

M. Smith #24 BOS 7-15-14

BOS Item 24, 7-15-2014

MARK E. Smith, Garden Valley

Item 24 ON CONSENT WAS pulled AT my Request. I ASKED FOR this BECAUSE I THINK it is NECESSARY to HAVE A DISCUSSION ON COUNTY PROPERTY ACQUISITION - the ONLY REAL WAY to LOOK AT that is SEIZURE of PRIVATE PROPERTY by the GOVERNMENT.

I KNOW you MAY disagree, but when A PRIVATE PARTY makes me AN OFFER on my home, I AM free to SAY NO. When the COUNTY, OR ANY GOVERNMENT ENTITY makes AN OFFER, if I SAY NO, you TAKE it ANYWAY. I CALL THAT SEIZURE, whether you PAY me OR NOT. IF I DIDN'T WANT to sell, AND you TAKE it ANYWAY, THAT'S SEIZURE.

I'm NOT here to ARGUE the legality of eminent domain. I AM here to SAY that TAKING PROPERTY under ANY CIRCUMSTANCES using the CONSENT CALENDAR is UNETHICAL, IMMORAL, AND just PLAIN WRONG.

Next Page Please →

← PARTIAL Page (MS)

BOS Item 24, Page 2

All dispositions of property should be individually voted on and reported on. The public deserves to know which supervisors voted to seize citizens homes and which did not - and they should be allowed the opportunity to speak publicly on each transaction.

It's as simple as this; if you don't have the courage to go on record, raise your hand and say "yes, I want to take Mary's home", and face Mary and the public while you do it, the consent calendar is not the answer, it is the problem.

I would like to add that Item 24 is just one property under seizure. There are 10, count them - 10 others. Item 55, 56, and 58 are also property seizures. Item 57 is a property sale to the state the public is interested in I'm sure.

The abuse of the consent calendar must stop. Consent is for items so brain dead that ~~no~~ everyone will agree. It is not for sliding sleazy activities through by overwhelming the public, or shoving giant spending projects through un-noticed. The CAO is on notice.

The King does not live in El Dorado County. Neither does the Queen - we the people are watching.

Thank you
m. l. l. l.

Page 2 of 2