

Objection to NH Rules Committee Proposal on Rule 51

Submitted for public comment

June 2, 2023

To NH Advisory Rules Committee:

- I object to the removal of Rule 51(d)(2)(B).
- This rule allows for a process for ensuring that, at a minimum, parties most affected by a proposal can be identified and contacted) where there is no other promotion or announcement made by the rules committee, other than by email to the NH bar list and that by removing this requirement, it would effectively consign the provision of input on rule changes to a very elite group of people.
- The drafters of rule proposals (who submit proposals to the committee) could be required to include, as part of any proposal, a list of potential affected parties, to assist the committee in identifying such parties as maybe relevant or necessary.
- Thus, there are several ways to streamline this responsibility to make it more efficient and easier to accomplish. It does not need to be stricken. It should not be stricken.
- Why is this being done? It allows for less people to be informed. This stripping away only allows a small elite to make these decisions that affect everyone in the state. Why would this committee want to strip that away?
- The committee want to take credit for allowing public input without really providing for that input or severely limiting that input.
- It is shown throughout history that when things are done without public input, things go wrong or serve the few elite interests.
- Otherwise, by removing this requirement, it would effectively consign the provision of input on rule changes to a very elite group of people.
- To limit those who can provide public input does not equate with public accountability and is not in the interest of transparency nor for the benefit of the public and the taxpayer.
- I realize that the folks that are in control of these matters could feel as though they can or should be able to do whatever they want to do and do not care much for what the little guy from the public, like me, has to say. But it is then better to simply come out and say that these things are not subject to public accountability and that no input is needed from the public, and let it be clear that these things are intended to be controlled by an elite or select few and chosen, who wield power and authority over the rest of us, as de facto overlords who are sovereign and are above public accountability, rather pay lip service to the concept or idea or principle of public accountability or give pretense to it, but never really intend to allow the public, to really be involved.
- This lip service is evidenced by the fact that Rule 51 was and is not being followed, thus violating this rule. And now to add fuel to the fire, now comes this proposal out of nowhere seeking to remove the requirement.
- I also request that this matter be allowed to be addressed in a public hearing and that I be allowed an opportunity to be heard on this matter at today's public hearing.
- I ask that this public comment be placed on the public docket of the rules committee website and on the public record and that it be distributed to the full committee members.

Sincerely,
Natalie Anderson
Concerned Citizen
Email: liberty_6@msn.com