

Legislative Testimony Submitted Online - December 7 2020 (Public)

Full Name	Home Address	City	Zip Code	Are you representing?	What organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachment
Kayla Griffith	5535 Greenock Road	Lothian	20711	Yes		Bill 69-20a3:	Support	I am a fifth generation farmer in Lothian. I've witnessed agriculture in this county change drastically in my life, and I recognize it will continue to change. Agritourism brings hope of increased economic prosperity for our farm to allow us to continue providing food for our community and welcoming the general public in ways they are always asking for, farm stays and events. I support bill 69-20 because as farming becomes more expensive and crops bring less money, we need to diversify as much as possible. To be able to generate income from underutilized areas of my farm so that I can farm without needing an off-farm job is critical. I currently need to maintain a part-time off-farm job to make ends meet and it creates a significant strain. We need to have farm stays and events, without a great financial and regulatory burden, in our county. The proper regulations are in place and farmers need help now more than ever. I strongly support bill 69-20 and encourage you to as well. I apologize I could not testify in person even though this bill is exceptionally meaningful to me, my husband has COVID and the only test I could find for myself conflicts with the meeting. Thank you.	
Laura Zech	107 Tolson St.	Annapolis	21401	Yes		Bill 69-20a3:	Support	I would like to express my support for Bill 69-20a3 on Farm or Agricultural Heritage Stays and Special Events. This bill helps promote agricultural tourism and support the local Maryland farming community to continue with sustainable farming practices. Through events and farm stays, this business will not only teach the local community about Maryland agriculture, it will help insure that it thrives by supporting our farmers. In the long run, this will create a cycle of positive development by building connections between farmers and the community, education, healthy living, and a healthy economy. As the existing noise ordinance is observed during any of these events or farm stays, respect to the neighboring communities would be maintained.	
Kira Farley	650 Tidehead Way	Lusby	20657	Yes		Bill 69-20a3:	Support	I would like to express my support of bill 69-20a3 Farm or Agricultural Heritage Site Stays and Special Events and I ask the county council to support this bill as well. Agriculture is an integral part of Maryland. Yet the general public is lacking many opportunities to learn about Agriculture as well as get involved themselves. Focusing on the opportunity to let people connect with the farm lands, fresh local food, and the farmers creates a new found appreciation and in turn an investment in local communities is created. This is the benefit of agritourism. With the passing of Bill 69-20a3, farms can now create and foster new bonds in the community by highlighting agritourism and sharing what the farm has to offer. By allowing special events and farm stays members of the community can learn so much and connect with the land and what makes agriculture so special. This also benefits the farms by providing additional income to working farmers to then be able to reinvest into their farms to ensure sustainability.	
Karis Schollenberger	682 Mt Zion Marlboro Road	Lothian	20711	Yes		Bill 69-20a3:	Support		
Nancy Oliver	6527 Clagett Ave.	Tracys Landing	20779	No	(Property Owner on the Attachment)	Bill 69-20a3:		BILL 69-20 as amended and as regarding possible additional amendments. Please see concerns in the Letter attached.	YES
							5		
Debra Luzietti-Myers	606 Forest Hill Drive	Annapolis	21403	Yes		Bill 97-20:	Oppose	Oppose unless amended. Amendment requests are included in attached testimony.	YES
Dan C Tootle	108 Askewton Road	Severna Park	21146	Yes		Bill 97-20:	Oppose	Please review the information contained within the attached document.	YES
							2		

To: County Executive Steuart Pittman and Councilwoman Jessica Haire  
Date: October 5, 2020  
Re: Statement regarding Bill No. 69-20 (Agritourism)

We, the undersigned property owners in Tracys Landing, recommend that Anne Arundel County postpone action on piecemeal zoning measures like Bill 69-20 and instead consider such proposals as part of the ongoing General Development Plan known as Vision2040.

Expanding commercial uses in rural areas will have both benefits and costs. Because Bill 69-20 was developed outside of the public planning process, there is no public agreement on its purpose or about ways to manage any negative unintended consequences. The lack of public vetting is evident in some of the specific shortcomings of this bill. For example:

- Bill 69-20 is seen as a way to generate more income for farms and agricultural heritage sites, but the legislative language does not require that the principal use of the property be farming.
- Bill 69-20 ignores traffic safety. Given the character of South County, it's likely that many of the tourist events will be located on narrow, winding rural roads that are ill equipped to handle vast amounts of vehicle traffic and are often enjoyed by cyclists and other recreational users.
- Bill 69-20 allows tourism businesses to host weekly events that could disrupt neighboring communities throughout the summer and other months. For temporary and conditional uses, the operator will be allowed to decide what mitigation measures are necessary, without the benefit of the public input required for special exception uses.

We fully support activities that will promote the viability of our farming communities and sound management of our natural resources. We concur with the Growth Action Network that the GDP process is the appropriate venue for reaching a consensus on what the community hopes to achieve through new commercial land uses and how to balance the trade-offs. If you have any questions about our comments, please contact Nancy Oliver at [batte@comcast.net](mailto:batte@comcast.net)

Mike Brewer, Fairhaven  
Peggy Carr, Fairhaven  
Ramona Couteau, Fairhaven  
Jette Findsen, Highview  
Sharon Griffing, Fairhaven  
John W. Groves, Fairhaven  
Lou Hyde, Fairhaven  
Marylyn Leet, Town Point  
Gail Martinez, Fairhaven  
Fred and Joele Michaud, Fairhaven  
Andy Myers, Fairhaven  
Nancy Oliver, Fairhaven  
Margaret and Larry Sigler, Fairhaven  
Barbara Smith, Fairhaven  
Scott Smith, Fairhaven  
Anne Stewart, Fairhaven  
Joyce and Scot VanSlyke, Fairhaven  
Lisa and William Veith, Fairhaven  
Jean and David Williamson, Fairhaven

## Testimony for Bill 97-20 Veterans Affairs Commission

**Debra Luzietti-Myers, Esq.  
606 Forest Hill Drive  
Annapolis, MD 21403**

I oppose the proposed legislation contained within Bill 97-20 Veterans Affairs Commission as submitted to the Anne Arundel County Council by the Anne Arundel County Executive's Office because, in my opinion, it requires amendment in order to properly define and direct the work of the Commission. I concur with the testimony submitted by Dan C. Tootle.

My name is Debra Luzietti-Myers. I have been a resident of Anne Arundel County for 39 years, moving here in 1981 when my husband and I were on active duty, stationed at the U.S. Naval Academy. I was appointed to the Anne Arundel County Veterans Affairs Commission (the "Commission") by the County Executive in March 2019. However, **I am testifying in my individual capacity**, not as a member of the Commission.

I bring a wide variety of personal experiences to my position on the Commission. I have experienced military life not only as an active duty veteran of the United States Navy, but also as the daughter of a veteran of both WWII and Korea, the wife of a veteran who served well over 20 years in the U.S. Navy including service in two war zones (on an air craft carrier off the coast of Viet Nam during the Viet Nam war and overseas during the first Iraq war; and finally, as the mother of a toddler whose father was overseas on an unaccompanied tour for two years. I understand what life is like for the spouses and the service members' families -- who also serve their country. Additionally, I am a service-connected disabled vet, and I've worked for a national veterans' service organization for over 25 years, which organization serves the most catastrophically disabled vets.

In May 2019 Mr. Tootle and I were tasked with identifying needed changes to the existing County Code that defined the Commission. Changes were needed to modernize some of the provisions. One of the goals was to provide for a more diverse membership, to allow for varied experiences to be represented on the Commission. In this case, diversity would include not only traditional diversity considerations (including, but not limited to, racial and gender diversity), but would also include veterans who served in different branches of the Uniformed Services, whose ranks varied, and who served during different periods of time. A veteran who served during peace time may have different concerns than a veteran who served during the Viet Nam war. And, a vet who served during Viet Nam may have different concerns than one who served during the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. In light of the proposed expanded activities by the Commission, an additional goal was to add members to the Commission. During Commission meetings, it was decided to recommend that four (4) non-voting members be added, as involvement of more than just county veterans themselves would be helpful. County residents who demonstrated support for veterans, even though they were not veterans themselves, but were representatives of supporting organizations; such as businesses, non-profit and professional organizations could be meaningful assets. Another goal was to ensure continuity and maintain progress on continuing projects by staggering membership terms, rather than have all members' terms expire at the same time. Also, changes were needed to update language within the Code for better clarity, and to align the existing County Code to other County Commissions' changes that were already considered by the County Council.

The recommended changes to the County Code for the Veterans Affairs Commission were approved by the Commission members and given to the Anne Arundel County Veterans and Military Liaison, Mr. Pete Smith, in September 2019 for further presentation to the County Executive's Office for action. Mr. Smith advised the Commission approximately two months ago, that staff members of the County Executive's Office were considering the proposed Code changes for action; and, they prepared what became Bill 97-20 that has been provided to the County Council in November 2020 for consideration and approval.

Few of the requested Code changes the Veterans Affairs Commission developed and provided to the County Executive's Office are contained within Bill 97-20 other than the addition of four (4) non-voting members, and an expanded listing of the organizations from which the Commission can draw voting members. What now exists as Bill 97-20 does not address the original purposes of the requested change, needed clarification is missing, disparity with other County Commission direction is present, and the proposed legislation does not equip the Commission for the purpose it was originated and currently exists.

Rather than repeat the information Mr. Tootle has already provided, I will just add a few comments.

1. **§ 3-12A-102. Purpose.** I concur with Mr. Tootle's comments.

2. **§ 3-12A-103. Composition.** Regarding the composition list of organizations from which voting members may be drawn. I drafted the expanded list by identifying some of the organizations that the Department of Veterans Affairs includes in its Directory of Veterans Service Organizations. When I recommended adding an organization, I kept in mind the goal of diversifying the Commission membership. Additionally, I considered the fact that by virtue of an organization's membership guidelines, some of the organizations will eventually close as their members age, or their veteran members will age beyond the point where they are willing to volunteer, while new organizations will be developed by younger vets. The list is not, nor was it ever intended to be, an all-inclusive list. That is why amending the article now to allow for adding members from other organizations with similar requirements is so important. Such an amendment will allow for change over time, without necessitating amendment of the Code itself at a later date.

3. **§ 3-12A-104. Term of members.**

**Generally.** ~~Members serve at the pleasure of the County Executive.~~ This sentence should be deleted. This provision appears to have been added to replace the provision which stated that all members terms expired at the end of the County Executive's term in office. Once staggered terms were added to the Code, the original provision conflicted with the concept of staggered terms. In addition to Mr. Tootle's comments, the sentence "Members serve at the pleasure of the County Executive" is really a method of terminating a voting member's service without cause. Neither the Human Relations Commission nor the Commission on Disability Issues which codification provisions the County Council has already considered, include that sentence for voting members. Additionally, the County Council previously addressed this issue at the July 15, 2019 hearing regarding the Human Relations Commission, Bill 57-19 (at the 4:47 point on the video of the hearing) and the Council unanimously agreed that the sentence should be stricken from that Bill and Mr. Peter Baron representing the County Executive's office also agreed that it should be stricken. As the Council discussed this really is a way of de-politicizing these

commissions and probably should not appear in the Code for any Commission. A member should be permitted to serve the entire term for which they were appointed, unless they are removed for cause.

Interestingly, the following response to one of the Commission's questions was just received on 11-30. It was forwarded to us by Kaley Schultze who advised that the response was from Christine Neiderer, the attorney in the Office of Law, who drafted the legislation.

"It is important to note that members of boards and commissions who are appointed by the County Executive serve at the pleasure of the County Executive whether the Code includes this language or not. The language was revised because coterminous is not really compatible with staggered terms. Without the change, at the end of every County Executive's term, the terms of all members expire, the entire commission would have to be appointed again, and the staggered terms would have to start again. By revising the language to specify that the members serve at the pleasure of the County Executive, the staggered terms can continue, and the members can continue to serve without reference to a County Executive's term unless they are replaced by a new County Executive (which they could anyway)."

Professionally, I disagree with the above legal opinion, but, I am not the County's attorney. Unfortunately, this is why I originally requested a formal opinion from the County Attorney, as different attorneys within an office can disagree, particularly when one is only providing an e-mail note, rather than a formal opinion. Plus, the Commission was advised by Mr. Smith that the County Code provisions for the various County Commissions were being reviewed and revised to assure some uniformity. If that is the case, then that is another reason this divergence from the established norm does not make any sense.

#### **4. § 3-12A-109. Powers and duties.**

Among its powers and duties, **including but not limited to**, the Commission may ...

This provision is necessary to allow for unforeseen taskings to be assigned to the Commission, without necessitating the very slow process of amending the Code at a later date. And, because the amendment process is so slow, an amendment would likely come too late to be useful for the intended tasking. This was one of the provisions the Commission requested additional information on, but which was not received in time to be considered prior to the Commission's vote.

The County Council may be advised that the Commission voted to not recommend any amendments to the bill. Technically that is a correct statement, but it may be misleading. In brief, what actually happened was at the Commission's October meeting amendments were discussed and an official opinion from the County Office of Law was requested regarding several of the changes before a final decision was to be made. Mr. Smith agreed to obtain the opinion. Unfortunately, perhaps due to the brief amount of time allotted between when the Commission members found out the County Executive's staff was actually considering the Code changes, and when a response was due, the Commission did not receive the requested opinion. Ultimately, after additional e-mail discussions, which centered almost exclusively on the issue of whether the County Code should include the words "veterans and their families" or "veterans and military families" the Commission Chair recommended that Commission members vote to forward the bill without offering amendments. A vote "yes" would authorize him to proceed without recommending any amendments at this time. Subsequently, he advised me that seven of the thirteen members agreed to do so which, although it is a simple majority and allows for some action to be taken, it does not reflect everyone's opinion.

I respectfully request you vote no on this bill as presently drafted, and amend the bill as described.

## **Testimony for Bill 97-20 Veterans Affairs Commission**

**Dan C. Tootle  
108 Askewton Road  
Severna Park, MD 21146**

I oppose the proposed legislation contained within Bill 97-20 Veterans Affairs Commission as submitted to the Anne Arundel County Council by the Anne Arundel County Executive's Office because it requires amendment in order to properly define and direct the work of the Commission. The amendments for Bill 97-20 that I consider necessary, along with the rationale for each recommended amendment are attached to this document,

Until November 2020 I was an active member of the Veterans Affairs Commission having been appointed as a Commissioner by the County Executive on February 5, 2019. I am a US Navy veteran having served 21 years on active duty and have been a County resident since April 1986. I resigned from being a member of the Commission upon realization that the direction being taken by the County Executive's Office and the Commission is not in the best interests of the veterans, military members and their families who live and work in Anne Arundel County; and that in order to address that shortcoming, I could no longer remain as a Commission member due to my disagreement with the path for the Commission that has been directed by the County Executive's Office and concurred with by the Commission members.

In May 2019 myself and one other Commission member were charged with identifying needed changes to the existing County Charter that defined the Veterans Affairs Commission. Changes considered needed to the Charter were in light of the proposed expanded activities by the Commission that would require additional numbers of members, as well as involvement of more than just county veterans themselves to be engaged along with appropriate representatives of supporting organizations; such as businesses, non-profit and professional organizations, etc. Also, changes to the Charter to update language within the Charter for better clarity, and to align the existing Charter to other commission's Charter changes that were forthcoming to the County Council for approval were identified.

The recommended changes to the County Charter for the Veterans Affairs Commission were approved by the Commission members and given to the Anne Arundel County Veterans and Military Liaison person, Mr. Pete Smith, in September 2019 for further presentation to the County Executive's Office for action. In October 2020, the County Executive's Office took up the proposed Charter changes for action and prepared what became Bill 97-20 that has been provided to the County Council in November 2020 for consideration and approval.

Very little of the requested Charter changes the Veterans Affairs Commission developed and provided to the County Executive's Office for the Charter change is contained within Bill 97-20 other than the addition of four (4) non-voting members, and an expanded listing of the organizations from which the Commission can draw voting members. What now exists as Bill 97-20 does not address the original purposes of the requested change, needed clarification is missing, disparity with other County Commission direction is present, and the proposed legislation does not equip the Commission for the purpose it was originated and currently exists. In order for that to happen it should be amended as requested.

## Requested Amendments to Bill No. 97-20

The following amendments are requested to Bill No. 97-20 that is pending its first public hearing by the Anne Arundel County Council on December 7, 2020:

Portions of Bill No. 97-20 that reflect the amendments to be made are shown in **RED** text.

### 1. § 3-12A-101. Established.

There is a Veteran **and Military Families** Affairs Commission to be known as the “Anne Arundel County Veterans **and Military Families** Affairs Commission.”

#### Rationale for the Requested Amendment

- a. This Anne Arundel County commission has been charged with the responsibilities identified in **Section § 3-12A-102** of the County Charter. The name of the Commission should reflect the responsibilities that are assigned to the Commission as delineated within that Section. Similar commissions that have been established in other adjacent Maryland counties that have significant numbers of veterans, active duty military and families as residents vary with regard to the inclusion of resident military families within their Veterans Affairs Commissions. Other Maryland counties with commissions for this purpose are:
  - (1) Prince Georges County – Commission for Veterans – programs and services for veterans and their families,
  - (2) Montgomery County – Commission on Veterans Affairs – programs and services for the U.S. Uniformed Services, and their families, and recognizing the Military Service of our Armed Forces,
  - (3) Howard County – Commission for Veterans and Military Families – local services to military service members and veterans,
  - (4) Baltimore City – Baltimore City Veterans Commission – assistance to veterans and their families,
  - (5) Carroll County – Veterans Advisory Council – guidance and assistance to veterans, dependents, and survivors,
  - (6) Hartford County – Commission on Veterans Affairs – programs and services to veterans and their families.
  - (7) Calvert County / St. Mary’s County / Charles County – Tri County Veterans Regional Advisory Council – create opportunities for veterans and their families,
  - (8) Eastern Shore Counties (Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne’s, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico and Worcester) – Mid Shore Veterans Network and Lower Shore Network – *purpose not stated.*
- b. Our nation’s military services personnel, both those who have previously served and those who are currently serving directly reflect the demographic makeup of all of our county residents; and when encountered in our communities and businesses can only be recognized as such if in uniform or are wearing a distinctive item showing such service. So, all of us spend time in our neighborhoods, schools, churches, businesses, recreation parks and entertain places side-by-side with them without a personal

recognition of the unique services previously given while in uniform or as a member of a military family to this county and to our nation; seeing them as just another person who lives in this beautifully blessed part of Maryland.

- c. Veterans, active duty military persons and family member county residents bring many gifts, both material and intangible to daily life within their communities, at their working places and businesses, and to the many organizations that contribute to the qualities of life that we all enjoy and rely upon. This is not surprising to those who understand that, although our veterans and families are no longer actively serving, all who have and are serving know that *Honor and Integrity* are the core values of military service. Although each service states its own specific values, military service embodies the tenets of *Loyalty, Respect, Selfless Service, Honor and Integrity, Excellence and Commitment, Personal Service and Courage, and Devotion to Duty.*

## 2. § 3-12A-102. Purpose.

The purpose of the Commission is to advocate and help to enhance the quality of life for veterans of military service and ~~their-military~~ families who live and work within Anne Arundel County, **and to provide assistance and guidance to those transitioning from military to civilian life** by advising the County Executive and the County Council on the coordination and development of government policies, programs, services, and the allocation of resources for veterans and their families.

### **Rationale for the Requested Amendment**

- a. Advocacy and representation by the Anne Arundel County Veterans Affairs Commission for military families who live and work in Anne Arundel County is considered to be appropriate:
  - (1) in recognition of the fact that military families, of both veterans and military personnel who are assigned to duty in one of Anne Arundel County's three active military facilities live within our communities, provide tax revenue through home ownership, income tax, local sales purchases and taxes, and are provided services from Anne Arundel County departments and offices when requested;
  - (2) in recognition of the fact that, along with the veterans who live and work in Anne Arundel County, they are part of the "less than 1%" of the U.S. population who have volunteered to join a military service, wear a uniform, and serve to protect this nation and its people;
  - (3) in recognition of the fact that, while living and working within Anne Arundel County, form core responsible positions of leadership and example within the communities of this County;
  - (4) like the veterans of this County, have unique needs for service and support due to their commitment, obligations, and sacrifice as part of military service that are available in large part from existing Anne Arundel County departments and offices; and
  - (5) have a readily available advocacy and representation body as the Anne Arundel County Veterans Affairs Commission, the members of who have specific insight, appreciation, and understanding of the unique challenges military families face in their daily lives.
- b. Providing assistance and guidance to active duty military members and their families while transitioning from military to civilian life is a specific charge given to each Anne Arundel County Veterans Affairs Commission member by the County Executive in the appointment letter to the Commission as;
  - (1) the charge to provide such assistance and guidance directly reflects the original purpose of the Commission when it was implemented in 2005,
  - (2) such assistance and guidance from Commission members draws directly on each member's personal experience in having previously made such transition,
  - (3) it is in the direct interest of the Anne Arundel County government and administration, the Anne Arundel County Council, and business and residents of

Anne Arundel County for active duty military members and their families to become full-time county residents upon leaving active duty,

- (4) providing active duty to civilian status transition assistance and guidance by a knowledgeable and purposed body can be expected to be a positive influence toward a decision to be an Anne Arundel County resident upon such transition.

### **3. § 3-12A-103. Composition.**

The composition of the Commission shall consist of 13 voting members and 4 non-voting members for a total composition of 17 Commission members.

(4) nine shall be from any of the following organizations and selected in consultation with that organization by the voting members; however, additional organizations may be considered that are not currently listed with the same proviso.

#### **Rationale for the Requested Amendment**

- a. A clear statement that describes the composition of the Commission membership is needed since this section provides information about the voting and non-voting members but does not have an overall description of the membership composition.
- b. The list of organizations to be included within the Commission's composition is not a totally inclusive list, nor has it intended to be. As proposed, this provision is restrictive, and as younger veterans become present and create new organizations, and some of the older organizations decrease in size and activity level by virtue of the age of their member veterans, the change as now written will not be responsive to those expected changes.

#### 4. § 3-12A-104. Term of members.

(a) **Generally.** ~~Members serve at the pleasure of the County Executive.~~ The initial terms of newly appointed voting members shall be staggered so that four members shall serve initial terms of one year, four members shall serve initial terms of two years, and five members shall serve initial terms of three years. Non-voting members, and, after the expiration of the initial terms, voting members shall serve three year terms. A member whose term has expired holds over until a successor is appointed. A member may serve up to three consecutive full terms, and, after a one-year lapse in service, a member is eligible to be appointed.

#### **Rationale for the Requested Amendment**

The sentence. "Members serve at the pleasure of the County Executive." should be removed. Please note that subsection (b) **Removal for cause**, is worded exactly as the wording for a voting member's removal from the Human Relations Commission and Commission on Disability Issues bills that were recently approved by the County Council and is the wording being used within the County Code.

This language about "serving at the pleasure of the County Executive" was intentionally removed from the above two commissions bills. "Serving at the will of" or "at the pleasure of" is a legal concept dealing with employees. This concept provides that if an employee does not have a contract to the contrary, the employee is an "at will" employee whose position can be terminated for any reason, or no reason at all, provided the reason is not legally prohibited, for example a termination cannot be based on things like: race, gender, religion, etc. Commission members are not County employees. At the July 15th hearing they discussed removing the "Members serve at the pleasure of the County Executive" from that bill as it was not correct. The Disability Commission has non-voting auxiliary members, who are drawn from County departments, and actually are county employees, and for those non-voting employees, the language was inserted that they serve at the pleasure of the County Executive, as their service on the commission is specifically tied to their county job, however, it was listed separately and distinctly from the voting members.

**5. § 3-12A-107. Rules and regulations.**

The Commission shall adopt rules and regulations to govern procedures for its meetings, and activities

**Rationale for the Requested Amendment**

The functions of the Commission are considered to be best accomplished through ordered and defined procedures due in large part to the diverse makeup of the Commission members for whom an established manner of process and mutual agreement directs both its meetings and its activities. The Commission is charged through its assigned duties and responsibilities to carry out a wide range of advocacy and representation. With a body of mutually understood manners of carrying out the work of the Commission confusion is mitigated and proper management of meetings and that work is able to effectively go forward under an established set of ByLaws.

**6. § 3-12A-109. Powers and duties.**

Among its powers and duties, **including but not limited to**, the Commission may:

- (1) establish a forum for all veterans **and their military families** of the County;
- (2) maintain coordinated communication with County and local governments, businesses, and veterans **and their military families** of the County;
- (3) provide assistance, guidance, and information to the business and academic communities of the County and various levels of government to ensure adequate consideration of veterans **and their military families** in employment, education, training and public programs;
- (4) Review County, State, and Federal legislation that may impact veterans and **their military** families and make recommendations regarding the legislations :
- (5) advise the County Executive on the coordination of services among all public and private agencies, departments, and organizations which provide services and programs to veterans and **their military** families; and
- (6) identify and recommend to the County Executive sources of private and public financial assistance available to expand or improve services and programs for veterans and **their military** families.

**Rationale for the Requested Amendment**

- a. The statement regarding the stated Commission's powers and duties with the proviso as not being limited to just what is within this one-time-statement as proposed allows the County Executive and the County Council, along with the Commission, to carry out activities not yet identified, but that are inevitable to become identified and necessary over time; and
- b. the inclusion of the term "military families" is consistent with and reflective of the rationale stated in "**§ 3-12A-101. Establishment.**" and "**§ 3-12A-102. Purpose.**" above.