

From: Retired Renocop@earthlink.net <renocop@earthlink.net>

Sent: Friday, January 25, 2019 1:37 PM

To: Ande Engleman <andelee@aol.com>; Angel De Fazio <ntefusa@aol.com>; Coralie Peterson <c-peterson@nvdetr.org>; Elizabeth Avram <eavram@puc.nv.gov>; Esmeralda Rojas <e-rojas@nvdetr.org>; Fred Voltz <zebedee_177@yahoo.com>; Garrett Weir <gweir@pucn.nv.gov>; Holly Welborn <welborn@aclunv.org>; Kevin Lyons <kevin@flashvote.com>

Cc: Tax Revolt <renotaxrevolt@sbcglobal.net>

Subject: RE: Open Meeting Law Task Force Meeting - January 30, 2019

Subj: OML Meeting

I hope to attend the upcoming OML meeting. I had suggested and thank those responsible for proposing changing secret meetings from date of hidden offense to date of discovery + time for AG to investigate.

A few other suggestions I hope to address (since the AG indicates I can formally submit input in advance. I do think there are ADA issues the committee needs to pay attention to:

Jeff Church

www.RenoTaxRevolt.com

800 554 9519

1) Address Public Comment/ Input Written/ Electronic Comments in advance.

Issue: AG Ott indicated I could not supply input in advance and the policy disenfranchises those in remote locations such as Tribal property, Ely, Dyer, etc. If you don't attend, i.e. Vegas and Carson: you don't get to offer input. When I did attend last time at joint CC/LV meeting in Carson, my written hand out could not be rapidly distributed to Vegas before their vote. What about ADA issues, they don't get any input? With modern technology growing daily, why does one have to be physically present to have input or speak?

2) Public Comment Cards: or "Citizen Request to Speak" (see attached) cards: Nothing in NRS, OML addresses this invention of government but the A.G upheld the requirement and use. I certainly reject the term "Citizen" and "Request" in favor of "Public Comment". The entire comment card issue needs too be examined. The term is discriminatory and implies that non-citizens may not speak. Also I don't "request" to exercise my First amendment Rights.

As I read the A.G. opinion it is OK to require the cards as long as they allow "anonymous" on the name line. The public is not noticed of that option. Literacy is apparently required as well as not all citizens know about the process to locate or fill out the cards. The below example is not WCSD but a Flood Committee as an example. Note the use of the word "must" and nothing in this nor the WCSD policy notices the speaker of the option of remaining anonymous. Underline added:

3) Public Comment; During the "Public Comment" periods listed below, anyone may speak pertaining to any matter that is not on the agenda. Additionally, during agenda items, public comment will be heard on that particular item after it is opened and before any action is taken. In either event, each speaker must fill out a "Request to Speak" form and/or submit comments for the record to the recording secretary.

The two take-aways here: you can't speak on an agenda item at initial public comment and you "must" fill out a card. Why? Why do you have to wait to a time uncertain- many times hours away, to speak rather than at initial public comment?

4) **STANDING**: In a previous matter, the A.G. indicated I lacked standing. Any citizen should have standing. This is not a judicial process but an administrative one to complain about violations of NRS/ OML.

5) **ADA**: May a person read a letter for another that is present if they claim an ADA issue such as fear of public speaking?

6) **THANK YOU**: Date of Discovery not Action: Pretty common sense and lots of case law. An entity that holds secret polling should not escape action simply because the discovery was beyond 60 days. See AG Opinion 2018, Church v WCSO. The Washoe School District was "cautioned" but the AG held the secret email polling was outside the time frame although I was within the date of discovery time frame had the law allowed such.

In summary based on that listed A.G. opinion and others I raise issues about the right for public comment/input if they can't be present; the use of Citizen Request to Speak" cards and related issues; "Standing" This is a non-judicial complaint process, anyone should have standing to complain about abuses; ADA issues, etc.