

**Copies of Letters Received from the
Public Related to LAFCO 3200**

Attachment 7

RECEIVED
FEB 09 2016

Kenneth L. Kreklau
P.O. Box 342
Twentynine Palms, California 92277-0342

LAFCO
San Bernardino County

January 30, 2016

Local Agency Formation Commission
Attn Ms Kathleen Rollings-McDonald, Executive Officer
215 North D Street, Suite 204
San Bernardino, California 92415-0490

Re: LAFCO 3200 – Reorganization to Include Annexation to the San Bernardino County Fire Protection District, Its South Desert Service Zone, and Its Service Zone FP-5, Formation of Service Zone 29 Palms Retirement, and the Divestiture of the Fire Function from Twentynine Palms Water District

Dear Commissioners,

The proposal scheduled for public hearing on February 17, 2016 is seriously flawed in that consideration of municipal responsibilities for public safety by the City of Twentynine Palms and its inherent population of an estimated 25,000 is altogether omitted from the proposal.

As a real property owner, tax-paying citizen, and duly registered voter of the County of San Bernardino, I object to the Commission's formalizing the aforementioned proposal without addressing the legitimate responsibilities for public safety by the municipal government of the City of Twentynine Palms. The argument for cityhood was one of local control.

Should the responsibility for fire protection for the population of Twentynine Palms revert to the County of San Bernardino, then so should all manner of things municipal governance involving the City of Twentynine Palms revert to the County of San Bernardino as was prior to 1987. The City of Twentynine Palms has had more than 28 years to achieve adequate and proper policy and standards for public safety which address and abide by inherent and legal responsibilities for a municipal government within the State of California. The City of Twentynine Palms has to date failed to meet these responsibilities.

Therefore, it would be inappropriate for this Local Agency Formation Commission to proceed as proposed so as to enable continuation of this failure of commitment and responsibility by the City of Twentynine Palms and its legal and implied duties to the State of California and the County of San Bernardino.

Sincerely,


Kenneth L. Kreklau
Esquire

Copy to: Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr.

RECEIVED
FEB 09 2016

LAFCO
215 N. "D" Street, Suite 204
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0490

LAFCO
San Bernardino County

2-6-2016

Attn: Kathleen Rollings-McDonald

Re: LAFCO 3199 and 3200

Dear Mrs. Rollings-McDonald:

We are opposed to the annexation of the Twentynine Palms area into the San Bernardino County Fire Protection District #5(FP-5.)

This annexation would be very similar to the Silver Lakes portion of FP-5 in which thousands of property owners are taxed approximately \$150. per year for services they do not receive. FP-5 Silver Lakes is essentially barren land with no improvements.

The exception being Silver Lakes, an area of approximately 3 square miles out of what is believed to be a total 170 square miles. The subsidies being paid to Silver Lakes by probably 85% of the property owners in the district amounts to approximately \$1 million per year.

Silver Lakes receives "enhanced fire services" with possibly 80% of the service calls going toward non-fire related emergencies. When FP-5 Silver Lakes was passed in 2006, with the aide of then Supervisor Possums, Silver Lakes already had fire services being paid for through property taxes.

Supervisor Postmus desired the FP-5 funding to pre-aid the proposed Sun-Cal development in the Brisbane Valley Area. Sun-Cal went bankrupt and the majority of the funding is still being collected. Taxation without representation and certainly not equal protection under the law.

It is now proposed to use a similar formula to tax thousands of property owners in the Twenty Nine Palms Area to subsidize the very limited amounts of development in that area. What is the number of parcels within that 60,000+ acre area? This action should not be approved as it would be another example of "formula" taxation about which the County of San Bernardino has become very familiar. The "cash-cow" of out-of-area

taxpayers who will not even be able to vote in a formation election or receive services is outrageous.

We presume that the TAX will be a parcel tax with no variance based upon parcel size. The owner of 100 acres pays the same as the owner of one acre.

We might also add that San Bernardino County Fire becomes a beneficiary under this taxing scheme as it will allow for hiring of more fire personnel and help in the increases of wages and benefits and promotions. The benefit to the unions is a windfall.

The FP-5 Silver Lakes election "MAY" have been legal but it certainly was not ethical.

We are asking that the FP-5, Twentynine Palms annexation not be approved. We are dismayed that the LAFCO Board is governed by too many persons who stand to politically benefit from such annexation.

Sincerely,



Al Vogler

cc: LAFCO Board members