Meeting Date: December 10, 2024

Agenda Item No. 36

Distribution Date: December 9, 2024

Batch No. 03

From: Office of Chairwoman Nora Vargas

To: FGG, Public Comment

Subject: Fwd: [External] NO on Agenda Item 36
Date: Monday, December 9, 2024 2:15:43 PM

Dear Clerk of the Board,

Please find below a comment regarding Agenda Item 36 for the upcoming Board Meeting on December 10, 2024. Kindly include it in the official record for consideration.

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

From: Lore Meanley <

Date: 12/9/2024, 1:17:31 PM Dear Supervisor Nora Vargas,

This is a blatant violation of the First Amendment & Fourteenth Amendment!

First Amendment: Protects free speech, assembly & petitioning the govt. Public meetings are a forum for ALL voices—not just the ones the Chair likes.

Fourteenth Amendment: Arbitrary enforcement = NO due process. This chills dissent & punishes controversial views.

Restore San Diego won't stand for unconstitutional silencing of the public!

Lore Meanley Sent from my iPad

--

Best Regards,

Dennise Juarez Aguilar

To: <u>FGG, Public Comment</u>

Subject: Fwd: [External] NO on Agenda Item 36 **Date:** Monday, December 9, 2024 2:15:24 PM

Dear Clerk of the Board,

Please find below a comment regarding Agenda Item 36 for the upcoming Board Meeting on December 10, 2024. Kindly include it in the official record for consideration.

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

From: G Community <nora.vargas@sdcounty.ca.gov>

Date: 12/9/2024, 1:22:53 PM Dear Supervisor Nora Vargas,

This is a blatant violation of the First Amendment & Fourteenth Amendment!

First Amendment: Protects free speech, assembly & petitioning the govt. Public meetings are a forum for ALL voices—not just the ones the Chair likes.

Fourteenth Amendment: Arbitrary enforcement = NO due process. This chills dissent & punishes controversial views.

Restore San Diego won't stand for unconstitutional silencing of the public!

--

Best Regards,

Dennise Juarez Aguilar

To: <u>FGG, Public Comment</u>

Subject: Fwd: [External] NO on Agenda Item 36
Date: Monday, December 9, 2024 2:14:55 PM

Dear Clerk of the Board,

Please find below a comment regarding Agenda Item 36 for the upcoming Board Meeting on December 10, 2024. Kindly include it in the official record for consideration.

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

From: Gail Levin <ga bal.net>

Date: 12/9/2024, 2:11:43 PM

Dear Supervisor Nora Vargas,

This is a blatant violation of the First Amendment & Fourteenth Amendment! First Amendment: Protects free speech, assembly & petitioning the govt. Public meetings are a forum for ALL voices—not just the ones the Chair likes.

Fourteenth Amendment: Arbitrary enforcement = NO due process. This chills dissent & punishes controversial views.

Gail Levin

Best Regards,

Dennise Juarez Aguilar

To: FGG, Public Comment

Subject: Fwd: [External] NO on Agenda Item 36

Date: Monday, December 9, 2024 4:23:43 PM

Dear Clerk of the Board,

Please find below a comment regarding Agenda Item 36 for the upcoming Board Meeting on December 10, 2024. Kindly include it in the official record for consideration.

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

From: Dave S <davepointloma@gmail.com>

Date: 12/9/2024, 3:11:50 PM Dear Supervisor Nora Vargas,

I am appalled at the idea a public official would suppress public comment. You have an obligation to listen to those who have opposing views regardless of the content. You have taken an oath to serve the constituents and that means listening to those you serve. By taking action as outlined in agenda item 36, you suppress the public comment in an arbitrary and inconsistent manner that has been ruled unconstitutional.

Please remove item 36 from the agenda.

Below are the Supreme Court Case that specifically identify your action in legal precedence.

City of Madison Joint School District v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission (1976): The Supreme Court ruled that public bodies cannot suppress individuals' right to speak at public meetings based on their viewpoint or content of their speech.

Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (1995): Reinforced that viewpoint discrimination in public forums is unconstitutional.

Shuttlesworth v. City of Birmingham (1969): Held that overly broad and arbitrary restrictions on speech or assembly are unconstitutional.

New York Times Co. v. Sullivan (1964): is a landmark U.S. Supreme Court case that emphasized the need for "uninhibited, robust, and wide-open" debate on public issues, even if it includes harsh criticism of public officials.

--

Best Regards,

Dennise Juarez Aguilar

To: <u>FGG, Public Comment</u>

Subject: Fwd: [External] NO on Agenda Item 36

Date: Monday, December 9, 2024 4:23:24 PM

Dear Clerk of the Board,

Please find below a comment regarding Agenda Item 36 for the upcoming Board Meeting on December 10, 2024. Kindly include it in the official record for consideration.

------ Forwarded message -------From: bzasid <bzasid@aol.com>
Date: 12/9/2024, 2:52:38 PM

Dear Supervisor Nora Vargas,

This is a blatant violation of the First Amendment & Fourteenth Amendment!

First Amendment: Protects free speech, assembly & petitioning the govt. Public meetings are a forum for ALL voices—not just the ones the Chair likes.

Fourteenth Amendment: Arbitrary enforcement = NO due process. This chills dissent & punishes controversial views.

Restore San Diego won't stand for unconstitutional silencing of the public!

Barbara Ziebarth

--

Best Regards,

Dennise Juarez Aguilar