Vickie Sanders <vickie.sanders@edcgov.us>

Please post to the 7/25/17 RMAC Special Meeting Agenda

Melody Lane <melody.lane@reagan.com> Thu, Jul 20, 2017 at 1:18 PM
To: Michael Ranalli <michael.ranalli@edcgov.us>, Donald Ashton <don.ashton@edcgov.us>, Vickie Sanders <vickie.sanders@edcgov.us>, Noah Rucker-Triplett <noah.rucker-triplett@edcgov.us>, Jim Mitrisin <jim.mitrisin@edcgov.us>
Cc: Roger Trout <roger.trout@edcgov.us>, Vern R Pierson <vern.pierson@edcgov.us>, edc.cob@edcgov.us, shiva.frentzen@edcgov.us, john.hidahl@edcgov.us, sue.novasel@edcgov.us, brian.veerkamp@edcgov.us, James Williams <james.williams@edcgov.us>, brian.shinault@edcgov.us, gary.miller@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us

Please ensure the attached documents are publicly posted to the 7/25/17 RMAC Agenda along with the entirety of this correspondence.

It is significant that certain RMAC members are in violation of the Brown Act and their Principal Agent Oaths of Office. Equally important is the 5/16/17 CAO memo recommending that the RMAC be dissolved by the end of 2017. Multiple audio recorded meetings with Vickie Sanders and consultant Steve Peterson validate the fact the decision to "disempower RMAC" had been made over two years ago. In the interim RMAC has been conducting serial meetings for the purpose of maintaining their control and influence over the River Management Plan with Nate Rangel remaining as the RMAC chairman.

Note as well the minutes of the 7/10/17 RMAC meeting have not yet been publicly posted, nor was a response ever received from county staff concerning the **May 26, 2016 Special Meeting requested by Nate Rangel** scheduled to be held at 6:00 PM in the MGD Park Museum. Although the 5/26/16 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. Since then the previously posted minutes have disappeared from the government website. The audio of that Special Meeting 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.

The 6/22/17 Planning Commission Agenda Item #4 was posted on Legistar as a workshop and falsely promoted by Nate Rangel as a hearing. There was no discussion or action taken by the Planning Commission. In actuality it was nothing more than a government charade.

In the interest of public transparency and accountability, an explanation is also in order as to why this meeting is again being held in the MGD Park Museum instead of the customary BOS chambers.

Melody Lane

Founder – Compass2Truth

"It is not what a lawyer tells me I may do; but what humanity, reason, and justice tell me I ought to do. ~ Edmund Burke, Second Speech on Conciliation, 1775 ~

2 attachments

BOS CAO Memo 5-16-17 (2) (1).pdf
553K

Ranalli Pre-letter 6-26-17.pdf
9108K

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.

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
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.

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, bostwo@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 9th 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 Discover State Historic Park Museum Building 310 Back St. Coloma, Ca *Special Meeting*	Meeting details	Agenda		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 27th 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 14th 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.*
>
> *Whomever 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 agendize 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 (7th 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 inconsistences 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 14th 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,

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 MGDP 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

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

5/16/17 BOS 1t 6

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 MGDP 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

EXHIBIT D

Wednesday November 12, 2014 @ 10:00 AM

Robyn Drivon/Paula Franz / Pamela Knorr

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

EXHIBIT E-1

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

EXHIBIT E-2

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

EXHIBIT F