

From: [Michael Hilber](#)
To: [CommAsst](#)
Subject: November 21, 2024 - Commission Meeting, Comment on Agenda Item 9 Lynda Hopkins
Date: Wednesday, November 20, 2024 3:31:52 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL EMAIL

As Lynda Hopkins claims her vote in this case was an oversight, a simple mistake, that is a load of bull.

I clearly recall speaking on this same issue some years back. It was at a Sonoma County Supervisors meeting and money for LandPaths was on the agenda and Lynda Hopkins was not abstaining. It was on the “consent calendar” and when the opportunity for public comment came up I said that I understood her husband works for LandPaths and she should be abstaining. Lynda Hopkins arrogantly replied that it was not a conflict. There was no confusion. There was an attitude that the vote and issue should not be questioned.

I do not recall the date of this exchange as it was a while ago, but my memory of it is clear. It was a date other than the vote that is the subject of this stipulation; quite possibly a prior occasion. It was a regular board meeting and I recall it being on the agenda and I got up and spoke on it. I believe it was “5th district advertising funds” which were being given to LandPaths. This would be TOT or hotel room taxes that are collected and put in a fund. Also they get divided up by supervisorial districts and each supervisor has discretion as to how to give out their share of funds.

So these “advertising funds” that get awarded are not only voted on at the meeting, they are decided by supervisors and their staff how to divvy them up. Then these proposed disbursements get put onto the agenda for the vote. So there is a conflict not only when the final vote is taken, but before that when the decision to put the award on the agenda is made.

It is plain common sense that awarding public funds to a nonprofit that an immediate family member works for is a conflict of interest, yet Lynda Hopkins arrogantly denied this to be the case.

It also appears to me that a nonprofit may choose to employ a spouse of a sitting county supervisor with the expectation that it may facilitate channeling public funds to the nonprofit.

For this reason I do not support this “stipulation.” It represents pocket change to the respondent and does not address the underlying disrespect for that tax paying public.

Michael Hilber