

To: Mr. Les Baugh
Shasta LAFCO Commissioner

From: Terry Briggs--Shasta County resident
Fall River Mills, Ca.

December 22, 2014

Re: Last meeting

Dear Mr. Baugh:

For at least two reasons your performance at the last LAFCO was quite an eye opening experience. If there is anything like a Parallel Universe, that meeting was it.

First your behavior, towards your Executive Officer, Jan Lopez, was nothing short of abusive, as all in the audience could see. Even your fellow commissioners were rolling their eyes at some of your comments.

However, this behavior was especially appalling to me, as I sat before you for over 13 months of meetings, where you seldom reacted to any of my comments about the previous E-O, Amy Mickelson, even when I outlined and documented her incompetence, abusive behavior, reckless actions and finally her lying to the Fall River CSD, during one of her meetings there. Never mind her costing the CSD over \$40,000 during her tenure didn't seem to phase you a bit.

It is therefore ironic that I point out your lack of comments, as to Amy's work product, inasmuch as she did so little to comment about. But as I commented to you folks, **"Jan has done more work in 8 months than Amy did in 8 years"**!

My comments were a reaction to Mr. Brent Cassity bringing my name into the fray during his time to speak. You should have listened to one of your colleagues when she commented about the huge amount of work being done by this E-O. When you have one year to write, essentially, 'War and Peace' you might discover you made a few typos. Get over yourself, you aren't that special.

I take particular umbrage to the notion that you are open and transparent, as you failed to share at least one of my past communications with your commissioners, that I sent you about Amy. Which directly contradicts your stated policy of: "One gets it, all gets it".

So Mr. Baugh, I will cut to the chase. If you persist in harassing Mrs. Lopez, I fully intend to ask you just two questions in public: How can you legally approve new annexations with seriously outdated MSRs and SOIs, when you need both to change the boundaries of cities or districts? Therefore, how is it the Stillwater Business Park and other annexations from Cottonwood to Shasta Lake City were approved without EITHER?

Believe me, I have asked several well qualified LAFCO Executive Officers and NONE of them can explain it to me. They allege it is impossible to do, without violating LAFCO law. Isn't that what your Commission Counsel is supposed to protect you from doing? There have been few MSRs and NO approved SOIs since the late 80's or 90's and I would hazard a guess the complexion of these cities and districts have radically changed since then.

Secondly, perhaps I am mistaken in the belief that the LAFCO Commission is made up of a broad spectrum of representation of the different cities and districts. In essence it is you folks representing the tax and rate payers of these cities and districts. And it is your job to see that LAFCO laws are obeyed, when these different organizations wish to expand either borders or spheres of influence. Do I have that right?

Well then you will pardon my shock when you were openly campaigning for Cal Fire's naked power grab of the McArthur and Northwest Lassen fire districts, with promises of new fire trucks and equipment, never once explaining where the money to pay for it is coming from. Please, let me enlighten you.

California is broke. In 2011 California's pension debt was a paltry \$111 billion, give or take. By 2013 their unfunded obligations had ballooned to \$290 billion, with teachers pension under-funding adding another \$132 billion. To picture the 'corrective inaction' of the teacher's pension fund, they are now going in the hole at the rate of \$22 million a day.

Then the California legislature came up with the brilliant idea of letting the

unfunded liabilities (read that as debt) rise to \$328 billion, like that's going to make everything better. Now you ask, what's that got to do with Cal-Fire?

Well, my backstabbing friend, it has everything to do with Cal-Fire. It doesn't take a Rhodes Scholar to figure out that every department of the State of California is scrambling to find money. In order to backfill a pension fund that serves less than 15% of working Californians, you have to have lots, and lots of money, from 100% of working Californians, to Hell with 'their' pensions and savings.

A good friend of mine often reminds me, "Follow the money". And if anyone here believes it isn't about the money, "Wake up and Smell the Coffee". Cal-Fire is in desperate need of money. And every parcel they lose, they lose money, and every parcel they take, they make money, with no end in site for fee increases, established in Sacramento.

Here's a news flash Les: Cal-Fire loves giving away 'Other Peoples Money'. However, Cal PERS being allowed to go almost \$400 billion in debt on top of California's general obligation bond liabilities of hundreds of billions more, is what happens when you run out of 'Other Peoples Money'. Especially when Moody's is downgrading Cal Pers investments from 7.5% to under 5.5% interest.

Perhaps it is well past time for Shasta LAFCO to focus on their stated mission and stop cheerleading the takeover of Special Districts by an incompetent, bankrupt California government. No good can come of this.

My advise to you, Mr. Baugh, as a representative of rate and taxpayers, retain your Executive Officer and make shed of your alliance to Cal-Fire.

Terry Briggs