

## Lee, Katherine

---

**From:** Kitt Saginor <ksaginor@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 9, 2020 4:24 PM  
**To:** Lee, Katherine  
**Cc:** T. Taplin  
**Subject:** Managing the length of PRC Commission meetings

**WARNING:** This email originated outside of City of Berkeley.  
**DO NOT CLICK ON** links or attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Ms Lee,

I'm not putting my hands on the correct email address to send a message to all PRC commissioners, and I do not have an email address for Commissioner Moore. Could you forward for me please? I had thought to speak to this issue tonight - but now I can email without violating the Brown Act.

Thanks!

Kitt  
[ksaginor@gmail.com](mailto:ksaginor@gmail.com)  
415-860-4173

Dear Commissioners,

The Police Review Commission is a very productive group, using its time effectively. But - there's always more to be done! From my past experience at City College of San Francisco managing meetings with too many important items and too little time, I have some suggestions for the PRC:

- 1) Time limits for commissioners to speak is already in PRC's Standing Rules (pp.1-2, E. 1-2.) and are mostly observed, at least approximately.
- 2) Missing from PRC Standing rules are time limits for **others** speaking to agenda items, for example, Chief Greenwood and officers from the police department. The PRC Standing Rules p. 2 (E.5.) says:  
Guest speakers who are not on the agenda may address the commission only by general consent, or upon a formal motion.  
But that doesn't cover folks who are there for agenda items. There need to be some standard limits for how often or for how long these participants speak to an issue. These should be similar to the limits on commissioners, and with parity, it will be easier to hold everyone to their limits.
- 3) Presentations would also benefit from time limits. Presenters should be made aware of these well before the meeting, of course. I always found it helpful to specify the number of minutes for the initial presentation separately from the number of minutes for questions (usually half and half). Otherwise, presenters tend to talk for the entire time allotted for the presentation and then more time must be provided for questions. Since PRC members and the public have advance access to materials being presented, meeting time is best focused on the presenters highlighting the main ideas, rather than narrating plentiful details.

4) For weighty issues or issues expected to be controversial, it is helpful to specify that there will not be a vote on the whole matter at the first meeting. I think you've done this with some issues - perhaps it could be done with more. Although this adds calendar time, knowing that an item will come back at the next meeting allows commissioners time to think between meetings -- perhaps to compose suggestions for wording changes for distribution with advance materials before the next meeting. Knowing that an item will get a second reading can also remove some of the urgency that causes speakers to repeat the same argument several times over again in different words.

5) It can be helpful to periodically ask participants to keep in mind that the importance of any one agenda item should not eclipse the importance of other items - including those that cannot even find space on the agenda. Another helpful thought: although it is emotionally satisfying to WIN arguments unanimously, the most functional feature of Robert's Rules (and parliamentary procedure in general) is the simple majority vote. It may be less satisfying, but constituents are best served by sincere consideration of various arguments, voting one's best judgement, and then moving on.

My thanks to all of you for your work for Berkeley.

Kitt Saginor, community member

[ksaginor@gmail.com](mailto:ksaginor@gmail.com)

415-860-4173