

A few years ago I hosted an all-day symposium featuring two international speakers on the subjects of Constitutional law, RICO Act, and land patents. Guest speaker Kirk MacKenzie from **Defend Rural America** had to be “disinvited” when we learned he wanted to bring Sheriff D’Agostini and Brian Veerkamp into my home which would have jeopardized the identity of my 18 prominent guests and subjected them to government retaliation. When my guests were asked to introduce themselves and their reason for attending, they unanimously stated GOVERNMENT CORRUPTION. One of my guests was Joe Hardesty, owner of the Big Cut Gold Mine who eventually won a \$107M ~~in a related~~ lawsuit that made national news.

Speaking of corruption, Laurel Brent-Bumb once described Coloma as the environmental belly of the beast. The CAO announced that RMAC would be disbanded by the end of 2017; however the River Mafia Mob continued to conduct serial meetings which the Brown Act strictly prohibits at the Marshall Gold Discovery Park and Camp Lotus. Then on May 21st Lori Parlin allowed Brian Veerkamp to take charge over the predetermined agenda item that further empowered the River Mafia Mob to operate under a new name as CLAC. Despite multiple objections, the Board ignored the facts and unanimously passed a deceptively written resolution allowing the continuation of Mob Rule.

For the record, RMAC has NEVER operated lawfully, nor can they be expected to do so under the “new voice” of CLAC which is RMAC on steroids. The Board of Supervisors knows their sordid history of fraud, threats & assaults but you still advocated for the continuation of their unlawful conduct!

Consultant Dr. Dale Smith and I have had multiple meetings with Richard Esposito about the Mob’s long history of bully tactics and abysmal failure to abide by the Brown Act. Following is an excerpt from one of Dr. Smith’s columns published in the Mtn. Democrat:

“On April 22nd COMPAS President Melody Lane and I gave a brief presentation on **“The Brown Act Open Meetings for Local Legislative Bodies”**. RMAC representative Dave Martinez angrily stormed out of the meeting and former Chairman Martin Harris submitted his resignation...As is her legal right, COMPAS President Lane recorded the entirety of that kangaroo court. My research on Municipal Advisory Councils across California found no parallel... Minutes have been altered and information purposely eliminated to falsely portray what transpires at RMAC meetings... Reporter Chris Daley’s story followed the pattern set by Ron Briggs, leading the unwary public down a rabbit path of deception. Incriminating RMAC meeting video/audio tapes undeniably reveal who are the real culprits. The illegal disruptions, shouting, disrespect, slander and intimidation tactics primarily by male RMAC representatives against Ms. Lane are easily heard.”

As history teaches us, if the people have little or no knowledge of the basics of government and their rights, those who wield governmental power inevitably wield it excessively. After all, a citizenry can only hold its government accountable if it knows when the government oversteps its bounds.

For example, Advisory Committees and Commissioners are NOT mere ~~advisory~~ **volunteers** without authority as Lori falsely claimed. They are appointed by the Board of Supervisors and are bound by their **Principle Agent Oaths of Office**. Commissioners & committee members are the AGENTS, and the BOS the PRINCIPLES who've delegated authority to them. They are expected to operate lawfully within the restrictions of the Brown Act, yet this entire Board appears willfully ignorant of their legal and ethical requirements. This would apply especially to Sue Novasel who has arrogantly flouted on numerous occasions that the BOS isn't required to respond to public inquiries. That is a government LIE!

Permit me to set the record straight. The preamble to the Brown Act states: *"The people, in delegating authority, do **not** give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people do **not** yield their sovereignty to the bodies that serve them. The people **insist** on remaining informed to retain control over the legislative bodies they have created."*

U.S. v. Tweel states: **"Silence can only be equated with fraud where there is a legal or moral duty to speak or where an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading."**

The BOS has consistently demonstrated that truth, facts, and evidence are irrelevant. You've made it apparent you'll continue to advocate Mob Rule and have no intention of abiding by your oaths of office or upholding the rights of the public. Tyrannies do the same.

If there is anything you don't understand or disagree with, please make your comments now while I'm at the podium.

Madam Clerk: Please enter these documents into the public record:

- 1) This transcript
- 2) Brown Act Rights of the Public

CALIFORNIA BROWN ACT

PREAMBLE:

"The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people do not yield their sovereignty to the bodies that serve them. The people insist on remaining informed to retain control over the legislative bodies they have created."

CHAPTER V.

RIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC

§54954.3 Public's right to testify at meetings. (c) The legislative body of a local agency shall not prohibit public criticism of the policies, procedures, programs, or services of the agency, or of the acts or omissions of the legislative body. Nothing in this subdivision shall confer any privilege or protection for expression beyond that otherwise provided by law. Care must be given to avoid violating the speech rights of speakers by suppressing opinions relevant to the business of the body.

As such, members of the public have broad constitutional rights to comment on any subject relating to the business of the governmental body. Any attempt to restrict the content of such speech must be narrowly tailored to effectuate a compelling state interest. Specifically, the courts found that policies that prohibited members of the public from criticizing school district employees were unconstitutional. (*Leventhal v. Vista Unified School Dist.* (1997) 973 F. Supp. 951; *Baca v. Moreno Valley Unified School Dist.* (1996) 936 F. Supp. 719.) These decisions found that prohibiting critical comments was a form of viewpoint discrimination and that such a prohibition promoted discussion artificially geared toward praising (and maintaining) the status quo, thereby foreclosing meaningful public dialog.

Where a member of the public raises an issue which has not yet come before the legislative body, the item may be briefly discussed but no action may be taken at that meeting. The purpose of the discussion is to permit a member of the public to raise an issue or problem with the legislative body or to permit the legislative body to provide information to the public, provide direction to its staff, or schedule the matter for a future meeting. (§ 54954.2(a).)