

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION**

Office of Dispute Resolution
810 First Street, N.E., 2nd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20002

OSSE
Office of Dispute Resolution
November 14, 2017

<i>Student</i> , ¹)	Case No.: 2017-0259
through <i>Parent</i> ,)	
<i>Petitioner</i> ,)	Date Issued: 11/14/17
)	
v.)	Hearing Officer: Keith L. Seat, Esq.
)	
District of Columbia Public Schools)	Hearing Date: 11/9/17
("DCPS"),)	ODR Hearing Room: 2006
Respondent.)	
)	

HEARING OFFICER DETERMINATION

Background

Petitioner, Student’s Parent, pursued a due process complaint alleging that Student had been denied a free appropriate public education (“FAPE”) in violation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (“IDEA”) because Student had not been evaluated despite Parent’s numerous requests or based on Student’s circumstances. DCPS responded that Parent had not cooperated when it first sought to evaluate Student and that more recently there had been no request or other reason to evaluate.

Subject Matter Jurisdiction

Subject matter jurisdiction is conferred pursuant to the IDEA, 20 U.S.C. § 1400, *et seq.*; the implementing regulations for IDEA, 34 C.F.R. Part 300; and Title V, Chapter E-30, of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (“D.C.M.R.”).

Procedural History

Following the filing of the due process complaint on 9/26/17, the case was assigned to the undersigned on 9/27/17. DCPS filed a response on 10/6/17 and did not challenge jurisdiction. The resolution session meeting took place on 10/13/17, but the parties neither settled the case nor terminated the 30-day resolution period, which ended on 10/26/17. A

¹ Personally identifiable information is provided in Appendix A, including terms initially set forth in italics.

Hearing Officer Determination

Case No. 2017-0259

final decision in this matter must be reached no later than 45 days following the end of the resolution period, which requires a Hearing Officer Determination (“HOD”) by 12/10/17.

The due process hearing took place on 11/9/17, and was closed to the public. Petitioner was represented by *Petitioner’s counsel*. DCPS was represented by *Respondent’s counsel*. Petitioner was present throughout the entire hearing.

Petitioner’s Disclosures, submitted on 11/2/17, contained documents P1 through P7, which were admitted into evidence without objection. Respondent’s Disclosures, submitted on 11/2/17, contained documents R1 through R15, which also were admitted into evidence without objection.

Petitioner’s counsel presented 2 witnesses in Petitioner’s case-in-chief (*see Appendix A*):

1. *Educational Advocate* (qualified over objection as an expert in Special Education Programming)
2. Parent

Respondent’s counsel presented no witnesses in Respondent’s case.

The issue to be determined in this Hearing Officer Determination is:

Issue: Whether DCPS denied Student a FAPE by failing to adequately and comprehensively evaluate Student in all areas of suspected disability pursuant to its Child Find obligations (a) upon request of Parent in 2015/16² and 2016/17, and/or (b) based on behavioral/disciplinary issues in 2015/16, 2016/17, and 2017/18, including 6 documented incidents during the first week of 2017/18; being removed from the classroom and taken to the dean’s office; on 9/18/17, running out of class and refusing to follow instructions, and then running out of class again and onto 15th Street; and on 9/21/17 attacking a teacher. *Petitioner has the burden of persuasion on this issue.*

The relief requested³ by Petitioner is:

1. A finding that Student was denied a FAPE.
2. Within 10 school days, DCPS shall fund at reasonable market rates: (a) an independent comprehensive psychological evaluation, and (b) independent autism and adaptive behavior assessments, if determined necessary by the psychologist conducting the comprehensive psychological evaluation.

² All dates in the format “2015/16” refer to school years.

³ At the prehearing conference, Petitioner’s counsel expressly withdrew (without prejudice) Proposed Resolution paragraph d on p.2 of the due process complaint attachment, which was “DCPS will immediately provide a one-to-one aide for the student for the entire school day.”

Hearing Officer Determination

Case No. 2017-0259

3. DCPS shall conduct a comprehensive Functional Behavioral Assessment (“FBA”), which shall be initiated within 10 school days.⁴
4. Within 10 school days after receiving the final report from the evaluations ordered in the previous paragraphs, DCPS shall convene an IEP team meeting and develop an appropriate IEP and provide an appropriate special education placement.
5. Compensatory education for any denial of FAPE is reserved pending the completion of Student’s evaluations and determination of a special education placement.

Findings of Fact

After considering all the evidence, as well as the arguments of both counsel, the Findings of Fact⁵ are as follows:

1. Student is a resident of the District of Columbia; Petitioner is Student’s Parent.⁶ Student is *Age, Gender* and in *Grade* at *Public School*, where Student began in 2017/18.⁷ Student attended *Prior Public School A* in 2015/16 and 2016/17, *Prior Public School B* in 2014/15, and *Prior Public School C* in 2013/14.⁸ Student has never been formally evaluated or found eligible for special education services.⁹ Student passed an ASQ screening on 9/11/13.¹⁰

2. **Behavioral Issues.** Parent testified that she has been receiving calls from Student’s schools “every day” or “just about every day” for years due to Student’s problematic behaviors, beginning in 2013/14.¹¹ Student has had behavior problems since at least 2014/15, including fighting staff, running out of the classroom, and not being available for

⁴ At the prehearing conference, Petitioner’s counsel shifted from having DCPS “fund” (in the complaint) to instead “conduct” a comprehensive FBA.

⁵ Footnotes in these Findings of Fact refer to the sworn testimony of the witness indicated or to an exhibit admitted into evidence. To the extent that the Hearing Officer has declined to base a finding of fact on a witness’s testimony that goes to the heart of the issue(s) under consideration, or has chosen to base a finding of fact on the testimony of one witness when another witness gave contradictory testimony on the same issue, the Hearing Officer has taken such action based on the Hearing Officer’s determinations of the credibility and/or lack of credibility of the witness(es) involved.

⁶ Parent.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ Parent; R4-2; R10-1.

⁹ Parent.

¹⁰ R9-1.

¹¹ Parent.

Hearing Officer Determination

Case No. 2017-0259

learning.¹² According to Parent, Student's behaviors at Prior Public School A were about the same as at Public School.¹³

3. The only documentary evidence of Student's behavior offered by Petitioner in this case was from the first month of 2017/18, when Student had just begun Public School.¹⁴ Student had 4 office referrals and 3 minor incidents in the first 6 days at Public School.¹⁵ The worst incidents were on 9/21/17 when Student grabbed a teacher's clothing and ripped the sleeve of her blouse, and on 9/28/17 when Student was suspended for 1 day for bullying.¹⁶ Public School's dean of students took particular care with Student as a new student, checking on Student and communicating with Parent regularly, and even allowing Student to nap in her office when she was due for a lunch break.¹⁷

4. Parent believed that Student's behavior problems were because Student's medications were not working.¹⁸ Public School's dean and Parent communicated regularly about Student's medication and whether it needed to be adjusted.¹⁹ Educational Advocate testified that medications were being adjusted in an effort to address Student's behaviors.²⁰ Student improved at the end of 2016/17, as Parent was taking Student to therapy and medications were helpful.²¹

5. Report Cards. The only documentary evidence in the case relating to 2015/16 and 2016/17 were Student's report cards.²²

6. Student's grades in 2016/17 were mostly "2"s (Basic) in core academics and mostly "3"s (Proficient) in other subjects.²³ Comments by Student's reading and math teachers in 2016/17 were positive, each noting that Student was "a joy" to teach.²⁴ In math, Student reached a final score of 415, exceeding Student's learning goal of 385; in reading, Student did not meet Student's personal goal, but made more than a year of growth (1.16) over 2016/17.²⁵ By the end of term 4, Student had reached the reading level that was expected by

¹² Educational Advocate (who testified that all her information came from Parent and the limited number of documents in the parties' disclosures); R2-2 (summarizing statement by Educational Advocate).

¹³ Educational Advocate.

¹⁴ P7; Administrative Notice of Hearing Officer.

¹⁵ P7-1.

¹⁶ P7-15,16.

¹⁷ P7-2,3,7,8,13.

¹⁸ Parent.

¹⁹ P7-2,3,6,7,8.

²⁰ Educational Advocate.

²¹ Parent.

²² Administrative Notice by Hearing Officer.

²³ R14-1.

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ *Id.*

Hearing Officer Determination

Case No. 2017-0259

the end of term 2 in 2016/17.²⁶ Student's work habits, personal and social goals in 2016/17 were poor and declined over the year and from the previous year.²⁷

7. Student's grades in 2015/16 were mostly "2"s and "3"s, with a couple of "4"s (Advanced).²⁸ The comment of Student's teacher was very positive, as Student had a good year, made many friends, became a good reader, met academic expectations, was liked by peers, aimed to please, and was "a pleasure" to have in class.²⁹ By the end of term 4, Student had reached the reading level that was expected by the end of term 3 in 2015/16.³⁰ Student received reasonably good marks for work habits, personal and social goals.³¹

8. In 2016/17, Student was "chronically truant" (as stated on Student's report card) with 19 days absent, of which 10 were unexcused.³² In 2015/16, Student was absent 36 days, of which 4 were unexcused.³³

9. Parental Request for Evaluation. Parent did not ask for an evaluation of Student at Public School in 2017/18.³⁴ Parent told Educational Advocate that she "constantly" asked for Student to be evaluated at Prior Public School A in 2015/16 and 2016/17.³⁵ Parent testified that she asked the principal (who was assistant principal in 2015/16) or Student's teacher every week or every other week for an evaluation of Student at Prior Public School A.³⁶ Parent testified that the principal responded that there was nothing wrong with Student and Student didn't need an IEP, but that Parent could seek a 504 plan.³⁷ Parent submitted a written request for a 504 plan to the school office, but Prior Public School A did not take any action.³⁸

10. Previously, Parent referred Student for an initial evaluation at Prior Public School B, which received the referral on 4/1/15 and acknowledged it on 4/27/15, providing Parent a copy of the Procedural Safeguards Notice.³⁹ DCPS proposed to evaluate Student in a Prior Written Notice ("PWN") dated 5/28/15.⁴⁰ Parent failed to provide consent for evaluation of Student, so the 2015 case was closed.⁴¹ A PWN sent to Parent on 6/23/15 explained that

²⁶ R14-4.

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ R15-1.

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ R15-4.

³¹ *Id.*

³² R14-1.

³³ R15-1.

³⁴ Parent.

³⁵ Educational Advocate.

³⁶ Parent.

³⁷ Parent; Educational Advocate.

³⁸ Parent.

³⁹ R3-1.

⁴⁰ R4-1.

⁴¹ R5-1.

Hearing Officer Determination

Case No. 2017-0259

DCPS proposed not to proceed with the evaluation process because Parent failed to make Student available for evaluation and failed to give consent and authorize DCPS to evaluate Student.⁴²

11. Parent made a referral of Student for an initial evaluation which Prior Public School C received on 4/15/14 and acknowledged on 6/16/14, along with providing a copy of the Procedural Safeguards Notice to Parent.⁴³ As noted in a 7/4/14 PWN, DCPS proposed to evaluate Student.⁴⁴ On 8/4/14, the evaluator sent a letter to Parent noting that Student had not been brought in for evaluation as scheduled, but that the evaluator was “still eager to move forward” and asked Parent to call.⁴⁵ An 8/7/14 PWN sent to Parent explained that DCPS proposed not to proceed with the evaluation process because Parent failed to bring Student in for evaluation and attempts to contact Parent had been unsuccessful.⁴⁶

12. Prior Public School B and Prior Public School C attempted to contact Parent to discuss the evaluation process, but received no response.⁴⁷ Parent testified that she was unable to respond due to health problems and that she was in and out of the hospital in 2013/14 and 2014/15, which Student’s schools knew.⁴⁸

Conclusions of Law

Based on the Findings of Fact above, the arguments of counsel, as well as this Hearing Officer’s own legal research, the Conclusions of Law are as follows:

The overall purpose of the IDEA is to ensure that “all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living.” 20 U.S.C. § 1400(d)(1)(A). *See Boose v. Dist. of Columbia*, 786 F.3d 1054, 1056 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (the IDEA “aims to ensure that every child has a meaningful opportunity to benefit from public education”).

“The IEP is ‘the centerpiece of the statute’s education delivery system for disabled children.’” *Andrew F. ex rel. Joseph F. v. Douglas County Sch. Dist. RE-1*, 137 S. Ct. 988, 994, 197 L. Ed. 2d 335 (2017), *quoting Honig v. Doe*, 484 U.S. 305, 311, 108 S. Ct. 592, 98 L.Ed.2d 686 (1988). “The IEP is the means by which special education and related services are ‘tailored to the unique needs’ of a particular child.” *Andrew F.*, 137 S. Ct. at 994, *quoting Bd. of Educ. of Hendrick Hudson Cent. Sch. Dist. v. Rowley*, 458 U.S. 176, 181, 102 S. Ct. 3034, 73 L. Ed. 2d 690 (1982).

⁴² R6-1,3; R7-1.

⁴³ R8-1.

⁴⁴ R10-1.

⁴⁵ R11-1.

⁴⁶ R12-1.

⁴⁷ R2-2; R13 (Parent contact log listing numerous attempts).

⁴⁸ Parent.

Hearing Officer Determination

Case No. 2017-0259

Once a child who may need special education services is identified and found eligible, DCPS must devise an IEP, mapping out specific educational goals and requirements in light of the child's disabilities and matching the child with a school capable of fulfilling those needs. *See* 20 U.S.C. §§ 1412(a)(4), 1414(d), 1401(a)(14); *Andrew F.*, 137 S. Ct. at 994; *Sch. Comm. of Town of Burlington, Mass. v. Dep't of Educ. of Mass.*, 471 U.S. 359, 369, 105 S. Ct. 1996, 2002, 85 L. Ed. 2d 385 (1985); *Jenkins v. Squillacote*, 935 F.2d 303, 304 (D.C. Cir. 1991); *Dist. of Columbia v. Doe*, 611 F.3d 888, 892 n.5 (D.C. Cir. 2010).

The IEP must be “reasonably calculated to enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of the child's circumstances.” *Andrew F.*, 137 S. Ct. at 1001. The Act's FAPE requirement is satisfied “by providing personalized instruction with sufficient support services to permit the child to benefit educationally from that instruction.” *Smith v. Dist. of Columbia*, 846 F. Supp. 2d 197, 202 (D.D.C. 2012), *citing Rowley*, 458 U.S. at 203. The IDEA imposes no additional requirement that the services so provided be sufficient to maximize each child's potential. *Rowley*, 458 U.S. at 198. In its recent decision, the Supreme Court made very clear that the standard is well above *de minimis*, however, stating that “[w]hen all is said and done, a student offered an educational program providing ‘merely more than *de minimis*’ progress from year to year can hardly be said to have been offered an education at all.” *Andrew F.*, 137 S. Ct. at 1001.

In addition, Respondent must ensure that to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities are educated with children who are nondisabled, and special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only if the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. 34 C.F.R. 300.114; *Andrew F.*, 137 S. Ct. at 1000 (children with disabilities should receive education in the regular classroom to the extent possible).

A Hearing Officer's determination of whether a child received a FAPE must be based on substantive grounds. In matters alleging a procedural violation, a Hearing Officer may find that a child did not receive a FAPE only if the procedural inadequacies (i) impeded the child's right to a FAPE; (ii) significantly impeded the parent's opportunity to participate in the decision-making process regarding the provision of a FAPE to the parent's child; or (iii) caused a deprivation of educational benefit. 34 C.F.R. 300.513(a). In other words, an IDEA claim is viable only if those procedural violations affected the child's *substantive* rights. *Brown v. Dist. of Columbia*, 179 F. Supp. 3d 15, 25-26 (D.D.C. 2016), *quoting N.S. ex rel. Stein v. Dist. of Columbia*, 709 F. Supp. 2d 57, 67 (D.D.C. 2010).

Petitioner carries the burden of production and persuasion, except on issues of the appropriateness of an IEP or placement on which Respondent has the burden of persuasion, if Petitioner establishes a *prima facie* case. D.C. Code Ann. § 38-2571.03(6); *Schaffer ex rel. Schaffer v. Weast*, 546 U.S. 49, 62, 126 S. Ct. 528, 537, 163 L. Ed. 2d 387 (2005). “Based solely upon evidence presented at the hearing, an impartial hearing officer shall determine whether . . . sufficient evidence [was presented] to meet the burden of proof that the action and/or inaction or proposed placement is inadequate or adequate to provide the student with a FAPE.” 5-E D.C.M.R. § 3030.3.

Hearing Officer Determination

Case No. 2017-0259

Issue: *Whether DCPS denied Student a FAPE by failing to adequately and comprehensively evaluate Student in all areas of suspected disability pursuant to its Child Find obligations (a) upon request of Parent in 2015/16 and 2016/17, and/or (b) based on behavioral/disciplinary issues in 2015/16, 2016/17, and 2017/18, including 6 documented incidents during the first week of 2017/18; being removed from the classroom and taken to the dean's office; on 9/18/17, running out of class and refusing to follow instructions, and then running out of class again and onto 15th Street; and on 9/21/17 attacking a teacher. (Petitioner has the burden of persuasion on this issue.)*

Petitioner did not meet her burden of proving that DCPS failed in its affirmative Child Find obligations to identify and evaluate Student in 2015/16, 2016/17 or 2017/18, due to insufficient objective indicators suggesting a need for evaluation or confirming Parent's assertions that she unsuccessfully requested that Student be evaluated.

The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia recently emphasized in *DL v. Dist. of Columbia*, 860 F.3d 713, 717 (D.C. Cir. 2017), that Child Find is among the most important IDEA requirements, in order to identify, locate and evaluate every child in need of special education. *See* 34 C.F.R. 300.111. DCPS's Child Find obligations are triggered either by awareness of the child's circumstances or by parental request. *See Long v. Dist. of Columbia*, 780 F. Supp. 2d 49, 57 (D.D.C. 2011). DCPS's awareness of Student's circumstances and parental requests are both at issue in this case and are considered in turn below.

Student's Circumstances. In this case, the only evidence of Student's circumstances in 2015/16 and 2016/17 is Parent's testimony that she was called "just about every day" due to problematic behaviors such as fighting staff and running out of the classroom, so that Student was not available for learning. The only witness in the case other than Parent was Educational Advocate, who acknowledged that her only information about Student came from Parent or from the small number of documents in the parties' disclosures.

The only documents in the case relating to 2015/16 and 2016/17 were Student's report cards for those 2 years from DCPS's disclosures. The report cards do not provide objective confirmation of a need for evaluation, but instead indicate that Student had decent grades, mostly Basic or Proficient, while the comments from Student's teachers were positive in both years, as Student was praised for being "a pleasure" and "a joy" to have in class. The undersigned does note that Student's performance appears to have somewhat declined from 2015/16 to 2016/17 and that Student had a large number of total absences (36; all but 4 excused) in 2015/16 and was chronically truant (10 unexcused absences) in 2016/17. However, in 2016/17 Student still reached Student's learning goal in math; Student did not make Student's personal reading goal, and was 2 terms behind expectations at the end of the year, but still had slightly more than 1 year's growth over the course of the school year, suggesting that Student was making progress.

As for 2017/18, Petitioner did include documentary evidence of Student's behavior from the first month at Student's new school, where Student had 4 office referrals and 3 minor incidents in the first 6 days. P7-1. The worst incidents were on 9/21/17 when Student grabbed a teacher's clothing and ripped the sleeve of her blouse, and 9/28/17 when

Hearing Officer Determination

Case No. 2017-0259

Student was suspended for 1 day for bullying. However, the due process complaint in this case was filed on 9/26/17, so Public School could hardly have taken action based on these incidents. Further, the evidence shows that Public School's dean of students took particular care with Student, checking on Student and communicating with Parent regularly, and allowing Student to nap in her office even when the dean was due for her lunch break. Parent believed that Student's behavior problems were caused at least in part by Student's medication not working properly; Public School's dean and Parent communicated regularly about Student's medication and whether it needed to be adjusted. Parent testified that Student had improved at the end of 2016/17 when Student's medications were helpful, along with therapy.

This Hearing Officer concludes that, given the limited evidence concerning Student's behavior, the full measure and scope of which was difficult to ascertain in the absence of documentation or additional witnesses, Student's report cards showed educational progress in 2015/16 and 2016/17, such that Petitioner did not meet her burden of showing that it was a denial of FAPE for Prior Public School A not to identify and evaluate Student. *See D.K. v. Abington Sch. Dist.*, 696 F.3d 233, 249 (3rd Cir. 2012) ("Child Find does not demand that schools conduct a formal evaluation of every struggling student. . ."). As for Public School, the evidence indicated that proactive steps were being taken to try to help Student settle in and, while Student seemed to be having more serious incidents after a month, the due process complaint was filed before action could reasonably be taken, so this Hearing Officer concludes that there was no violation of Child Find based on Student's circumstances, especially since DCPS unequivocally committed on the record at the due process hearing to proceed with evaluations of Student as soon as Parent provides consent to proceed.

Evaluation Requests. The parties are in sharp disagreement over whether Parent requested evaluation of Student during 2015/16 and 2016/17. There is no disagreement about 2017/18, for Parent acknowledged that she did not ask for evaluation of Student at Public School in the first weeks of this school year. Nor is there disagreement about 2 earlier years, when Parent successfully initiated evaluations of Student at Prior Public School B in 2014/15 and at Prior Public School C in 2013/14. While DCPS sought to proceed with evaluations in both years, each floundered as Parent did not provide consent to evaluate or arrange for Student to show up for the evaluations. Parent testified without contradiction that she was in poor health during those school years, including being in and out of the hospital, even though it seems that a single phone call from Parent might well have kept the evaluation process alive.

More significant for the current analysis, however, is the fact that after successfully initiating evaluations of Student in 2 different schools over 2 school years, Parent apparently understood the steps to be taken, had received a copy of the Procedural Safeguards Notice each year, and seemingly could have initiated an evaluation at Prior Public School A in 2015/16 and 2016/17, or taken necessary action to overcome any roadblocks. Thus, in the absence of any corroborating testimony or evidence, the undersigned does not view Parent as having met her burden of proof, given the standard set by case law. For example, in *G.G. ex rel. Gersten v. Dist. of Columbia*, 924 F. Supp. 2d 273, 275 (D.D.C. 2013), the child was in a DCPS school which might have suspected a disability based on "serious anxiety,

Hearing Officer Determination

Case No. 2017-0259

including clenching his fists and teeth, continually repeating nonsensical phrases, and banging his head on his desk,” but even his parents meeting with the principal and others to discuss their concerns was not sufficient to trigger Child Find until parent’s counsel wrote a letter to the school insisting on an IEP. *See also N.G. v. Dist. of Columbia*, 556 F. Supp. 2d 11, 29 (D.D.C. 2008) (the child’s attempted suicide, diagnosis of clinical depression, grades dropping precipitously and a clinical psychologist report did not trigger Child Find until DCPS received notice about two potentially qualifying disabilities); *but see Horne v. Potomac Preparatory P.C.S.*, 209 F. Supp. 3d 146, 157 (D.D.C. 2016) (LEA violated its Child Find obligation by not reevaluating student after suicide attempt).

In sum, Petitioner has not met her burden on Child Find based on either Student’s circumstances or Parent’s request. However, DCPS has committed to move forward with necessary evaluations of Student, including a comprehensive psychological evaluation and an FBA, as soon as Parent provides her consent for the evaluations to proceed.

ORDER

Petitioner has not prevailed on the issue in this case. Accordingly, **it is hereby ordered** that any and all claims and requests for relief are **dismissed with prejudice**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated in Caption

/s/ Keith Seat

Keith L. Seat, Esq.
Hearing Officer

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

This is the final administrative decision in this matter. Any party aggrieved by this Hearing Officer Determination may bring a civil action in any state court of competent jurisdiction or in a District Court of the United States without regard to the amount in controversy within ninety (90) days from the date of the Hearing Officer Determination in accordance with 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i).

Copies to:

Counsel of Record (Appendix A, by email)
OSSE-SPED (due.process@dc.gov)
ODR (hearing.office@dc.gov)
Contact.resolution@dc.gov