

- ☐ III. The Board of Supervisors has received the following items of correspondence which require no official action by the Board at this time:



# County of Santa Cruz

## HOUSING ADVISORY COMMISSION

701 Ocean Street, Room 418, Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Liaison (831) 454-2332

[cdi.santacruzcountyca.gov/Planning/Housing/HousingAdvisoryCommission\(HAC\).aspx](http://cdi.santacruzcountyca.gov/Planning/Housing/HousingAdvisoryCommission(HAC).aspx)

### HOUSING ADVISORY COMMISSION 2024 Attendance Report

Housing Advisory Commission regular meetings are held from 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. on the first Wednesday of every odd month (or the second Wednesday in case of a holiday). Meeting dates shown in strike-out text were cancelled. Meetings are held in person in at the County Government Center, 701 Ocean Street, in the Coastlines Meeting Room on the 5<sup>th</sup> Floor.

#### Calendar Year 2024

~~January 10, 2024~~

~~July 10, 2024~~

March 6, 2024

~~September 11, 2024~~


May 1, 2024

~~November 6, 2024~~

HAC meeting attendance in 2024 was as follows:

| District | Commissioner                | Jan | Mar | May | Jul | Sept | Nov |
|----------|-----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|
| 1        | Sibley Simon (Chair)        | C   | A   | C   | C   | C    | C   |
| 1        | John Flaniken               | C   | P   | C   | C   | C    | C   |
| 2        | Bud Carney                  | C   | P   | C   | C   | C    | C   |
| 2        | Kate Minott                 | C   | P   | C   | C   | C    | C   |
| 3        | Bo Aucion                   | C   | P   | C   | C   | C    | C   |
| 3        | Amanda Harris-Altice        | C   | P   | C   | C   | C    | C   |
| 4        | Bianca Alvarez              | C   | A   | C   | C   | C    | C   |
| 4        | Rose Marie McNair           | C   | P   | C   | C   | C    | C   |
| 5        | Kent Washburn               | C   | A   | C   | C   | C    | C   |
| 5        | Bryan Chambers (Vice-Chair) | C   | P   | C   | C   | C    | C   |

**A = Absent; C = Cancelled Meeting; P = Present; V = Vacant**

Submitted by:   
ED40962149CE4E6...  
**Suzanne Isé, HAC Liaison**

**January 31, 2025**

## IHSS Advisory Commission 2024 Attendance Roster

| Name                   | Affiliation                    | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Foster Andersen        | Consumer (A)                   | E   | X   | X   | X   | C   | X   | E   | E   | E   | C   |
| Michael Molesky        | Consumer (A)                   | E   | X   | X   | X   | C   | E   | E   | X   | E   | C   |
| Linda Campbell         | Consumer (A)                   | X   | X   | X   | X   | C   | X   | X   | X   | X   | C   |
| Jozett Irgang          | Consumer (A)                   | E   | X   | X   | E   | C   | X   | X   | E   | E   | C   |
| Christine Kiebert-Boss | Consumer (A)                   | X   | X   | X   | X   | C   | X   | X   |     |     |     |
| Stephanie Auld         | Consumer (A)                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | X   | X   | C   |
| Vacant                 | Consumer (A)                   | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Maria Arreola          | Provider (B)                   | X   | X   | X   | X   | C   | A   | X   | X   | X   | C   |
| Patricia Fohrman       | Provider (B)                   | X   | X   | X   | X   | C   | X   | R   | R   | R   | R   |
| Vacant                 | Provider (B)                   |     |     |     |     |     |     | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Lois Sones             | Seniors Commission (C)         | X   | X   | X   | X   | C   | E   | X   | X   | E   | C   |
| Becky Taylor           | Commission on Disabilities (C) | X   | X   | X   | X   | C   | X   | X   | X   | X   | C   |
| Stephanie Auld         | Family Member of Consumer (C)  | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | C   | X   | X   |     |     |     |
| Christine Kiebert-Boss | Family Member of Consumer (C)  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | X   | X   | R   |
| Vacant                 | Family Member of Consumer (C)  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | n/a |

Key:

- X = Present
- E = Excused
- A = Absent
- R = Resigned
- n/a = Not yet appointed
- C = meeting cancelled



# County of Santa Cruz

## Water Advisory Commission

701 Ocean Street, Room 312, Santa Cruz, CA 95060

(831) 454-2022 TDD/TTY - Call 711 [www.scceh.com](http://www.scceh.com)

[EnvironmentalHealth@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:EnvironmentalHealth@santacruzcounty.us)



**2024**

### SANTA CRUZ COUNTY WATER ADVISORY COMMISSION

#### Attendance Report

| <b>2024</b>      | 1ST<br>DISTRICT  | 2ND<br>DISTRICT | 3RD<br>DISTRICT | 4TH<br>DISTRICT | 5TH<br>DISTRICT | PUBLIC<br>WATER | SMALL<br>SYSTEMS |
|------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
|                  |  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                  |
|                  | CHEAP  | PEREYRA         | WILSON          | LOCKWOOD        | LARGAY          | Gillespie       | LEGO             |
| Feb. 7,<br>2024  | P  | P               | P               | P               | P               | P               | P                |
| April 3,<br>2024 | P  | P               | P               | P               | P               | E               | P                |
| June 12,<br>2024 | E  | P               | P               | P               | P               | P               | P                |
| Aug. 7,<br>2024  | P  | P               | P               | P               | P               | P               | P                |
| Oct. 2,<br>2024  | P  | P               | P               | P               | P               | P               | E                |
| Dec. 4,<br>2024  | A  | P               | P               | E               | P               | P               | P                |
|                  | <div>Indicates attendance at that meeting</div> <div>Excused from meeting</div> <div>Absent from meeting</div> |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                  |
| P                |  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                  |
| E                |  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                  |
| A                |  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                  |

Submitted by Sierra Ryan

Staff Liaison to the Water Advisory Commission

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please pass a ban against train horns on personal vehicles or personal use in public settings.  
**Date:** Thursday, January 30, 2025 1:29:27 PM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Cameron King [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2025 12:38 PM  
To: Board Of Supervisors <[boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov](mailto:boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov)>  
Cc: [contact@chasesantacruz.org](mailto:contact@chasesantacruz.org)  
Subject: Please pass a ban against train horns on personal vehicles or personal use in public settings.

\*\*\*\*CAUTION:This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Hi, I am Cameron, a resident of Santa Cruz County and I would like to pass a ban on putting train horns on personal vehicles in the county because of noise pollution concerns. While they are technically illegal to use statewide, there are no laws exist against installing them onto personal vehicles. I have a major concern about noise pollution on our roadways. People live away from train tracks because they don't like the sound of trains and their horns. And on a train is where such horns belong. They do not belong on our roadways or in any public setting. A train horn could really frighten someone, and even could damage their hearing. They cause unnecessary loud noise which in turn causes unnecessary stress, fright, shock, and even hearing loss. They could also cause someone to get into an accident or fall down and hurt themselves. Because of what I mentioned, train horns on personal vehicles should be banned outright in Santa Cruz County.

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please pass a restriction on amplified sound in public spaces  
**Date:** Monday, February 3, 2025 11:56:59 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Cameron King [REDACTED]  
Sent: Friday, January 31, 2025 4:13 PM  
To: Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
Subject: Please pass a restriction on amplified sound in public spaces

\*\*\*\*CAUTION:This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Hi I am Cameron, a resident of Santa Cruz County, and I would like it if we had better control on amplified sound in our public spaces. People like to enjoy their music, and there is nothing wrong with that unless they are playing it out loud - especially at a high volume. It's frustrating because it creates unreasonable disruption and noise for other people in the vicinity that they didn't ask for. I think that the restriction should be something like: "Amplified sound and music shall be allowed in public settings as long as it is not played at an unreasonably loud volume or is disturbing another person or party. Amplified sound shall also not be used as a tool to intentionally cause annoyance in another person or party or as a retaliation tactic." I think this restriction should apply to all parks, beaches, hiking areas, nature preserves, streets, scenic overlooks, swimming areas, and any other public settings.

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 63% of heavy cannabis users show memory impairment  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 4, 2025 11:04:22 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

---

**From:** Dr. Susan Gyr [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 4, 2025 10:21 AM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <[boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov](mailto:boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: 63% of heavy cannabis users show memory impairment

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Dear Supervisors, Please be aware of all the studies showing deleterious effects of cannabis and reconsider your votes. Government income at the expense of our citizens is reprehensible. Do the right thing for all of us.  
Susan Hughmanick, MD

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Medical News Today <[newsletter@newsletter.medicalnewstoday.com](mailto:newsletter@newsletter.medicalnewstoday.com)>  
**Date:** Sat, Feb 1, 2025 at 5:04 PM  
**Subject:** 63% of heavy cannabis users show memory impairment  
**To:** [REDACTED]

MEDICALNEWTODAY | DAILY NEWS



6-345x75-eml-header-mobile



## Today's News

Updated on February 1, 2025 at 8:00 a.m. PST



## [63% of heavy cannabis users show memory impairment](#)

[READ ON](#) ☐

## [How might soft drinks lead to type 2 diabetes?](#)

☐ [READ ON](#)



## [Could stopping NAD depletion be key to slowing down aging?](#)

[READ ON](#) ☐


[READ LATEST NEWS](#)



[MNT RESOURCE](#)

## [How does it work? Targeted therapy for lung](#)

**cancer**



What are targeted therapies for lung cancer, such as ALK and MET therapy? In this article, learn about the possible side effects and how these medications work.

What are targeted therapies for lung cancer, such as ALK and MET therapy? In this article, learn about the possible side effects and how these medications work.

[READ ON](#) ☐

---

**MNT REVIEWS**

**Best CBD Gummies for**

## Anxiety and Stress Relief

Unwind naturally with our selection of CBD gummies. Find your perfect match for anxiety and stress relief.



[SHOP NOW](#)

---

[NEW PODCAST EPISODE](#)

## **Brain health, sleep, diet: 3 health resolutions for 2025**

Hosted by Maria Cohut and Yasemin Nikola Sakay

For tips on getting better sleep at night, how to follow a healthful diet, and ways to incorporate more exercise into one's daily life, listen to our latest podcast episode.

[LISTEN TO THIS EPISODE](#)



---

## **Most popular with *MNT* readers**

- [What are the best ways to lose leg fat?](#)
- [Does Medicare cover oral surgery?](#)
- [What is targeted cancer therapy? Everything to know](#)

- [Signs and symptoms of a tooth infection spreading to the body](#)
- [Does Medicare Cover Eliquis?](#)

---

We'd love to hear from you in the meantime, so please send any feedback, comments, suggestions, or questions to the team [by email](#).

Reminder: Add [newsletter@medicalnewstoday.com](mailto:newsletter@medicalnewstoday.com) to your contact list so you don't miss a single update.

Kindly,

**The *Medical News Today* team**

---



You are receiving this newsletter because you subscribed on our web site, [Medical News Today](#).

Did a friend send you this email? [Subscribe here](#).

[View in Browser](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Unsubscribe](#)

*Our website services, content, and products are for informational purposes only. Medical News Today does not provide medical advice, diagnosis, or treatment and should not be used as a substitute for medical advice from a healthcare professional. Medical News Today encourages you to make any treatment decisions with your healthcare professional. Medical News Today is owned by RVO Health.*

© 2025 RVO Health  
1101 Red Ventures Drive  
Fort Mill, SC 29707



**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW:  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 11:38:03 AM

---

---

**From:** Elizabeth [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 26, 2025 10:18 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Subject:**

**\*\*\*\*CAUTION:** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. \*\*\*\*

Regarding the traffic and road near 4151 Soquel Dr in Soquel. At one time we did not have a lot of traffic, but it is out of control. People are speeding who should be cited. I believe the speed limit is too the fact that is not far from a school

And where I live there are many seniors, disabled people and children. The traffic is too fast, and to get to the signal is a struggle. Even the signal only gives 12 seconds and cars will almost run you over. We need a crosswalk in front of or near 4151 Soquel Dr. We need yellow cross walk, so we can be treated with dignity. Possibly flashing light would be ideal, or maybe the light at 41st and Soquel be longer so pedestrian have time to walk.  
Sincerely a grandmother and concerned citizens

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Border Crisis  
**Date:** Monday, February 3, 2025 11:58:31 AM

---

**From:** Greg Fontana [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 2, 2025 1:15 PM  
**To:** cob@co.monterey.ca.us; Mary Bier <mbier@pacifica.gov>; Mary Andersen [REDACTED]; Sophia Brink [REDACTED] Lizet Cortes [REDACTED]; senator.becker@outreach.senate.ca.gov; Rafeal Mandelman <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; Rosemary Kamel <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; Beverly Bigger <brbigger@sbcglobal.net>; Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Wendy Thomas <[REDACTED]>; JK Dineen <jdineen@sfnchronicle.com>; Lori Parlin <bosfour@edcgov.us>; Marci Dragun <mdragun@smcgov.org>; Pam Foley <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; Mary Rickert <mricket@co.shasta.ca.us>; Domingo Candelas <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; Amit Pal <apal@suisun.com>; Kara Meyberg Guzman <info@santacruzlocal.org>; Sophia Layne <LayneS@cabrillo.k12.ca.us>; Maria Doerr <mdoerr@menlopark.gov>; Kevin Crye <kcrye@co.shasta.ca.us>; Tim Garman <tgarman@co.shasta.ca.us>; Randie Marlow <randie@coastsidenewsgroup.com>; Brian Sagrafena <briansagrafena@gmail.com>; Noella Corzo <ncorzo@smcgov.org>; pescadero-ca@googlegroups.com; Cecilia Taylor [REDACTED] Debbie Ruddock [REDACTED]; NEIL A PANTON [REDACTED]; Kelly Platter <[REDACTED]>; Kim Calame <kim.calame@prk.sccgov.org>; Steve Arnold [REDACTED]; Elizabeth Richardson <erichardson@calwaterfowl.org>; Will Young <wyoung@smcgov.org>; Susie Castoria <scastoria@smcgov.org>; Allison Farmwald <alison@coastsidenewsgroup.com>; Mathew Clark <mrc.gcsd@gmail.com>; Maureen La Grande [REDACTED]; Hilda Solis <FirstDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov>; Lynda Brocchini <lbrocchini@pacificasd.org>; Jen Wolosin <jwolosin@menlopark.gov>; Mike Will <mike.will@prk.sccgov.org>; Mary Alexander [REDACTED] Frank Imhof <[REDACTED]>; Dan Newit [REDACTED]; Cynthia Dizikes <cdizikes@sfnchronicle.com>; p [REDACTED] Malcolm Brooks <[REDACTED]> Catherine Stefani <Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org>; Mitch Mashburn <[REDACTED]> Christine Boles <[REDACTED]> Matt Davis <matt@i-c-contracting.com>; Thomas Thompson <[REDACTED]>; Ted Panofsky [REDACTED] Ashley Harrell [REDACTED]; Tony Bayudan <tbayudan@smcgov.org>; m [REDACTED]; Dan Walsh <[REDACTED]>; Brooke Laine [REDACTED]; info@sonomaafb.org; Sonoma County Parks <parks@sonoma-county.org>; Wanda Williams <WLWilliams@solanocounty.com>; Elizabeth Bredall <ebredall@pacificasd.org>; John Hidahl <bosone@edcgov.us>; Jackie Neau <jneau@cityofplacerville.org>; Drew Combs <dcombs@menlopark.gov>; Joseph Aguilera <joseph.aguilera@prk.sccgov.org>; Bill Silverfarb <bs [REDACTED]> Megan Cassidy <megan.cassidy@sfnchronicle.com>; Kathryn Barger <Kathryn@bos.lacounty.gov>; Patrick Jones <pjones@co.shasta.ca.us>; Carmen Daniel <DanielC@cabrillo.k12.ca.us>; Sarah Dussault <sdussault@bayareanewsgroup.com>; Kai Doggett <kdoggett@pacificasd.org>; Sue Beckmeyer

<sbeckmeyer@pacifica.gov>; Princess Washington <[REDACTED]>; Harvey Rarback  
<HRarback@hmbcity.com>; Mike McClaski <[REDACTED]>; Warren Slocum  
<wslocum@smcgov.org>; Deborah Penrose <DPenrose@hmbcity.com>; April Smith  
<april.smith@prk.sccgov.org>; Mary Moseley <mary@coastsidenewsgroup.com>; Dave Pine  
<dpine@smcgov.org>; David Cohen <district4@sanjoseca.gov>; Betty Nash  
<bnash@menlopark.gov>; Micheal Richardson <mrichardson@smcgov.org>; Devora Davis  
<district6@sanjoseca.gov>; Demian Bulwa <demian.bulwa@sfchronicle.com>; Kurtis Alexander  
<kalexander@sfchronicle.com>; Don Rocha <Don.rocha@prk.sccgov.org>; Monica Brown  
<MEBrown@solanocounty.com>; Tim Nelson <[REDACTED]>; Audrey Diaz  
<audrey.diaz@prk.sccgov.org>; Sara Colby <scolby2519@outlook.com>; Johnnie Hamiltone  
<ridinjohnnie@yahoo.com>; Kent German <kent.german@sfgate.com>; Dean Preston  
<prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Barbara Dye <bdye@granada.ca.gov>; Sergio Jiminez  
<district2@sanjoseca.gov>; Alec Regimbal <alec.regimbal@sfgate.com>; Debra King  
<debra.king@prk.sccgov.org>; Aaron Peskin <Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org>; Robert Brownstone  
<RBrownstone@hmbcity.com>; Jason Tyler <jasonchoosesin@yahoo.com>; Jenale Dawson  
<jdawson@suisun.com>; Blen Dean <district7@sanjoseca.gov>; Joe Cameron  
<joedan@mesquitecattle.com>; San Mateo City Parks Department  
<parksandrecreation@cityofsanmateo.org>; Sue Vaterlaus <svaterlaus@pacifica.gov>;  
cmo@fairfield.ca.gov; Julie Horner <julie@slvpost.com>; George Turnboo <bostwo@edcgov.us>;  
Myrna Melgar <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Micheal Cabanatuan <mcabanatuan@sfchronicle.com>;  
Micheal Turpin <mturpin@bayareanewsgroup.com>; Dale Tobiasen <[REDACTED]>; Janice  
Hahn <FourthDistrict@bos.lacounty.gov>; Rachel Kitchens <[REDACTED]>; Lindsey Horvath  
<Thirddistrict@bos.lacounty.gov>; Josie Ruddach <josie.ruddach@prk.sccgov.org>;  
[REDACTED] Holly Mitchell <HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov>; Nancy Marsh  
<nmarsh@granada.ca.gov>; Michael Ewing <cougar\_biggamehounds@yahoo.com>; Matt Dorsey  
<DorseyStaff@sfgov.org>; Kathy Troike <[REDACTED]>; St. John Smith  
<st.john.smith@sfchronicle.com>; Pacifica Police Department <police@pacificapolice.org>; San  
Mateo Police Department <police@cityofsanmateo.org>; Sabine Sander  
<Sabine.sander@prk.sccgov.org>; Connie Chan <ChanStaff@sfgov.org>; Sylvia Arenas  
<district1@bos.sccgov.org>; Omar Torres <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; David Canepa  
<dcanepa@smcgov.org>; Mike Fisher <mfisher@sierracounty.ca.gov>;  
citycouncil@cityofsanmateo.org; Lori Jacobs <magickeko1@gmail.com>; Alma Hernandez  
<ahernandez@suisun.com>; Marlon Osum <[REDACTED]>; Kathleen Moazed  
<kmoazed@smcgov.org>; prcommission@cityofsanmateo.org; Sheila Bowen  
<[REDACTED]>; Cindy Chavez <Cindy.Chavez@bos.sccgov.org>; [REDACTED]  
Peter Tokofsky <peter@coastsidenewsgroup.com>; Sally Bella <[REDACTED]>; Mark  
Lacey <media@calcattlemen.org>; Marisol Escalera <sanderson1@smcgov.org>; Cindy Crowe  
[REDACTED]; Micheal O'neil <mjoneill@smcgov.org>; Stephanie Anderson  
<mdurani@smcgov.org>; Jeremy Farr <jeremy.farr@prk.sccgov.org>; Yarbrough  
<dyarbrough@cityofplacerville.org>; [REDACTED] Stephen Hallett  
<SHallett@solanocounty.com>; John Vasquez <jmvasquez@solanocounty.com>; Jennifer Hamilton  
<jhamilton@solanocounty.com>; Daniel Bennett <dgbennett@smcgov.org>; Mary Bordi  
<maryabordi@gmail.com>; Grant Marek <grant.marek@sfgate.com>; Daniel Tichenor  
<datich3@aol.com>; Lisa Nash <[REDACTED]>; Shannon Hagan  
<shagan@cityofsanmateo.org>; Shannon Walton <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Chris Kelstrom

<ckelstrom@co.shasta.ca.us>; Len Beato <lbeato@smcgov.org>; Madilynne Medina <Madilynne.Medina@sfgate.com>; Kimberly Hines <[REDACTED]>; Tara Duggan <tduggan@sfnchronicle.com>; Susana Guerrero <susana.guerrero@sfgate.com>; Buie, Donald <[REDACTED]>; Rae Mueller <rmueller@smcgov.org>; Deborah Dowling <[REDACTED]>; Zack Falcon <[REDACTED]>; Nicole Gotberg <ngotberg@cityofplacerville.org>; Rick Roberti <[REDACTED]>; Matt Mahon <mahon@sanjoseca.gov>; Erin Hannigan <ehannigan@solanocounty.com>; Dan Borenstein <dborenstein@bayareanewsgroup.com>; Jim Grant <jgrant@granada.ca.gov>; Half Moon Bay Review <customerservice@coastsidenewsgroup.com>; Nidhi Patel <nidhi.patel@hillsborough.net>; Protect The Harvest Protect The Harvest <info@sanmateorcd.org>; Alix Winston <AWinston@solanocounty.com>; Arjun Batra <district10@sanjoseca.gov>; Anthony Riccardi <ariccardi@cityofsanmateo.org>; Katie Roberts <katier@calcattlemen.org>; Sharon Rye <publisher@bayareanewsgroup.com>; Tessa Mclean <tessa.mclean@sfgate.com>; so.website@shf.sccgov.org; Jasette Lacey <jmlacey@solanocounty.com>; Timothy Karoff <timothy.karoff@sfgate.com>; Peter Ortiz <district5@sanjoseca.gov>; Hillary Ronen <RonenStaff@sfgov.org>; Nuala Bishari <Nuala.Bishari@sfnchronicle.com>; Frank Pine <editor@bayareanewsgroup.com>; Micheal Wilson <mwilson@solanocounty.com>; Ken Leiboff <kleiboff@me.com>; John Clerici <jclerici@cityofplacerville.org>; Sophia Bollag <Sophia.Bollag@sfnchronicle.com>

**Subject:** Border Crisis

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

The border crisis and inflation are serious issues at the fault of The Biden/Harris presidency. Harris was put in charge of the southern border but failed. In 2013 I found a major foreign drug cartel operation living above The Lobitos Creek Bridge that drained into Martins Beach in Half Moon Bay CA while running hounds for predator deterrent that I reported when helping my father run cattle on Mid Peninsula Regional Open Space District property that local authorities ignored for 3 years after I reported it. I walked authorities into the environmentally contaminated area and personally showed it to them. Open Space did nothing. Other neighbors were reporting the issue also, so it was finally raided a few years later. CA State Department of Fish and Wildlife officers warned us that we should not be back there without carrying firearms for our own personal protection because the drug cartel operation was linked to a very dangerous well organized drug cartel south of the border. This was kept quiet with our local news media because authorities claimed they did not want to receive

any bad publicity.

Open Space ranch policies also contributed to the drug cartel issue due to over-regulating the ranchers under The Mid Pen Ordinances, neglecting a major mountain lion problem, and not letting the cattle drink out of the creek. People need to better understand Rural America. Harris is from The SF Bay Area so she is affiliated with the same SF Bay Area authorities who have already failed themselves, their supporters, the CA voters, taxpayers, wildlife, agriculture, and public safety in our SF Bay Area Open Space. The border crisis is all around us; in our local creeks, our pockets, and city streets. Harris most likely would have destroyed Rural America by further regulating rural communities which would have driven up consumer costs and inflation so she lost.

Trump understands Rural America and what it takes to truly feed a nation. Biden/Harris does not. Biden was proven by his own political party to be dysfunctional, so they got rid of him. Was Harris hiding Biden's dysfunctional incompetency all along or was she blind of it? If Harris was just trying to be polite and not say anything, then she should also be partly held accountable for the disaster in Afghanistan that killed good American soldiers and handed over billions of dollars in modernized American weapons to one of the most dangerous terrorist organizations in the world who went from a primitive gorilla type army to a modern day war machine thanks to the failed Biden/Harris presidency.

Harris never offered any solution for the rural community crisis so Rural America determined the outcome of the 2024 election. It's time for the urban democratic crime infested sanctuary cities to wake up. Rural America is sick of being stepped on and ignored. The democratic party has failed Rural America, (like our SF Bay Area Open Space) which has caused consumer costs to rise, and food production to shrink. Without Rural America the pavement people will starve.

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: SO PROUD OF YOU ALL and our precious, inclusive and protective County!  
**Date:** Thursday, January 30, 2025 9:55:34 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Molly Ording [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2025 9:21 AM  
To: Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
Subject: SO PROUD OF YOU ALL and our precious, inclusive and protective County!

\*\*\*\*CAUTION:This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Dear Supervisors!

Please accept our very deeply felt appreciation & admiration for your strong and clear message regarding our County's values and your/our determination to protect them!

I am always so grateful and proud to be a resident of this amazing County but now, even more-so, in the face of this recent stream Of hate and intolerance emanating from the White House! We are gratefully counting on your continued strength, resilience and determination. Let us all rededicate ourselves and our actions to protecting our freedoms and the freedoms of those among us who have struggled to live in peace and privacy and prosperity!!! May it ever be so! Thank you so much!

Most sincerely,  
MOLLY & MICKEY ORDING  
[REDACTED]  
Capitola, Ca. 95010

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Protecting communities, human and non-human  
**Date:** Monday, February 3, 2025 11:56:22 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Nichole Ousley [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2025 10:45 PM  
To: Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
Subject: Protecting communities, human and non-human

\*\*\*\*CAUTION: This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Hello all,

I hope this reaches you, and finds you all well.

My name is Nichole and I am a resident of Aptos. As someone who cares deeply for the well-being of our planet, and all life that makes Earth so special, I understand the need for renewable energy and the trial-and-error that inevitably comes along with that pursuit. It is, however, unacceptable that the price for negligence occurring within BESS facilities is being paid for with human and animal life and health. Our communities, human and non-human, deserve our protection and it is our responsibility to defend and speak for those without a voice. When you think about a future worth looking forward to, please don't let it destroy that which is struggling to survive already right now, when no amount of money can bring it back. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Nichole

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: silencing pain  
**Date:** Thursday, January 30, 2025 9:56:21 AM

---

---

**From:** Nita nita [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 12:14 PM  
**To:** citycouncil@santacruzca.gov; Board Of Supervisors  
<boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** silencing pain

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Dear elected officials,

We in the community know that a Black man lit himself on fire last week as a statement, a message. I am writing to call you out to make this news known, not his identity, that is not the point. This person, had the courage, and selflessness to deliver this painful message that has been squashed, silenced by all of you. That he is a Black man, a member of our community, and being silenced, is even more egregious.

It is your responsibility to lead a community through painful and challenging times like this and to honor his act by acknowledging it not hiding it. You can protect his identity and do him honor as well.

Please have the courage yourselves to look at what this act

means and walk with all of us through it.

Sincerely,

Nita Hertel



**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Response to Trump's threats to sanctuary cities  
**Date:** Thursday, January 23, 2025 1:52:32 PM

---

---

**From:** Peter Gelblum [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 23, 2025 12:09 PM  
**To:** Tony Condotti (tcondotti@abc-law.com) <tcondotti@abc-law.com>; Jason Heath <Jason.Heath@santacruzcountyca.gov>; City Council <citycouncil@cityofsantacruz.com>; citycouncil@watsonville.gov; cityclerk@watsonville.gov; Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>; szutler@bwslaw.com  
**Subject:** Response to Trump's threats to sanctuary cities

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Dear elected officials and counsel - I want to make sure that you're all aware of this analysis, which demonstrates that you are protected by the law in establishing and maintaining your jurisdictions as sanctuaries. <https://nipnlg.org/sites/default/files/2025-01/DOJ-AFL-response.pdf>.

The ACLU is preparing its own analysis, which I will forward when I get it. Thank you for your work in protecting our immigrant residents

--

Peter Gelblum  
Chair, Santa Cruz County Chapter  
ACLU of Northern California

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Response to Trump's threats to sanctuary cities  
**Date:** Monday, January 27, 2025 1:17:12 PM

---

---

**From:** Peter Gelblum [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 23, 2025 5:04 PM  
**To:** Tony Condotti (tcondotti@abc-law.com) <tcondotti@abc-law.com>; Jason Heath <Jason.Heath@santacruzcountycal.gov>; City Council <citycouncil@cityofsantacruz.com>; citycouncil@watsonville.gov; cityclerk@watsonville.gov; Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountycal.gov>; szutler@bwslaw.com  
**Subject:** Re: Response to Trump's threats to sanctuary cities

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

And here is the ACLU's memo on the same topic: <https://www.aclu.org/documents/aclu-letter-and-memo-on-the-trump-administrations-legally-baseless-threats-against-state-and-local-officials>.

Peter Gelblum  
Chair, Santa Cruz County Chapter  
ACLU of Northern California

On Thu, Jan 23, 2025 at 12:09 PM Peter Gelblum <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear elected officials and counsel - I want to make sure that you're all aware of this analysis, which demonstrates that you are protected by the law in establishing and maintaining your jurisdictions as sanctuaries. <https://nipnlg.org/sites/default/files/2025-01/DOJ-AFL-response.pdf>.

The ACLU is preparing its own analysis, which I will forward when I get it. Thank you for your work in protecting our immigrant residents

--

Peter Gelblum  
Chair, Santa Cruz County Chapter  
ACLU of Northern California

--

Peter Gelblum

Chair, Santa Cruz County Chapter

ACLU of Northern California

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Social Housing Emerging in Cities Needs Local Govt Support  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 11:42:27 AM

---

---

**From:** Priscilla Williams [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 28, 2025 6:40 PM  
**To:** citycouncil@cityofsantacruz.com; Board Of Supervisors  
<boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** Social Housing Emerging in Cities Needs Local Govt Support

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Six cities and a county have initiated social housing programs to provide permanently affordable, publicly owned, and controlled housing for lower and middle-income working families.

[Social Housing Emerging in Cities Needs Local Govt Support - CounterPunch.org](#)

Respectfully submitted,  
Priscilla Williams

## **LEGAL NOTICE**

### **TO:**

Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors  
Santa Cruz County Assessor-Recorder's Office  
Santa Cruz County Counsel  
Santa Cruz County Department of Information Services  
All Relevant County Officials

### **DATE:**

2/1/2025

**RE: Notice of Noncompliance with Assembly Bill 1785, Violation of the California Public Records Act, and Unlawful Restriction of Public Records Access – Demand for Immediate Remedial Action**

---

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

This legal notice is served to inform Santa Cruz County ("the County") that its recent actions in response to Assembly Bill 1785 (AB 1785) not only exceed the limitations set forth by the statute but also constitute an unlawful, arbitrary, and overbroad restriction on public access to government records as guaranteed by the California Public Records Act ("CPRA") (Government Code §§ 6250–6276.48) and applicable constitutional provisions. Instead of implementing targeted measures to redact only those portions of the public records that relate to the home addresses or telephone numbers of elected or appointed officials—as expressly mandated by AB 1785 and as supported by the legislative findings—the County has, through a series of internally documented communications (including, but not limited to, emails from County officials such as Sheri Thomas, Jason Hoppin, and others), chosen to remove all public access to Assessor Parcel Number ("APN") lookups, while ironically, not actually accomplishing such in further demonstration of negligence.

This action is patently inconsistent with the statutory purpose of AB 1785, which is to protect personal privacy only to the extent required, while preserving full public access to public records for all other purposes.

Moreover, the County's approach—removing links from its Geographic Information Systems ("GIS") portal while leaving the underlying data available on internal systems and accessible via third-party commercial services—misleads the public and violates both the letter and the spirit of the law.

Further compounding the problem is the involvement of elected officials in directing these policies, which raises serious conflicts of interest and undermines both transparency and accountability in government decision-making.

The County's failure to adopt a less restrictive alternative (for example, by obtaining consent from those officials who wish to allow public posting and/or by implementing a selective redaction mechanism) subjects it to immediate legal liability under multiple state and federal laws.

The purpose of this notice is to (1) detail the factual background and legal basis for the claim that the County's implementation of AB 1785 is improper; (2) set forth the various statutory, case law, and

constitutional violations that result from the County’s actions; (3) demonstrate that the actions are further tainted by improper influence and conflicts of interest among elected officials; and (4) demand the immediate restoration of proper public access to APN data and the adoption of a compliant, selective redaction system that protects the privacy of elected and appointed officials only as required by law. (5) make notice to all members of the public of such.

---

## **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

### **A. Overview of Assembly Bill 1785**

Assembly Bill 1785, as enacted and chaptered on September 25, 2024, amends Section 7928.205 of the Government Code. Under the amended provision, no state or local agency shall publicly post, on the internet, the home address, telephone number, or both the name and the assessor parcel number associated with the home address of any elected or appointed official without first obtaining that official’s written permission.

In clarifying this statute, the Legislature expressly intended to (1) protect the personal safety and privacy of public officials and their families by preventing the easy conversion of APN data into physical addresses; (2) avoid blanket removals that impede public access to records; and (3) ensure that the public’s right to inspect records, as guaranteed under the CPRA and the California Constitution (Cal. Const., art. I, § 3(b)(1)), remains robust. This includes but was not limited to :

#### **1. Avoiding Blanket Removals That Impede Access:**

AB 1785 was carefully drafted to avoid a wholesale removal of public records. Rather than eliminating access to all property-related information online, the amendment narrowly targets the aspect that could lead to a privacy breach. Public records—including those available through the county recorder or assessor during business hours—remain accessible. This ensures that transparency and the public’s right to inspect governmental records under the California Public Records Act (CPRA) are not compromised.

By clarifying the scope of what may not be posted online, the Legislature intends to “avoid blanket removals” of databases that provide necessary public access to recorded documents (Digital Democracy).

#### **2. Preserving the Public’s Constitutional Right to Access Records:**

The bill reinforces the public’s right to inspect records as guaranteed by the CPRA and by the California Constitution (Cal. Const., art. I, § 3(b)(1)). In doing so, the Legislature ensures that while personal data of officials is protected, the mechanisms for public oversight and accountability of government operations remain robust. This careful balance is central to the bill’s design—it protects individual privacy without unduly restricting access to governmental information.

Legislative documents note that the changes are “designed to ensure that the public’s right to inspect records remains robust,” even while sensitive information is shielded (LegiScan).

### **Supporting Citations:**

- LegiScan’s detailed presentation of AB 1785 provides the full amended text of Section 7928.205 and outlines the legislative rationale behind the changes.
- An analysis from Digital Democracy on AB 1785 highlights that the bill specifically targets the loophole enabling APN data to be converted into physical addresses, emphasizing the need to protect public officials’ safety and privacy.
- Additional legislative context available in committee documents underscores that the bill was crafted with the dual objectives of protecting individual privacy and preserving constitutional access to public records.

## **B. Santa Cruz County’s Implementation of AB 1785 in Contrast**

Instead of adhering to a narrowly tailored approach that restricts only the specific data elements associated with elected or appointed officials, such as neighboring Santa Clara County, Santa Cruz County has taken the drastic measure of eliminating all public APN lookups via its GIS portal.

Internal county communications indicate that this decision was made without a thorough legal analysis with support from internal parties, or any attempt to obtain the requisite written permissions from public officials.

For example, emails from county personnel—purportedly including statements such as, “Since we cannot redact the recorded maps, we would have to remove the links” (attributed to a county official, e.g. Sheri Thomas)—demonstrate a clear misunderstanding of the statutory requirements.

Similarly, other internal emails show that other parties questioned the effect of such, stating that it would knowingly burden other governmental entities and the public.

These emails unequivocally confirm by omission that the County knew, or should have known, of the available legal alternatives yet chose to apply an indiscriminate and unlawful solution.

Furthermore, despite the removal of the public link, the underlying APN data remains stored on the County’s internal systems and is still accessible through commercial third-party services and openly online, including accessible to web searches.

This reality invalidates the County’s claim that the data has been “removed” from the internet and further undermines its argument that the measure was necessary for compliance.

The juxtaposition of removing a hyperlink with leaving the data intact creates a legal fiction designed to appease statutory mandates while not truly protecting the data as purported.

---

## **III. LEGAL VIOLATIONS**

Santa Cruz County’s actions in response to AB 1785 implicate several legal violations under state law, constitutional guarantees, and federal legal standards. These include, but are not limited to:

### **A. Violations of the California Public Records Act (CPRA)**

- 1. Obligation to Provide Public Records**

The CPRA (Gov. Code §§ 6250–6276.48) mandates that all documents and writings of public agencies be made available for public inspection unless an express exemption applies. APN data, in this context, qualifies as a public record. By removing online access to this data entirely, the County has imposed a restriction that goes well beyond the limited scope intended by AB 1785. Instead of selectively redacting only the information that relates to the home addresses of elected or appointed officials, the County’s blanket removal violates the CPRA’s fundamental guarantee of public access. See, e.g., *CBS v. Block*, 42 Cal.3d 646 (1986). It clearly appears that this decision differs from other counties actions, and was directly influenced by affected county officials themselves, and or closely related parties.

- 2. Failure to Provide Notice and Adequate Access**

Government Code § 7922.545 requires that if a public record is posted on a website, the agency must direct the public to its location for inspection. The County’s removal of the public link while the data remains on internal systems open to the public through data links, and on public terminals without limitation served by “online” data, fails to meet the statutory obligation to provide reasonable public access during business hours. This not only violates the CPRA but also the spirit of open government principles entrenched in the California Constitution. Recent emails confirm the negligence of county employees as related to this extremely important nuance.

## **B. Violations of Government Code §§ 7928.205 and 7922.545**

AB 1785 amends Section 7928.205 to restrict the public posting of certain information about elected or appointed officials. However, the statute permits public agencies to post records if written permission has been obtained. By failing to pursue the available alternative of obtaining such permission, nor selectively redacting, Santa Cruz County has not only exceeded the statutory mandate but has also contravened Government Code § 7928.205(a) and (b), which provide a narrowly tailored exception for officials who consent to disclosure. This is further compounded by the County’s failure to abide by the statutory language that defines “publicly post” as an intentional communication on the internet in an unrestricted manner. The County’s actions thus represent an application of the law that is “overbroad and arbitrary.”

## **C. Constitutional Violations**

- 1. Due Process and Equal Protection**

The California Constitution guarantees the public’s right to access information concerning the conduct of government (Cal. Const., art. I, § 3(b)(1)). By indiscriminately removing online access to APN records and maps, Santa Cruz County has restricted this right in a manner that is neither narrowly tailored nor justified by a compelling state or local interest.

- 2.** This action violates the due process rights of citizens who rely on such data for purposes ranging from real estate transactions to governmental oversight. Furthermore, by treating public agencies differently from private data aggregators—who continue to provide access to APN data—the County may be subject to an equal protection challenge for imposing a burdensome regulation on the public while benefiting a select group of insiders, including it’s own officials,

employees, and closely related parties (IE ex-employees, ex-counsel, ex-officials, now in private practice and/or family members or close relationships).

### 3. **First Amendment Concerns**

Although the primary focus of AB 1785 is to protect the privacy of public officials, the County's approach raises First Amendment concerns by impeding the free flow of information that is essential for democratic governance. As noted in cases such as *City of San Jose v. Superior Court* (2 Cal.5th 608 (2017)) and *Long Beach Police Officers Assn. v. City of Long Beach*, 59 Cal.4th 59 (2014), even when public records contain sensitive information, the remedy must be narrowly tailored. Santa Cruz County's failure to do so results in an unconstitutional blanket ban on access. Recent PRA responses indicate this is systemic in its nature, with far greater consequences than AB 1785 and county officials.

### **D. Failure to Adopt the Least Restrictive Means**

A cornerstone of administrative law is the "least restrictive means" principle. In this context, AB 1785 permits alternative methods of compliance such as selective redaction or the establishment of password-protected databases accessible only to those with a legitimate need for the information. Instead, Santa Cruz County has opted for the most extreme measure available—removing all public links to APN data—which is not only unnecessary but also legally indefensible given the availability of less restrictive alternatives. This approach directly contravenes the principle articulated in *Heller v. Doe*, 509 U.S. 312 (1993) wherein the courts have held that administrative actions must be narrowly tailored to serve the government interest without imposing undue burdens on the public.

Ironically, and in demonstration of the gross negligence of the parties involved, the removal of the links failed to actually remove the county's publication of data to the internet, where it feeds to title companies and others via electronic data interchange which is publicly accessible.

In other words, the county both failed to actually accomplish what it intended in removal of all data, which itself was highly improper.

---

## **IV. ANALYSIS OF INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE INCOMPETENCE**

### **A. Evidence from County Emails**

Internal communications within Santa Cruz County, as evidenced by emails exchanged among county officials, reveal an alarming degree of administrative incompetence and disregard for the legal requirements imposed by AB 1785. For example:

- **Email from Sheri Thomas (Assessor's Office):**

In one email, Ms. Thomas stated, "Since we cannot redact the recorded maps, we would have to remove the links." This statement reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of both the statutory requirements and the technical capabilities available for targeted redaction. The law does not require the complete removal of all APN access; it only mandates that information linking an elected official's name with an assessor's parcel number be posted only with written permission. The failure to consider a selective redaction solution constitutes a clear departure from the legal mandate.

- **Email from Jason Hoppin (Communications Manager):**

Mr. Hoppin's emails further confirm or imply that the County was aware of alternative, legally acceptable methods of compliance. His inquiry indicates that there was an internal consensus that the blanket removal approach may have been damaging or excessive. Yet, no corrective measures were undertaken, further implicating the County in administrative negligence.

- **Other Internal Correspondence:**

Additional emails (as referenced in internal communications provided to us) reveal that county staff expressed concern about the implementation of the new policy, anticipating a significant increase in public inquiries and administrative burdens.

- These emails corroborate that the County's actions were taken without a full understanding of the technical and legal nuances of AB 1785, thereby exacerbating the adverse effects on public access to information, perhaps mis-advised by its own counsel and/or officials directly and personally affected, and or closely related parties to such.

## **B. Inconsistencies in the County's Representations**

Santa Cruz County has repeatedly claimed that the APN data has been "removed from the internet" in compliance with AB 1785.

However, as documented in our investigation and supported by the fact that the data remains on externally available computer systems and is available both on the county's web servers and then commercially linked through third-party commercial databases, freely available, such as onxmaps.com, the County's assertions are misleading.

The removal of a hyperlink from a public GIS portal does not equate to the removal of the underlying data from public access.

This discrepancy between the County's public statements and the actual status of the data constitutes a deceptive practice that undermines public trust and violates the fundamental principles of government transparency.

Ironically, the county is so incompetent, et-al, that it both damaged itself and other government agencies, while failing to actually accomplish what it improperly intended to do.

## **C. Administrative Overreach and the Lack of Proper Consultation**

By adopting a one-size-fits-all approach to removing APN access, the County has engaged in administrative overreach.

The statutory language of AB 1785, and clear intent, clearly provides for a mechanism whereby elected or appointed officials can choose to allow the public posting of their information through a formal opt-in process.

The County's failure to engage in any such consultation with the affected officials—not to mention its decision to bypass the available legal alternatives—demonstrates an unprincipled exercise of administrative power that fails to adhere to the requirement that any limitation on public records access be supported by findings demonstrating both the need for and the narrow tailoring of such limitations.

---

## **V. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND IMPROPER INFLUENCE**

### **A. Elected Officials' Involvement in Policy Decisions**

The involvement of elected officials in influencing the decisions surrounding the implementation of AB 1785 is especially troubling. When elected officials participate directly in shaping policies that affect the disclosure of public records—policies from which they might derive a personal benefit—the risk of conflicts of interest becomes acute. In this case, not only did certain elected officials appear to advise on the implementation strategy, but their guidance appears to have been used to justify the blanket removal of APN data. This practice is contrary to the ethical standards set forth by the California Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC), which explicitly prohibits public officials from engaging in activities where their personal interests might conflict with their official duties. See, for example, FPPC guidelines available on the FPPC website.

### **B. Role of County Counsel and Administrative Ethics**

County counsel, whose role is to provide impartial legal advice to county officials, has been implicated in the decision-making process without appropriate safeguards to prevent self-dealing. The legal opinion provided by county counsel—which seemingly supported a broad interpretation of AB 1785—has contributed to the County's overbroad implementation as expressly stated in disclosed internal emails.

Such a failure to maintain strict separation between legal advice and policy formulation undermines the integrity of the decision-making process and opens the door to subsequent legal challenges on the basis of improper influence and conflicts of interest. It further appears that other examples of such on unrelated matters are apparent, such as blanket PRA dismissals, and other self-dealing of officials and closely related parties.

### **C. Precedents and Legal Authorities on Conflicts of Interest**

In several cases, courts have held that the appearance of a conflict of interest is sufficient to disqualify a public official from participating in governmental decision-making. For instance, in *City of San Jose v. Superior Court*, 2 Cal.5th 608 (2017) the court emphasized that governmental actions must be free of any undue influence that might compromise their integrity. The County's failure to implement mechanisms to avoid such conflicts not only contravenes established legal standards but also threatens the legitimacy of the government's record-keeping functions.

The public's right to access records is fundamentally intertwined with the requirement for unbiased administrative action, and any taint of self-interest undermines this right. Amongst the most sacrosanct and fundamental core principles of governance is the identification of ownership, and taxation thereof, of real property, located within the boundaries of a county.

---

## **VI. CROSS-COUNTY COMPARISONS AND POLICY ANALYSIS**

### **A. Comparative Approaches to AB 1785**

Several other California counties have responded to AB 1785 in a manner that balances the need to protect public officials' privacy with the imperative to preserve public access to records. For example:

- **Santa Clara County's Method:**

In contrast to Santa Cruz County's blanket removal, Santa Clara County has implemented processes and techniques that allow non-sensitive APN data to remain accessible online as of 2/1/2025

**B. Santa Cruz County's Uniquely Overbroad Action**

Santa Cruz County's decision to remove all online APN access—not merely the data pertaining to elected or appointed officials—is an anomaly when compared to other jurisdictions. The overbroad removal creates unnecessary administrative burdens, as it forces citizens, businesses, and public agencies to make in-person requests for information that should otherwise be readily available online. Moreover, by effectively abandoning the technological tools that facilitate efficient public access to governmental records, the County is impeding transparency and undermining its own accountability.

---

## **VII. REMEDIES AND DEMANDS FOR IMMEDIATE COMPLIANCE**

In light of the foregoing, Santa Cruz County is hereby notified that it must immediately take remedial action to bring its policies into compliance with both the letter and the spirit of AB 1785 and the CPRA. The following steps are demanded:

**A. Immediate Restoration of Public Access**

1. **Reinstate Online APN Access:**

The County must immediately restore online access to APN data for all public records that do not fall within the exemption of elected or appointed officials' personal information. The restoration should be implemented in a manner that clearly delineates between records that are subject to the privacy protections of AB 1785 and those that are not.

2. **Selective Redaction Mechanism:**

In accordance with the statutory requirement, the County must develop and deploy a selective redaction system that allows elected or appointed officials to opt out of public disclosure of their APN data through a formal written process. This system should ensure that only the sensitive information for which permission has not been granted is redacted, while all other public records remain accessible.

**B. Obtaining Written Permission Where Appropriate**

1. **Consultation with Affected Officials:**

The County must immediately engage with all elected and appointed officials to determine whether any of them wish to provide written permission for their APN data to be publicly posted. Such consultations must be documented and the resulting consents maintained in the County's records.

2. **Transparent Public Process:**

The County must publish a clear and accessible notice on its website explaining the process by

which elected officials may either opt in or opt out of the public posting of their personal APN data. This notice should include the legal basis for the process, reference to AB 1785, and instructions for submitting written permission.

### **C. Ceasing the Misleading Practice of “Removal” Claims**

**1. Clarification of Data Availability:**

The County must immediately issue a public clarification that the removal of hyperlinks from the GIS portal does not equate to the removal of the underlying APN data from public systems. It must acknowledge that the data remains accessible through internal channels and third-party services.

**2. Corrective Communication:**

A formal retraction and correction of any previous statements or public communications that misrepresented the status of the APN data must be issued. This communication should explain the distinction between removing a hyperlink and actually removing data from the internet, and it must reaffirm the public’s right to access records.

### **D. Policy and Administrative Reforms**

**1. Internal Review of Administrative Processes:**

The County must conduct an immediate internal audit of its decision-making processes related to the implementation of AB 1785. This audit should focus on identifying any instances of improper influence or conflicts of interest involving elected officials or county counsel. The findings of this audit must be made available to the public.

**2. Revised Policy Guidelines:**

Based on the audit’s recommendations, the County must develop revised policy guidelines that ensure compliance with AB 1785, the CPRA, and all applicable constitutional and administrative law standards. These guidelines should adopt a framework that prioritizes the least restrictive means of compliance and provides clear procedures for obtaining the necessary written permissions from public officials.

**3. Training for County Staff:**

In order to prevent future misinterpretations of legal mandates, the County must implement comprehensive training for all relevant county staff on the requirements of AB 1785, the CPRA, and the proper methods for handling sensitive public records.

### **E. Legal and Equitable Relief**

Should the County fail to take the remedial actions outlined above, members of the public, reserve the right to pursue all available legal remedies, including but not limited to:

- **Filing a Mandamus Petition:**

A petition for mandamus to compel the County to restore public access to the APN data and to implement a compliant redaction system.

- **Civil Litigation:**

Filing a civil lawsuit seeking injunctive relief, statutory penalties, and any appropriate damages

for the unlawful denial of public records access and the associated administrative burdens imposed on citizens and businesses.

- **Administrative Complaints:**

Submitting complaints to state agencies charged with enforcing the CPRA and other relevant statutes, as well as to the FPPC regarding conflicts of interest and unethical conduct by elected officials and county counsel.

---

## **VIII. LEGAL ANALYSIS: WHY THE CURRENT PRACTICE IS ILLEGAL**

### **A. Statutory Interpretation of AB 1785**

The legislative history of AB 1785 clearly indicates that its purpose is to protect the personal safety and privacy of public officials by ensuring that only those individuals who consent to the public posting of their personal information have it posted online. The specific language of Section 7928.205(a) emphasizes that no state or local agency shall post the sensitive information without written permission. By removing all APN data from public online access, Santa Cruz County has not only exceeded the statutory limitation but has also disregarded the legislative intent to allow for lawful posting when consent is obtained.

### **B. Precedents Supporting the Restoration of Access**

1. **CBS v. Block, 42 Cal.3d 646 (1986):**

In *CBS v. Block*, the court held that governmental agencies must not impose restrictions on public records beyond those expressly provided by statute. Santa Cruz County's blanket removal of APN access clearly imposes an additional restriction that is unsupported by any statutory mandate.

2. **Sierra Club v. Superior Court, 57 Cal.4th 157 (2013):**

This case reinforces the principle that government data stored electronically remains subject to public records disclosure, regardless of changes in the mode of access. The County's action of removing public hyperlinks while leaving the data intact violates this principle.

3. **City of San Jose v. Superior Court, 2 Cal.5th 608 (2017):**

The court in this case underscored the importance of narrowly tailoring any limitation on public access to records, thereby supporting the argument that a blanket removal is unconstitutional when less restrictive alternatives exist.

4. **Long Beach Police Officers Assn. v. City of Long Beach, 59 Cal.4th 59 (2014):**

This decision clarifies that even when redaction is necessary, it must be done selectively and with precision. The County's failure to implement a system of selective redaction falls short of this legal standard.

### **C. Analysis of Administrative Errors and Misrepresentations**

The internal emails and communications reveal that the County was fully aware of the alternatives to blanket removal but chose not to pursue them due to either administrative haste or an unwillingness to invest in a more nuanced solution. Such actions are not only legally unsound but also indicative of a

broader pattern of administrative mismanagement that may warrant further investigation by state oversight bodies.

#### **D. Conflicts of Interest and Ethical Violations**

As discussed in Section V above, the involvement of elected officials in determining the scope of the removal raises serious questions of conflicts of interest. The FPPC guidelines require that public officials refrain from actions that might benefit their personal interests at the expense of the public. By influencing the policy in a manner that results in a more restrictive and less transparent system, the County has breached these ethical standards. The resulting conflict not only taints the decision-making process but also exposes the County to potential legal sanctions on both state and federal grounds.

---

### **IX. CONCLUSION AND DEMAND FOR COMPLIANCE**

Santa Cruz County's implementation of AB 1785—by unilaterally and indiscriminately removing all public APN lookups—is both legally indefensible and administratively imprudent. The County's actions violate the CPRA, conflict with the narrowly tailored mandate of AB 1785, and infringe upon the constitutional rights of California citizens. Moreover, the decision-making process that led to this overreach is marred by internal miscommunications, a failure to adopt the least restrictive means, and improper influence by elected officials who should instead be recusing themselves from such decisions.

**Accordingly, we demand that Santa Cruz County take the following immediate corrective actions:**

1. **Restore Online APN Access:**  
Re-establish online public access to APN data for records not subject to the privacy exemption. This restoration must be implemented immediately and accompanied by a clear explanation that only data pertaining to elected or appointed officials will be subject to selective redaction following a formal written consent process.
2. **Implement a Selective Redaction System:**  
Develop and deploy a system that allows for the selective redaction of sensitive APN data. This system should permit elected and appointed officials to provide written permission for the public posting of their data and ensure that only the sensitive information (i.e., the combination of name and APN that can reveal a home address) is withheld when such permission is not granted.
3. **Issue a Public Clarification:**  
Provide a prompt public statement clarifying that the removal of online hyperlinks from the GIS portal does not equate to the removal of the underlying data from public access, and correct any misleading representations that have been made in this regard.
4. **Conduct an Internal Audit:**  
Initiate a full internal audit of the administrative decisions that led to the blanket removal of APN data, including a review of all communications involving county officials and elected representatives. The audit findings should be made public and used to institute policy reforms that ensure future compliance with AB 1785 and the CPRA.

5. **Address Conflicts of Interest:**

Reassess the role of elected officials and county counsel in the decision-making process regarding public records access. Implement measures to ensure that future policy decisions are made in accordance with established ethical guidelines and that any potential conflicts of interest are fully disclosed and mitigated.

Failure to comply with these demands will leave us no choice but to pursue all available legal remedies, including filing a mandamus petition, initiating civil litigation for injunctive relief and statutory penalties, and filing complaints with relevant state oversight bodies.

In summary, Santa Cruz County must immediately reverse its overbroad and unlawful removal of online APN access and adopt a measured, legally compliant approach that protects public officials' privacy only to the extent required by law while preserving the public's unimpeded right to access governmental records.

---

**XI. DEMAND FOR RESPONSE**

You are hereby required to provide a written response within ten (10) business days from the date of service of this notice, detailing the steps that will be taken to restore compliance with AB 1785 and the CPRA. Failure to respond within the stipulated time period will be interpreted as a refusal to comply with the statutory and constitutional requirements, and we will proceed with the appropriate legal actions without further notice.

---

**XII. APPENDICES AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

The following documents are hereby incorporated by reference as part of this notice:

1. **Internal Email Communications:**

Copies of emails from county officials (including Sheri Thomas and Jason Hoppin) demonstrating the County's decision-making process and misrepresentations regarding the removal of APN access.

2. **Comparative Policy Statements from Other Counties:**

Documents and published statements from Ventura County and Santa Clara County showing their selective, targeted approach to implementing AB 1785 in contrast to the County's blanket removal.

3. **Statutory and Case Law Citations:**

Relevant portions of the Government Code, the CPRA, and decisions in cases such as *CBS v. Block* (42 Cal.3d 646 (1986)), *Sierra Club v. Superior Court* (57 Cal.4th 157 (2013)), *City of San Jose v. Superior Court* (2 Cal.5th 608 (2017)), and *Long Beach Police Officers Assn. v. City of Long Beach* (59 Cal.4th 59 (2014)) are appended as exhibits to support the legal analysis herein.

4. **Legislative History of AB 1785:**

Copies of the legislative counsel's digest and committee analysis documents for AB 1785, demonstrating the narrow tailoring intended by the Legislature.

5. **Public Communications and Notices Issued by the County:**

Printed copies and screenshots of the County's public website and other communications that inaccurately claim that APN data/maps of record, as per GIS and otherwise, has been removed from the internet or "online".

---

### **XIII. CONCLUDING REMARKS**

In conclusion, the actions taken by Santa Cruz County represent a clear departure from the statutory mandates and constitutional principles that govern public records access in California.

The decision to attempt to remove all online APN access without pursuing the legally available alternative of selective redaction or obtaining written permission from elected officials is not only arbitrary and overbroad but also a violation of the public's right to inspect and obtain government records. Moreover, the county didn't actually accomplish what it intended, it only made it possible for knowledgeable parties to access such information on its public facing .gov web servers, including as of and up-to 2/1/2025. Future decision to redact or restrict such further, or fail to restore link to such where no privilege exists to do so in compliance with state and federal law, while in possession of this notice, has significant and wide-reaching systemic and personal implications on the county, its officials, counsel, and employees.

Santa Cruz county's approach imposes a knowingly unnecessary burden on citizens, businesses, and other governmental entities while simultaneously failing to provide the intended privacy protection for public officials, continuing to publish and supply such information online to informed members of the public

Furthermore, the involvement of elected officials in directing this policy – and those surrounding PRA requests generally—despite clear alternatives and established legal requirements—raises serious ethical questions and creates conflicts of interest that further undermine the legitimacy of the County's actions. The misleading representations regarding the removal of data (as opposed to merely the removal of a hyperlink) exacerbate the issue, creating a facade of compliance while the data remains fully accessible through other means.

We trust that this notice, along with the supporting documentation, will prompt an immediate and thorough review of the County's policies. We demand that Santa Cruz County take all necessary steps to restore proper access to public records in a manner that is consistent with AB 1785, the CPRA, and the fundamental principles of transparency and accountability. Failure to do so will compel us to seek relief through all available legal channels.

---

### **XIV. ADDITIONAL LEGAL ANALYSIS AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS**

#### **A. Broader Policy Implications**

Santa Cruz County's overbroad approach not only harms the immediate interests of the public and elected officials but also sets a dangerous precedent. If unchecked, such administrative overreach could erode the very foundations of open government in California, resulting in increased bureaucratic

inefficiencies, greater administrative costs, and a diminished public trust in government institutions. The blanket removal of APN access undermines decades of legal precedent that supports the public's right to access governmental records and diminishes the effectiveness of modern digital systems that facilitate transparency and accountability.

## **B. Potential for Systemic Legal Challenges**

Should the County fail to remedy its actions promptly, it is anticipated that a coalition of affected parties—including private entities, concerned citizens, and even public officials—may initiate legal challenges. These challenges could take several forms:

- **Mandamus Petitions:**  
A petition for mandamus could be filed to compel the County to restore the public's access to APN data and to implement a selective redaction system that complies with both AB 1785 and the CPRA.
- **Civil Rights and Due Process Lawsuits:**  
Affected parties may file lawsuits alleging violations of the public's constitutional rights, including due process and equal protection under the law. Such litigation could potentially result in significant injunctive relief and statutory penalties.
- **Administrative Complaints:**  
Complaints may be lodged with state oversight bodies and agencies tasked with enforcing the CPRA and ensuring governmental transparency. These complaints could lead to investigations that further expose the County's administrative missteps and conflicts of interest.

## **C. Future Administrative Reforms**

The remedial measures demanded in this notice are not only essential for immediate compliance but also for the long-term reformation of County policies. Future administrative reforms should include:

- **Establishment of a Permanent Review Mechanism:**  
The County should create an independent review board tasked with overseeing all changes to public records policies. This board should include members from the public, legal experts, and representatives from affected industries to ensure that policy changes are balanced and legally compliant.
- **Enhanced Training and Oversight:**  
County employees involved in the management of public records should receive regular training on the CPRA, AB 1785, and the principles of administrative law. Furthermore, an oversight mechanism should be put in place to monitor compliance with these laws on an ongoing basis.
- **Regular Public Reporting:**  
The County should commit to regular, transparent reporting on the status of public records access, including any modifications to the system, the number of records requested, and the measures taken to protect sensitive data. Such reporting will help rebuild public trust and ensure accountability in the management of public records.

## **D. Importance of Preserving Technological Capabilities**

The evolution of digital information systems has dramatically enhanced the public's ability to access government records. By removing online APN access entirely, Santa Cruz County not only contravenes statutory requirements but also forgoes the benefits of modern technology. A balanced approach that leverages technology to provide robust public access while safeguarding sensitive information is essential. The County must recognize that the digital age demands innovative solutions—such as selective redaction and secure, permission-based access—to reconcile privacy concerns with the public's right to information.

#### **E. Ethical and Governance Considerations**

The role of elected officials and county counsel in shaping policies that affect public records must be scrutinized under strict ethical standards. The County's approach in this instance has blurred the line between private interest and public duty. It is imperative that all officials involved in policy decisions concerning public records recuse themselves when there is a potential conflict of interest. Transparency in governance is not merely a statutory requirement but a cornerstone of democratic accountability. The County must therefore adopt robust conflict-of-interest policies and enforce strict recusal protocols to prevent future abuses.

---

### **XV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Based on the foregoing, the people, respectfully prays for the following relief:

- 1. Immediate Restoration:**

An immediate order directing Santa Cruz County to restore public online access to APN data for all records not subject to the privacy exemption provided in AB 1785.

- 2. Selective Redaction Implementation:**

A declaratory and injunctive relief requiring the County to develop, implement, and maintain a selective redaction system that complies with AB 1785 and permits elected or appointed officials to provide written permission for the public posting of their sensitive data.

- 3. Correction of Misleading Statements:**

An order mandating the County to issue public corrections clarifying that the underlying APN data remains available and that the removal of hyperlinks does not constitute removal of public records.

- 4. Audit and Policy Reform:**

An order directing the County to conduct a full internal audit of its decision-making process, particularly the involvement of elected officials and county counsel in policy decisions, and to adopt remedial measures to prevent future conflicts of interest and administrative overreach.

- 5. Costs and Attorney's Fees:**

A determination that the County be held liable for all costs, including reasonable attorney's fees, incurred by [Your Name or Your Organization] in enforcing these rights and remedies.

---

### **XVI. CONCLUSION**

In summary, the actions taken by Santa Cruz County in response to AB 1785 appear to be in clear violation of state and federal law. By adopting an overbroad measure that intends to remove all online APN referenced maps and data, while not actually accomplishing such goal, rather than implementing a narrowly tailored, consent-based redaction mechanism, the County has restricted the public's right to access governmental records, as guaranteed by the CPRA and the California Constitution.

Due to its failure to accomplish such, it simultaneously, is in violation of AB 1785 continuing to make such available, despite no link directly to such, through its GIS systems and .Gov server addresses.

This overreach is further compounded by misleading public statements and the improper involvement of elected officials in the decision-making process—practices that expose the County to substantial legal liability. The county was noticed of such, and chose not to comply with a PRA regarding such.

We trust that the County will give this matter the urgent attention it deserves and take the necessary steps to correct its course. A publicly posted, written response detailing your plan for remediation is requested and will be subject to further PRA.

---

Respectfully submitted,

Members of the public

---

#### CITATIONS

- California Public Records Act, Government Code §§ 6250–6276.48.
- Government Code § 7928.205 (as amended by AB 1785) and § 7922.545.
- California Constitution, Article I, Section 3(b)(1).
- *CBS v. Block*, 42 Cal.3d 646 (1986)
- *Santa clara county webserver and GIS*

[trackbill.com](http://trackbill.com)

- .
- *Sierra Club v. Superior Court*, 57 Cal.4th 157 (2013)

[trackbill.com](http://trackbill.com)

- .
- *City of San Jose v. Superior Court*, 2 Cal.5th 608 (2017)

[trackbill.com](http://trackbill.com)

- .
- *Long Beach Police Officers Assn. v. City of Long Beach*, 59 Cal.4th 59 (2014)

[trackbill.com](http://trackbill.com)

.

- Legislative materials and committee analyses for AB 1785, as referenced in

[leginfo.legislature.ca.gov](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov)

and

[calmatters.digitaldemocracy.org](http://calmatters.digitaldemocracy.org)

---

## **XIX. NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SEEK LEGAL RELIEF**

This document constitutes formal notice of Santa Cruz County's noncompliance with AB 1785 and the CPRA. It is intended to provide Santa Cruz County with an opportunity to correct its course and restore compliance without the need for judicial intervention. However, if the County fails to act in accordance with the demands set forth herein, Members of the public, will have no alternative but to pursue all legal remedies available under state and federal law.

---

*This notice is submitted without prejudice to any and all rights and remedies available to Members of the public under applicable law, and nothing contained herein is intended as a waiver of any such rights or remedies.*

---

*End of Notice*

---

*This legal notice is provided for informational purposes and should not be construed as legal advice by any party, group or entity. Consult with legal counsel regarding the interpretation and application of these legal principles in any specific matter.*

**From:** [Caitlin Smith](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Yes Cannabis Lounges! A Lifeline for the Industry  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 11:48:47 AM

---

**From:** Lucas [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 27, 2025 8:37 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountycalifornia.gov>  
**Subject:** Yes Cannabis Lounges! A Lifeline for the Industry

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

I'm writing to urge you to support the establishment of cannabis lounges in Santa Cruz County. The legal cannabis industry in California is struggling under the weight of high taxes, overregulation, and stiff competition from the illicit market. Allowing cannabis lounges would be a meaningful step toward revitalizing this vital sector of our economy while providing new opportunities for our community.

Cannabis lounges can bring significant economic benefits to Santa Cruz. As a region known for its culture, innovation, and hospitality, these spaces could attract tourists and locals alike, generating additional tax revenue and supporting nearby businesses like restaurants and shops. They would also provide safe, regulated environments for cannabis consumption, ensuring that responsible use is prioritized and reducing the risks of public consumption or impaired driving.

By embracing cannabis lounges, Santa Cruz County can help bridge the gap between the regulated market and the challenges posed by unlicensed operators. Unique experiences like these create an incentive for consumers to choose legal options, boosting compliance and keeping dollars in the regulated economy. More importantly, these spaces can foster education and community, helping to normalize cannabis in a safe, welcoming setting that encourages responsible use.

The cannabis industry has been a significant job creator and revenue source for our state, but without innovative policies like this, its future is uncertain. By supporting cannabis lounges, you have an opportunity to strengthen our local economy and lead the way in showing how thoughtful regulation can create opportunities for growth while prioritizing public safety and community well-being.

Thank you for considering this important issue. I hope you will take this opportunity to help revitalize the cannabis industry and position Santa Cruz County as a forward-thinking leader in this space.

Sincerely,  
Lucas



**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Some ideas on cannabis lounges--Tim Delaney  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 11:02:32 AM

---

---

**From:** skitumbleweed <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 28, 2025 4:24 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <[boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov](mailto:boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Some ideas on cannabis lounges--Tim Delaney

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

You could perhaps have air purifying systems in the lounge for the workers if need be. Makes sense and may be good for other customers too that are trying the product because maybe they would not want the interference of fumes from others.

As for the arguments against, I see worn out arguments. I know of way too many people that have died from tobacco smoke. Many military veterans. And my mother was harmed as well. I could not get her to stop smoking until after the heart attack.

My own health is in stark contrast considering my usage of cannabis when I was younger. Sure I could have suffered some brain and lung harms...Not sure. I have also been exposed tremendously from industrial chemicals throughout my life too. Aside from that, like it or not my engineering work is actually on Mars. Things I touched are on another planet. Think about that. And health wise my cardio health is probably in the top 1% of men nationwide. Particularly for my age. Think about that.

Both my kids have never tried cannabis. I explained to them the harm to their young brains potentially and I wanted their brains to be better than my brain. My kids are a bit sharper than I am.

Surgery wise for me my surgeons were stunned when they worked on me. They had never seen an individual in my kind of health at my age. And like it or not in spite of my use when I was young while in college I was remarkably rough competition in a math or physics class. I was the grader for a reason. Other students did not always like the discovery that I was in their math class.

That said, I am a bit concerned about folks driving. But law enforcement campaigns to encourage concepts of sober folks driving these other folks can work. And having law enforcement engaged could make the concept of these lounges a success and learning opportunity for the community.

Tahoe, I was against this because of the ice and snow danger up there. Tourism is just not responsible and they would lose control over the situation.

We are all different. And all have different reactions. So knowledge is the better way I think. My son specifically may be too risky to ever try cannabis per his medical conditions. Whatever the case, knowledge is power and these old arguments regarding the harm I just don't buy into.

I am much more concerned regarding metals in our water, air, and land from that battery explosion.

Anyways,

You folks have a fine day.

Tim Delaney

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: cannabis lounge permits  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 11:41:53 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Judi Gremminger [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 4:33 PM  
To: Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
Subject: cannabis lounge permits

\*\*\*\*CAUTION:This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Dear Board, I have just read the letter to you concerning cannabis lounges in Santa Cruz County. What she has to say is greatly disturbing and it should be given much thought before allowing such lounges in our county. I know that marijuana use greatly impacts young people's minds and has a lasting effect. Please turn this request down. Thank you, Judi & Bob Gremminger, Ben Lomond residents

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Gotta love Kimberly De Serpa---Yep-How does Vistra make money  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 11:01:41 AM

---

---

**From:** skitumbleweed [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 28, 2025 12:28 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** Gotta love Kimberly De Serpa---Yep-How does Vistra make money

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Excellent words. Superior!!!

The issue is that there are too many angles regarding this battery disaster and the public is not informed and our state unfortunately is not controlling the matter enough.

Tim Delaney

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: I don't trust Trump's EPA for environmental testing  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 10:59:09 AM

---

---

**From:** skitumbleweed [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 28, 2025 12:12 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** I don't trust Trump's EPA for environmental testing

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Trump does not care about any Californian whether Republican or Democrat.

So I am not really interested in Federal testing. Sure they can do it. But how can I trust a Trump EPA and a bunch of Texas boys doing the testing?

That's like expecting a Federal Judge in Texas to rule in favor of my Mom who is based in California or Nevada regarding a Medicare dispute. That Texas Judge flushed the case down the drain. He was indifferent to my Mom and her issues.

So I would not expect much Federal help at all regarding this Vistra disaster. They just are not smart enough to understand that the berries they eat come from our region.

Best approach is to hatch a bunch of lawyers on them.

Tim Delaney

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: I see discrimination---Vistra  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 10:59:24 AM

---

---

**From:** skitumbleweed [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 28, 2025 12:20 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** I see discrimination---Vistra

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

First of all, how would your average low income migrant who's education also may be lower engage in any public discussions or even understand these technologies being deployed by Vistra?

I see this company as pulling a fast one on the community and the community did not understand that they needed more discussions.

Most folks don't have my Physics Degree and may not be able to articulate concerns in public meetings and my understanding is that the public didn't respond and was left out of the discussions.

Tim Delaney

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Just make sure Californian's control the testing regime  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 11:01:51 AM

---

---

**From:** skitumbleweed [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 28, 2025 12:39 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** Just make sure Californian's control the testing regime

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Trump's FDA and EPA or whatever it will be. Trust is lost right now with the Federal Government.

Have California professionals control all angles the matters of energy and Vistra.

Tim Delaney

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Vistra fire and future battery storage facilities  
**Date:** Monday, February 3, 2025 12:00:18 PM

---

---

**From:** kat [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 2, 2025 5:01 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountycalifornia.gov>  
**Subject:** Vistra fire and future battery storage facilities

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Dear Board of Supervisors:

Thank you for your efforts in regards to understanding the causes and consequences of the recent Vistra fire in Moss Landing.

I want to add my voice in urging you to continue to support the investigation of how this release of toxic chemicals has affected our air, soil, water and the impacts on agriculture, marine life, and human health and how we can prevent future fires.

Being a local public school teacher, I was distressed on Friday, the 17th with the mixed message about air quality in Santa Cruz. I would have liked a clearer message from the Santa Cruz County Department of Health and a preventative stance re: pollutants which are not measured by AQI with a recommendation from the start that children ( a vulnerable population for air pollution) be kept indoors. And I'm extremely concerned with fellow adults who have reported symptoms of sore throat, cough, metallic taste in their mouth, etc. San Jose State's findings of a spike of heavy metals in the soil is deeply worrisome in regards to how this may affect our food and water supply.

Moving forward, how can we, Santa Cruz County, work together with Monterey County, to prevent future fires at the Moss Landing site? It was disturbing to learn this had been the fourth fire in five years at the facility. I believe Vistra needs to be held accountable and I hope the \$750 gift cards to evacuees are just the beginning of their attempt to make reparations, not the end.

It's my understanding that new battery storage facilities are slated for Santa Cruz, Watsonville, and Aptos. With the world moving so quickly with new technologies it's important that we have safety plans and systems of regulation/oversight in place.

Thank you for your important work in serving our county.  
Best,

Kat Burke



**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Enjoyed Manu's comments to Mr. Watson---Vistra  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 10:59:02 AM

---

---

**From:** skitumbleweed [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 28, 2025 12:07 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** Enjoyed Manu's comments to Mr. Watson---Vistra

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

This is laughable.

I thought the smile on Manu's face when he mentioned wondering about how this was permitted was legendary.

The smoke had metals in it most likely. Of course heavy metals can be lifted into the air. Whatever it was I too could smell it outside my home at the top of Summit. And I noticed the difference in the look of the air hanging over Santa Cruz. There was inversion in your region and that inversion layer of pollution did not look like the inversion layers of pollution that I have seen before from wildfires or typical pollution in the Bay Area during winter time cold air inversion periods.

So whatever the case the company is liable. They are negligent as engineers and did not properly design their concepts for the energy industry.

Their stock compensation is a real concern. And remember these folks are not based in California. My recommendation for such sensitive growing regions that are key to world food supply is that West Coast families and their engineering relatives should be the ones steering these ships. We have the most to lose. But also Texans and the deep south have a bunch to lose too. Their own food supply is not optimum. So if they junk our environment and food supply that also harms a Texan.

Whatever the case this is ignorance all around. Maybe for such sensitive regions for food supply it is not too wise to have such plants nearby. Anyone look into sodium for instance instead of lithium? Anyone look at other options that don't have these

contamination risks. And if we must assume risk it seems like they did not have the optimum concepts deployed to contain that risk.

I just don't see the due diligence that I provided the government while an engineer at Lockheed for space missions applied here by Vistra with our food and water being at risk. It's outrageous.

**I do not trust Trump's Federal Government on environmental matters. The state of CA and counties of CA with our UC and State universities should control the environmental discussions.**

**Lawsuits are on order and lawyers need to go after their assets and stock compensation. That's my take.**

**You'd think Trump would behave like Reagan and understand the importance of food security to national security. Rounding up immigrants and poisoning our farms in a era of 50/50 demographics in the USA seems to be a recipe for causing considerable harm to the USA. It's an interesting problem we have now.**

Tim Delaney

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Urgent need for our safety: Change is essential for Lithium-Ion battery future storage AND Telone pesticide use in our County and State  
**Date:** Monday, February 3, 2025 12:01:27 PM

---

---

**From:** Kathy S [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 2, 2025 7:27 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountycalifornia.gov>  
**Subject:** Urgent need for our safety: Change is essential for Lithium-Ion battery future storage AND Telone pesticide use in our County and State

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Attn:

Manu Koenig  
Kimberly De Serpa  
Justin Cummings  
Felipe Hernandez  
Monica Martinez

Thank you for your attention to my letter here regarding a complete disturbing alarming realization that our environment including air water and soil are all being poisoned because of the Lithium-Ion fire. Additionally learning that the farming industry allows Telone pesticide on our fruits and vegetables in our county of course the salad bowl of America as well.

From what I've heard and learned recently that the storage was too compact and stacked there are other ways to store the battery packs. Also there is a lot of open space away from agricultural and the ocean where our food sources our primary and this local lovely beautiful area that we live in. Why are we allowing the poisoning of our food and destroying our environment with careless storage facilities.

Please do not allow any more of these facilities locally there are so many other options in California that would not impact our food source or any community close by with all the open space that we have why has this been permitted?

Telone pesticide is outlawed in 40 other countries so why is California farming and agricultural allowing this? There are other options I'm sure and we can adopt those ideas from cleaner living communities whether it's Europe or new science ideas.

Please gather a group of environmentalist and scientists and experts to adopt this change.

I am grateful for your service to our community I feel sure that you agree how important this is so please let me know if I can sign something to go take this further and join in a crusade a peaceful process.

Sincerely with gratitude

Katherine Sparrow

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Cummings---You bet!!! Who pays??!  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 11:02:01 AM

---

---

**From:** skitumbleweed [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 28, 2025 12:51 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** Cummings---You bet!!! Who pays??!

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

And more good comments.

Drag Trump down here and let him talk to the surfing community. Who pays for the testing in regards to this Vistra mess. I say Vistra for sure. And possibly the Federal Government. Our region should not have to foot the bill.

Let Trump talk to a bunch of men with wetsuits on and surfboards about toxic metal in their food. And let Kelly Slater think about that angle too.

That's uncomfortable. My advice to Trump is don't show up in a power suit for the discussion. Let Donald shake hands with a kid that just came out of the water with the seal or otter in the background. Let Donald struggle to explain to that kid that he will somehow get Vistra and the Federal Government to foot the bill to clean up the food supply and soil in our region for the benefit of that kid who surfs.

Tim

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: A divided military loses on the battlefield--LBGTQ  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2025 11:02:10 AM

---

---

**From:** skitumbleweed [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 28, 2025 2:41 PM  
**To:** Board Of Supervisors <boardofsupervisors@santacruzcountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** A divided military loses on the battlefield--LBGTQ

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Tis the thing Donald Trump does not understand.

How can our military have lethality to defend us when the intelligence community is hollowed out, defense sector has no creativity, FBI doesn't exist, and lastly our entire military of all walks of life do not trust or appreciate one another.

A U.S. military that hates one another and that has nothing worth fighting for is a losing military. No American parent wants their kid in that.

I can assure you Vladimir Putin loves Trump. Vladimir Putin feared all the other Presidents, Republican or Democrat.

I don't see the economic or military value in causing so much suffering to migrants or the LBGTQ community. His strategies make no sense whatsoever for the security of the American people and do nothing more but hand the advantage to all our enemies. It's unprecedented and hateful. Astounding to me.

I am the real war hawk in the room. All American people have a contribution to American society and to all of our peace and prosperity. Somehow I can't imagine how Ronald Reagan would behave in such a way. Especially when confronted with demographics and numbers in today's technology world. Our top military is well aware of the quality of potential recruits. Many LBGTQ folks are in excellent physical condition. You need excellent physical condition and a modern education to function in our military. Expecting a contingent of southern brainwashed white boys to be the backbone of our society and military is highly unrealistic. Ronald Reagan would see that just like he saw

the value of farmers when he was confronted with immigration. Today we need immigrants even more. And we cannot afford to turn away any American that has physical or education abilities for military service. Doing so starves our military of lethality and technology advantage. And that is a bogus cost to society that we all cannot afford. It would be so much better to have all these migrant labor folks for farming and all sorts of land work that needs to be done in our communities. So it's a huge cost. And we are all getting older like other nations. It would be better to have them stay and have legal status paying into our tax systems in my view over spending so much money to harass communities while rounding people up. Not to mention fear and anxiety in just sending a kid to school for instance. So I see huge ignorance with the Trump administration.

Securing the border is one issue. Large expulsion? That is a whole different ball game.

I see no military or economic value whatsoever. Only harm and strained relations with other nations. And this plays into Putin's hand in total. That's my view.

Thank you so much for all your hard work.

Tim Delaney



**SANTA CRUZ**  
COUNTY OFFICE OF  
**EDUCATION**  
DR. FARIS SABBAH • SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

**BOARD OF EDUCATION**

Mr. Ed Acosta  
Mr. Edward Estrada  
Mr. Greg Larson  
Ms. Sue Roth  
Mr. Abel Sanchez  
Mr. Bruce Van Allen  
Ms. Rachel Williams

400 Encinal Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 ♦ Tel (831) 466-5600 ♦ Fax (831) 466-5607 ♦ [www.santacruzcoe.org](http://www.santacruzcoe.org)

## **WILLIAMS SETTLEMENT LEGISLATION**

### **ANNUAL REPORT FOR SANTA CRUZ COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS 2024-2025 FISCAL YEAR**

The Williams Settlement Legislation requires the County Superintendent of Schools to annually monitor and report on schools ranked by the CDE as CSI/ATSI, Teacher Credentialing Issues, and Graduation Rate (California Department of Education's Website)

<https://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/ce/wc/wmsschools.asp>

The Santa Cruz County Superintendent of Schools and staff at the Santa Cruz County Office of Education are responsible for:

1. Determining if students have “sufficient” standards-aligned instructional materials in four core subjects areas (English language arts, mathematics, history/social science and science), including science laboratory equipment in grades 9-12, and, as appropriate, in foreign languages, and health;
2. Determining if there is any facility condition that “poses an emergency or urgent threat to the health or safety of pupils or staff”;
3. Determining if the school has provided accurate data on the annual School Accountability Report Card (SARC) related to the sufficiency of instructional materials and the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of school facilities;
4. Ensuring that a Uniform Complaint Process (UCP) policy is in use and UCP notices are posted in all classrooms and in administrative offices; and
5. Determining if there are any Teacher Mis-Assignments or Teacher Vacancies at these schools.

This report presents the results of our visits and review at Pajaro Valley Unified School District, Delta, Santa Cruz City Schools, San Lorenzo Unified, Pacific District, and SCCOE for the period of August - October 2024. The following schools were visited, and a complete Site Summary Report and Facilities Inspection Tool for each school has been included with this annual Report for submission to Districts and COE Board Members and Superintendents.

| <b>District</b> | <b>School</b>                    | <b>Principal</b>   | <b>Facilities Rating</b> | <b>Facilities Percentage</b> | <b>Instr. Materials Insufficiencies</b> |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| SCCS            | Bayview Elementary               | Renee Golder       | Good                     | 98.30                        | None                                    |
| PVUSD           | Calabasas Elementary             | Todd Westfall      | Good                     | 83.4                         | None                                    |
| Charter (SCCS)  | Delta High School                | Jen Gebbie Ra'anan | Exemplary                | 100                          | None                                    |
| PVUSD           | E. A. Hall Middle                | Mary Ann Hilton    | Good                     | 95.98                        | None                                    |
| PVUSD           | MacQuiddy Elementary             | Sarah Pearman      | Good                     | 96.88                        | None                                    |
| Pacific         | Pacific Elementary               | Eric Gross         | Exemplary                | 100                          | None                                    |
| PVUSD           | Pajaro Valley High               | Todd Wilson        | Good                     | 98.13                        | None                                    |
| PVUSD           | Rolling Hills Middle             | Selene Munoz Casas | Exemplary                | 100                          | None                                    |
| SLVUSD          | San Lorenzo Valley Middle School | Shanna Urbancic    | Exemplary                | 100                          | None                                    |
| SCCOE           | Career Advancement Charter       | Denise Sanson      | Exemplary                | 100                          | None                                    |

**Our findings for each are as follows:**

**Instructional Materials**

The team found that all students had access to sufficient instructional materials, including textbooks, in the core subject areas (including science laboratory materials at the secondary schools). All nineteen schools reviewed for instructional materials/textbook sufficiency fully complied with the Williams settlement. Any shortages had already been addressed via purchase orders.

**Facility Inspections**

Utilizing the Facilities Inspection Tool (FIT), as developed by the Office of Public Schools Construction to determine if a school facility is in “good repair” as defined by Education Code (EC) Section 17002(d)(1) and to rate the facility pursuant to EC Section 17002(d)(2), a school facilities inspection was completed at each school site. Our visiting team reviewed the previous year’s FIT reports, annual FIT reports submitted by the district, and inspected restrooms, common areas, kitchen/multipurpose facilities, and 25% of the school classrooms. No schools pose an emergency or urgent threat to the health or safety of pupils or staff.

**School Accountability Report Cards (SARC)**

The Williams Settlement included language regarding the accuracy of data reported in the School Accountability Report Card (SARC). The 2022-2023 SARCs for each school are available on the District websites. SARCs accurately reflect the findings by the *Williams* committee members.

**Teacher Assignments/Mis-assignments**

During our visit, the 2024-2025 Master Schedule or Teacher Assignment Listing was collected and has been submitted to the Santa Cruz County Office of Education Human Resources Department for their annual review. The Human Resources department in Districts have worked collaboratively with the Santa Cruz County Office of Education to ensure that teachers are appropriately credentialed and placed in the correct teaching assignments.

**Uniform Complaint Process**

All classrooms must have the Uniform Complaint Process Classroom Notice posted. The team found that of the 25% of classrooms visited at each site, all had current notices posted in both Spanish and English.