

From: IveSCreW@pm.me
To: [BOR AllReps](#)
Cc: [Dave Adams](#)
Subject: LR32.005
Date: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 1:48:14 PM

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Board,

LR32.005 (Item 6) "REVIEW; of Section IV.E.3 of the Board's Rules of Order (Time for Public Comment) to discuss potential revisions (including but not limited to deletion) of the Rule."

Please REJECT this item. DO NOT FURTHER LIMIT PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

As was written to the Legislative & Rules Committee earlier last month:

"As a Democrat, I find it interesting that a Board comprised of 40 Democrats, without any Minority opposition, is seriously considering limiting the Public Comment Period, or even deleting it entirely. Public engagement in the democratic processes of their Representatives, their municipal Legislature, their "People's House", is critical to the work of the Board. The effect of spoken words, intonation, manner grant observers far greater context than an email, that some may not even read, based on who may have sent it. Removing, or even limiting the opportunity to speak even once, makes the legislative process exclusionary and may prevent the uncovering of pertinent perspectives, new business, community solidarity behind issues (i.e. putting the East Side Library in the Glenbrook Community Center, in lieu of the deed restricted Hunt Park, that should legally never have had Signs and Lines built there by the State), etc.

While it may seem arduous, time consuming, perhaps even redundant at times, it is absolutely an imperative for Representatives to engage with the public in this process in whatever format best suits the public seeking to participate, within reason. 30 mins of Public Comment, limited to 3 mins per speaker, once a month, is little to ask.

Further to that point, creating subjective limitations to the number of times per year, or topic, outside of the specific situation of a very recent Public Hearing, creates a potentially disproportionate, and possibly unconstitutional, method of targeting engaged or critical speakers. When considering any limitations of such engagement, restrictions must be reasonable, content-neutral, and narrowly tailored.

Additionally, the last edit "Disparaging personal comments about a Board member or other public official (elected or appointed) shall be deemed to be disruptive or unruly, whether or not the speaker states the name of the Board member or public official." comes with a whole of host of challengeable restrictions.

For one, who gets to define "disparaging" and "personal"? Secondly, why "other public officials (elected or appointed)", as if you were addressing the administration, and not the Board Members tasked with oversight of said administration, elected, appointed, employed or contracted?

Lastly, why, after the experience of the incredibly toxic 31st Board, is the public being held to a standard higher than that of two of the authors of this rule change? Perhaps you weren't

there for it, but I was.

I watched and listened, in real time, as one member routinely acted out of turn, used vulgarity, and projected observable hostility towards members of the public and fellow Board Members alike. I was there when another repeatedly denigrated their very own Caucus's Leader, in public, on the floor, and even inferred that both their colleagues and members of the public were unsophisticated, not capable of comprehending complex contracts and/or legislation.

These folks even named names in the press... What folly?!?"

Kind Regards,

Dave Adams
Glenbrook
203 309 7008

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.

From: IveSCreW@pm.me
To: [Dave Adams](#)
Cc: [BOR AllReps](#)
Subject: Re: LR32.005
Date: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 2:15:19 PM

Addendum:

At the most recent Regular Board Meeting, Board Leadership pre-empted Public Comment, stating that residents could not speak on Ordinances that were vetoed by the Mayor, that were up for Overturn, as new Items before the Board, under the guise that prior Public Hearings had already been held.

This is an interesting interpretation of process, and in my opinion, violates the Board Rules as they existed prior to the Public Comment Period of this Meeting.

A. The Overturn Items were NEW BUSINESS, having new Item designations (i.e. LR32.00X), in lieu of the Item designations under which the Public Hearings were held (i.e. LR31.XXX).

B. Once the Board considers and Approves or Rejects an item, the restriction against speaking to the item specifically, ceases to exist. Continuing a restriction barring discussion on an Item that has already finalized consideration of the Board, receiving and up or down vote, would logically prevent discussion on ANY Item that has ever been considered by any prior Board, essentially muting any discussion on historical legislation.

C. Limitations to speaking to an Item that has already had a Public Hearing, is absolutely a compromise on the infringement of Free Speech. US Law and Case Law on this subject overwhelmingly leans in favor of the Public (please see article, <https://www.thefire.org/research-learn/first-amendment-protections-public-comment-government-meetings>).

At the last meeting, I heard a lot of concern for making decisions that will likely lead to litigation. I believe it would be prudent to carefully consider the risk/reward of any further decisions of this nature. I have a feeling that measures like this are considerably more likely to motivate class action lawsuits against the city, as there is enough precedent to increase the probability of judgment against the City.

Thank you for your attention to this matter!

Kindest,

Dave Adams
Glenbrook

On Jan 7, 2026, at 13:48, <IveSCreW@pm.me> <IveSCreW@pm.me> wrote:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Board,

LR32.005 (Item 6) "REVIEW; of Section IV.E.3 of the Board's Rules of Order

(Time for Public Comment) to discuss potential revisions (including but not limited to deletion) of the Rule.”

Please REJECT this item. DO NOT FURTHER LIMIT PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

As was written to the Legislative & Rules Committee earlier last month:

“As a Democrat, I find it interesting that a Board comprised of 40 Democrats, without any Minority opposition, is seriously considering limiting the Public Comment Period, or even deleting it entirely. Public engagement in the democratic processes of their Representatives, their municipal Legislature, their “People’s House”, is critical to the work of the Board. The effect of spoken words, intonation, manner grant observers far greater context than an email, that some may not even read, based on who may have sent it. Removing, or even limiting the opportunity to speak even once, makes the legislative process exclusionary and may prevent the uncovering of pertinent perspectives, new business, community solidarity behind issues (i.e. putting the East Side Library in the Glenbrook Community Center, in lieu of the deed restricted Hunt Park, that should legally never have had Signs and Lines built there by the State), etc.

While it may seem arduous, time consuming, perhaps even redundant at times, it is absolutely an imperative for Representatives to engage with the public in this process in whatever format best suits the public seeking to participate, within reason. 30 mins of Public Comment, limited to 3 mins per speaker, once a month, is little to ask.

Further to that point, creating subjective limitations to the number of times per year, or topic, outside of the specific situation of a very recent Public Hearing, creates a potentially disproportionate, and possibly unconstitutional, method of targeting engaged or critical speakers. When considering any limitations of such engagement, restrictions must be reasonable, content-neutral, and narrowly tailored.

Additionally, the last edit “Disparaging personal comments about a Board member or other public official (elected or appointed) shall be deemed to be disruptive or unruly, whether or not the speaker states the name of the Board member or public official.” comes with a whole of host of challengeable restrictions.

For one, who gets to define “disparaging” and “personal”? Secondly, why “other public officials (elected or appointed)”, as if you were addressing the administration, and not the Board Members tasked with oversight of said administration, elected, appointed, employed or contracted?

Lastly, why, after the experience of the incredibly toxic 31st Board, is the public being held to a standard higher than that of two of the authors of this rule change? Perhaps you weren’t there for it, but I was.

I watched and listened, in real time, as one member routinely acted out of turn,

used vulgarity, and projected observable hostility towards members of the public and fellow Board Members alike. I was there when another repeatedly denigrated their very own Caucus's Leader, in public, on the floor, and even inferred that both their colleagues and members of the public were unsophisticated, not capable of comprehending complex contracts and/or legislation.

These folks even named names in the press... What folly?!?"

Kind Regards,

Dave Adams
Glenbrook
203 309 7008

Caution: This email originated from outside our organization. Please be careful when clicking links or opening attachments.