

LATE DISTRIBUTION

DATE

6/27/17

BJS 6/27/17

#50

Agenda item #50, File #17-0592, SOFAR Charter submitted by Sue Taylor

We have a general plan that is very specific about forest policies and ordinances that should have been implemented by, at the very latest, 2011.

The collaborative vision and the goals of the South Fork American River Cohesive Strategy is in conflict with our general plan. There is nothing in the vision that includes the timber industry as a sustainable product of importance to our local economy.

Any one person can sign on to this charter and will have the same weight as the Board of Supervisors. Who is truly the appropriate authority to be stewards over our county's critical resource? According to the general plan, it's the Board of Supervisors, who should actively participate with federal and state agencies in the development and implementation of policies that effect our custom, culture, and economic stability.

The charter is internally conflicting. Where it states that it does not impose any legally binding requirements on the individuals and entities that adopt and participate in this charter, it also states that activities will follow the consensus recommendation model, followed by the supermajority vote model when consensus cannot be reached. The charter calls for a proposed action for a project based on consensus.

My concern is how do you address those that join this collaborative whose interests are in conflict with the County's interest as stated in our General Plan? It appears that this charter circumvents our General Plan.

The following excerpts are out of the El Dorado County general plan regarding goals, ordinances, and policies that should be implemented to protect and preserve our forest resources. We should be sharing this with the collaborative as an existing plan to be implemented rather than having the collaborative decide these issues for us. Please do not sign onto this undefined collaborative.

## GENERAL PLAN ASSUMPTION

The agriculture and timber industries will remain economically viable during the 20-year planning time horizon of the Plan. The viability of these industries is critical to the maintenance of the County's customs, culture, and economic stability.

## CUSTOM, CULTURE, AND ECONOMIC STABILITY

Public land within El Dorado County provides economic and ecological value to the County, State, and Nation. Since the Eldorado Forest comprises about 57 percent of El

Dorado County's land base, and these Federal lands are exempt from local property taxes, the County requires Federal and/or State compensation to offset the loss of potential tax dollars to the County's economy.

Activities on public land include but are not limited to timber harvesting, grazing, mining, tourism, recreation, and the production of clean water within a healthy forest environment. El Dorado County is blessed with abundant natural resources and has long been recognized for its spectacular beauty. While impacted, these same attributes exist today.

The County has a tradition of appreciating and conserving these resources, using them wisely, and upholding a strong ethic of stewardship over these assets. It is the combination of these features that are now referred to as rural character.

The value and historical productivity of the Eldorado National Forest is associated with commodity production, ecological diversity, and geological significance. Its long-term economic and environmental value depends upon overall forest health. There is an abundance of non-timber oriented natural resource lands in the County. Some of these lands have produced, and will continue to produce, a variety of agricultural products. Others are inherently valuable for their natural environmental characteristics.

All of the County's natural resource lands are important to the local and regional economies due to their availability for crop production, recreational opportunities, watershed values, and contributions to the tourism industry. In general, in order for these resources and opportunities to be available in the future, these important lands require sound management. The General Public specifies the manner in which the historic culture, custom, and economic importance of these lands can be sustained in the future.

Conflicts do exist as a result of population expansion into resource rich lands. This Plan provides policy guidance and direction on how to avoid and/or minimize these conflicts. Careful management applies especially to the County's abundant water resources and watershed areas. Healthy economies cannot be maintained without a reliable and clean water source. This Plan also acknowledges that the County will continue to grow but will attempt to retain the qualities of its natural resource base, both consumptive and environmental, in order to maintain its custom and culture and to assure its long-term economic stability.

This Plan acknowledges the ecological and historic values of these lands while saving and conserving the lands for future economic benefits for all the purposes stated in this section.

The rural character of the County is its most important asset. Careful planning and management can maintain this character while accommodating reasonable growth and

achieving economic stability. The County will actively participate with Federal and State agencies in the development and implementation of policies that affect our custom, culture, and economic stability.

To facilitate this participation, the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors shall establish Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with the United States Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the California Department of Forestry, the California Department of Fish and Game, and other agencies as the need arises.

## **El Dorado County General Plan Agriculture and Forestry Element**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Agriculture and Forestry Element addresses the conservation, management, and utilization of the County's agricultural and forest lands. In El Dorado County, these lands are regarded by residents as fundamental components of the County's rural character and way of life. In recent years, large influxes of new residents have resulted in increased development and thus a changed landscape. While this growth has benefited the County in many ways, the low-density residential growth has threatened important agricultural and forest lands. Prudent management of the County's agriculture and forestry resources is needed to provide future generations with opportunities to experience both the economic benefits and rural lifestyle residents now enjoy. This prudent management strategy involves maintenance of large parcel sizes and the minimization of incompatible land use encroachment into these resource rich lands.

An open space element "used for the managed production of resources, including . . . rangeland, agricultural lands, and areas of economic importance for the production of food or fiber. . . ." (Government Code Section 65560(b)(2)).

The focus of the Agriculture and Forestry Element is on conserving these non-renewable lands for agriculture and timber activities, natural resource values, and long-term productivity.

## **EL DORADO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN**

### **AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY ELEMENT**

#### **FOREST LAND CONSERVATION AND PRODUCTION**

**GOAL 8.3: FOREST LAND CONSERVATION**

**Maintain healthy sustainable forests that provide for raw materials while limiting the intrusion of incompatible uses into important forest lands.**

**OBJECTIVE 8.3.1: IDENTIFICATION OF TIMBER PRODUCTION LANDS**

**Identification of existing and potential timber production lands for commercial timber production.**

Policy 8.3.1.1      Lands suitable for timber production which are designated Natural Resource (NR) on the General Plan land use map and zoned Timber Production Zone (TPZ) or Forest Resource (FR) are to be maintained for the purposes of protecting and encouraging the production of timber and associated activities.

Policy 8.3.1.2      The procedures set forth in *The Procedure for Evaluating the Suitability of Land for Timber Production* shall be used for evaluating the suitability of forest lands for timber production. The procedure shall be developed and maintained by the Agricultural Commission and approved by the Board of Supervisors. Revisions to said procedure shall not constitute a General Plan amendment. These provisions shall be used in the following instances:

- A. To evaluate commercial forestry and timber lands within areas designated Natural Resource (NR) and/or lands zoned Timber Production Zone (TPZ) for their timber production value;
- B. To evaluate lands outside of areas designated Natural Resource (NR) and/or zoned Timber Production Zone (TPZ) for their timber production values for recommendation to the approving authority for inclusion within the Natural Resource designation and/or Timber Production Zone zoning district; and
- C. To evaluate lands designated NR and/or zoned TPZ generally located below 3,000 feet elevation for their timber production value.

Policy 8.3.1.3      The County Agricultural Commission shall assess lands to determine their suitability for timber production. Lands considered suitable for timber production shall be based on the following criteria:

- A. Lands designated Natural Resource (NR) on the General Plan land use map or lands zoned Timber Production Zone (TPZ);
- B. Soils identified as El Dorado County “choice” timber production soils which shall consist of soils found on Timber Site Classifications I, II, or III as defined in the California Forest Handbook and the Soil Survey of El Dorado Area issued April 1974

by the USDA Soil Conservation Service and the U.S. Forest Service;

- C. Lands used for commercial forestry/timber production;
- D. Lands that possess topographical and other features that make them suitable for timber production; and
- E. Low development densities in vicinity.

## **EL DORADO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT**

Policy 7.1.1.1      Conserve and maintain important agricultural soils for existing and potential agricultural and forest uses by limiting non-agricultural/non-forestry development on those soils.

Policy 7.4.2.7      The County shall form a Plant and Wildlife Technical Advisory Committee to advise the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors on plant and wildlife issues, and the committee should be formed of local experts, including agricultural, fire protection, and forestry representatives, who will consult with other experts with special expertise on various plant and wildlife issues, including representatives of regulatory agencies. The Committee shall formulate objectives which will be reviewed by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

**OBJECTIVE 7.4.3: COORDINATION WITH APPROPRIATE AGENCIES**  
**Coordination of wildlife and vegetation protection programs with appropriate Federal and State agencies.**

**OBJECTIVE 7.4.4: FOREST AND OAK WOODLAND RESOURCES**  
**Protect and conserve forest and woodland resources for their wildlife habitat, recreation, water production, domestic livestock grazing, production of a sustainable flow of wood products, and aesthetic values.**

Policy 7.4.4.1      The Natural Resource land use designation shall be used to protect important forest resources from uses incompatible with timber harvesting.

<p><b>GOAL 7.6: OPEN SPACE CONSERVATION</b> <b>Conserve open space land for the continuation of the County's rural character, commercial agriculture, forestry and other productive uses, the enjoyment of scenic beauty and recreation, the protection of natural resources, for protection from natural hazards, and for wildlife habitat.</b></p>
--

## **OBJECTIVE 7.6.1: IMPORTANCE OF OPEN SPACE**

### **Consideration of open space as an important factor in the County's quality of life.**

- Policy 7.6.1.1     The General Plan land use map shall include an Open Space land use designation. The purpose of this designation is to implement the goals and objectives of the Land Use and the Conservation and Open Space Elements by serving one or more of the purposes stated below. In addition, the designations on the land use map for Rural Residential and Natural Resource areas are also intended to implement said goals and objectives. Primary purposes of open space include:
- A. Conserving natural resource areas required for the conservation of plant and animal life including habitat for fish and wildlife species; areas required for ecologic and other scientific study purposes; rivers, streams, banks of rivers and streams and watershed lands;
  - B. Conserving natural resource lands for the managed production of resources including forest products, rangeland, agricultural lands important to the production of food and fiber; and areas containing important mineral deposits;
  - C. Maintaining areas of importance for outdoor recreation including areas of outstanding scenic, historic and cultural value; areas particularly suited for park and recreation purposes including those providing access to lake shores, beaches and rivers and streams; and areas which serve as links between major recreation and open space reservations including utility easements, banks of rivers and streams, trails and scenic highway corridors;
  - D. Delineating open space for public health and safety including, but not limited to, areas which require special management or regulation because of hazardous or special conditions such as earthquake fault zones, unstable soil areas, flood plains, watersheds, areas presenting high fire risks, areas required for the protection of water quality and water reservoirs, and areas required for the protection and enhancement of air quality; and
  - E. Providing for open spaces to create buffers which may be landscaped to minimize the adverse impact of one land use on another.
- Policy 7.6.1.3     The County shall implement Policy 7.6.1.1 through zoning regulations and the administration thereof. It is intended that certain districts and certain requirements in zoning regulations carry out the purposes set forth in Policy 7.6.1.1 as follows:

- A. The Open Space (OS) Zoning District is consistent with and shall implement the Open Space designation of the General Plan land use map and all other land use designations.
- B. The Agricultural and Timberland Production zoning districts are consistent with Policy 7.6.1.1 and serve one or more of the purposes set forth therein.
- C. Zoning regulations shall provide for setbacks from all flood plains, streams, lakes, rivers and canals to maintain Purposes A, B, C, and D set forth in Policy 7.6.1.1.
- D. Zoning regulations shall provide for maintenance of permanent open space in residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and residential agricultural zone districts based on standards established in those provisions of the County Code. The regulations shall minimize impacts on wetlands, flood plains, streams, lakes, rivers, canals, and slopes in excess of 30 percent and shall maintain Purposes A, B, C, and D in Policy 7.6.1.1.
- E. Landscaping requirements in zoning regulations shall provide for vegetative buffers between incompatible land uses in order to maintain Purpose E in Policy 7.6.1.1.
- F. Zoning regulations shall provide for Mineral Resource Combining Zone Districts and/or other appropriate mineral zoning categories which shall be applied to lands found to contain important mineral deposits if development of the resource can occur in compliance with all other policies of the General Plan. Those regulations shall maintain Purposes A, B, C, D, and E of Policy 7.6.1.1.

Policy 7.6.1.4 The creation of new open space areas, including Ecological Preserves, common areas of new subdivisions, and recreational areas, shall include wildfire safety planning.

**MEASURE CO-J**

**Develop and implement a program to perform water quality analysis and monitoring of the County’s recreational waters. [Policy 7.3.2.5]**

**Responsibility:**

**Environmental Management and Department of Transportation**

**Time Frame:**

**Develop and implement program within eight years of General Plan adoption.**



M. Lane

BOS 6/27/2017

#50

For clarification, "RMP" refers both to the River Management Plan, and to River Mafia Politics.

Under the Political Reform Act, federal anticorruption law broadly guarantees the public "honest services" from public officials. Depriving the public of honest services is a federal crime. Any enterprise undertaken by the public official who tends to weaken public confidence and undermine the sense of security for individual rights is against public policy. Fraud, in its elementary common law sense of deceit, is one of the meanings that fraud bears. Just a few examples:

1. Falsified RMAC minutes and data submitted to BOS by Noah Rucker, Vickie Sanders, Roger Trout and consultant Steve Peterson concerning the RMP (see Ranalli letter)
2. Censorship, deliberate stall tactics, obfuscation & diversions <sup>(\*)</sup> - Demonstrated last week when BOS refused to pull Consent Item #9 until Shiva pulled it but refused public dialog and surreptitiously rescheduled it today.)
3. In a meeting held August 2016 with Don Ashton and Mike Ranalli, Roger Trout admitted the 9/14/15 RMAC meeting was a "set up" to discredit me and Compass2Truth – Witnessed by Parks & Rec Commissioner Kris Payne & 3 other individuals I asked to be present.
- <sup>(\*)</sup>4. Failure to track and respond to CPRAs concerning the RMP and SUPs – 2,000 pages of duplications (10x) contained Noah Tripplett & Nate Rangel "nuggets" exposing collusion of Parks & Rec personnel with other government agencies (contained in Ranalli letter.) CSP/ARC Confidential Contract > CPRA
5. Serial meetings and collusion – (see Ranalli letter)
6. Violations of Principal Agent Oaths of Office.
7. Complicity of BOS by their failure to take remedial action, especially Mike Ranalli and Shiva Frentzen (see evidence in letter)
8. No resident representation as mandated by the RMP.

For years RMAC representatives have been in violation of their Principal Agent Oaths of Office and the Brown Act. Serial meetings are explicitly prohibited by the Brown Act. (A serial meeting is a series of communications, each involving less than a quorum, but which taken as a whole involves a majority. Serial meetings may occur in various ways. Examples include members of the body communicating with each other and a staff member communicating with members



of the body, to orchestrate a consensus. Unlawful serial meetings may occur through oral, written or electronic communications.)

~~The issue of serial meetings stands at the vortex of two significant public policies: first, the constitutional right of citizens to address grievances and communicate with their elected representatives; and second, the Act's policy favoring public deliberation by multi-member boards, commissions and councils.~~ **The purpose of the serial meeting prohibition is not to prevent citizens from communicating with their elected representatives, but rather to prevent public bodies from circumventing the requirement for open and public deliberation of issues.** The Act expressly prohibits serial meetings that are conducted through direct communications, personal intermediaries or technological devices for the purpose of developing a concurrence as to action to be taken.

The truth be told, evidence contained in this letter to Supervisor Ranalli substantiates the decision to disband the RMAC and create the SOFAR charter was made over two years ago behind closed doors. It essentially turns control over to the River Mafia, American River Conservancy, BLM and CA State Parks & Recreation. The email sent out on CL News by Nate Rangel misinformed the river community that this item was slated for last Thursday's Planning Commission as a hearing. The fact is it wasn't a hearing OR a workshop. It was a charade orchestrated by the CAO and the BOS ~~falsely~~ intended to give the false appearance of community participation and government transparency. Details of collusion are contained in Ranalli letter and in the 5/9/17 Deputy CAO memo.

*THIS IS REALLY ABOUT WHO CONTROLS THE MOST VALUABLE WATERSHED IN EDC @ THE SLEPPAS.*

ANY act by ANY public official that doesn't support and defend the Constitution, opposes and violates it. Your fraudulent pre-approval of the SOFAR Charter simply condones and empowers the River Mafia to continue their corrupt business as usual without any transparency or accountability whatsoever. Rather than colluding, the solution is clear: Do the right thing by respecting constituents and honoring your Constitutional Oaths of Office.

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

1. This transcript
2. CL News Nate Rangle RMP email @ 10:09 PM
3. 8/3/16 Agenda w/Don Ashton, Mike Ranalli, Roger Trout
4. Ranalli letter 6/26/17

**From:** 'Melody Lane' via Coloma-Lotus News [mailto:clnews@googlegroups.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 19, 2017 10:09 PM  
**To:** nate@raftcalifornia.com; 'Coloma-Lotus News'  
**Subject:** RE: [CLNews] River Management Plan Hearing

The June 22 Planning Commission issue #4 concerning the RMP is a workshop, NOT a hearing:

4. 17-0659 WORKSHOP - Chief Administrative Office, Parks Division requesting a workshop to discuss proposed changes to the El Dorado County River Management Plan. This item is for discussion purposes only.

*Melody Lane*

**Founder – Compass2Truth**

“I don't make jokes. I just watch the government and report the facts.” -- Will Rogers

**From:** [clnews@googlegroups.com](mailto:clnews@googlegroups.com) [mailto:clnews@googlegroups.com] **On Behalf Of** Nathan Rangel  
**Sent:** Monday, June 19, 2017 4:39 PM  
**To:** 'Coloma-Lotus News'  
**Subject:** [CLNews] River Management Plan Hearing

Hi Neighbors....

The long River Management Plan revision process is coming back to an active status with a workshop scheduled before the El Dorado County Planning Commission this coming Thursday, June 22nd. You can find more information on the RMP revision and staff summary online at:

[file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/Agenda%20\(39\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/Agenda%20(39).pdf)

The item is number 3 on the Commission agenda and, unfortunately, it is not time certain...which means it could come up at 10:00 AM, or later. Best guess from folks I know is that it will likely be heard between 10:30 AM and noon.

This is a workshop which means that staff will be giving a presentation on just what has occurred during this RMP revision process, as well as their suggestions for the final product. Testimony will be taken, either verbally or in writing, but no action will be taken by the Commission at this meeting.

Many of you attended a presentation of the draft RMP last year at the Grange in Coloma. Please do check out the attached materials on the above site and please do plan on either attending or sending in your comments if you have concerns over any part of the draft RMP or plans as they relate to the future of our River Management Advisory Committee.

Thanks and I hope to see you there this Thursday!

Regards,  
Nate Rangel

**Agenda**  
**8-3-16 @ 4 PM**  
**Don Ashton – Mike Ranalli – Roger Trout**

- I. RIVER MANAGEMENT PLAN
  - A. RMAC Representation
    - 1) EDSO
    - 2) MGDP
    - 3) Resident
  - B. Brown Act Violations
    - a. 9/14/15 meeting (attendees)
    - b. MGDP Rep. Bill Deitchman – absent/approved minutes
    - c. 5/26/16 MGDP Special Meeting
    - d. 7/11/16 Lotus Fire House > 8/8/16
  - C. RMP Update
    - 1) EDSO Revisions
    - 2) BLM/CA State Parks
    - 3) Ranalli strategy
  
- II. CODE/LAW ENFORCEMENT
  - A. EDSO Jurisdiction
  - B. SUPs
    - 1) Code Enforcement coordination w/EDSO (John Desario replaced Jim Wassner)
    - 2) Documentation
    - 3) Complaint process > responsibility?
    - 4) Consequences/Revocations
    - 5) Retaliation
  
- III. CPRAs
  - A. Oaths of Office
  - B. CAO/County Counsel
  - C. Violations – Late/non-compliant responses
  
- IV. FOLLOW UP
  - A. Remedy & Expectations
    - 1) CAO
    - 2) Mike Ranalli
    - 3) Roger Trout
    - 4) EDSO
  - B. Next meeting target date:

*Melody Lane  
Compass2Truth  
P.O. Box 598  
Coloma, CA 95613*

June 26, 2017

Supervisor Michael Ranalli, Dist. #4  
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors  
330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667

Supervisor Michael Ranalli,

This letter is lawful notification to you, and is hereby made and sent to you pursuant to the national Constitution, specifically, the Bill of Rights, in particular, Amendments I, IV, V, VI, VII, IX and X, and the California Constitution, in particular, Article 1, Sections 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 21, 23, and Article 3 Section 1. This letter requires your written rebuttal to me, specific to each claim, statement and averment made herein, within 30 days of the date of this letter, using fact, valid law and evidence to support your rebuttal.

You are hereby noticed that your failure to respond within 30 days as stipulated, and rebut with particularity everything in this letter with which you disagree is your lawful, legal and binding agreement with and admission to the fact that everything in this letter is true, correct, legal, lawful and binding upon you, in any court, anywhere in America, without your protest or objection or that of those who represent you. Your silence is your acquiescence. See: *Connally v. General Construction Co.*, 269 U.S. 385, 391. Notification of legal responsibility is "the first essential of due process of law." Also, see: *U.S. v. Tweel*, 550 F. 2d. 297. "*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.*"

What I say in this letter is based in the supreme, superseding authority of the Constitution for the United States of America, circa 1787, as amended in 1791, with the Bill of Rights, and the California Constitution, to which all public officers have sworn or affirmed oaths, under which they are bound by Law. It is impossible for an oath taker to *lawfully* defy and oppose the authority of the documents to which he or she swore or affirmed his or her oath. My claims, statements and averments also pertain to actions taken by you regarding multiple violations of the River Management Plan, the California Ralph M. Brown Act, and your lack of response to constituents, in this case me, as required pursuant to your oaths. When I use the term "public officer(s)", this term includes you.

Since America and California are both Constitutional Republics, not democracies, they are required to operate under the Rule of Law, and not the rule of man. The Supreme Law and superseding authority in this nation is the national Constitution, as declared in Article VI of that document. In Article IV, Section 4 of that Constitution, every state is guaranteed a republican form of government. Any "laws", rules, regulations, codes and policies which conflict with, contradict, oppose and violate the national and state Constitutions are null and void, *ab initio*. It is a fact that your oath requires you to support the national and state Constitutions and the rights of the people secured therein.

During two meetings that I audio recorded, specifically on August 4, 2016, and again on May 17, 2017, you verbally affirmed that all public officers are required to abide by their oaths in the performance of their official duties. No public officer, including you, has the constitutional authority to oppose, deny, defy, violate and disparage the very documents to which he or she swore or affirmed his or her oath. All actions by public officers conducted in the performance of their official duties either support and defend the national and state Constitutions, or oppose and violate them.

*"The Oath of Office is a quid pro quo contract in which clerks, officials, or officers of the government pledge to perform (Support and uphold the United States and State Constitutions) in return for substance (wages, perks, benefits). Proponents are subjected to the penalties and remedies for Breach of Contract, **conspiracy** under Title 28 U.S.C., Title 18 Sections 241, 242. **treason** under the Constitution at Article 3, Section 3., and intrinsic **fraud**..."*

The Board of Supervisors has been regularly apprised that they are routinely receiving falsified information from the River Management Advisory Committee, Parks & Recreation, the CAO, and the Planning Commission. Despite frequent public testimony and evidence submitted into the public record of fraudulent information submitted by the aforementioned public agencies to the BOS, you have failed to take corrective action and the BOS voted unanimously to approve their recommendations. Any enterprise, undertaken by any public official, such as you and other Board of Supervisor members, which tends to weaken public confidence and undermines the sense of security for individual rights, is against public policy. Fraud, in its elementary common-law sense of **deceit**, is the simplest and clearest definition of that word. My claims, statements and averments also pertain to your actions taken regarding your failure to provide honest public services, pursuant to your oaths.

It is the duty of every Citizen to demand that government employees, such as you, specifically perform pursuant to the constitutional mandates contained within their oaths, thereby uphold and protect the rights of the people, as opposed to upholding and promoting the profits of a rapacious, destructive association that perniciously violates the rights of the people as its apparent routine custom, practice and policy.

Whenever constitutional violations are committed by public officers, there are constitutional remedies available to the people. Such remedies make those who violate their oaths, such as you, accountable and liable for their unconstitutional actions conducted in perjury of their oaths. When public officers take oaths, yet are ignorant of the constitutional positions to which they are bound by their oaths, and then fail to abide by them in the performance of their official duties, this suggests that they may have had no intention of ever honoring their oaths, and their signatures upon the oath documents constitute fraud. Fraud vitiates any action.

The preamble of the Ralph M. 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.”**

You’ve publicly stated three times during the January 5, 2016 Board of Supervisors meeting, *“I’ll meet with anyone...I’ve never refused a meeting.”* However, you have refused to respond publicly to verbal inquiries, denied the public the right to pull an item from Consent for public dialog, and failed to respond to my meeting requests for the purpose of resolving specific issues that have been perpetually avoided for years. Concerns have been expressed monthly, and sometimes weekly, particularly regarding the transparency and accountability of the **River Management Advisory Committee, Parks & Recreation Commission, Planning Commission, Code & Law Enforcement, Coloma-Lotus Fire Council, and CA Environmental Quality Assurance (CEQA)**. Additionally CA Public Record Act requests for information have not been responded to as required by law. You have either been unresponsive to communications, relegated your comments to hallway conversations, or you’ve obfuscated and diverted any meaningful public replies whatsoever. (See U.S. versus Tweel above.)

For example, in 2016 and 2017 the following interrelated public meetings were all **cancelled** by county staff without explanation but with your foreknowledge:

**Parks & Recreation Commission:**

**2016:** January, April, June, August, September, October and December.

**2017:** April and June

**River Management Advisory Committee (RMAC):**

**2016:** February, March, July, August, September.

**2017:** January, February, March, and May. (June minutes not yet posted.)

**Planning Commission:**

**2016:** February, March, April, July.

**2017:** January

One example of your evasion occurred on October 4, 2016. You and Sheriff D'Agostini both failed to show up for a scheduled meeting, without explanation, and instead, CAO Don Ashton and county counsel Paula Franz appeared in your stead and represented you. They have no authority whatsoever to act as your spokespersons. **(See Exhibit A)**

Another example of evasion is the May 9, 2017 memo from Laura Schwartz, Deputy CAO, posted as Consent Item #6 to the 5/16/17 BOS agenda concerning two new appointments to the River Management Advisory Committee (RMAC). I requested this item be pulled from Consent, but you refused to pull it or dialog as required by the Brown Act, Sections 54954.2(a) and 54954.3:

---

**Please pull Item #6 from Consent for public discussion and dialog**

1 message

---

Melody Lane <melody.lane@reagan.com>

Mon, May 15, 2017 at 10:18 AM

To: Michael Ranalli <michael.ranalli@edcgov.us>

Cc: shiva.frentzen@edcgov.us, brian.veerkamp@edcgov.us, sue.novasel@edcgov.us, john.hidahl@edcgov.us, Jim Mitrisin <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>, edc.cob@edcgov.us, Donald Ashton <don.ashton@edcgov.us>, bosfive@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bos two@edcgov.us

Supervisor Ranalli. et al:

There are several issues pertaining to the River Management Advisory Committee that have been perpetually swept under the rug of government bureaucracy. In the interest of public transparency and accountability, and pursuant to Sections 54954.3 and 54954.2(a) of the Brown Act, please pull Item #6 from Consent for public discussion and dialog.

Also ensure the entirety of this message, with attachments, is timely posted via the government distribution system.

In her May 9, 2017 memo Ms. Schwartz states, *"...we recommend that this committee be dissolved and that the County encourage interested participants to form an ad-hoc committee...Over the past several months, the majority of RMAC members have stepped down from the Committee resulting in not enough members to reach quorum. Several meetings have been cancelled at the request of RMAC due to a lack of a quorum or no issues to discuss...The Chief Administrative Office recommends that the Board consider filling the vacancies noting that RMAC may be dissolved by the end of the year."* **(See Exhibit B)**

Despite sufficient members to constitute a quorum for monthly meetings, all evidence obtained through CA Public Record Act requests indicates that county staff has been colluding in cancelling RMAC meetings in an attempt to stall the River Management Plan updates. In actuality, the RMAC members have not stepped down; rather they have been participating in serial meetings which the law specifically prohibits. In fact, the ACAO's May 9<sup>th</sup> memorandum outlines the county's long range plan for RMAC, thus demonstrating that public meetings and workshops soliciting resident input are nothing more than fraudulent bureaucratic attempts to convince



Citizens that their input makes a difference in the management of the most valuable Sierra watershed.

Yet a third example is the May 26, 2016 Special Meeting requested by Nate Rangel scheduled to be held at 6:00 PM in the Marshall Gold Discovery Park Museum. The only topic of this special meeting was the RMP Update. By 6:30, there were only three people in the room, including myself and one other member of the public. After waiting for a half hour, RMAC Representative Marilyn Tahl announced that she had no idea where everyone was. When it was apparent no meeting was going to take place, I exited the building. I was bid farewell by Chairman Nate Rangel seated outside the Museum casually talking to another individual

Although the RMAC meeting was never officially cancelled, the next day the meeting minutes appeared on the EDC Legistar calendar indicating that the RMAC meeting commenced immediately at 6:30 PM *after I had left the premises*. The stall tactics apparently were a strategic attempt to get me to leave so they could conduct the meeting without me. It is significant that the previously posted minutes have disappeared from the government website and the audio is "unavailable" and cannot be played. "Technical difficulties" appear to be a convenient frequent problem, especially when there are matters concerning government transparency and compliance with the law:

[River Management Advisory Committee \(RMAC\)](#) 5/26/2016 6:00 PM Marshall Gold Discovery State Historic Park Museum, Building 210 Back St. Coloma, CA Meeting details Agenda List & Attendees Video

Authentic transparency and accountability in the administration of the RMP, and the public's right to address their grievances concerning the RMP, have been blatantly avoided literally for decades by the BOS. This was one of the topics addressed during our 8/3/16 meeting with you, CAO Don Ashton, and Planning Services Director Roger Trout. (See Exhibit C)

Note the specific item addressing the RMP Update was the only topic on the most recent June 12, 2017 RMAC meeting agenda. Significantly, the SOFAR Charter (RMP) was scheduled as Consent Item #9 on the June 20, 2017 BOS meeting agenda, but it was surreptitiously diverted to the June 27<sup>th</sup> BOS meeting Item #50. The same topic was also scheduled for the June 22, 2017 Planning Commission Item #4: **17-0659 WORKSHOP - Chief Administrative Office, Parks Division, requesting a workshop to discuss proposed changes to the El Dorado County River Management Plan (RMP). No action was to be taken by the Planning Commission.** Contrary to the posting made by Nate Rangel to the CL News, that Planning meeting was neither a workshop nor a hearing as Mr. Rangel publicly had communicated. Commissioner Gary Miller, who has a history of violating the Brown Act and abusing his Principal Agent Oath of Office, permitted Nate Rangel to speak for 15 minutes, meanwhile dialoging and asking him numerous questions. Notably, Chairman Miller denied other members of the public the same rights to dialog.

You've been made aware of numerous unlawful government practices within your district, yet you've failed to take any corrective action. In so, doing you've aided and abetted the perpetuation of government fraud, and are therefore culpable, complicit and liable.

Mr. Ranalli, you were not elected to maintain the dysfunctional status quo of El Dorado County via bureaucratic obfuscations and diversions. Public Service Ethics training as required by the Political Reform Act and AB1234 is mandatory of all elected officials. The ethics manual published by the Institute for Local Government repeatedly emphasizes the following:

- Must conduct public hearings in accordance with due process principles.
- Cannot retaliate against those who whistle-blow.
- Even though a course of action may be lawful under state law, it may not be lawful under federal law.
- The law provides only minimum standards for ethical conduct. Just because a course of action is legal, doesn't make it ethical/what one ought to do.
- Refrain from discussing or voting on a matter
- Transparency is an important element of public service.

By your actions and in some cases, inaction, it is clear that you have violated each and every one of these provisions on numerous occasions.

When you and other public officers violate the Constitutions, at will, as an apparent custom, practice and policy of office, you and they subvert the authority, mandates and protection of the Constitutions, thereby act as domestic enemies to these Republics and their people. When large numbers of public officers so act, this reduces America, California and the County of El Dorado to the status of frauds operating for the benefit of governments and their corporate allies, and not for the people they theoretically serve.

You have no constitutional or any other valid authority to defy the Constitution, to which you owe your LIMITED authority, delegated to you by and through the People, and to which you swore your oath. Yet, by your actions against me, committed repeatedly on the aforementioned dates and several other occasions too numerous to mention, you've deprived me and other members of the public their rights to address public officers and provide testimony. It is apparent the public's input has been reduced to irrelevancy, thereby demonstrating that public meetings are little more than predetermined outcomes designed to falsely give Citizens the impression of government transparency and accountability, while providing neither. This blatant fraud perpetrated by you and other elected/appointed officers against the people they are required to serve and who pay their respective salaries.

The Ralph M. Brown Act further states:

**§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).)”

Anytime public officers, pursuant to their oaths, violate Rights guaranteed to Citizens in the Constitutions, they act outside their limited delegated authority, thus, perjure their oaths, and by their own actions, invoke the self-executing Sections 3 and 4 of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment; thereby vacate their offices and forfeit all benefits thereof, including salaries and pensions, as you did on several other occasions, which are now a matter of public record. Following are just a few examples:

- 1) On September 14, 2015, I requested four witnesses to accompany me to the meeting of the River Management Advisory Committee (RMAC). One of my witnesses was Parks & Recreation Commissioner, Kris Payne. After consultation with Parks & Recreation Manager Vickie Sanders, and at my request, the planned subject matter of the September RMAC meeting focused on Special Use Permits (SUP) and other violations of the River Management Plan. As is my custom, I personally audio recorded the meeting as I always do. You were present for the entirety of the meeting seated at the back of the room when RMAC business representative, Adam Anderson, falsely accused me of using profanity. As all four of my witnesses can attest, in reality I was quietly seated in the audience. This appeared to be the cue to the audience to launch their attack.

Planning Services Director Roger Trout then actively participated with some members of the community known as the "River Mafia" who then proceeded to take turns at publicly vilifying me.

In violation of the Brown Act and my constitutional secured inherent rights, I was not permitted by Chairman Nate Rangel to respond to any of their fraudulent accusations, nor would Vickie Sanders correct the minutes to reflect what actually transpired as I later requested in writing. You were apprised and requested by me to take action to correct the on-going deception, but you failed to respond to my phone calls or correspondence.

Then, during a meeting held April 1, 2016 in the Marshall Gold Discovery Park, with Superintendent Barry Smith and CSP RMAC representative Bill Deitchman, the issue of the September 14, 2015 RMAC meeting was on the agenda. Of primary concern was the fact that Bill Deitchman was not present for that meeting, yet it appeared he was in collusion with El Dorado County staff and other government agencies to unethically deprive the public of honest services. Contrary to public policy, the minutes of the September 2015 RMAC meeting reflect Mr. Deitchman's approval of the fraudulent meeting when he should have actually recused himself as being absent. Mr. Deitchman responded, "*County Counsel told us we don't have to be present to approve the minutes!*" (See Exhibit D)

**Significantly, on February 18, 2014 @ 3:38 PM, Noah Triplett had distributed to all RMAC representatives the following directive:**

*Ms. Lane submitted a doc. Cc'd to half the County Gov. today. You do not need to pull the minutes from consent and have her 3 three or 5 minutes allowed to speak. It is attached.*

*Whoever is the chair please let her know she can speak after the committee is done discussing whatever agenda item it is during public comment on whatever item she wishes to comment on **and you do not have to reply to her if you do not want to.***

**On August 7, 2015 @ 5:20 PM, Noah Triplett distributed an email to RMAC representatives informing them the August 10, 2015 RMAC meeting had been CANCELLED without reason. The following exchange took place between Noah Triplett and RMAC Chairman Nate Rangel:**

**On August 7 2015 @ 6:31 PM, Nathan Rangel wrote:**

*Hi Noah,  
I think it would be both prudent and courteous to at least check in with me prior to cancelling any of our meetings. That's what occurred in the past. Any reason why it didn't this time?*

**On August 7, 2015 @ 7:05 PM Noah Triplett replied:**

*Hi Nate,*

*I was understood that Vickie talked to you about the draft not being done and no need to agendaize HLP property issues.*

*There's nothing for the agenda at this time.*

*Melody Lane wants us to put a SUP compliance item on the next meeting agenda for discussion.*

*I will confirm with you before cancelling another meeting.*

**On August 8, 2015 @ 5:21 AM Nathan Rangel responded:**

*Hey Noah,*

*No worries. No, Vickie didn't touch base with me. It's just that when we cancel a meeting I let the other members know the reason. I've got 4 emails asking why....I'll let them know.*

*Melody's item should be interesting! Take care and I'll touch base with you next week.*

It should be noted that in our audio recorded meetings with Parks & Recreation Manager Vickie Sanders and consultant Steve Peterson that we specifically requested confidentiality of these sensitive issues due to the personnel problems associated with Noah Rucker-Triplett and his association with the "River Mafia." It became apparent that Ms. Sanders did not honor her agreement, and thus violated EDC personnel protocols as well as her Oaths of Office. During our 8/3/15 meeting with you, concern was expressed about the history of retaliation, particularly against women in the river community, by the "River Mafia" and Parks & Recreation personnel. In addition to being entered into the public record during several BOS meetings, these frequent breaches in public policy were also brought to the attention of the Human Resources Director and County Counsel. **(See Exhibit E)**

The subject of the 9/14/15 RMAC meeting was also broached again during our 8/3/16 meeting with you, CAO Don Ashton, and Planning Services Director Roger Trout. A major concern was the absence of Roger Trout's "3 Strikes" policy concerning violations of Special Use Permits (SUPs) and the county's reticence to respond lawfully to Public Record Act Requests (CPRAs). No response has ever been forthcoming from you concerning any of these issues.

- 2) Previously mentioned was the Special RMAC meeting requested by RMAC Chairman, Nate Rangel, to be held May 26, 2016 at 6:00 PM in the Marshall Gold Discovery Park Museum regarding updates to the River Management Plan. By 6:30 Nate Rangel had not shown up, there still was no quorum, and it was apparent no meeting would take place, so I left the premises. Although the meeting wasn't officially cancelled, the meeting commenced immediately after I was persuaded to leave. The agenda for that meeting still appears, but the

minutes and the audio of the fraudulent 5/26/16 meeting have since disappeared from the government website

Just prior to the May 26, 2016 Special RMAC meeting I had submitted a CA Public Record Act request for the following information which was due 5/31/16:

- Pursuant to my rights under the California Public Records Act (Government Code Section 6250 et seq.), I asked to obtain the following:
- Copies of all RMAC representative correspondence pertaining to the River Management Plan Update from January 1, 2016 through May 15, 2016.
  - Copies of all Parks and Recreation correspondence between Vickie Sanders and consultant Steve Peterson from January 1, 2016 through May 15, 2016.
  - Documentation proving the necessary 4/5 BOS vote substantiating the transfer of \$25,000 from the River Trust Fund for the River Management Plan Update.

You, and the entire BOS, were publicly apprised that the CPRA response was received two days late and was incomplete. Furthermore, the entirety of the requested correspondence between the RMAC representatives was never received by me, and what was actually received from Parks & Recreation Manager Vickie Sanders contained primarily blank pages. Contrary to our audio recorded conversations, Vickie's response to the CPRA *denied* her possession of *any* correspondence with consultant Steve Peterson whom she personally authorized and hired to update the RMP. Significantly, she also failed to produce the signed and dated contract with Mr. Peterson. Not surprisingly, the BOS unanimously voted, March 22, 2016, to authorize an expenditure of \$25,000 to pay Mr. Peterson out of the River Trust Fund (RTF), which trust fund Noah Rucker Triplett stated in an email was "flat broke".

Then, during the March 22, 2016 BOS meeting, I reminded you, and the other Supervisors, of their fiduciary responsibility to the citizens of El Dorado County, and the fact that Steve Peterson had been meeting behind closed doors with county representatives, BLM and CA State Parks long before the item had been put on the BOS agenda or the contract officially entered into with the consultant. Ms. Sanders and Mr. Peterson both confirmed during one of our audio recorded meetings that the county's plan was to take control away from RMAC and turn it over to CA State Parks and BLM who work in conjunction with American River Conservancy and other unaccountable non-government organizations (NGOs.)

We discussed during our 8/3/16 meeting that evidence obtained via CA Public Record Act requests reveals collusion with county staff to deprive the public of their right to public information, refusal to engage in dialog, or participate in the deliberation of public policy. Consequently, the decisions

made by you and the other Supervisors that are based on collusion and deliberately falsified information will ultimately adversely affect all EDC tax payers through unnecessarily expensive litigation, thus, undermining the public trust in local government. See *USC Title 18, § 241 Conspiracy Against Rights*. For example:

**In an email dated April 28, 2014 @ 3:21 PM, Noah Triplett informed all RMAC representatives:**

*“Vickie informed the committee that the County is looking at starting a more comprehensive update to the RMP beyond what was identified in the 5 year summary reports next year (July 2014). This update would include the River Rescue proposal and Institutional Proposal and anything else. The goal being to not piecemeal updates but to try and do it all at once. This is also going to cost money since the County wants to use the consultant who did the 2001 RMP and as you know the RTF is broke.*

*The floodplain litter ord. was tabled indefinitely.*

*The alternate RMAC representative proposal was also continued.*

*Maybe Stephen and Keith could get together and come up with a proposal since it sounds like there may be differences?*

*Please do not respond to all as that could be considered a violation of the Brown act.”*

**In yet another email sent October 5, 2015 @ 1:58 PM to CA State Park RMAC representatives, Noah Triplett wrote:**

*“We received a public records request from Melody Lane which requests copies of correspondence between RMAC representatives and me.*

*I am seeking an opinion from County Counsel on whether I can I include the emails between you to because there is a confidentiality statement with your emails so she may have to request them from the State.”*

- 3) It has also been brought to your attention during BOS meetings, and on numerous other occasions, that county staff is habitually falsifying reports and conducting what California Sunshine Laws and the Brown Act describe as “serial meetings”, particularly as it affects the River Management Advisory Committee, Parks & Recreation Commission, and the Planning Commission:

*The issue of serial meetings stands at the vortex of two significant public policies: first, the constitutional right of citizens to address grievances and communicate with their elected representatives; and second, the Act’s policy favoring public deliberation by multi-member boards, commissions and councils. The purpose of the serial meeting prohibition is not to prevent citizens from communicating with their elected representatives, but rather to prevent public bodies from circumventing the requirement for open and public*



***deliberation of issues.*** *The Act expressly prohibits serial meetings that are conducted through direct communications, personal intermediaries or technological devices for the purpose of developing a concurrence as to action to be taken. (§ 54952.2(b); Stockton Newspapers, Inc. v. Redevelopment Agency (1985) 171 Cal.App.3d 95, 103.)*

***Serial meetings are explicitly prohibited.*** *A serial meeting is a series of communications, each involving less than a quorum, but which taken as a whole involves a majority. Serial meetings may occur in various ways. Examples include members of the body communicating with each other and a staff member communicating with members of the body, to orchestrate a consensus. Unlawful serial meetings may occur through oral, written or electronic communications.*

By your own actions and the actions of other public officers, it is clear that you have violated all of these requirements in letter and spirit, thus, you have violated the law, the rights of the people and have perpetrated ongoing fraud as your usual custom, practice and policy of you and that of the other public officers.

- 4) Primary concerns that have been publicly addressed but ignored by you, and the BOS, regard to the topics of public safety and retaliation, particularly as it pertains to the River Management Plan, and the lack of SUP code and law enforcement. As you have been made aware, Public Record Act requests for information pertinent to the River Management Plan have been ignored, are late, or are insufficiently responded to as required by law. Just one example, as cited above, is Roger Trout's fraudulent "3-Strikes" policy which has been the topic of meetings with you, the Planning Commission and other county staff. You've been apprised that Commissioners Gary Miller and James Williams both stated in May 2017 that Roger's "3-Strikes" policy **does not exist**. *A policy that does not exist cannot be lawfully enforced.*

***Depriving the public of honest services is a federal crime.*** My claims, statements and averments also pertain to your actions taken regarding your failure to provide honest public services, pursuant to your oaths. All public officers within whatever branch and whatever level of government, and whatever be their private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly labor under every disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees relative to the making of personal financial gain from a discharge of their trusts. That is, a public officer occupies a fiduciary relationship to the political entity on whose behalf he or she serves and owes a fiduciary duty to the public. The fiduciary responsibilities of a public officer cannot be less than those of a private individual. You have failed your fiduciary responsibilities and duty.

Furthermore, any enterprise undertaken by the public official who tends to weaken public confidence and undermine the sense of security for individual rights is against public policy. Fraud, in its elementary common-law sense of **deceit**, is the simplest and clearest definition of that word [483 U.S. 372] in the statute. See *United States v. Dial*, 757 R2d 163, 168 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir 1985) *includes the deliberate concealment of*

*material information in a setting of fiduciary obligation. See also USC Title 18, § 2071 – Concealment, removal, or mutilation generally.*

On one occasion, October 4, 2016, your attendance was required at a meeting, but you and Sheriff D'Agostini both failed to show up. The topics included inconsistencies in responding to CA Public Record Act Requests as required by law, ethics issues, Brown Act violations and lack of Code/Law Enforcement in the Coloma-Lotus region of the South Fork American River.

Another example entailed a recent meeting request. Since you and your Administrator, Brenda Bailey, have been reluctant to respond to correspondence or meeting requests, I asked Marshall Gold Discovery Park Superintendent, Barry Smith, to coordinate a meeting to include you and DOT Director, Bard Lower. The meeting request made in my email dated March 19, 2017 specifically stated:

*“You are required to be responsive to constituent grievances and provide a method of resolution pursuant to your Constitutional Oaths of Office. The purpose of summoning you to this one-hour meeting is to transparently address inter-related issues and a viable plan of action to achieve resolution. Your personal participation is mandatory, not optional. That means no substitutes or additional personnel are permitted—not the CAO or Counsel—as has been the past practice.”*

The day of the meeting, May 17, 2017, Mr. Lower failed to show up, but despite the conditions set forth in the initial meeting request, you were accompanied by two representatives from the CAO's office. Consequently we found it necessary to terminate the meeting before it began. You were provided a copy of the prepared agenda which included the topics of *Public Safety and Retaliation*. **(See Exhibit F)**

The First Amendment guarantees the Right of free speech and the Right to petition government for **redress of grievances**, which, the oath taker, pursuant to his oath, is mandated to uphold. If he fails this requirement, then, he has violated two provisions of the First Amendment, the Public Trust and perjured his oath. By not responding and/or not rebutting, the oath taker denies the Citizen remedy, thus, denies the Citizen constitutional due process of law, as stated within the Bill of Rights. By your own actions, pursuant to your oath, you have violated these First Amendment guarantees. An American Citizen, such as I, can expect, and has the Right and duty to demand, that his government officers uphold their oaths to the Constitution(s) and abide by all constitutionally imposed mandates of their oaths. This is an un-enumerated Right guaranteed in the Ninth Amendment, which I hereby claim and exercise.

Furthermore, there is no legitimate argument to support the claim that oath takers, such as you, are not required to respond to letters or meeting requests, which, in this case, act as petitions for redress of grievances, stating complaints, charges and claims made against them by their constituents or by Citizens injured by their actions. When public officers harm the Citizens by their errant actions, as you have done, and then refuse to respond to or rebut petitions from Citizens, as you have also done, then,

those public officers, as are you, are domestic enemies, acting in sedition and insurrection to the declared Law of the land and ***must be opposed, exposed and lawfully removed from office.***

As stated previously, actions by a public officer either uphold the Constitutions and rights secured therein, or oppose them. By your stepping outside of your delegated authority you lost any "perceived immunity" of your office and you can be sued for your wrongdoing against me, personally, privately, individually and in your professional capacity, as can all those in your jurisdiction, including your supervisors and anyone having oversight responsibility for you, including any judges or prosecuting attorneys and public officers for that jurisdiction, if, once they are notified of your wrongdoing, they fail to take lawful actions to correct it, pursuant to their oaths and their duties, thereto:

*"Personal involvement in deprivation of constitutional rights is prerequisite to award of damages, but defendant may be personally involved in constitutional deprivation by direct participation, failure to remedy wrongs after learning about it, creation of a policy or custom under which unconstitutional practices occur or gross negligence in managing subordinates who cause violation." (Gallegos v. Haggerty, N.D. of New York, 689 F. Supp. 93 (1988)).*

If those superiors referenced above fail to act and correct the matter, then, they condone, aid and abet your criminal actions, and further, collude and conspire to deprive me and other Citizens of their Rights guaranteed in the Constitutions, as a custom, practice and usual business operation of their office and the jurisdiction for which they work. This constitutes treason by the entire jurisdiction against me, and based upon the actions taken and what exists on the public record, it is impossible for any public officer to defend himself against treason committed. See: 18 USC § 241 - Conspiracy against rights and 18 USC § 242 - Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law. See also: U.S. v. Guest, Ga. 1966, 86 S.Ct. 1170, 383 U.S. 745, 16 L.Ed 239.

Supervisor Ranalli, your choice is very simple. You can either uphold your oath and the rights and best interests of the people, or violate your oath and your duties to the people. As stated previously, anytime you perjure your oath, defy the authority of the Constitutions and step outside of the lawful scope of your duties and authority, you are personally liable. In fact, the national Constitution provides remedy for the people when public officers, such as you, perjure their oaths, which remedy, in part, can be found at the referenced Sections 3 and 4 of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment.

Pursuant to the constitutional mandates imposed upon them, by and through their oaths, there is no discretion on the part of public officers to oppose the Constitutions and their oaths thereto, nor to be selective about which, if any, mandates and protections in the Constitutions they support. The mandates and protections set forth in the Constitutions are all-encompassing, all-inclusive and fully binding upon public officers, without exception, as they are upon you.

If you disagree with anything in this letter, then rebut that with which you disagree, in writing, with particularity, to me, within thirty (30) days of the date of this letter, and support your disagreement with valid evidence, fact and law.

Your failure to respond, as stipulated, is your agreement with and admission to the fact that everything in this letter is true, correct, legal, lawful, and is your irrevocable agreement attesting to this, fully binding upon you, in any court in America, without your protest or objection or that of those who represent you.

Sincerely,

All Rights Reserved



Melody Lane

**Attachments:**

- Exhibit A – 10/4/16 Meeting Agenda
- Exhibit B – 5/9/17 CAO Dissolve RMAC Memo
- Exhibit C – 8/3/16 Ashton/Ranalli/Trout Meeting Agenda
- Exhibit D – 4/1/16 MGDG Meeting Agenda
- Exhibit E – 11/12/14 & 8/3/15 Meeting Agendas
- Exhibit F – 5/17/17 Meeting Agenda

**Cc:** Supervisor Brian Veerkamp  
Supervisor Sue Novasel  
Supervisor Shiva Frentzen  
Supervisor John Hidahl  
D.A. Vern Pierson

**Agenda**  
**8-3-16 @ 4 PM**  
**Don Ashton – Mike Ranalli – Roger Trout**

- I. **RIVER MANAGEMENT PLAN**
  - A. **RMAC Representation**
    - 1) **EDSO**
    - 2) **MGDP**
    - 3) **Resident**
  - B. **Brown Act Violations**
    - a. **9/14/15 meeting (attendees)**
    - b. **MGDP Rep. Bill Deitchman – absent/approved minutes**
    - c. **5/26/16 MGDP Special Meeting**
    - d. **7/11/16 Lotus Fire House > 8/8/16**
  - C. **RMP Update**
    - 1) **EDSO Revisions**
    - 2) **BLM/CA State Parks**
    - 3) **Ranalli strategy**
  
- II. **CODE/LAW ENFORCEMENT**
  - A. **EDSO Jurisdiction**
  - B. **SUPs**
    - 1) **Code Enforcement coordination w/EDSO (John Desario replaced Jim Wassner)**
    - 2) **Documentation**
    - 3) **Complaint process > responsibility?**
    - 4) **Consequences/Revocations**
    - 5) **Retaliation**
  
- III. **CPRAs**
  - A. **Oaths of Office**
  - B. **CAO/County Counsel**
  - C. **Violations – Late/non-compliant responses**
  
- IV. **FOLLOW UP**
  - A. **Remedy & Expectations**
    - 1) **CAO**
    - 2) **Mike Ranalli**
    - 3) **Roger Trout**
    - 4) **EDSO**
  - B. **Next meeting target date:**

**EXHIBIT C**

**Tuesday October 4, 2016 @ 2:30 PM**  
**Don Ashton, Mike Ranalli, Paula Franz**  
*ABSENT*

- I. CPRAs - FOIA
  - A. Guide to CPRAs
  - B. Government PRA Tracking system – COB Discrepancies
  - C. Legal vs. Lawful
  
- II. Ethics & HR policies
  - A. Brown Act Violations
  - B. Transparency & Accountability
    - 1. BOS
    - 2. EDSO
    - 3. CAO
  
- III. Obstacles - Bureaucratic Shenanigans
  - A. Communication breakdown
  - B. Fees - Resolution 113-95 v. AB1234
  - C. Code/Law Enforcement policy inconsistencies
  
- IV. Follow up - Target date

**EXHIBIT A**



# County of El Dorado

*Chief Administrative Office*

*Parks Division*

330 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667-4197

*Don Ashton, MPA*  
*Chief Administrative Officer*

*Phone (530) 621-5360*  
*Fax (530) 642-0301*

DATE: May 9, 2017  
TO: Board of Supervisors  
FROM: Laura Schwartz, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer  
RE: River Management Advisory Committee

## Background

In 2001, the Board adopted Resolution number 065-2002 establishing the River Management Advisory Committee (RMAC). The committee consists of seven members appointed by majority vote of the Board of Supervisors. The RMAC was formed to provide a forum for the discussion of river use issues, ideas or conflicts among persons or groups with an interest in the South Fork of the American River. The committee is advisory to the Board of Supervisors.

El Dorado County Chief Administrative Office, Parks Division entered into a contract with Environmental Stewardship and Planning on July 28, 2014. The purpose of this contract was to prepare a redlined revision of the River Management Plan (RMP). This plan has not been updated since 2001 and since that time the County has fifteen years of data to support the recommendations made in the redlined version. One of the recommendations from the consultant was specifically related to the River Management Advisory Committee (RMAC). The recommendation was as follows:

### **5. Dissolve the RMAC.**

The most significant change that we propose is to dissolve the RMAC. This committee has done some very good and dedicated work since its inception in 1984, but has evolved into more of a community-focused, rather than River-focused organization. Because of the lack of substantive issues that require deliberation and the wide-ranging interests of the RMAC, we recommend that this committee be dissolved and that the County encourage interested participants to form an ad-hoc committee. This committee could be supported by the County in same manner as the Rubicon Oversight Committee that has successfully conducted ad-hoc meetings for over 10 years.

**EXHIBIT B**



The draft Redlined Version of the RMP was posted to the County website on February 10, 2016 for public comments. On February 18, 2016 a public meeting was held at the Coloma Grange with the consultant present to answer any questions. The recommendation for the dissolution of RMAC had the most comments from the public as they were not in support of this recommendation.

Staff concurs with the recommendation of the consultant. RMAC was formed by Resolution of the Board and not by the RMP; therefore all references to RMAC have been removed from the plan. The reporting structure and recommendations are addressed in the revised plan.

Timeline

The timeline for the Redlined Version of the RMP has changed many times. The public comment period was extended from March 18, 2016 to April 15, 2016. RMAC then requested that they have a separate deadline as they wanted to review the public comments before they made their comments. RMAC's comment period was extended to May 26, 2016. It was requested that the deadline be extended again. It was extended to June 14, 2016, giving RMAC an opportunity to discuss at their June 13, 2016 meeting.

Comments were received during the busy river season and staff did not review the comments until the river season was complete. Staff compiled the draft plan and sent the Administrative Draft to County departments for comment on January 13, 2017. Staff received comments from Roger Trout of the Community Development Agency and Jim Byers of the Sheriff's Department. Staff met with County Counsel on April 18, 2017. Their comments were addressed and incorporated into the draft.

This is the proposed schedule to complete this project.

* Planning Commission Workshop	June 24, 2017	* 6/22/17
Planning Commission Project Description & Initial Study Approval	July 2017	
Board of Supervisors-Project Description & Initial Study Approval	July 2017	
CEQA Document Prepared	August 2017	
30 Public Comment Period for CEQA Document	September 2017	
Prepare Final Document	October 2017	
Planning Commission Approval	November 2017	
* Board of Supervisors Approval	November 2017	

Issue and Recommendation

Until the new River Management Plan is approved and adopted, RMAC is still an advisory committee to the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission. Over the past several months, the majority of RMAC members have stepped down from the Committee resulting in not enough members to reach to quorum. Several meetings have been cancelled at the request of

**RMAC due to a lack of a quorum or no issues to discuss. Per the resolution, the County posted notices of vacancies and received applications to fill the vacancies.**

**The Chief Administrative Office recommends that the Board consider filling the vacancies, noting that RMAC may be dissolved by the end of the year.**

**Agenda**  
**8-3-16 @ 4 PM**  
**Don Ashton – Mike Ranalli – Roger Trout**

- I. RIVER MANAGEMENT PLAN
  - A. RMAC Representation
    - 1) EDSO
    - 2) MGDP
    - 3) Resident
  - B. Brown Act Violations
    - a. 9/14/15 meeting (attendees)
    - b. MGDP Rep. Bill Deitchman – absent/approved minutes
    - c. 5/26/16 MGDP Special Meeting
    - d. 7/11/16 Lotus Fire House > 8/8/16
  - C. RMP Update
    - 1) EDSO Revisions
    - 2) BLM/CA State Parks
    - 3) Ranalli strategy
  
- II. CODE/LAW ENFORCEMENT
  - A. EDSO Jurisdiction
  - B. SUPs
    - 1) Code Enforcement coordination w/EDSO (John Desario replaced Jim Wassner)
    - 2) Documentation
    - 3) Complaint process > responsibility?
    - 4) Consequences/Revocations
    - 5) Retaliation
  
- III. CPRAs
  - A. Oaths of Office
  - B. CAO/County Counsel
  - C. Violations – Late/non-compliant responses
  
- IV. FOLLOW UP
  - A. Remedy & Expectations
    - 1) CAO
    - 2) Mike Ranalli
    - 3) Roger Trout
    - 4) EDSO
  - B. Next meeting target date:

**EXHIBIT C**

**4/1/16 MGDPA Agenda  
Barry Smith**

- I. **EDSO & CSP**
  - A. **Public Safety meeting w/Mike Ranalli, Roger Trout, CSP, Sheriff D'Agostini**
  - B. **Notice & Demand**
  - C. **Mt. Murphy Road**
    - 1) **DOT**
    - 2) **Fencing repairs**
    - 3) **No Parking signs**
    - 4) **Hang gliders**
    - 5) **Trespassers**
  
- II. **Coloma Lotus Fire Safe Council**
  - A. **Tim Kulton & Deborah Kruze**
  - B. **Bill Deitchman – Project Manager**
  - C. **CPRA – County Counsel**
  - D. **Coloma Resort**
    - 1) **Annual fireworks**
    - 2) **Code/law enforcement**
    - 3) **Mt. Murphy Bridge egress**
  
- III. **RMAC**
  - A. **No EDSO representative**
  - B. **Bill Deitchman – approval of 9/14/15 minutes**
    - 1) **No response**
  
- IV. **Citizen Complaints**
  - A. **Jeremy McReynolds**
  - B. **Suzie Matin**
  - C. **Bill Deitchman (?)**
  
- V. **CL News**
  - A. **CF15-5698 & CF15-5793**
  - B. **Censoring Committee**

**Wednesday November 12, 2014 @ 10:00 AM**

**Robyn Drivon/Paula Franz** *Amelia Unors*

- I. CPRAs - FOIA
  - A. CAO - Ross Branch
  - B. Process - Coordination, logging, tracking
  - C. Spreadsheet Discrepancies
  - D. EDSO
  
- II. Brown Act – Bagley Keene Act Violations
  - A. BOS Agendas
  - B. Censoring/minimizing info.
  - C. Technical Difficulties
  
- III. Obstacles - Bureaucratic Shenanigans
  - A. Communication breakdown
  - B. Resolution 113-95 v. AB1234
  - C. Fees - Paper v. electronic copies or CD
  - D. Code/Law Enforcement inconsistencies
  - E. Diverted responses/lack of response
  
- IV. Solutions – Follow up
  - A. 10/21 CPRA presentation – publish CPRAs to government website?
  - B. Transparency/Accountability
  - C. Right-to-know v. media blackout

## **8/3/15 RMAC Meeting**

**Parks & Recreation – Vickie Sanders**

### **I. Personnel Issues**

- A. Noah Rucker**
- B. RMAC minutes/Brown Act violations/Audio recordings**
- C. Conspiracy/harassment/discrimination**
- D. Remedial action**

### **II. Next RMAC Meeting**

- A. Rescheduled Date?**
- B. May 2010 Brown Act – Ciccozzi/Briggs/Mtn. Demo**
- C. Wording of agenda > Bullying**
- D. EDSO**

**May 17, 2017**

**Michael Ranalli, Bard Lower, Barry Smith (MGDP)**

- I. Coloma Lotus Fire Safe Council**
  - A. Bill Deitchman, Tim Kulton, Deborah Kruse**
  - B. CL News**
    - 1) Media**
    - 2) Rural Communities Coalition**
  
- II. Public Safety**
  - A. Trespassing**
  - B. Hang gliders**
  - C. Egress**
  - D. DOT – Cal Trans**
    - 1) Mt. Murphy Road maintenance**
    - 2) Hwy 49**
  
- III. River Management Plan (RMP = River Mafia Politics)**
  - A. RMAC representation**
    - 1) EDC Parks & Recreation**
    - 2) Falsified reports & data**
  - B. MGDP – BLM – American River Conservancy**
  - C. SUPs – Code & Law Enforcement**
  - D. Jurisdiction**
  - E. Retaliation**
  
- IV. Remedial Action**
  - A. Oaths of Office – Principle Agent Oaths of Office**
  - B. Accountability**
  - C. Follow up**