

## April Leggett

---

**From:** Robin S Kuykendall <robin@kuykendalladvocates.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 3, 2021 5:00 PM  
**To:** Aldermen  
**Cc:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** Complete support for revisions to ORD-21:025

Thank you for tightening up some loose ends here, without loss of citizen access or council ability to adequately and publicly deliberate.

I hope the whole thing passes, as is. (Well, never opposed to improvements, but can't think of any here.)

Thank you once again for your service,

Robin S. Kuykendall  
*Advocate & Educate, LLC*  
(870) 918-3431  
565 Virginia Avenue  
New Madrid, Mo 63869  
MAIL: 1408 Market Place Drive, No. 8  
Jonesboro, AR 72401  
<https://kuykendalladvocates.com>  
*Tenn. BPR No. 019463; MoBar #69817; not licensed in Arkansas*  
*Hours by appointment only, night or day*



**ADVOCATE & EDUCATE, LLC**

## **April Leggett**

---

**From:** paul vellozo <vellozo.p@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 4, 2021 4:56 PM  
**To:** Aldermen; City Clerk  
**Subject:** Support for ORD -21:025

I support this ordinance

Thanks.

Paul Vellozo

3811 Wolf Chase Ln, Jonesboro, AR 72404

## **April Leggett**

---

**From:** Kathryn Burns <kdburns999@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 4, 2021 6:03 PM  
**To:** Aldermen; City Clerk  
**Subject:** Support for ORD-21:02

I support this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Burns  
Jonesboro, AR

## **April Leggett**

---

**From:** Kathryn Burns <kdburns999@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 4, 2021 8:22 PM  
**To:** Aldermen; City Clerk  
**Subject:** Re: Support for ORD-21:02

I forgot to include my street. It is Park Hill Blvd in Jonesboro.

Thanks!

On Friday, June 4, 2021, 06:02:55 PM CDT, Kathryn Burns <kdburns999@yahoo.com> wrote:

I support this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Burns  
Jonesboro, AR

## **April Leggett**

---

**From:** Kimberly Roberts <kimdamita@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 9, 2021 3:52 PM  
**To:** Aldermen  
**Subject:** SUPPORT

I support ordinance 21:025.

Kimberly Roberts  
903 Live Oak Circle  
Jonesboro, AR 72405

## April Leggett

---

**From:** Linda Denny <lindaraedenny@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 18, 2021 8:11 PM  
**To:** alderman@jonesboro.org; Tony Thomas; Harold Copenhaver; Brian Richardson; City Clerk; Carol Duncan; Charles Frierson; Brian Emison; Charles Coleman; Chris Moore; Ann Williams; Chris Gibson; John Street; Mitch Johnson; Larry J. Bryant; Joseph Hafner; Bobby Long; jmcclain@jonesboro.org; Adria Hyde; Amanda Hanson; Brittany Williams; Chris Wessel; Jonesboro Sun; newsroom@kait8.com; Stan Morris  
**Subject:** ORD-21:025 AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE JONESBORO CODE OF ORDINANCES CHAPTER 2 ARTICLE 3, ENTITLED CITY COUNCIL, ESTABLISHING CITY COUNCIL RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR 2021

Please stand up for the citizens of Jonesboro and do not try to limit their participation in City Council meetings. It is hard enough to get up in front of a group of people and talk about what matters most to you as a citizen.

There is no reason to limit the number of people that can speak.

Please give Bobby Long a second to remove the second sentence in this unfair ordinance!

Sincerely,

Linda Denny  
3905 Pleasant View Drive  
Jonesboro, AR 72405

870-926-0378

## April Leggett

---

**From:** Renay! <bottle.of.shine@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 11:17 AM  
**To:** Aldermen  
**Cc:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** Support & feedback for ORD-21:025

Hello, city council!

I am very happy with ORD-21:025 for clarifying the rules for engaging in the city council meetings as well as the increased accessibility options.

I've been reading some concerns about how these changes allow fewer chance for residents to speak to the council on the public record, which makes me wonder if some folks aren't aware that emailing the council members on the public record is an option and also gives both the resident writing in and the council member reading their thoughts more time to deliberate and consider. This aligns with confusion over Legistar that I've seen a few times over the last year.

Regardless of whether the council decides to go with a timed and per-person limit on both sides or a time limit with no per-person limit (similar to public comment), perhaps the city could consider providing some guidance on using digital tools so people realize that our city council is one of the best in the county when it comes to digital transparency on public records related to items being put on the floor at both committee and council meetings. I'm not sure what that looks like: free quarterly workshops? Mentioning where the documents for each item are stored on Legistar? More clarity about Legistar on the city website? There are lots of options. :)

Thank you for your service!

Renay Williams  
Bunker Hill

## **April Leggett**

---

**From:** David McAvoy <david.mcavoy2@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 5, 2021 11:41 PM  
**To:** Council Coments  
**Subject:** New rules

I would just like to say as someone who has spoken before the city council before and who has reviewed the proposed new rules for the public to have their chance to speak that I find no problem in the proposed requirements. It seems to me that those who have worked on these rules have attempted to balance things out so that everyone has a fair chance to be heard and the council can get on to other business.

-David McAvoy  
1524 Charles Drive in Jonesboro



## April Leggett

---

**From:** Patti Lack <pglack@suddenlink.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 6, 2021 9:29 AM  
**To:** Aldermen  
**Cc:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** Amending a section of Ordinance 21:025

Hello Council Members,

THREE minutes more of your time isn't asking much!

The third and final reading of Ordinance 21:025 is on the agenda of the City Council today(7-6-2021).

In Chapter 2, Article 3, Number 8, where it has been added-

8. There shall be a three (3) minute time limit per person with no redundancy for proponents and opponents of agenda items. There shall be a maximum of four persons per side for proponents and opponents to speak for or against.

**\*\*There needs to be a motion to remove the above statement and it needs to have a second and then voted by all of you to approve the motion.**

-What needs to be written in Chapter 2, Article 3, Number 8 -

8. There shall be fifteen minute(15) time limit per side for proponents and opponents to speak for or against.

I agree that there should be a time limit. But DO NOT LIMIT the number of citizens that can speak especially when they take the time to come to our City meetings.

Especially when the Mayor keeps saying that he'd like the citizens to be more involved and see them attend City meetings!

There has been some "controversial, emotional, heated" topics that have come in front of all of you. It doesn't happen on most of the items and it certainly doesn't happen at every meeting.

When there is an item that is important enough for citizens to come and speak their concerns or make a comment- THEY SHOULD BE HEARD!

And, it should be done without having the option to suspend the rules if the Mayor feels the circumstances justify it.

Thank you. See you all later today!

Patti Lack

## April Leggett

---

**From:** Hard L <weino7@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 6, 2021 11:14 AM  
**To:** Aldermen  
**Cc:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** Fw: Vote "Nay" to restrict free speech at meetings

Resend, corrected "To" addressee.

Howard L. "Hard L" Weinstock  
"oorah 1977-'81, hooah '82-2010"

540-287-7749  
Founder, LifeMarkers, LLC (Est. 2014)  
Founder, Asawa Kasama, LLC (Est. 2015)  
<http://www.linkedin.com/in/weino7>

---

**From:** Hard L <weino7@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 6, 2021 4:04 PM  
**To:** alderman@jonesboro.org <alderman@jonesboro.org>  
**Cc:** councilcomments@jonesboro.org <CouncilComments@jonesboro.org>; cityclerk@jonesboro.org <cityclerk@jonesboro.org>  
**Subject:** Vote "Nay" to restrict free speech at meetings

Please read this aloud into the minutes, thanks.

Vote "nay" on changing rules and procedures that are 1) vague and poorly defined and 2) restrict participation in meetings, which limits free speech, as follows:

1) The phrase "with no redundancy" implies that the government knows what will be said before a person utters comments, that those who wish to speak must coordinate comments before uttering them, at the risk of being cut-off by the mayor; and, that further implies that entire 3-minute time for comments will be identical;

2) Imposing an unnecessary restriction on speakers is an insidious restriction on free speech, prohibited by the First Amendment of Our Bill of Rights to the US Constitution, and beneath the dignity of Arkansas' Bill of Rights city.

-Has the council determined how routine and normal are the agenda items that result in more attendees queueing up to make comments? If so, identify all of them since the MLK street naming issue.

-The proposed language appears to be a boomerang of increased restrictions on citizens. During Covid, the council increased the ways for citizens to address an item with the phone-in option, which greatly increased the length of meetings but, now, it limits access for those who must take the time to attend a meeting, which could include

taking time off from work, and other inhibiting factors. As such, the council is pre-determining that all attendees must coordinate with people they may not know, because they may be #4, #9, #50 in line for those who want to speak.

-More so, the proposed restriction places a higher burden on citizens who oppose an item, as silence implies consent to what is being proposed. Opponents must attend to speak, again at the risk of not speaking due to a limit on numbers and that, in standing against the item, getting cutoff by the mayor - at his discretion.

Again, vote against limiting citizen participation. Beyond the reasons mentioned, the fact that the city attorney and two attorneys on the council have let the issue reach this point in the process without addressing concerns indicates that they prioritize reducing the time of now already shortened meetings, since the end of the Covid emergency, over citizen involvement in local government - at the citizens' discretion...that's each citizen's discretion.

Howard L. "Hard L" Weinstock  
"oorah 1977-'81, hooah '82-2010"

Wilkins Avenue  
Jonesboro

Ward 4  
District 5

## April Leggett

---

**From:** Melissa Baldwin <missylou1950@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 6, 2021 3:45 PM  
**To:** Aldermen  
**Cc:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** Limited time

I am against the limiting of the allowable time for proponents and opponents to speak on a matter at City Council meetings. Whereas, I'm sure none of you wish to sit up there all evening, and I get that, I feel that this will be discouraging citizens from participating in City Council meetings.

Make it simple.

Allow 15 minutes for each side, period. If 15 people are able to speak in that time limit, great. If only one gets to speak, well that would be on them not the Council.

Thank you,

Melissa Baldwin

Sent from my iPhone

## April Leggett

---

**From:** Iris Stevens <irisstevens@suddenlink.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 6, 2021 4:04 PM  
**To:** Aldermen  
**Cc:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** Ordinance 21-25

July 6, 2021

Jonesboro City Council  
Jonesboro City Administration  
Re: Ordinance 21:025 Establishing City Council Rules and Procedures for 2021

Please vote NO on the current ordinance 21:25.

I am quite concerned about this particular section of the ordinance, **(8) There shall be a three (3) minute time limit per person with no redundancy for proponents and opponents of agenda items. There shall be a maximum of four persons per side for proponents and opponents to speak for or against.**

The Jonesboro city administration and City Council are generally considered the servants of the people of Jonesboro. How are you to know what the people of Jonesboro need or want if you are not willing to listen to them? [Of all the complaints I've heard personally about city issues, the one most frequent is that city administration and council members "don't care what we think." While that complaint is generally not true, this ordinance lends itself to making more people feel exactly that way.]

Why limit the number of people who desire to speak to an issue? It would be logical to limit the amount of time for comments, but limiting the number of people to speak is indicative that the decision to vote yea or nay has already been made, and arguments made by petitioners would not have any weight on that vote. Is that the impression you wish to make to the citizens of Jonesboro?

To divide speakers into camps of For or Against a particular issue implies that all opinions are neatly categorized. What about those who simply have questions? Will those who simply want issues better explained or have specific questions be relegated to not speaking at all?

What does the term "with no redundancy" even mean in the context of this ordinance? Redundancy means repetition. Do you believe that it's even possible for individual speakers to get up and know beforehand whether they are making a

redundant argument for or against? To expect that would appear to require people to choose sides and arguments before even attending the council meetings. This would be an unreasonable limitation on the ability of citizen petitioners to be able to address their own local government.

This section [8] of this ordinance needs to be reconsidered and/or rewritten to make it clear and unambiguous. It also needs to take into consideration what the purpose of the city administration and council is – to be, not just the leaders, but the servants of the people they represent. To do that you must first be very careful about limiting what those people have to say.

Thank you,

Iris Stevens  
2714 Turtle Creek Rd  
Jonesboro