

E. Veerkamp Open Forum  
3-25-14

To the Board of Supervisors March 25, 2014

I would like to make an observation about an item on the March 18, 2014 Board of Supervisors' Agenda and its subsequent Minutes.

Item, 14-0129 began with a request from the CAO's Office that:

1. Staff establish a Development Agreement Negotiating **Team** consisting of representatives from the CAO, County Counsel, and Community Development Agency.
2. **Team** is to negotiate a draft term of a Development Agreement with each project applicant.
3. **Staff** is to return to BOS with a draft Development Agreement prior to, or as part of, hearings for proposed projects.

However, on page 11 of the Minutes (draft) a motion to deny this request was passed.

On page 12, item 14-0129 appears again, stated exactly as it appeared on the previous page.

This time the motion reads: A motion was made by Supervisor Santiago, seconded by Supervisor Veerkamp to direct staff to work with the Board of supervisors, to include Supervisor Veerkamp, to **establish a framework to define the County Benefit Community Agreement**. This motion was passed.

If 14-0129 does not at all mention a "framework" or a "County Benefit Community Agreement" how can a motion to establish one be made? There is no explanation in either the agenda or the minutes as to what this is. How can this new topic be voted upon without providing a written explanation and notice to the public? This appears to a reader to be a new topic and one not previously mentioned in any part of any agenda item.

Is this a violation of the Brown Act?

Please consider this a formal Public Records Act Request to provide documentation stating that voting on this new, un-noticed, topic is not a Brown Act Violation.

Thank you,

Evelyn Veerkamp  
3047 Lewis St.  
Placerville, CA 95667