

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Some final thoughts on remote testimony  
**Date:** Thursday, November 2, 2023 2:46:14 PM

---

Hello,

Please see below for communication from Joe Kunzler regarding File No. 231020, Motion No. M23-129.

**File No. 231020, Motion No. M23-129** - Amending the Rules of Order - Limiting Remote Public Comment Opportunities (Peskin)

Sincerely,

**Joe Adkins**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**  
**Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Fax: (415) 554-5163**  
[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

---

**From:** Joe A. Kunzler <growlernoise@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 29, 2023 12:57 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Some final thoughts on remote testimony

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,  
J News lacked room for this so here you go.  
Additionally, I'm going to wax philosophical for a moment after the past week or so: I can't get enough people to care about restoring remote testimony down there and too many outside of Clerk Angela's/City Hall want to be chiefs versus team players. Do their own thang for anti-social media and bait the SFBOS President, I guess. Especially as some expect and gain more attention & publicity from their in-person performances that President Peskin is selectively giving. It's a right-wing *thang* and I'm a Stefani Fighter-Attack Wing guy. Politics is a team sport.  
One last thing, just for the record: There are and were several "correct" answers for Supervisor Stefani's vote. I'll let Supervisor Stefani explain in her own words due to these unique concepts called *respect* and *mutual*

*admiration.*

I am too busy fighting Avrum (Alex) Tsimerman in my part of the world to concern myself too much with a SF that does not want to save thyself together in action and brotherhood. SF's about to lose your "Maverick" to Sacramento barring a serious last-minute candidate...

Onward;

JOE

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **J Website** <[webcontact@jweekly.com](mailto:webcontact@jweekly.com)>

Date: Tue, Oct 24, 2023 at 11:11 PM

Subject: New submission from Letters to the Editor

To: <[growlernoise@gmail.com](mailto:growlernoise@gmail.com)>

Hi Joe, here's a copy of the information you submitted. We will reach out to you if we need further information.

<b>Name</b>
Joe Kunzler
<b>Email</b>
<a href="mailto:growlernoise@gmail.com">growlernoise@gmail.com</a>
<b>Letter</b>
<p>As one of the proponents of Washington State's 2022's HB 1329 that made oral remote testimony required alongside in-person testimony and also having a Jewish relative plus some contacts in the Bay Area, I follow with equal parts interest and horror the closing of the skies to remote testimony such as Emma Goss' "<a href="#">More Bay Area governments end remote comments to stop antisemitic rants</a>". The Brown Act, a 1953 law since amended, apparently needs a full renovation for the 2020s.</p> <p>But fret not; renovating the Brown Act can be done. See what this open government advocate did in Washington State was politely ask now-former Representative Emily Wicks to legislate making remote testimony law and other necessary fixes to our Open Public Meetings Act like how to have remote meetings in an emergency law. It took two legislative sessions and compromises to win allyship of local government lobbyists, but we did protect remote testimony.</p> <p>I am confident that if California could create a posse of local government lobbyists, voices for inclusion, and a few empathetic legislators – civility and inclusion could return to California skies. The Brown Act should state that hate speech is disruptive by dissuading participation on public policy – which is the anti-thesis of open government law. Additionally, all remote callers should preregister and agree to a code of conduct that includes a one-year ban for two violations in a month. Tough but fair.</p> <p>I sincerely wish to help that posse. I have a very special reason why. I greatly enjoyed calling into the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to be a superfan of Supervisor Catherine "Maverick" Stefani. Catherine's an Italian Catholic ally of Jewry who fought with valor and defeated like a Zelensky the anti-Semitic attackers in her committee and plus is the best gun violence prevention advocate ever.</p>