

Public Comment #21

BOS RCVD 11-17-2025

From: [Gary Kinghorn](#)
To: [Kim Dawson](#); [BOS-Clerk of the Board](#)
Cc: [Thomas Murphy](#); [michael.powell](#); [Jackson, Debbie](#); [Sue Colby](#); [Eric Mettler](#); [Mary Crowley](#); [Knowles, Matt](#); [Michael Galane](#); [CONNIE JO Neustadter](#); [Ken Pauley](#); [Chief, X911](#); [gina.posey](#); [Gary Kinghorn](#); [InvisiblePTSD@gmail.com](#); [Bill Knox](#)
Subject: Public comment to Agenda Item No. 25-1864
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 12:26:32 PM
Attachments: [Comment to Agenda Item 25-1864.docx.pdf](#)

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Clerk of the Board,
Please record the attached document as public comment to Agenda Item No. 25-1864 for the November 18 Board of Supervisors meeting.

Regards,
Gary



November 17, 2025

Board of Supervisors
El Dorado County
330 Fair Lane, Building A
Placerville, CA 95667

CC: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

As President of the El Dorado County Chapter of the California Civil Grand Jurors' Association, I submit the following comment on behalf of our membership regarding Agenda Item No. 25-1864.

Our goal is to raise awareness of the Civil Grand Jury system, promote its efforts within the County, and enhance recruitment and retention efforts.

1) Consent Calendar item

We request that Board of Supervisors responses to Civil Grand Jury reports not be placed on the consent calendar, as has been the practice in recent years. The public should be given an opportunity to provide input and comments to the response, especially where the responses are not in agreement with the Grand Jury findings.

Thank you for your attention,

Sincerely,

Gary Kinghorn

President

El Dorado County Chapter, Civil Grand Jurors' Association

Public Comment #21

BOS RCVD 11-17-2025

From: [Lee Tannenbaum](#)
To: [BOS-Clerk of the Board](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 25-1864
Date: Monday, November 17, 2025 3:27:52 PM
Attachments: [BOS Good Governance V2.pdf](#)

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Madame Clerk,

Please attach the following comments to the agenda item listed above. Thank you.

Lee Tannenbaum
President, Taxpayers Association of El Dorado County
650.515.2484

Board of Supervisors
El Dorado County
330 Fair Lane, Building A
Placerville, CA 95667

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

As President of the Taxpayers Association of El Dorado County, I write on behalf of our membership and the people of El Dorado County regarding Agenda Item No. 25-1864, which concerns Board meeting procedures, agenda structure, and public participation practices. Our objective is to improve transparency, strengthen public access, and ensure your processes remain fully aligned with both the Brown Act and the County's broader commitments to open and effective governance.

1) Consent Calendar – Removal and volume of items

While the consent calendar helps streamline routine matters, these reforms are being requested:

(a) Ability to request removal of an item from the consent calendar

Many California counties—including Placer, Mariposa, Orange, San Diego, Santa Clara, and Ventura—allow items to be pulled from the consent calendar upon request by a Board member, staff, or in many jurisdictions, a member of the public.

El Dorado County's current practice restricts removal to Board members (or staff) and often requires the Board to vote if a supervisor or staff requests an item be pulled. While the Brown Act does not prescribe consent-calendar procedures, this rule is technically permissible as an internal policy. However, statewide best-practice guidance uniformly states that any Supervisor may pull an item without a vote, and such a request does not require a second.

A rule requiring a vote may be challenged if it functions to prevent public comment or suppress discussion of a properly noticed item. While not explicitly illegal, the requirement is inconsistent with open-government norms and undermines the openness expected of consent-calendar procedures. It creates the appearance of suppressing discussion by allowing a Board majority to block the public hearing of a properly noticed agenda item.

We respectfully request the Board adopt a revised policy that:

- Automatically removes items upon request of any Supervisor or staff—no vote, no second.
- Allows any member of the public to request removal of a consent item
- Reduce the number of items placed on the consent calendar to ensure materially significant matters receive proper public discussion.
- Restrict the following from being placed on the consent calendar:
 - a. Any contract with a value of \$250,000 or greater
 - b. Board of Supervisor responses to El Dorado County Civil Grant Jury reports.
 - c. Large development or housing approvals

2) Public comment prior to adopting the agenda (Brown Act compliance)

The Brown Act requires that the public be given an opportunity to comment on any item on the agenda before or during the Body's consideration of the item.

Adoption of the agenda is itself an action item—a decision point that determines what the Board will or will not discuss, and in what order.

However, this Board routinely adopts the agenda and consent calendar without providing a public comment opportunity before the vote.

This prevents the public from:

- requesting that items be moved off consent,
- requesting correction of agenda errors,
- objecting to last-minute modifications, or
- raising Brown Act concerns before the agenda is finalized.

To comply with both the text and the intent of the Brown Act, we request that the Board formally include a public comment period before the vote to adopt the agenda and before approval of the consent calendar.

3) Restore a 5-minute time limit for organizational speakers

El Dorado County previously allowed recognized organizations up to five minutes to present positions during public comment and agenda items.

This practice is consistent with many other counties and is essential for organizations representing large constituencies to present detailed and meaningful testimony.

We request restoration of the five-minute speaking time for recognized organizations, while retaining a three-minute limit for individual speakers.

This balances meeting efficiency with the public's right to meaningful advocacy.

Thank you for your attention to these requested reforms. Enhancing transparency in these key procedural areas will strengthen public trust and ensure that El Dorado County remains fully aligned with the principles of open government.

Respectfully,

Lee Tannenbaum

President

Taxpayers Association of El Dorado County