

From: webmaster@portolavalley.net
To: [Town Center](#)
Subject: New Entry on Town Council Comments Survey
Date: Friday, October 6, 2023 10:53:29 PM

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

Form Name: Comment on an Agenda Item for Town Council Meeting
Date & Time: 10/06/2023 10:53 PM
Response #: 37
Submitter ID: 7101
IP address: [REDACTED]
Time to complete: 1 min. , 8 sec.

Survey Details

Page 1

1. First and Last Name

Ronny Krashinsky

2. Email address (will not be publicly displayed)

[REDACTED]

3. Organization (Enter name of organization, business, or non profit if you are submitting comments on their behalf.)

Not answered

4. Street address (will not be publicly displayed)

[REDACTED]

5. City

Portola Valley

6. State

CA

7. Zip Code

94028

8. Date of Meeting you are submitting comment for.

10/11/2023

9. Agenda Item number or name

4 -- Electronic Communications Policy Update

10. Comment

Section II.a defines "Personal computing device", but this term is not used in the resolution itself, so it seems unnecessary.

Section II.c defines Social Media Platform using the term "publicly accessible". Why? I do understand that this terminology is consistent with AB 992, but the intention here seems to be to go beyond that e.g. by explicitly including PVForum. Are non-public platforms such as email lists for PV Ranch or Westridge residents included? If not, why not?

Section III.c references "the Town alias e-mail address", but it's not clear what this is?

Section III.d does not seem to accommodate communications between "Brown Act buddies" and subcommittees. My understanding is that such communications are not required to be "for informational purposes only". Additionally, the clause "should never take place during a noticed public meeting" is redundant with Section III.e and the 2022 PV Texting Policy.

For Section III.e I disagree with further prohibiting communication beyond what is legally required by the Brown Act and the 2022 PV Texting Policy. Purportedly the intention is to encourage members to focus on Town business without distraction. However, I would note that there are no similar prohibitions against browsing the Internet, reading a magazine, working on a crossword puzzle, daydreaming, etc. The fact is that we have dedicated volunteers who know how to pay attention in meetings. I would encourage the Town Council to trust our volunteers and perhaps provide guidance in a handbook rather than creating onerous and intimidating laws. For example, if my wife texts me during a meeting to ask when I will be home I should be able to use my judgment about replying quickly from the meeting itself vs. excusing myself to reply. Some specific opinions which the Council could consider: (1) strike the section entirely (my recommendation), (2) make it apply only to TC, or (3) only to TC and Commissions, (4) make it apply only to e-communications about Town business, (5) exclude all e-communications with family members, (6) exclude e-communications with staff and e-communications about meeting logistics (see 2022 PV Texting Policy).

Section III.g seems redundant with Section III.f and the Brown Act itself. Section III.f already prohibits all communication between members on Social Media, so Section III.g does not seem to add anything by prohibiting communication between a quorum of members.

11. Optional: You can upload a copy of your comments.

Thank you,
Portola Valley, CA

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.