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Public Participation in Regular Meetings

The Brown Act mandates that agendas for regular meetings allow for two types of public comment periods. The first is a general audience comment period, which is the part of the meeting where the public can comment on any item of interest that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the local agency. This general audience comment period may come at any time during a meeting (Section 54954.3).

The second type of public comment period is the specific comment period pertaining to items on the agenda. The Brown Act requires the legislative body to allow these specific comment periods on agenda items to occur prior to or during the City Council’s consideration of that item (Section 54954.3).

Some public entities accomplish both requirements by placing a general audience comment period at the beginning of the agenda where the public can comment on agenda and non-agenda items. Other public entities provide public comment periods as each item or group of items comes up on the agenda, and then leave the general public comment period to the end of the agenda. Either method is permissible, though public comment on public hearing items must be taken during the hearing. Caution should also be taken with consent calendars. The body should have a public comment period for consent calendar items before the body acts on the consent calendar, unless it permits members of the audience to “pull” items from the calendar.

The Brown Act allows a body to preclude public comments on an agenda item in one situation, where the item was considered by a committee of the body which held a meeting where public comments on that item were allowed. So, if the body has standing committees (which are required to have agendized and open meetings with an opportunity for the public to comment on items on that committee’s agenda) and the committee has previously considered an item, then at the time the item comes before the full body, the body may choose not to take additional public comments on that item. However, if the version presented to the body is different from the version presented to, and considered by, the committee, the public must be given another opportunity to speak on that item at the meeting of the full body (Section 54954.3).

Limitations on the Length and Content of the Public’s Comments

A legislative body may adopt reasonable regulations limiting the total amount of time allocated to each person for public testimony. For example, typical time limits restrict speakers to three or five minutes. A legislative body may also adopt reasonable regulations limiting the total amount of time allocated for public testimony on legislative matters, such as a zoning ordinance or other regulatory ordinance (Section 54954.3(b)). However, we do not recommend setting total time limits per item for any quasi-judicial matter such as a land use application or business license or permit application hearing. Application of a total time limit to a quasi-judicial matter could result in a violation of the due process rights of those who were not able to speak to the body during the time allotted.

The Act precludes the body from prohibiting public criticism of the policies, procedures, programs, or services of the agency or the acts or omissions of the city council (Section 54954.3(c)). This does not mean that a member of the public may say anything. If the topic of the public’s comments is not within the subject matter jurisdiction of the agency, the member of the public can be cut off.
The body also may adopt reasonable rules of decorum for its meetings which preclude a speaker from disrupting, disturbing or otherwise impeding the orderly conduct of public meetings. Also, the right to publicly criticize a public official does not include the right to slander that official, though the line between criticism and slander is often difficult to determine in the heat of the moment. Care must be given to avoid violating the speech rights of speakers by suppressing opinions relevant to the business of the body.

The use of profanity may be a basis for stopping a speaker. However, it will depend upon what profane words or comments are made and the context of those comments in determining whether it rises to the level of impeding the orderly conduct of a meeting. While terms such as “damn” and “hell” may have been disrupting words thirty years ago, today’s standards seem to accept a stronger range of foul language. Therefore, if the chair is going to rule someone out of order for profanity, the chair should make sure the language is truly objectionable and that it causes a disturbance or disruption in the proceeding before the chair cuts off the speaker.