

Board of Supervisors

Meeting Time: 12-10-24 09:00

eComments Report


Meetings	Meeting Time	Agenda Items	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
Board of Supervisors	12-10-24 09:00	55	114	1	105	4

Sentiments for All Meetings

The following graphs display sentiments for comments that have location data. Only locations of users who have commented will be shown.

Overall Sentiment

Support (0%) Oppose (92%) Neutral (3%)
No Response (3%)



Board of Supervisors

12-10-24 09:00


Agenda Name	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
36. CONSIDERATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES AND MEETING MANAGEMENT OPTIONS THAT AMEND THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	114	1	105	4

Sentiments for All Agenda Items

The following graphs display sentiments for comments that have location data. Only locations of users who have commented will be shown.


Overall Sentiment

Support (0%) Oppose (92%) Neutral (3%)
No Response (3%)



Agenda Item: eComments for 36. CONSIDERATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES AND MEETING MANAGEMENT OPTIONS THAT AMEND THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Overall Sentiment



AL JULIAN

Location: 91911, Chula Vista
Submitted At: 2:28pm 12-10-24

I oppose this item.

" ... those that disrupt a meeting ..." is certainly subjective. Let the public's voice be heard and extend discussion if necessary.

Carole Otterstad

Location: 92106, San Diego
Submitted At: 12:27pm 12-10-24

You SERVE the public! Not the other way around. OUR VOICES are TO BE HEARD- NOT SILENCED. I agree with Steve Brant, you are FREE TO RESIGN if you don't wish to hear the voices of the citizenry of this ONCE GREAT CITY/COUNTY. Dissenting opinions are an important part of CRITICAL THINKING as well as a hallmark of a FREE SOCIETY! I OPPOSE item 36

Steve Brant

Location: 92101, San Diego
Submitted At: 11:24am 12-10-24

You decided to become a servant to the public. If you take actions or support actions that are antithetical to the health an wealth of legal San Diego residents then you must be subject to intense public scrutiny and/or verbal comments no matter the form or function they might take. You are free to resign if you don't like hearing from your bosses, but are never to limit their voices.

Darla Morgan

Location: 91941, La Mesa
Submitted At: 8:11am 12-10-24

Do not suppress the freedom of speech of the citizens you represent. Transparency of the County Board is essential for the purpose of truth and integrity. When the voters see the need for opposition to the actions and

decisions of the board, it's our right to have a voice!!

Seth Fulton

Location:

Submitted At: 7:45am 12-10-24

Team CLOWNworld politician attempts to create rule preventing the public from calling them what they are...CLOWNS! lmao.

Elizabeth Kirby

Location: 92011, Carlsbad

Submitted At: 7:29am 12-10-24

I oppose this change as this is a violation of freedom of speech. We have a right to have all of our voices heard at meetings.

Seth Zibman

Location: 92126, San Diego

Submitted At: 11:29pm 12-09-24

I oppose.

Dr FAFO

Location:

Submitted At: 10:09pm 12-09-24

Your office was SERVED! Trespass and violation of rights will have major consequences for you all as an individual who vote for this. This is treason.

Dee Carl

Location: 91945, Lemon Grove

Submitted At: 10:05pm 12-09-24

There are too many 1st amendment cases that have been brought to the Supreme Court. It is illegal to squelch the voices of the public solely b/c it is annoying to you. Unless your life/fives are being threatened you have no right to say people cannot speak. This is not China and it is shameful that some of you supervisors seem to think you can bully SD residents. You have lost your way and have gotten too big of a head.

Karen V

Location: 92128

Submitted At: 9:40pm 12-09-24

I Oppose this amendment limiting speech at Board Meetings. Unless people are actually threatening county employees, the public need to be heard. That is part of your job. You may not like the speech or the people talking, but they have a right to say whatever is on their mind and as a public servant you should listen. Respect is a two way street and I've often seen Board members not even looking or listening to people that take the time to come down and express their concerns.

Renee Roberds

Location: 92007, Cardiff

Submitted At: 8:56pm 12-09-24

I STRONGLY oppose this agenda. This is not a dictatorship! You are OUR employees... not our rulers.

Kim Yeater

Location: 92111, SanDiego

Submitted At: 8:38pm 12-09-24

STOP CENSORSHIP & GIVE THE PEOPLE THEIR 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Zach B

Location: 92021

Submitted At: 7:33pm 12-09-24

Hi Terra, if someone were to say that being non-binary is made up and anyone thinking they are has a mental illness, would that break this new rule you want to enforce? Just checking to see if we still have the First Amendment or if your feelings trump it.

mike schaefer

Location: 92071, santee
Submitted At: 6:35pm 12-09-24

I oppose agenda item 36. Unless , the verbal abuse is over the top and highly disrespectful , I believe we the people have the right to be heard.

Carolyn Rogerson

Location: 92178, Coronado
Submitted At: 6:21pm 12-09-24

I oppose Item #36. All speech should be allowed unless specific violence and threats are expressed,

K Newell

Location: 92126, San Diego
Submitted At: 6:13pm 12-09-24

I strongly oppose this item. There are rights given to us by powers greater than government and those cannot be squashed. Your efforts to tyrannize your citizenry is only going to push us further into determination to vote you out of office next election cycle. Actions such as this drive us to attend your meetings and disagree with you. If you put your citizenry ahead of yourself, exercise common sense and fulfill your oath of office, we might be able to come to agreement more often.

Lisa Gonzalez

Location: 92020, El Cajon
Submitted At: 6:07pm 12-09-24

I OPPOSE AGENDA ITEM #36 as it blatantly violates the First Amendment's protections of free speech and the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of due process by enabling arbitrary enforcement. Public meetings exist to amplify diverse voices and facilitate democratic engagement, not to suppress opinions that may challenge those in power. Restricting public participation undermines the principles of accountability and transparency, eroding trust in local government.

Kathleen Smith

Location: 91950, National City
Submitted At: 6:01pm 12-09-24

Curtailing the right to express opposing viewpoints is downright wrong. You are elected and expected to represent all of us, even no especially if we disagree. You learn nothing by only listening to those with whoe you agree.

Deborah D

Location: 92130, San diego
Submitted At: 5:41pm 12-09-24

We strongly oppose this item, this is overreacting to a civic right to hear differing viewpoints. Please reconsider and be open to listen to others who disagree, regardless of the words they chose, as long as others are not threatening your health and safety, all discourse should be allowed.

Cynthia D

Location:
Submitted At: 5:07pm 12-09-24

Oppose this asinine agenda item— this isn't North Korea! This is overreaching and childish of you Terra because you don't like different views! STOP!

john hoyt

Location: 91941, la mesa
Submitted At: 4:37pm 12-09-24

This blatant attack on free speech is a violation of the First Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment:

_ First Amendment: Protects your right to free speech, assembly, and petitioning the government. Public meetings are a space for ALL voices—not just the voices approved of by the radical far-left Chair.

_ Fourteenth Amendment: Arbitrary enforcement means NO due process. This creates a chilling effect on dissent and punishes controversial views.

Dave Spencer

Location: 92110, San Diego
Submitted At: 3:15pm 12-09-24

You are obligated to listen to those with opposing views regardless of the content. Your oath is to serve the constituents, which means listening to those you serve. Agenda item 36 suppresses the public comment that has been ruled unconstitutional. 2 Supreme Court Cases that specifically identify your action in legal precedence. City of Madison Joint School District v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission (1976) Rosenberger v. Rector and visitors of the University of Virginia (1995)

Ger Schulkind

Location: 92107, San Diego
Submitted At: 1:54pm 12-09-24

Please stop your socialist movements. We love America. And you are trying to change our foundation.

PM Billings

Location: 92054, Oceanside
Submitted At: 12:55pm 12-09-24

You are not allowed to remove a citizen from a meeting because you do not like their language.

You already limit the citizen to a specified time allotted to speak.

Whatever they say in that time period is called "Freedom of Speech".

If you vote to enforce something like this, then supervisors who make nasty social meeting postings must also be censured.

Jamie Vorzimmer

Location: 92109, San Diego
Submitted At: 12:19pm 12-09-24

I oppose Agenda item 36! Free speech is protected by the Constitution. It is the duty of all elected officials to uphold the Constitution and thereby protect our freedom of speech.

Nancy Wheeler

Location: 92130, San Diego
Submitted At: 12:13pm 12-09-24

OPPOSE Agenda Item 36 and it is your duty to protect our right to free speech.

Raquel Hall

Location: 92106, San Diego
Submitted At: 9:23am 12-09-24

When is the board going to stop accepting the corrupt government bribes to destroy our schools? You're forced to push sexualization agenda and brainwash children into self identity confusion. Child abuse is implemented! How do you sleep at night? You will be held accountable.

Cindy Canfield

Location: 92123, San Diego
Submitted At: 8:53am 12-09-24

Protect citizens please.

Allyson Smith

Location: 92019, El Cajon

Submitted At: 8:42am 12-09-24

Strongly oppose. You have no constitutional right to limit free speech just because you don't like or agree with it.

Sally N

Location: 92064, Poway

Submitted At: 8:07am 12-09-24

This proposal strikes one as more than just odd -- unless one only wants to hear the sound of one hand clapping. Which, of course, is silence for the others. If you are elected, then you ought to hear the good, the bad and the ugly of what is going on in our communities. After all, the first amendment was not intended to protect nice speech, but distasteful speech. So, if that is what you don't want to hear, then you are infringing on the first amendment rights to free speech.

Patricia Mondragon

Location: 92104

Submitted At: 7:46am 12-09-24

I'm a D4 resident and support these amendments. There is absolutely NOTHING in these amendments that limit Free Speech. It is about time management and while I wish we had all the time in the world to make our points it is not practical nor reasonable to expect unlimited time during a public meeting when others have an equal right to be heard. Why is it SO hard for some to just make their points in a civil manner? No, you cannot threaten public officials. PERIOD. That's the law everywhere.

Kim P

Location: 92011, CARLSBAD

Submitted At: 7:27am 12-09-24

You are elected officials, not dictators. You have a duty to listen to your constituents & heed their voice. Stop this tyranny now. This is a violation of our right to FREE SPEECH.

Molly Spitz

Location: 92019, El Cajon

Submitted At: 7:05am 12-09-24

I strongly OPPOSE AB 36. Your ELECTED position is to LISTEN to the citizens of the community you REPRESENT. AB 36 is UNconstitutional and you are breaking the OATH you took to UPHOLD the constitution of the United State of America. FREE speech = the good, the bad, and the ugly.

Carla Buff

Location: 92103, San Diego

Submitted At: 6:04am 12-09-24

I strongly oppose AB 36. If the board of supervisors decides they need to consolidate the agenda by not listening to the citizens of the community I'm seeing a challenge of time in relationship to effective workload. Trimming "the voice of the people" tells me the board of supervisors is either two scattered in their projects or they have not completed projects to the benefit of the communities they serve before they take on more projects.

Amy Penszynski

Location: 92129, San Diego

Submitted At: 3:12am 12-09-24

It's UNconstitutional to ban free speech. Legal citizens have a RIGHT to free speech and will not be silenced or censored.

As public servants, you work for the people you are supposed to represent. All voices and comments must be heard and actually considered. Too much has already been done at these meetings to stifle and silence the people. We are not peasants.

John W

Location: 91902, Bonita

Submitted At: 12:28am 12-09-24

Free speech is vital to public discourse, I oppose this measure.

Edward Johnson

Location: 91910, chula vista
Submitted At: 12:12am 12-09-24

Consent Calendar? These items are bundled like a bureaucratic bouquet. You get 2 minutes to comment on the whole shebang, but you must specify which items you're yakking about. The Chairperson or any board member might chime in or request more info, but it won't unbundle the bouquet.

Group presentations? Forget about it for most matters unless you're talking land use or adjudicatory issues.

heidi johnson

Location: 91910, chula vista
Submitted At: 12:10am 12-09-24

Time limits? The Chairperson plays timekeeper, potentially slicing up the speaking time like a bureaucratic pizza to keep the meeting from turning into an endless debate fest.

So, in essence, speaking at these meetings is like trying to get a word in during a family argument at Thanksgiving dinner - you've got your chance, but don't overstay your welcome!

robert johnson

Location: 91910, chula vista
Submitted At: 12:09am 12-09-24

Limiting public speech at meetings stifles free expression by capping time and speakers, potentially discouraging participation. Government shouldn't restrict engagement, as it's vital for democracy, but these rules can chill public discourse, making citizens feel their voices are less valued or heard.

Kevin Michael

Location: 92103, San Diego
Submitted At: 11:48pm 12-08-24

The proposal raises 1st Amendment concerns by limiting comments, imposing vague "disruption" definitions, and allowing excessive sanctions like banning individuals from meetings. These measures risk arbitrary enforcement, suppressing dissent, and chilling public criticism. Restrictions must be content-neutral, narrowly tailored, and protect robust public discourse. Provisions barring participation or speech may violate free speech and due process, silencing voices and lawful criticism.

Ann Ashcraft

Location: 92119, San Diego
Submitted At: 11:47pm 12-08-24

Please abandon the unconstitutional agenda item 36. You are our employees so as your employer drop this agenda.

Ann Ashcraft

Location: 92119, San Diego
Submitted At: 11:47pm 12-08-24

Please abandon the unconstitutional agenda item 36. You are our employees so as your employer drop this agenda.

Paul Sabadin

Location: 92011, Carlsbad
Submitted At: 10:18pm 12-08-24

The people must not have their voices silenced by fascist government rules. This is America. Not Soviet era Russia. Oppose!

Pamela Klein

Location: 91942
Submitted At: 9:21pm 12-08-24

Please oppose agenda item 36. It is important to protect the right of free speech.

Cynthia Kozakiewicz

Location: 92119, San Diego
Submitted At: 9:02pm 12-08-24

I oppose item #36. Please protect our right to free speech.

Rose Higuera

Location: 92057, Oceanside
Submitted At: 7:48pm 12-08-24

I completely oppose item 36, it is completely unconstitutional! Our rights are from God and God alone & NO ONE can take them away. We have the freedom to assemble, speak & hold our elected officials accountable! We will not be silenced or intimidated Tara!!! This is the USA not a banana republic! Shame on you!!!

Sonia Diaz

Location: 91977, Spring Valley
Submitted At: 7:45pm 12-08-24

Oppose Agenda Item 36
Dear SD Supervisors

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.

We won't stand for unconstitutional silencing.

John Zagarella

Location: 92056, Oceanside
Submitted At: 7:44pm 12-08-24

We should have order in public forums, but public bodies cannot suppress individuals' right to speak at public meetings based on their viewpoint or content of their speech.

Rebecca Stuart

Location: 92123, San Diego
Submitted At: 7:07pm 12-08-24

I strongly oppose agenda item #36! Free speech is *critical* to our city's survival. Please stop and consider the damage you are doing by proposing such anti-American bills and agenda items.

Diane Lech

Location: 92018, Carlsbad
Submitted At: 6:14pm 12-08-24

I oppose Agenda item #36. It is your job to protect our right to free speech under the United States Constitution. I am amazed that this idea is even being considered by some of our democratic "leaders." Some of you need to step down and move to Cuba for awhile.

Kelly Donivan

Location: 92021, El Cajon
Submitted At: 5:54pm 12-08-24

I VEHEMENTLY oppose agenda item #36. This is a serious First Amendment RIGHT violation. This board is an elected body and all members have taken an oath to uphold the UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION. This proposed agenda item is a complete violation of the FIRST AMENDMENT. This proposed suppression of the First Amendment VIOLATES your oath and puts you, as an elected official, in violation of that oath. This item is the ultimate demonstration of disrespect to San Diego County residents.

Gail Levin

Location: 92108, San diego
Submitted At: 5:04pm 12-08-24

I oppose agenda item #36 and urge the Board of Supervisors to vote No on this agenda item. I have never heard in America of our First Amendment rights being shut down in a meeting of officials elected by citizens. That is not America. It is difficult to believe this is even up for your vote. Thank you for serving, and please remember you do so by the will of the people, not the other way around.

Anita Heringer

Location: 91942, La Mesa
Submitted At: 5:02pm 12-08-24

Strongly oppose!

Steve Warner

Location: 92102, San Diego
Submitted At: 4:59pm 12-08-24

Every single time a low-status clown honks in dismay as they don't get their way. You obviously slept through your 1st Amendment class while pursuing a clown JD. The 5th element of the 1st Amendment allows ANY US Citizen to redress their grievances to government. This includes using WHATEVER speech, with NO restrictions. The taxpayer parasite has her feelings hurt because an American informs their public servant in rough language? Too Bad, Honk, Honk.

Faith M

Location:
Submitted At: 4:56pm 12-08-24

This item is targeting public speakers not in agreement with your dark agenda. Will this be applied to an organized union disruption? Remember the union takeover of chamber on 4/30/24 causing a 30 minute delay and you all immediately scurried out of the chambers and allowed the disruption to continue - with NO warning given because you weren't in the chambers to deliver the warning. I vehemently oppose your blatant disregard for the US Constitution and my First Amendment Rights.

Laura Alvarez

Location:
Submitted At: 4:47pm 12-08-24

You should be dismissed for being on your phone on meetings!!!

B Hilgeman

Location: 92020, el cajon
Submitted At: 4:35pm 12-08-24

You are elected to serve at the will of the people, us and our 1st and 14th amendment rights. Do better and we won't need to call you out on your nonsense. Story trying to censor our speech and eliminate us from the process of government.

Karen Schuppert

Location:
Submitted At: 3:11pm 12-08-24

I oppose agenda item 36. San Diego constituents deserve to have their voices heard. You are a representative of the PEOPLE. This is a clear violation of free speech.

Steven Scoggin

Location: 92129, San Diego
Submitted At: 2:07pm 12-08-24

I oppose agenda item 36

Doreen ORiley

Location: 91977, Spring Valley
Submitted At: 1:56pm 12-08-24

I oppose agenda item #36 and ask the Board of Supervisors to vote No on this agenda item. This item violates constitutional free speech rights of citizens. In addition there is legal precedent per multiple Supreme Court cases that public bodies cannot suppress an individuals' right to speak at public meetings based on their viewpoint or content of their speech.

Margaret Baird

Location: 92107, San Diego
Submitted At: 1:54pm 12-08-24

As a resident of the Point Loma area, I strongly oppose Agenda Item 36, on constitutional grounds

Colleen Souza

Location: 92106-2833, San Diego
Submitted At: 1:51pm 12-08-24

I oppose agenda item 36 they need to hear all arguments!

Pat Carunchio

Location: 92025, Escondido
Submitted At: 1:34pm 12-08-24

Save us from this travesty

ADMIRAL RIVERA

Location: 91915, CHULA VISTA
Submitted At: 1:30pm 12-08-24

I oppose agenda item #36__

The Queen Clown_ Circus Master Vargas__ Should be arrested by District Attorney Office on charges of conspiracy and threats to National Security____Make America Great Again_____

Sean Bauer

Location: 92109, San Diego
Submitted At: 1:29pm 12-08-24

I oppose agenda item 36 and anyone attempting to pass it. Free speech is a fundamental aspect of our democracy. It is not negotiable. Anyone attempting to curtail the free speech of American citizens is showing the world that they do not have American values. The attempt to pass this legislation seems to be evidence of deeper corruption and citizens are right to be concerned.

Michael Stephens

Location: 92107, San Diego
Submitted At: 1:24pm 12-08-24

Freedom isn't free. Free speech isn't pretty. Deal with it, you are an adult.

Theresa Donahuegalvan

Location: 92058, Oceanside
Submitted At: 1:23pm 12-08-24

I oppose item 36 on the agenda.

Edy J

Location:
Submitted At: 1:19pm 12-08-24

I oppose agenda Item #36. A free society does best when there is open dialogue between the people and those they elect to represent them. If passed these changes to the rules of procedure would violate the First and Fourteenth Amendments to our Constitution. We learn more when we hear dissenting viewpoints. I want a stronger San Diego County, not a weak one. Rules and procedures must be applied equally. The residents of the County deserve better than what is included in Item #36. No on #36.

Rick Moore

Location: 92020, El Cajon
Submitted At: 12:57pm 12-08-24

I oppose agenda item # 36! Free Speech!

Debbie Caudle

Location: 92021, El Cajon
Submitted At: 12:55pm 12-08-24

Agenda item 36 How dare ANYONE including Terra try to take away our freedom of speech for town meetings!!!

Navid Shahrzad

Location: 92592-9181, San Diego
Submitted At: 12:36pm 12-08-24

I oppose this and we must maintain free speech

John McCartney

Location: 92116, San Diego
Submitted At: 12:18pm 12-08-24

I oppose Item 36. Please vote no on item 36.

Warren Brazas

Location: 92029, Escondido
Submitted At: 12:15pm 12-08-24

Your authoritarian positions are detrimental to our rights as American citizens. You violate our free speech rights & impose harsh punitive measures for opinions u do not like. You have turned the BOS into a Soviet style Politburo. 3 of you have a Communist Ideology. I find your behavior offensive & disgraceful. As a retired USMC LtColonel who fought Communists in Vietnam & the Cold War I see what you are up to. I oppose your Soviet rules.

Gary Burrows

Location: 92116, San Diego
Submitted At: 12:15pm 12-08-24

I firmly oppose item 36. Please vote no on this abysmal item.

Gabriel Velarde

Location: 92154, San Diego
Submitted At: 12:10pm 12-08-24

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!

Ruben Fernandez

Location:
Submitted At: 11:32am 12-08-24

NO on Agenda Item 36

MaryAnn F

Location:
Submitted At: 10:44am 12-08-24

NO on Agenda Item 36

Please reconsider your latest, flagrant attack on the citizens of San Diego County. I strongly oppose agenda item 36. This anti-American, anti-USA Constitution proposal is outrageous. As a collective, who were ELECTED

to represent THE PEOPLE, you are doing a terrible job, and WE THE PEOPLE, have a CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT to let you know, via public comment, email, telephone, snail mail and IN PERSON. NO to the tyranny of this proposed agenda item 36.

WILLIAM JAMISON

Location: 91941, La Mesa
Submitted At: 10:39am 12-08-24

Free speech is the cornerstone of our democracy.

Shelley Tancil

Location: 92116, San Diego
Submitted At: 10:25am 12-08-24

KNOCK IT OFF! You wouldn't hear opinions you don't like if we concentrated on the better good for the people you serve! Why do you think so many are upset. GET TO WORK! Stop this nonsense of trying to ban free speech.

Lisa Sadowski

Location: 92069, San Marcos
Submitted At: 10:18am 12-08-24

I oppose agenda 36 and urge you to vote NO on this matter. It infringes on our constitutional first amendment rights. Everyone has a right to freedom of speech and their opinion even if we don't agree with it. Please vote no on this matter. Thank you.

Ruth Lundstrom

Location: 92130, San Diego
Submitted At: 10:13am 12-08-24

Opposed Agenda Item 36

Michelle Mohrlock

Location: 92117, San Diego
Submitted At: 10:06am 12-08-24

OPPOSE Agenda Item 36

Kymerly Tuttle

Location: 91941, La Mesa
Submitted At: 10:02am 12-08-24

If we are not able to ask skeptical questions, to interrogate those who tell us that something is true, to be skeptical of those in authority, then, we are up for grabs for the next charlatan (political or religious) who comes rambling along.

Carl Sagan

Lisa James

Location: 92131, San Diego
Submitted At: 9:41am 12-08-24

I strongly oppose Article 36. This is a direct attack on our country's constitution and especially the first amendment. It prevents opposing views and sets up a dangerous precedent. Elected officials are public servants and represent those who put them in office. This is wrong for so many reasons, but allows the elected official to do their personal will without weigh in or opposition of the public. Shame on you! Please vote against!

Jennifer Houck

Location: 92064, Poway
Submitted At: 9:40am 12-08-24

I strongly urge the board to OPPOSE this meeting item. Supervisor LawsonRemers proposal is a violation of San Diego's First Amendment rights which Protects your right to free speech, assembly, and petitioning the government. Public meetings are a space for ALL voices—not just the voices approved of by the radical far-left

Chair such as Lawson-Remer. It's time for the BOS to go back to Civics class and reread and review the US constitution.

Lynette Pena

Location: 92111

Submitted At: 9:38am 12-08-24

Dear Supervisors,

Please remember that the Constitution starts with "We the People" of the United States, not 'We the Supervisors.' You are placed in your position to serve the people of San Diego, not to make your jobs easier by censoring the right of said people to disagree or dispute your opinion(s) at meetings that are open to the public. The people of SD see you and the attempt here to squash freedom of speech.

John Gaugh

Location: 92167, San Diego

Submitted At: 9:27am 12-08-24

Oppose. Please vote against. Thank you.

Rachel C

Location: 91945, Lemon Grove

Submitted At: 9:02am 12-08-24

While Lawson Remer plays a "person for the people" then she turns around to restrict our Constitutional Rights even further. For her to back Nora "Anti American" Vargas tells me there is a big deal on the line. Nora voted yes to allow CARB to tax us even more. Voicing our displeasure of their actions isn't illegal. They tax us at every point and treat us with dismissiveness, trying to take our 1st Amendment is NOT for grabs.

Carol Williams

Location: 91910, Chula Vista

Submitted At: 8:57am 12-08-24

I oppose this blatant attack on our right to a different opinion. You need to respect the constitution, particularly the 1st and 14th amendments.

Never forget who you work for.

david nino

Location: 92119, San Diego

Submitted At: 8:56am 12-08-24

Free speech is not linked to your emotional feelings or lack of tolerance to speech that goes against a particular narrative. Categorizing speech, in any way, in order to exempt it or limit it is meant to reinforce propaganda for the benefit of one side.

sara ames

Location: 92120, San Diego

Submitted At: 8:37am 12-08-24

Free Speech. Who do you work for?

Stephanie Hebert

Location: 92069, San Marcos

Submitted At: 8:31am 12-08-24

Oppose. Stop trying to infringe on our constitutional rights.

Diane Wall

Location: 92117, San Diego

Submitted At: 8:30am 12-08-24

I OPPOSE Agenda Item 36. You all work for the people in your districts, and the people need to be able to express their concerns and complaints. All speech is protected. And you cannot arbitrarily determine which speech is not allowed at public meetings. Name calling and insulting people is rude, but it is protected speech

nonetheless, and it is allowed. As elected government officials you should know the Constitution and not need people like me to remind you.

Ashley Ellinwood

Location:

Submitted At: 8:27am 12-08-24

People can say what they want, free speech

Nicholas Perez

Location: 91977, Spring valley

Submitted At: 8:26am 12-08-24

I oppose to give the government the power to restrict tax payers from use there voices even if it makes us as a people uncomfortable. That's what makes us Americans. We must respect the constitution. Please vote no on this bill.

Michelle Price

Location: 92069, SAN MARCOS

Submitted At: 8:16am 12-08-24

Item 36 is a blatant attack and violation on the 1st and 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

_ First Amendment: Protects your right to free speech, assembly, and petitioning the government. Public meetings are a space for ALL voices—not just the voices approved of by the radical far-left Chair.

_ Fourteenth Amendment: Arbitrary enforcement means NO due process. This creates a chilling effect on dissent and punishes controversial views.

Kathleen Halligan

Location: 92119, San Diego

Submitted At: 8:09am 12-08-24

I strongly OPPOSE Agenda Item 36. This is a blatant violation of the 1st Amendment right to free speech, assembly & to PETITION THE PEOPLES ELECTED GOV. You work for the electorate, & you don't get to decide who gets to criticize your governing, or what they get to say. To give carte blanche enforcement via SD Sheriffs implies suspension OF DUE PROCESS, as well as a purposeful chilling effect on any decent for fear of being BRUTALIZED by a vengeful Sheriff. This act VIOLATES THE CONSTITUTION.

Colleen Mata

Location: 92065, Ramona

Submitted At: 8:06am 12-08-24

Free Speech

K W

Location:

Submitted At: 7:56am 12-08-24

The first amendment is nonnegotiable. Agenda item 36 is straight communism, and Terra Lawson Reemer should be ashamed of herself.

Mark Shreves

Location: 91901, Alpine

Submitted At: 7:56am 12-08-24

This is unconstitutional and sickening! How could such a proposal even see the light of day!

Jeffrey Redondo

Location: 91910, Chula Vista

Submitted At: 7:55am 12-08-24

As a voter of District 1 that lives at 420 Milagrosa Circle Chula Vista CA 91910 I am OPPOSING Item 36.

This is a blatant violation of the First Amendment

_ First Amendment: Protects free speech, assembly & petitioning the govt. Public meetings are a forum for ALL

I would encourage you a no vote on this item. Additionally I would not want to use our tax dollars to defend this opens.

Jeff Redondo
420 Milagrosa Circle
Chula Vista CA 91910

Bonnie Kane

Location: 91941, La Mesa
Submitted At: 7:55am 12-08-24

I cannot understand why the Board wants to skate so close to violation of free speech.

Lynne Ahles

Location: 92160, San Diego
Submitted At: 7:55am 12-08-24

We the people have a constitutional right to be heard. Silencing opposing views ruins democracy. We must have open discourse and due process. Please do not limit our freedoms.

Karen Grube

Location: 92027, Escondido
Submitted At: 7:54am 12-08-24

I adamantly OPPOSE Agenda Item 36. This idiotic, anti-free-speech, unconstitutional item cannot be approved. Good grief! READ THE CONSTITUTION for once! NO government entity is allowed to suppress our freedom of speech. Just stop this nonsense and actually START LISTENING TO YOUR CONSTITUENTS whether you like what they say or not.

Shannon B

Location: 92065, Ramona
Submitted At: 7:53am 12-08-24

What's the first thing a dictator does? Punish people for opposing them. This item is unconstitutional and shame on any supervisor who votes in favor.

Stanley Baczynski

Location: 91945, Lemon Grove
Submitted At: 7:53am 12-08-24

item36

Ann Rebuffattee

Location: 92119, San Diego
Submitted At: 7:50am 12-08-24

Come on people!! Get real and stop this madness-we are a republic and a democracy-if you want to prevent free speech then move to a country that does just that.

Patricia Powers

Location: 92104-5753, San Diego
Submitted At: 7:48am 12-08-24

This is tyrannical at best, you are public servants and the public who elected you have a right under the First Amendment to express their concerns with our government is being run. This isn't North Korea.

Carrie B

Location:

Submitted At: 7:46am 12-08-24

I absolutely oppose this agenda. It is an attack on free speech!!!

Diane L

Location: 92010, Carlsbad

Submitted At: 7:39am 12-08-24

NO to Item 36. NO to reduction of speaking time or suppress of 1st Amendment as it is unconstitutional.

Micaela Swim

Location: 92107, San Diego

Submitted At: 7:24am 12-08-24

Oppose

Oliver Twist

Location:

Submitted At: 4:54pm 12-07-24

1. NO to ANY Reduction in Speaking Time
2. NO to Consolidating Non-agenda Comments for Two Meetings into Just One Chance to Speak
3. Rules, Sanctions, and Penalties MUST Be Equally Applied:
e.g., union takeover of chamber on 4/30/24 that caused a 30 minute delay
4. Clapping: Equal Standard & Application (1st & 14th Amendments). The act of clapping is either "disruptive" or it is not.
i.e. telling gallery that "Yes, everyone should clap!" <https://bit.ly/3ZLFYyA>

Amy Reichert

Location: 91942, La Mesa

Submitted At: 5:55am 12-07-24

Supervisor Terra Lawson-Remer is pushing Agenda Item 36 on Tuesday to BAN public meeting speakers for 60 days or 4 meetings—whichever is longer.

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 she likes and agrees with.

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

Paul Henkin

Location: 91902, Bonita

Submitted At: 7:28pm 12-05-24

About 6 total motions to change the rules of procedure at the Board have been introduced in the last year and a half. All have failed or been withdrawn (more-or-less an admission of failure, BTW.) I do not think it productive to discuss punishment without discussing the reason for misbehavior and arbitrary discipline at the Board both of which lead to inordinate tension. Therefore, this is as unlikely to produce good results as the first 6. In fact, this is more threatening and stressful.