

Ticket ID	Ticket created - Date	Public Comment
71702	2022-01-14	<p>Good afternoon, I saw your presentation this AM at the BOCC meeting on the PAB comments / revisions. Then I printed out the current draft on the PAB page of the county site. Is it safe to presume that there will be another updated draft prior to the 1/25 meeting at the Brown Center? I presume that public comments / recommendations from 1/25 will be reviewed for inclusion into the final document. When I read the current draft online, I was surprised again by the Membership section - part IV. It still opens with the "To the extent practicable" phrase which is not a firm commitment to reflect the " racial, gender, and cultural diversity of Calvert County." It's a hedge phrase/ a bailout phrase to cover a board that could look too male, too white, and too police-oriented. The hedging can be simply avoided by stating: The membership of the CCPAB and CCACC shall reflect the racial, gender, and cultural diversity of Calvert County. Also, the current draft states that the PAB chairperson will be a retired law officer who had command or supervisory experience? Are we grooming this position for someone in particular? Previous drafts simply stated: the chairperson of the CCPAB shall have experience relevant to the position. Where did all of the added specifics come from? Did they come from the LWV? Past drafts had 2 members being retired law officers. The current draft has 3 members being retired law officers. So that's 4 of the 9 PAB members being retired officers. In my opinion, that's moving away from the stated consensus of the previous two public meetings where folks urged that the PAB be transparent with a clear citizen-based, citizen- oriented membership. We look forward to hearing from everyone at the next Town Hall on 1/25.</p>
71708	2022-01-17	<p>COMMENTS: DRAFT THREE Issue: Section IV H Members of the CCPAB and CCACC shall maintain confidentiality relating to all matters Recommendation: Although Section IV H states that "Members of the CCPAB and CCACC shall maintain confidentiality relating to all matters before the respective Board and Committee" confidentiality agreements should be required. Having appointees sign such agreements would confirm understanding of the need to hold information confidential and provide guidance as to the scope 'all matters before the respective Board and Committee" Issue: IV J4. The Chairperson of the CCPAB shall have experience relevant to the position. Recommendation: Relevant experience should be defined since the term "relevant may be subject to a variety of unrelated interpretations including policing experience, committee experience, and chairperson experience. Issue: IV. K. With regard to the CCACC 3. The Board of County Commissioners of Calvert County shall appoint two (2) Calvert County civilians as members of the CCACC and 4. The CCPAB shall appoint two (2) Calvert County civilians to the CCACC by majority vote Recommendation: Since the Board of County Commissioner (BOCC) influence is heavily weighted based on its role in appointing the nine members of the CCPAB as well the Chairperson of the CCPAB (who also serves on the CCACC), these sections should be amended to appropriately reflect private citizen representation as follows: 3. The Board of County Commissioners of Calvert County shall appoint the Chairperson of the CCPABG as member of the CCACC and 4. The CCPAB shall appoint four (4) Calvert County civilians to the CCACC by majority vote.</p>
71709	2022-01-17	<p>COMMENTS: DRAFT THREE Issue: Section IV H Members of the CCPAB and CCACC shall maintain confidentiality relating to all matters Recommendation: Although Section IV H states that "Members of the CCPAB and CCACC shall maintain confidentiality relating to all matters before the respective Board and Committee" confidentiality agreements should be required. Having appointees sign such agreements would confirm understanding of the need to hold information confidential and provide guidance as to the scope 'all matters before the respective Board and Committee" Issue: IV J4. The Chairperson of the CCPAB shall have experience relevant to the position. Recommendation: Relevant experience should be defined since the term "relevant may be subject to a variety of unrelated interpretations including policing experience, committee experience, and chairperson experience. Issue: IV. K. With regard to the CCACC 3. The Board of County Commissioners of Calvert County shall appoint two (2) Calvert County civilians as members of the CCACC and 4. The CCPAB shall appoint two (2) Calvert County civilians to the CCACC by majority vote Recommendation: Since the Board of County Commissioner (BOCC) influence is heavily weighted based on its role in appointing the nine members of the CCPAB as well the Chairperson of the CCPAB (who also serves on the CCACC), these sections should be amended to appropriately reflect private citizen representation as follows: 3. The Board of County Commissioners of Calvert County shall appoint the Chairperson of the CCPABG as member of the CCACC and 4. The CCPAB shall appoint four (4) Calvert County civilians to the CCACC by majority vote.</p>
71778	2022-01-18	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please see the comments attached.</p>

71826	2022-01-19	Police Accountability Board Public Comment, entered in the "Description" field. The 3rd draft is again much improved, but I have two serious concerns: IV.A: The membership of the CCPAB and CCACC should represent the racial diversity of the county. Given that the Black population is 10% and there are only 9 (5) members, there may never be a Black member. It is important that minorities be represented on each of these committees, even if by quota their populations are too small. It is also important that gender equity be written into the plan. V.B.1: The Board of County Commissioners can remove a member of the CCPAB or CCACC by "discretion." This is truly unacceptable. They should only have the ability to remove a member for cause, not for any opinions they express or decisions they support. Thank you!
71847	2022-01-19	Thank you for your comment regarding background checks. It will be added to the record of this hearing. The answers to your questions are provided below. You can track the progress of this at: CalvertCountyMD.gov/PAB. Good Morning – I'd like to provide comment pertaining to the requirement for background checks for these individuals. The board should consist of individuals with a clear background to ensure integrity is held at the upmost importance. A few questions: 1. Would you please forward the Juror Qualifications in Maryland? Information does not appear readily accessible online. https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Laws/StatuteText?article=gcj&section=8-103&enactments=false 2. What is the current law enforcement agency's disciplinary matrix? Not known to us. State law requires the Maryland State Police Training and Standards Commission to prepare a disciplinary matrix, and further, requires the Sheriff adopt that matrix by July 1, 2022. 3. Is there a list of allegations that would only be considered by the board, or are all allegations sent before the board without just cause? The Police Accountability Board is required, by State law, to forward all complaints received within 3 days of receipt, to the Administrative Charging Committee; there is no filter at the Accountability Board. 4. I'm concerned about the establishment of this board for the law enforcement community and the political ramifications of the board depending on the makeup. 2021 Laws of Maryland Ch. 59 has become law, eliminating the Law Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights effective July 1, 2022, and creating the obligation for each county and Baltimore City to establish an accountability board and charging committee by July 1, 2022. The consequences of implementing the State law is why public input has been sought to create the current, third, draft offered for public comment. 5. Will a criminal attorney be provided for the board to explain each degree of a crime or an allegation if no crime occurred? Neither the Police Accountability Board or the Administrative Charging Committee are to review or pass judgment on criminal charges. The Police Accountability Board is required, by State law, to forward all complaints received within 3 days of receipt, to the Administrative Charging Committee. The Administrative Charging Committee will be trained by the Maryland State Police Training and Standards Commission in its role to investigate, call witnesses, review video, and determine if administrative charges should be brought and, if so, the administrative punishment that will be levied using the Sheriff's disciplinary matrix approved by the State. 6. Is the law enforcement community required to obtain their own representative or attorney? I see this as a costly hinderance on the law enforcement community and they should be provided representation by the local government. If allegations are found where the officer is charged the officer should be required to pay the necessary representative or attorney fees at X rate. The law enforcement officers may hire an attorney to appear before the Administrative Charging Committee, the Trial Board, or both. Today, the local government does not provide for or reimburse for representation for administrative charges under the Law Enforcement Officer's Bill of Rights; additionally, there is likely a conflict of interest that would preclude the same under either the current or new structure of accountability.
71902	2022-01-21	In the matter of the police accountability board meeting I offer the following since I can not participate. There are too many with an ax to grind against the police in these meetings. First and foremost Calvert County and probably all of Maryland does not need a police accountability board. It is just more non sense coming out of the liberal lunatics that run the state. What we really need is a state government accountability board especially a legislature accountability board. I suggest that they would find little accountability. I implore the BOCC not to cave in to the very vocal minority when it comes to selecting the members of this board. There can be no felons on this board. There can be no non paying tax payers and no one without either a police or military background with the exception of one college educated or professional member. Police work is a dangerous profession with spilt second decisions required. To after the fact find fault with an officers life and death decision by people who would very likely soil themselves if faced with the same situation is just bad policy. You will just run off quality offices and be left with doughnut shop officers. I also suggest that you make your opinion known to the so called representatives in Annapolis. You will get rebuffed but the bug will be in their ear and you can never give in. My comments where not public comments just for the commissioners or whoever has input on the selection of committee members.
71929	2022-01-23	Please see attached document
71956	2022-01-24	Please also see copy of LWVCC letter attached, as well as highlighted copy of BOCC Resolution

71957	2022-01-24	<p>Hello Mr. Norris and staff, Thank you for the amount of time and effort that you have put collectively into this process for the PAB. After reading the draft for 1/25, I have a few additional questions/comments. Part II - Police Accountability Ability Board part A — why does this definition of the PAB’s purpose not include, “ to serve the citizens of Calvert County” as well as the local LEAs?? Part III - Administrative Charging Committee part A — ditto above — it needs to include “ to serve the citizens of Calvert County” It’s my understanding that part of the statewide push for PABs was to improve the relationship and the transparency of the complaint + investigation process between LEAs and their local citizens. Part VIII: Support — 2. Why isn’t Operational Tasking provided for both the CCPAB and the CCACC? 3. Why doesn’t it state that your office would provide legal support to both the CCPAB and the CCACC? Also, I’m curious about the overall sequence of roles for the PAB and the ACC. Is this the correct sequence? • A citizen files a complaint to the PAB. • The PAB notifies the LEA of the complaint. • The LEA conducts an investigation. • Its results are forwarded the ACC, which determines whether an officer would be charged or acquitted/exonerated. • If needed, the ACC, also, has the option to further investigate, or have the LEA re-investigate. I think it would be helpful to explain the complaint process in its steps either in a ppt slide, or in a separate handout for folks to see. I hope there’s a good turnout on Tuesday night. I hope to see you then.</p>
71969	2022-01-25	<p>I sent these comments as an attachment on 1/16, but they were not included in the presentation for tonight's public hearing. So here they are again. Comments on 3rd Draft of Police Accountability Board 1/16/2022 Change Paragraph IV to include: •The Board of County Commissioners will ensure transparency in the selection of members of the Police Accountability Board and the Administrative Charging Committee including making public, prior to selection, the names of all applicants for both boards, and the system used for selection. •Based on the estimated female population of Calvert County as of July 2021 at 50.4%). The Police Accountability Board should have at least 4 female members, and the Administrative Charging Committee should have at least 2 female members. •Due to the interaction by police with private citizens from Calvert County and surrounding Counties, the Non-White population is much higher than Calvert County alone). The Police Accountability Board should have at least 3 members who identify as Black, and 1 member who identifies as other than White or Black. The Administrative Charging Committee should have at least 1 member who identifies as Black and 1 member who identifies as other than White or Black. •No more than Two (2) members, including the Chair, shall be retired, sworn law enforcement officers who retired in good standing at least five (5) years prior to appointment on the CCPAB, with sufficient time and responsibility of service in a Maryland Law Calvert County Police Accountability Board to adequately represent a law enforcement Agency or Federal Law Enforcement Agency to adequately represent a law enforcement perspective. •County Commissioners, civilian employees of the Calvert County Sheriff’s office or the State Police who have served in those capacities within the last 5 years shall not be eligible to serve on either the Police Accountability Board or the Administrative Charging Committee. Spouses, of law enforcement officers who are not eligible to serve, shall likewise not be eligible to serve. •Members of the CCPAB and CCACC shall sign a confidentiality agreement and maintain confidentiality relating to all matters before the respective Board and Committee during and after their membership on the Board or Committee. Change Paragrah V to include: 1. The Board of County Commissioners retains the authority to remove any member on its own initiative or based on recommendation of a majority vote of the CCPAB, when, in its discretion, the best interest of the community or Commission would not be served by continued membership. the member has become disqualified from membership for any of the reasons set forth in Paragraphs IV.D, E, F, or H. No member shall be subject to removal based solely upon the expression of their individual opinions during board meetings.</p>

71971	2022-01-25	<p>I sent these comments as an attachment on 1/16, but they were not included in the presentation for tonight's public hearing so here they are again. Change Paragraph IV to include: •The Board of County Commissioners will ensure transparency in the selection of members of the Police Accountability Board and the Administrative Charging Committee including making public, prior to selection, the names of all applicants for both boards, and the system used for selection. •Based on the estimated female population of Calvert County as of July 2021 at 50.4%). The Police Accountability Board should have at least 4 female members, and the Administrative Charging Committee should have at least 2 female members. •Due to the interaction by police with private citizens from Calvert County and surrounding Counties, the Non-White population is much higher than Calvert County alone). The Police Accountability Board should have at least 3 members who identify as Black, and 1 member who identifies as other than White or Black. The Administrative Charging Committee should have at least 1 member who identifies as Black and 1 member who identifies as other than White or Black. •No more than Two (2) members, including the Chair, shall be retired, sworn law enforcement officers who retired in good standing at least five (5) years prior to appointment on the CCPAB, with sufficient time and responsibility of service in a Maryland Law Calvert County Police Accountability Board to adequately represent a law enforcement Agency or Federal Law Enforcement Agency to adequately represent a law enforcement perspective. •County Commissioners, civilian employees of the Calvert County Sheriff's office or the State Police who have served in those capacities within the last 5 years shall not be eligible to serve on either the Police Accountability Board or the Administrative Charging Committee. Spouses, of law enforcement officers who are not eligible to serve, shall likewise not be eligible to serve. •Members of the CCPAB and CCACC shall sign a confidentiality agreement and maintain confidentiality relating to all matters before the respective Board and Committee during and after their membership on the Board or Committee. Change Paragrah V to include: 1. The Board of County Commissioners retains the authority to remove any member on its own initiative or based on recommendation of a majority vote of the CCPAB, when, in its discretion, the best interest of the community or Commission would not be served by continued membership. the member has become disqualified from membership for any of the reasons set forth in Paragraphs IV.D, E, F, or H. No member shall be subject to removal based solely upon the expression of their individual opinions during board meetings. e they are again. Comments on 3rd Draft of Police Accountability Board 1/16/2022 Change Paragraph IV to include: •The Board of County Commissioners will ensure transparency in the selection of members of the Police Accountability Board and the Administrative Charging Committee including making public, prior to selection, the names of all applicants for both boards, and the system used for selection. •Based on the estimated female population of Calvert County as of July 2021 at 50.4%). The Police Accountability Board should have at least 4 female members, and the Administrative Charging Committee should have at least 2 female members. •Due to the interaction by police with private citizens from Calvert County and surrounding Counties, the Non-White population is much higher than Calvert County alone). The Police Accountability Board should have at least 3 members who identify as Black, and 1 member who identifies as other than White or Black. The Administrative Charging Committee should have at least 1 member who identifies as Black and 1 member who identifies as other than White or Black. •No more than Two (2) members, including the Chair, shall be retired, sworn law enforcement officers who retired in good standing at least five (5) years prior to appointment on the CCPAB, with sufficient time and responsibility of service in a Maryland Law Calvert County Police Accountability Board to adequately represent a law enforcement Agency or Federal Law Enforcement Agency to adequately represent a law enforcement perspective. •County Commissioners, civilian employees of the Calvert County Sheriff's office or the State Police who have served in those capacities within the last 5 years shall not be eligible to serve on either the Police Accountability Board or the Administrative Charging Committee. Spouses, of law enforcement officers who are not eligible to serve, shall likewise not be eligible to serve. •Members of the CCPAB and CCACC shall sign a confidentiality agreement and maintain confidentiality relating to all matters before the respective Board and Committee during and after their membership on the Board or Committee. Change Paragrah V to include: 1. The Board of County Commissioners retains the authority to remove any member on its own initiative or based on recommendation of a majority vote of the CCPAB, when, in its discretion, the best interest of the community or Commission would not be served by continued membership. the member has become disqualified from membership for any of the reasons set forth in Paragraphs IV.D, E, F, or H. No member shall be subject to removal based solely upon the expression of their individual opinions during board meetings.</p>
72050	2022-01-27	<p>I think you have done a great job. I would urge the Board to keep in the portion relating to the voting by the law enforcement members. I further feel that the minority representation if more than fair when taking into consideration the demographic makeup of the community and that the disqualification for prior convictions should remain as stated. The fact that Mr. Kent had no objections to the proposal and stated that he had also checked with ACLU should be given great weight. I again commend all of those who participated in this process and Mr. Norris has been very responsive to all questions.</p>

72051	2022-01-27	<p>If the PAB is to be credible to police officers and Calvert residents, it needs to follow clear criteria on potentially controversial matters in order to avoid even the appearance of an arbitrary, political, or personally vindictive decision. Unfortunately, Section V. B.1. could raise serious questions and is troublingly ambiguous on several points. While I have no problem with the BOCC having the authority to remove any member of the CCPAB or CCACC, I do not understand: •What the criteria would be for the BOCC or the Commission to determine the criteria for removing a member “in the best interest of the community.” What does that mean? Where are such “best interests” spelled out? •What criteria would be used in the murky justification that “... Commission would not be served by continued membership”? Who determines what actions would or would not “serve” the community or commission? •There is double ambiguity in the use of the phrase, “in its discretion” regarding someone's dismissal. 1.The use of the pronoun “its” is not clear. Does that refer to the BOCC or CCPAB? 2.That phrase is vague and could be used to justify an arbitrary, and, therefore, potentially troublesome removal. This section needs to be revised to make it much more clear and explicit as to what commonly recognized criteria could be used for removing someone from this politically sensitive body. By way of contrast, Section V.B.2. is clear and unambiguous as justification for dismissal. Section B.1. needs similar clarity and objectivity. Lack of such clarity on a potentially controversial dismissal could generate the very political upheaval by aggrieved members of the community that the PAB was established to avoid.</p>
72052	2022-01-27	<p>Thank you for accepting my comments. I appreciate the BOCC considered public comment on subsequent drafts of the originally proposed legislation. I concur with the League of Women Voters 3rd draft recommendation that those PAB seats reserved for retired law enforcement or military be non voting seats.</p>
72109	2022-01-28	<p>please see comments below... I have been a resident of Calvert County for 22 years. Raised my two children who have attended schools, and we own our home. Moved from Los Angeles CA, the move to Calvert was a culture shock. We are Pasqua Yaqui/Chicano. The ethnic population is changing and that requires a better understanding of all people here in Calvert. Either as residents or coming here to work, I know that there is a quick judgment of different people Police/Sheriffs may come in contact with. The Police Accountability Board Draft is a good start but only as good as the County Commissioners' foresight is in having a template that can be adjusted to fit the new normal. Good people on the board with strong integrity not just because they have been in law enforcement or federal professional work. It must remain a civilian oversight but represent all citizenry of Calvert County. Not just by population numbers. Otherwise, the "minority" voice will always remain an unheard voice. Civic clubs throughout the County should be contacted and encouraged to submit names of potential members for the PAB. For many members of the "minority" community police have not always been their friends or relatives and that issue prevails today. Be mindful that the PAB must be able to speak as a stand-alone entity to gain the respect of all and not another mouthpiece for the status quo. Communication is key to all that moves us forward as a better community for all. Thank you for your time.</p>
72125	2022-01-29	<p>Thank you for recording the meetings and for allowing additional time for public comment. Please provide objective criteria for removing members of PAB. And please include the service.of citizens as part of the Board's mission.n.</p>
72178	2022-02-01	<p>I’m not sure how I can begin to impress upon the council that the success of the board hinges entirely on its impartiality; therefore no board member can have any association (past or present) with police. There is no public oversight during police training, and there is no public oversight when police are on the beat, so this is our turn to have unilateral control of how we are policed. The council seems determined to ensure a minimum of two retired police enshrined as a mandatory requirement, or should I say minimum of partiality toward police. So, if I have a complaint to file with the board, I can be sure to walk away from their review questioning whether (or not) I got a fair shake. That’s terrible! The accountability board is about holding police accountable to the people who are subject to the execution of the violent nature of their work, not to retired officers who are in the club and therefore not (nor ever will be) subjected to policing. They cannot know, feel or share our fear of the police, or moreover value police accountability as we civilians do. You the council owe the citizens: impartial, unbiased, checks and balances of power, free from all conflicts of interest. That is our birthright as U.S. Americans, and it is non-negotiable. There is sound reason why our state legislators exempted active-duty police from the boards; don’t use retirement as a loophole! You might have limited retired police on the board to no more than two, but you instead make two a mandatory minimum so that there’s absolutely no possibility of impartiality, and clearly aren’t backing down from this seemingly deliberate mistake... That’s truly outrageous. Retired police should at least not outnumber a required minimum of mental health practitioners, who might actually have a chance of imparting some sense of fresh and learned perspective into this echo-chamber of blind leading the blind. I want you to notice that all the verbal testimony in support of a minimum of retired police on the board, comes entirely from lobbyists and retired law-enforcement personnel themselves; representing various agencies, federal and local. That should show you just how “impartial” they truly are... They’re organized, and paid (\$ = conflict of interest) and we civilians (that is the few of us that managed to get the memo.) must go the extra mile without pay, to keep an eye on them and government in general while distracted by prioritization of our own livelihood. Please have our backs as you’ve been elected to, and help us keep police accountable to us while our safety and sanity are at stake.</p>

72230	2022-02-02	<p>Comments on Hearing & Resolution. All Comments IV. Membership Page 4. If you intend to hold police accountable you can not have any police on the board, retired or otherwise, especially ex Calvert County police or law enforcement. Board members should seek expert opinion from officers to support their vote but police should not be voting, especially ex Calvert law enforcement. Revise to read: No active or retired Calvert police officers or law enforcement shall have voting rights however, they may serve as expert opinion for board members decisions or determinations. The presiding officer/chair is required to remain impartiality. Therefore, they should not even be required to vote, and should not need to if the voting membership is maintained as an odd number such 9 voting members +plus one chair. Revise to read: The CCPAB shall be composed of nine (9) voting members and one (1) chair. To address point 1 and 5 - Since there is interest to ensure each district is represented, change this language to read, "composed of minimum of 3 members from each district" plus one chair person . For example if its 3 districts, a minimum total of 10 members. This way you have 9 votes, which eliminates the possibility of a tie, because the chair does not need to vote. Also, depending upon the growth of the county you may need to create more districts so you don't want to say a flat number of 9, which may not be enough staff to cover, if we go from 3 districts to 5. Lastly, Chairs should be appointed by the CCPAB, not the Commissioners. The PA Act specifically states An active police officer may not be a member of the PAB. For obvious reasons. A retired police officer is still a police officer in the eyes of the the complainant. Placing these individuals on the board will destroy any fair and impartial out come because retired police still have access to officers, and relevant police information. If the commissioners feel strongly about having law enforcement on the board, then it should be explicitly stated, no Calvert County police active or retired No Calvert County law enforcement. There are residents that live in Calvert who are not Calvert law enforcement, to consider as a member. Page 5. K. With regard to the CCAC 1. The presiding officer/chair is required to remain impartiality. Therefore, they should not even be required to vote, and should not need to if the voting membership is maintained as an odd number such 5 voting members +plus one chair. Revise to read: The CCACC shall be composed of five (5) voting members and one (1) chair. Page 7. B. Rules 3. This should state, the chair is entitled to a ballot vote, when deemed necessary. The ballot vote ensures impartiality vs. a regular voice vote. The presiding officer/chair is required to remain impartiality. Therefore, they should not be required to vote, unless necessary but likely should not need to if the voting membership is maintained as an odd number such as 9 voting members +plus one chair or 5 voting members +plus one chair.</p>
72309	2022-02-04	<p>John, I could not find a portal to add to the record, but I wanted to suggest to the Commissioners that they wait until the PAB makes their choices for the Charging Board before they appoint anyone. This should give them more control over making the charging Board balanced. Thanks.</p>
72310	2022-02-04	<p>Good morning Mr. Norris and Staff: By my math tomorrow, 2/4/22, is the 10 day deadline to submit further questions / comments for the PAB document, There are several references to "trial boards and charging committees."(page 1 of 8 — second Whereas paragraph) Then again under definitions — part II of PAB, item B.2 —"appoint civilian members to charging committees and trial boards." So, are these civilian folks members of the PAB who then work on sub-committees as charging committees and/or trial boards? Or, are these folks coming from a new pool of citizens who will be appointed by the PAB to work on a particular complaint? I think it would improve clarity and transparency if charging committees and trial boards (referred to in the plural) were defined and their duties explained in the definitions section. Also, in regards to training, for the Membership section, part K, #8 — it states that the CCAC members will get training from the MD Police Training and Standards Commission. Will the CCPAB and the ad hoc (?) charging committees and trial boards also get any training from that MD Commission? If not from it, then from whom? Finally, my last question — can you translate the legalese on page 7 of 8 in the 3rd Resolved statement —"this Resolution shall be effective upon recordation without publication of a fair summary, (italics mine) but not sooner than 7/1/22. Thanks again for all of your time and efforts in getting this framework crafted. — Mike Shisler PS - the county page for the PAB implies that applications for the PAB membership are available — is that true?</p>