

Sasha Linker

From: Larissa Berry [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, November 19, 2019 8:19 PM
To: CommAsst; Thomas Jones
Cc: Scott Vaughn; Bradley Cutler
Subject: Unable to attend for public comments regarding Supervisor Uhler's failure to disclose a disqualifying financial conflict of interest

EXTERNAL EMAIL

Chairman and Commissioners

Due to personal circumstances, I will be unable to attend the hearing this Thursday to speak during public comments. Please accept this as part of the record.

As founder of Defend Granite Bay (DGB), a 501C3 dedicated to upholding the Granite Bay Community Plan and seeing that due process is adhered by Placer County in regards to development and updates to zoning text and ordinances, I can personally attest that the County has been negligent in providing complete records for PRA's. We have yet to receive a single email from any Board member particularly Supervisor Uhler. DGB has assisted residents in research and document procurement for multiple projects and multiple CEQA lawsuits. We have emails from County Counsel stating that incomplete records were provided and subsequent subpoenas by the Courts of Law have produced additional emails and records which were ALL in favor of the plaintiffs.

There is currently an alliance of fourteen 501C3's fighting to see that due process and state and local laws are adhered and to my knowledge at minimum another 9 also seeking open, honest and transparent representation. Our Board of Supervisors is not subject to FPPC Pay to Play Campaign Contribution rules and as such we have seen a pattern of practice of projects and County ordinances being created in favor of large campaign donors. This has crippled the rights of the residents and has halted any transparency or honest government. Now we see the personal financial gain of an elected representative not unlike the personal gains realized in Bell County.

Supervisor Uhler's "temporarily absent" is not a term in either the Political Reform Act or FPPC Regulations and appears to have been *created* to allow him to leave the room without required disclosure. Merits of the raise are only a portion of our concern, the collusion and conspiracy by multiple individuals across multiple departments to intentionally conceal this information from the public and to aid and abet his lack of disclosure are egregious and should also be a concern to you as guardians of political ethics and transparency.

It has taken residents hours to amass information through Public Records Act request and research of both the FPPC function and the Political Reform Act. There is no question that there is "perceived" conflict and your duty is to investigate even if only to verify that no abuses are at hand. The position of Assistant Director of Child Support Services requires a 4-year degree and a driver's license. As with positions overseeing Medical Doctors with the same requirements, no compaction was required since those being supervised have advanced degrees. While Ms. Uhler is a licensed attorney active with the CA BAR, this only indicates that she is overqualified for her role. Additionally, her direct supervisor is within less than 8% of her new pay. No compaction was required meaning that this position was handled unlike any position within the group. It was not handled in an equal fashion and special circumstances were applied.

I request that you reopen your investigation and subpoena all records to determine: were there meetings with County Counsel and Supervisor Uhler, why was no fiscal impact analysis done, why was the largest raise not disclosed to the public, why was County Counsel not held to uphold their obligation to ensure that all impacts of the ordinance were relayed in a manner clearly understood by the public, why was a new term "temporarily absent" coined so that Supervisor Uhler could side step his "perceived" disqualifying conflict of interest. If he had publicly disclosed a conflict, there would be no issue. Instead he chose to hide from the public a financial gain and a use of tax dollars resulting in personal benefit.

These are only a few of the issues that the FPPC is obligated to investigate so as to provide answers to the public in a manner clearly understood with substantial evidence. There is no doubt that there is a perceived conflict and there is no doubt that your legal responsibility is to fully vet this issue.

Respectfully,

Larissa Berry a concerned citizen