



Request to pull Item #4 from the 9/17 #2 Consent Calendar

1 message

Melody Lane <melody.lane@reagan.com>

Sun, Sep 15, 2013 at 10:21 PM

To: Ron Briggs <bosfour@edcgov.us>, edc.cob@edcgov.us

Cc: Terri Daly <terri.daly@edcgov.us>, Jim Mitrisin <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>, bosfive@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us

Please pull Item #4 from the 9/17/13 #2 Consent Calendar and provide explanation why the minutes of the 8/27/13 and 9/10/13 BOS meetings were not posted 72-hours in advance as required by the Brown Act.

Also provide explanation to all questions on the previously submitted items on 9/10/13 (attached.)

CONSENT CALENDAR 2

4. 13-0007 Clerk of the Board of Supervisors recommending the Board approve the Regular Meeting Minutes from Tuesday, September 10, 2013.

File #: 13-0007 Version:

Type: Agenda Item Status: Consent Calendar

File created: 1/2/2013 In control: Board of Supervisors

9/16/13

Edcgov.us Mail - Request to pull Item #4 from the 9/17 #2 Consent Calendar

 40K

REPEAT REQUEST SUBMITTED 9/10/13 TO BOS:

8/20/13 OPEN FORUM ITEMS REQUIRING WRITTEN EXPLANATION AND/OR CORRECTIONS

BOS VIDEO: http://eldorado.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=250

13-1075 OPEN FORUM

PUBLIC COMMENT: Amy, P. Green, J. Schwartz, M.Villalobos, K. Payne, M. Bailey,
J. Barbieri, M. Lane.



- [Details](#)
- [Reports](#)

File #: 13-1075 Version: 1

Type: Agenda Item Status: Department Matters

File created: 8/20/2013 In control: [Board of Supervisors](#)

On agenda: 8/20/2013 Final action:

Title: OPEN FORUM

Attachments: 1. [Public Comment 8-20-13.PDF](#)

- [History \(0\)](#)
- [Text](#)

Title
OPEN FORUM

QUESTIONS:

1. Please provide written explanation why the names of Open Forum speakers and corresponding topics addressed still aren't indicated in the minutes. Has there been a change of BOS policy, and if so, when and what is the legal justification?
2. Open Forum Public Comment 1. [8-20-13.PDF](#) - Please explain why my name isn't indicated on this formal notice to the BOS, and why it wasn't appropriately labeled as suggested, "**BOS Breach of Fiduciary Obligation & Oath of Office.**" *The impression is this item has been deliberately obfuscated from the public and their right-to-know.*
3. Please provide explanation why the video bypasses Open Forum cannot be viewed (jumps to item #17 - Prostate Cancer) and why the video has not been corrected to reflect the significant **NOTICE** addressed to the BOS (1. 8-20-13.PDF).

THIRD FORMAL REQUEST SUBMITTED 9/10/13:

6/11/13 OPEN FORUM ITEMS REQUIRING WRITTEN EXPLANATION AND/OR CORRECTIONS:

Share    ...  RSS

- [Details](#)
- [Reports](#)

File #: 13-0008 Version:
Type: Agenda Item Status: Department Matters
File created: 1/2/2013 In control: Board of Supervisors
On agenda: 6/11/2013 Final action:
Title: OPEN FORUM

Attachments: 1. 20A - Open Forum 06-11-13 .PDF, 2. 16A - Nutting Ranch doc. presented by David Weiner 5-7-13.pdf, 3. 15A - Open Forum from J. Harn.pdf, 4. 15B - Ltr from Sue Taylor received 4-30-13.pdf, 5. 15C - Ltr from Sue Taylor requesting Public Records Act received 4-30-13.pdf, 6. 15D - Ltr from Sue Taylor requesting Public Records Act Silva Valey received 4-30-13.pdf, 7. 14 A - Open Forum from J. Scully.pdf, 8. 13 A - Open Forum from E. Van Dyke.pdf, 9. 9A - Open Forum 3-19-2013.pdf, 10. 6A - Public Comment 2-26-13.pdf

- [History \(19\)](#)
- [Text](#)

Title
OPEN FORUM

QUESTIONS:

1. Please provide an explanation why the corrections have not been made to Open Forum as previously requested.
2. 20A – Please explain why my name isn't indicated on this document like all the other speakers?
3. 9A – Please explain why my document submitted to the BOS on 3/19/13 is clumped with Evelyn Veerkamp's document, and the reason our names aren't individually identified. What relevance do the 3/19/13 documents have to the 6/11/13 BOS Open Forum?
4. 6A – Please explain why the formal Notice that I read to the BOS on 2/26/13 is included in the 6/11/13 BOS Open Forum. Is there a reason my name doesn't identify Public Comment 6A like all the others?
5. Please explain why Public Comments under Approval of Consent Calendar Part 2 are not labeled with corresponding topics addressed by speakers?

REPEAT REQUEST SUBMITTED 9/10/13 TO BOS:

8/27/13 CONSENT & OPEN FORUM ITEMS REQUIRING WRITTEN EXPLANATION AND/OR CORRECTIONS

BOS VIDEO: http://eldorado.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=253

Approval of the Consent Calendar No. 2

A motion was made by Supervisor Veerkamp, seconded by Supervisor Mikulaco, to approve Consent Calendar No. 2 with the following changes: Item No. 15 was pulled off of Consent Calendar No. 2 and added to Consent Calendar No. 1; Item No. 29 was pulled off of Consent Calendar No. 2 and acted on separately.

Yes: 4 - Briggs, Santiago, Mikulaco and Veerkamp

***NOTE: CHAIRMAN BRIGGS & SUPERVISOR MIKALACO WALKS OUT WITHOUT CAUSE WHEN CHALLENGED BY M. LANE. SUPERVISORS VEERKAMP AND SANTIAGO REMAIN SEATED.**

13-1095 OPEN FORUM

PUBLIC COMMENT: E. Scott, M. Lane.



QUESTIONS:

1. Please provide an explanation why the speakers and topics are not mentioned under **Consent Calendar #2** when Chairman Briggs calls 5-minute recess ****WITHOUT CAUSE****.
2. Please provide legal justification for Chairman Briggs' refusal to provide a written response to repeated inquiries regarding the policies/procedure inconsistencies pertaining to BOS minutes.
3. Repeat request for **Open Forum** speakers and corresponding topics to be identified according to past procedures.
4. The Brown Act requires minutes be publicly posted 72-hours in advance. An explanation is in order as to why the 8/27/13 BOS minutes were not publicly posted until **8/26/13 @ 5:16 PM**.