



# Authorities Budget Office

---

January 2026

GR-2025-01

## **Governance Review**

### **Public Authority Boards: Use of Executive Session**

---

**ACCOUNTABILITY ● TRANSPARENCY ● INTEGRITY**

---

---

## INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

---

---

The mission of the Authorities Budget Office (ABO) is to make public authorities more accountable and transparent, and to act in the public interest consistent with their intended purpose. The ABO is committed to the principles of public disclosure and the transparent reporting of public authority information. Based on those principles, the ABO fulfills its mission in part by assisting public authorities in improving their management practices and the procedures by which their activities and financial practices are disclosed to the public.

The ABO is authorized by Article 1, Title 2 of Public Authorities Law to review and analyze the operations, practices, and reports of public authorities. This compliance review covers a sample of 16 public authorities' board meeting minutes for meetings held between January 2023 and June 2025. The primary objective was to determine if public authorities' boards are appropriately using executive session under the Open Meetings Law (OML)<sup>1</sup> and adequately disclosing to the public which of the limited and specifically enumerated reasons in OML provided the basis to enter executive sessions.

### **Open Meetings Law Requirements**

Section 2829 of Public Authorities Law (PAL) provides that state and local authorities, which are defined under Section 2 of PAL, and their subsidiaries, are subject to OML. OML requires meetings of public bodies, including the board of a public authority,<sup>2</sup> to be open to the public. A meeting is the official convening of a public body for the purpose of conducting public business. Authorities must be responsive and responsible to the public and perform their public business in an open and public manner to allow for stakeholders to be fully aware of, and able to observe, the performance and decision-making of the board and officials. This includes allowing the public to attend and listen to their deliberations and decisions. Minutes shall be taken at all open meetings and are required to include a record or summary of all motions, proposals, resolutions, and any other matter formally voted on, including the results of the vote.

OML provides that, in limited circumstances, boards of directors may vote to discuss specifically permitted matters in "executive session." OML defines "executive session" as a portion of an open meeting that is not open to the general public. Public authorities are

---

<sup>1</sup> Article 7 of the Public Officers Law.

<sup>2</sup> Section 102(2) of OML defines a public body as "any entity, for which a quorum is required in order to conduct public business and which consists of two or more members, performing a governmental function for the state or for an agency or department thereof, or for a public corporation as defined in section sixty-six of the general construction law, or committee or subcommittee or other similar body consisting of members of such public body, or an entity created or appointed to perform a necessary function in the decision-making process for which a quorum is required in order to conduct public business and which consists of two or more members. A necessary function in the decision-making process shall not include the provision of recommendations or guidance which is purely advisory and which does not require further action by the state or agency or department thereof or public corporation as defined in section sixty-six of the general construction law."

authorized to enter executive session only for the purposes enumerated in Section 105(1)(a) – (h) of OML, provided that no action by formal vote is taken during executive session to appropriate public moneys. All board members and any other persons authorized by the board may attend an executive session.

A board meeting may only go into executive session following a motion identifying the subject to be considered during executive session is passed by the majority of the total members of the board. The motion to enter executive session must provide enough specificity about the purpose of the meeting and subject matter that will be discussed to make it clear that executive session is appropriate.<sup>3</sup> The allowable purposes enumerated in Section 105(1) of OML to enter executive session are:

- a. Matters which will imperil the public safety if disclosed.
- b. Any matter which may disclose the identity of a law enforcement agent or informer.
- c. Information relating to current or future investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense which would imperil effective law enforcement if disclosed.
- d. Discussions regarding proposed, pending or current litigation.
- e. Collective negotiations pursuant to article fourteen of the civil service law.
- f. The medical, financial, credit or employment history of a particular person or corporation, or matters leading to the appointment, employment, promotion, demotion, discipline, suspension, dismissal or removal of a particular person or corporation.
- g. The preparation, grading or administration of examinations.
- h. The proposed acquisition, sale or lease of real property or the proposed acquisition of securities, or sale or exchange of securities held by such public body, but only when publicity would substantially affect the value thereof.

The Committee on Open Government (COOG) is responsible for overseeing and advising entities subject to OML through advisory opinions. COOG has advised, and courts have ruled, that boilerplate motions to enter executive session are a violation of OML if they fail to specifically identify the topic to be discussed.

The ABO has issued [Policy Guidance 25-01: Freedom of Information Law and Open Meetings Law](#) and [Recommended Practice: Meetings – Best Practice Guide for Public Authorities](#) to assist authorities with their board meetings. As a result of this review, [Policy Guidance 26-01: Appropriate Use of Executive Session](#) has been updated to include a quick reference guide to help authorities comply with the law when using executive session (See Appendix B).

---

<sup>3</sup> COOG OML-AO-5644.

## Compliance Review Objective, Scope, and Methodology

The ABO is directed by Article 1, Title 2 of PAL to review and analyze the operations, practices, and reports of public authorities to assess their compliance with various provisions of PAL and other relevant state statutes, and to recommend ways for them to improve their performance and reporting. The ABO's review was conducted to determine if public authorities' boards are complying with OML when they enter executive session during a meeting by limiting executive sessions to matters specifically permitted by OML and adequately disclosing the basis for the executive sessions. Adequate disclosure includes identifying the specific statutory exemption and the subject to be discussed in the motion to enter executive session during the open portion of the meeting<sup>4</sup> and in the meeting minutes which record the motion.<sup>5</sup>

The review was conducted between May and September 2025 and included a sample of 16 public authorities' board meeting minutes for meetings held between January 2023 and June 2025. The sample of authorities was selected based on a random sample of the various types of authorities that commonly used executive session during the review period. The sample is not intended to project the results onto the entire population of authorities, but to highlight areas of compliance and non-compliance across a variety of different authority types.

The 16 authorities sampled included the following (by authority type):

### *State Authorities*

- Central New York Regional Transportation Authority
- Erie County Medical Center Corporation
- New York State Energy Research and Development Authority
- Power Authority of the State of New York

### *Industrial Development Agencies (IDAs)*

- Brookhaven IDA
- Oswego County IDA
- Rockland County IDA
- Yates County IDA

### *Local Development Corporations (LDCs)*

- Capitalize Albany Corporation
- Monroe County Industrial Development Corporation
- Sleepy Hollow LDC
- Southern Tier Network, Inc.

---

<sup>4</sup> COOG OML-AO-5644.

<sup>5</sup> Section 106 of OML.

### *Other Local Authorities*

- Albany Parking Authority
- Onondaga County Water Authority
- Syracuse Regional Airport Authority
- Ulster County Resource Recovery Agency

This report contains recommendations and updated policy guidance to improve transparency and assist authorities to appropriately cite the specific exemption permitted under OML and clearly identify the specific issue to be discussed in executive session.

### **Enforcement of Open Meetings Law**

Section 107(1) of OML provides that any aggrieved person may commence a proceeding in court for enforcement of the provisions of OML under Article 78 of Civil Practice Law and Rules (CPLR) or an action for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief.

Generally, there are two types of enforcement remedies available through an Article 78 proceeding pursuant to OML.<sup>6</sup> The first pertains to a court's authority to invalidate action taken at a meeting held in violation of the law under Section 107(1) of OML. If the court determines that a public body failed to comply with OML, it may (upon good cause shown) declare that the public body violated OML and/or declare the action taken void (in whole or in part). Where the court determines that the public body violated OML, it may require the members of the public body to participate in training concerning their obligations under OML conducted by COOG staff. The unintentional failure to comply with the notice requirements imposed by OML is not by itself grounds for invalidating an action taken at a meeting of a public body.

The second enforcement remedy is a court's authority to award costs and reasonable attorney's fees to the successful party under Section 107(2) of OML. If the court determines that a vote was taken in material violation of OML, or that substantial deliberations occurred in private prior to such vote, the court's award of costs and attorney's fees is mandatory, unless there was a reasonable basis for a public body to believe that a closed session could properly have been held. In other instances, the award of attorney's fees by a court is discretionary.

---

---

## **REVIEW RESULTS**

---

---

The ABO identified and reviewed 397 sets of meeting minutes for meetings held between January 2023 and June 2025 that were posted on the respective websites of 16 public authorities. There were 326 meetings that included executive session (82 percent). Oftentimes a board will motion to enter executive session for more than one reason. The

---

<sup>6</sup> COOG OML-AO-4829.

meeting minutes reflected that authorities' boards motioned to enter executive session for 549 reasons during the 326 meetings.

While a large number of meeting minutes reviewed by the ABO showed compliance with the law, there were numerous instances where public authorities' boards voted to use executive session for matters not permitted under Section 105 of OML. Of the 549 reasons supporting a board's motion, in 240 instances the public authority correctly utilized executive session (44 percent).

There were 145 instances where 11 of the 16 public authorities' boards entered executive session for matters that are not permitted under Section 105 of OML. These included unpermitted reasons such as "legal," "discussing contracts," "planning sales," and "marketing strategies."

There were 2 instances where boards entered executive session without disclosing any matter, in clear violation of OML.

The review found authority boards cited 155 reasons to enter executive session that were likely permissible under Section 105 of OML but were not sufficiently described in meeting minutes to meet the specificity standards required by law. For example, "personnel" was used 29 times as a reason to enter executive session. However, personnel on its own is not a statutorily permitted reason for entering executive session; specific language is required to support the use. Authorities often generically cited "litigation" as a reason to go into executive session. The OML requires a specific citation to a matter being litigated before executive session can be used. Without providing the additional detail required by the OML and by COOG guidance<sup>7</sup> this is not a sufficient reason for using executive session.

The remaining 7 reasons provided by boards were exempt pursuant to Section 108(3) of OML since they were confidential under state or federal law. These included board member evaluations and discussion protected by attorney-client privilege.

See Appendix A for a breakdown of the executive session reasons reviewed.

To assist with future compliance, the ABO is providing updated policy guidance to support public authorities in identifying the appropriate use of executive session (See Appendix B).

### Boards Voted to Enter Executive Session for Reasons Not Listed in OML

OML allows for a public body to conduct an executive session only for an enumerated purpose. The board must identify at least 1 of the 8 exempt purposes found in Section 105 of OML and adequately disclose the subject to be discussed.

---

<sup>7</sup> COOG OML-AO-5644.

There were 145 instances where 11 authorities used reasons to enter executive session that are not listed as an enumerated permission, some more than others. For example, Oswego County IDA entered executive session on 27 occasions using “contractual matters” as its reason. Southern Tier Network, Inc. entered executive session 30 times using various unauthorized reasons such as “sales and marketing” on 11 occasions and “contractual” on 11 occasions. Sleepy Hollow LDC also went into executive session on 21 occasions for unauthorized reasons using the reason “contract negotiations.”

There were 7 authorities that invoked a variation of “legal” a total of 46 times as a reason to go into executive session. For example, Rockland County IDA went into executive session 18 times to “discuss legal matters” while the Central New York Regional Transportation Authority used “obtain advice from counsel” 11 times. Erie County Medical Center Corporation had 7 meetings and Sleepy Hollow LDC had 5 meetings where they used “legal matters” or “legal issues” to go into executive session. Both Capitalize Albany Corporation and Ulster County Resource Recovery Agency had 2 meetings each where they used “seek and obtain legal counsel” or “seeking legal advice” respectively. Finally, Monroe County IDC used “seek advice from counsel” once to go into executive session. These reasons are not authorized under Section 105(1)(d) of OML as none relate specifically to “discussions regarding proposed, pending or current litigation.”<sup>8</sup>

#### Board Entered Executive Session and Did Not Adequately Disclose Purpose

A board may hold an executive session only when it is considering at least 1 of 8 exempt reasons found in Section 105(1)(a) – (h) of OML. The board must identify a specific statutory exemption and adequately disclose the subject to be discussed. The review identified multiple instances where the board correctly identified a provision of the statute that would permit the use of executive session but did not provide adequate details about the matter to be discussed to meet the standard required by law. COOG has opined that merely regurgitating the statutory language does not comply with the intent of the statute.<sup>9</sup>

#### *Board Entered Executive Session for “Litigation” Purpose*

Section 105(1)(d) of OML allows a public body to discuss “pending, proposed, or current litigation.” The board must identify with particularity the pending, proposed or current litigation to be discussed during the executive session. The motion to enter executive session must name the litigation if it has commenced. If the board seeks to discuss its litigation strategy in relation to a person or entity that it intends to sue, the motion does not need to identify the person or the entity but should clearly indicate that the discussion will involve litigation strategy.

---

<sup>8</sup> Attorney client privilege is separate and distinct from matters that fall under OML. Section 108(3) of OML provides that “[n]othing contained in [OML] shall be construed as extending” those provisions to “any matter made confidential by federal or state law”, for example, an attorney-client relationship considered confidential under Section 4503 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules. We acknowledge that it is possible that the entities described here may be mistakenly utilizing executive session to discuss matters that otherwise fall outside the parameters of Section 105 of OML.

<sup>9</sup> COOG OML-AO-3096, citing *Daily Gazette Co., Inc. v. Town Board, Town of Cobleskill*, 44 NYS 2d 44,46 (1981).

There were 68 instances where 8 authorities used “litigation” as the purpose to enter executive session without identifying with particularity the litigation to be discussed. Oswego County IDA used “litigation” 27 times; Sleepy Hollow LDC used it 19 times; Capitalize Albany Corporation used it 9 times; Brookhaven IDA used it 6 times; Onondaga County Water Authority used it 3 times; and Ulster County Resource Recovery Agency used it twice. Both Central New York Regional Transportation Authority and Syracuse Regional Airport Authority went into executive session once each to discuss “potential litigation.” None of the reasons given to enter executive session were sufficient as they did not indicate the subject or subjects of the litigation which must be incorporated to comply with the intent of the statute.

### *Board Entered Executive Session for “Real Property” as a Purpose*

Section 105(1)(h) of OML allows a public body to go into executive session to discuss “the proposed acquisition, sale or lease of real property or the proposed acquisition of securities, or sale or exchange of securities held by such public body, but only when publicity would substantially affect the value thereof.” COOG has opined that public business must be discussed in public unless public discussion would in some way be damaging to an authority in terms of its capacity to perform its functions appropriately and is in the best interest of the public.<sup>10</sup> The law does not permit public bodies to conduct executive sessions to discuss all matters that may relate to the transaction of real property; only to the extent that publicity would “substantially affect the value of the property” can that provision validly be asserted.

There were 54 instances where 7 authorities used “real property” as the purpose to enter executive session. For example, Sleepy Hollow LDC used real property reasons 30 times over the period reviewed, mostly using such language as “the purchase and sale of certain real property”. Yates County IDA used “Discuss the potential sale of real property” 13 times to go into executive session. Onondaga County Water Authority, Syracuse Regional Airport Authority, and Ulster County Resource Recovery Agency each had 3 board meetings where they went into executive session to discuss the “proposed acquisition of property”, “Discuss matters pertaining to the proposed lease of real property by the Authority”, and “Discuss proposed sale or lease of real property”, respectively. Finally, Albany Parking Authority and New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) each went into executive session once to “Discuss the proposed acquisition of real property” and “Discuss[ing] the proposed sale, acquisition, or lease of real property,” respectively. COOG has advised that a motion under Section 105(1)(h) of OML should indicate that the public discussion of the proposed action would “substantially affect the value” of the property.<sup>11</sup>

### *Board Entered Executive Session With “Particular Person” as a Purpose*

Section 105(1)(f) of OML authorizes a public body to conduct an executive session to discuss “the medical, financial, credit or employment history of a particular person or

---

<sup>10</sup> COOG OML-AO-4740.

<sup>11</sup> COOG OML-AO-4740.

corporation, or matters leading to the appointment, employment, promotion, demotion, discipline, suspension, dismissal or removal of a particular person or corporation." COOG has opined that a discussion of "personnel" may be considered in an executive session only when the subject involves a particular person or persons, and only when at least 1 of the topics listed in 105(1)(f) is considered.<sup>12</sup> It is not necessary to identify the individual who is the subject of the executive session.<sup>13</sup>

There were 29 instances where 4 authorities used a "particular person" as a reason to enter executive session but were not sufficiently described. For example, Ulster County Resource Recovery Agency went into executive session 13 times to "Discuss employee review". Rockland County IDA, Southern Tier Network, Inc., and Erie County Medical Center Corporation went 7, 5, and 4 times, respectively, to discuss "...personnel matters" which are not sufficiently precise in their wording per COOG's opinion.

#### *Board Entered Executive Session for the Purpose of the Financial or Credit History of a Particular Corporation*

Section 105(1)(f) of OML also authorizes a public body to conduct an executive session to discuss the financial or credit history of a particular corporation. However, COOG has issued opinions that Section 105(1)(f) does not authorize a public body to conduct an executive session to discuss its own financial history.<sup>14</sup>

There were 4 instances where 2 authorities (NYSERDA and Sleepy Hollow LDC) used the financial condition of their own authority as the reason to go into executive session, which COOG has deemed to be an unauthorized purpose.

#### Boards Voted to Enter Executive Session and No Purpose Provided in Resolution

The review found 2 meetings where the board of directors voted to enter executive session and did not provide a purpose. This is a violation of Section 105(1) of OML, which requires a vote in an open meeting based on "a motion identifying the general area or areas of the subject or subjects to be considered. . ." The plain language of the law required Monroe County IDC and Syracuse Regional Airport Authority to have provided a purpose for using executive session to assure the public that the subject matter to be discussed in executive session would meet the statutory requirements. Invoking the use of executive session without providing any justification undermines the public's confidence in the decisions and actions of the board.

#### Board Appropriately Used Executive Session for Purposes Enumerated in Law

Boards may hold executive sessions when at least 1 of the 8 specific statutory exemptions outlined in Section 105 of OML is used and adequately identifies the subject to be

---

<sup>12</sup> COOG OML-AO-5611.

<sup>13</sup> COOG OML-AO-5237.

<sup>14</sup> COOG OML-AO-4912.

discussed. The review found 240 instances where boards appropriately voted to enter executive session and provided a specific permitted purpose.

#### *Appropriate Use for Discussions Regarding Proposed, Pending or Current Litigation*

The exemption of litigation was used appropriately 6 times by 4 authorities over the review period. The description used by Yates County IDA for the 4 meetings it entered executive session was appropriate as the names of the parties involved in the litigations were provided. Sleepy Hollow LDC and Ulster County Resource Recovery Agency each had one litigation reason that was sufficiently described to use executive session.

#### *Appropriate and Sufficient Use of the Proposed Acquisition, Sale or Lease of Real Property*

The exemption of real property was used appropriately 24 times by 2 authorities. The description used by Capitalize Albany Corporation for 15 of its meetings to enter executive session clearly stated, “The proposed acquisition of real property where the value could be significantly affected by public disclosure”. This is appropriate as the reason meets the requirement of law and mirrors COOG’s opinion.<sup>15</sup> Also, Albany Parking Authority went into executive session 9 times to “Discuss proposed acquisition of real property that if publicly discussed, could substantially affect the value thereof” which also fit the requirement of law.

#### *Appropriate and Sufficient Use of a Particular Person*

There were 9 authorities that used the purpose of a particular person appropriately to enter executive session for a total of 85 times. For example, Onondaga County Water Authority entered executive session at 17 meetings and appropriately provided a specific purpose and description to “Discuss matters leading to the employment of a particular individual”. The review found Albany Parking Authority’s board appropriately entered executive session at 15 meetings as it provided the specific purpose of “...matters leading to the appointment, employment, promotion, demotion, discipline, suspension, dismissal or removal of a particular person...”. Ulster County Resource Recovery Agency used executive session 11 times for various appropriate purposes including “Matters pertaining to appointment of a particular person”. Brookhaven IDA, Capitalize Albany Corporation, and NYSEDA each had 8 meetings where they motioned to discuss “...the employment history of a particular individual.” Syracuse Regional Airport Authority, Central New York Regional Transportation Authority, and Yates County IDA used executive session to discuss “...a particular person.”

#### *Appropriate and Sufficient Use of a Particular Corporation*

There were 10 authorities where the board entered executive session for the permitted purpose of discussing the credit history of a particular corporation over a total of 99 times. The review found the description used by Oswego County IDA’s board to enter executive

---

<sup>15</sup> COOG OML-AO-4740.

session at 27 meetings to be appropriate to “Discuss the financial history of a particular corporation or individual,” Monroe County IDC for the 17 meetings it went to executive session to be appropriate to “Discuss financial information of a particular individual and corporation.” Yates County IDA adequately used executive session 14 times to “Discuss the financial history of a particular company.”

Albany Parking Authority’s and New York Power Authority’s 11 meetings each also met COOG’s requirement through their use of the purpose to enter executive session to “Discuss the financial and credit history of a particular corporation”. Brookhaven IDA, Onondaga County Water Authority, Capitalize Albany Corporation, Sleepy Hollow LDC, and Syracuse Regional Airport Authority all appropriately used a specific purpose to enter executive session to discuss “the financial history of a specific corporation” or “the financial history of a particular individual”.

### A Note on OML Section 108(3) - Attorney-Client Privilege and Confidential Matters

Based on this review the ABO concludes that boards are often conflating legal matters subject to OML and matters that would otherwise be considered confidential under the protections of attorney-client privilege.

A matter made confidential by federal, or state law is exempt from OML under Section 108(3) of OML. Provisions of state law that are confidential may fall under Section 4503 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules where the confidential communication between an attorney and their client is privileged. Under such a scenario, no communication can be disclosed to the public and the requirements of executive sessions are not in effect during that time. As such, when an exemption under Section 108 of OML applies, the Open Meetings Law does not. To discuss any matter exempted from OML, a public body need not follow the procedure imposed by Section 105(1) that relates to entry into an executive session.

For example, NYSERDA invoked Section 108(3) of OML under its attorney-client privilege 5 times over the review period to meet in private session which is an appropriate use of the law, but ultimately not a required one.

---

---

## CONCLUSIONS

---

---

The ABO’s review found instances where the authorities violated OML by using executive session for reasons not allowable under OML. In addition, authorities used reasons that were allowable but that were not adequately described in meeting minutes and, as a result, were not in compliance with the law.

As a result of this review, the ABO has updated [Policy Guidance 26-01: Appropriate Use of Executive Session](#) to take the findings of this review and provide more clarification to

guide boards in conducting business in an environment that fosters transparency and public disclosure. Providing sufficient justification to hold an executive session would give the public more confidence in the decisions and actions of the board. The Policy Guidance has been updated to include a quick reference guide to help authorities comply with the law when using executive session (See Appendix B).

---

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

---

---

1. Boards should use executive session only for those purposes set forth in Section 105 of Open Meetings Law.
2. Boards should ensure motions to enter executive sessions provide the necessary details to support the exclusion from the public meeting in accordance with Public Officers Law. This includes citing the specific exemption to the Open Meetings Law as well as identifying the specific issue to be discussed.

---



---

APPENDIX A

---



---

<b>Stated Reasons for Executive Session</b>			
<b>Instances of Allowable Executive Session Reasons (OML 105 (1))</b>			
<i>Unique Reason</i>	<i>Adequately Described</i>	<i>Not Adequately Described</i>	<i>Total</i>
Particular Person (f)	85	29	114
Particular Corporation (f)	99	4	103
Real Property (h)	24	54	78
Litigation (d)	6	68	74
Collective Bargaining (e)	25	0	25
Public Safety (a)	1	0	1
<i>Permissible Subtotal</i>	<i>240</i>	<i>155</i>	<i>395</i>
<b>Instances Where Reason Not Listed in OML for Executive Session</b>			
Other Reasons	99		
Legal	46		
No Reason	2		
<i>Not Listed Subtotal</i>	<i>147</i>		
<b>Instances Where Reason Exempt under OML 108 (3) from Open Meetings</b>			
Attorney-Client Privilege	5		
Board Evaluation	2		
<i>Exempt Subtotal</i>	<i>7</i>		
<b>Total Reasons Examined</b>	<b>549</b>		

## APPENDIX B



### Authorities Budget Office Executive Session Quick Reference Guide

- Do:**
- Conduct most authority business in meetings that are open to the public.
  - Interpret OML exemptions narrowly and err on the side of disclosure.
  - Be as specific as possible and provide as much detail as possible in the motion about which statutory exemption is applicable.
- Do Not:**
- Enter into executive session for any reason other than the eight (8) specific subject-area exemptions provided in OML Section 105.
  - Cite vague reasons such as “litigation” or “personnel” or simply repeat the statutory language in the motion to enter into executive session.

### **A Non-Exhaustive List of Common Mistakes**

<u>Exemption</u>	<u>Don't Say</u>	<u>Do Say</u>
Litigation	“Legal” or “to discuss legal matters” or “to discuss proposed, pending or current litigation” or “to discuss potential litigation”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● “To discuss litigation strategy in XYZ v. Board case.”</li> <li>● “To discuss litigation strategy in the board’s proposed suit against a particular individual/entity”</li> <li>● <i>Note:</i> The individual/entity name does not need to be disclosed if it could adversely affect the interests of the Board.</li> </ul>
Property Transactions	“To discuss the purchase and sale of certain real property.”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● “To discuss the proposed acquisition of real property where the value could be significantly affected by public disclosure.”</li> <li>● <i>Note:</i> The specific property does not need to be disclosed.</li> </ul>
Personnel	“To discuss personnel” or “personnel matters or decisions,” generally.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● “To discuss matters pertaining to the employment history of a particular person.”</li> <li>● <i>Note:</i> The person’s name does not need to be disclosed.</li> </ul>
Corporations	“To discuss the authority’s own finances.” <i>Note:</i> Discussion of the authority’s finances should be open to the public.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● “To discuss the financial history of a particular third-party corporation.”</li> <li>● <i>Note:</i> The third-party corporation’s name does not need to be disclosed.</li> </ul>
Collective Bargaining	“To discuss contract negotiations.”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● “To discuss collective bargaining negotiations involving XYZ public employee union.”</li> <li>● <i>Note:</i> The specific union should be disclosed.</li> </ul>
Public Safety	“To discuss matters of public safety.”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● “To discuss matters which could endanger public safety if disclosed.”</li> </ul>
Misc. issues.	Strategic planning, marketing, contracts, sales, legislation, economic development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● It is never permitted to utilize executive session for these commonly used reasons as they are not an authorized exemption.</li> </ul>