

**Summary of Discussion
Broward County Charter Review Commission
Health & Social Services Subcommittee Meeting
Monday, February 11, 2008
Main Library, 100 S. Andrews Avenue
6th Floor, Ceremonial Room
11:00 AM - 12:30 AM**

Members Present:

Mr. Wil Trower, Chair
Ms. Jodi Jeffreys-Tanner, Vice Chair
Mr. Mark Ketcham
Mr. David Esack
Ms. Bernadette Norris-Weeks, Esq.

Members Absent:

Dr. Mark Lieberman
Mr. Joseph Maus, Esq.

Others Attending:

Chedley Etienne, Administrative Assistant, CRC
Yolanda Grooms, Administrative Specialist, CRC
Maria Gross, Assistant Director, CRC
Jacob Horowitz, Esq.
Phyllis A. King, Transcriber, PKING Consulting
Lisa Vondrak, News-Abstracts

(A copy of the sign-in sheets identifying those present is filed with the supplemental papers to the summary of this Subcommittee Meeting.)

A meeting of the Broward County Charter Review Health and Social Services Subcommittee "Committee, Subcommittee, or HSSC," was held at 11:00 a.m. on Monday, February 11, 2008 at the Main Library, 100 S. Andrews Avenue, 6th Floor, Ceremonial Room.

I Call to Order/Roll Call

The Chair Wil Trower called the meeting to order at 11:04 a.m. He then requested the roll call by Phyllis A. King, PKING Consulting, Inc. Upon completion of the roll, the Chair recognized the presence of a quorum.

II. Discussion of Draft Language Regarding Housing Council Resolution

The Chair stated that the purpose of today's meeting was that subsequent to the presentation of the recommendation of CRC Resolution 2008-005, which occurred January 9, 2008 at the full CRC meeting, there was a vote of 11 in favor of the Resolution and 7 against the Resolution. He advised that subsequent to the failure of the Resolution to pass, there was a unanimous vote of 19:0 to send Resolution 2008-005 back to the HSSC for review and discussion to include those changes made prior to the vote. He explained that the challenge is to make further changes incorporating language that will allow those who voted against the Resolution to vote for it.

The Chair advised that he reviewed the Minutes of the 1/9/08 full CRC meeting and there were a number of Commission members who raised questions. In looking at the objections to the Resolution there were three issues.

- Two members were against the Resolution because they didn't feel it was strong enough and felt that it needed stronger language, there shouldn't be a Council, but a Czar in charge of housing.
- The general direction of Council needs to be a more targeted in the role the Council described in the Resolution.
- Discussion of the inclusion of homeless issues as opposed to separating them out.

[Ms. Norris-Weeks entered at this time 11:09 a.m.]

The Chair opened the floor to discussion.

Ms. Tanner expressed disappointment regarding the Resolution not passing the full Commission. She stated that while reading through previous meeting minutes, she believes that the HSSC has addressed some of the concerns that the full Commission had and that after

listening to the full Commission, the current resolution is a happy median as far as the Resolution not being too strong or not being too weak. She suggested going through the Resolution as a subcommittee and addressing each individual area of concern.

Ms. Norris-Weeks explained that she asked Ms. Gross to call members who voted against the Resolution to ask them to report publicly why they were against it. She advised that she tried to get an idea of what some of their concerns were. She asked if Ms. Gross had a report to provide.

Ms. Gross: In fact Wil Trower raised one or two of the issues. One of them was about whether a Czar would be more effective and these are the responses, in general that I got.

Ms. Norris-Weeks asked who raised the issue.

Mr. Horowitz: I think it was Mr. Rogow.

Mr. Esack stated that Mr. Rogow has strong sentiments about a Czar.

Ms. Gross: To make the language stronger as Jodi had just mentioned, the last comment was to clean up the language the “shall” and the “may,” in the document and one last thing, The County Commission should replace a selection if needed. Those are pretty much the comments that I got back.

Ms. Norris-Weeks suggested working through the issues Ms. Gross just mentioned to ensure they are in the current document.

The Chair advised that this is the current goal of today's meeting.

Mr. Esack restated the three issues for Ms. Norris-Weeks and asked Mr. Ketcham what his thoughts and concerns are.

Mr. Ketcham advised that his concern is philosophical. He advised that the Charter is the County's Constitution and the Resolution only suggests and doesn't do anything. He referred to the Broward County Commission Agenda Item 61; which was provided in the Subcommittee folders, wherein the County Commission created a Blue Ribbon Panel to deal with the Housing Crisis. He advised that the way Resolution is currently, there's no stick, no funding, there's no way. If they don't go to this, we're going to hold back the funding. Mr. Ketcham advised that a

Housing Council would be great if it was done in the same model as the *Ryan White Aids Consortium* where the Federal government gives money to the County and everyone sits to a table and decides the best way to spend that money. He stated that he does not see collaboration occurring with funding. He also pointed out that no representation from a Housing organization has been at the meetings testifying that there is a problem. Mr. Ketcham advised that he does not believe he will change his position and he still does not feel that the Resolution does not belong in the Charter.

Ms. Norris-Weeks thanked Mr. Ketcham and advised she appreciates his position. She reminded Mr. Ketcham that Housing representatives were present at some of the meetings. She informed the HSSC that during her tenure on the MESC, the representatives from Housing appeared there as well. She advised that there are similar Boards, which have been very effective and stated that she is not one to do something just to try to do it. She stated that the HSSC has the opportunity to give the voters the option. If there is a group of people who can get ahead of it all, why not allow the people to decide. She feels it is a very appropriate thing to be in the Charter.

Ms. Tanner advised that she respectfully disagrees with Mr. Ketcham's position and stated that it is about being pro-active. There is really no down side to the Resolution and it is giving the people a forum to handle all of the issues affordable housing, homelessness, etc.

Mr. Esack pointed out that there is a Cultural Affairs Council that is in the Charter.

Mr. Ketcham advised that the Cultural Affairs Council makes funding suggestions, and that it is a big difference.

Mr. Esack stated that the Broward Housing Council would be a Body to help everyone communicate, that in the future he would like to see fiscal implications attached to requests that are being reviewed. The associated fiscal implications of putting the council together may or may not have swayed some votes. He suggested that in the future this information should be attached.

Ms. Tanner advised that she sees nil to none fiscal impact, ;the upside is that fiscal impact is immeasurable. She stated that if people are leery about the Resolution, it's because they think it's somewhat negative. She advised that if that problem can be alleviated then there would not be any concerns.

Mr. Esack suggested attaching “negligible” under the term fiscal impact.

Ms. Tanner suggested doing the positive because there really is no negative.

Mr. Ketcham stated that Commissioner Jacobs brought up what the cost would be to the County. He advised that Commissioner Jacobs tends to be a more liberal Commissioner and this needs to be addressed. He informed that no matter how negligible the cost are going to be that when they are looking at 100 to 150 million dollar cuts next year, there is no negligible cost.

Ms. Tanner advised that the Resolution does not come with a price tag on it.

Mr. Ketcham stated that as a voter the government is here to help. . He believes what Mr. Esack is saying, is that they may want to come up with what they think the cost would be.

Ms. Tanner responded that it is pulling away from it unnecessarily.

Ms. Norris-Weeks advised that she does not want to make the meeting about convincing Mr. Ketcham; she wants to focus on the people who were against the Resolution. She reminded the subcommittee that the County has gone with a Czar previously and it is not happening. She stated that with regard to the County Commission Agenda Item #61, it related to one issue. She requested that Ms. Gross reach out to the Housing organizations (including Suzanne Weiss)

The Chair advised that Ms. Weiss had received copies of the Resolution and he had spoken with her already.

Mr. Ketcham informed the members that Ms. Weiss was recommended for the Blue Ribbon Panel.

Ms. Norris-Weeks stated that she would like to invite Ms. Weiss to the CRC meeting, and make calls to particular people so that they can come and inform us of their thoughts.

Ms. Gross: I know Suzanne Weiss and Jim Carras have been invited several times, and he is on the distribution list. We’ve invited in-house people like Suzanne Ferber, and if there are other specific individuals that you want me to invite.

Ms. Tanner suggested inviting Steve Werthman.

Ms. Gross: In terms of what we want to accomplish on Wednesday is to have these things finalized because the last meeting, the proposed draft is suppose to be in by the 27th. There has to be a time where you cap things and say that this is what we've got, and this is what we're going with; so I am more than happy to do that but...

Ms. Norris-Weeks explained that the County Commission Agenda Item 61 is more immediate as an Ordinance than as a Charter change.

Ms. Gross: Right, let's just say on Wednesday you've invited all the people and they have other comments, and those have to be revised and brought back so they should be finalized by the 27th; that's what we have to keep in mind.

Mr. Esack stated that Christine Lorber the Advisory Board Coordinator for Broward County oversees all of the Advisory Boards. He explained that staff is being thinned out and he believes it should be addressed. He provided an example of the situation they are in where they have to have the work done in the next two weeks for something that's going before the voters nine months from now. He explained that he feels the HSSC is being rushed.

Ms. Gross: Well, just keep in mind that the last Public Hearing is on April 9th. So, from April 9th to May 9th is a month. The final copies and everything have to be given to the County Commission the first week in June. That leaves a month or so for those revisions and there may be more meetings. I was looking at the last Charter Review Commission meetings and in May they were having two a week, two a month; they're still having meetings. So to make a deadline of February, I think is a realistic deadline.

Mr. Esack stated that was when the County Commission had the ability to modify. He advised that now they don't have that ability.

The Chair explained that the CRC might be getting feedback from the Public Hearings that requires them to go back.

Ms. Tanner advised that the representatives for the housing industry and the homelessness might not have thought that the subcommittee would have any contention against this when it came to the Commission for vote. She stated that she believes people will come out and give their support.

The Chair stated that one of the main things to do would be to communicate with the various agencies. He asked what Ms. Weiss' title is.

Ms. Norris-Weeks explained that Ms. Weiss is Associate Director/Real Estate Sales and a Neighbor Works Chartered Member.

Ms. Tanner reiterated the request for staff to communicate with these individuals or agencies again to get their input.

Ms. Gross: So, what you're asking staff to do, which is fine, is to communicate with these individuals and organizations again to get their input.

Mr. Esack suggested letting them know that this is the last chance for public comment.

Mr. Ketcham asked that the Public Housing Organization be added to the list.

Mr. Horowitz: You may want to keep in mind; one of the changes we did make was to incorporate the Broward County Housing Authority appointing a member. You may want to contact Kevin Cregan the Executive Director over there.

Mr. Trower asked if it is appropriate to provide them with a draft from the subcommittee.

Mr. Horowitz: We can certainly provide a draft, sure.

Mr. Trower suggested sending the agencies/organizations a copy of the subcommittee recommendation inclusive of changes from today's meeting.

Mr. Horowitz: As soon as the meeting is over, we can go ahead and make the changes this afternoon and get it back to you.

The Chair asked Mr. Horowitz, if that resolution in front of the HSSC with regard to Exhibit "A," voted on 1/9/08.

Mr. Horowitz: That's actually not correct, we made a number of changes after the 1/9/08 meeting based on some recommendations of the Full CRC, which came out on the 15th and the version I looked at that you have Jodi is the latest. The most recent correct.

Mr. Trower stated that his understanding of what was voted on at the meeting on the 9th, was the original resolution with the changes made through the discussion at the meeting on the 9th.

Mr. Horowitz: That's correct the version that was in your packets for today incorporates some specific comments from the meeting on the 9th, with those changes. This version you're looking at on the top that's dated 1/15/08; that includes revisions after the last full meeting. There were some specific comments that the Full CRC had that we incorporated into this draft. I can go through and just highlight and point out.

The Chair asked if this is the document including the revisions that failed to pass.

Mr. Horowitz: Some of the revisions they commented on, that we incorporated, were changes that they want sent back here for you to consider in the hopes that when it goes back it will pass.

The Chair stated that the changes were agreed upon prior to taking the final vote.

Mr. Horowitz: That's correct, when the vote was taken the changes I believe, had already been discussed.

The Chair advised that the changes were already incorporated in the current draft and approved by the subcommittee.

Ms. Tanner advised that she believes there was something else that may have been changed after the vote.

Mr. Ketcham inquired about the Czar issue.

Mr. Esack stated that if you eliminate the Czar, then there are two areas that need addressing. He advised that the two areas would be either making the language stronger or doing something to effectuate the homeless situation.

Mr. Ketcham advised that he was using that as an example, and he was not pushing it.

Mr. Esack informed that there were a couple of members who voted against it because it needed to have stronger language.

Mr. Horowitz: I believe that some of the changes that were made tighten up some of that loose language.

The Chair referred to the minutes of 1/9/08 and explained that an item-by-item review was done. He explained that this was done before the final vote on the Resolution.

Ms. Tanner advised that since no one saw the revisions written down it can be forwarded with the changes.

Ms. Norris-Weeks asked Mr. Horowitz to review the changes.

Mr. Horowitz: Can you go to the summary of discussion two on page 15, this will help everyone follow along as the Chair has gone through B (1) & B (2), most of those were approved by consensus. The changes that we made were; we had a majority vote of the Broward County Commission. Majority vote was a little redundant besides voted by a County Commission, that's inherently by a majority. That was just a cosmetic change that we made. Ms. Tanner stated that B (2) removed the Mayor. Again, that's also just cosmetic because the Mayor is part of the Commission. We were just cleaning it up to essentially provide for consistency throughout the Charter so all of the membership on page one essentially has not changed with the exception of (B) 15.

Mr. Esack suggested presenting the changes that have already been recommended previously.

Ms. Norris-Weeks asked if a CRC member requested to remove the Mayor.

Mr. Esack responded yes.

Mr. Horowitz: Yes, they said we want it by the "Commission"; and the term majority vote of the Commission is a little redundant because the vote of the Commission is by majority. Jumping ahead to (B) 15; the draft we initially presented included reference to an appointment by the Broward Teachers' Union. That was struck and now we had the Broward County Housing Authority and that was a specific change that was recommended, and subsequently voted on. Keep in mind when that vote was taken, it was voted down; so it's not that this was approved; these comments were reflected. The vote was on the draft as amended, so these comments were considered when that vote was taken but it still failed.

Ms. Tanner explained that the CRC members did not see the changes in the Resolution.

Mr. Horowitz: You're absolutely right, nobody saw it, and it's going to go back as amended for full review. Now in subsection (C), these are some changes that we did make. All of these strike throughs in subsection (C) were eliminated; 16 and 17 we added the appointment by the Association Mortgage Brokers. That was initially a blank because we were trying to find an appropriate organization to appoint so we went ahead and clarified that. Seventeen is the non-voting member of the Council, which is the County Administrator or his/her designee. Now jumping down to (C) as I was saying, here we essentially revised this entire section. There was some discussion particularly into the no more than 19 members, because it was initially open-ended where they could appoint as many members as they wanted, but I guess the CRC wanted to cap it at 19. So, we have 17 appointments above, but there was essentially a window for two more appointments by the County Commission. Now we have no more than 19, and the last 5 or 6 lines where the strike throughs are was in the original language, and that's been stricken out. That's averaged to a point of an individual's background, experience related in housing issues.

Ms. Norris-Weeks asked if that change was agreed to, referring to deleted language - page 2 / right margin of Exhibit A, Article XI.

Mr. Horowitz: That was the language the group asked to have stricken, and I believe it was by consensus.

Ms. Norris-Weeks requested language pertaining to background/experience remain. She stated that removing the language, "Use best efforts to appoint individuals with background and experience relating to housing issues," was not her intent.

Mr. Horowitz: If it's the prerogative of the Board, we can put that back. I'm just looking at the notes from the meeting and that was all.

Ms. Norris-Weeks advised that she believes that language would be a good, because they would want people who have background or interest in the issues.

Ms. Tanner explained that the discussion was that the appointer and the appointee will already consider that issue without having to put that language in the Resolution.

Ms. Norris-Weeks stated that by virtue of the people who are going to be serving on the Council, it would be taken care of.

Mr. Esack agreed with Ms. Tanner that to attempt to put the language back into the Resolution would lessen the chances of what they are trying to achieve.

Mr. Horowitz: That was actually it; those were the substantive changes that were made, and particularly the main change was to that subsection. The appointment changes were really for the most part cosmetic, with the exception of the swapping the Broward County Housing Authority for the Broward Teachers' Union, vice-versa.

The Chair asked if any other items would address some of the issues discussed.

Ms. Norris-Weeks advised the comments from Ms. Gross, with the exception of the Czar issue.

Ms. Gross: One of the issues was that the County Commission should place a selection if needed.

The Chair referred to (H) Vacancies. He asked if discussion had taken place regarding some of the agencies picking their representative.

Ms. Norris-Weeks stated that if stronger language is wanted, then maybe they can find a way to make it stronger. She explained that she was not sure what was being referenced.

Mr. Horowitz: Keep in mind that the vacancies that are created may be filled by the County Commission, by Ordinance subsequently. If you look at the sentence in subsection (H), there's a little flexibility there. There are other circumstances, creating a vacancy may be defined by ordinance and shall be filled pursuant to subsection (B). So, if there are vacancies down the road, the County Commission has the flexibility to work with the appointment process by ordinance, to go ahead and fill it as needed.

Ms. Norris-Weeks suggested providing a list of how specific concerns were addressed by the HSSC to the full CRC.

Mr. Trower agreed.

Ms. Tanner suggested having a redlined version of the Resolution. She also suggested discussing the homeless issue because she feels that it needs to be a part of the Resolution.

Ms. Norris-Weeks stated that maybe the people from public comment will speak before the HSSC, start its discussion and explain why they think it's so important.

Ms. Tanner suggested inviting Steve Werthman.

Mr. Ketcham asked if the changes are what the full CRC voted on.

Mr. Horowitz: That's correct, but my understanding was that the vote was as amended; the comments were incorporated. The vote was as amended and it was actually voted down and sent back to you all.

Mr. Ketcham informed that the Resolution received 11 votes for the current draft.

Ms. Tanner stated that the Resolution was never in front of CRC like it is currently. She explained that it was the old resolution that didn't have any deletions in it.

Mr. Ketcham reminded the Subcommittee of the Mortgage Broker conversation with Ms. Rogers and explained that it is not a change. He advised that they had also voted on an appointment by Broward County Housing Authority which also fell under the vote.

Ms. Norris-Weeks advised that she liked the changes.

Mr. Ketcham advised that he had a problem because it has already been voted and failed.

The Chair advised that it becomes a procedural issue which is, should we take this back to the subcommittee with a motion to reconsider. He informed that the question is did the HSSC prevail since they received a majority vote.

Ms. Norris-Weeks stated that the 11 votes allow the HSSC to have Council draft it. She explained that she does not see where there is a motion to reconsider. She informed that she thinks they are trying to correct the procedural mishap. She suggested a way to delineate the comments addressed with multi-colored highlights.

The Chair stated that he agree with Mr. Ketcham. He advised that his concern is losing, based on procedure.

Ms. Tanner advised that she believe the Resolution is good.

Mr. Horowitz: That's not the issue because the full CRC sent it back to you, all you need to do is resubmit it.

Ms. Norris-Weeks advised that the HSSC brought it to them.

Mr. Esack advised that a lot of the response is perception. He informed them that by showing that things have been taken into consideration, the things that have been discussed and mentioned, the Resolution should pass.

Ms. Norris-Weeks stated that it would also show the two other issues that have been changed and she thinks it should be enough to get the two votes.

Ms. Gross: The way I understood it, was that the revisions were voted down by the CRC. They made the comments, those revisions, and they were voted down. I think your challenge was to find some other kinds of changes that could be made, maybe slight changes, but at least make some slight changes. Then you could say, you made some slight changes and the CRC members, we incorporated what you said at the last meeting and we've made these other changes, how does this fit. That way you've said that you included them.

Ms. Tanner stated that that's what they need to end up with at the end of today.

Mr. Esack advised that this goes back to a Czar, homelessness, or stronger language.

Ms. Norris-Weeks asked what the issues were with the Resolution.

The Chair advised that the four issues were:

- *Direction and role of the Council*
- *Homeless Issue*
- *Stronger Role for the Council or a Czar and*
- *Should this be in the Charter or not.*

Mr. Horowitz: One thing that's not in here that may help is some specific duties. I mean it talks in subsection (A), are some goals so to speak, affordable housing, workforce housing, and homelessness but there are no specific duties. Ms. Norris-Weeks explained that it was discussed and the HSSC wanted the Council to be an array of housing issues, which wouldn't exclude anything.

The Chair referred to the comments made on page nine of the minutes. He suggested that they create a paragraph relating to duties and making broad comments without being very specific.

Ms. Norris-Weeks suggested adding something about market trends.

The Chair stated that they discussed the verbiage of facilitating coordination between the various agencies and entities. He asked if they wanted to create another paragraph.

Mr. Ketcham asked if the word clearinghouse had been added. He stated that he does not like the word trend.

The Chair read the verbiage from Section 11.07 (A).

Mr. Horowitz: That could be a section like an intent, or purpose statement, or an aspirational goal, and if you go ahead and then you have a membership; we can add an alternate, maybe subsection (C) or an alternate subsection (D) called duties, if you want to set out some specific tasks.

Ms. Tanner suggested using conduit or Advisory Council in place of clearinghouse.

The Chair asked if the Advisory Council had a specific legal definition with the County.

Mr. Horowitz: Yes, it makes recommendations. The Chair suggested creating a separate paragraph called *Duties*, and be specific about what the Council should do.

Ms. Tanner suggested creating duties after membership.

Ms. Gross: Ms. Norris-Weeks mentioned about making it broad, but you may want to specify maybe some limitations, that way you're looking at it from the other side to bring it a little bit closer together. I'm not promoting this, I'm just saying think of what kind of limitations you might want.

Mr. Horowitz: Keep in mind anything you put in there we can always have included but not limited too. So, you're listing a few and then there's going to be whatever else.

The Chair asked what the main generic components are that the Council should be looking at.

The Chair asked what the duties of the Council should be.

Ms. Tanner advised that the Council's mission is under Section (A).

Mr. Ketcham suggested a list of duties to add:

- *Disbursement of Housing Models to all members*
- *Import Housing Models from other areas of Country*
- *Promote alternative Housing Models*
- *Share funding strategies*
- *Collaborate with agencies to maximize leverage*
- *Sharing personnel*
- *Best Practices*
- *Preventing Duplication of Services*
- *Maximize Resources*

Ms. Norris-Weeks suggested addressing specifically who had the concern.

The Chair asked if there was more to add.

Mr. Horowitz: I just want to run down the list of things that I'll add.

- *Explore Housing Models elsewhere in the Country*
- *Promote Alternative Housing Models.*
- *Explore enhance and share funding strategies*
- *Collaborate with other agencies to maximize leverage*

Ms. Tanner advised that sharing funding strategies and collaborating with agencies to maximize leverage. She stated that the subcommittee already knows that they are two separate duties.

The Chair explained that by drilling down another level, it may help the full CRC understand the details better.

Mr. Horowitz: So, we're collaborating with other agencies to maximize County leverage.

The Chair suggested County-wide funding leverage.

Ms. Tanner suggested putting collaborate with other agencies towards maximizing County-wide funding leverage.

Mr. Esack suggested adding County-wide funding opportunities.

Mr. Horowitz: The last thing I have is, preventing and minimizing duplication of services. So, that's five and it's going to be again, including but not limited to. They're going to be open-ended so any other duties they want to add in there they can go ahead and run with it.

The Chair asked if the word coordinate was added.

Mr. Horowitz: *Collaborate and coordinate* with agencies to maximize County-wide funding opportunities.

Mr. Ketcham asked if language should be added that this Board will not have taxing authority.

Ms. Norris-Weeks advised that it would be a meager amount of funding.

Mr. Esack advised that he believes the Resolution is clear.

Mr. Horowitz: You're talking about in the ballot question now?

Ms. Norris-Weeks stated that it would be in the question. She asked if enough words were left.

Mr. Horowitz: We can re-word it. I think we're probably at about 74, but we can figure something out. I'm looking at the 3rd line down of the ballot question; "Shall the Charter be amended to provide for a Broward County Housing Council to serve in a non-taxing advisory capacity." Three lines down on the ballot question on page 3.

The Chair acknowledged consensus.

Ms. Gross: Do you have what Mark said, "Disburse every type of Housing Model to all members." Did you mention that?

Mr. Horowitz: Well I have: Explore Housing Models elsewhere in the country and promote alternative Housing Models. Do you want me to add a third or does that get you there?

Ms. Gross: No

Mr. Ketcham asked Ms. Gross if she was saying something different or was it the same thing.

Ms. Gross: No, import Housing Models to all members.

Mr. Ketcham advised that there is an educational component that they are trying to capture.

Mr. Horowitz: Promote alternative Housing Models, does that get you there?

Ms. Tanner suggested, "*Educate about alternative Housing Models.*"

The Chair advised that he feels this substantially pulls it together.

Mr. Esack asked for opinions if the Broward County Housing Council were in existence, would the Blue Ribbon Panel be necessary.

Ms. Norris-Weeks advised that she believes if this resolution passes, they may kill the ordinance because this is more expansive.

The Chair agreed with Ms. Weeks and advised that she made a good point.

Ms. Norris-Weeks stated that the Blue Ribbon Panel is just for the foreclosure issues and it should be going away.

Mr. Ketcham asked if they should add that members are encouraged to attend the meeting.

Mr. Horowitz: The meetings are inherently opened to the public and they're advertised. They're noticed. I mean, it's all subject to Chapter 286. It's going to be a public meeting; it's just a matter of getting people there. Like you'd be getting people here, I mean it's not always an easy thing to do.

The Chair asked if the language should be spelled out that says the Council will make an attempt to make sure that all interested parties are brought to the table.

Mr. Ketcham advised that there are different Housing Programs but they are related to Housing.

Mr. Horowitz: I think if we just had a statement under Duties, indicating that one of the responsibilities of the Council is to make the initiative and ensure that they're constantly communicating with the public.

Mr. Esack stated that they should educate the public to the issues.

Mr. Horowitz: So how do you want to work that out, educate the public, or encourage involvement?

Mr. Esack suggested *encourage involvement and educate the public to ensure all affected and interested parties are aware.*

Ms. Tanner asked what means were to be used to educate the public.

Ms. Norris-Weeks suggested sending the minutes to various Housing organizations.

Mr. Horowitz: I have, *educate the public and engage interested parties to ensure maximum county-wide involvement.* How does that work?

Mr. Ketcham suggested adding, of all housing stakeholders.

The Chair asked if there were any other items.

Mr. Ketcham requested clarification of color coordination.

Ms. Norris-Weeks explained that she suggested having two colors. She stated that the things that the Commission has done would be one color and the revisions from the HSSC would be another.

The Chair suggested showing the evolution of the changes.

- Original
- 2nd color
- 3rd color

The Chair asked if there were any other items or changes. He also asked if there were further comments on Agenda Item 61.

There were no comments related to the item.

Mr. Horowitz: Revisions for the list to be added to Section (6) Section (C). I have:

- *Explore Housing Models elsewhere in the country*
- *Educate about Alternative Housing Models.*
- *Share and explore funding strategies*
- *Coordinate and collaborate with the agencies to maximize County-wide funding opportunities.*

- *Prevent and minimize duplication of services.*
- *Educate public and engage interested parties to ensure maximum involvement of all stakeholders.*

Including ***but not limited to***, so there are six. I believe it's going to be Section C but that's subject to change depending on how it fits.

The Chair asked if a vote is needed for the things that were added.

Mr. Horowitz: If this is going back on Wednesday, you can approve all of this as amended and I'll go ahead, incorporate the changes, and send it over to Maria.

Mr. Esack MOTIONED to approve proposed Resolution 2008-005 as amended, Ms. Tanner SECONDED, and the motion PASSED.

The Chair asked if there was any other business

III. Old Business

None

IV. New Business

None

The Chair opened the floor for public comment.

V. Public Comment

None

VI. Adjournment

There being no further discussion the meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

The minutes of this meeting are recorded on CRC-HSSC CD # 2.11.08 (BCGV CTR)