated in the restorative justice program, as well as any additional evaluation of outcomes the agency has conducted or information about recidivism the agency has collected.

RESPONSE: The fiscal year used for this analysis is based on the fiscal year in which the program was completed, which may be a different fiscal year than when the matter was opened by OAG or when the matter was referred to the restorative justice program. Of the youth who successfully completed the restorative justice program in FY 2025 and Q1 FY 2026 and could be observed for

¹⁶ A Restorative Justice conference is “unsuccessful” if the youth did not show up or the group failed to come to a consensus agreement.

¹⁷ For example: respondent opted for trial, absconded, or the case was dismissed.

¹⁸ Other successful cases means that the respondent completed all aspects of the restorative justice program but could not have an RJ conference through no fault of their own.

delinquency recidivism, 9 of 39¹⁹ youth (23%) had subsequent matters²⁰ opened for a delinquency offense in the District, and of those 9, 8 youth (21%) were papered. As this analysis includes youth who completed the program between FY 2025 and Q1 FY 2026, many of these youth have not been observed for the length of time included in the analysis for Q60 (3, 6, 9, and 12 months).

Among the youth who successfully completed the restorative justice process since the program started in 2016 (302 youth²¹), 115 (38%) had subsequent matters opened after their program completion date. Of those, 88 youth (29%) were papered.

OAG tracks recidivism for youth participants in the restorative justice program until they turn 18. For some of these respondents, depending on the date of their program completion, as many as 9 years have passed, and many have likely since aged out of the juvenile justice system.

Violence Intervention

50. Please describe the agency's efforts to coordinate with the Office of Neighborhood Safety and Engagement (ONSE) and its violence intervention initiative, at the end of FY 2025 and in FY 2026, to date, with regard to the transition of Cure the Streets sites to ONSE.

RESPONSE: OAG has worked closely with ONSE to provide the office with a seamless and well-supported transition of the Cure the Streets (CTS) program. The CTS grants team met with ONSE more than half a dozen times during FY 2025. These meetings include a presentation and facilitated question and answer session designed to orient ONSE staff to OAG's grant administration process, a follow-up discussion two weeks later, and an informational session during which the CTS grants team provided insight into the operational aspects of the CTS program and shared copies of standard operating procedures and administrative templates with ONSE staff. Several transition meetings were also held during August and September of 2025. The Director of OAG's Grants unit also prepared a detailed transition memo for ONSE's Director in August 2025 which outlined every aspect of the CTS program and provided links to relevant FY 2025 grant management documents and other program-related materials. Additionally, OAG included ONSE in the review and selection process for FY 2026 CTS grantees.

With respect to FY 2026 efforts, a representative from OAG's grants team serves as a member of the VI Advisory Team established by CM Pinto pursuant to the transition of CTS to ONSE and participated in the inaugural meeting hosted by ONSE at the beginning of FY26. OAG will continue to attend Advisory Team meetings during FY 2026, and the grants team remains available as a resource for questions about the CTS program.

¹⁹ While 43 youth completed the program, 39 were younger than 18 years old at the time of program completion and therefore included in the delinquency recidivism analysis.

²⁰ Recidivism was defined as a delinquency matter with an opened date and offense date after the youth completed the restorative justice program (subsequent matter).

²¹ While 347 youth completed the program, 302 were younger than 18 years old at the time of program completion and therefore included in the delinquency recidivism analysis.

51. Were OAG’s FY 25 monthly report cards that are developed to assess grantees’ performance shared with ONSE?

RESPONSE: OAG conducted quarterly compliance reviews of its CTS grantees and issued report cards identifying performance concerns and areas of deficiency. In FY 2025, OAG completed three rounds of compliance reviews covering Q1 through Q3. These report cards were shared with ONSE to support the program’s transition. OAG did not conduct a compliance review after conclusion of Q4, as OAG was no longer administering the program at that time.

52. How is OAG using the remainder of federal funding in the Litigation Support Fund that was designated for violence prevention?

RESPONSE: OAG will use the remainder of grant funds awarded by DOJ to continue working toward the same violence prevention goals and serving the same target population contemplated in the original project. DOJ has approved a modification to the scope of OAG’s grant award that adds new violence prevention components that align with its FY24 award, including:

1. Development of District-wide standardized community violence intervention (CVI) training and certification(s).
2. Construction and maintenance of a centralized data platform to support subaward oversight, performance measurement, and technical assistance.
3. Design and dissemination of a CVI best-practices toolkit.
4. Delivery of paid career development programming for high-risk individuals.

Juvenile Justice

53. Please provide data regarding OAG’s prosecution of juvenile matters:

- a. **How many juvenile matters were presented to OAG in FY 2025?**
 - i. **Of those, how many involved an alleged violent crime?**
 - ii. **Of those, how many involved an alleged homicide?**
 - iii. **How many involved an alleged gun possession?**
- b. **How many juvenile matters did OAG petition in FY 2025?**
 - i. **Of those, in how many did the top charge involve a “crime of violence” (as defined by D.C. Code §23-1331(4))?**
 - ii. **Of those, how many did the top charge involve a homicide?**
 - iii. **How many included a gun possession charge?**
- c. **How many juvenile matters did OAG decline to petition in FY 2025?**
 - i. **Of those, in how many did the top charge involve a “crime of violence” (as defined by D.C. Code §23-1331(4))?**
 - ii. **Of those, how many did the top charge involve a homicide?**
 - iii. **How many included a gun possession charge?**

RESPONSE: All data points below reference OAG’s top recorded charge and the fiscal year in which OAG opened the delinquency matter²², not necessarily the year in which it was petitioned or declined. Matters included are those that have a final papering decision. Excluded are fugitive matters, delinquency matters pending a decision on petitioning, and delinquency matters presented to OAG but for which the United States Attorney’s Office for the District of Columbia assumed jurisdiction under D.C. Code §16-2301(3). Petitioned matters include “re-brings” where OAG initially declined to petition a matter but later filed a petition, such as when a matter was diverted but the youth did not complete the diversion program. The data provided below is for matters that involved an arrest.

Delinquency matters, FY25	All	Crime violence	of	Homicide	Gun possession
Arrest matters	1493	599		<10	162
Petitioned	1080	500		<10	138
Not petitioned	413	99		<10	24
Arrest papering rate	72%	83%			85%

- d. **How many youth were offered Deferred Prosecution Agreements (DPA), Deferred Disposition Agreements (DDA), and Consent Decrees (CDs) in FY 2025?**

RESPONSE: See the table below for matters that OAG opened in FY 2025 and where a youth entered a CD, DPA, or DDA. OAG does not track offers of CDs, DPAs, or DDAs.

Matters opened in FY25 that entered a CD, DPA, or DDA	FY25
CD	19
DPA	14
DDA	268

- i. **How does OAG determine whether a juvenile is eligible for a DPA, DDA, or CD?**

RESPONSE: OAG prosecutors consider myriad factors in assessing eligibility for Consent Decrees, Deferred Prosecution Agreements, and Deferred Disposition Agreements. These include: the nature of the offense, the extent of any prior offenses or current contacts with the delinquency system, system or other agency involvement, and other social factors such as education, mental and behavioral health needs, and familial cooperation.

²² Each juvenile matter presented to OAG is generally catalogued as one or more delinquency offenses involving a distinct individual. For example, 3 youths charged for the same offense would typically generate 3 separate matters. Therefore, a single offense may result in the initiation of multiple matters. A single matter can also be multiple interrelated offenses involving a distinct individual. For example, 2 different offenses involving the same suspect that are interrelated could be catalogued by OAG as a single matter

- ii. What percentage of youth with DPAs, DDAs, or CDs were at any point found to be noncompliant with the terms of the agreement?**

RESPONSE: OAG does not track data for individual instances of noncompliance.

- iii. When a youth is found to be noncompliant with a term of their DDA, DPA, or CD, what steps does OAG take to address the noncompliance?**

RESPONSE: In cases where OAG has determined that public safety and the rehabilitation of the youth would be fulfilled through a CD, DPA or DDA, we work with our partners to support successful completion of the agreement, even when youth exhibit non-compliant behaviors. For example, if a youth is non-compliant with a curfew or missing school, the goals of enhancing public safety and rehabilitating the youth will not be met by forcing the youth to further penetrate the juvenile justice system. The adults responsible for supporting the youth must engage and work with the youth so that they become compliant. The Juvenile Section works with the parties to the case, including Court Social Services, to determine if a youth can come into compliance with the terms of the agreement. If the youth is unable to achieve substantial compliance with the terms of the agreement, the petition may be reinstated or the Juvenile Section may move forward with prosecution or sentencing, the DPA or DDA may be revoked, and prosecution of the matter resumes.

- iv. If a youth does not cure their noncompliance, what steps does OAG take?**

RESPONSE: See response 53.d.iii above.

- v. Please provide data on the reasons youth were found to be non-compliant with the terms of their DPA, DDA, or CD.**

RESPONSE: We do not track data on individual instances of noncompliance. Examples of noncompliance, most commonly, are re-arrest or violation of conditions of release, like curfew violations, failing to attend school, and failing to attend programming. It is important to distinguish between non-compliance and revocation. Court Social Services and community-based organizations providing programs work closely with the young person to get them back into compliance. If OAG ultimately exercises its discretion to revoke the CD, DPA, or DDA, the most common reason for revocation is re-arrest for a violent or serious offense.

- vi. What percentage of youth who were non-compliant were subsequently prosecuted by OAG?**

RESPONSE: We prosecute every revoked CD, DPA, and DDA. In exercising our prosecutorial discretion, we may decline to proceed for the following reasons: victim or complaining witness no longer desires to participate, subsequent arrest for more serious matter or adult charge, or death of the respondent.

54. Regarding carjackings specifically:

- a. Please provide data on the number of juveniles charged by OAG with carjackings in FY 2025.**

RESPONSE: See table below.

Youth charged with carjacking, by fiscal year matters opened

	FY25
Number of youth prosecuted with carjacking charge	64
Number of matters prosecuted with carjacking charge	76

- b. What percentage of juveniles charged with carjackings in FY 2025 had previously been charged with carjacking? With another violent crime? With any crime?**

RESPONSE: OAG prioritizes all felony offenses including carjackings. Carjacking arrests are processed by the next day, including Saturdays and all holidays. Felony pre-petition custody orders are acted upon within days, provided the MPD investigation is adequate and complete, and provides sufficient evidence for the prosecution to meet its burden of proof.

The table below shows the number and percentage of matters and youth for which OAG petitioned a charge of carjacking in FY25. It also shows the number of youth who were previously charged with carjacking, a crime of violence²³ other than carjacking, and/or any crime, respectively²⁴.

Youth charged with prior carjacking, crime of violence, or any other crime²⁵

	FY25
Number of youth prosecuted with carjacking charge	64
Youth previously prosecuted with carjacking charge	13 (20%)
Youth previously prosecuted with some other crime of violence	<10
Youth previously prosecuted with any other crime	16 (25%)

- c. How many juveniles charged with carjacking have been referred to the restorative justice program in FY 2025?**

RESPONSE: A referral to the Restorative Justice Program means that restorative justice may be a part of the plea agreement offered to the youth in the case. When a case is referred to the Restorative Justice Program, it implies that the case is eligible for restorative justice. However, before proceeding with the restorative justice process, the prosecutor and the Restorative Justice

²³ Crime of violence as defined by DC Code §23-1331(4).

²⁴ Prior crimes may include matters opened prior to the carjacking offense but not petitioned until after the carjacking offense.

²⁵ To maintain juvenile confidentiality, results of fewer than 10 are reported as <10.

Facilitator must first evaluate whether the victim and youth are appropriate for restorative justice, and the victim and youth must be amenable to participating in the program.

For matters that were opened in FY 2025, 21 youth who were charged with a carjacking were referred to the Restorative Justice program. Less than ten youth who were charged with carjacking ultimately took guilty pleas with restorative justice as a condition of their plea agreement. An additional fewer than ten youth who were charged with carjacking in FY 2025 have pending cases, meaning it has not yet been determined whether their cases will go to conference.

55. How is OAG working with CJCC to gain access to juvenile arrest data in Maryland and Virginia?

RESPONSE: OAG, through its Information Technology Office, has been working with CJCC to obtain JUSTIS access to Maryland and Virginia juvenile arrest data.

56. What steps has OAG taken in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date, to expand data sharing with CJCC and ensure CJCC has access to the individualized juvenile data they need to conduct aggregate analysis?

RESPONSE: OAG provides data to CJCC in accordance with DC Code §§ 16-2331, *et seq.*

57. How many juveniles did OAG charge with unauthorized use of a vehicle in FY 2025 or FY 2026, to date?

RESPONSE: In the table below, all data points below refer to **matters** with any OAG charge of unauthorized use of a vehicle (UUV), not just the top charge. Fiscal year refers to when OAG opened the matter, not necessarily the year in which it was petitioned or declined.

Petitioned matters	FY25	FY26Q1
Any UUV charge	170	33
Any UUV charge excluding carjacking	125	29

In the table below, all data points below refer to **youth** with any OAG charge of unauthorized use of a vehicle (UUV), not just the top charge. Fiscal year refers to when OAG opened the matter, not necessarily the year in which it was petitioned or declined.

Youth with a petition matter	FY25	FY26Q1
Any UUV charge	153	33
Any UUV charge excluding carjacking	106	28

There were less than 10 youth that were petitioned with a UUV charge in both FY 2025 and Q1 FY 2026.

58. In last year’s responses, OAG mentioned that it “tracks the number of matters presented to OAG where USAO exercised their discretion, pursuant to D.C. Code § 16– 2301 (3), to assume jurisdiction over the matter under Title 16 or where a youth previously prosecuted by USAO under Title 16 was arrested on a subsequent crime.” How many such matters were tracked in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date?

RESPONSE: OAG does not track how many matters involving youth USAO-DC brings charges against under Title 16. However, OAG tracks the number of matters presented to OAG where USAO-DC exercised their discretion, pursuant to D.C. Code § 16–2301 (3), to assume jurisdiction over the matter under Title 16 or where a youth previously prosecuted by USAO-DC under Title 16 was arrested on a subsequent crime. In FY 2025, there were 58 such matters involving 30 of youth, and in Q1 FY 2026, there were fewer than 10 such matters.

59. Please provide any updates on OAG’s engagement with USAO-DC regarding USAO’s prosecution of juvenile crime. Have there been any changes to OAG’s MOU with USAO-DC regarding Title 16 cases? Please provide a copy of the MOU.

RESPONSE: There have been no changes to the Title 16 MOU between OAG and USAO. Please see **Attachment 15**, “Title 16 OAG USAO MOU.”

a. In last year’s testimony, OAG indicated that under the MOU regarding Title 16 cases, USAO has agreed to consult with OAG before papering a youth as an adult; contact OAG regarding every case in which a juvenile, who has not previously been prosecuted under Title 16, is prosecuted as an adult prior to charging the juvenile; and consider the factors in DC Code § 16-2307(e) in making its decision to charge a young person as an adult. Please indicate whether USAO is abiding by these provisions, in whole or in part; describe what “consult with” constituted in 2025; and share any confirmation you’ve received that USAO is fulfilling their commitment to consider factors in DC Code § 16-2307(e) prior to charging the youth as an adult.

RESPONSE: OAG and USAO continue to abide by the terms of the Title 16 MOU. Whenever USAO considers transferring a young person pursuant to DC Code § 16–2301, OAG and USAO consult about the matter and discuss the factors set forth in DC Code § 16-2307(e). OAG does not have statutory authority over USAO’s prosecutorial decision. Consult means USAO and OAG have a telephone conversation about the youth’s background, including prior juvenile contacts, amenability to rehabilitation, OAG’s position on whether the young person is amenable to treatment, the nature of the offense and surrounding circumstances, and social factors such as education and home environment.

b. Please indicate how many youth OAG sought to prosecute as adults in 2025, including their ages, charges, and whether there was judicial concurrence with your request.

RESPONSE: OAG has sought transfer of youth to prosecute as adults in 2025 for fewer than 10 youth pursuant to DC Code § 16-2307. Due to juvenile confidentiality restrictions, we cannot

disclose additional information such as age, charge, and whether the motion to transfer was granted by the court.

60. In the agency’s performance oversight responses for FY 2024, OAG noted that the agency measures recidivism in few different ways according to both time frame and opened and papered cases. Please provide, once again, updated versions of the tables provided in Attachment 15 your FY 2024-2025 pre-hearing performance oversight questions regarding juvenile recidivism rates.

RESPONSE: Please see **Attachment 16**, “Question 60 Juvenile Recidivism Rates.”

61. Does OAG continue to hold weekly meetings with MPD at the Juvenile Processing Center to discuss issues with juvenile cases? Please provide a summary of what issues have been addressed through these meetings.

RESPONSE: Managers from the Juvenile Section meet weekly with the MPD command staff in charge of the Juvenile Processing Center via Teams to discuss issues related to juvenile cases. This includes logistic, procedural, and substantive issues dealing with school and community, community safety, papering procedures, arrest procedures, evidence, charges, investigations, detention decisions, the judicial system, and other issues related to juvenile accountability and rehabilitation.

62. Please provide the following information regarding the Alternatives to the Court Experience (“ACE”) Diversion Program:

a. A brief description of the ACE Program;

RESPONSE: The Alternatives to Court Experience (ACE) program is a diversion program implemented by the Department of Human Services. OAG collaborates with ACE, the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD), and Court Social Services to create a unified entry point for all diversions from juvenile prosecution.

b. The number of cases referred in FY 2025 and FY 2026, broken down by underlying reason for referral (e.g., type of offense, reported runaway);

RESPONSE: The table below provides data for FY 2024 and FY 2025, the last two full fiscal years (24 months), rather than one full and one partial fiscal year (15 months).

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)

OAG

Offense Category²⁶	FY 2024	FY 2025
<i>Post-arrest diversion</i>		
Crimes Against Persons	70	81
Crimes Against Property	42	36
Public Order Offenses	11	*
<i>Pre-arrest diversion</i>		
Delinquency offenses	12	<10
Status offenses ²⁷	164	125
Grand Total	299	265

c. For the cases identified in (b), OAG’s recidivism analysis.

This analysis includes post-arrest diversion matters only.

Of the youth included in the recidivism analysis provided in response to Question 60, OAG prosecuted 1330 distinct respondents and diverted 251 distinct respondents. Youth who committed Public Order Offenses were excluded because the number of respondents was small.²⁸ Recidivism for each respondent was examined at 4 specific time points: 3, 6, 9, and 12 months after OAG opened the initial **arrest** matter. With each successive time frame, the number of respondents that could be observed for both measures decreased,²⁹ which makes the recidivism rate more sensitive to small fluctuations in recidivism.

Please note these definitions for the table below:

- Diverted: diverted respondents in the time period FY 2024 through FY 2025
- Prosecuted: prosecuted respondents **who were not diverted** in the time period FY24 - FY25 (As such, 73 respondents who were both diverted and prosecuted in the time period are counted in the Diverted Cases population and excluded from the Prosecuted Cases population).

As shown in the table below, total respondents with a diverted matter have a considerably lower rate of prosecuted recidivism than those with a prosecuted matter at all points of interest. After 6 months, 17% of diverted respondents recidivated, compared to 23% of prosecuted respondents.

²⁶ Results of 0-9 are reported as <10. See D.C. Code §16-2333.03. To avoid redactions being unveiled by the yearly totals in this or other published data, where the sum of the redacted results in single year is less than 10, the next lowest result of 10 or greater in that fiscal year is listed as *. Data reported by fiscal year OAG opened that matter. Includes matters where OAG diverted youth prior to arrest and matters diverted after arrest based on consultation between OAG and Court Social Services.

²⁷ Includes runaway and truancy matters.

²⁸ Due to the small population size, all observed periods of recidivism for youth charged with Public Order Offenses included less than 10 youth. Also note that this recidivism analysis only examines delinquency data and not PINS diversions.

²⁹ A youth would be excluded from observation at a point of interest if they either turned 18 before then or if the date of the point of interest had not yet passed when the analysis was run (e.g., a youth who had their observed matter opened on October 1, 2025 would be excluded from the analysis at the 1 year mark as this analysis was completed before 1 year had passed)

After 12 months, 28% of diverted respondents recidivated, compared to 34% of prosecuted respondents.

In interpreting these results, it is important to keep in mind 2 considerations. First, because the number of diverted respondents is quite small, the recidivism rates are especially sensitive to small changes in the number of youth who recidivate. For example, if 5 youth are observed at a point of interest, 1 youth who recidivated would make the recidivism rate go from 0% to 20%. Second, care should be taken in ascribing a causal impact of diversion or prosecution on subsequent recidivism rates. Notably, the types of matters that tend to be papered differ from those that are diverted; for instance, papered matters tend to involve more serious offenses than diverted matters. Additionally, respondents who commit different types of offenses are likely to have varying recidivism rates, irrespective of any perceived effect of prosecution or diversion on subsequent delinquency.

Rates for Arrest Matter Recidivism by Top Charge of Initial Case for Youth with Diverted Focal Case and Prosecuted Focal Case [FY24 - FY25]

Top Charge		3 months		6 months		9 months		12 months	
		Diverted Cases (n = 243)	Prosecuted Cases (n = 1251)	Diverted Cases (n = 203)	Prosecuted Cases (n = 1065)	Diverted Cases (n = 156)	Prosecuted Cases (n = 866)	Diverted Cases (n = 127)	Prosecuted Cases (n = 694)
Crimes Against Persons	Against	12%	14%	18%	23%	26%	28%	32%	32%
Crimes Against Property	Against	11%	16%	20%	24%	21%	32%	22%	37%
Total		11%	13%	17%	23%	24%	29%	28%	34%

d. What is the recidivism rate for youth referred to ACE who do not complete the program?

RESPONSE: While ACE notifies OAG about program completion status, OAG does not track or maintain data on ACE participants unless we re-bring a petition for those matters.

63. Please describe any policy and/or legal initiatives or projects undertaken or in development by OAG relating to delinquency in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date. Please include information for each policy, legal initiative, program or project regarding referral rates, utilization rates, and outcomes.

RESPONSE: OAG continues to work with MPD, DHS and Sasha Bruce Youthworks to provide an alternative to arrest and prosecution for youth who are engaged in family conflict through its

Community Approaches to Rapid Engagement Services Program (CARES Program). The CARES Program, piloted in FY 2024-2025 and continuing in this FY 2026, provides respite care for youth and comprehensive, wrap-around assistance to families who are engaged in cycles of familial unrest that is better addressed through social support instead of prosecution of the youth in the delinquency court. As a pre-arrest diversion program, CARES allows MPD and OAG to divert youth with probable cause for intrafamily offenses (excluding intimate partner violence and serious harm). CARES also accepts referrals from DHS for at-risk youth. The program collaborates with MPD, OAG, and DHS to support families experiencing intrafamily violence and offers crisis response and stabilization services, including respite at a Sasha Bruce facility if needed.

- a. Please provide an update on the operation and outcomes of the Juvenile Hotline in FY 2025 and FY 2026. How many calls did the Juvenile Hotline receive in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date?**

RESPONSE: See the table below on Juvenile Section hotline calls from FY 2025 through December 2025 of FY 2026.

Fiscal year	Hotline calls
FY25	260
FY26Q1	83

64. The CJCC’s Public Safety and Justice Reports dashboard showed that only 56 percent of youth referred to the ACE Diversion Program in 2024 actually started the program.

- a. What was the program start and completion rate in 2025?**

RESPONSE: OAG does not collect or hold DHS’ ACE program data.

- b. In last year’s response, OAG stated that “ACE and OAG have been working collaboratively to decrease the overall early closure rate” and to increase the rate of who starts the program. Please provide an update on these efforts in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date. What impact have these efforts had on the completion rate?**

RESPONSE: OAG continues to partner with DHS’s ACE Diversion Program to find ways to support youth participation. For delinquency matters, the increased collaboration continues to involve DHS having a representative in OAG's office to immediately begin working with the parent(s) when OAG refers the matter to ACE. ACE follows up with a letter and a home visit, generally, before closing the case due to a lack of cooperation and referral back to OAG.

For truancy, during FY 2025, OAG continued to provide weekly potential referral lists to ACE to cross reference names with other DHS programming prior to referral submission. This maximized resources and streamlined the process. During FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date, OAG meets monthly with DHS to review the status of referrals and amend protocols as needed.

Since OAG does not collect data on youth performance in the ACE Program, we cannot comment on whether the collaboration between DHS and OAG has had an impact on completion rates.

- c. What is the average length of time between an arrest and OAG referring the juvenile to ACE in FY 2025? How many youth who were referred to ACE for non-truancy related issues but who did not complete the program, were subsequently prosecuted by OAG in FY 2025 and FY 2026 to date?**

RESPONSE: OAG's referral to ACE upon a new arrest is generally whenever the case is presented to OAG, for example, the next day, excluding Sundays. Meaning, if the arrest occurred on day one, when law enforcement presents that case to OAG (the next day excluding Sundays), OAG will make the referral to ACE.

- 65. Please describe any updates to the policy or legal initiatives or projects undertaken or in development by OAG relating to truancy and school attendance in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date. Please include information for each policy, legal initiative, program or project regarding referral rates, utilization rates, and outcomes.**

RESPONSE: OAG is committed to reducing truancy and increasing daily school attendance for youth ages five to seventeen. Addressing the underlying obstacles to regular and timely school attendance is the most effective approach to reducing truancy and improving school attendance, rather than involving children and their families in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Therefore, OAG has increasingly focused on referring youth to programs that address their underlying needs and on developing initiatives that can help meet those needs.

Approach to Persons In Need of Supervision (PINS) Cases (13 to 17 Year Olds): Youth who are 13 to 17 years old and are chronically truant are referred to as Persons In Need of Supervision (PINS). OAG's priority is to ensure these youth and their families have access to community-based services and District resources to address barriers to regular school attendance. When OAG receives a PINS referral, before petitioning the case, OAG staff contact the caregiver(s) and providers to determine whether they have exhausted all community-based supports. When appropriate, OAG refers youth to DHS's Parent and Adolescent Support Services (PASS), and Alternatives to the Court Experience (ACE) programs, or DBH's Intensive Care Coordination (ICC) formerly called High-Fidelity Wrap (HFW) Program. OAG does not run any of its own diversion programs for this population. In FY 2025, OAG continued its collaboration with agency partners to review referral protocols, prioritized referrals from DHS's truancy pilot schools, and refined interagency coordination.

Addressing Truancy Through Engagement and Negotiated Dialogue (ATTEND): Since FY 2018, OAG's ATTEND program has provided free mediations conducted by trained professionals to parents whose children struggle with school attendance. During mediation, parents have an opportunity to identify the underlying barriers that hinder their children's daily attendance. ATTEND provides case-management services with linkage to community-based supports through partner agencies and local nonprofits. ATTEND started as a diversion model for parents facing criminal charges for failing to ensure their elementary-school-aged children's attendance (starting

at 15 unexcused absences). In FY20, OAG began a prevention model that shifted ATTEND’s focus and resources to early intervention (after five unexcused absences) and direct services in select partner schools.

During FY 2025, ATTEND supported four Ward 8 DCPS elementary schools (Malcolm X, Patterson, Simon, and Turner); two DCPS middle schools (Sousa in Ward 7 and John Hayden Johnson in Ward 8); 6th graders at Paul Public Charter Middle School; and kindergarten through 6th graders at two Center City Public Charter Schools Campus - Trinidad/NOMA and Capitol Hill. ATTEND expanded to its first DCPS education campus-Leckie- and two additional Ward 8 DCPS elementary schools at the end of FY25, Garfield and Hendley. Patterson and Center City—Trinidad/NOMA phased out of the prevention model and converted to court referrals as needed. Mediations started at Garfield and Hendley in FY 2026.

In addition to the prevention model, OAG offers ATTEND for parents referred for criminal prosecution under Family Special Proceedings (FSP) or in matters it has reviewed and deemed the parent primarily responsible for youth referred for PINS cases (FSP Conversion).³⁰

a. How many unique parents participated in ATTEND mediation services in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date?

RESPONSE: In FY 2025, 148 families were referred to ATTEND services (mediation and non-mediation). In Q1 FY 2026, 89 families were referred to ATTEND services.

b. How is OAG measuring success for other ATTEND activities? Please provide performance metrics and outcomes for FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date.

RESPONSE: OAG interprets “other ATTEND activities” as number of participants from the partner school, number of goods distributed or partner agency participation during events like coat drives, resource fairs, and back to school nights. OAG does not track success via a performance matrix.

66. Please provide the number of juveniles by school that were referred to OAG for truancy in FY 2025. Please disaggregate by race, ethnicity, and gender.

RESPONSE: In FY 2025, CSS referred 2341 matters to OAG. The tables below reflect results of referrals to OAG by school system, school, gender, race/ethnicity. To comply with confidentiality laws including DC Code §16-2333.03, OAG consolidated results of fewer than 10 referrals.

Truancy referrals presented to OAG, by school system and school for FY 2025

School System and School	FY 2025
DCPS	2002
Anacostia SHS	18

³⁰ OAG partners with the DC Superior Court’s Multi-Door Dispute Resolution Division to conduct this subset of mediations.

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)

OAG

Ballou SHS	267
Ballou STAY	80
Bard HS Early College DC	22
Cardozo EC	132
Columbia Heights EC	135
Coolidge SHS	180
Dunbar SHS	247
Eastern SHS	80
Garnet-Patterson STAY	47
Ida B. Wells MS	14
Jackson-Reed SHS	51
Kelly Miller MS	11
Luke C. Moore Academy	102
MacArthur SHS	43
Phelps SHS	21
Ron Brown College Preparatory HS	25
Roosevelt SHS	317
Roosevelt STAY	29
Woodson SHS	140
Schools with <10 referrals each	41
PCSB, Private*, Other (OSSE/Private Placement)*, and Unknown*	339
DC International School	17
KIPP DC - College Preparatory PCS	139
KIPP DC - Legacy College Preparatory PCS	46
Paul PCS - International High School	45
SEED PCS of Washington, DC	11
YouthBuild PCS	30
Schools with <10 referrals each	51
Grand Total	2341

*Results of <10.

Truancy referrals presented to OAG, by gender for FY 2025

Gender	FY25
Female	962
Male	978
Other* or Unknown	401

*Results of <10.

Truancy referrals presented to OAG, by race/ethnicity for FY 2025

Race/ethnicity	FY 2025
-----------------------	----------------

African/American	1278
Caucasian	52
Hispanic/Latino	229
Asian*, Native American, or Other	33
Unknown	749

*Results of <10.

- a. Additionally, please provide the number of educational neglect cases brought and, of those cases brought, the number of actual prosecutions for that charge in FY 2025.**

RESPONSE: In FY 2025, FSD petitioned 48 cases with educational neglect as a primary allegation and declined to prosecute fewer than 10. Of those 48 cases petitioned, FSD obtained adjudications in 44 cases and moved to dismiss in fewer than 10. Of the 44 adjudications, FSD obtained adjudications for educational neglect for 39.

- 67. Please provide the number of juveniles by school that were referred as runaways to OAG and the number of referrals petitioned in FY 2025. Please disaggregate by race, ethnicity, and gender.**

RESPONSE: In FY 2025, a total of 24 runaway referrals were sent to OAG, of which 14 were petitioned.³¹

- 68. How often did OAG depart from the recommendations of the Child Support Services Division (CSSD) in terms of its petition and detention recommendations in FY 2025? Please list for each how often OAG’s decision was more severe versus less severe.**

RESPONSE: Child Support Services Division (CSSD) is a Division within OAG and does not make petition and detention recommendations to Public Safety Division prosecutors. If this question refers to the Court Social Services (CSS), OAG considers Court Social Services’ recommendations when formulating our position on filing petitions and requests for secure detention. OAG does not track how often our decisions align or diverge from CSS’ recommendations.

- 69. Have there been any updates to the eligibility standards for OAG recommending different diversion programs?**

RESPONSE: No.

³¹ For FY25 data, the requested disaggregation is redacted because either the individual results are less than ten or, if greater than ten, would nevertheless unveil data related to fewer than 10 matters. Data as of 1/2/26.

70. How many youth were recommended for diversion during FY 2025 (please distinguish between youth diverted prior to arrest and youth diverted after arrest)? Please list the number of youth diverted by program—such as the Department of Human Service’s Alternatives to the Court Experience (ACE) Program, the Department of Human Services’ PASS program, the Department of Behavioral Health’s (DBH) Intensive Care Coordination (ICC), and the Children’s National Hospital’s Child and Adolescent Protection Center Program (CAPC).

RESPONSE: OAG currently utilizes two diversion programs for eligible youth (ACE and CAPC), each with different guidelines for diversion referrals, and refers youth to two other programs (PASS and ICC).

Department of Human Services’ Alternatives to the Court Experience (ACE) Program: OAG generally refers young people charged with status offenses (e.g. truancy and running away) or low-level delinquency offenses to ACE.

Youth diverted to ACE by fiscal year OAG opened matter and aggregated offense categories

Offense Category	FY 2025 By Youth³²
<i>Post-arrest diversion</i>	
Crimes Against Persons	79
Crimes Against Property	35
Public Order Offenses	*
<i>Pre-arrest diversion</i>	
Delinquency offenses	<10
Status Offenses	125

Department of Human Services’ PASS Program: The PASS Program offers intensive case management (ICM), family functional therapy (FFT), and crisis stabilization (PCAST). OAG uses PASS for youth exhibiting truancy and runaway behaviors. OAG considers PASS when the parent is seeking an informal consultation, or the youth is formally referred to our office, but the facts do not meet legal sufficiency for court intervention. Additionally, a youth is eligible for PASS if they have no prior contacts, minimal unexcused absences or social factors, or referred to PASS but have not yet had an opportunity to engage with the program.

Department of Behavioral Health’s (DBH) Intensive Care Coordination (ICC), formerly High Fidelity Wrap Around Program: OAG considers ICC for youth with a mental health diagnosis or indicators which suggest a need for more intensive behavioral health supports and/or

³² Results of 0-9 are reported as <10. See D.C. Code §16-2333.03. To avoid redactions being unveiled by the yearly totals in this or other published data, where the sum of the redacted results in single year is less than 10, the next lowest result of 10 or greater in that fiscal year is listed as *. Data reported by fiscal year OAG opened that matter. Includes matters where OAG diverted youth prior to arrest and matters diverted after arrest based on consultation between OAG and Court Social Services.

coordination of services. Youth referred for truancy and/or runaways who are no longer missing are eligible for ICC. For PINS-truancy matters that OAG opened in FY 2025, OAG referred 231 matters to ICC and 150 matters to PASS.

Children’s National Hospital’s Child and Adolescent Protection Center Program (CAPC): CAPC provides a specialized treatment program for youth who display problematic sexual behaviors. Treatment in the CAPC program typically lasts about a year. If the youth successfully completes treatment, OAG does not prosecute. Youth offered diversion are usually under age 14; alleged to have committed less serious offenses; or referred based on the wishes of the person harmed. During FY 2025, from 10/1/24 through 12/31/25, OAG diverted fewer than ten (<10) matters.

71. What factors, including whether a youth is a “crossover youth,” does OAG take into consideration when addressing diversion or placement decisions following a youth’s arrest?

RESPONSE: The following factors are considered when assessing a youth for participation in a diversion program or placement decision following arrest: nature of the alleged crime, prior contact with the delinquency system and compliance during the prior contact, current contact with the delinquency system and compliance with release conditions, programming/support services being provided to the youth and level of engagement, family support and level of engagement of parent or guardian. When the Juvenile Section learns that a youth presented in a delinquency matter also has an active child welfare matter pending, we discuss the matter with partners in OAG’s Family Services Division and CFSA to assist in evaluating the presented public safety concerns and the youth’s rehabilitative needs. We consider what services the youth and family are receiving and what additional support they need to keep the community safe and work towards rehabilitation of the youth.

72. How often in calendar year 2025 did OAG seek the transfer of a youth under age 18 to the adult criminal system?

RESPONSE: OAG sought transfer of fewer than 10 youth during calendar year 2025.

Extreme Risk Protection Orders & Civil Protection Orders

73. How many extreme risk protection order (“ERPO”) cases has OAG handled in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date? Please include a brief description of each case (including the date filed, petitioner type, to whom harm is posed (self or others), ex parte granted, final outcome, and outcome date).

RESPONSE: OAG handled 30 new ERPO cases in FY 2025 and Q1 FY 2026. The table below includes matters resolved or initiated during the relevant time period. 30 are resolved and 3 are pending. OAG also had 5 ERPOs renewed for another year and has 4 more renewals pending.

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)

OAG

Date filed	Petitioner type	Poses harm to	Ex part³³ granted	Final outcome	Outcome date
2/23/2024	MPD	Others	Y	Dismissed when criminal case dismissed	9/11/2025
5/24/2024	MPD	Others	Y	Dismissed unable to prove	12/30/2024
5/24/2024	MPD	Others	Y	Granted by consent	10/10/2024
7/24/2024	MPD	Others	Y	Dismissed by govt based on extended compliance	7/8/2025
9/4/2024	MPD	Others	Y	Granted by consent	10/3/2024
9/6/2024	MPD	Others	Y	Granted after hearing	11/19/2024
9/26/2024	MPD	Others	Y	Dismissed -- firearms prohibition in related guardianship case	2/28/2025
10/4/2024	MH ³⁴	Self	Y	Dismissed by Petitioner	11/13/2024
10/15/2024	MPD	Others	Y	Granted by default	10/29/2024
10/24/2024	MPD	Others	Y	Granted by default	12/17/2024
12/9/2024	MPD	Others	Y	Dismissed unable to prove	2/27/2025
12/16/2024	MPD	Self	Y	Granted by consent	1/13/2025
1/2/2025	MPD	Others	Y	Granted by consent	1/30/2025
1/13/2025	MPD	Others	Y	Granted by default	6/11/2025
1/31/2025	MPD	Others	Y	Dismissed unable to serve	4/11/2025
2/14/2025	MPD	Others	Y	Granted by consent	2/27/2025
2/25/2025	MH	Others	Y	Pending	1/12/2026

³³ An ex parte order is a temporary ERPO sought by the petitioner and ruled on the day they are filed. If granted, they are effective until the hearing on the final order, which is typically up to 14 days.

³⁴ "MH" means mental health professional.

J&PS Performance Oversight Questions (FY25-26)

OAG

3/4/2025	MPD	Others	Y	Denied after trial	5/21/2025
3/10/2025	MPD	Others	Y	Granted by consent	10/15/2025
4/11/2025	MH	Both ³⁵	Y	Dismissed by Petitioner	6/3/2025
4/11/2025	MPD	Others	Y	Dismissed unable to prove	5/2/2025
4/22/2025	MPD	Others	Y	Granted by consent	10/23/2025
5/30/2025	Individual IPV ³⁶	Both	Y	Dismissed for CPO entry ³⁷	7/17/2025
8/13/2025	MPD	Both	Y	Granted by consent	10/2/2025
8/14/2025	MPD	Self	Y	Granted by consent	9/25/2025
9/5/2025	MPD	Others	Y	Pending	1/26/2026
10/2/2025	MPD	Self	Y	Denied after trial	12/8/2025
10/3/2025	MH	Self	Y	Granted by consent	10/31/2025
10/17/2025	MPD	Both	Y	Pending	1/15/2026
11/4/2025	Individual IPV	Others	Y	Dismissed for CPO entry	12/15/2025

74. Last year, OAG answered that staff “conducted approximately twenty training sessions with professionals” to publicize the ERPO law. How were the outcomes of these trainings measured? Please discuss OAG’s work in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date, to increase public awareness of the District’s ERPO law.

RESPONSE: OAG staff participated in 38 local and national conferences, roundtables, and trainings to increase public awareness, coordinate best practices, and share OAG’s expertise in the District’s ERPO law. Local trainings and/or awareness sessions included DC Superior Court judges, social workers, MPD Crisis Intervention Officers, Department of Behavioral Health Officer Agents, Georgetown Law School students, and staff from the Department of Aging and Community Living, domestic violence attorneys and advocates, and advocates from the National Address Confidentiality Program. National conference presentations included the annual

³⁵ “Both” means the person posed harm to themselves and others.

³⁶ “IPV” means Intimate Partner Violence.

³⁷ “CPO” means Civil Protection Order. CPO’s bar the subject person from possessing weapons, obviating the need for an ERPO.

conference of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the annual conference for the National Association for Behavioral Intervention and Threat Assessment, and the Center for American Progress's, 11th National Gun Violence Summit. OAG does not measure the outcomes of trainings.

75. How many requests for assistance were received by or on behalf of Petitioners in a Civil Protection Order matter?

RESPONSE: In FY 2025, OAG received 12 requests for assistance from parents in CPO matters to file a child support case in Family Court. CSSD has obtained approximately 9 permanent support orders; 1 case is pending service; 1 case had a court hearing continued; and 1 case is awaiting a court date. To date in FY 2026, OAG has received two requests for assistance. Both cases are pending service.

The public does not make requests for assistance in civil protection order (CPO) matters directly to OAG. Petitioners who file for CPOs through the city's Domestic Violence Intake Centers and would like legal representation are placed on a referral listserv that includes all the city's legal service providers, including OAG, that offer CPO representation. The primary case load for the domestic violence attorneys in OAG's Domestic Violence and Special Victims Section is prosecuting violations of CPOs. Because the city's legal service organizations provide robust legal representation in CPO cases and OAG cannot prosecute a violation in a case in which it also represented the petitioner, OAG takes relatively few CPO representation cases. In FY 2025 and Q1 FY 2026, OAG attorneys took 47 cases from the listserv and provided brief advice to an additional 17 petitioners.

a. In FY 2025 and in FY 2026 to date, how many cases was OAG able to expedite the filing of a separate petition for support to enable service at the CPO hearing?

RESPONSE: OAG was able to expedite the filing of a petition for support for 12 parents with CPO cases in FY 2025. To date in FY 2026, there have been 2 requests submitted to CSSD to assist parents with child support in CPO cases. Both cases are pending service. OAG does not serve petitions at CPO hearings and instead uses field investigators to serve respondents apart from the court proceedings.

Drug Court

76. How many Drug Court participants in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date, were OAG cases? If this includes both juveniles and adults, how many of each participated?

RESPONSE: Juveniles do not participate in Drug Court. OAG's data is not broken down by when the defendant began Drug Court and when they finished. So, we cannot provide data on how many Drug Court participants were OAG cases by fiscal year. As of the date of this filing, there were 31 participants.

77. Of those who began Drug Court in FY 2025 and FY 2026, to date, how many graduated? And again, if there are both juveniles and adults, please indicate how many of each graduated.

RESPONSE: There were a total of 36 graduates in FY 2025 and 5 graduates in FY 2026 to date (October 1, 2025 – January 14, 2026).

78. How many drug court participants were screened for substance use disorders before being accepted, and of those, how many screened positive? Of those who screened positive, how many received clinical treatment?

RESPONSE: In FY 2025, OAG screened and referred 109 cases to Drug Court. In FY 2026 to date (October 1, 2025 – January 14, 2026), OAG has screened and referred 37 cases to Drug Court. Pretrial Services Agency (PSA) assesses the defendants for substance abuse treatment eligibility. If assessed as needs intensive outpatient treatment or higher, the defendant is eligible for Drug Court, which is what we interpret “screened positive” to mean. Of those who are eligible per PSA requirements, not all are admitted to Drug Court and receive substance abuse treatment.

79. Of Drug Court participants graduating in FY 2025 or FY 2026, to date, how many have been convicted of a new offense post-graduation?

RESPONSE: Of the 36 graduates in FY 2025, only one has been rearrested for a new offense post-graduation. The defendant has not yet been convicted as the arrest date was 1/3/2026. The new offense is a DUI. Of the 5 graduates in FY 2026 to date, none have been rearrested or convicted of a new offense post-graduation.