

---

**BOS Agenda Item 30, Jun-9-2026**

---

**From** LINDA CAMPBELL <lcampbell03@comcast.net>

**Date** Fri 6/5/2026 11:59 AM

**To** BOS-District I <bosone@edcgov.us>; BOS-District II <bostwo@edcgov.us>; BOS-District III <bosthree@edcgov.us>; BOS-District IV <bosfour@edcgov.us>; BOS-District V <bosfive@edcgov.us>; BOS-Clerk of the Board <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Public Comment Item 30 – June 9, 2026

Legistar 26-1003

Hello Supervisors,

I have a few thoughts to share related to the powerpoint and your ultimate decision on the item for Public Comment Policy.

1. I do not see any weighting related to the three reasons that initiated this change; efficiency, transparency and public engagement. Typically, in evaluating metrics for decision-making there is a weighting factor included. So, as you evaluate, which one of the three is most important or the highest priority?
2. Slide 4 - there is a prior and current comparison of Average Meetings per Month, and Average Meeting Time, however there is no similar comparison included for Total Public Comments Received. Without that, it puts public engagement at a disadvantage for assessment alongside the other items.
  1. If total public comment for the 6 months prior to the change was provided, then there could be a comparison to determine if public engagement improved, deteriorated or stayed the same.
3. Slide 5 - shows a breakdown of time utilized, which is also leveraged slightly on slide 6. I hope there is no consideration of changing the allowable time to 2 minutes, particularly since slide 5 displays that almost 60% of the time speakers were over 2 minutes.
4. Slide 6 - although the number of items on average for comments is referenced, there is a sizable difference between closed/consent vs non-hearing items.
  1. Typical closed/consent item count is approximately 30, so 1.8 out of 30 for comment.
  2. Non-hearing item count is approximately 4 per week, so 1.3 out of 4 for comment.
  3. This shows a trend by the public to speak more often on non-hearing agenda items.
  4. By evaluating an apparently small item count on average, it minimizes the public impact when they want to cover multiple items. That may not occur every week, but if it does then the time limitation can curtail effective input on one or more items.

5. The data does not appear to support any improvement in efficiency related to the change in public comment, nor improvement of transparency. All the metrics relate to public engagement. Here are a few general concepts missing from a public standpoint.
  1. As noted in item 2 above, there is no before/after comparison for public engagement. As a regular attendee, I certainly see and hear a reduction in engagement in the room, online and even via email. If public engagement is a priority, then this is an adverse result from the change.
  2. There should NOT be primary reliance on email for communications, although I agree it is helpful for lengthy input (hence why I write in). However, rarely are items covered in discussion based on written input. Although we may get a response confirming receipt, that is not the same as having questions answered, or thinking our input is beneficial. One supervisor confirmed for me that a reply means the input itself was read, which I appreciated hearing. But there is no way to know if all supervisors have read items and are considering them in discussion, which contributes to a lack of transparency. When we are able to speak to anything new in the discussion, at least we know everyone in the room can hear the same comments.
  3. It would have been interesting to have a count of how many times over the last 6 months people have requested for the prior process to return vs. any that have commended the change. Or recognition of how often people start speaking at the wrong opening because the procedure is confusing to the public. It does not contribute to efficiency or positive public engagement for someone to start speaking, then be stopped and asked to speak at a later time.

In summary, my recommendation is to reinstate the prior method of verbal comment engagement per regular agenda item. Having the opportunity to speak with real time information from discussion is critical, if real public engagement is a priority objective.

Regards,

Linda K Campbell