



COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND REVIEW BOARD

MEMORANDUM

January 9, 2026

TO: Marc Elrich, County Executive
Natali Fani-González, County Council President

FROM: Muriel Hairston-Cooper, Co-Chair *Muriel Hairston-Cooper*
Sofya Orlosky, Co-Chair *Sofya Orlosky*

SUBJECT: Committee Evaluation and Review Board Final Report

As required by Montgomery County Code §2-146 (c) (2), the Committee Evaluation and Review Board (CERB) presents the attached **Final Report**. Please let us know if you have any comments or questions on the contents of the report. Thank you.



COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND REVIEW BOARD (CERB)

Review and Evaluation of Montgomery County's
Boards, Committees, and Commissions (BCCs)
FINAL REPORT

Members

Sofya Orlosky and Muriel Hairston-Cooper, Co-Chairs
Justin Carlson, Jake Didinsky,
Mary Ann Keeffe, Deeptaanshu Kumar,
Karl Pitt, Catherine Sindos, Jeffrey Slavin, Clint Sobratti

Staff

Ken Hartman-Espada, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
Beth Gochrach, Administrative Specialist II
Eritrea Thomas, Office Services Coordinator

January 9, 2026

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
1. Introduction	4
2. Methodology	6
3. Key Findings	8
4. Recommendations	16
5. Suggested Additional Research	23
List of Abbreviations and Acronyms	24
Appendix A. List of BCCs and Their Classifications	25
Appendix B. CERB Notes and Recommendations by Individual BCC	29
Appendix C. BCC Self-Assessment Questionnaire.....	129
Appendix D. Direct Observation Form	131
Appendix E. Director Interview Guide.....	134
Appendix F. CERB Interim Report	136

Executive Summary

Background and Purpose

The Committee Evaluation and Review Board (CERB) was appointed on May 22, 2024, to conduct the first comprehensive review of Montgomery County's advisory boards, committees, and commissions (BCCs) in over a decade. This Final Report fulfills the mandate established under Montgomery County Code Article XI, Section 2-146, to evaluate both the BCC system as a whole and individual advisory bodies.

The CERB, comprising 10 dedicated county residents, conducted an 18-month review of 54 advisory BCCs through direct observation of meetings, comprehensive questionnaires, interviews with Department heads, and analysis of governing legislation, meeting materials, and websites. This evaluation employed an equitable engagement lens to assess how effectively BCCs channel the diverse experiences and needs of Montgomery County's residents into County government operations.

Key Findings

Montgomery County provides extensive opportunities for community input through its BCC system, with committed individuals contributing valuable professional and lived experiences. However, the CERB identified critical systemic weaknesses that undermine effectiveness and equitable engagement:

Governance and Oversight: The system lacks clear oversight and accountability structures. Neither the County Council nor the County Executive definitively oversees the BCC system, creating confusion about reporting lines and responsibilities. Laws governing BCCs have evolved inconsistently over decades without standardization, resulting in contradictory requirements for membership, reporting, and functions.

System Structure: The BCC structure has become unnecessarily complex and illogical. Regional advisory boards no longer align with current demographic and economic realities. Both geographic and thematic coverage is confusing, with overlapping jurisdictions that perplex residents seeking to engage.

Staffing and Coordination: Staffing levels for the BCC system have remained stagnant for over a decade despite increased demands. Individual Departments struggle with inadequate support, with one County Department managing 20 BCCs. Communication between BCCs, Departments, and the County Council remains inconsistent, with no formal feedback mechanisms to close the loop on recommendations and resident input.

Membership and Participation: Despite aggressive recruitment efforts, BCCs face chronic vacancies and attendance challenges. Many boards are unnecessarily large, making effective facilitation difficult. Legally mandated membership compositions often create structural imbalances, requiring overly specific professional expertise that conflicts with diversity goals. The few existing incentives appear inadequate to remove persistent barriers for participation, especially for youth, working parents, and less affluent county residents.

Public Engagement: BCC websites contain outdated, duplicative, and conflicting information that likely discourages residents seeking involvement. Most BCCs lack proactive engagement strategies and struggle with visibility. County residents remain largely unaware of BCCs and their role in County governance, limiting their effectiveness as channels for community input.

Impact Evaluation: The system lacks a strategic framework and consistent evaluation methodology. Most BCCs operate without strategic plans tied to Department goals, making it difficult to assess their value or communicate their impact to residents. Without clear performance indicators, the County cannot effectively track whether BCCs fulfill their intended purpose.

Recommendations for the System

The CERB presents comprehensive recommendations organized into six strategic priorities:

- 1. Streamline Governance:** Clarify whether BCCs serve the County Council or Executive. Conduct comprehensive legislative revision using uniform language templates. Establish clear mechanisms for action on BCC recommendations, including mandatory department review processes.
- 2. Reduce System Complexity:** Adopt standardized BCC classification. Simplify and realign regional structures to reflect current county demographics, while reducing duplicity through strategic consolidation. Create guardrails for BCC decision-making and escalation procedures.
- 3. Strengthen Capacity:** Increase centralized staffing in the County Executive's Office to strengthen system management and oversight. Establish a County "Board Academy" providing comprehensive training beyond procedural requirements. Review and increase department-level staff support consistently across all BCCs and ensure proactive data sharing.
- 4. Engage Effective Members:** Standardize membership to 10-15 voting members per BCC. Implement targeted recruitment through community organizations, houses of worship, and social service networks. Streamline the application process with a single application and rolling recruitment. Establish robust incentive systems including stipends for labor-intensive BCCs, SSL hours for students, and recreation vouchers.
- 5. Ensure Visibility:** Launch innovative awareness campaigns highlighting the importance of civic participation. Dedicate Public Information Office resources to BCC-specific outreach. Establish standardized information sharing tools for the public. Create a one-stop method for residents to identify and contact relevant BCCs. Conduct comprehensive website audits to ensure consistent, user-friendly navigation.
- 6. Evaluate for Impact:** Implement monitoring and evaluation frameworks tied to the County Strategic Plan. Require strategic planning alignment between departments and their BCCs. Replace decennial CERB reviews with continuous improvement systems powered by consistent data gathering. Consider professional evaluation services for robust system-wide assessments.

Individual BCC Recommendations

Of the 54 advisory BCCs reviewed, the CERB recommends:

- **13 continue without changes** (24%)

- **24 continue with specific modifications** (44%)
- **11 be eliminated** through consolidation or obsolescence (20%)
- **6 be reclassified** to non-advisory tiers (11%)

These recommendations address duplicative functions, outdated mandates, chronic dysfunction, and opportunities for strategic consolidation that would strengthen the remaining BCCs while reducing system complexity. The CERB provides additional recommendations for the continuing BCCs to improve their effectiveness and equitable engagement of residents.

Conclusion

Montgomery County's BCC system represents a significant investment in civic engagement, but it requires substantial reform to fulfill its potential. The current system, built incrementally over decades without strategic oversight, no longer serves residents or County government effectively. By implementing these recommendations, Montgomery County can transform its BCC system into a streamlined, accessible, and impactful mechanism for channeling diverse community voices into responsive governance.

The CERB acknowledges that these recommendations represent ambitious changes requiring sustained commitment from both the County Council and County Executive. However, the alternative of maintaining an increasingly complex system that frustrates residents, burdens staff, and fails to demonstrate clear value is untenable. Montgomery County's residents deserve a civic engagement infrastructure worthy of their participation and reflective of their diverse needs.

1. Introduction

This Final Report is submitted to the Montgomery County Executive and County Council by the Committee Evaluation and Review Board (CERB), as required by Montgomery County Code Article XI, Sec. 2-146.

Purpose of the Committee Evaluation and Review Board

As stipulated in Sec. 2-146 of the Montgomery County Code, the Montgomery County Executive must appoint and convene the Committee Evaluation and Review Board. This body is a citizens review committee that reviews each of the Montgomery County Advisory Committees and Boards appointed under Sec. 2-146.

Specifically, the task of the CERB is to *“review the group system and each then-existing board, committee, commission, and task force and report to the Executive and Council its recommendations for changes in individual boards, committees, commissions, and task forces and the group system as a whole.”* Additionally, the CERB *“must review each advisory board that requests continuation under subsection (b)(2) and recommend to the Council whether the advisory board should continue.”*

The most recent CERB was formed in 2012 and delivered its findings and recommendations to the County Executive and County Council in 2013. The current CERB was appointed on May 22, 2024, more than 10 years after the previous review effort. CERB members realize the particular urgency to their mandate given the extended timeframe since the previous review.

CERB Composition

The current CERB, consisting of 13 members, as selected by the County Executive as per the statutory requirements, officially convened on the 11th of July. Since July 2024, the CERB has experienced three resignations that lowered the member count to 10. The members of the CERB as of January 1, 2026, are:

Justin Carlson, Jake Didinsky, Muriel Hairston-Cooper (Co-Chair), Mary Ann Keeffe, Deeptaanshu Kumar, Sofya Orlosky (Co-Chair), Karl Pitt, Catherine Sindos, Jeffrey Slavin, and Clint Sobratti.

The CERB is supported by Assistant Chief Administrative Officer Ken Hartman-Espada, and Administrative Specialist, Beth Gochrach,

Scope of Review

The CERB is established under Sec. 2-146 to:

“review the group system and each then-existing board, committee, commission, and task force and report to the Executive and Council its recommendations for changes in individual boards, committees, commissions, and task forces and the group system as a whole and submit an interim report to the Executive and Council within 6 months of appointment and submit a final report within 12 months of appointment.”

At the time of this CERB’s appointment, there were 98 boards, committees, and commissions (BCCs), of which 50 were tentatively deemed “advisory,” as defined in Montgomery County Code

Sec. 2-146 Editor's note Sec. 3. (b) (1). After the initial discussions, the CERB was unable to reach consensus on the interpretation of Sec. 2-146 (as amended by Bill 32-11 (1) and Bill 2-05 (2) and as executed in the 2013 CERB report) pertaining to the scope and coverage of the 2024 CERB review and CERB report. Following the consultation with the Office of the County Attorney, the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer established the following classification of County's BCCs based on their statutory authority, function, membership, and governing legislation:

Tier	Type	Description	# of BCCs
1	Advisory Board	As defined in MCC Sec. 2-146 Editor's note Sec. 3 (b) (1).	54
2	Coordinating Body	Primarily composed of representatives of County agencies and/or external agencies coordinating efforts on a particular range of issues.	5
3	Regulatory Body	Primarily performs regulatory functions, such as permitting, complaint review and adjudication, policy development and recommendations for County Council, etc.	7
4	County Agency	Performs regularly scheduled work to implement County policies and programs, has a dedicated staff and a budget.	14
5	External	Established and/or governed by laws or bodies external to the County.	18

The full list of BCCs and their classification is provided in Appendix A.

The CERB requested clarification of the scope of its review following the establishment of this classification rubric. The Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, in consultation with the Office of the County Attorney, directed the CERB, in accordance with Sec. 2-147 subsections (b) and (c), to focus its review solely on **advisory** BCCs to most closely align the scope of work with the spirit of Sec. 2-146, as amended.

For the purpose of this Report, “BCC” means “advisory board, committee, or commission.” Also for the purpose of this report, the Regional Services Centers and the Regional Services Center Directors will be considered Departments and department heads, respectively.

Timeline

The CERB has met monthly and frequently twice monthly for work sessions between July 2024 and the end of December 2025, completing the following project stages:

Period	Work Stage
July – August 2024	Scope review and methodology development
September – November 2024	Data gathering: BCC self-questionnaires
September 2024 – March 2025	Data gathering: BCC visits by the CERB
December 2024 – January 2025	Interim report preparation
April – July 2025	Data gathering: Interviews with Department Directors

June – September 2025	Data review
September – October 2025	Formulation of findings and recommendations
November 2025 – January 2026	Final report preparation

Even though the CERB's scope of review was limited to approximately 54 advisory BCCs, it became apparent that 12 months is a drastically insufficient amount of time for a volunteer body to complete all data collection, review, and report writing. On August 1, 2025, the CERB requested a six-month extension to the deadline to submit its final report to the County Council, which the President of the Council granted.

Acknowledgements

The work of this CERB and the resulting Final Report builds and expands on the tremendous work conducted by the Committee Review and Evaluation Board in 2012-2013. Its members and the County staff who supported them lay down the critical groundwork to establish the methodology of review and present recommendations so that the resulting changes to the system and individual BCCs could be observed over time.

The CERB would not have been able to accomplish their task without the thoughtful responses from all the BCCs that took time to review and complete the self-assessment questionnaires and welcomed CERB members at their meetings. The CERB also thanks the Department heads who participated in interviews. Finally, we are deeply grateful for the timely and comprehensive support of County staff Beth Gochrach, Eritrea Thomas, Nikki Smallwood, and Ken Hartman-Espada.

2. Methodology

The CERB embarked on its dual mandate to evaluate the group system overall and each advisory board, committee, or commission individually by establishing a grounding framework.

Approach

The CERB review seeks to determine whether the advisory BCCs understand and dutifully implement their mandates, and whether they do so effectively and with the most efficient use of County resources. Specifically, the CERB pursued three main lines of inquiry:

- 1) **Purpose and alignment.** Are BCCs acting in accordance with their chartered purpose? Is their work aligned with the stated objectives of the BCC and the goals of the corresponding County Department? Is the purpose of the BCC relevant to and reflecting the needs of the county residents?
- 2) **Function and operations.** Are BCCs implementing the actions stated in their charters? Is their membership full and active? Are they carrying out their business with applicable regulations? Do they have sufficient staff support and access to other necessary County resources?
- 3) **Engagement and representation.** Do BCCs enjoy robust and active membership? Do members adequately represent the BCC's relevant stakeholder groups? Do BCCs regularly engage with county residents who are not members of these BCCs or offer opportunities for community participation?

Equitable Engagement

Equitable engagement was a particular focus of this CERB. The overarching policy premise for the establishment of various BCCs in Montgomery County is that “[p]ublic participation in boards, committees, and commissions contributes to the work of County government and provides a valuable service to the community by presenting the concerns and viewpoints of county residents on a variety of issues.”¹ Thus, the CERB worked with County Staff to develop evaluation questions that specifically gauge the BCCs’ ability to effectively channel the varied experiences and needs of the diverse Montgomery County community into the work of the County government in an equitable way. By conducting the review through the *equitable engagement* lens, the CERB attempts to assess how effective BCCs are in informing communities about issues of focus, facilitating open dialogue with government agencies, soliciting and channeling feedback from diverse members of the public, and championing initiatives that empower county residents to actively shape their communities.

Data Collection and Analysis

The CERB’s review and recommendations are based on the analysis of data collected using the following instruments:

- Review of BCC’s purpose and membership structure as codified in law
- Review of BCC’s website, meeting minutes and agendas
- 49 responses to the self-assessment questionnaire distributed to all BCCs (see template in Appendix C)
- 51 direct observations of the regularly scheduled BCC meetings (see assessment form in Appendix D)
- 7 interviews with the heads of relevant County departments (see interview guide in Appendix E)
- Review of the recommendations from the 2013 CERB Final Report
- Review of the findings and recommendations of the 2024 Office of the Legislative Oversight Contractor Report on Composition of Montgomery County Boards, Commissions, and Committees²

The CERB analyzed the data for individual board and for the BCC system as a whole, working with over 250 text documents. To aid in synthesizing data, identifying patterns, and singling out unique observations across the system, CERB members and County staff utilized AI assistance in accordance with County policy.

Limitations

The CERB is composed of volunteers with widely ranging professional backgrounds and lived experiences, who have come together for the sole purpose of serving on this board. Due to a lack of consistent evaluation framework, CERB members, with support from County staff, had to develop an approach and data gathering tools, and to systematize the resulting data in limited time. With these limitations in mind, CERB’s approach is primarily qualitative, and channels members’ points of view as county residents with diverse lived and professional experiences. The CERB

¹ <https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/boards/policy.html>

² https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/OLO/Resources/Files/2024_reports/OLOResport2024-7.pdf

acknowledges that there is a vast body of information about individual BCCs and the system as a whole that it did not have an opportunity to access or incorporate in this report.

3. Key Findings

It is evident that Montgomery County provides a vast range of opportunities for community input and feedback on government services and critical issues through its system of advisory boards, committees, and commissions. Overall, the CERB observed that members of BCCs are committed to the mandates of their groups, stay engaged, and contribute diverse and relevant professional and lived experiences to their work.

However, the CERB has identified weaknesses that undermine the BCC system's effectiveness and ability to equitably engage residents in advancing the County's program and policy priorities.

Governance and Oversight

1) *Lack of clarity about oversight, reporting, and accountability lines*

CERB members were not able to observe a distinct pattern as to which branch of County government ultimately oversees the BCC system. Some BCCs are required to submit annual reports to the County Council. Others are required to provide advice on Departments' programs and priorities. Several BCCs have overt mandates to conduct advocacy at state and federal levels and to fundraise. However, the County law and publicly facing communication materials fail to explain clearly whether it is the County Council, which legislates BCCs, or the County Executive, whose Department heads are supposed to work with BCCs, that ultimately oversees the system as a whole.

Correspondingly to the unclear oversight, the lines of accountability for BCCs are also unclear. With the number of BCCs assigned to Departments, the CERB discovered some Department heads were unaware that they had oversight of new boards. Furthermore, the requirement of BCCs to provide annual reports to the County Council (while working in support of a County Department) further blurs reporting lines and exposes BCCs to political vulnerability.

2) *Variability and confusion in the design and purpose of BCCs over time*

The BCC system has evolved over the years, with some boards established decades ago (e.g., Agricultural Advisory Committee, 1976) and others just having their inaugural meetings in 2025 (Community Reinvestment and Repair Fund Commission). The CERB observed significant variation in how purposes and membership requirements are formulated in the law, ranging from vague and open to interpretation (Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities Commission, Committee Against Hate/Violence) to overly prescriptive and thus limiting (Animal Services Advisory Committee). Some BCCs are tasked with advocacy activities; most others are explicitly prohibited from them; some are codified to submit an annual report to the County Executive and County Council, the majority of others are required to generate an annual report by default; one BCC is even endowed with the task to raise funds. This variability and the resulting confusion make the task of evaluating the system and holding it to some uniform standard difficult. (Also see Impact Evaluation, below.)

3) *Legislation governing BCCs is outdated, inconsistent, and confusing*

Laws governing BCCs have evolved piecemeal without alignment across decades, and there appears to be no standard template or approach to establishing a new BCC. There is no guiding policy establishing a definitive strategic framework for types of BCC purposes, functions, membership, and other factors, with relation to the assessment of needs of specific Departments.

Overall, the governing laws call for a combination of voting and non-voting (often *ex officio*) members, members of the public and County representatives, community partners, and external entities (such as representatives from the State of Maryland). Laws are inconsistent in defining various aspects of BCC's structure and functions: some require the County Executive to appoint the chair and/or officers, others do not. The roles and numbers of *ex-officio* members vary drastically; whether department representatives are term members or substitutable delegates is often unclear. Some BCCs have bylaws, despite the opposite advice from the County Attorney's Office. It is unclear why some BCCs are required to submit annual reports (with legally prescribed contents) to the County Council; for those who are, the process is not defined, and the role of the County Executive's Office or Department heads in reviewing those reports is not clear.

System Structure and Authority

1) *Complex regional structure, duplicative advisory bodies and purposes are confusing*

The BCC structure has become complicated and proliferated by attempts to align various BCCs with the political and economic subdivisions of Montgomery County. The County Government has many departments, each with county-wide responsibility. In order to manage support more locally, the County has partitioned the County into five Regional Services Centers (RSCs). The RSCs were established between 1974 and 1985, reflecting the socio-demographic composition of the County. These five centers are administrative only and do not correspond to legislative districts nor do they supersede the rights of the various municipalities in the County.

Montgomery County is also partitioned into municipalities, transportation management districts, and communities/business areas. The County has 19 official municipalities which have their own representative government and ordinances. There are also five County-created urban districts and/or corporations (UD/UC) that are self-funded for specific functions. In addition, there are many community/business associations (including Home-Owner Associations and civic associations) in the unincorporated areas that rely on the County for both representative government and services.

Over the years, legislators created BCCs to address county-wide departmental functions (and sub-functions) and for each of the RSCs to ensure resident input. However, their naming convention, geographic coverage, and alignment with other economic and political subdivisions of the County is no longer logical. For example, the Bethesda-Chevy Chase RSC is supported by the Western Montgomery County Citizens Advisory Board (WMCCAB), whose membership requirements specify representation from the City of Rockville. At the same time, the WMCCAB covers the area represented, partially, by Councilmembers from Districts 1, 3, 4, 6, and At-Large.

With just a few BCCs sunsetting over the years, political and pragmatic priorities dictated the establishment of new BCCs over time without any apparent regard for how the new bodies fit

into the increasingly opaque system of geographic, economic, transportation, and other special-function bodies. The result is a system devoid of logic or thematic alignment that is incongruent not just to residents, but also to County staff and County Councilmembers.

[Case in Point: Silver Spring] If a resident of Silver Spring wanted to bring up the issue of declining air quality due to the increasing traffic congestion in their neighborhood to the attention of an advisory board, they would need to invest time, intellectual effort, and emotional labor to figure out which BCC to engage with: Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board; Silver Spring Transportation Management District Advisory Committee; Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee; Climate, Energy, and Air Quality Advisory Committee; Commission on Health; or, perhaps, Racial Equity and Social Justice Advisory Committee?

2) Unclear mandates lead to mission creep

In a number of instances, CERB members noted that a broadly defined BCC purpose and an apparent lack of strategic planning have resulted in the BCC undertaking tasks and thematic priorities outside of general mandate of advisory groups and not aligned with Department goals. For example, the CERB observed several BCCs pursuing a heavily advocacy-focused agenda as if they were a standalone organization, resulting in external messaging that may conflict with the County's posture or raising concerns about possible conflict of interest for entities represented on those BCCs (e.g., Animal Services Advisory Committee, Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities Commission, Mental Health Advisory Committee).

3) BCCs' added value is not clear to most Departments

The CERB observed that most Departments' leadership, with some exceptions, do not perceive BCCs as partners in the advancement of strategic priorities, but rather another workstream that they need to manage. The great variation in the number of members, the often-overwhelming ratio of officials to members of the public, and the absence of standardized succession planning undermines the ability of advisory BCCs to consistently articulate recommendations rooted in community input and ensure smooth transitions in BCC leadership without disruption of the ongoing work with Department heads.

4) Unclear what impact BCCs have on policy and decisions

While some BCCs have the charge to "advise the County government on all aspects of... finances" and "review the budget" related to their specific area of work, the CERB was not able to verify that these BCCs review Departments' budgets as part of the annual budgeting process. Yet, the CERB did observe some BCCs working on specific program funding requests to Department heads in the FY2025 budget season. Moreover, the CERB noted the hesitancy of BCC members to engage on specific issues or recommendations in what appears to be a perceived lack of authority or clarity about their role.

Staffing and Internal Information Flow

1) Inadequate staffing for the system as a whole and individual BCCs hampers effectiveness

The BCC system is currently coordinated out of the County Executive's Office, with 1.5 full-time equivalents (FTEs) dedicated to member recruitment, onboarding, procedural training, and bimonthly information exchanges among BCC staff. This level of staffing has remained consistent since 2010, when it was reduced from a previous benchmark by 40%. Despite the

previous CERB notation that this reduction in staffing and the corresponding increase in responsibilities on the remaining staff had significantly undermined the success of the BCC system, not much has changed since. County BCCs still struggle with recruiting members, communicating successes and the benefits of engagement to county residents, channeling communities' input, and thus contributing to the public trust in the County government.

The proliferation of BCCs appears to have further exacerbated these difficulties, as cited more than a decade ago, the BCCs continue to be assigned to different Departments, with unequal access to staffing support. For example, the Department of Health and Human Services has 20 individual BCCs (advisory and others) assigned to it with corresponding staff liaisons to support their work (not including the Department's three health initiative programs and their respective boards). Similarly, the Department of Environmental Protection has six advisory and non-advisory BCCs with corresponding staff to liaise. At the same time, the Victim Services Advisory Board enjoys two full-time staff. The County staff who do support specific BCCs find themselves in constant challenging positions where they must support the needs of multiple BCCs that may be inconsistent with the priorities of their department leadership.

The CERB is concerned with a lack of a uniform and evidence-based approach to managing the BCC system. The current level of dedicated staffing at the County Executive's Office is clearly insufficient to lead the strategic planning, coordination, oversight, and ongoing evaluation of BCCs, and to serve as a centralized resource hub for County Departments on the best practices in leveraging BCCs for the achievement of their strategic priorities.

2) *Limited training for BCC members or staff*

When new members join BCCs, they go through training mandated by County and state law, organized by the County Executive's Office. The Executive's Office staff have compiled a BCC Manual, currently under review by the County Attorney's Office, which serves to instruct BCC membership and staff on applicable rules and regulations. However, these materials and onboarding trainings are procedural in nature. The CERB noted that there is currently no effort in place that would provide comprehensive, systematic, and recurring opportunity for county residents serving on BCCs to understand how their board fits in the overall County governance structure, how the BCC functions as a system and how different BCCs should interact with each other, what authorities they have, how they can innovate, when and how they can engage various County departments and County Council, and what the expectations and tools are at their disposal to channel input from their fellow residents.

As Montgomery County struggles to recruit new BCC members, those who do get appointed come on board with various preconceived notions (or lack thereof) of what BCCs are and why they exist. The limited understanding of the true value the BCC can bring can serve as a powerful demotivator from continued engagement, exacerbating member retention issues. At a time when professional associations, research institutions, and government organizations nationwide innovate and experiment with new tools to stimulate public engagement and build trust, the CERB observes that Montgomery County is not integrating them into training and experience sharing opportunities for staff and BCC members.

3) Communication between BCCs, Departments, and the County Council is inconsistent

Some BCCs have established strong mutual connections and coordination on complementary issues (e.g., the Climate, Energy, and Air Quality Advisory Committee and the Racial Equity and Social Justice Advisory Committee). However, this collaboration is not consistent across all BCCs, and even when members of one BCC are supposed to also contribute to others, ineffective. The CERB noted multiple instances of thematic or geographic overlap in issues, where proactive coordination among BCCs would have been beneficial (e.g., infrastructure recommendations from the Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Traffic Safety Advisory Committee could be coordinated with the Commission on People with Disabilities).

Example of Excellence: Victim Services Advisory Board This board enjoys strong and productive relationships with County Departments, County Councilmembers, other BCCs, community organizations and beyond. The board regularly liaises with DHHS's Trauma Services Division; takes part in Policy Department's focus group meetings; attends meetings of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission; meets with elected County and State officials; and provides testimony in County and State legislative hearings.

Sec. 2-147 of the Montgomery County Code requires all BCCs to submit annual reports to the County Executive and County Council, however, their submission is not tracked and appears inconsistent. It is unclear how the County Council engages with the BCC reports that do get submitted and if they are truly necessary. Some BCCs enjoy regular participation from Councilmembers or their staff. Yet several boards have noted that they have struggled to gain attention from Councilmembers on important issues despite repeated invitations or other communication (e.g., Dickerson Area Facilities Implementation Group). It is unclear how the Council decides which BCC meetings to attend and which issues and recommendations to engage on. The lack of formal feedback loops between BCCs, Departments, and Council raises further questions about the role of advisory BCCs in the County's governance.

4) Minimal use of data and evidence limits ability to produce meaningful recommendations

Most BCCs do not possess the required expertise or staff support to use data available through the County to inform their discussions and formulate data-driven recommendations. In several instances, BCCs noted a lack of access to Department-specific data, but it was unclear whether the necessary data was not collected, not shared, or whether the BCC did not feel empowered to even request it.

Membership and Participation

The significant issue of BCC membership and participation is critical to the success of the BCC process. There is universal agreement that Montgomery County has a wealth of talent from its residents' professional and lived experiences and many of these individuals are very willing to serve the County in the voluntary capacity of a BCC. There are, however, many additional county residents who may also be willing to participate in local government service, but they are likely unaware of the BCC process.

1) Overly large BCCs struggle with chronic vacancies and low attendance

The CERB commends the efforts of the County Executive's office to more aggressively advertise BCC vacancies through County mailing lists, announcements on the County website, notices in

the County Executive's weekly bulletin, and the regular updates from County Councilmembers to their constituents. Yet, based on direct observation, interviews with Department heads and BCCs' self-assessment questionnaires, the CERB noted that recruitment and attendance challenges are persistent in the BCC system.

Keeping up with recruitment is a daunting task in a system with over 1300 total positions and over 180 vacancies. The CERB observed that many County BCCs have unnecessarily large membership numbers mandated by law, some of them exceeding 25 (e.g., Commission on Children and Youth, Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission, Human Trafficking Prevention Committee, Commission on Juvenile Justice). In some cases, only the minimum number of members is specified (Commission on Aging). These membership requirements are inconsistent with the evidence that suggests boards larger than 20 persons are difficult to facilitate.³

Example of Excellence: Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board This board consists of five members—three farmers and two non-farmers. It is a small, but very hard-working board. Their monthly meetings last two hours with productive and well-informed discussion among the members, involving analysis of legislation and dealing with “real community issues” with many county citizens attending and making presentations.

2) Legally mandated membership composition creates structural imbalance

Because the work of the BCCs is varied, some BCCs benefit more from subject matter expertise on the board while others find a broader resident representation with diverse backgrounds to be more beneficial. Some BCCs' composition is stipulated by the governing laws too prescriptively, for example, by mentioning specific professions or even named organizations. In addition to unwieldy size, this can result in non-representative boards. The CERB noted that the requirement of specific professional expertise on some BCCs created tension with the County's stated goals of diversity and inclusion. It results in hard-to-fill vacancies or discussions that either skew towards technical detail with little consideration of affected stakeholder experience, or, conversely, are driven by emotional contributions from residents who lack professional background to produce specific recommendations. The governing laws are inconsistent in the language stipulating member composition, and, when aiming to achieve diversity, do not specify the order of priorities in the selection criteria.

The CERB observed that overall, BCCs continue to lack diversity in membership, with youth and ethnic communities under-represented; women and older individuals continue to make up the majority of BCC members.⁴ Geographic representation overall is consistent with findings of the Office of Legislative Oversight report 2014-7, “Contractor Report on Composition of Montgomery county Boards, Commissions, and Committees.” The CERB noted strong participation of residents and businesses from Bethesda, Silver Spring, Rockville and Potomac on both county-wide and geographically focused boards, while membership (as a percentage of population), is lower in Upcounty and East County zip codes.

³ <https://www.epa.gov/international-cooperation/public-participation-guide-citizen-advisory-boards>

⁴ This finding is consistent with the 2024 OLO Report.

3) Barriers to member participation persist

Since the advent of Covid-19, with government and business implementing virtual and hybrid work options, BCCs have adopted options for remote participation by providing videoconferencing links to the public. This step has made it possible for county residents to join meetings, helping to address transportation as one of the barriers to participation. However, in hybrid instances, the CERB observed the video connection was not always high quality, limiting the ability of attendees to view or hear the proceedings of a meeting. Some BCCs have implemented in-person only meetings as well, meeting either in a set location or around the County.

Example of Excellence: Montgomery Sports Advisory Committee (MCSPAC) and East County Citizens Advisory Board (ECCAB) With transportation sometimes an issue, these BCCs take into account the geographic diversity of their membership and their scopes of work. MCSAC holds its meetings in-person each month in a different County Recreation Center location. Similarly, ECCAB alternates its meetings between the RSC and various community locations. This enables greater attendance of both the BCC members and other county residents, allowing them to engage in discussions involving programs for their geographic area.

The County does offer a reimbursement for BCC members to cover transportation and dependent care for regularly scheduled BCC and subcommittee meetings to enable county residents to volunteer. However, CERB members noted that, at \$30 per meeting, the dependent care reimbursement does not match market rates and thus likely is not an effective incentive.

Advisory BCCs do not provide stipends or other remunerative incentives to its members, despite often extremely demanding scopes of work, such as the production of an annual report. The Racial Equity and Social Justice Advisory Committee is a notable exception; however, it was not immediately clear to the CERB what set it apart, considering it has membership requirements similar to many other BCCs in the County.

Public Engagement and Visibility

1) Outdated websites with inconsistent information

Before attending each BCC's meetings, CERB members tried to find as much information about their work ahead of time, with the objective of understanding how easy it is for an ordinary resident to find information about BCCs and figure out which one would be relevant to their issue. The CERB's experience was generally straightforward, but the members noted that it takes multiple steps on the County's website to figure out where the information is. Moreover, many BCCs have duplicate websites with conflicting information, and it is not clear which one is primary; older websites also show up higher in search engine results, exacerbating user confusion. Some BCC websites are not updated, with agendas, minutes, and meeting information missing. In several instances, multiple videoconferencing links were provided on different pages, further complicating the user experience. These systemic obstacles cause frustration and discourage participation from the public.

Example of Excellence: Advisory Committee on Consumer Protection The website of this committee is well organized and navigable, with highlights from its past activities and links to most recent annual reports. However, it could be further

strengthened with announcements and links to information about in-person and virtual educational training programs held in libraries and senior centers across the county, which bring the committee's activities close to residents who may be particularly vulnerable to scams. It could also articulate the connection of the committee to the Montgomery County Office of Consumer Protection's (OCA) Podcast, "Consumer Connection" which is available through the OCA website, on YouTube, and on major podcast platforms.

2) *Lacking proactive public engagement strategies*

Most BCCs identified public outreach and engagement as a continuing challenge in their self-assessment. Often, this limitation was explained by a lack of staff time and training; outreach capacities vary widely across departments. There appears no centralized guidance or involvement from the Public Information Office to assist BCCs. Most BCC meetings that CERB members attended did not include representatives from the public. With the exception of several BCCs whose members set up tables at public events, the CERB did not observe a consistent effort on behalf of the County to deliberately position the BCC system as a desirable and effective way to contribute diverse inputs into County activities and policy. It is not clear to the CERB how residents are supposed to be excited to volunteer on BCCs or participate in meetings if they do not know that BCCs exist and what their value is.

Example of Excellence: Dickerson Area Facilities Implementation Group

(DAFIG) As the work of the Dickerson area solid waste management facilities has a direct and potentially serious impact on the health of nearby communities, DAFIG has established a robust system for notifying residents about incidents and for collecting resident concerns to present to the County. Each member of DAFIG reports back about the work of the Group to their community and solicits feedback. Members of the public know about DAFIG and attend its meetings.

In several personal observations, CERB members noted that they do not receive any information about the work of BCCs that supposedly cover their geographic areas or issues of concern. For example, CERB members noted that they do not receive information about the work of regional citizens advisory boards. With the exception of updates from some Councilmembers and the County Executive's newsletter (for which an individual still needs to subscribe), information about BCC work did not trickle down otherwise. The CERB had no opportunity to conduct a public survey to collect comprehensive data on community perceptions about the BCC system and its value.

Example of Excellence: Commission for Women This Commission hosts the annual Women's Legislative Briefing, demonstrating leadership in bringing together women from throughout the county to learn, advocate and connect around policy priorities shaping their lives and their future. In its 46th year, the Women's Legislative Briefing is the longest-standing women's legislative event in the state of Maryland. Attendees can participate in sessions on issues such as economic justice and equality, human trafficking prevention, reproductive health and rights, and sexual assault and domestic violence prevention, with policy makers, advocates, and emerging leaders. This is a wonderful example of how a BCC is going the "extra mile" to empower, engage and mobilize county residents around issues affecting them.

Impact Evaluation

1) No strategy and evaluation framework for the BCC system

When the CERB members began assessing the scope of their assignment, they noted the absence of an evaluation framework for the BCC system. While the governing laws mention several data points that the CERB should consider, such as “a list of accomplishments,” or “an explanation of government resources... used,” there is no universal approach to regularly monitor the performance and impact of BCCs through data collection and analysis of clearly defined indicators. It was challenging for this CERB to determine up front what data it would need and would have time to analyze. In the absence of a results framework that would be tied to a County-wide strategic plan, decennial evaluations of the BCC system will be biased by the specific CERB members’ experiences and backgrounds, provide only a snapshot in time, and will not allow to effectively track how well the County government adapts the BCC system and its use of resources to the rapidly changing socio-economic profile of the county.

2) Few BCCs have a strategic plan tied to their Departments’ goals

Similarly, when examining individual BCCs, the CERB observed that each board, committee and commission has their own definition of success, which are not consistent across the board or tied to a broader objective shared across the system. Most BCCs also do not have a strategic plan or a component thereof developed jointly with the Department leadership. In the context of vaguely defined or overly ambitious mandates, strategic plans can help narrow down priorities and empower BCC members with a sense of purpose. Without a focused strategy and related performance benchmarks, most BCCs appear to not use data to track their impact, while the corresponding Department heads struggle to clearly articulate the added value of BCCs in their work. What is more concerning, BCCs miss the opportunity to communicate their impact to county residents, further distancing themselves from ordinary people and perpetuating challenges with recruitment.

4. Recommendations

Recommendations for the System as a Whole

1) Streamline governance and clarify oversight roles.

The County Council should:

- Determine which BCCs need to exist in perpetuity, and which ones should be converted to project-specific task forces with clearly defined timelines and engagement tasks.
- Empower the County Executive to create time-bound, project-specific task forces comprised of county residents. Such task forces should be managed at the discretion of the County Executive, not considered part of the BCC system, and sunset when the related project is completed, without the need for additional legislative action.
- Conduct a comprehensive revision of the legislation governing BCCs and amend it to ensure clear communication of purpose, authorities, and membership requirements, using a uniform and consistent language template.
- Frequently and proactively publicize the BCCs to its constituents; review agenda, minutes, and outputs of the BCCs; attend or send representatives to meetings as appropriate;

- discuss any concerns relevant to the BCC with the BCC chair and/or the overseeing Department.
- Work with the County Executive to clarify and consistently communicate to the BCCs the mechanisms of engagement on their recommendations and reports.

The County Executive should:

- Consistently communicate to all relevant stakeholders that the role of advisory BCCs is to primarily support County functions by advising specific departments. Task the relevant department heads to work with the County Executive and Council to revise membership numbers and criteria, including expertise, geography, and stakeholder distribution, for their assigned BCCs. The establishment and refreshment of membership criteria may require periodic legislative action.
- Enable department head to oversee, manage, support, and facilitate the BCCs under their purview, and to recommend the necessary changes to the BCC's statutory purpose based on the evolving priorities of the department. The department should provide functional expertise, external coordination, and day to day administrative support to the relevant BCCs. The department head should be responsible for ensuring appropriate financial controls over funds associated with the BCC or its functions. All recommendations (especially on budget) should be coordinated through the overseeing department before release. The department should be responsible for ensuring that any required reviews and/or approvals (County, State, National) are obtained.

2) Reduce system complexity and articulate BCC authority.

The County Council and Executive should work collaboratively to:

- Adopt a standardized classification of County's boards, committees, and commissions, such as the one proposed in this report.
- Update and simplify the current regional BCC structure to facilitate a closer connection of government to residents:
 - align the structure and geographic representation of RSCs to the current demographic and economic composition of the County;
 - rename the RSCs to reflect their present-day alignment;
 - group and rename advisory BCCs that serve the same areas as RSC to be consistent with the RSC nomenclature;
 - fold issues specific to a geographic area under the purview of those regional BCCs.
- Ensure that regionally aligned BCCs are empowered and have proper tools to communicate with the relevant County departments, municipalities, urban districts, community associations, businesses, and other stakeholders in their coverage area.
- Establish clear mechanisms for action on recommendations from advisory bodies (e.g., mandatory department review or Council hearing), especially on urgent or long-ignored issues.
- Create clear guardrails for BCC decision-making and procedures for escalating issues raised by residents and closing the feedback loop.

3) Strengthen the capacity of staff and BCC members to work collaboratively and efficiently, and deliver results.

The County Council and Executive should work collaboratively to:

- Increase full-time staffing in the County Executive's Office to support the BCCs as a system. Designate a dedicated, manager-level staff member empowered to lead centralized management, oversight, coordination, training, and performance evaluation of the BCC system, as well as provide and procedural support to Department liaisons.
- This centralized unit should provide guidance on strategic planning, alignment with County and Department goals, performance and impact assessments, and addressing management challenges. The information management should include guidance on and management of agenda, minutes, documents, website content, external communications, and annual reports across the BCC system. The central staff should continue member recruitment, vetting, training, and on-going support, and also incorporate succession planning into their services to ensure continuity and reduce friction between new BCC leadership and Department heads during transition.
- Establish a County Board Academy that provides mandatory, comprehensive, recurring training to all BCC members and staff about the County government, decision-making processes and authorities, the role of BCCs and their impact, and coordination with other civic bodies. Ideally, the Academy should be open to all county residents interested in this form of participation. The Academy should fully prepare county residents to serve on BCCs and go beyond the procedural training and support on the Maryland Open Meetings Act, County Ethics Law, Robert's Rules of Order, and the appropriate use of information management tools.
- Review BCC staff support levels at individual Departments and increase support where necessary consistently across all BCCs.
- Provide Department heads and staff liaisons with rigorous and continuing training on BCC management for impact, including on strategic planning, collective innovation, and civic engagement techniques.
- Ensure consistent sharing of relevant County-owned data with BCCs proactively and upon request.

4) Engage energized, motivated, and informed members, ensure their voices are heard, and reward their participation.

The County Council and Executive should work collaboratively to:

- Seek to reduce and standardize the number of BCC members to 10-15 per advisory body to ensure everyone's voice is heard and members feel encouraged, appreciated, and responsible for contributing to their group. Reduce the number of nonvoting members to the absolute minimum necessary to support a balanced and well-informed discussion.
- Qualitatively refocus recruitment efforts by establishing consistent communication with existing talent pools of active county residents, through civic associations, neighborhood alliances, PTSAs, houses of worship, social service organizations, trusted community leaders and grassroots activism groups, Montgomery College, Universities at Shady Grove, popular local media, and various community chats on social media.
- Whenever a combination of specific socio-demographic characteristics and professional expertise or lived experiences is required by BCC membership criteria, conduct targeted

recruitment with the help of community organizations and/or business allies. For BCCs in which businesses are represented, seek worker representation (e.g., union member participation) when possible.

- For BCCs that continuously experience difficulty recruiting the right combination of lived experience and professional expertise as required, consider decoupling members' required attributes from the issues they are supposed to advise on.
- Streamline the recruitment process by:
 - creating a single BCC application in which individuals could identify multiple advisory bodies of interests
 - reviewing applications on a rolling basis instead of group-specific deadlines
 - advertising the BCC application through existing County job recruitment platforms, such as Work4MCG, GovernmentJobs, and LinkedIn;
 - ensuring Councilmembers consistently publicize the BCC application through their constituent communication channels.
- Increase and periodically revise dependent care reimbursement rates for BCC members to meet market rates.
- Establish a robust system of incentives for participation in BCCs, focused on removing barriers for young adults and working parents and rewarding dedication. These may include:
 - monetary stipends for labor-intensive BCCs, e.g. ones that produce mandatory deliverables to the County Executive, County Council or Departments;
 - Student Service Learning (SSL) hours for high school students;
 - internship credit for college students or recent graduates;
 - discounts or free vouchers for County's Recreation Department activities and camps;
 - gift cards to local retail businesses.
- Annually poll BCC members about their experiences serving on boards, committees, and commissions. Leverage positive testimonials in recruitment and communication campaigns. Assess negative feedback and develop evidence-based corrective action, making sure to provide feedback to individual residents.
- Consider replacing the word "citizen" in the names of "citizen advisory boards" to "resident" or "civic," in order to reduce polarization in the public discourse and signal that the BCC experience is open to people of all backgrounds.

5) Ensure residents know about BCCs and their role in supporting County services and channeling public input.

The County Council and Executive should work collaboratively to:

- Consistently communicate to county residents how the BCCs fit into the broad structure of public engagement opportunities. This information could be included into County emails, direct mail, press releases, traditional and social media outreach, RideOn buses, public events, posters in County buildings, and other means. Ensure the outreach methods effectively reflect the County's changing demographics and information channel preferences.

- Conduct innovative awareness campaigns, in collaboration with local businesses and community groups, to more effectively reach underrepresented communities, highlighting the importance of civic participation and how one can serve their peers by being a BCC member.
- Dedicate Public Information Office (PIO) or County Executive Office resources to support BCC-specific outreach, including information campaigns, event advertising, participation opportunities, or celebration of BCC impact and achievements.
- Advertise the established mechanisms to share BCC updates with the public, delivering them to residents' inboxes; this can be as simple as upcoming meeting reminders and minutes of past meetings, or the more involved "key priorities" updates via email. Create an option for the public to sign up for specific BCC updates through eSubscription.
- Create a one-stop method for residents to channel their issues to a relevant BCC. Consider using an AI-powered chatbot, or form, as well as 311 integration, to help residents quickly figure out which BCC they should be engaging with based on their issue or interest.
- Share examples of excellence in public engagement and outreach through training and best practice exchange opportunities among BCCs; the proposed County Board Academy can be an outstanding platform for this type of learning.
- Conduct a comprehensive audit of BCC websites to remove duplicate pages, streamline navigation, and reduce the time it takes for an individual to find information they need. Focus website navigation on user experience. Ensure that all BCC websites are structured consistently and clearly show the dates, times and locations for upcoming meetings, modality (online or in-person), the meeting agenda, and a list of the current board members. Virtual meeting links should be always updated. Each BCC page should include a description of what the group does and past meeting agendas and meeting minutes, as well as annual reports.

6) Evaluate BCCs together with Departments as a standard and intentional practice.

The County Council and Executive should work collaboratively to:

- Implement a monitoring and evaluation framework for the BCC system tied to the County's Strategic Plan to ensure comparable results and progress tracking over time.
- Establish a standardized process for strategic planning and goal alignment between County Departments and their individual BCCs.
- Instead of a CERB review every 6 years as currently prescribed, consider implementing a system of continuous improvement with clear results and performance targets, informed by consistent data gathering and facilitated by central staff in the County Executive's Office.
- For a robust recurring assessment of the BCC system as a whole, consider procuring a professional evaluation.
- Conduct periodic surveys or focus groups among the public whose input is supposed to be channeled by specific BCCs, including individuals who attend BCC meetings, to gauge their experience and feedback on the work of the BCCs.

Recommendations for Individual BCCs

After a multifaceted review of each individual advisory BCC, the CERB organized its recommendations according to the following rubric:

- 1) **Continue – No Change.** BCCs function well and according to their purpose, with meaningful community participation. The CERB proposes no changes to their scope or functions.
- 2) **Continue – Recategorize to Another Tier.** After a careful review, the CERB determined that these BCCs are not advisory in nature and therefore should be recategorized under other Tiers (Coordinating Group, Regulatory Body, County Agency, or External). Since this CERB focused its review on advisory BCCs, no further recommendations are made.
- 3) **Continue – Modify.** These BCCs should continue but with specific modifications to their scope, structure, or function that could improve their performance and engagement with the community.
- 4) **Continue – Absorb Another BCC.** These BCCs have considerable overlap with other BCCs but are better functioning or broader in scope and could subsume the scope or functions of duplicative boards, committees, or commissions.
- 5) **Eliminate by Absorbing into Another BCC.** These BCCs overlap in scope or function with larger, better functioning BCCs, and are largely redundant, and therefore should be absorbed into another BCC.
- 6) **Eliminate Outright.** The CERB finds that these BCCs are either obsolete or have a history of consistently failing to perform its functions and therefore should be abolished entirely.

Out of **54** BCCs reviewed, the CERB recommends that **13** BCCs continue without any changes; **24** continue with some changes; and **11** be eliminated. Six bodies initially considered advisory were determined by the CERB otherwise and recommended for reclassification to other Tiers.

The summary of determinations is presented below. The overview of each BCC, the CERB's most notable findings, and specific recommendations are provided in Appendix B.

No.	BCC Name	CERB Determination
1	Aging, Commission on	Continue - Modify
2	Agricultural Advisory Committee	Continue - Modify
3	Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board	Continue - No Change
4	Airpark Community Advisory Committee	Continue - Modify
5	Animal Services Advisory Committee	Continue - Modify
6	Charter Review Commission	Continue - Re-Categorize
7	Child Care, Commission on	Continue - Modify
8	Children and Youth, Commission on	Continue - Modify
9	Climate, Energy, and Air Quality Advisory Committee	Continue - No Change
10	Committee Evaluation Review Board	Continue - Modify
11	Community Development Advisory Committee	Continue - Re-Categorize
12	Community Reinvestment and Repair Fund Commission	Continue - No Change

13	Consumer Protection, Advisory Committee on	Continue - No Change
14	County-Wide Recreation and Parks Advisory Board	Continue - Modify
15	Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission	Continue - Absorb
16	Dickerson Area Facilities Implementation Group	Continue - Modify
17	Domestic Violence Coordinating Council	Eliminate - Absorb
18	East County Citizens Advisory Board	Continue - Modify
19	Fire and Emergency Services Commission	Continue - Modify
20	Firearm Safety Commission	Continue - Re-Categorize
21	Friendship Heights TMD Advisory Committee	Eliminate - Absorb
22	Friendship Heights Urban District Advisory Committee	Continue - Absorb
23	Greater Shady Grove TMD Advisory Committee	Continue - Modify
24	Hate/Violence Committee	Continue - Modify
25	Health, Commission on	Continue - Modify
26	Homelessness, Interagency Commission on	Continue - Re-Categorize
27	Human Trafficking Prevention Committee	Eliminate - Absorb
28	Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities Commission	Continue - Modify
29	Juvenile Justice, Commission on	Eliminate - Absorb
30	Library Board	Continue - Modify
31	Mental Health Advisory Committee	Continue - Modify
32	Mid-County Citizens Advisory Board	Continue - Absorb
33	Montgomery Cares Program, Advisory Board for	Continue - No Change
34	Pedestrian, Bicycle and Traffic Safety Advisory Committee	Eliminate
35	People with Disabilities, Commission on	Continue - No Change
36	Permitting Services Advisory Commission, Department of	Continue - Modify
37	Policing, Advisory Commission on	Continue - No Change
38	Public Election Fund Committee	Eliminate
39	Racial Equity and Social Justice Advisory Committee	Continue - No Change
40	Rustic Roads Advisory Committee	Continue - No Change
41	Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board	Continue - Absorb
42	Silver Spring TMD Advisory Committee	Eliminate - Absorb
43	Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee	Eliminate - Absorb
44	Solid Waste Advisory Committee	Continue - No Change
45	Sports Advisory Committee, Montgomery County	Continue - No Change
46	Taxicab Services Advisory Committee	Eliminate
47	UpCounty Citizens Advisory Board	Continue - No Change
48	Veterans Affairs, Commission on	Continue - Modify
49	Victim Services Advisory Board	Continue - No Change
50	Water Quality Advisory Group	Continue - Re-Categorize
51	Western Montgomery County Citizens Advisory Board	Continue - Modify

52	Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee	Eliminate - Absorb
53	White Flint Downtown Advisory Committee	Eliminate
54	Women, Commission for	Continue - Re-Categorize

5. Suggested Additional Research

In the course of its work, CERB members encountered serious limitations to their ability to holistically review the BCC system, because it was missing a range of qualitative data from the members of BCCs and the general public. In order to develop tailored, actionable recommendations for improving the BCC system, the CERB suggests that the County:

- Conduct additional research among county residents to better understand **cultural, psychological, and systemic barriers** to their participation in BCCs and other public engagement opportunities beyond the well-known factors of time, transportation, and dependent care needs.
- Regularly gauge the **perceptions of county residents about their role in County governance**, the effectiveness of County's public engagement opportunities, the visibility of BCCs, and the residents' understanding of their purpose.
- Carry out a comprehensive evaluation of the County's **entire portfolio of public engagement opportunities, tools, and methods**, alongside its public communication practices, to better understand where the BCC system fits and what specific value it brings to residents and to the County government.
- Consistently explore and implement **innovative practices and evidence-based recommendations** from professional associations, trailblazing local governments, universities, philanthropies, and research institutions that focus on strengthening public engagement, including through innovation around formal methods like boards and commissions.

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

Acronym/Abbreviation	Full Term
BCC	Board, Committee, or Commission
CAB	Citizens Advisory Board
CE	County Executive
CEO	County Executive's Office
CERB	Committee Evaluation and Review Board
DAFIG	Dickerson Area Facilities Implementation Group
ECCAB	East County Citizens Advisory Board
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
FY	Fiscal Year
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
MCSAC	Montgomery County Sports Advisory Committee
MCC	Montgomery County Code
OCA	Office of Consumer Affairs
OLO	Office of Legislative Oversight
PIO	Public Information Office
PTSA	Parent Teacher Student Association
RSC	Regional Service Center
Sec.	Section
SSL	Student Service Learning
TBD	To Be Determined
TMD	Transportation Management District
UD/UC	Urban District/Urban Corporation
WMCCAB	Western Montgomery County Citizens Advisory Board

Appendix A. List of BCCs and Their Classifications

No.	Acronym	Board Name (Substantive)	Initial Tier Determination	Recommended Tier Determination
1	COA	Aging, Commission on	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
2	AAC	Agricultural Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
3	APAB	Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
4	ACAC	Airpark Community Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
5	ASAC	Animal Services Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
6	CRC	Charter Review Commission	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 3 - Regulatory body
7	COCC	Child Care, Commission on	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
8	CCY	Children and Youth, Commission on	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
9	CEAQAC	Climate, Energy, and Air Quality Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
10	CERB	Committee Evaluation Review Board	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
11	CERFPEF	Committee to Recommend Funding for the Public Election Fund	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
12	CDAC	Community Development Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 3 - Regulatory body
13	CRRFC	Community Reinvestment and Repair Fund Commission	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
14	ACCP	Consumer Protection, Advisory Committee on	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
15	CWRAB	County-Wide Recreation and Parks Advisory Board	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
16	CJCC	Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
17	DAFIG	Dickerson Area Facilities Implementation Group	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
18	DVCC	Domestic Violence Coordinating Council	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
19	ECCAB	East County Citizens Advisory Board	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
20	FESC	Fire and Emergency Services Commission	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
21	FSC	Firearm Safety Commission	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 3 - Regulatory body
22	FHTDMAC	Friendship Heights TMD Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
23	FHUDAC	Friendship Heights Urban District Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
24	GSG TMD	Greater Shady Grove TMD Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
25	COHV	Hate/Violence Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
26	COH	Health, Commission on	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
27	ICH	Homelessness, Interagency Commission on	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 2 - Coordinating group
28	HTPC	Human Trafficking Prevention Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
29	IDDC	Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities Commission	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board

30	CJJ	Juvenile Justice, Commission on	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
31	LB	Library Board	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
32	MHAC	Mental Health Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
33	MCCAB	Mid-County Citizens Advisory Board	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
34	ABMCP	Montgomery Cares Program, Advisory Board for	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
35	PBTSAC	Pedestrian, Bicycle and Traffic Safety Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
36	CPWD	People with Disabilities, Commission on	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
37	DPSAC	Permitting Services Advisory Commission, Department of	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
38	ACP	Policing, Advisory Commission on	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
39	RESJAC	Racial Equity and Social Justice Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
40	RRAC	Rustic Roads Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
41	SSCAB	Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
42	SSTMDAC	Silver Spring TMD Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
43	SSUDAC	Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
44	SWAC	Solid Waste Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
45	MCSAC	Sports Advisory Committee, Montgomery County	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
46	TSAC	Taxicab Services Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
47	UCAB	UpCounty Citizens Advisory Board	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
48	CVA	Veterans Affairs, Commission on	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
49	VSAB	Victim Services Advisory Board	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
50	WQAG	Water Quality Advisory Group	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 3 - Regulatory body
51	WMCCAB	Western Montgomery County Citizens Advisory Board	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
52	WUDAC	Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
53	WFDAC	White Flint Downtown Advisory Committee	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 1 - Advisory board
54	CFW	Women, Commission for	Tier 1 - Advisory board	Tier 4 - County agency
55	AODAAC	Alcohol and Other Drug Addiction Advisory Council	Tier 2 - Coordinating group	Tier 2 - Coordinating group
56	ECCC	Early Childhood Coordinating Council	Tier 2 - Coordinating group	Tier 2 - Coordinating group
57	RRC	Remembrance and Reconciliation Commission	Tier 2 - Coordinating group	Tier 2 - Coordinating group
58	BPIB	Building Performance Improvement Board	Tier 2 - Coordinating group	Tier 2 - Coordinating group
59	AMHB	Animal Matters Hearing Board	Tier 3 - Regulatory body	Tier 3 - Regulatory body
60	COLOC	Common Ownership Communities, Commission on	Tier 3 - Regulatory body	Tier 3 - Regulatory body
61	HPC	Historic Preservation Commission	Tier 3 - Regulatory body	Tier 3 - Regulatory body
62	HRC	Human Rights Commission	Tier 3 - Regulatory body	Tier 3 - Regulatory body

63	CLTA	Landlord-Tenant Affairs, Commission on	Tier 3 - Regulatory body	Tier 3 - Regulatory body
64	BRFBC	Registration for Building Contractors, Board of	Tier 3 - Regulatory body	Tier 3 - Regulatory body
65	SRB	Sign Review Board	Tier 3 - Regulatory body	Tier 3 - Regulatory body
66	ICBFCUPF	Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Public Facilities	Tier 4 - County agency	Tier 4 - County agency
67	CR	Redistricting, Commission on	Tier 4 - County agency	Tier 4 - County agency
68	ACC	Administrative Charging Committee	Tier 4 - County agency	Tier 4 - County agency
69	BUP	Bethesda Urban Partnership, Inc. Board of Directors	Tier 4 - County agency	Tier 4 - County agency
70	CRHBT	Consolidated Retiree Health Benefits Trust Board of Trustees	Tier 4 - County agency	Tier 4 - County agency
71	ETHICS	Ethics Commission	Tier 4 - County agency	Tier 4 - County agency
72	BIT	Investment Trustees, Board of	Tier 4 - County agency	Tier 4 - County agency
73	MSPB	Merit System Protection Board *	Tier 4 - County agency	Tier 4 - County agency
74	PAB	Police Accountability Board	Tier 4 - County agency	Tier 4 - County agency
75	RA	Revenue Authority	Tier 4 - County agency	Tier 4 - County agency
76	MSCD	Soil Conservation District, Montgomery	Tier 4 - County agency	Tier 4 - County agency
77	MCTB	Trial Board, Montgomery County	Tier 4 - County agency	Tier 4 - County agency
78	CRPC	Citizens Review Panel for Children	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
79	CAB	Community Action Board	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
80	ECECE	Early Care and Education Coordinating Entity (Children's Opportunity Alliance)	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
81	MCEDC	Economic Development Committee, Montgomery County	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
82	LMBRFCYAF	Local Management Board for Children, Youth and Families	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
83	BSS	Social Services, Board of	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
84	MCP	Planning Board *	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
85	APGRB	Adult Public Guardianship Review Board	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
86	ABAB	Alcoholic Beverages Advisory Board	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
87	BOA	Appeals, Board of *	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
88	BECC	Board of Education Compensation Commission	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
89	DCWASA	D.C. Water and Sewer Authority Board of Directors	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
90	GEPPBOD	Glen Echo Park Partnership Board of Directors	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
91	HOC	Housing Opportunities Commission	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
92	BLC	License Commissioners, Board of *	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
93	NCBTMC	Nominating Committee for Board of Trustees of Montgomery College	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
94	PTAAB	Property Tax Assessment Appeals Board *	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
95	SHFBOD	Strathmore Hall Foundation Board of Directors	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
96	WSSC	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission *	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External

97	WSTC	Washington Suburban Transit Commission *	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External
98	WDB	Workforce Development Board	Tier 5 - External	Tier 5 - External

Appendix B. CERB Notes and Recommendations by Individual BCC

COMMISION ON AGING

Created: Montgomery County Code Section 27-35

Purpose: Be concerned with educational, health and welfare, employment, recreation and social issues, housing, legislation and other programs and projects that relate to the aging; advocate for local, state and federal programs or services that can benefit the elderly.

Membership: No less than 18. **Members must be county residents;** a majority shall be senior citizens. Membership shall include individuals who are or who have been active in business, industry, labor, community service, religion, welfare, and/or education, the professions and representatives of major organizations or agencies significantly concerned with the problems of aging.

Terms: Three year terms no compensation. Members must not serve more than two consecutive terms-.

Meetings: Fourth Thursday of each month.

Staff: Peter Illig, Community Outreach Manager
Area Agency on Aging, DHHS/Aging
&Disability Services 401 Hungerford
Drive; 4th Floor 240-777-1354

2013 Comment:	<p>The commission can increase its effectiveness by adding permanent representatives from the Mental Health Advisory Committee and the Commission on Veterans Affairs. The interaction between these three groups could be very helpful.</p> <p>What is age for "senior citizens"? 60? 65? Membership is listed as "No less than 18". What is the maximum? 19? 25?</p>
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this BCC continue, but with modifications to its membership. CERB strongly suggests that a representative be added from the Mental Health Advisory Committee and the Commission on Veterans Affairs.
2025 Comment:	The Commission is highly active and effective, with multiple subcommittees and a strong chair. Members noted that it is "tackling real problems" and that its meetings are well-attended and productive. While some concerns were raised about the large size of the board and the number of priorities, the overall consensus was that the Commission is functioning well and should not be disrupted.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue, but with modifications:

- Reduce the number of members
- Reduce and streamline its priorities

AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

<u>Created:</u>	MD. Agriculture Code § 2-504 (2023) of the Maryland Annotated Code 1977 and <u>Sec. 2B-2 (b)</u> of the Montgomery County Code, as amended (1988).
<u>Purpose:</u>	To advise the County Executive and County Council with respect to the establishment of agricultural districts and the approval of purchases of easements; to review the status of agricultural districts and land under easement; to promote preservation of agriculture.
<u>Membership:</u>	Five members at least three of whom shall be owner/operators of commercial farms who earn 50 percent or more of their income from farming. All must be county residents. No member may serve for more than two consecutive full terms.
<u>Financial Disclosure:</u>	Not required.
<u>Lobbying:</u>	Must not engage in any advocacy activity at the State or federal levels unless that activity is approved by the Office of Intergovernmental Relations.
<u>Terms:</u>	Five-year terms no compensation.
<u>Meetings:</u>	First Tuesday of each month.
<u>Staff:</u>	Mike Weyand, Program Administrator, Agricultural Land Preservation, Office of Agricultural Services 301-590-2856

2013 Comment:	There was consideration that there might be enough overlap to warrant a merger with the Agricultural Advisory Committee. After a great deal of discussion it became evident that this should not happen. Evidence shows that the two groups have different, but complementary functions.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	The Committee is more community-based and includes stakeholders such as the Revenue Authority, Manna, and the County Fair. It was noted that non-farmer members only serve one-year terms, which may limit continuity. The Committee is active and well-run, with a strong focus on community engagement.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue. The CERB further recommends that non-farmer members should serve longer than one year, and the Committee should keep the community informed of activities in the Agricultural Reserve.

AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD

<u>Created:</u>	MD. Agriculture Code § 2-504 (2023) of the Maryland Annotated Code 1977 and <u>Sec. 2B-2 (b) of the Montgomery County Code, as amended (1988).</u>
<u>Purpose:</u>	To advise the County Executive and County Council with respect to the establishment of agricultural districts and the approval of purchases of easements; to review the status of agricultural districts and land under easement; to promote preservation of agriculture.
<u>Membership:</u>	Five members at least three of whom shall be owner/operators of commercial farms who earn 50 percent or more of their income from farming. All must be county residents. No member may serve for more than two consecutive full terms.
<u>Financial Disclosure:</u>	Not required.
<u>Lobbying:</u>	Must not engage in any advocacy activity at the State or federal levels unless that activity is approved by the Office of Intergovernmental Relations.
<u>Terms:</u>	Five-year terms no compensation.
<u>Meetings:</u>	First Tuesday of each month.
<u>Staff:</u>	Mike Weyand, Program Administrator, Agricultural Land Preservation, Office of Agricultural Services 301-590-2856

2013 Comment:	There was consideration that there might be enough overlap to warrant a merger with the Agricultural Advisory Committee. After a great deal of discussion it became evident that this should not happen. Evidence shows that the two groups have different, but complementary functions.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	This Board was described as more business-focused, with members from the Farm Bureau and agricultural producers. It plays a key role in advising on easements and land preservation. CERB members agreed it should remain separate from the Agricultural Advisory Committee due to its distinct mission and legal foundation under state law.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions.

AIRPARK COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

newly established 2023

Created: County Council Bill No. 24-23 Airpark Community Advisory Committee eff. 10/20/2033.

Purpose: The Committee advises the County Executive, County Council, and Revenue Authority regarding Montgomery County Airpark operations, community concerns, safety and community impact; and reports annually to the County Executive, County Council and the Revenue Authority regarding available: (A) data on noise complaints; (B) data on itinerate flight operations; (C) data on local flight operations, including “touch-and-go” operations; (D) recommendations of the Committee regarding operations, safety, community impact, and other community concerns; and (E) facility improvement plans or recommended changes to the Airport Layout Plan.

Membership: **11** total members. **8 voting:** **one** representative of the Montgomery Village Foundation; **three** members who reside within a 3-mile radius of the Airpark and who represent geographic diversity surrounding the Airpark; **one** representative of the Montgomery County Economic Development Corporation; **one** representative of a flight school operating at the Montgomery County Airpark; and **two** members who: (i) are pilots who use the Airpark; (ii) represent owners or operators of businesses, other than flight schools, located at the Airpark; or (iii) represent owners or operators of aviation-related businesses, other than flight schools, located within a 3-mile radius of the Airpark. **3 non-voting ex officios:** **one** designee of the Revenue Authority; **one** County Executive or designee; one designee of the County Council.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Officers: The Committee must elect, from among its voting members a chair, vice chair, and other officers it deems appropriate.

Terms: Three-year terms initially staggered. No compensation.

Meetings: Meeting dates/time and location will be determined.

Staff: Joe Pospisil, Dept. of Transportation
101 Monroe Street – 10th Floor
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: 240-777-2160

Staffing. The County Executive must designate a principal office or department identified under Section 1A-201(a)(1) to provide the staff support necessary for the Committee to perform its duties.

2013 Comment:	There are 18 positions for this committee – this appears excessive since the Committee meets only on an infrequent basis. While all listed groups have an interest, not all necessarily need to be formal members. For example, the Planning Board should be kept informed, but does not really need to have membership. The Executive Branch and Council could
---------------	--

AIRPARK COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

newly established 2023

	<p>be retained as Ex officio members. In this manner they can be kept informed and shown as having an official interest in the committee's activities.</p> <p>This BCC is an example of one that should have sunset on a given date, and no timely action occurred. An extension was eventually passed on 7/17/12.</p>
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	The Committee is active and community-focused, with discussions centered on noise and flight paths affecting Montgomery Village and surrounding areas. It was noted that the Committee could benefit from broader community representation.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue, but with modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Expand the range of communities represented

ANIMAL SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE **(NEW MARCH 2022)**

Created:

Established by County Council Bill 37-21, effective May 26, 2022.
Montgomery County Code, Chapter 5, Animal Control, Sec. 5-105

Duties:

The Committee must work with the Office of Animal Services to advise the Executive and the Council on issues and recommendations for: (1) animal care and welfare; (2) animal rescue; (3) animal fostering and adoption; (4) control of the animal population; (5) animal bite prevention; (6) zoonotic disease transmission; (7) educating the public on safely coexisting with wildlife; (8) best practices for animal shelters; (9) recruiting volunteers for the County animal shelter; and (10) the operation of the Office.

The Office must respond to Committee requests for information within 30 days after receiving the request. By July 1 each year, the Committee must submit to the Executive and Council an annual report on its functions, activities, accomplishments, plans, and objectives.

Membership:

The 14-member Committee is composed of 11 voting members and 3 ex officio non-voting members, appointed by the Executive and confirmed by the Council. The Executive should appoint: **(A)** 1 licensed veterinarian with pet and wildlife experience; **(B)** 1 person with expertise in animal or pet behavior; **(C)** 1 person with experience in recruiting, training, and retaining volunteers; **(D)** 1 person designated by the Montgomery County Partners for Animal Well-Being (MCPAW) or a similar organization if MCPAW is no longer operating **(E)** 1 person designated by the Second Chance Wildlife Center (SCWC) or similar organization if SCWC is no longer operating; **(F)** 1 person representing a non-profit organization that provides animal fostering services in the County; **(G)** 1 person representing the Montgomery County Cat Coalition (MCCC) or a similar organization for feral cats if the MCCC is no longer operating; **(H)** 1 person representing Friends of Montgomery County Animals (FMCA) or a similar organization in the County; **(I)** 1 person representing an animal rescue organization in the County; and **(J)** 2 public members who live or work in the County. **Ex Officio non-voting members** are from the Office of Animal Services **(A)** the Director or designee; **(B)** the lead veterinarian **(C)** the budget operations manager.

Financial

Disclosure:

NA

Advocacy:

The Committee must not engage in any advocacy activity at the State or federal levels unless that activity is approved by the Office of Intergovernmental Relations.

Terms:

Three years – initially staggered

Compensation:

NA

Officers:

The Executive must designate the Chair and Vice-Chair until the Committee elects the Chair and Vice-Chair.

Meetings:

At the call of the chair as often as required to perform its duties, but at least six times each year. Meeting dates/times to be determined.

ANIMAL SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE **(NEW MARCH 2022)**

Staff: Caroline Hairfield, Director
Phone: 240-773-5929.
Patricia Ranshaw, Phone: 240-773-5931

Staffing: The Director of the Office must provide appropriate staff to the Committee.

2013 Comment:	Newly established board; not under 2013 CERB review.
2013 Recommendation:	N/A
2025 Comment	The Committee is relatively new and its membership is observed to be passionate about animal welfare. The committee appears to be primarily responsible for assisting the Office of Animal Services (OAS) in overseeing and coordinating the efforts of multiple non-governmental organizations (NGOs) whose purpose is the rescue, rehabilitation, fostering, and placement of animals (pet, feral, wild) but not livestock or laboratory research animals. The naming of specific organizations for a long-term advisory body would appear to be a simplistic placeholder for specifying and managing representation from the various categories of animal welfare support organizations, which raises concerns of conflict of interest. Furthermore, the number of public members does not provide sufficient voice for members of the public who are not directly engaged in various aspects of animal welfare.
2025 Recommendation	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue, but with modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Align issues of focus with the stated purposes of the Committee• Specify membership in terms of activities not organizations• The Office of Animal Services should establish a mechanism for maintaining a list of active animal welfare organizations with their potential role in support of Montgomery County goals• Expand membership to more representatives of the public

CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION

Created: Charter of Montgomery County, Maryland Section 509

Purpose: To study the Charter and report at least once to the County Council on its activities within one year after appointment. Commission reports shall be submitted not later than May 1 of every even-numbered year. The reports shall contain recommendations concerning proposed Charter amendments, if any.

Membership: Eleven members who shall be residents of the County, five of whom shall be appointed from a list of names submitted by the County Executive. Not more than six members shall be of the same political party.

Meetings: Second Wednesday of each month, 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. at the Council Office Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, Rockville.

Terms: Four year terms to coincide with the Council term of office. No compensation.

Staff: Christine Wellons, County Council
100 Maryland Ave, 5th Floor Rockville, MD 20850
Phone: 240-777-7892

2013 Comment:	None.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	The Charter Review Commission is currently classified as a Tier 1 advisory board. However, CERB members agreed that it falls outside the scope of CERB's review, due to its authority to study the County Charter and make recommendations to the County Council to amend the Charter.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue, however it should be recategorized as Tier 3 - Regulatory Body.

COMMISSION ON CHILD CARE

Created: **Montgomery County Code Section 10A-4 (previously Section 27-62).
Amended 7/20/16, Bill 4-16. Non-voting ex officio CUPF member added. MML member eliminated.**

Purpose: Advise the County Executive and County Council on policies, programs and services that enhance community support for high quality, affordable and accessible child care. The Commission must issue an annual report that addresses child care needs and recommends priorities to improve services in support of child care.

Membership: **17 voting members and 6 to 8 non-voting members. (A) Seven members are providers of childcare services. The Executive should appoint providers of different types of child care services and providers to different age groups.**

These include family child care providers, group child care providers, private educational institutions, and providers serving infants, toddlers, pre-school and school-age children, and children with special needs. (B) Five members are parents of children receiving child care services. (C) Five members are selected from the business community and the general public.

The Superintendent of Schools, the Chairman of the Montgomery County Planning Board, the President of Montgomery College, or their designees, are nonvoting members of the Commission. Two designees of the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services, and one designee of the Director of the Community Use of Public Facilities are also nonvoting members of the Commission. In addition, upon recommendation of the Commission, the Executive may designate representatives of up to 2 public agencies to serve as nonvoting members. The Executive may appoint these additional members to serve less than 3-year terms.

Each member must reside or work in Montgomery County.

Financial

Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms - no compensation.

Meetings: Third Wednesday of each month, 7:30 PM

Staff: **Erin Stillwell, DHHS, 7300 Calhoun Place, Suite 700
Rockville, MD 20855
(240) 777-1716**

2013 Comment:	The position allocated to the Maryland Municipal League (MML) has been filled only once in the past 15 years and has recently been filled, having been vacant since 2007. The League's mission is not consistent with that of the Commission, which may explain why the MML is not
---------------	--

COMMISSION ON CHILD CARE

	<p>working with the Commission. CERB could not find a rationale for including a member from MML.</p> <p>The non-voting membership list is very confusing. As underlined above, the Executive may add 2 non-voting representatives if the Commission asks. Has this ever occurred? What is the rationale for this requirement?</p> <p>There also should be a description of what is meant by selecting two members from “public agencies” – agencies involved with child care?</p>
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue, but with changes to its membership. The position reserved for the Maryland Municipal League should be removed, and a clarification/review of the non-voting member selection process should be done.
2025 Comment:	This committee stands out for its specific focus on child care and its members are directly involved in the child care system, ensuring priorities are grounded in real experiences. The CERB observed that the number of members present at meetings was consistently low, undermining the quorum. CERB members also noted that MCPS has not participated in this Commission's work for years despite having a designated seat. The CERB also raised questions about the apparent duplication of this Commission's scope with the other bodies created by county law, such as the Early Care and Education Coordinating Entity and the Early Childhood Coordinating Council.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue, but with modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce membership size so that quorum can be reached• Conduct a thorough review of the scopes of the various childcare-related entities and bodies created by county law and ensure their better delineation and coordination• Expand priorities to include issues related to licensing and economic support to childcare centers/providers and their employees

COMMISSION ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

<u>Created:</u>	<u>Montgomery County Code Section 27-48</u>
<u>Purpose:</u>	To advise the County Executive and County Council, the Department of Health and Human Services and the Board of Education on the development of coordinated community and government policies, programs and services which support children, youth and families.
<u>Membership:</u>	27 members including one representative from the public school system; one representative from the private schools in the County; one representative from the Department of Recreation; and two representatives from the Department of Health and Human Services. The remaining 22 members should be divided as equally as possible among individuals with recent experience in agencies providing services to children and youth; youth and young adults; and parents. <i>The Chair and Vice Chair shall be appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council (The Commission may make recommendations to the CE)</i>
<u>Financial Disclosure:</u>	Not required.
<u>Terms:</u>	3 year terms for parents and agency representatives; one year terms for youth, (June 1 – May 31). There is no compensation.
<u>Meetings:</u>	2 nd Wednesday of each month.
<u>Staff:</u>	Jameela Hyland, DHHS, 7300 Calhoun Place, Suite 700 Rockville, MD 20855 (240) 301-461-443-

2013 Comment:	<p>“Parents of youths, and high school students” – need definition of “youths”. Are advocates of children in the elementary and middle schools included?</p> <p>An in-depth discussion on the possibility of a merger with the Commission on Child Care resulted in the conclusion that the functions of the two groups, while similar, are different enough that each should remain independent. Also, with a combined membership of 49, all of whom are active and involved, would create a very large and unwieldy group.</p> <p>After attending meetings of the Commission, it was quite obvious that there is a high level of interest in participation on this commission as evidenced by the number of youth, parents, and educators in attendance.</p>
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	This committee is more focused on youth/young adults as opposed to young children. This is reflected in its successful outreach of such events as a youth “have a voice townhall,” and youth led policy

COMMISSION ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

	<p>recommendations. Conversely, the website should reflect its outreach to youth and be updated in a timely manner. Also, the Commission has faced challenges in obtaining critical data from MCPS and in the advertising of its events due to legal restriction.</p>
2025 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue, but with modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review MCPS partnership and update priorities accordingly• Consider changing the name to "Commission on Children, Youth, Young Adults, and Families" to better reflect its scope

CLIMATE, ENERGY AND AIR QUALITY ADVISORY

Created: Montgomery County Code Sec. 18-A-5, as amended 1995. Amended by Bill 26-20 changing name and purpose.

Purpose: To advise the County Executive and the County Council on the development, promotion and implementation of programs to heighten energy awareness, increase energy efficiency and improve indoor and outdoor air quality

Membership: Fifteen members. Chair is designated by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council. Members must be citizens of the County who are technically knowledgeable and interested in energy and air quality.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three year terms no- compensation.

Meetings: First Wednesday evening of each month.

Staff: Lindsey Shaw, Dept. of Environmental Protection,
255 Rockville Pike, 240-777-7754

2013 Comment:	Each member of the Committee has informally agreed to forgo any requests for reimbursements for expenses in order to save County resources.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	The Committee was described as well-run and responsive to emergent issues within its stated scope.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions.

COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND REVIEW BOARD

Created: Montgomery County Code, Chapter 2, Section 2-146. Amended by Bill 32-11, effective 2/20/12, modifying membership, structure and function.

Department: Office of the County Executive

Purpose: The County Executive must appoint and convene at least every ten years, subject to confirmation by the Council, a citizens review committee, which must review the committee system and each then-existing committee and report to the Executive and Council its recommendations for changes in individual committees and the committee system as a whole. The committee must submit an interim report to the Executive and Council with 6 months of appointment and submit a final report within 12 months of appointment.

Membership: At least 11 members.

Terms: One year terms, per (Bill 32-11). No compensation.

Staff: Beth Gocrach, Office of the County Executive
101 Monroe Street, 2nd Floor Rockville, MD 20850
Phone: 240-777-2528

2013 Comment:	CERB believes it would be better and more efficient to review the BCC system more frequently than every 10 years.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee should convene every five to six years. Note: CERB also recommends that CERB members not be allowed to serve concurrently on another County BCC while a member of the CERB.
2025 Comment:	CERB is a mandated oversight body tasked with reviewing the structure, function, and effectiveness of all BCCs. Members expressed concern about the infrequency of reviews and suggested that future CERBs be convened more regularly to ensure timely oversight and have more time allotted for the task.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information and hands-on experience, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its functions. The CERB further recommends that: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The scope of the review be clarified to include only true advisory BCCs• Future reviews occur more frequently than every 10 years• More time be allocated to conduct the review• Address member retention issues

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Created: Executive Order 165-94, dated October 17, 1994; Executive Order No. 176-95; effective date 9/26/95 revised name to CDAC. Executive Order 191-07, increasing membership, effective 6/19/07.

Purpose: Makes recommendations to the Director, Department of Housing and Community Affairs, and the County Executive on applications submitted for the Community Development Block Grant Program and the Emergency Shelter Grant funds and any successors to these programs; reviews the consolidated plan and makes recommendation on the plan; and conducts public hearings to review community development needs when necessary.

Membership: No fewer than fifteen (15) nor more than twenty (20) members serving during any given year. Membership should be broadly representative of the County as a whole, with participation encouraged by persons from low income, urban and rural areas, the elderly, women, minorities, persons for whom English is not a native language, persons who are or have been homeless, as well as by persons with physical or mental impairments. Those persons who currently serve on a Board, Committee or Commission established by the County Council or County Executive, or who are employees of the Montgomery County Government, HOC, MNCPPC or elected officials of any federal, state or local government are not eligible to apply for membership on the CDAC. **Residents of incorporated municipalities are eligible for membership. Note: Not confirmed by Council.**

Terms: Members are appointed by the County Executive and serve three year terms. Members may be reappointed by the CE no more than once; total number of years served must be not more than six.

Officers: The Chairman will be designated annually by the CE and may serve no more than two years.

Meetings: A public hearing is held in October; meetings are held weekly while applications are being reviewed and recommendations developed. (Members may be asked to serve on one of three committees: Special Needs; Youth, Families and Senior Citizens; and Economic Development, Job Training, and New Immigrant Assistance).

Staff: Catherine Mahmud, Grants and Asset Management, DHCA
(240)777-3669
Catherine.Mahmud@montgomerycountymd.gov

2013 Comment:	None.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	The Community Development Advisory Committee primary function is to review federal grant applications, and the County must have this committee in order to be eligible for specific federal grants.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue, however it should recategorized as Tier 3 - Regulatory Body.

COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT AND REPAIR FUND COMMISSION

(newly established October 2024)

Created: Established by County Council Bill 4-24 effective October 24, 2024 Montgomery County Code Article XI. Montgomery County Community Reinvestment And Repair Fund Commission.

Duties: (a) The County's Office of Grants Management, after consultation with the Commission, must develop and administer a public process for community-based organizations to apply for grants that support community-based initiatives intended to benefit (1) low-income communities and (2) that service disproportionately impacted areas. (b) The Commission annually must recommend to the Office grant awards to the selected community-based organizations from County Reinvestment funds, subject to: the appropriation of funds; and the execution of grant agreements between the County and the awardees. (c) The Commission may submit to the County Executive and the County Council recommendations regarding: (1) existing or potential County programs related to community-based initiatives intended to benefit low-income communities or to serve disproportionately impacted areas; (2) existing or potential County programs to repair damage done to communities most impacted by disproportionate enforcement of the cannabis prohibition before July 1, 2022; and (3) changes to County law or regulation related to community-based initiatives or reparations intended to benefit low-income communities or to serve disproportionately impacted areas.

Membership: **Total of 14 members: 13 voting members and one non-voting ex-officio member** who is the Director of the Dept. of Health and Human Services. The members, appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council must include: (1) **11 County residents** (2) at least **one member who represents a service provider** for incarcerated persons or persons with a criminal record; (3) at least one **member who was incarcerated or has a criminal history**. The members who are County residents must submit an application to the County Executive and Council describing the individual's demonstrated knowledge, through education, training, work, or personal experience of one or more of the following: (1) the history of the resistance of people of African descent to white supremacy, enslavement, Jim Crow laws, and other examples of racial violence and discrimination; (2) the history of the resistance of racial, ethnic, and other minority groups against discrimination, violence, and inequality; (3) the needs of individuals returning to the community after incarceration; (4) the impact of the disproportionate enforcement of drug laws on the quality of life experienced by racial and ethnic minorities, especially people of African descent, including specialization in: (A) the disruption of families; (B) exposure to the prison system; (C) trauma experienced as a result of community and police violence; or (D) another similar factor contributing to quality of life; and (5) methods for delivering community investment that empower marginalized people to have a voice in the distribution of resources. Resident members may include individuals with demonstrated experience in youth engagement and education programs; jobs training and placement programs for marginalized individuals; housing services and unhoused prevention services; and economic development or entrepreneurship benefitting low-income communities or disproportionately impacted areas.

Financial Disclosure: NA

Advocacy: NA

COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT AND REPAIR FUND COMMISSION
(newly established October 2024)

Terms: Three years – initially staggered. 4 one-year, 4 two years, 5 three years

Compensation: Stipend and Reimbursement. (1) A member must receive a stipend of \$1,000 from the County, subject to appropriation and the availability of County reinvestment funds. (2) A member may receive reimbursement for travel and dependent care.

Officers: The Board must elect from among its voting members a chair, vice-chair, and other officers it deems appropriate.

Meetings: At the call of the chair and at least 6 times annually. Meeting dates and times will be determined.

Staff: Nina Ashford, Dr. Christopher Rogers, Briana Hunter. Dept. of Health and Human Services.

The Dept. must also monitor and administer the grants awarded.

2013 Comment:	N/A
2013 Recommendation:	N/A
2025 Comment	This is a newly established Committee in 2024 and has not yet begun meeting. As such, the CERB was unable to evaluate its performance or structure.
2025 Recommendation	The CERB makes no recommendation at this time due to insufficient information. The Commission should be reviewed during the next CERB cycle once it has been operational for a sufficient period.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

Created: Montgomery County Code Section II-3.

Purpose: The Committee must advise the Office of Consumer Protection in carrying out its duties and functions under this Chapter, and may hold public hearings on any topic related to Consumer Protection.

Membership: Nine members, which must reflect a cross-section of consumer and business interests. Of the members appointed at least two must be from the Better Business Bureau, Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce or a local chamber of commerce or another County-wide or local association of merchants; at least two must be from the Community Action Board (one member of and one recommended by the CAB), and five from the community at large.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three year terms - no compensation.

Meetings: 1st Tuesday morning of each month, 8:00 AM, COB, 2nd Floor

Staff: Brittany Freeman
Office of Consumer Protection
Montgomery County Office of Consumer Protection
100 Maryland Avenue
Rockville, MD 20850
Phone: 240-777-3732

2013 Comment:	<p>The Committee coordinates with OCP in researching and investigating categories of consumer complaints. It then advises OCP on corrective action. The Committee may also advise OCP on preventive actions (e.g., conducting a financial seminar for low-income people). Overall, the Committee performs a valuable service for OCP and by extension the community.</p> <p>Well documented activities which are often cited in the various media.</p> <p>Costs are proportionate with value received.</p>
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	This Committee was described as a model for how advisory bodies can use data to inform their work and demonstrate impact. It uses complaint data by ZIP code to identify trends and target outreach, and supports public education campaigns and podcasting. The Office of Consumer Protection considers the Committee its "eyes and ears," and CERB members praised its strong alignment with its mission.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
----------------------	--

COUNTY-WIDE RECREATION AND PARKS ADVISORY BOARD

Created: Montgomery County Code – Section 41-21 thru 30. Exec. Order 239-01 expands the Recreation District to five areas to coincide with the Regional Service Centers. Bill No. 32-01 changes the composition and duties of the County-wide and regional recreation advisory boards. Bill 4-16 (eff. 7/20/16), adds “Parks” to name of board, eliminates regional area boards and changes public membership.

Purpose: Advisory to the County Executive, the County Council, the Director of the Department of Recreation, and the Planning Board. The Board shall encourage the development of desirable recreational and park opportunities in the County.

Membership: **25 total members.** 18 voting members, including 3 representatives of each of the four regional recreation areas and 6 from the County at-large. 7 non-voting ex-officio members, including a representative of the Dept. of Parks of the M-NCPPC, an administrative representative of the Board of Education, and representatives from the Office of Community Use of Public Facilities, Community Action Board, Commission on Aging, Commission on People with Disabilities, and the immediate past Board Chair (unless serving on the Board in another capacity).

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three year terms – no compensation.

Meetings: 2nd Monday of each month at 7:00 p.m., (no mtgs in July and August)
EOB – 9th Floor Conf Room

Staff: Jason Fasteau, Dept. of Recreation, 240-777-4934,
2425 Reedie Drive, 10th Floor, Wheaton, MD 20902

2013 Comment:	<p>There has been much discussion suggesting that this Board be reorganized and renamed. In effect, the four regional Boards would be incorporated into the main Board. A memorandum, dated May 8, 2012, was submitted by the Board, which outlined their support of this concept.</p> <p>With the addition of regional representatives to the main Board, a greater degree of efficiency and coordination can be achieved. The current Boards have been almost operating this way for a while. The number of members from each area should be great enough to ensure representation at most meetings.</p>
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, and in response to a memorandum submitted by this Board, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with modifications to membership and name. 1) Membership should include three representatives from each of the regional recreation areas, six members appointed from the County at large, and seven non-voting ex officio members, including a representative from the Dept. of Park and Planning. 2) The Board should be renamed the “Recreation and Parks Advisory Board”.

COUNTY-WIDE RECREATION AND PARKS ADVISORY BOARD

2025 Comment:	The County-Wide Recreation and Parks Advisory Board plays an important role in advising on recreational and park services across Montgomery County. The Board is active and engaged, and its members demonstrate a strong commitment to improving access to recreation for all residents. However, during our review, we noted that the Board could benefit from clearer definitions of success and more structured outreach to underrepresented communities. There is also an opportunity to better coordinate with other recreation-related advisory bodies to avoid duplication and strengthen impact.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, we recommend that this Board continue, but with modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Define success metrics beyond meeting participation• Expand outreach efforts to ensure broader representation across the County's diverse populations

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COMMISSION

Created:

Montgomery County Code Section 2-60 (as amended 2/08)

Purpose:

Evaluate the organization and adequacy of law enforcement and the administration of justice in the County; review and comment, at the request of the County Executive or County Council, on programs proposed by law enforcement and criminal justice agencies for: long-term impacts on the criminal justice system; feasibility; and implementation issues; respond to requests from the Executive, Council, and the judicial system for any analysis concerning criminal justice programs; educate the community about law enforcement, crime prevention, reentry of individuals to the community, and other criminal justice issues, promote respect for law, and encourage community involvement in law enforcement and other appropriate components of the criminal justice system; facilitate coordination of the programs and activities of County law enforcement and criminal justice agencies; facilitate coordination of County law enforcement and criminal justice agencies with those of the State and neighboring state and local governments; promote efficient processing of criminal cases at every stage from arrest to completion of trial and correctional programs; and advise the County on how to achieve fair and effective law enforcement, crime prevention, and juvenile justice. The Commission makes reports and recommendations to the Executive and Council as it finds appropriate. The Commission must report to the Council and Executive on request.

Membership:

32 members total (twenty are ex-officio; see list on page 3). The County Executive appoints, subject to Council confirmation, a member of the County Legislative Delegation selected jointly by the Chairs of the House and Senate Delegations; 7 members of the public, one of whom must be a member of the Maryland bar who practices law in the County; an employee of the Division of Parole and Probation in the State Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, after giving the Director of the Division an opportunity to make a recommendation; an employee of the State Department of Juvenile Justice, after giving the Secretary of the Department an opportunity to make a recommendation; a member of the Commission on Juvenile Justice, after giving the Commission an opportunity to make a recommendation; and a member of the Victim Services Advisory Board, after giving the Board an opportunity to make a recommendation.

Financial Disclosure:

Not required.

Terms:

Appointed members serve three year terms.

Chair and VC:

After considering recommendation of the CJCC, if any, the CE must Designate the Chair and Vice Chair who serve one-year terms.

Meetings:

The Commission must meet at least four times per year.

Staff:

Earl Stoddard, Asst. Chief Administrative Officer
Phone: 240-777-2469

<u>2013 Comment:</u>	CERB received a suggestion from a Commission staff member that the Commission should have a member from the Commission on Veterans
----------------------	--

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COMMISSION

	<p>Affairs. After discussion, CERB decided to not support the idea since the Commission is already so large as to be almost unwieldy. The addition of any other members should only be considered if there were reductions in the current membership.</p> <p>CERB members observed the Commission in operation, and found it well organized and very efficient. Considering there are 32 members, including a police chief, judges, attorneys and other public officials, the leadership and staff should be commended.</p>
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment	The Commission was described as well-organized and informative, with participation from law enforcement and judiciary representatives. However, its work overlaps with other justice-related boards.
2025 Recommendation	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue, but with modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Absorb the Commission on Juvenile Justice• Absorb the Domestic Violence Coordinating Council• Absorb the Human Trafficking Prevention Committee

DICKERSON AREA FACILITIES IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

Created: County Council Resolution No. 13-1498, adopted 12/1/98 and amended 10/11/05

Purpose: To address community and environmental issues and concerns pertaining to the operations of the County's solid waste facilities located in the Dickerson area. These facilities include the Resource Recovery Facility, the Yard Trim Composting Facility, properties originally purchased for the Site 2 landfill, and property associated with the original Matthews Farm.

Membership: 18 members. 12 voting members including representatives of Sugarloaf Citizens Association, For a Rural Montgomery (FARM), the town of Poolesville, the town of Barnesville, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC), the Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board, and 6 representatives of the affected community. **Six** non-voting members including representatives of the Operator of the Resource Recovery Facility, the Operator of the Dickerson Compost Facility, the Operator of the Dickerson PEPCO Facility, and the County's Departments of Public Works and Transportation, Environmental Protection, and M-NCPPC.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three year terms — no compensation. The initial terms of the voting members will be staggered, with four being appointed for one year terms, four being appointed for two year terms, and four being appointed for three year terms.

Meetings: Must meet at least quarterly. A quorum of seven voting members is required for voting on actions to be taken. All meetings will be open public forums and will be **advertised in local newspapers**.

Staff: David Rosenbaum, Program Manager
Recycling and Resource Management Division, DEP
101 Monroe Street, Rockville, Maryland 20850
Phone: 240-777-6571 3

2013 Comment:	While covering only a few specific areas of interest, the Group is key to ensuring that the Dickerson area environmental issues are monitored by those directly affected. Since the efforts are well underway, and the only real need is to monitor, analyze and provide any suggestions for change. It is the CERB's recommendation that the name of this group be changed. Perhaps replace the word "Implementation" with "Study." This issue is not included in the recommendation, but might be worthy of discussion.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Group continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	This is a highly focused advisory body with very active representation from communities affected by solid waste and energy projects in the

DICKERSON AREA FACILITIES IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

	<p>Dickerson area. Despite limited technical expertise among members, the Group has been resourceful in soliciting information from guest speakers and has a well-established, community-driven outreach system to notify area residents of adverse incidents. The Group serves a critical function in providing a reality check on the progress around the Dickerson area solid waste management plan. The CERB noted that the Group acts as an important voice for the local residents against a concerning pattern of disregard of community input and the impact of the solid waste operations in the Dickerson area.</p>
2025 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information and hands-on experience, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Elevate the role of this Group and overtly endow it with accountability authority by renaming it “Dickerson Area Facilities Civic Oversight Committee”• Consider tasking the Group with submitting an annual “critical issues” report (such as review of resident notification mechanisms) to the Council to provide a transparent way for area residents to elevate their concerns

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COORDINATING COUNCIL

Created: Montgomery County Code Sec. 2-59, eff. 3/17/06. Amended by Expedited Bill 26-09 and Expedited Bill 41-10. Amended by Expedited Bill 39-18 eff. 12/10/18 adding two domestic violence organization members, and modifying the student member requirements and chair and vice chair terms.

Purpose: The Coordinating Council must: (1) advise the County Executive, County Council, and Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission on policies, programs, and legislation necessary to prevent domestic violence; (2) promote and facilitate an effective community-wide response to domestic violence; (3) coordinate with the Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence and all other County, State, federal and non-governmental agencies, committees, boards, commissions, and organizations that operate, monitor, or coordinate domestic violence programs or services in the County; (4) develop recommendations to improve the coordination and effectiveness of County, State, federal, and non-governmental efforts regarding domestic violence; (5) cooperate with the Abused Persons Program in HHS, and any other organizations to periodically review the quality and sufficiency of programs and facilities available to domestic violence victims, offenders and their children; (6) obtain and evaluate the findings and recommendations of the County's Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team; (7) obtain and evaluate statistical data, reports, and other information related to domestic violence; (8) advocate for policies or legislation at the County, State and federal levels that would improve efforts to address domestic violence issues. **(State and federal advocacy must be approved by the office of Intergovernmental Relations.)**

Membership: **19 voting members. 5 *ex-officio* members requested to serve:** (A) the Administrative Judge or designee for District 6 of the Maryland District Court; (B) the Administrative Judge or designee for the Montgomery County Circuit Court; (C) the State's Attorney or designee; (D) the Regional Director or designee of the Division of Parole and Probation, Maryland Department of Public Safety and Corrections; and (E) the County Sheriff or designee. **6 *ex-officio* members appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council:** (A) A member or designee of the County Council, selected by the Council President; (B) the Chief of Police or designee; (C) the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services or designee; (D) the Executive Director of the Commission for Women or designee; (E) the Director of the Department of Correction and Rehabilitation or designee (F) the Board of Education President or designee. **8 members** appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council: **1 attorney** with experience representing victims of domestic violence; **4 members of the public** with a demonstrated interest in domestic violence issues, including at least one individual who is a former victim of domestic violence, **2 representatives from a non-governmental domestic violence service or advocacy organization** serving County residents, and **1 student member** to serve for a 1-year term, renewable for 1 additional year, who must be a high school student who resides in the County when initially appointed.

Financial Disclosure:

Financial disclosure is not required.

Lobbying:

May not engage in any advocacy efforts at the State or federal levels unless these efforts are approved by the Office of Intergovernmental Relations.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COORDINATING COUNCIL

Terms: Three years - no compensation. The County Executive may stagger the initial terms of the general public members so that approximately one-third of the terms of these members expire each year. **Student member serves only one year.**

Officers: Chair and Vice Chair for elected for two-year terms.

Meetings: Must meet at least 4 times per year, but generally meets five to six times per year the second Thursday of every other month at 5:30 p.m. in the Family Justice Center building, 600 Jefferson Plaza in Rockville.

Staff: Ashley Noy, 600 Jefferson Plaza, Suite 500, Rockville, MD 20850
(240) 773-0446

2013 Comment:	As written, eleven of the members are Ex-Officio, and only 6 are "regular"; that is a distribution that cannot be accurate? The DVCC stated in its survey that its ongoing challenge is making the community aware of its services. They need to determine and establish the best medium or method to "get the word out" about what the DVCC does.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Council continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment	The Council's work overlaps with the Commission on Juvenile Justice and the Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission.
2025 Recommendation	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Council be eliminated and absorbed into the Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission.

EAST COUNTY CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

Created: Resolution 12-1032 (created 1993)

Purpose: To advise the County Executive and the County Council of East County citizens' issues and concerns; advocate for regional priorities; and help facilitate solutions. The board serves as a liaison between the Eastern County community, and the County Executive, County Council, and County government departments by identifying community concerns and recommending possible solutions. It also advises the Director of the Eastern Montgomery Regional Services Center on transportation, economic development, housing, education, human services, environment, recreation, public safety, and other issues of importance to the area. The group reviews and comments on the County's capital and operating budgets and master plans; assists with strategies to tailor services to regional needs; and conducts workshops and forums, as well as acts on other ad hoc issues.

Membership: Eighteen members, including one position reserved for a business representative. The membership represents a cross-section of citizens living or working in the Eastern region, including communities in the Fairland, White Oak and Cloverly vicinities. The area is roughly bound on the west by the Northwest Branch, on the north by Ednor Road, on the east by the Howard County and Prince George's County lines, and on the south by I-495.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms. No compensation.

Meetings: First Wednesday of every month at 7:15 PM.

Staff: Jewru Bandeh, Regional Director
Montgomery County Government - East County
3300 Briggs Chaney Road, Silver Spring, MD 20904
Phone: (240) 777-8414

2013 Comment:	<p>One serious problem impacts this Board's operation: the limited staff support available. There is only one staff person at the regional center, and the required support level is difficult to provide. The Citizens Advisory Board is the first line of interaction between the citizens and the County government. CERB suggests that the Board (as one of four regional Boards) continue, but with increased staff support to maintain effectiveness.</p> <p>The Centers have been cut one time too many. It is incomprehensible that such important entities continue without even basic staff support.</p>
2013 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions.</p> <p>The CERB strongly suggests that all five regional boards be supported by increased staff at the Regional Centers.</p>

2025 Comment:	The Board is very well-run, with strong community representation and engagement. It holds annual planning retreats and has been successful in advocating for community projects. CERB members recommended increasing staff support and offering online meetings to accommodate older residents.
2025 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue, but with modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review community representation based on an updated analysis of the socio-economic composition of the County and the involved stakeholders • Increase staff support and expand virtual meeting options

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES COMMISSION

****New Board ** Replaces the Fire and Rescue Commission, 2008**

<u>Created:</u>	<u>Montgomery County Code Section 21-2. Bill 38-8 effective 8/1/2009.</u>
<u>Purpose:</u>	The Fire and Emergency Services Commission must recommend how the County can (a) achieve and maintain effective, efficient, and equitable fire, rescue, and emergency medical services County-wide, and (b) improve the policy, planning, and regulatory framework for all fire, rescue and medical service operations.
<u>Membership:</u>	Seven voting members. Two members must be County career fire/rescue personnel , 2 members must be volunteer local fire and rescue department personnel , and 3 members must have no personal, family, or business connection with the County volunteer or career fire and emergency services. Each member must be a resident of the County and reside in various geographic areas of the County and have a variety of occupational backgrounds. The Executive should appoint the career and volunteer members from a list of at least 5 volunteer local fire and rescue department personnel submitted by the LFRD representative, and organizations composed of career fire or rescue personnel. If the Executive chooses from a name not on the list, the Executive must explain to the Council. If the appropriate organizations do not submit names within 30 days, the Executive may appoint a qualified person.
<u>Chair/Vice Chair:</u>	The Commission annually must designate one of its public members as Chair and another public member as Vice Chair. The Vice-Chair serves as Chair in the absence of the Chair.
<u>Financial Disclosure:</u>	Public financial disclosure is required.
<u>Terms:</u>	Three years beginning August 1. Initial terms staggered.
<u>Compensation:</u>	No compensation.
<u>Meetings:</u>	Second Thursday of each month in Rockville, with additional meetings as needed.
<u>Staff:</u>	Ashley Robinson, FRC, 240-777-4792

2013 Comment:	The Commission operates in an efficient and productive manner.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	CERB members acknowledged that the County has a relatively new Fire Chief and that the Commission has raised the need to review its objectives and role vis-a-vis MCFR. The CERB raised concern about the lack of substantive issues or discussions during the Commission's meetings and the absence of evident community

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES COMMISSION

****New Board ** Replaces the Fire and Rescue Commission, 2008**

	impact or outreach beyond attendance at non-public MCFR events. Further questions were raised about the Commission's role as an advisory body.
2025 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue, but with modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conduct a thorough review of the scope and purpose of the Commission vis-a-vis the goals of MCFR• Revisit the Commission's status as an advisory body and revise its classification if needed

FIREARM SAFETY COMMITTEE

Created: Montgomery County Code Section 57-2, amended 1991

Purpose: To issue approval certificates for target, trap and skeet range, and shooting areas which specify the type of gun or ammunition that may be used on such range or area. The committee also makes recommendations to the County Executive and the County Council concerning the extension of the maximum expansion area boundaries as well as the boundaries of the urban area.

Membership: Seven voting members - no compensation. The Police Range Officer is a non-voting member.

Officers: Chairman designated by the County Executive from among the voting members.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three year terms

Staff: Sgt. Brent Kearney
8751 Snouffer School Rd, Gaithersburg MD 20878
Phone: 240-773-6900

2013 Comment:	Minimal staff required.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommend that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	The Committee performs a licensing and regulatory function, including range and academy approvals. It is not structured as an advisory board and operates more like a licensing body.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue, however it should be recategorized as Tier 3 - Regulatory Body.

FRIENDSHIP HEIGHTS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT DISTRICT **ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Created: Montgomery County Code Section 42A-23(e) Council Resolution No. 14-325, Adopted October 26, 1999.

Purpose: The FHTMDAC provides advice and recommendations to the TMD staff, the Department of Transportation, and the County Executive on the transportation system and TMD-related policies, programs, and operations relating to the implementation of the transportation system and demand management in the Friendship Heights TMD and vicinity. Specifically, the FHTMDAC may (a) propose guidelines for traffic mitigation plans; (b) monitor the implementation of the traffic mitigation plans; (c) evaluate progress in attaining the commuting goals specified in the Annual Growth Policy (AGP), if any; (d) recommend government, private or joint actions necessary to facilitate attainment of the commuting goals specified in the AGP, if any; (e) advise the Director of DPWT on parking policies; (f) review traffic patterns and control measures in the Friendship Heights TMD and vicinity, including any relevant issues relating to neighborhood parking and pedestrian access and safety.

Membership: 14 Voting and 8 Nonvoting representatives. Voting Representatives: 4 members nominated by the Greater Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce, with two representing employers of fewer than 50 employees in the Friendship Heights TMD and two representing employers of 50 or more employees in the Friendship Heights TMD, and including one representative with retail employees; 2 members nominated by the Friendship Heights Village Council; 1 member nominated by the Chevy Chase Village Board of Managers; 1 member nominated by the Somerset Town Council; 1 member nominated by the Somerset House Management Association; 1 member nominated by the Citizens Coordinating Committee on Friendship Heights; 4 members nominated from among the development projects mandated to participate in the TMD. These can be tenants and/or employers designated by the owners of these projects. Nonvoting representatives: The Directors, or their designees, of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Regional Services Center and DPWT; a designee of the Planning Board; a representative of the County Police Department, and a representative of the Chevy Chase Village Police Department; three representatives of the District of Columbia as follows: (a) one nominated by the Advisory Neighborhood Commission of the adjacent neighborhood; (b) one nominated by the business community of the adjacent neighborhood; and (c) one nominated by the District of Columbia Government.

Financial Disclosure: Not Required

Terms: Three years terms beginning July 1

Meetings: 2nd Tuesday morning of each month except August at the Wisconsin Place Community Center, 5311 Friendship Boulevard, Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Staff: James Carlson, DOT, 101 Monroe Street, 10th Floor Rockville, MD 20850
Phone: (240) 777-8382

FRIENDSHIP HEIGHTS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	CERB found that the Friendship Heights TMD Advisory Committee functions primarily as an internal advisory group, with limited engagement from the public. Much of the committee's activity appears to be driven by the Department of Transportation (DOT), and its role is largely informational rather than participatory. CERB noted that the committee's structure results in repetitive communication across multiple TMD advisory bodies, and that citizen involvement is minimal. DOT staff often bear the burden of explaining the same material to different groups, which reduces efficiency and limits strategic coordination.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, CERB recommends that the Friendship Heights Transportation Management District Advisory Committee be eliminated and absorbed by the Friendship Heights Urban District Advisory Committee.

FRIENDSHIP HEIGHTS URBAN DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

(NEW APRIL 2023)

Created: Montgomery County Code, Sec. 68A-5 (a)(4)

Purpose: The Committee should, by July 15 of each year, advise the County government on all aspects of the program, management, and finances of the urban district; by September 15 of each year, review the urban district budget and submit comments to the department; and by October 1 of each year, meet with the head of the department to resolve areas of disagreement regarding the budget.

Membership: Five members. The County Executive **must strive** to appoint two commercial property owners in the district nominated by the Friendship Heights Alliance; one resident renter in the district; one residential property owner in the district; and one business representative nominated by the Greater Bethesda Chamber of Commerce.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms **beginning July 1** - no compensation.

Meetings: Meeting date/time and location will be determined.

Staff: Pete Fosselman, Director, Bethesda Chevy Chase Regional Director
4805 Edgemoor Lane
Bethesda, MD 20814
Telephone: 240-777-8416

2013 Comment:	Newly established board.
2013 Recommendation:	N/A
2025 Comment:	The Committee is relatively new and still defining its role. CERB members expressed concern about its structure and oversight, particularly in relation to the Friendship Heights Alliance and other urban district entities. Further investigation is needed to clarify its purpose and effectiveness.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue and absorb transportation management issues from the Friendship Heights Transportation Management District Advisory Committee.

GREATER SHADY GROVE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Created: Montgomery County Executive Regulation, Number 3-15, authorized by Mo. Co. Code Section 42A-23(e) and Adopted by County Council Resolution 18-210, eff. 7/14/15.

Purpose: The GSGTMDAC will advise the County government and/or a designated contractor on all aspects of programs, management, and finances relating to the implementation of transportation demand management in the GSGTMD and vicinity, including proposing guidelines and monitoring employer traffic mitigation plans and developer traffic mitigation agreements; evaluating progress and recommending actions to attain commuting goals, advising the Dept. of Transportation Director on transit, pooling, bicycling, bikesharing, pedestrian, parking, and related policies and programs; and reviewing traffic patterns and control measures in the GSGTMD.

Membership: The 20+ members include: 4 private sector employers, of which 2 must be employers of 50 or more employees, and 2 must be employers of fewer than 50 employees; 2 major public sector employers, including the Universities at Shady Grove and the National Cancer Institute or other public sector employers of more than 50 employees; 4 residents of neighborhoods (such as The Villages at Decoverly, Avalon at Traville, the Crossings at Washingtonian Center, and the City of Derwood) in the unincorporated areas of the County; and 3 development interests selected from among developers active in the area; 1 member of the Gaithersburg-Germantown Chamber of Commerce; and non-voting residents of properties located within the GSGTMD that are also within the municipalities of Rockville and Gaithersburg. The GSGTMDAC will also include the following ex officio members: the Montgomery County Dept. of Transportation Director or designee; Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission designee; Montgomery County Chief of Police or designee; Upcounty Regional Services Center Director or designee; City of Rockville designee (a representative from Community Planning and Development Services or similar agency); and City of Gaithersburg designee (the Planning Director or representative of a similar agency).

Financial Disclosure: None

Terms: Members appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council will serve 3 year terms (initially staggered). Ex officio and non-voting members serve without term expiration dates.

Compensation: Members are not compensated for service on the Committee.

Officers: Officers will be determined.

Meetings: 1st Wednesday of the month 8:30 AM. Johns Hopkins University Building/Room TBD, 9601 Medical Center Dr., Rockville

Staff: James Carlson, DOT, 101 Monroe Street, 10th Floor Rockville, MD 20850
Phone: (240) 777-8382

GREATER SHADY GROVE TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT
DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2013 Comment:	Newly established board; not under 2013 CERB review.
2013 Recommendation:	N/A
2025 Comment:	The Committee lacks citizen representation and functions more as a technical advisory group. There was also concern that the committee operates in isolation from other regional advisory structures.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue, but with modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review the alignment of the purpose and representation of community and other stakeholders based on an updated analysis of socio-demographic and business composition of this area

COMMITTEE AGAINST HATE/VIOLENCE

Created: Montgomery County Code, Chapter 27-63, as amended, created 8/91.

Purpose: The Committee advises the County Council, the County Executive and County agencies about hate/violence in the County and recommends such policies, programs, legislation or regulations as it finds necessary to reduce the incidence of acts of hate/violence. An annual report is submitted each year by October 1 to the Executive and Council on the activities of the Committee, including the source and amount of any contribution received from a public or private source to support the activities of the Committee. Members also develop and distribute information about hate/violence in the County; promote educational activities that demonstrate the positive value of ethnic and social diversity in the County; and adopt necessary rules and procedures.

Membership: Fifteen voting members who are County residents and six nonvoting members. Of the 15 voting members, **at least 9 should be identified with ethnic or other groups in the County which are frequently the subject of acts of hate/ violence; at least 2 should be parents of school-age children; and at least one should be identified with the County business community.** The six non-voting members are representatives of the County Council, County Executive, Dept. of Police, Human Rights Commission, MCPS, and Montgomery College. No alternates are to be appointed for the non-voting representatives.

The County Executive appoints a Chair after receiving a recommendation from the Committee. The appointment for Chair does not have to be confirmed by the County Council.

Partnership Fund

Subcommittee: Est. 1/1/06, by CERB Bill 3-05, Sec. 1, amending 27-26, the Partnership Fund for victims of hate/violence was created to compensate victims of hate/violence for personal injury and property damage. The HRC must define an act of hate/violence. The County Exec. must designate a subcommittee to administer the Partnership Fund. Under Sec. 1, amending 27-63, the COHV must establish a subcommittee with members designated by the Exec. Under Sec. 2, until 1/1/09 members of the subcommittee need not be members of the CAHV.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms

Meetings: Second Wednesday of each month (7-9pm)

Staff: Anis Ahmed, Office of Human Rights,
20 Maryland Ave, Suite 330, Rockville,
240-777-8454.

<u>2013 Comment:</u>	Membership guidelines are confusing; only 12 of the 15 voting members are clearly defined. Also, lists 15 + 6 nonvoting – while WEB site lists 14+9? Updating County material for consistency is necessary.
----------------------	---

COMMITTEE AGAINST HATE/VIOLENCE

	<p>The actual statistics on hate/violent crimes are maintained by the Police Department. Police Staff make presentations to the Committee and provide it with information on victims.</p> <p>This is one of the few Committees that can solicit funds for its activities. It also manages the Partnership Fund for Victims of Hate/Violence.</p> <p>Close coordination with ethnic affairs advisory groups is strongly suggested.</p>
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	This committee has the mandate to advise the executive and council on mechanisms to oppose and mitigate hate and violence in Montgomery County that is driven by group membership (ethnic, social, belief, etc). CERB members observed the lack of clarity in the Committee's overarching mission, strategy, and authority to cooperate with various County bodies, despite the Committee's attempts. The scope of the problem requires access and coordination with a broad spectrum of county activities to include daycare, schools, health care, and elder care. A review of activities suggests that the committee does not have access or coordination with critical activities such as MCPS. Furthermore, the linkage between the Committee and the Partnership Fund for Victims of Hate/Violence is not clear.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue, but with modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarify the committee's scope, strategy, and authority• Clarify the role of the committee in collecting and disbursing funds to compensate victims• Improve coordination with MCPS and other county institutions

COMMISSION ON HEALTH

Created: Montgomery County Code Section 24 23. Bill 7-95, effective 6/30/11/95 re: Department of Health and Human Services Reorganization.

Purpose: To advise the County Executive and the County Council on public health programs, services and facilities and comment on any gaps, deficiencies or duplication of efforts. The Commission will report each year on the performance of Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services programs, needed improvements, funding and priorities. The Commission will also advise on local public health planning needs, metropolitan area wide institutional health services and State of Maryland health related issues where appropriate.

Membership: 19 voting members representing a cross section of consumers and providers of health care, who are drawn from such populations as the disabled, the elderly, minority groups, the general population, physicians, other health professionals, health care institutions, health care insurers, health maintenance organizations, health professional schools and the allied health professionals and one member must be a member of the Montgomery County Medical Society. The majority of the members must not be providers of health services. Each member must reside or have a primary place of business in Montgomery County. Two non-voting ex-officio members are (1) a member of the County Council or the Council's designated representative (if the Council desires), and (2) the county health officer.

Officers: Commission elects its own chair for a term of one (1) year.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms – no compensation. Terms begin July 1.

Meetings: Third Thursday evening of each month.

Staff: Meghan Sontag, Program Manager
DHHS, 401 Hungerford Drive – 1401 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20850
Phone: 240-777-4668

2013 Comment:	None.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	The Commission features strong technical expertise from representatives from the community, providers of medical services, and medical societies. Commission public membership tends to be older and wealthier than the general population. Furthermore, it is noted that health care is relevant to the charter of many other BCCs and it is not evident that the Commission on Health is reaching out to the other boards to

COMMISSION ON HEALTH

	coordinate on health issues critical to specific population segments such as childcare, schools, eldercare, veterans, etc.
2025 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue, but with modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Incorporate minority health groups (including any relevant NGOs)• Improve coordination with relevant BCCs to identify health related concerns <p>These changes would help ensure that the Commission reflects the full diversity of the County's health needs.</p>

INTERAGENCY COMMISSION ON HOMELESSNESS

Created:

Montgomery County Code, Ch. 24-62 thru 24-70, effective 7/10/14. Amended by Bill 7-20 10/28/20.

Purpose:

The County Council intends that the Interagency Commission on Homelessness and function in such a manner that it may serve as the governing board of the Montgomery County Continuum of Care, and in serving this function comply with applicable federal regulations governing the Continuum of Care program.

Duties:

24-67 The Commission will promote a community-wide goal to end homelessness by developing a strategic plan and reviewing and monitoring programs that are components of the Continuum of Care. The Commission will recommend to the County Executive and County Council improvements to the Continuum of Care, educate the community about homelessness, and recommend and promote partnerships with private organizations, businesses and foundations, or any state or federal government agency, to improve the County's ability to prevent and reduce homelessness. The Commission must submit an annual report to the Executive and Council on November 30 each year.

Membership:

- (a) **The Commission has 25 voting members.**
- (b) **The Executive must appoint the following to serve as ex officio members:** (1) Director (or designee) of the Dept. of Health and Human Services; (2) Chief of Services (or designee) to End and Prevent Homelessness of the Dept. of Health and Human Services (3) Director (or designee) of the Dept. Housing and Community Affairs (4) A representative from the Office of the County Executive.
- (c) **The Executive must invite the following to serve as ex officio members:** (1) A Councilmember or staff member of the County Council, selected by the Council President; (2) Executive Director (or designee) of the Housing Opportunities Commission; and (3) A member of the County Legislative Delegation selected jointly by the Chairs of the House and Senate Delegations.
- (d) **The Executive must appoint 4 members who are representatives of government agencies.**
- (e) **The Executive must appoint 4 members who are representatives of homeless service organizations that** (1) prevent homelessness or assist homeless families, single adults, or youth; or (2) help households to exit homelessness and maintain stable, permanent housing.
- (f) **The Executive must appoint 4 members who are representatives of private organizations** that provide behavioral health, children and family services, healthcare, domestic violence services, aging and senior services, disability services, or veterans' services.
- (g) **The Executive must appoint:** (1) At least 1 member who is a homeless or formerly homeless resident of Montgomery County; (2) at least 1 member who is a representative of a hospital or other healthcare provider located in Montgomery County; (3) at least 1 member who is a representative of a private philanthropic organization or foundation; and (4) at least 1 member who is a representative of an affordable housing developer.

INTERAGENCY COMMISSION ON HOMELESSNESS

(h) The Executive must appoint 2 members of the general public who are residents

INTERAGENCY COMMISSION ON HOMELESSNESS

of the County.

The term of each non-ex officio member is 3 years. If a member is appointed to fill a vacancy before a term expires, the successor serves the rest of the unexpired term.

Financial Disclosure: None

Terms: Members appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council serve **3** year terms (initially staggered). Ex officio members- serve without term expiration dates.

Compensation: Members are not compensated for service on the Board.

Officers: The Executive must designate a Chair and Vice Chair.

Meetings: Commission must meet at least four times per year. Currently meeting every other month on Wednesdays from 3-5pm.

Advocacy: The Commission must not engage in any legislative advocacy at the state or federal levels unless that activity is approved by the Office of Intergovernmental Relations.

Staff:
Rozina Adhanom, ICHCoordinator, DHHS
401 Hungerford Drive, Rockville, MD
Phone: 240-777-4735

2013 Comment:	Newly established board; not under 2013 CERB review.
2013 Recommendation:	N/A
2025 Comment:	The Commission was described as critically important, with representation from County departments and service providers. However, CERB members expressed concern that individuals experiencing homelessness were not adequately represented or heard during meetings. There was a strong recommendation to include more members with lived experience of homelessness and to ensure that the Commission is responsive to community concerns. While the Commission is well-managed and has a strong charter, its effectiveness is limited by a lack of direct community engagement and unclear oversight within DHHS.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue and be recategorized as Tier 2 - Coordinating Body.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION COMMITTEE

Created: Bill 27-17, amending Mo. Co. Code Section 27-62 Human Rights and Civil Liberties, establishing the Human Trafficking Prevention Committee. eff. 1/18/18. Amended by Bill No. 18-18, effective 7/2/18, increasing the number of voting members to 17, by adding two public members with a direct interest in the prevention of human trafficking, and amending the requirement that each of the voting members must reside in the County to at least 9 of the voting members must when appointed either reside in or be an employee of the County.

Purpose: The Committee must: (1) adopt rules and procedures as necessary to perform its functions; (2) keep a record of its activities and minutes of all meetings, which must be kept on file and open to the public during business hours upon request; (3) develop and distribute information about human trafficking in the County; (4) promote educational activities that increase the understanding of human trafficking in the County; (5) develop and recommend interagency coordinated strategies for reducing human trafficking in the County; (6) advise the Council, the Executive, County agencies, and State elected officials about human trafficking in the County, and recommend policies, programs, legislation, or regulations necessary to reduce human trafficking; (7) submit an annual report by October 1 of each year to the Executive and Council on the activities of the Committee, including the source and amount of any contributions received to support the source and amount of any contributions received to support the activities of the Committee; and (8) establish three subcommittees: the Legislative Subcommittee; the Victim Services Subcommittee; and the Education and Outreach Subcommittee.

Membership: The Executive must appoint, subject to confirmation by the Council, the following: **17 voting members and up to 10 ex-officio nonvoting members. At least 9 of the voting members must, when appointed, either reside in or be an employee of the County. Voting members** must broadly reflect the geographic, economic, and social diversity of the County. Each voting member should be associated with an organization involved in addressing some aspect of human trafficking or have a direct interest in an issue related to human trafficking: (A) an employee of the Montgomery County Public Schools (B) an employee of the County State's Attorney's Office (C) a member of the Montgomery County Judiciary (D) an employee of the County Sheriff's Office (E) a member designee of the County Council (F) an employee of the County Police Department (G) an employee of the County Department of Health and Human Services (H) an employee of the County Office of Intergovernmental Relations (I) an employee of the County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation (J) a member of the County's Commission for Women (K) a member of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission (L) Two voting members should be from two different advocacy organizations (M) an owner or employee of a non-profit service provider (N) an academic advisor (O) Two voting members should be public members with a direct interest in the prevention of human trafficking. **Nonvoting members.** (A) **the Committee must also include the following ex officio nonvoting members or their designees:** (i) the Council President (ii) the County Executive (iii) the Director of the Department of Permitting Services (iv) the Director of the Commission on Human Rights and (v) the Director of the Office of Community Partnerships (B) **The Committee may also include the following ex officio nonvoting members or their designees:** (i) One Senator from the Montgomery County Delegation selected by the Chair of the County's Senate Delegation (ii) One Delegate from the Montgomery County Delegation selected by the Chair of the County's House Delegation and (iii) the President of an appropriate health care agency located in the County that serves victims of human trafficking.

Financial Disclosure: None

Advocacy: Must not engage in any advocacy activity at the State or federal levels unless that activity is approved by the Office of Intergovernmental Relations.

Terms: Voting members serve 3-year terms (initially staggered). Non voting *ex officio* members serve without term expiration dates.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION COMMITTEE

Compensation: Members are not compensated for service on the Committee.

Officers: The Committee must annual elect one **voting** member as chair and another as vice chair, and may elect other officers.

Meetings: Rockville Library, Wednesdays, every other month from 12:00PM-1:30PM, at the call of the chair as often as required to perform its duties, but at least six times each year or if a majority of the voting members submit a written request for a meeting to the chair at least 7 days before the proposed meeting.

Staff: Jodi Finkelstein, Commission for Women.
Phone: (240) 777-8333

2013 Comment:	Newly established board; not under 2013 CERB review.
2013 Recommendation:	N/A
2025 Comment:	The Committee is embedded within the Commission for Women and shares staff and resources. CERB members noted that the Committee's structure and purpose are unclear—whether it is advisory or coordinating. It was also observed that the Committee has overlapping membership with other boards such as the Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission. Members expressed concern about transparency, public accessibility of minutes, and the need for clearer public engagement. The Committee appears to function more as a coordinating body and may be duplicative of efforts already underway within the Commission for Women.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee be eliminated and absorbed into the Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission.

INTELLECTUAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES COMMISSION

(newly established 2023)

Created: [County Council Bill No. 10-23 Health - Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities Commission eff. 7/10/2023 Montgomery County Code Article 10](#)

Purpose: The Commission will advise the County Council and County Executive, and support individuals with IDD and their families by coordinating the provision of services; promoting communication among families, support staff, private and public organizations and the general public regarding programs and services; instituting and conducting educational and other programs, meetings and conferences; cooperating with public and private agencies, departments and organizations that provide services; reviewing and reporting on gaps in services; preparing recommendations on best practices, innovations in service areas and program costs; working with county and state level organizations; and advocating at the local, state and federal levels.

Membership: **25** total members: **19 voting** – **two** individuals with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities; **nine** individuals who are family members, guardians, or support staff of individuals with IDD; and **seven** individuals representing service providers or advocacy organizations that support individuals with IDD, **one** member of the Commission on People with Disabilities; and **six non-voting** designees of the Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Recreation, Montgomery County Public Schools, Montgomery College, Worksource Montgomery, and the Maryland Developmental Disabilities Administration.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Advocacy: The Commission must advocate at the local, state, and federal levels to advance the needs of individuals with IDD.

Terms: Three-year terms initially staggered. No compensation.

Meetings: Third Thursday of every month, 4:25 pm – 7:00 pm by Zoom.

Staff: Crystal Britto, IDD Program Coordinator, DHHS 401
Hungerford Drive, 2nd Floor
Rockville, MD 20850
240-777-4570

2013 Comment:	Newly established board; not under 2013 CERB review.
2013 Recommendation:	N/A
2025 Comment:	While noting the importance of the ensuring timely feedback and advise to the County on the needs of the people with intellectual and developmental disabilities, the CERB observed that the scope of this Commission is too broad, resulting in unclear priorities and avenues for community input. The representation of people with I/D disabilities was glaringly inadequate (two

INTELLECTUAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES COMMISSION

(newly established 2023)

	<p>out of 25 members). A large number of providers on the Commission (one third of voting members), combined with the charge to make recommendations on services, crowded out voices of people with I/D disabilities and raised concerns of conflict of interest.</p>
2025 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue, but with modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revise the scope of this Commission to narrow its focus and maximize its added value• Consider removing advocacy from the list of purposes and supporting efforts of providers and interest groups through other available avenues, such as grants or joint campaigns• Reduce the number of providers and increase the number of individuals with I/D disabilities among members.

COMMISSION ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

Created:

Section 12-36 of the Montgomery County Code. Bill 7-95, effective 7/11/95, re: Dept. of Health and Human Services reorganization. Bill No. 4-00, effective 7/14/2000, revised the membership and changed the name from Juvenile Court Committee to Commission on Juvenile Justice. Bill No. 9-12 effective 8/9/12, eliminated one public member position and added one Collaboration Council representative.

Purpose:

The Montgomery County Commission on Juvenile Justice is an independent advisory body whose purpose is to advise the County Executive, County Council and the Juvenile Court on matters concerning juveniles. This is accomplished by gathering and disseminating information from public and private agencies serving youth, monitoring the functioning of the Juvenile Justice system, visiting facilities, and closely following State and County legislative proposals affecting juveniles.

Membership:

(34 total voting members) 22 voting members representing the public at large. 12 agency representatives (also voting): One each representing the **County Council**, the **County Executive**, the **State's Attorney**, the **Family Division of the Circuit Court**, **Police Department**, the **State Department of Juvenile Justice**, the **Court Appointed Special Advocate**, the **Board of Education**; two representatives from the **County Department of Health and Human Services** (one representing child welfare services and one representing community-based services for at-risk youth), the **Montgomery County Office of the Public Defender**, and the **Collaboration Council for Children, Youth and Families** in each case appointed by the Executive, subject to Council confirmation, after receiving a recommendation from the person or office to be represented. **Nonvoting members emeritus** who are past members who have given outstanding service and possess special expertise in juvenile matters. Members emeritus may be appointed by the Executive, subject to confirmation by the Council.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms - no compensation.

Meetings: Third Tuesday evening of each month, 7:30 p.m. at 7300 Calhoun Place, #600. Diane Lininger, Staff Liaison, Division of Children, Youth and Families, Health & Human Services 240-777-3317, FAX 240-777-4665

2013 Comment:	<p>Need to clarify membership details. For example, ensure that the public at large representatives reflect the socio-economic and ethnic makeup of the County. Need to determine how well the agency reps are in place, and should any of the agencies be eliminated from membership.</p> <p>The large membership might contribute to problems, although the observed meetings were very well run. Consideration of reducing the membership to a more manageable number might be warranted.</p>
---------------	--

COMMISSION ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the
----------------------	--

COMMISSION ON JUVENILE JUSTICE

	CERB recommends that this Commission continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment	The Commission was described as a coordinating board with limited community outreach. Its work overlaps with the Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission (CJCC) and the Domestic Violence Coordinating Council (DVCC). CERB members noted that the CJCC already has a juvenile justice subcommittee, and that many of the same individuals participate in all three bodies. The Commission was seen as more of an internal advisory group with minimal public engagement.
2025 Recommendation	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission be eliminated and absorbed by the Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission to streamline operations and reduce redundancy.

LIBRARY BOARD

Created: Montgomery County Code Section 2-46, as amended. Amended by CERB Bill 4-16 eff. 7/20/16 increasing membership and adding 1 member recommended by Montgomery College.

Purpose: Inquire into matters affecting the County public library system including the acquisition and location of new library facilities, the adequacy of book collections, services to outlying districts and personnel needs of the Department of Libraries and to make recommendations thereon to the County Executive.

Membership: 14 total members: 13 members, including 1 member recommended by Montgomery College and one supervisor of school libraries is an ex officio member of the board.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms no- compensation.

Meetings: Second Wednesday of each month at 7:00 p.m.

Staff: Darcell Graham, Director, 240-777-0012
Regina Holyfield-Jewett, 240-777-0106

2013 Comment:	All information and recent history shows that the Montgomery County Library Board is a very effective group. They maintain close cooperative relationships with two auxiliary organizations, the Friends of the Library (FOL), and the Library Advisory Committees (LAC), thus providing outreach into the community and the users of the libraries. The Board has also conducted effective efforts to lobby for additional funds through the County budget. The Board has expressed interest in adding an ex-officio member to the Board. This request is for a representative from Montgomery College.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no change in its scope and functions, but with a modification with the addition of an ex-officio member position to represent Montgomery College.
2025 Comment:	CERB members noted that libraries now serve broader functions beyond books, including digital media, technology access, and community gathering spaces. The Library Board would bring greater value by coordinating more closely with the Recreation Department, IT, Regional Services, and the individual Library Advisory Committees to reflect this evolving role. There was consensus that the Board is valuable but must adapt to the changing landscape of library services.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue, but with modifications:

LIBRARY BOARD

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure consistent coordination of services with the Recreation Department, IT, Regional Services, and Library Advisory Committees
--	---

MENTAL HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

<u>Created:</u>	<p><u>Montgomery County Code Chapter 24-34</u>, as amended.(1990, 1992). Bill 7-95, effective 7/11/95 re: Department of Health and Human Services reorganization and State law, Chapter 21.</p>
<u>Purpose:</u>	<p>The Committee monitors, reviews, and evaluates the allocation and adequacy of publicly-funded mental health services within the County through means such as conducting or participating in site visits; determines the needs of the County mental health system, including quality of services, gaps in the system, and interagency coordination; and, participates in the development of the local mental health plan and local mental health budgets. The Committee also prepares an annual report to certain state and County officials; reviews and comments on the annual mental health plan and preliminary budget for the state mental health grant to the County; and reviews and comments on the annual budget for mental health services of the Department of Health and Human Services.</p>
<u>Financial Disclosure:</u>	Not required.
<u>Membership:</u>	19 voting members (as described in the listing below) and at least 3 nonvoting ex officio members. Members serve without compensation.
<u>Voting Members:</u>	<p>(a) 7 individuals selected as representatives from the following 13 categories: the County Executive, the County Council, the County public schools, the practicing physicians in the County; mental health professionals in the County who are not physicians; the clergy in the County; the legal profession in the County; a local law enforcement agency; a local general hospital that contains an inpatient psychiatric unit; the county office on aging; the Department of Juvenile Services; the Department of Health and Human Services; and a local community rehabilitation or housing program; (b) 4 individuals who are currently receiving or have in the past received mental health services; (c) 3 parents or other relatives of adults with mental disorders; (d) 3 parents or other relatives of children or adolescents with emotional, behavioral, or mental disorders, the onset of which occurred during childhood or adolescence; (e) one representative from the local mental health association; and (f) one member of the general public.</p> <p>*Bold = organizations currently represented on the Committee</p>
<u>Nonvoting Members:</u>	<p><u>Ex-Officio, Nonvoting Members are the following individuals or their designees:</u></p> <p>a) the State Mental Hygiene Administration regional mental health director who serves the County; b) a representative of a State inpatient facility that serves the County; c) Director of the County DHHS; and d) if there are designated State inpatient beds located in County general hospitals, a representative from those facilities.</p>
<u>Additional Requirements:</u>	<p>A Committee member must not receive direct or indirect monetary benefits from State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene grants or contracts, except local general hospitals that contain a clinic or State designated inpatient beds, a local community rehabilitation or housing program, and the representative from the County mental health association. "Monetary benefits" do not include reimbursement for ordinary expenses, such as travel, or compensation received by a government employee. The State Director of Mental Hygiene appoints the representative of the State inpatient facility under State law.</p>
<u>Terms:</u>	Three year terms. A voting member who has served 2 consecutive full terms must not

MENTAL HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
be reappointed for 2 years after completing those terms.

MENTAL HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meetings: First Thursday evening of each month

Staff: Diane Lininger, Program Manager, Dept. of Health & Human Services
7300 Calhoun Place, Rockville, MD 20855
Phone: 240-777-1411

2013 Comment:	<p>This Committee is mandated by State Law.</p> <p>Coordination between this committee and the Veteran's Affairs Commission is warranted. Suggest that consideration be given to the idea that a member be designated to be a representative to the Veterans group.</p>
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	The Committee boasts diverse membership, consistently strong participation, and constructive relationships with multiple County and State agencies, as well as MCPS. It has strong connections with local organizations, other BCCs, and affinity groups. The CERB noted that the Committee is experiencing mission creep, with a strong desire to act as an advocacy group rather than an advisory body to DHHS. There appears to be a disconnect between the department's goals and the Committee's activities.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue, but with modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conduct a strategic planning process jointly with DHHS to realign this Committee's priorities more closely with departmental objectives and this Committee's stated purpose

MID-COUNTY CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

Created: Council Resolution No. 9-40, adopted January 30, 1979.

Purpose: To provide advice to the Director of the Mid-County Center on area priorities and on ways to tailor services in the center to residents of the region, the board works to identify and understand community issues and advises the County Executive and County Council on the appropriate role for government to assume in resolving these issues.

Membership: Fifteen members who are residents or business owners in the area.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three year terms - no compensation.

Meetings: Third Tuesday of each month.

Staff: Nestor Alvarenga, Director, 240-777-8101

2013 Comment:	<p>One serious problem impacts this Board's operation: the limited staff support available. There is only one staff person at the regional center, and the required support level is difficult to provide. The Board is the first line of interaction between the citizens and the County government, the CERB would suggest that the Board (as one of five regional Boards), continue, but with increased staff support.</p> <p>There should be some additional criteria for selecting members than they live in or own a business in the area.</p> <p>CERB observers noted that the meetings are overly concerned with the details of Robert's Rules of order. This concern with the rules took time away from the discussion of the issues. This may have been an isolated incident; regardless, it was quite an unusual situation for a non-judicial group.</p>
2013 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions.</p> <p>The CERB strongly suggests that all five regional boards be supported by increased staff at the Regional Centers. A staff increase will guarantee that the Boards will be able to do their job even better than now.</p>
2025 Comment:	<p>This Board is very active and well-functioning; its activities are aligned with the stated purpose. The CERB questioned why nine out of 15 members were Silver Spring residents, while Silver Spring is already covered by East County Citizen Advisory Board and Silver Spring Citizen Advisory Board. Additionally, CERB members noted that the Wheaton Urban District Advisory Board overlaps in its</p>

MID-COUNTY CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

	function with this Board.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue, and absorb the issues currently covered by Wheaton Urban District Advisory Board to reduce duplication and strengthen participation. The CERB further recommends strengthening targeted recruitment of community members from the Mid-County region and avoiding representation overlap with other regional advisory boards.

ADVISORY BOARD FOR MONTGOMERY CARES PROGRAM

Created: Montgomery County Code, Ch. 24-47 thru 24-53, effective 5/11/06. Sunset: 1/1/09. Amended 12/29/08, Bill 29-08. Board term continued until 1/1/15.
Amended 7/12/11, Bill 6-11. Two current or former recipient positions added.
Amended 10/8/15, Bill 36-15 one managed care position added. Amended 12/16/21, Exped. Bill 43-2. Automatic termination date repealed, one managed care position abolished, two public and one person with knowledge of health care for uninsured positions added, vice chair election added, “underinsured” residents included.

Purpose: The Board's Mission is to guide the development of the Program to ensure steady and measurable growth in the number of uninsured County residents accessing high quality and efficient health care services including primary, specialty, dental and behavioral health care services.

Duties: The Board may advise the County Executive, County Council, and Department on any matter relating to the goal of ensuring a steady and measurable improvement in accessibility of low income, uninsured and underinsured County residents accessing high quality health care services including: (1) eligibility criteria for participating health care providers; (2) eligibility criteria for individuals served by the Program; (3) the method for allocating Program funds; (4) the method of distributing funds to participating health care providers; (5) the Program budget; (6) growth targets and resources needed to meet those targets; (7) assistance to eligible individuals to obtain State and federal care coverage; (8) policies and practices to maximize the use of County funds for direct services to clients; (9) evaluation of the program to improve access to health care and related services for low-income uninsured and underinsured County residents; and (10) strategic planning.

The Board must submit a quarterly report to the County Executive, County Council, and Department on its activities, findings and recommendations.

Membership: Nineteen voting members. **Members who should be appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council:** (1) 2 representatives of community health providers that participate in the Program; (2) 1 representative of hospitals that participate in the Program; (3) The chair of the Board of Directors or designee of the entity that contracts with the Department to administer the distribution of funds for the delivery of Program services; (4) 5 members of the public (5) 4 individuals who have knowledge of and experience with issues relating to health care for uninsured individuals such as primary care, specialty care, dental care, behavioral health care, or fiscal matters relating to any of these types of care; (6) 1 representative of the Commission on Health; (7) 1 representative of the County Medical Society, and (8) 2 current or former recipients of services under the Program. **Ex-officio members:** (1) the County Health Officer or designee; (2) the Chief of the Department's Behavioral Health and Crisis Services or designee.

Financial Disclosure: Not required as of 2016.

Terms: Members appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council will serve 3 year terms. **Beginning 1/1/09 the terms of each member appointed on or after that date must be staggered so that one-third are appointed for a 1-year**

ADVISORY BOARD FOR MONTGOMERY CARES PROGRAM

term, one third are appointed for a 2-year term, and one third are appointed for a 3-year term. Attendance policy does not apply to *ex-officio* members. [Note: bold text indicates 2008 amended term.]

Compensation: Members are not compensated for service on the Board.

Officers: Members of the Board must elect a chair and vice chair by majority vote to serve a 1-year term.

Meetings: Fourth Wednesday of each month from 6:00 PM to 8:30 PM, at 401 Hungerford Drive, 1st Floor Conference Room, Rockville.

Staff: Dr. Christopher Rogers, DHHS, 1401 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20850
240-777-4422, Ashley Miller, Phone: (240)-672-4931

2013 Comment:	Two “ex-officio” members are counted in the voting total of 17. Perhaps they should be listed as regular members. Meetings of this large board are well attended. The meetings, with presenters, speakers, etc., run from 2-3 hours. Members observe Roberts Rules of Order throughout the meeting.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	This Board channels outstanding technical expertise from representatives of the involved agencies, providers, and experts. However, representation of community members on this Board has been lacking.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions. The CERB further recommends that the Board emphasize targeted recruitment among current/former recipients of services under the Montgomery Cares Program to ensure greater representation and engagement of beneficiaries.

PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, AND TRAFFIC SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

<u>Created:</u>	County Council Resolution No. 14-1281 (as amended 10/11/05), and County Council Resolution No. 16-192 (adopted 6/19/07) extending the Committee and amending <u>Mo.Co.Code § 49-81</u> , and Bill 27-11 (eff. 2/6/12), amending § 49-81, repealing the sunset of the PTSAC, renaming the committee, and adding a member representing the disability community.
<u>Purpose:</u>	The Committee must: (1) advise the Executive and Council on the status of the implementation of the recommendations in the Pedestrian Safety Final Report, issued in 2002; (2) advise the Executive and Council of priorities and needs for pedestrian and bicycle safety and access, and other pedestrian- related issues; and (3) continue to gather information on pedestrian safety and other pedestrian-related issues and identify new issues that emerge. By November 1 each year, the Committee must submit to the Executive and the Council an annual report on its functions, activities, accomplishments, and plans and objectives
<u>Membership:</u>	17 members appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council. The Executive must appoint a representative from each of the following: Police Department, Department of Transportation, and one of the Regional Services Centers. The Executive must invite a representative from the County Council, County Planning Board, Montgomery County Public Schools, and the State Highway Administration. The Executive must appoint one member representing a municipality from a list provided by the County Chapter of the Maryland Municipal League, one bicycle advocate and one representative of people with disabilities. The Executive must appoint the remaining individuals from different geographic areas of the County.
<u>Officers:</u>	The County Executive must designate a member of the Committee to be Chair. The Chair will be appointed for one two-year term.
<u>Financial Disclosure:</u>	Not required.
<u>Terms:</u>	Three-years - <u>The term of the Committee originally ended at the expiration of 5 years (7/2007), but was extended until 7/2012. Bill 27-11 eff. 2-6-12 repealed the sunset of the committee.</u>
<u>Meetings:</u>	Every other month, first Thursday of the months of February, April, June, August, October and December from 7:00 PM – 9:30 PM. at the Rockville EOB and various locations throughout the County.
<u>Staff:</u>	Nima Upadhyay, DOT, 240-777-2192
<u>2013 Comment:</u>	The existing membership shows a great deal of enthusiasm and involvement. The staff liaisons and support staff are highly appreciated by the Committee members. Meetings are well attended, and are usually supported by three staff members.

PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, AND TRAFFIC SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
----------------------	--

PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, AND TRAFFIC SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2025 Comment	<p>The CERB noted that the Committee experienced significant recruiting and member retention issues, resulting in cancellation of multiple meetings. The inclusion of 8 representatives of government agencies, many of whom routinely did not attend meetings, limited input from members of the public. Inequitable representation from all County districts and an over-emphasis on bicycling concerns further skewed the focus of this Committee. Pedestrian and traffic safety matters are also being tackled by several other BCCs.</p>
2025 Recommendation	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee be eliminated as a standalone body.</p> <p>The CERB further recommends to narrow down areas of concern and incorporate them into every Regional Advisory Committee's scope for equitable, resident-driven input.</p> <p>Alternatively, consider assigning issues related to Vision Zero to a term-limited, resident-heavy advisory body that would sunset with the Action Plan's 2030 target date.</p>

COMMISSION ON PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

<u>Created:</u>	Section 27-51 of the Montgomery County Code, 1978 (amended 1990, 1995). Amended by CERB Bill No. 4-16, effective 7/20/16, adding 1 nonvoting member of the Commission on Veterans Affairs.
<u>Purpose:</u>	Advise the County Executive and the County Council on matters relating to residents with disabilities of the County; review overall programs and services for people with disabilities, including identifying unmet needs and gaps in services; review federal, state and local legislation that affect people with disabilities; and identify, analyze and evaluate barriers to programs and services for people with disabilities. The Commission also studies ways to maximize the use of facilities and services available to people with disabilities; initiates and sponsors conferences, forums and special task forces to identify and assess needs and promote the coordination of services among public and private agencies that provide services and programs for people with disabilities; reviews budgetary recommendations for the County's contribution to programs and services to disabled individuals; and, submits an annual report.
<u>Membership:</u>	25 members and at least six non-voting members. Thirteen of the voting members are to be people with disabilities; three members are to be parents of people with disabilities and nine members are to be representatives from organizations and agencies that provide services or represent people with disabilities. Six non-voting members including one from the Department of Recreation, Department of Transportation, Human Rights Commission, and Commission on Veterans Affairs; and two non-voting members from the Department of Health and Human Services. The County Executive may appoint additional nonvoting members from other governmental agencies.
<u>Financial Disclosure:</u>	Not required.
<u>Terms:</u>	Three year terms - no compensation.
<u>Meetings:</u>	Second Wednesday of each month, except for July and August.
<u>Staff:</u>	Betsy Luecking, Program Manager, Dept. of Health and Human Services, Aging & Dis. Services, 401 Hungerford Drive, 4th Fl., 240-777-1256; Md. Relay Service 1-800-735-2258; Paratransit 301-468-4446 (V) or 301-468-4109 (TTY)

2013 Comment:	<p>There appears to be a need to have a representative from the Commission on Veterans Affairs added to the membership.</p> <p>Due to the nature and importance of the work done by this Commission, there is a great deal of staff time provided to ensure all issues are handled efficiently.</p> <p>There are 5 non-voting Ex-officio members; a question was raised as to how frequently they attend. It was also noted that the requirement is for</p>
---------------	---

COMMISSION ON PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

	the Executive to appoint “at least 5” in this category. Does that mean that 6 or 12 might be acceptable?
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue but with the modification of adding a representative from the Commission on Veterans Affairs.
2025 Comment:	This Commission effectively engages with the community on disability-related issues and County services. However, member retention has been a repeated challenge.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue with no changes to its scope or functions. The CERB further recommends a particular emphasis on increased targeted member recruitment and retention incentives.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES

Created:

Montgomery County Code, Section 2-42B, est. October 2006.

Purpose:

The Committee must advise the Department of Permitting Services on the performance of its functions and recommend to the Director, the Executive, and the Council of any steps necessary to improve the Department's performance. The Department of Permitting Services is responsible for: (1) reviewing building plans and specifications, building permits, occupancy permits and licensing facilities for compliance with the fire protection law; (2) code enforcement, inspection, and licenses (except where those functions are assigned by law to another department or agency), including: (a) administering, interpreting, and enforcing construction codes, and laws and regulations governing sediment control, stormwater management, floodplain management, special protection areas, and pond and excavation safety; (c) issuing building, electrical stormwater discharge, and on-site water supply and sewage disposal permits; (d) administering and enforcing agricultural preservation and historic resources laws and regulations.

Membership:

11 voting members; 6 non-voting members. The ex-officio, non-voting members must be nominated respectively by the Director of Environmental Protection, the Director of Housing and Community Affairs, the Director of Public Works and Transportation, the Fire Chief, the Planning Board, and the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission. [Note attendance policy does not apply to ex-officio members.]

The County Executive from time to time designates one voting member as Chair and one as Vice Chair.

Financial

Disclosure:

Not Required.

Terms:

Three year terms (initial terms of the voting members are staggered as follows: 3 to one-year terms; 4 to two-year terms; and 4 to three-year terms); members serve until a successor is confirmed.

Meetings:

The second Tuesday of the month in the evening in Rockville. (The Committee meets at the call of the Chair at least four times per year.)

Staff:

Leah Ortiz, Department of Permitting Services
255 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20850
Phone: 240-777-6272

2013 Comment:	<p>The committee provides a critical function, and draws from a wide range of stakeholders of the building and development industry.</p> <p>Its primary function is to advise the Department of Permitting Services on its performance, and secondarily to advise the Executive and Council on needed changes. Most BCCs do not appear to be so closely tied to a Department.</p>
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES**

2025 Comment:	This Committee has experienced challenges with member recruitment. CERB members noted a lack of clarity in whether the Commission truly channels public input to advise the Department of Permitting Services or serves as a de-facto coordination body for various County agencies and a semi-formal escalation channel for complaints.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue, but with modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review the purpose and classification of this Committee to either focus on advising the Department of Permitting Services, per its title, or be recategorized as Tier 2 - Coordinating Body, to streamline collaboration from relevant County agencies and divisions.

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON POLICING

(Formerly Policing Advisory Commission)

Created: Sec. 35-6. Advisory Commission on Policing. Amended by Bill 32-23 11/6/2023 changing name and membership requirements.

Purpose: The Commission must: 1) advise the Council on policing matters; 2) provide information regarding best practices on policing matters; 3) recommend policies, programs, legislation, or regulations; 4) comment on matters referred to it by the Council; 5) conduct community outreach for community input on policing matters; 6) accept correspondence and comments from members of the public; and 7) engage in public education. The Commission must submit an annual report to the Executive and Council on its functions, activities, accomplishments, and plans and objectives, by July 1 each year.

Membership: The 15-member Commission consists of 13 voting members **all appointed by the County Council:** 11 public members each nominated by a Councilmember; one youth member and one voting young adult member each nominated by the County Executive and appointed by the County Council; and two non-voting ex officio members appointed by the County Council: the Police Chief or the Police Chief's designee, and the President of an employee organization certified under Article V of Chapter 33 (Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 35) or the President's designee. Of the Councilmember nominees, if there is a vacancy on the Commission and the Councilmember who appointed the Commissioner is no longer on the Council, then the Councilmember's successor must appoint the public member to fill the vacancy.

Every public member should represent a community organization operating in the County or be an individual. Commission members should reflect a range of ethnicities, socioeconomic status, and places of origin to reflect the racial and economic diversity of the County's communities, including religious creed, age, sex – including on the basis of gender identity or orientation, disability, and geographic location, with emphasis on those disproportionately impacted by inequities; and have an interest or expertise in policing matters. Every new member must participate in an orientation program consisting of a menu of training opportunities determined by the Chair in consultation with staff.

Financial

Disclosure:

Not required.

Terms:

Three-year terms - no compensation.

Meetings:

Virtually the second Monday evening of the month from 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm.

Staff:

Susan Farag, Legislative Analyst, Montgomery County Council

Phone: (240) 777-7921 Email: susan.farag@montgomerycountymd.gov

2013 Comment:	
2013 Recommendation:	
2025 Comment:	CERB determined that this Commission is not under its purview, as it is appointed directly by the County Council and not the County Executive.

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON POLICING

(Formerly Policing Advisory Commission)

2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission not be reviewed by CERB, as it falls outside the scope of its mandate.
----------------------	--

PUBLIC ELECTION FUND COMMITTEE

The Public Elections Fund Committee appears to have been abolished.

https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/COUNCIL/public_campaign_finance.html

Public Elections Fund Committee

Bill 16-14 originally established a Public Elections Fund Committee. This Committee was required to report to the Council by March 1 of each year and estimate the funding necessary to implement the campaign finance system and recommend an appropriation for the Public Election Fund for the following fiscal year. Bill 20-24, as approved by the Council on November 12, 2024, has removed this Committee as active as of February 20, 2025.

Sec. 16-31. Reserved.

Editor's note—Former Sec. 16-31, Public Election Fund Committee, which was formerly Section 16-27; derived from 2014 L.M.C., ch. 28, § 2; amended by 2019 L.M.C., ch. 23, § 1; renumbered and renamed by 2020 L.M.C., ch. 31, § 1; and amended by 2021 L.M.C., ch. 26, § 1; was repealed by 2024 L.M.C., ch. 21, § 1.

2013 Comment:	N/A
2013 Recommendation:	N/A
2025 Comment	The Public Election Fund Committee no longer exists. Bill 20-24, approved by the Council on November 12, 2024, officially removed the Committee effective February 20, 2025. Section 16-31 of the Montgomery County Code, which previously governed the Committee, has been repealed and is now reserved. The Committee's former responsibilities are no longer active under County law.
2025 Recommendation	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that the Public Election Fund Committee be removed from all BCC listings.

RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

<u>Created:</u>	<p><u>Established by County Council Bill 27-19</u>, effective March 2, 2020. <u>Montgomery County Code, Sec.27-83</u>. Amended by Bill 44-20 adding two public members effective March 12, 2021.</p>
<u>Purpose:</u>	<p>The Committee must: (1) adopt rules and procedures as necessary to perform its functions; (2) keep a record of its activities and minutes of all meetings, which must be kept on file and open to the public during business hours upon request; (3) develop and distribute information about racial equity and social justice in the County; (4) promote educational activities that increase the understanding of racial equity and social justice in the County; (5) recommend coordinated strategies for reducing racial and social justice inequity in the County; (6) advise the Council, the Executive, and County agencies about racial equity and social justice in the County, and recommend policies, programs, legislation, or regulations necessary to reduce racial and social justice inequity; (7) meet periodically with the racial equity and social justice lead for each department and office; and (8) submit an annual report by December 1 of each year to the Executive and Council on the activities of the Committee.</p>
<u>Membership:</u>	<p>The 17-member Committee is composed of 10 public members and 7 agency members, to include: 1) a designee of a public education system in the County; 2) the Director of the Office of Human Rights or the Director's designee; 3) a designee of the County Council; 4) an employee of the County Department of Health and Human Services; 5) an employee of the County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation; 6) a sworn officer of the County Police Department; and 7) a Chair of the Montgomery County Planning Board or the Chair's designee. Members must reflect a range of ethnicities, professional backgrounds, socioeconomic status, and places of origin to reflect the racial, economic, and linguistic diversity of the County's communities, with an emphasis on those most disproportionately impacted by inequities. Each member should have some experience in redressing disparate impacts based on race and social justice issues.</p>
<u>Financial Disclosure:</u>	NA
<u>Advocacy:</u>	NA
<u>Terms:</u>	Three years
<u>Compensation:</u>	Each of the 10 public members may receive an annual stipend of \$2,000.00 and reimbursement for expenses incurred in serving.
<u>Officers:</u>	The Committee must annually elect one member as chair and another as vice chair and may elect other officers.
<u>Meetings:</u>	At the call of the chair as often as required to perform its duties, but at least 6 times each year. Meets monthly the 3 rd Wednesday of every month at 6:00 pm.
<u>Staff:</u>	Andrea Gardner, Office of Racial Equity and Social Justice Phone: 240-777-5330

RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2013 Comment:	Newly established board; not under 2013 CERB review.
2013 Recommendation:	N/A
2025 Comment:	CERB members praise the Committee's commitment to equity and its data-driven approach. However, they noted concerns about the lack of clarity on how collected data is being translated into actionable outcomes. The Committee meets virtually, which may limit broader community engagement.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions. The CERB further recommends the Committee improve data utilization and increase in-person engagement opportunities to strengthen community participation.

RUSTIC ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Created: Montgomery County Code, Sec. 49-80 (1993) Amended by Bill 30-23 eff. 11-6-23, changing membership composition and adding two members.

Purpose: To promote public awareness and knowledge of the rustic roads program in the County; review and comment on classification of rustic roads and exceptional rustic roads; review and comment on Executive Regulations and other County policies and programs that may affect the program; and report bi-annually to the County Executive, the County Council, and the Planning Board on the status of the rustic roads program.

Membership: The Committee has **10** members: nine voting and one non-voting. **Each member must be a resident of the County.** The County Executive should appoint **three** members who operate commercial farmland earning 50 percent or more of their income from direct involvement in commodity farming, **one** representative of the Agricultural Advisory Committee; **one** member who has knowledge of rural preservation techniques; **one** member who knows roadway engineering through practical experience and training; and **three** public at large members. The Chairman of the Planning Board must designate **one** member of the Planning Staff as a non-voting member.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three years.

Lobbying: The Committee must not engage in any advocacy activity at the State or federal levels unless that activity is approved by the Office of Intergovernmental Relations.

Meetings: Meetings are usually held the 4th Thursday of each month at 6:00 p.m.

Staff:
Chris Van Alstyne, DOT
101 Monroe Street, Rockville
Phone: 240-777-4934

2013 Comment:	A rustic road is a fragile piece of the landscape that can be ruined by tree removal, grading, and other construction. Once the damage is done, there is usually no comeback or repair. The County residents on the committee observe whether rustic road protection rules in the zoning ordinances are being followed. They make observations that County Staff cannot afford the time to do. The cost factors to support this effort are minimal. Local residents are more than willing to help protect this valuable resource.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	The Committee plays a unique role in preserving the County's agricultural and historic roadways. CERB members noted its importance in balancing tourism, preservation, and agricultural needs.

RUSTIC ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

	While some discussion occurred about merging it with other groups, the consensus was that its distinct mission justifies its continued independence.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.

SILVER SPRING CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

Created: Resolution No. 8-449. Executive Order No. 35-99 increases membership to 18 members, effective 2/19/99

Purpose: To strengthen communication between the community and the various agencies of the County Government, coordinate necessary interagency action with regard to Silver Spring, and recommend programs and policies tailored to the Silver Spring area.

Membership: 18 members

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms.

Meetings: Usually second Monday of each month.

Staff: Nahom Tekle
Silver Spring Civic Building at Veterans Plaza, One Veterans Place
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Telephone: 240-777-5307

2013 Comment:	<p>One serious problem that impacts this Board's operation: the limited staff support available. There is only one staff person at the regional center, and the required support level is difficult to provide. The Board is the first line of interaction between the citizens and the County government. CERB suggests that the Board (as one of 5 regional Boards), continue, but with increased staff support.</p> <p>There should be some criteria listed for selecting members; can it be presumed that they must at least live or own a business in the area?</p> <p>The Board is lending its support to important ongoing initiatives in the Silver Spring area, such as the tree trimming program by Pepco; making the area greener; closing certain in-demand soccer fields for renovation; visiting and supporting the small business incubator in Silver Spring; supporting the Small Business Saturday initiative; and encouraging use of the Silver Spring Civic Building.</p> <p>For conformity among the committees, suggest name change to "Down County Citizens Advisory Board".</p>
2013 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions.</p> <p>The CERB strongly suggests that all five regional boards be supported by increased staff at the Regional Centers. A staff increase will guarantee that the Boards will be able to do their job even better than now.</p>

SILVER SPRING CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

2025 Comment:	<p>The Board's work is aligned with the stated purpose. At the same time the CERB noted consistent challenges with meeting attendance and community engagement and raised concerns that Silver Spring residents also serve on the Mid-County Citizen Advisory Board and the East County Citizen Advisory Board. CERB members further questioned the need for a separate Silver Spring advisory body considering the existence of the highly effective East County CAB, but acknowledged the geographic and socio-economic divergence of these two regions that warrant separate civic advisory boards.</p>
2025 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue, but with modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Absorb the Silver Spring Transportation Management District Advisory Committee• Absorb the Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee• Review and clarify stated purpose and functions resulting from these mergers

SILVER SPRING TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

<u>Created:</u>	Montgomery County Code, Section 42A-23(e) and Council Resolution No. 14-1511, Adopted November 26, 2002.
<u>Purpose:</u>	The Committee may advise the County government on all aspects of programs, management and finances relating to the implementation of transportation system management in the Silver Spring Central Business District and vicinity. The Committee also proposes guidelines for traffic mitigation plans; monitors the implementation of the traffic mitigation plans; evaluates progress in attaining the commuting goals specified in the Annual Growth Policy for Silver Spring; recommends government, private or joint actions necessary to facilitate attainment of the commuting goals specified in the Annual Growth Policy; advises the Director of DOT on parking policies, including any relevant issues relating to neighborhood parking and pedestrian access and safety; and, submits comments and recommendations on the Director's Annual Report by December 1 of each year.
<u>Membership:</u>	12 voting members and 4 non-voting members. Three members are nominated by the Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce; three members are nominated by the Silver Spring Advisory Board of which: one is a resident of the transportation management district established in the Silver Spring Central Business District; one is a resident within the North and Western Silver Spring Sector Plan areas; and, one is a resident of the southern portion of the Kemp Mill-Four Corners or the Silver Spring East master plan area, or the Montgomery County portion of the Takoma Park planning area. Three members are employers of fewer than 50 employees and three members are employers of 50 or more employees in the Central Business District. Non-voting members are the Directors or the designees of the Department of Public Works and Transportation and the Silver Spring Regional Service Center; a representative of the Montgomery County Police Department, and a representative of the Planning Board.
<u>Financial Disclosure:</u>	Not required.
<u>Terms:</u>	Three year terms - no compensation
<u>Meetings:</u>	Second Thursday of each month at 8 a.m.
<u>Staff:</u>	James Carlson, DOT, 101 Monroe St., 10 th Floor, Rockville, MD (240) 777-8382; General #: (240) 777-8380

2013 Comment:	Are non-voting members "ex-officio"? This is an example of the variety of ex officios.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no change to its scope or functions.

**SILVER SPRING TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ADVISORY
COMMITTEE**

2025 Comment	CERB members found that the Committee lacks citizen engagement and functions more as a departmental communication outlet. It was noted that the committee's structure and purpose are unclear, and that it overlaps with other transportation-related bodies.
--------------	---

**SILVER SPRING TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ADVISORY
COMMITTEE**

2025 Recommendation	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee be eliminated and absorbed by the Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board.
---------------------	---

SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Created: Montgomery County Code, Sec. 68A-5(a).

Purpose: The Committee should, by July 15 of each year, advise the Department of Transportation on the program and budget of the urban district; by September 15 of each year, review the urban district budget and submit comments to the Department; and by October 1 of each year, meet with the Department Director to resolve areas of disagreement regarding the budget.

Membership: Eleven members. The County Executive **must strive** to appoint two persons nominated by the Greater Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce; three representatives of optional method developers; three representatives from businesses that employ fewer than 25 employees; two representatives of residential communities in the urban district; and one representative of a residential community in or outside of the urban district who is a member of the Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms **beginning July 1** - no compensation.

Meetings: Meetings are held the third Thursday of each month at 3:30 p.m. at Discovery Communications, Inc., 1 Discovery Place, Silver Spring 20910

Staff: Jacob Newman, Director, SS Regional Services Center
Silver Spring Civic Building at Veterans Plaza, One Veterans Place
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Telephone: 240-777-5307

2013 Comment:	The membership section contains the awkward wording "The County Executive must strive to" Clearer wording would definitely be appropriate.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	CERB members observed that the Committee is interlocked with other Silver Spring boards and suffers from limited coordination and unclear roles. Some meetings lacked quorum or public participation.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee be eliminated and absorbed under the Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board.

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Created: Montgomery County Code Section, 48-38.

Purpose: To review and make recommendations on the 10 year solid waste management plan for the County; make recommendations for the storage, collection, transportation, etc. of solid wastes; recommend local and State legislation necessary to accomplish effective solid waste management.

Membership: Fifteen voting members representing all geographical areas of the County as well as representatives from the solid waste industry, business users, and general public. At least one (1) member is a representative of the Montgomery County chapter of the Maryland Municipal League. In addition, there is one ex-officio, non-voting representative of MNCPPC. *Prior to making appointments, the County Executive requests nominees from the County Council.*

Officers: The Committee elects its Chair and Vice Chair.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms - no compensation.

Meetings: First Tuesday evening of each month.

Staff: Lisa Shine, DEP
101 Monroe Street, Rockville, Maryland 20850
Phone: 240-777-6459

2013 Comment:	Committee members have consistently striven to reduce administrative costs, including taking their own minutes. Committee members expressed frustration at maintaining sufficient membership, and the frequency of not having a quorum. The question has partially been answered by providing the committee with a clearer interpretation of the membership rules.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	The Committee was described as well-run and focused on real issues in alignment with its stated purpose. CERB members found no concerns with its operations.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY SPORTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE **(NEW OCTOBER 2022)**

Created: Established by County Council Bill 6-22 effective October 25, 2022.
Montgomery County Code Sec. 41-25.

Duties: The Committee must: (a) prepare and submit to the County Executive and the County Council an annual report regarding sports participation in the County, including: (1) factors that affect sports participation in the County, including the availability of and access to athletic fields, facilities, and sports; and (2) recommendations to improve the quality, quantity, and variety of sports opportunities and facilities in the County; and (b) together with the County Executive and County Council, formally recognize teams and athletes in the County who win state or national championships, or who represent the United States in international competition.

Membership: The **26**-member Board includes **17** voting members appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council. The voting members of the Committee should reflect the diversity of the County, including diversity in race, ethnicity, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, geography, sports represented, and non-profit and for-profit organizations. There are also nine ex officio members or their designees: (1) the Director of the Department of Recreation; (2) the Chair of the Planning Board; (3) the Superintendent of the Montgomery County Public Schools; (4) the President of Montgomery College; (5) the Director of Community Use of Public Facilities; (6) a mayor of a municipality designated by the County Executive, (7) the Chair of the Revenue Authority; (8) the Chair of the Board of the Montgomery County Sports Hall of Fame; and (9) the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services.

Financial Disclosure: NA

Advocacy: NA

Terms: Three years, initially staggered. The terms of the initial members of the Committee must be staggered. Of the initial 17 voting members, 5 must be appointed to serve 1-year terms, 6 must be appointed to serve 2-year terms, and 6 must be appointed to serve 3-year terms.

Compensation: NA

Officers: The Board must elect a chair and vice-chair from its voting members.

Meetings: Meeting dates/times to be determined.

Staff: The Dept. of Recreation must provide staff to the Committee.
Jason Fasteau, Program Manager, Dept. of Recreation (240) 777-7964

2013 Comment:	Newly established board; not under 2013 CERB review.
2013 Recommendation:	N/A

MONTGOMERY COUNTY SPORTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

(NEW OCTOBER 2022)

2025 Comment:	CERB members praised the Committee's outreach and in-person engagement. The Committee was found to be active and effective, though there was a suggestion to better define success metrics and expand outreach to underrepresented communities.
---------------	---

MONTGOMERY COUNTY SPORTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(NEW OCTOBER 2022)

2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
----------------------	--

TAXICAB SERVICES COMMISSION

Created:

Montgomery County Code Section 53-103. Amended by Bill No.53-14, effective 7/31/15.

Purpose:

To advise the Director of the Dept. of Transportation in carrying out duties and functions under Chapter 53; evaluate the performance of the taxicab industry in serving members of the population with special transportation needs, such as senior citizens and people with disabilities; and conduct the biennial review of the taxicab industry.

Membership:

Thirteen total members (11 voting and 2 non-voting ex officio)

Public - Voting: 4 (1 represents senior citizens and 1 represents people with disabilities)

Taxicab Industry -Voting: 7 (3 represent management and 4 are taxicab drivers. Of the drivers 2 are owners 2 are non-owners)

Ex-Officio-Non-Voting: 2 (The Director or the Director's representative of the Dept. of Transportation, and the Chair, or the Chair's representative, of the Council Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy and Environment Committee

Chair:

The Commission must annually select one public member as chair.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms.

Meetings: At least quarterly or more frequently if requested by the County Executive or County Council or if the Chair finds necessary.

Staff: Walton Harris, Policy Analyst

Department of Transportation, 101 Monroe Street, 5th Floor
Rockville, MD 20850, Phone: 240-777-7193

2013 Comment:	The Committee did not meet at all in 2012; all 11 positions are currently vacant. The lack of interest suggests that issues are not important or are handled internally by staff. This status has been confirmed by Department of Transportation leadership, and they are agreeable to eliminating the Taxicab Services Advisory Committee. The Department assures CERB that all issues are adequately addressed by departmental staff. There also appears to be no objection from the taxicab industry itself.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee be eliminated, and that all former functions and responsibilities be assumed by Departmental staff.
2025 Comment:	The Committee was determined to be no longer operating as envisioned, with persistent recruitment and participation challenges. CERB members noted that its functions could be absorbed by the Office of Consumer Protection or other transportation-related entities.
2025 Recommendation:	The Commission should be eliminated. Functions related to consumer concerns could be absorbed by the Office of Consumer Protection or other transportation-related entities.

UPCOUNTY CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

<u>Created:</u>	Resolution No. 10-1279, adopted May 7, 1985 Resolution No. 12-1724, adopted July 5, 1994 Resolution No. 14-223 staggered terms, effective 7/27/99.
<u>Purpose:</u>	Review and comment, within statutory requirements and guidelines, proposed zoning amendments and section map amendments, master plans and related plan amendments, six year capital improvements program (CIP) of County and bi-County agencies, operating budgets of County and bi-County agencies; health and human service matters, land acquisition by County and other government agencies, location and design of fire stations, schools, recreation centers, libraries and other government buildings and facilities, transportation routes, schedules and services within the County, including school busing, and all other matters coming before the County government for decision which relate to, or affect, the Upcounty Center's service area. Advise the Director of the Upcounty Center in identifying demographic, economic and social patterns in the area.
<u>Membership:</u>	20 members, representing a cross-section of citizens living or working in the Upcounty region, such as in Germantown, Gaithersburg, Laytonsville, Damascus, Poolesville, Clarksburg, Montgomery Village, and North Potomac.
<u>Financial Disclosure:</u>	Not required.
<u>Terms:</u>	Three year terms - no compensation.
<u>Meetings:</u>	Third Monday of each month at 7 pm, Upcounty Government Center, Germantown.
<u>Staff:</u>	Ruben Rosario, Director, Upcounty RSC, 12900 Middlebrook Road, Germantown, MD 20874. 240-777-8040
2013 Comment:	<p>One serious problem impacts this Board's operation: the limited staff support available. There is only one staff person at the regional service center, and the required support level is difficult to provide. The Citizens Advisory Board is the first line of interaction between the citizens and the County government. CERB suggests that the Board (as one of four regional Boards), continue, but with increased staff support to maintain effectiveness.</p> <p>The Centers have been cut one time too many. It is incomprehensible that such important entities continue without even basic staff support.</p>
2013 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that the Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions.</p> <p>The CERB strongly suggests that all five regional boards be supported by increased staff at the Regional Services Centers.</p>
2025 Comment:	The CERB observed that the Board still suffers from limited staff support, which impacts its effectiveness in engaging with Upcounty residents. As the population of the Upcounty region is rapidly

	<p>growing, the Board would especially benefit from staff support to collect or make available the relevant data to inform its recommendations. The CERB also noted limited community engagement and a lack of field meetings across the largest geographic coverage area of all regional advisory boards.</p>
2025 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions. The CERB further recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff support for this staff be increased, with an eye for improved access to necessary County data and higher community outreach capacity • The Board conduct proactive outreach to homeowners' associations and other community groups, including by heavily advertising thematic meetings • The Board conduct meetings in various places across the Upcounty region to improve reach and resident engagement

COMMISSION ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Created:

Montgomery County Code Section 24-61. Established by Bill No. 23-08, effective 11/3/08, establishing a Commission on Veterans Affairs, by adding Montgomery County Code, Chapter 24 Health and Sanitation, Article VIII, Commission on Veterans Affairs. Amended by Bill No. 34-08, effective 12/10/08, increasing the number of voting members to 15, by adding a non-voting representative of the County's Congressional Delegation. Amended by Bill No. 52-10, effective 3/10/11, increasing the number of voting members to 16, by adding the President of Montgomery College or the President's designee. Amended by CERB Bill No. 4-16, effective 7/20/16, adding a non-voting member of the Commission on People with Disabilities. Amended by Bill No. 28-18, effective 1/10/19, adding one additional veteran member and eliminating the position of the Director of the Department of Economic Development, or the Director's designee.

Purpose:

The Commission will research, assemble, analyze and disseminate information and educational materials relating to activities and programs that will assist in meeting the needs of veterans and their families; institute and conduct educational and other programs, meetings, and conferences to promote the rights and opportunities for veterans; advise the Executive and the Council on the status of programs and services in the State and County related to the needs of veterans and their families; and assist in planning appropriate public acknowledgement of the contributions made by veterans, and assist in planning commemoration activities recognizing the contributions made by veterans.

Membership:

18 total members. 16 voting: 9 veterans, 4 public, 3 ex officios, appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council; **2 non-voting:** 1 non-voting representative from the County's Congressional delegation not appointed or confirmed; 1 non-voting member of the Commission on People with Disabilities. The Executive should appoint 9 members who are veterans and who may be members of veterans groups such as: Vietnam Veterans of America, American Veterans (AMVETS), Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Women Veterans of America, American Legion or the Military Order of the Purple Heart. The Executive must appoint 4 members to represent the general public, and must designate these ex officio members or their designees: Director Dept. of Health and Human Services, County Executive, and the President of Montgomery College. The Executive must invite a representative of the County's Congressional delegation who is either a member of the delegation or an individual designated to represent the delegation to be a non-voting member of the Commission. The Executive must appoint a member of the Commission on People with Disabilities as a non-voting member.

Chair/VC:

The Executive must designate a chair and vice chair from among the Commission's members.

Financial Disclosure: Not Required.

Compensation: None. Members may receive transportation and dependent care reimbursement.

COMMISSION ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Terms: Three year terms. Initial terms: 5 members 1-year term; 5 members 2-year term; 5 members 3 year term.

Meetings: At the call of the Chair, but not less than 9 times per year.

Staff: Betsy Luecking, Dept. of Health & Human Services, 240-777-1256
401 Hungerford Drive, Rockville, MD 20850

2013 Comment:	CERB feels strongly that a representative from the Commission on People with Disabilities and the Commission on Mental Health be added to the membership. Membership details need to be revised.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue but with the modification of adding a representative from the Commission on People with Disabilities and the Commission on Mental Health.
2025 Comment:	The Board has achieved notable accomplishments in disseminating information and assisting veterans, despite some challenges with outreach to the target audience. Better coordination with County departments and state agencies could improve access to the necessary data to inform recommendations on service provision and outreach. The CERB also observed the Commission could increase added value by also serving military families as many of them face similar challenges.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue, but with modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider expanding the scope of the Commission to include military families and renaming the Commission to reflect this change.

VICTIM SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

(formerly known as the Advisory Board on Victims and their Families)

Created: Montgomery County Code - Art. VII - Sec. 24-54 through 24-60.

Purpose: The Board must periodically review available services and facilities for victims and their families; determine needs of the victim and family services program; submit at least one report annually to the County Executive and County Council on the progress of programs to victims and their families and of actions needed to improve those programs; make recommendations for appropriate allocation of funds in accordance with agreed upon priorities and consideration of financial resources. The Board also assists the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services in the development of the annual victim services and families plan and acts as a local advocate for victim services programming.

Membership: 19 voting members who are residents of Montgomery County and 4 non-voting ex-officio members. The voting members consist of five from among the mental health, legal, medical, dental and nursing professions; ten may be members of the listed professions but represent the community as a whole; one should be a member of the clergy.

Four non-voting ex officio members shall be the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services and representatives of the State's Attorney's Office, Public Defender's Office; and the Department of Police.

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three year terms.

Meetings: Fourth Thursday evening of each month, 7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Staff: Rosalia Scotman, L.M.S.W. Phone: 240-777-1355
Manager III, Trauma Services, DHHS

2013 Comment:	CERB has noted that this is a very active Board, and provides a valuable function in helping victims of criminal violence.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	The CERB noted strong and productive relationships this Board has with County departments, community organizations, County Council, and beyond. The accomplishments of this Board are well-defined and tied to the stated purpose, its work is data-driven and rooted in in-depth analysis. This Board stands out as it has support of two full-time staff. The CERB noted that member recruitment is a continuous challenge.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board without changes to its scope or function.

VICTIM SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

WATER QUALITY ADVISORY GROUP

Created:

Montgomery County Code, Section 19-49, Adopted August 1996

Purpose:

To protect, maintain, and restore high-quality chemical, physical, and biological conditions in the waters of the state in the County; help fulfill interjurisdictional commitments to restore and maintain the integrity of the Anacostia River, the Potomac River; and the Chesapeake Bay; and promote and support educational and volunteer initiatives that enhance public awareness and increase direct participation in stream stewardship and reduction of water pollution. Recommends to the Executive and the Council by March 1 each year water quality goals, objectives, policies and programs.

Membership:

15 voting members, including up to three representatives each of the academic and scientific community, environmental community, agricultural community, and the business community, with the rest from the public at large. Up to 3 **non-voting** representatives of government agencies may be appointed.

Officers:

Group selects Chair and other officers annually.

Financial

Disclosure:

Not required.

Terms:

Three year terms—no compensation.

Meetings:

Second Monday night of each month, 255 Rockville Pike, #140, Rockville.

Staff:

Miranda Reid, Senior Watershed Planner
Dept. of Environmental Protection
Phone: (240) 773-0802

2013 Comment:	<p>Total membership appears to be 18.</p> <p>The Group members provide a high technical support base for the County government in relation to water quality within the county as well as within the region.</p> <p>Meetings are well attended, and members are working to reduce costs, even to the point of taking turns writing up the meeting minutes.</p>
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Group continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	The Group is well-resourced with technical expertise. The CERB noted low community participation and limited issues of residents' concern brought up in meetings. There is some thematic overlap on climate-related concerns with Climate, Energy and Air Quality Advisory Committee. However, the CERB acknowledged the tailored expertise required on water quality issues that warrants a standalone body to coordinate actions on existing interjurisdictional commitments and to educate the public.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue and be re-categorized as

WATER QUALITY ADVISORY GROUP

	Tier 2 – Coordinating Body, considering the interjurisdictional scope of related commitments, heavy participation of professional communities, and limited community engagement.
--	--

WESTERN MONTGOMERY COUNTY CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

<u>Created:</u>	Resolution No. 9-714, adopted April 15, 1980. Resolution No. 12-1723, adopted July 5, 1994. Name previously Bethesda-Chevy Chase Citizens Advisory Board Resolution No. 14-223 staggered terms, effective 7/27/99. Resolution No. 16-727 increasing membership to 19.
<u>Purpose:</u>	To provide advice to the County Executive and the County Council through the Director of the Bethesda Chevy- Chase Regional Services Center on: area priorities, needs of the Western Montgomery County region for programs and/or services, impact of current services (effectiveness), identification and understanding of the Western Montgomery County communities, and proposed changes in government services for the Western Montgomery County area.
<u>Membership:</u>	Nineteen business (including non-profit) and residential representatives from the Western Montgomery County region and including the City of Rockville.
<u>Financial Disclosure:</u>	Not required.
<u>Terms:</u>	Three year terms - no compensation.
<u>Meetings:</u>	Third Monday of each month @ 7 pm @ B-CC Regional Services Center.
<u>Contact:</u>	Peter Fosselman, Director, Bethesda-Chevy Chase Regional Services Center, 240-777-8206.
<u>2013 Comment:</u>	<p>One serious problem that impacts this Board's operation: the limited staff support available. There is only one staff person at the regional center, and the required support level is difficult to provide. The Citizens Advisory Board is the first line of interaction between the citizens and the County government. CERB suggests that the Board (as one of the five regional Boards), continue, but with increased staff support to maintain effectiveness.</p> <p>The Centers have been cut one time too many. It is incomprehensible that such important entities continue without even basic support staff.</p> <p>The membership details should be more explicit and include a listing of communities to be drawn from; this is done in the other regional advisory boards.</p>
<u>2013 Recommendation:</u>	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue with no changes to its scope or functions, but with a modification to its name. CERB recommends that this Board be renamed the West County Citizens Advisory Board, thereby conforming to the naming convention in use for the other four regional boards.</p> <p>The CERB strongly suggests that all five regional boards be supported by increased staff at the Regional Centers.</p>

WESTERN MONTGOMERY COUNTY CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

2025 Comment:	<p>The CERB noted heavy representation from Bethesda (11 out of 19 members) and a lack of diversity on the Board; meeting attendance has also been a challenge. The Board would also benefit from enhanced outreach and partnerships with homeowners' associations and community groups. The CERB also noted a confusing inconsistency between the title of the Regional Services Center (Bethesda-Chevy Chase), the name of this advisory body (Western Montgomery), and the inclusion of the City of Rockville into this Board's coverage area.</p>
2025 Recommendation:	<p>After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Board continue, but with modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider changing the name of this Board and the associated Regional Services Center to ensure alignment and avoid naming confusion• Improve recruitment efforts to ensure that member representation is more balanced across all service areas• Improve community engagement and outreach to the numerous HOAs and community associations across the service area

WHEATON URBAN DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Created: Montgomery County Code, Sec. 68A-5(a).

Purpose: To advise the County government on all aspects of the program, management, and finances of the urban district. By July 15 each year, advises the department on the program and budget of the urban district; by September 15 each year, reviews the urban district budget and submits comments to the department; and by October 1 each year, meets with the head of the department to resolve areas of disagreement regarding the budget.

Membership: 13 members (if 2 or more OMDs), 12 members (if there is only one OMD); 11 members (if there are no OMDs). The County Executive must strive to appoint **two** members who represent the **Wheaton/Kensington Chamber of Commerce**; **two** members who represent Wheaton **businesses that employ fewer than ten people**; **two** members who represent **businesses that employ 10 or more people**; **four** members who represent **residential communities in the urban district or within 2 miles of the urban district**; and **one** member who represents a residential community in or outside of the urban district and who is a **member of the Mid-County Citizens Advisory Board**. The remaining members represent **optional method developers**.
Note: As of 12/05, there are no optional method developments in Wheaton

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms.

Meetings: Second Tuesday of each month at 4:30 p.m. at the Mid-County Services Center, 2424 Reedie Dr., 1st Fl. Conf. Room, Wheaton

Staff: Nestor Alvarenga 240-777-8101, Mid-County Services Center, 2425 Reedie Drive, Wheaton

2013 Comment:	As noted in the Comments for the Wheaton Redevelopment Advisory Committee, there are major overlaps between the WRAC and WUDAC. In line with the recommendation to eliminate the WRAC, their functions should now move to those of the WUDAC. Among other things, this action would result in reduced BCC staff time. WUDAC, in order to preserve continuity and make use of extensive experience, should incorporate as many WRAC members into WUDAC as possible.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee continue, but with a modification whereby the functions of the eliminated Wheaton Redevelopment Advisory Board are incorporated. Representation from the current Wheaton Redevelopment Advisory Committee should be incorporated.
2025 Comment	CERB members noted that this committee overlaps in function with the Mid-County Citizens Advisory Board. They suggested that consolidating the Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee under the Mid-County

WHEATON URBAN DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

	Citizens Advisory Board could streamline operations and improve coordination.
2025 Recommendation	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Committee be eliminated and absorbed by the Mid-County Citizens Advisory Board.

WHITE FLINT DOWNTOWN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

(NEW BOARD 2/13**)**

Created: County Council Resolution No. 17-577, Effective 10/23/12.

Purpose: The Committee advises County departments on public services in the White Flint Sector Plan Area; and coordinates community activities that promote and advance business interests, and a sense of place, community, maintenance and walkability within the Area. The Committee will also advise and make recommendations to the County Executive and County Council on the feasibility and timing of the establishment of the Urban District in White Flint no later than September 2017. The Committee will provide an annual report to the County Executive and County Council.

Membership: Fourteen members: 11 voting and three ex officio non-voting. Members will be appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council. The County Executive must strive to appoint members so that:

- 2 members are persons nominated by the Greater Bethesda- Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce;
- 3 members represent (commercial) property owners in the Sector Plan Area;
- 2 members represent businesses that employ fewer than 25 employees;
- 2 members represent residential communities in the Sector Plan area;
- 1 member represents a residential community in or outside of the Sector Plan area;
- 1 member of the Western Montgomery County Citizens Advisory Board;
- 3 ex officio, non-voting members represent the County Executive, County Council, and North Bethesda Transportation Management District.

Terms: Three year terms - no compensation. Initial terms of voting members are staggered as follows: three members—one year terms; four members—two year terms; four members—three year terms.

Meetings: To be determined.

Staff: Pete Fosselman, Regional Services Director, Western Montgomery County Region, 4800 Edgemoor Lane, Bethesda
Phone: 240-777-8416

2013 Comment:	Newly established board; not under 2013 CERB review.
2013 Recommendation:	N/A
2025 Comment:	The Committee has not been meeting and is considered sunset. CERB found no evidence of recent activity or engagement.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that the White Flint Downtown Advisory Committee be removed from all BCC listings.

COMMISSION FOR WOMEN

Created: Montgomery County Code Section 27-27.

Purpose: To work to remove inequalities due to unmet needs or discrimination or prejudice on the basis of sex in such areas as housing, recreation, employment, education, community services, the legal system, and related matters.

Membership: The Commission consists of 15 members who shall be appointed by the County Executive subject to confirmation by the County Council. Nine are applicants who have been nominated and recommended by organizations within the County whose interests relate to the status of women (ENDORSED). Six are from among those applicants applying on their own behalf (INDEPENDENT).

Financial Disclosure: Not required.

Terms: Three-year terms - no compensation. **The term of office of each appointed member shall commence on July 1 of the year of appointment.**

Meetings: Fourth Wednesday of each month in Rockville.

Staff: Jodi Finkelstein, Executive Director
Community Engagement Cluster,
21 Maryland Ave. – Suite 330, Rockville, MD 20850
Phone: 240-777-8333

Note: See comments above relative to staff support needs.

2013 Comment:	Functions with limited staff support, and really needs more help considering the broad issues covered. This commission operates with only one full-time staff member and maintains an aggressive agenda and goals in support of women. This includes Commission for Women (CFW) goals of staying relevant, setting trends, helping women in the County, being progressive and in the fore-front of issues, while avoiding duplicative efforts. All of this is done with limited resources. It is still a critical time for women regarding health and safety, economic and financial, and educational issues, especially for impoverished and immigrant women, who need groups like the CFW to advocate for them.
2013 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission continue with no changes to its scope or functions.
2025 Comment:	CERB members found the Commission to be active and effective, with a clear mission and strong programming. However, they noted that it functions more like a County agency than a traditional advisory board. It has its own budget, staff, and programming, including events like the Legislative Briefing and Human Trafficking Prevention Committee, which is not typical of other BCCs. The Commission also hosts interns and has partnerships with institutions like the University of Maryland. Some CERB members raised concerns about transparency, such as the lack of publicly posted agendas and minutes.
2025 Recommendation:	After careful analysis and consideration of available information, the CERB recommends that this Commission be re-categorized as Tier 4 - County Agency.

Appendix C. BCC Self-Assessment Questionnaire

1. Briefly describe your board, committee, or commission (BCC) purpose and explain why it is valuable to the County. Based on conversations with members of the BCC,
 - Share reasons for why your BCC should or should not continue to serve, or be combined with another BCC.
 - Explain how your BCC collaborates with government services to meet the needs of the community.
 - Highlight specific expertise and lived experiences of your members have related to the advisory subject.
2. How many times has your BCC met in the past two years? In your answer, please detail the following,
 - How many of these meetings have been in-person, remote, or hybrid?
 - Do you ever hold "field" meetings in communities (ie. At Community Centers, Libraries, etc.)
3. Describe your relationship with department(s) or agency(ies) that you work with. Is this relationship beneficial? If so, why? If not, why? How does that department utilize the work of the BCC?
4. Share your BCC's top 2-3 impactful accomplishments within the past two years.
5. How does your BCC define success? Has this definition been effectively communicated with your members?
6. What do you believe are the greatest barriers, roadblocks, or challenges that may hinder success of your BCC over the last two years? What areas could you improve on?
7. Briefly summarize the Group's current priorities and anticipated workload for the next two years.
8. Name the specific communities that you serve (i.e. zip codes, cities, etc.). In your answer, please:
 - Detail how your BCC communicates/engages with, community leaders, groups and individuals.
 - Describe the methods your BCC implements for community involvement (e.g., surveys, forums, outreach programs).
9. List your key partner organizations, community groups, and other BCCs your BCC has worked with. How valuable are these partnerships to your mission?
10. How does your BCC include non-members in future planning and visioning activities.
11. List any communities that you have not yet engaged with your BCC and outline plans to include them in the next two years. In your reply,

- Please describe any challenges that have prevented your BCC from engaging with some communities.

12. What types of incentives could your BCC utilize to improve recruitment strategies and community participation?

13. Has the BCC used services to ensure inclusivity, such as sign language interpreters and translation services?

14. Has your BCC used data to measure engagement success; ensure equitable participation; and determine which activities to champion/support? What data have you used, and how that data is used.

15. Does your BCC have access to government resources such as staff time allocation? If so, please:

- Detail the specific tasks performed by staff to support the activities of your BCC.
- Describe how your BCC maximizes the efficiency of available resources and the effectiveness of the staff.
- What resources does your committee need to become more effective/impactful?

Appendix D. Direct Observation Form

BCC Name: _____

Meeting Date: _____

Chair: _____ Co-Chair: _____

CERB Member: _____

	Meeting/Interview/Report	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Comments
1	BEFORE THE MEETING: It was easy to find information about the BCC before the meeting (links, past meetings, agendas etc.).						
2	Were you prepared to attend the meeting (be a prepared attendee)? <ul style="list-style-type: none">• notification (was timely and available)• agenda (was timely and available)• past minutes (complete and usable)• read-ahead materials (complete and usable)						
3	The meeting is easy to access (online or in-person). The online connection instructions were clear. The venue was clearly marked and easy to find.						
4	Meetings with written agendas and materials relating to significant decisions are given to the Board in advance of meetings						
5	DURING THE MEETING: Members are prepared to report on their follow-up items in accordance with the agenda. The Board has clear goals and actions resulting from relevant and realistic strategic planning.						

6	The Board possesses the background, knowledge, skills, and expertise to help accomplish its goals.						
7	Board meetings facilitate focus and progress on important organizational plans and community matters.						
8	The Board conducts meetings properly and applies relevant actions from the Robert Rules of Order, Open MeetingS Act, etc.						
9	(reserved)						
10	Board members exhibit the ability to work well together and appear to show respect for the ideas and views of fellow Board members and staff. Members seem to seek and identify ways to collaborate and build consensus as well as to resolve conflicts.						
11	Members exhibit commitment, diligence, and the willingness to take the necessary time and make the necessary effort to fulfill their responsibilities.						
12	Board members seem to have equal access to Board discourse; no member appears to dominate dialogue.						
13	Members seem to tackle “real community issues” vs. protocol (agenda, meeting minutes, membership issues) and are significant contributors to the process.						
14	The board clearly identified follow up items, assigned responsibilities, and set deadlines.						
15	The language of the discussion was accessible to an ordinary person. The topics were understandable and free of jargon.						
16	Overall Impressions – See GENERAL RUBRIC The meeting was effective.						
17	AFTER THE MEETING When minutes are issued for the meeting, • The minutes match the actual meeting agenda and content.						

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meeting and minutes are in line with the goals and charter of the BCC. 						
18	As a MoCo resident, did I find this meeting useful or a waste of my time? Do I now understand better what this BCC does to the benefit of county residents and how I as a county resident can channel my input to the MoCo government through this BCC						

***** GENERAL RUBRIC *****

Poor

- ✓ dictatorial chair or no chair,
- ✓ a few board members dominate the meeting,
- ✓ public either blocked out or runs rampant,
- ✓ does not follow process,
- ✓ does not follow agenda (all known new business should be on the agenda),
- ✓ does not review prior minutes (or old business)

Acceptable

- ✓ chair allows others to talk in turn
- ✓ uses majority rule (to close debate, etc)
- ✓ allows limited public engagement (if appropriate),
- ✓ follows agenda, past actions are reviewed (some level of minutes)

Excellent

- ✓ chair explains and guides process,
- ✓ Parliamentary processes are explained (in complex meeting a specific parliamentarian is useful)
- ✓ chair tactfully explains the rationale for meeting and decisions to any external attendees (public)
- ✓ Read-aheads were provided for any complex matters
- ✓ the agenda is a tool that can be amended by the group as a whole,
- ✓ minutes are used for action tracking and closure,
- ✓ there are meeting results:
- ✓ decisions are made,
- ✓ issues are clarified,
- ✓ out of scope matters are forwarded to appropriate other bodies

Appendix E. Director Interview Guide

Department/Agency:	
BCC:	
Name of Staff:	
Name of CERB Interviewer:	
Date of Interview:	

1. Nature of relationship
 - How long have you been assigned to this BCC?
 - How would you describe your role in working with this BCC?
2. Value to Department/Agency Mission
 - How does the Department/Agency utilize the work of the BCC to connect community needs with your department's services?
 - Is there a particular expertise that the BCC brings to your Department/Agency that might not otherwise exist?
 - Are there any perceived or actual impediments for the BCC to effectively advise your department, the CE, or County Council?
 - How often do you monitor and review the alignment of Department/Agency mission with BCC?
 - Are there any synergies or conflicts of interest between your department and any other county Department/Agency in working with this BCC?
3. Recruitment and community participation
 - How do BCC's activities online and in-person differently stimulate community participation?
 - Do you think that BCC members adequately represent geographic and ethnic diversity, subject matter expertise, and various community interests?
 - Does your Department/Agency assist in any way in the recruitment for BCC members?
4. How does the BCC access government resources, including staff time allocation?
 - a. Detail specific tasks performed by your staff to support activities of the BCC.
 - b. How much time per week, on average, do you and other department staff dedicate to BCC-related tasks? Do you think this is too little, just right, or too much?
 - c. What other department resources does the BCC utilize, besides staff time?
 - d. What resources, financial and other, does the BCC need to be more effective?
 - e. Do you believe members of the BCC know about available resources from the Department and are empowered to request them?
5. Justification
 - a. Why should this BCC continue existence?
 - b. Do you find any duplication in the work of this and any other BCC(s)?

- i. If yes, please list areas of overlap.
- ii. Is there a rationale for the separate groups?
- iii. Should any BCCs be merged?

Appendix F. CERB Interim Report



COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND REVIEW BOARD

MEMORANDUM

January 31, 2025

TO: Marc Elrich, Montgomery County Executive
Kate Stewart, President, Montgomery County Council

FROM: Sofya Orlosky, Chair 

SUBJECT: Committee Evaluation and Review Board Interim Report

As required by Montgomery County Code §2-146 (c) (2), the Committee Evaluation and Review Board (CERB) presents the attached **Interim Report**. The CERB will provide a final report in July 2025. Please let us know if you have any comments or questions on the contents of the report. Thank you.

INTERIM REPORT

Committee Evaluation and Review Board

Members

Sofya Orlosky, Chair

Anthony Buccitelli, Justin Carlson, Jake Didinsky,

Muriel Hairston-Cooper, Mary Ann Keeffe, Deeptaanshu Kumar,

Karl Pitt, Catherine Sindos, Jeffrey Slavin, Clint Sobratti

Staff

Ken Hartman-Espada, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer

Beth Gochrach, Administrative Specialist II

Eritrea Thomas, Office Services Coordinator

January 31, 2025

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Assumptions and Constraints.....	3
3. Methodology.....	4
4. Progress to Date.....	4
5. Early Findings	5
6. Next Steps	5
7. Timeline.....	5
Appendix A. Self-Assessment Questionnaire	7
Appendix B. Direct Observation Form.....	9

1. Introduction

This Interim Report is submitted to the Montgomery County Executive and Council by the Committee Evaluation and Review Board (CERB), as required by Montgomery County Code Article XI, Sec. 2-146 (c) (2).

Purpose of the Committee Evaluation and Review Board

As stipulated in Sec. 2-146 of the Montgomery County Code, the Montgomery County Executive must appoint and convene the Committee Evaluation and Review Board. This body is a citizens review committee that reviews each of the Montgomery County Advisory Committees and Boards appointed under Sec. 2-146. In 2011, the Montgomery County Council expanded its responsibilities to not only review committees but also review the committee system as a whole.

Specifically, the task of the CERB is to “review the group system and each then-existing board, committee, commission, and task force and report to the Executive and Council its recommendations for changes in individual boards, committees, commissions, and task forces and the group system as a whole.” Additionally, the CERB “must review each advisory board that requests continuation under subsection (b)(2) and recommend to the Council whether the advisory board should continue.”

The CERB is mandated to evaluate 98 boards, committees, and commissions (BCCs), of which 50 are “advisory,” as defined in Montgomery County Code Sec. 2-146 Editor’s note Sec. 3. (b) (1).

The most recent CERB was formed in 2012 and delivered its findings and recommendations to the County Executive and Council in 2013. The current CERB was appointed on May 22, 2024, more than 10 years after the previous review effort. CERB members realize the particular urgency to their mandate given the extended timeframe since the previous review.

CERB Composition

The current CERB, consisting of 13 members, officially convened on the 11th of July. Since July 2024, the CERB has experienced two resignations that lowered the member count to the minimum requirement of 11. The members of the CERB as of January 1, 2025, are:

Anthony Buccitelli, Justin Carlson, Jake Didinsky, Muriel Hairston-Cooper, Mary Ann Keeffe, Deepsaanshu Kumar, Sofya Orlosky (Chair), Karl Pitt, Catherine Sindos, Jeffrey Slavin, and Clint Sobratti.

The CERB is supported by Assistant Chief Administrative Officer Ken Hartman-Espada, and Administrative Specialist, Beth Gochrach, as selected by the County Executive as per the statutory requirements.

2. Assumptions and Constraints

The CERB is established under Sec. 2-146 to: review the group system and each then-existing board, committee, commission, and task force and report to the Executive and Council its recommendations for changes in individual boards, committees, commissions, and task forces and the group system as a whole and submit an interim report to the Executive and Council within 6 months of appointment and submit a final report within 12 months of appointment.

The CERB has been unable to reach consensus on the interpretation of Sec. 2-146 (as amended by Bill 32-11 (1) and Bill 2-05 (2) and as executed in the 2013 CERB report) pertaining to the scope and coverage of the 2024 CERB review and CERB report.

The CERB asks that the Chief Administrative Officer (in accordance with Sec. 2-147 subsections (b) and (c)) work with Mr. Ken Hartman and the Office of the County Attorney to provide the CERB with interpretation and direction concerning the scope of CERB review and CERB report.

Given the lack of consensus on the scope of review of non-advisory BCCs, the CERB commenced its work by focusing on advisory BCCs.

3. Methodology

The CERB embarked on its dual mandate to evaluate the group system overall and each advisory board, committee, or commission individually by establishing a grounding framework.

The CERB review seeks to determine whether the advisory BCCs understand and dutifully implement their mandates, and whether they do so effectively and with the most efficient use of County resources.

The overarching policy premise for the establishment of various BCCs in Montgomery County is that “[p]ublic participation in boards, committees, and commissions contributes to the work of County government and provides a valuable service to the community by presenting the concerns and viewpoints of County residents on a variety of issues.”¹ Thus, the CERB worked with County Staff to develop evaluation questions that gauge the BCCs’ ability to effectively channel the varied experiences and needs of the diverse Montgomery County community into the work of the County government in an equitable way. By conducting the review through the *equitable engagement* lens, the CERB attempts to assess how effective BCCs are in informing communities about issues of focus, facilitating open dialogue with government agencies, soliciting and channeling feedback from diverse members of the public, and champion initiatives that empower county residents to actively shape their communities.

Within this framework, the CERB’s review and recommendations will be based on the analysis of data collected using the following instruments:

- A self-assessment questionnaire distributed to all BCCs (see template in Appendix A)
- Direct observation of the regularly scheduled BCC meetings (see assessment form in Appendix B)
- Interviews with the heads of relevant County departments
- Review of the recommendations from the 2013 CERB Final Report

4. Progress to Date

The CERB has been meeting monthly since its initial meeting. Following the establishment of the overall framework for the review, the CERB developed the self-assessment questionnaire, the direct observation form, and the schedule of visits to the advisory BCCs.

The CERB distributed self-assessment questionnaires to all advisory BCCs on August 30, 2024, and provided the required 60 days for the BCCs to return them to the CERB. As of the submission date

¹ <https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/boards/policy.html>

of this Interim Report, of the 50 BCCs, 48 answered the questionnaires. Two BCCs did not answer the questionnaires: the White Flint Downtown Advisory Committee is sunsetting, and the Workforce Development Board did not respond.

As of the submission date of this Interim Report, the CERB conducted 39 total visits to the advisory BCCs. Of the remaining 11 BCCs, two will not be visited: the Community Development Advisory Committee does not meet until November 2025 and the White Flint Downtown Advisory Committee is sunsetting.

5. Early Findings

The ambiguity of the law which establishes and governs the mandate of the CERB significantly complicates this Board's task. While the scope of "the first Committee Evaluation and Review Board appointed after November 8, 2011" is spelled out clearly, further clarifications are needed for the subsequent iterations of the CERB, in particular as it pertains to non-advisory BCCs.

Nevertheless, while prioritizing the review of advisory BCCs, each member of the CERB has had an opportunity to visit and observe the work of multiple advisory county boards, committees, and/or commissions. It is evident that Montgomery County provides a vast range of opportunities for community input and feedback on government services and critical issues through its system of advisory boards, committees, and commissions. Overall, members of BCCs are committed to the mandates of their groups, stay consistently engaged, and contribute diverse and relevant professional and lived experiences to their work.

At the same time, the CERB has noted that multiple BCCs have struggled to recruit members, in particular members representing the diverse communities of the entire County. Initial observations also suggest that BCCs have inconsistent experiences in and approaches to informing communities about their work, inviting county residents' input on issues meaningful to their communities, and collecting and channeling feedback on Montgomery County government's work. There are also opportunities to streamline the work of some BCCs to avoid duplication of effort or to improve focus.

6. Next Steps

The CERB recognizes that much work remains to be done in order to collect the necessary data, analyze it, distill findings, and develop its recommendations. The immediate priority is seeking guidance from the Office of the County Attorney on the scope of this CERB's mandate as it pertains to non-advisory BCCs. This guidance will determine the next steps in reviewing and evaluating those boards, committees, and commissions. The CERB will also address the remaining methodological questions as regards this Board's charge.

Additionally, in the next six months, the CERB will visit the remaining advisory BCCs, conduct interviews with relevant County Department heads and staff, and then analyze the data collected through BCC self-assessment questionnaires, direct observation forms, and interviews. If necessary, and if time allows, the CERB may conduct follow-up visits or interviews with individual BCCs. This work will culminate in the development of recommendations for the Final Report.

7. Timeline

The CERB aims to provide its Final Report to the Montgomery County Executive and Council in July 2025.

Appendix A. Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Boards, Commissions, and Committees (BCC) Questionnaire

1. Briefly describe your board, committee, or commission (BCC) purpose and explain why it is valuable to the County. Based on conversations with members of the BCC,
 - Share reasons for why your BCC should or should not continue to serve, or be combined with another BCC.
 - Explain how your BCC collaborates with government services to meet the needs of the community.
 - Highlight specific expertise and lived experiences of your members have related to the advisory subject.
2. How many times has your BCC met in the past two years? In your answer, please detail the following,
 - How many of these meetings have been in-person, remote, or hybrid?
 - Do you ever hold "field" meetings in communities (ie. At Community Centers, Libraries, etc.)
3. Describe your relationship with department(s) or agency(ies) that you work with. Is this relationship beneficial? If so, why? If not, why? How does that department utilize the work of the BCC?
4. Share your BCC's top 2-3 impactful accomplishments within the past two years.
5. How does your BCC define success? Has this definition been effectively communicated with your members?
6. What do you believe are the greatest barriers, roadblocks, or challenges that may hinder success of your BCC over the last two years? What areas could you improve on?
7. Briefly summarize the Group's current priorities and anticipated workload for the next two years.
8. Name the specific communities that you serve (i.e. zip codes, cities, etc.). In your answer, please:
 - Detail how your BCC communicates/engages with, community leaders, groups and individuals.
 - Describe the methods your BCC implements for community involvement (e.g., surveys, forums, outreach programs).
9. List your key partner organizations, community groups, and other BCCs your BCC has worked with. How valuable are these partnerships to your mission?

10. How does your BCC include non-members in future planning and visioning activities.
11. List any communities that you have not yet engaged with your BCC and outline plans to include them in the next two years. In your reply,
 - Please describe any challenges that have prevented your BCC from engaging with some communities.
12. What types of incentives could your BCC utilize to improve recruitment strategies and community participation?
13. Has the BCC used services to ensure inclusivity, such as sign language interpreters and translation services?
14. Has your BCC used data to measure engagement success; ensure equitable participation; and determine which activities to champion/support? What data have you used, and how that data is used.
15. Does your BCC have access to government resources such as staff time allocation? If so, please:
 - Detail the specific tasks performed by staff to support the activities of your BCC.
 - Describe how your BCC maximizes the efficiency of available resources and the effectiveness of the staff.
 - What resources does your committee need to become more effective/impactful?

Appendix B. Direct Observation Form

CERB BOARDS, COMMITTEES, AND COMMISSIONS (BCC) ASSESSMENT FORM

BCC Name: _____

Meeting Date: _____

Chair: _____ Co-Chair: _____

CERB Member: _____

	Meeting/Interview/Report	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Comments
1	BEFORE THE MEETING: It was easy to find information about the BCC before the meeting (links, past meetings, agendas etc.).						
2	Were you prepared to attend the meeting (be a prepared attendee)? <ul style="list-style-type: none">notification (was timely and available)agenda (was timely and available)past minutes (complete and usable)read-ahead materials (complete and usable)						
3	The meeting is easy to access (online or in-person). The online connection instructions were clear. The venue was clearly marked and easy to find.						
4	Meetings with written agendas and materials relating to significant decisions are given to the Board in advance of meetings						
5	DURING THE MEETING: Members are prepared to report on their follow-up items in accordance with the agenda. The Board has clear goals and actions resulting from relevant and realistic strategic planning.						

6	The Board possesses the background, knowledge, skills, and expertise to help accomplish its goals.						
7	Board meetings facilitate focus and progress on important organizational plans and community matters.						
8	The Board conducts meetings properly and applies relevant actions from the Robert Rules of Order, Open MeetingS Act, etc.						
9	(reserved)						
10	Board members exhibit the ability to work well together and appear to show respect for the ideas and views of fellow Board members and staff. Members seem to seek and identify ways to collaborate and build consensus as well as to resolve conflicts.						
11	Members exhibit commitment, diligence, and the willingness to take the necessary time and make the necessary effort to fulfill their responsibilities.						
12	Board members seem to have equal access to Board discourse; no member appears to dominate dialogue.						
13	Members seem to tackle “real community issues” vs. protocol (agenda, meeting minutes, membership issues) and are significant contributors to the process.						
14	The board clearly identified follow up items, assigned responsibilities, and set deadlines.						
15	The language of the discussion was accessible to an ordinary person. The topics were understandable and free of jargon.						
16	Overall Impressions – See GENERAL RUBRIC The meeting was effective.						
17	AFTER THE MEETING When minutes are issued for the meeting, • The minutes match the actual meeting agenda and content. • The meeting and minutes are line with the goals and charter of the BCC.						

18	As a MoCo resident, did I find this meeting useful or a waste of my time? Do I now understand better what this BCC does to the benefit of county residents and how I as a county resident can channel my input to the MoCo government through this BCC						
-----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

***** **GENERAL RUBRIC** *****

Poor

- ✓ dictatorial chair or no chair,
- ✓ a few board members dominate the meeting,
- ✓ public either blocked out or runs rampant,
- ✓ does not follow process,
- ✓ does not follow agenda (all known new business should be on the agenda),
- ✓ does not review prior minutes (or old business)

Acceptable

- ✓ chair allows others to talk in turn
- ✓ uses majority rule (to close debate, etc)
- ✓ allows limited public engagement (if appropriate),
- ✓ follows agenda, past actions are reviewed (some level of minutes)

Excellent

- ✓ chair explains and guides process,
- ✓ Parliamentary processes are explained (in complex meeting a specific parliamentarian is useful)
- ✓ chair tactfully explains the rationale for meeting and decisions to any external attendees (public)
- ✓ Read-aheads were provided are used for any complex matters
- ✓ the agenda is a tool that can be amended by the group as a whole,
- ✓ minutes are used for action tracking and closure,
- ✓ there are meeting results:
- ✓ decisions are made,
- ✓ issues are clarified,
- ✓ out of scope matters are forwarded to appropriate other bodies