

Sayers, Margery

From: joel hurewitz <joelhurewitz@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 3, 2020 11:01 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Fwd: Charter Amendments - State Law Citations and Terms of Boards

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Dear Council Members,

I am very disappointed that I do not see an amendment to make the technical correction to the State Code citation in Charter Section 202(d). Finding the old Code provisions is extremely difficult if not impossible for the general public.

If it is not amended now, at some future time, an amendment will be needed just to make the technical correction.

Joel Hurewitz

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **joel hurewitz** <joelhurewitz@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jun 24, 2020 at 10:58 AM
Subject: Charter Amendments - State Law Citations and Terms of Boards
To: Councilmail <councilmail@howardcountymd.gov>

Dear Council,

In reducing the terms of board members in CR99-2020, it seems that some consideration should also be given to the number of consecutive years in Line 10, and whether something less than eight years is appropriate, or whether three consecutive terms of nine years would be desired for most appointees.

Furthermore, consideration should also be given to amending the similar provisions in Sections 501 and 703 for the Board of Appeals and Personnel Board respectively.

As I testified, there are outdated State Code references in Sections 202(d) and 501(b). If Section 501 were to be amended regarding the terms of the Board of Appeals, then there would also be an opportunity to correct the citation in Section 501(b)

As always, I would be happy to discuss these further.

Sincerely,

Joel Hurewitz

Sayers, Margery

From: joel hurewitz <joelhurewitz@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 10:58 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Charter Amendments - State Law Citations and Terms of Boards

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Dear Council,

In reducing the terms of board members in CR99-2020, it seems that some consideration should also be given to the number of consecutive years in Line 10, and whether something less than eight years is appropriate, or whether three consecutive terms of nine years would be desired for most appointees.

Furthermore, consideration should also be given to amending the similar provisions in Sections 501 and 703 for the Board of Appeals and Personnel Board respectively.

As I testified, there are outdated State Code references in Sections 202(d) and 501(b). If Section 501 were to be amended regarding the terms of the Board of Appeals, then there would also be an opportunity to correct the citation in Section 501(b)

As always, I would be happy to discuss these further.

Sincerely,

Joel Hurewitz

Sayers, Margery

From: Angie Boyter <angie.boyter@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 20, 2020 6:11 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CR99-2020

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Dear Council Members,

I am writing to urge you NOT to pass this resolution, which reduces the terms for board and commission members from 5 years to 3. This STRONG recommendation is based on my own and my husband's experience serving on several boards and commissions over the years.

If these boards are going to be effective, the members need to be well informed. I serve as a consumer member on the Commission on Aging with a great group of people, most of whom have impressive specialized knowledge. None of us, though, had the breadth of knowledge of needs and services to which we have been exposed during our service. There is quite a learning curve. It took me probably more than three years to begin to feel I was informed enough to express an sound recommendation.

Others may have picked up knowledge faster, but they still need the learning time. This is even more true of several highly important boards like the Planning Board and the Board of Appeals.

Finally, I would have to disagree with the apparent reasoning behind this recommendation, the contention that there are not enough well qualified people willing to serve a 5-year term. My suspicion is that people who do not want to make the five-year commitment tend to be people who simply want to add it to their resume or who have "an axe to grind", a single issue they want to address and leave, rather than a genuine interest in the broad mission of a board or commission. I have on several occasions heard of vacancies and spoken to people I thought would be qualified. They were very willing to serve. They had NOT, however, heard of the opening until I brought it to their attention. I think we need to improve the publicizing of the vacancies, not reduce the term of office.

Please do NOT pass this resolution.

Angie Boyter