

GO Committee #3
May 3, 2012

MEMORANDUM

May 1, 2012

TO: Government Operations and Fiscal Policy (GO) Committee
FROM: Marlene Michaelson, ^{MM} Senior Legislative Analyst
SUBJECT: FY13 Operating Budget for Community Engagement Cluster

Those expected for this worksession:

Fariba Kassiri – Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
Judith Vaughan-Prather – Director, Commission for Women
Bruce Adams – Director, Office of Community Partnerships
Catherine Matthews – Regional Director, Upcounty
Ken Hartman – Regional Director, Bethesda-Chevy Chase
Reemberto Rodriguez – Regional Director, Silver Spring
Ana Lopez van Balen – Regional Director, MidCounty
Miti Figueredo – Regional Director, East County
Brady Goldsmith, Office of Management and Budget

The Government Operations and Fiscal Policy (GO) Committee met on April 23 to discuss the Executive's recommendations for the Community Engagement Cluster (CEC) (see © 1 to 5). The Committee asked for a follow-up discussion on two issues: potential additions to the budget for the Commission for Women, and revisions to the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the Council and Executive, adopted in 2007 regarding the relationship between the Council and the Regional Services Centers. The Council discussed the potential to amend the MOU to help improve communication. In addition, since the Committee inadvertently did not discuss revenue issues at the last meeting, they are again included in this memorandum.

Commission for Women

The Commission for Women's (CFW) mission is to identify gender-based inequities in laws, policies, practices and procedures, and to advocate remedies by advising the public and the local, state, and federal agencies on issues of concern to women, including organizing events relating to these issues.

Commission staff decreased from twelve positions in FY10 to two in FY12. The GO Committee agreed with the Executive recommendation to add \$70,000 to the budget to restore some of the Council services that had previously been offered by the Commission for Women. The Committee asked the Commission to identify other potential additions to the budget that the Committee could consider putting back on the reconciliation list.

Attached on © 6 are three scenarios prepared by the Executive in response to the Committee. The first scenario is what is proposed in the budget, which adds \$70,000 for approximately 1,000 counseling sessions. The second scenario would place \$70,000 on the reconciliation list for an additional 500 counseling sessions and coordination of seminars for a total audience of 500-1,000 individuals. An additional \$70,000 on the reconciliation list would allow them to increase counseling by another 500 hours and offer seminars to another 500 women (1,000 to 1,500 in total). Under any scenario, the services would be provided by contract and would not increase the number of County positions, and 30% of the services would be targeted to those 55 and older.

Memorandum of Understanding

During its review of the FY12 budget, several Councilmembers expressed concern regarding communication between Councilmembers and the Directors of the Regional Centers. There is a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the Council and Executive, adopted in 2007 regarding the relationship between the Council and the Regional Services Centers, and the Council discussed the potential to amend the MOU to help improve communication.¹ Several Councilmembers expressed their concern that the MOU had not worked as intended and last year the Council decided to revisit the MOU. At the April 23 meeting, GO Committee members asked that this be done before the Council votes on the FY13 operating budget.

Attached on the © 7 to 10 is a draft of potential revisions to the MOU developed based on input from the offices of those Councilmembers most concerned about this issue. The revisions more clearly delineate how the Directors will communicate with Councilmembers, provide Councilmembers with access to different groups organized by the Directors and to group contact lists, and provide written reports to Councilmembers. It also establishes a Council role in the evaluation of Regional Services Center Directors. The Executive had already agreed to see Council input during their evaluation. Councilmember Elrich's staff expressed concerns with several provisions in the MOU, and their comments are attached at © 11 to 13.

REVENUE ISSUES

The only revenues proposed for the CEC are \$10,500 in facility rentals. This is a significant decrease from the \$115,030 in the FY12 budget, but the FY12 budget inadvertently retained fees associated with their counseling program for the Commission for Women, even though counseling was eliminated. Although they are requesting funds for counseling this year, since they will only have a limited (\$70,000) contract, they have not assumed any revenues. The Committee may want to discuss

¹ In 2007, the Executive proposed making certain RSC directors non-merit to be appointed by the Executive. At that time, the Council was concerned that non-merit appointees would focus on serving the County Executive rather than representing and communicating with both the Executive and Legislative Branches. An MOU was created to ensure that the relationship between the Council and the RSCs did not change and to recognize that Citizen Advisory Boards are required to report to both the Council and the Executive, among other issues.

whether some assumption of limited fees for this service would be appropriate. For example, assuming there is a \$10 fee for each of the estimated 1,000 counseling sessions they will provide, this could yield \$10,000 in revenue. Alternatively, if the Commission only plans to offer this service to low income individuals, it may be appropriate to not charge any fee.

If the Committee supports a fee, then the appropriate revenue amount should be associated with any increase in counseling supported via the reconciliation list.

f:\michaelson\community engagement cluster\fy13 operating budget\120503.doc

Community Engagement Cluster

MISSION STATEMENT

The Community Engagement Cluster (CEC) works to build stronger, more informed and inclusive communities. The Cluster is responsible for strengthening Montgomery County's commitment to civic engagement and community service by engaging residents, organizations, businesses and other interest groups in our communities. The Cluster maximizes our communities' assets - time, talents, and other resources - working collaboratively to address and resolve community issues.

The new cluster is a combination of the five Regional Services Centers, the Commission for Women, and the Office of Community Partnerships, including the Gilchrist Center and the Volunteer Center, that has been operating as one unit since July 1, 2011. As a cluster, these offices/functions have combined facilities, resources, and support staff while retaining staff expertise and experience, as well as most of the objectives of the separate entities involved.

BUDGET OVERVIEW

The total recommended FY13 Operating Budget for the Community Engagement Cluster is \$3,246,492, an increase of \$492,972 or 17.9 percent from the FY12 Approved Budget of \$2,753,520. Personnel Costs comprise 86.2 percent of the budget for 18 full-time positions and one part-time position for 21.80 FTEs. Operating Expenses account for the remaining 13.8 percent of the FY13 budget.

LINKAGE TO COUNTY RESULT AREAS

While this program area supports all eight of the County Result Areas, the following are emphasized:

- ❖ *A Responsive, Accountable County Government*
- ❖ *Healthy and Sustainable Neighborhoods*
- ❖ *Vital Living for All of Our Residents*

DEPARTMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance measures for this department are included below, with multi-program measures displayed at the front of this section and program-specific measures shown with the relevant program. The FY12 estimates reflect funding based on the FY12 approved budget. The FY13 and FY14 figures are performance targets based on the FY13 recommended budget and funding for comparable service levels in FY14.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND INITIATIVES

- ❖ *The consolidation of the five Regional Services Centers, the Commission for Women, the Gilchrist Center and the Office of Community Partnerships into the Community Engagement Cluster has produced a streamlined organization with centralized support functions resulting in savings while retaining staff expertise and experience.*
- ❖ *While reducing its personnel complement by ten workyears, the CEC will sponsor or play a major role in planning 24 events in FY12 with a combined participation of over 200,000 residents of Montgomery County.*
- ❖ *Productivity Improvements*
 - *Consolidation of multiple wireless device accounts and reduction of telephone land lines by more than 50 percent.*

PROGRAM CONTACTS

Contact Fariba Kassiri of the Offices of the County Executive at 240.777.2512 or Brady Goldsmith of the Office of Management and Budget at 240.777.2793 for more information regarding this department's operating budget.

①

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Community Partnerships

The Office of Community Partnerships (OCP) is a bridge between our diverse community residents and organizations and the County government. The staff provides outreach and liaison services to ethnic, multilingual, and multicultural communities; works closely with the County's nonprofit and faith community organizations; and coordinates a number of community-building events throughout the year. The Volunteer Center connects residents and businesses to volunteer assignments in hundreds of nonprofits across Montgomery County.

Program Performance Measures	Actual FY10	Actual FY11	Estimated FY12	Target FY13	Target FY14
Overall satisfaction with The Office of Community Partnerships' provision of information, access and support to ethnic, multilingual and multicultural communities (scale 1-5)	NA	NA	NA	4	4

FY13 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY12 Approved	857,760	6.00
Enhance: Community Liaison for African and Caribbean Communities	60,330	0.50
Increase Cost: Funds to Maintain Retired Senior Volunteer Program	23,550	0.23
Decrease Cost: Loss of Federal Aid for Retired Senior Volunteer Program Grant	-18,170	-0.23
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs. Other large variances are related to the transition from the previous mainframe budgeting system to Hyperion.	102,000	0.00
FY13 CE Recommended	1,025,470	6.50

The Gilchrist Center for Cultural Diversity

The Charles W. Gilchrist Center for Cultural Diversity is the County's Welcome Center for newcomers and helps to build the network of immigrant service providers in the County. The Center offers various immigrant integration services at various locations throughout the County that prepare residents to contribute to our economy and our community.

Program Performance Measures	Actual FY10	Actual FY11	Estimated FY12	Target FY13	Target FY14
Gilchrist Center: Overall participant satisfaction with their experience at the Gilchrist Center (scale 1-5)	NA	NA	NA	4	4
Gilchrist Center: Overall satisfaction of participants in Gilchrist classes (scale 1-5)	NA	NA	NA	4	4

FY13 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY12 Approved	181,380	3.00
Enhance: Additional staff for Gilchrist Center	70,080	2.00
Increase Cost: Gilchrist Center Program Fees	5,500	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs. Other large variances are related to the transition from the previous mainframe budgeting system to Hyperion.	20,040	0.00
FY13 CE Recommended	277,000	5.00

Commission for Women

The Commission for Women's mission is to identify gender-based inequities in laws, policies, practices and procedures, and to advocate remedies by advising the public and the local, state, and federal agencies on issues of concern to women, including organizing events relating to these issues.

Program Performance Measures	Actual FY10	Actual FY11	Estimated FY12	Target FY13	Target FY14
Overall satisfaction of the Commissioners with the effectiveness of the CFW's identification of needs, problems and issues for the women of Montgomery County and the advocacy of resolution of these issues (scale 1-5)	NA	NA	NA	4	4

(2)

FY13 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY12 Approved	300,290	2.00
Add: Contractual counseling services	70,000	0.00
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs. Other large variances are related to the transition from the previous mainframe budgeting system to Hyperion.	36,555	0.00
FY13 CE Recommended	406,845	2.00

Regional Centers

The County has five Regional Centers: Bethesda-Chevy Chase, Eastern Montgomery, Mid-County, Silver Spring, and Upcounty. The Regional Directors in each of the County's five regions work with their respective regional citizens advisory boards, residents, community groups, businesses, and other public agencies to proactively seek and gather information and assess community needs, problems and issues in order to provide effective and timely input representing their regions in policy discussions and in liaison between Montgomery County and its residents. The Regional Directors of the Silver Spring, Wheaton and Bethesda/Chevy Chase regions provide oversight of the operations of their respective Urban Districts.

Program Performance Measures	Actual FY10	Actual FY11	Estimated FY12	Target FY13	Target FY14
Overall satisfaction of Regional Citizen Advisory Boards with the effectiveness of the Centers' assessment of community needs, problems and issues and the effectiveness and timeliness of the Centers' service as liaisons between County residents and the government (scale 1-5)	NA	NA	NA	4	4
Overall satisfaction of the Urban Districts Advisory boards with a) the effectiveness of the Urban Districts' promotion of their jurisdiction and b) Satisfaction with Urban Districts' provision of maintenance of streetscape amenities (scale 1-5)	NA	NA	NA	4	4

FY13 Recommended Changes	Expenditures	FTEs
FY12 Approved	1,414,090	8.50
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY12	-10,000	0.00
Add: Eliminate Weed and Seed Grant	-48,200	-0.20
Multi-program adjustments, including negotiated compensation changes, employee benefit changes, changes due to staff turnover, reorganizations, and other budget changes affecting multiple programs. Other large variances are related to the transition from the previous mainframe budgeting system to Hyperion.	181,287	0.00
FY13 CE Recommended	1,537,177	8.30

3

BUDGET SUMMARY

	Actual FY11	Budget FY12	Estimated FY12	Recommended FY13	% Chg Bud/Rec
COUNTY GENERAL FUND					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	0	1,867,610	1,961,465	2,080,121	11.4%
Employee Benefits	0	473,720	467,096	659,670	39.3%
County General Fund Personnel Costs	0	2,341,330	2,428,561	2,739,791	17.0%
Operating Expenses	0	285,630	274,879	446,511	56.3%
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	—
County General Fund Expenditures	0	2,626,960	2,703,440	3,186,302	21.3%
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	0	16	16	17	6.3%
Part-Time	0	1	1	1	—
FTEs	0.00	18.30	18.30	21.03	14.9%
REVENUES					
Commission for Women Fees	0	104,530	0	0	—
Facility Rental Fees	0	10,500	10,500	10,500	—
County General Fund Revenues	0	115,030	10,500	10,500	-90.9%
GRANT FUND MCG					
EXPENDITURES					
Salaries and Wages	0	75,630	75,630	48,139	-36.3%
Employee Benefits	0	24,480	24,480	12,051	-50.8%
Grant Fund MCG Personnel Costs	0	100,110	100,110	60,190	-39.9%
Operating Expenses	0	26,450	26,450	0	—
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	—
Grant Fund MCG Expenditures	0	126,560	126,560	60,190	-52.4%
PERSONNEL					
Full-Time	0	2	2	1	-50.0%
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	—
FTEs	0.00	1.20	1.20	0.77	-35.8%
REVENUES					
Federal Grants	0	126,560	126,560	60,190	-52.4%
Grant Fund MCG Revenues	0	126,560	126,560	60,190	-52.4%
DEPARTMENT TOTALS					
Total Expenditures	0	2,753,520	2,830,000	3,246,492	17.9%
Total Full-Time Positions	0	18	18	18	—
Total Part-Time Positions	0	1	1	1	—
Total FTEs	0.00	19.50	19.50	21.80	11.8%
Total Revenues	0	241,590	137,060	70,690	-70.7%

FY13 RECOMMENDED CHANGES

	Expenditures	FTEs
COUNTY GENERAL FUND		
FY12 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	2,626,960	18.30
Changes (with service impacts)		
Enhance: Americorps grant match and operating expenses	75,000	0.00
Enhance: Additional staff for Gilchrist Center [The Gilchrist Center for Cultural Diversity]	70,080	2.00
Add: Contractual counseling services [Commission for Women]	70,000	0.00
Enhance: Community Liaison for African and Caribbean Communities [Community Partnerships]	60,330	0.50
Add: Event Funding	50,000	0.00
Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)		
Increase Cost: Annualization of FY12 Personnel Costs	116,510	0.00
Increase Cost: Retirement Adjustment	80,908	0.00
Increase Cost: Lump Sum Wage Adjustment	42,515	0.00
Increase Cost: Group Insurance Adjustment	30,155	0.00
Increase Cost: Funds to Maintain Retired Senior Volunteer Program [Community Partnerships]	23,550	0.23
Increase Cost: Gilchrist Center Program Fees [The Gilchrist Center for Cultural Diversity]	5,500	0.00
Increase Cost: Longevity Adjustment	3,133	0.00
Shift: Help Desk - Desk Side Support to the Desktop Computer Modernization NDA	-1,990	0.00

	Expenditures	FTEs
Decrease Cost: Printing and Mail Adjustment	-3,810	0.00
Decrease Cost: Elimination of One-Time Items Approved in FY12 [Regional Centers]	-10,000	0.00
Decrease Cost: Contract expenses	-12,769	0.00
Decrease Cost: Turnover savings	-19,340	0.00
Decrease Cost: Telephone expenses	-20,430	0.00
FY13 RECOMMENDED:	3,186,302	21.03

GRANT FUND MCG

FY12 ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	126,560	1.20
Changes (with service impacts)		
Add: Eliminate Weed and Seed Grant [Regional Centers]	-48,200	-0.20
Other Adjustments (with no service impacts)		
Decrease Cost: Loss of Federal Aid for Retired Senior Volunteer Program Grant [Community Partnerships]	-18,170	-0.23
FY13 RECOMMENDED:	60,190	0.77

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Program Name	FY12 Approved		FY13 Recommended	
	Expenditures	FTEs	Expenditures	FTEs
Community Partnerships	857,760	6.00	1,025,470	6.50
The Gilchrist Center for Cultural Diversity	181,380	3.00	277,000	5.00
Commission for Women	300,290	2.00	406,845	2.00
Regional Centers	1,414,090	8.50	1,537,177	8.30
Total	2,753,520	19.50	3,246,492	21.80

FUTURE FISCAL IMPACTS

Title	(5000's)					
	CE REC. FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18
This table is intended to present significant future fiscal impacts of the department's programs.						
COUNTY GENERAL FUND						
Expenditures						
FY13 Recommended	3,186	3,186	3,186	3,186	3,186	3,186
No inflation or compensation change is included in outyear projections.						
Elimination of One-Time Lump Sum Wage Adjustment	0	-43	-43	-43	-43	-43
This represents the elimination of the one-time lump sum wage increases paid in FY13.						
Subtotal Expenditures	3,186	3,144	3,144	3,144	3,144	3,144

5

FY 2012 Budget Scenarios

Commission For Women

The County Executive's Budget proposed \$70,000 for contractual counseling services through the office of the Commission for Women (CFW). The County Council Government Operations Committee asked the CFW to describe services that could be provided at three levels of funding, as specified below. The Assistant Chief Administrative Officer has indicated that the County Executive will be supportive of any of these levels of funding as long as no new county positions are required.

All three scenarios assume the Executive Director contracts for services:

\$70,000

- Approximately 1000 sessions of individual counseling
- \$21,000 targeted to those age 55 and older

\$140,000

- Approximately 1500 sessions of counseling
- Coordination of seminars for a total audience of 500 – 1000 individuals
- \$42,000 targeted to those 55 and older

\$210,000

- Approximately 2000 hours of counseling
- Coordination of seminars for a total audience of 1000 – 1500
- \$63,000 targeted to those 55 and older

All services would be targeted to:

- Adults 18 years and older, with 30 percent of funding targeted to those age 55 and older
- Counseling Services Eligibility:
 - Single with no dependent children: income of less than \$50,000 per year,
 - Married couples or single parent with dependent children under age 21: combined incomes of less than \$75,000 per year.
- Counseling Services to be available in at least English and Spanish to address problems of:
 - Family Crises and Transitions
 - Balancing Work and Family
 - Self Esteem Issues
 - Effective Communication
 - Relationship Issues
- Seminars to Focus on:
 - Legal Process of Separation and Divorce (Informational)
 - Mediation and Alternative Dispute Resolution (Informational)
 - Financial Literacy, including Financial Security for Older Women (Informational)
 - Support Groups for Separation and Divorce (Group Counseling)
 - Balancing Work and Family (Information and/or Group Counseling Short Term)

NOTE: No career counseling; all reported victims of domestic violence will be referred to Abused Persons Program or Family Justice Center; all requests for mental health issues will be referred to Access to Behavioral Health Program, Crisis Center or Mental Health Association.

1 **Memorandum of Understanding**
2 **Between the Montgomery County Executive**
3 **and the County Council**

Deleted: ¶
¶
¶

4
5
6 **Issue**

7
8 Relationship between Regional Services Center Directors and the Montgomery County Council.

9
10 **Background**

11
12 In 2007, Regional Services Center Directors' positions were converted to non-merit
13 appointments made by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council. At that
14 time, the County Executive and County Council entered into a Memorandum of Understanding
15 (MOU) to recognize the unique nature of the relationships that these positions must maintain
16 with County Councilmembers in order to coordinate/facilitate public services in specific
17 geographical regions of the County.

Deleted: have traditionally been merit system employees working in the Executive branch of the Montgomery County government. The enactment of Expedited Bill 6-07 will convert these positions to

Deleted: In addition, Regional Services Center Citizens Advisory Boards are responsible for advising both the Executive and the County Council.

18
19 Despite the existence of the MOU, the Council believes further changes are necessary to ensure
20 that the Directors maintain the same cooperative and collaborative relationships with the County
21 Council as existed when the positions were in the merit system, and therefore believes that
22 amendments to the MOU are necessary. This MOU replaces the MOU entered into in 2007.

Deleted: conversion of these positions to non-merit status as a result of Expedited Bill 6-07, the County Executive and County Council desire and intend that these positions will continue to

Deleted: had

Deleted: status

Deleted: .

23
24 **Compact**

25
26 The County Executive and Council agree that Regional Services Center Directors will:
27

- 28 1. maintain open communication and responsiveness to County Council inquiries;
- 29 2. be responsive to County Council requests that enhance and support their regional work
- 30 programs;
- 31 3. maintain a mutually responsive relationship with County Councilmembers by regularly
- 32 discussing community issues and potential solutions with all interested Councilmembers
- 33 to jointly resolve community problems and address needs in regional service areas;
- 34 4. schedule a quarterly meeting with the relevant district Councilmember(s) and a quarterly
- 35 briefing for all interested Councilmembers or Council staff;
- 36 5. advise all County Councilmembers in a timely manner on the status and impact of public
- 37 policies affecting the regional service areas;
- 38 6. recognize the unique relationship between the Regional Services Center Directors and the
- 39 District Councilmembers who represent the regions and invite the relevant District
- 40 Councilmember(s) or their designee to serve as an ex-officio member of all Committees,
- 41 task forces, or groups organized or staffed by the Directors;
- 42 7. keep all County Councilmembers updated on the activities of the Citizen Advisory Board
- 43 (CAB) by providing agendas at least 48 hours in advance of the CAB meetings and
- 44 provide minutes after CAB meetings;
- 45 8. provide Councilmembers with agendas and minutes for any other group for which the
- 46 Director is involved with the preparation or circulation of agendas or minutes.
- 47 9. continue to include an opportunity for Councilmembers or their designee to participate
- 48 and comment during CAB or any other community advisory meeting;
- 49 10. present Council, as well as Executive, perspectives to CAB members when a Council
- 50 representative is not available to provide that perspective in person. When the Council

Deleted: which

Deleted: informing and interacting with each other to help

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: S

Deleted: .

Deleted: continue to include Councilmember representatives on interagency/intergovernmental task forces or committees for the siting of public facilities

Deleted: to

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: s

Deleted: meetings

51 and Executive have different positions on an issue, the Director should obtain Council
52 input to ensure that Council views are correctly portrayed.

53 11. recognize that the CABs, by their charter, are required to report to both the County
54 Executive and the County Council, and ensure that CAB members are aware of this
55 responsibility;

Deleted: ;

56 12. create an orientation for new CAB members, including a uniform portion for all CABs,
57 that addresses the relationship between Councilmembers and the CABs;

Deleted: s

58 13. assist each CAB to develop a yearly workprogram and obtain district Council input in
59 developing the workprogram;

60 14. provide Council access to any listserv or mailing list used by the Directors to contact
61 group members or citizens

62 15. copy the Council on all e-mail and correspondence sent to committee or group members.
63 This information should also be available to the public unless the information being
64 shared is not subject to disclosure under the Maryland public information act.

65 16. continue to provide a monthly written report that addresses the following topics:

66 • prior month's news and accomplishments and summaries of any Committee
67 meetings;

68 • key issues in the community;

69 • initiatives with which the office is currently engaged; and

70 • the work plan for the coming month

71 17. serve as a resource for Councilmembers when they are addressing constituent issues; and

72 18. accommodate Councilmember requests for space to hold meetings/drop in sessions at
73 Regional Services Centers.

Comments from the office of Councilmember Marc Elrich. These comments are in order that they appear in the draft MOU with the exception of point #14, which is discussed first.

14. provide Council access to any list serve, mailing list or (**ANYTHING ELSE TO ADD**) used by the Directors to contact group members or citizens

It appears that the attempt is to avoid the practice of a publicly appointed advisory board (which is subject to sunshine laws) having a private e-mail discussion that is not open to the public (or elected officials). However, the current wording suggests that e-mail lists could be used for purposes other than discussing the issues of the Citizens Advisory Board. Perhaps, instead, the CABs should be directed that any whole group or whole committee discussions via e-mail need to be on a listserv that is open to all (including residents, elected officials and the press). It is possible that only board members would be allowed to comment, but all could read the e-mails. If board members (and others) do not want their e-mail addresses available publicly, then there could be the option to sign in with name, not showing the actual e-mail address. The e-mail distribution list should not be available for use of other purposes, even for other elected officials.

First page, line 22, "some Directors have not maintained the same cooperative and collaborative relationships with the County Council as existed when the positions were in the merit system."

Request deleting this language. This does not reflect all Councilmembers' views and should not be part of MOU language. Instead, simply refer to this as an update or clarification of the existing MOU.

#6: "recognize the unique relationship between the Regional Services Center Directors and the District Councilmembers who represent the regions and invite the relevant District Councilmember(s) or their designee to serve as an ex-officio member of all Committees, task forces, or groups organized or staffed by the Directors"

Recommend eliminating this point. The language should not reference only District Councilmembers because the at-large members also represent these residents. To focus only on the District Councilmembers reduces residents' full representation. Additionally, it seems unnecessarily complicated to have councilmember or designee(s) be ex officio members of all the various entities; these meetings are open to the public already; the CABs are for the entire community.

Perhaps instead, the CAB members need to be reminded regularly that they advise the entire Council as well as the County Executive. Sometimes this point is forgotten.

#7 "keep all County Councilmembers updated on the activities of the Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) by providing agendas at least 48 hours in advance of the CAB meetings and minutes after CAB meetings;"

This should not be limited to Councilmembers – this information should be publicly available. However, imposing deadlines of any sort is unreasonable given the level of staffing at the RSCs. Usually a CAB member takes the minutes and they may not be available 48 hours in advance. Instead, documents such as agendas and minutes should be available to the public, elected officials and the CAB members at the same time.

#10: "present Council, as well as Executive, perspectives to CAB members when a Council representative is not available to provide that perspective in person. When the Council and Executive have different positions on an issue, the Director should obtain Council input to ensure that Council views are correctly portrayed."

Recommend eliminating this point. All the members of the Council are not necessarily in agreement and then it becomes unnecessarily complicated to determine how to present the differing views. If a Councilmember(s) has a differing view that s/he believes needs to be discussed, they can present directly to the CAB. For example, Councilmember Andrews is doing just that on the EMS fee; he disagrees with the County Executive's view, and he wants to be sure that his position is presented and understood. The current structure allows that exchange of differing opinions.

#13: "assist each CAB to develop a yearly workprogram and obtain district Council input in developing the workprogram;"

Recommend eliminating this point. The CABs are designed to give the community an opportunity to advise the Executive and Council of the community's priorities. It is not appropriate for either the Executive or the Council to use these Citizen Advisory Boards to set the agendas, which may or may not reflect the desires of the CAB members themselves. Councilmembers and their staff can always sit in and answer questions, provide guidance, suggestions and requests, but they should not be shaping the goals of the Citizen Advisory Boards.

Involving the Council in performance evaluations for the RSC Directors seems overly complicated and unnecessary and raises questions about why Council would be involved in those evaluations and not the evaluations of the department heads as well.

#15 “copy the Council on all e-mail and correspondence sent to committee or group members. This information should also be available to the public unless the information being shared is not subject to disclosure under the Maryland public information act.”

Recommend eliminating. This point appears to address the same transparency issues as point #14. If #14 is revised and a listserv as discussed above is created, the concerns in this point should be addressed. Presumably there are some exchanges that don't need to be on a public listserv that do not violate transparency (sunshine) rules; for example, discussing with several members about meeting dates or asking to raise the issue of attendance at the next executive committee meeting.