

**AGENDA
FIFTH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT
LOCKE COMMUNITY MEETING
JEAN HARVIE COMMUNITY CENTER
14273 RIVER ROAD
WALNUT GROVE, CA 95690**

MONDAY OCTOBER 28, 2024 6:30 PM

FIFTH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT

PUBLIC COMMENT PROCEDURES

The County fosters public engagement and encourages public participation, civility and use of courteous language. The County does not condone the use of profanity, vulgar language, gestures or other inappropriate behavior including personal attacks or threats directed towards any participant. To make a comment at the community meeting, speaker will be provided with a speaker request form to complete and submit to County staff. Speakers will be invited individually to make a comment.

Written Comment

- Send an email comment to pathume@saccounty.gov.
- Mail a comment to Supervisor Patrick Hume, District 5, at 700 H Street, Suite 2450, Sacramento, CA 95814.

ACCOMMODATIONS

If there is a need for an accommodation pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), medical reasons or other needs are available. Please contact the Clerk of the Board by telephone at (916) 874-5411 (voice) and CA Relay Services 711 (for the hearing impaired) or Boardclerk@saccounty.gov prior to the meeting for accommodation requests.

1. Welcome
 - Introduction
 - Background And Current Governance Issues
2. Presentation Of Alternative Governance Structures
3. Public Comment
4. Summary Of Process Forward

ITEM 3 LOCKE COMMUNITY MEETING PUBLIC COMMENT 001

From: Lisa Kirk <kirklisa07@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2024 2:34 PM
To: Gonzalez. Manuel <gonzalezma@saccounty.gov>
Subject: Public Comment Community Locke Meeting "Governance"

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments.
If you have concerns about this email, please report it via the Phish Alert button.

Questions and Points

The LMA was formed as a hybrid model.

The legislative seat appointed by Sacramento County makes it a public entity that comes under the Brown Act and the Fair Political Practice Commission. This was verified by the district attorney of Sacramento County in 2007.

The common interest development aspect, that can be found in the CCR and bylaws and assesses property owners, is governed by the Davis Sterling Act.

It is unclear at this point what 501c status

this organization is operating under, in order to collect assessments from property owners.

The deeds on the property state the Town of Locke which was the developer of the subdivision actions taken by Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment.

The deeds do not mention the Locke Management Association or the transfer to the Locke Management corporation.

The CCR's and bylaws are outdated and and are not current with compliance of both the Brown Act and the Davis Sterling Act.

Under the Brown Act the executive committee should be turned into a standing committee and all meetings should have published agendas and brought back to the full board before action.

Under the Davis Sterling Act, the question now presented is whether or not, non property owners can serve as directors. The law regarding the change in the Davis Sterling Act in 2020, needs to be reviewed and an opinion given whether or not this board can continue with non property owners serving as directors.

This is why we now have property owners not paying assessments along with the fact that assessments are being used to provide maintenance for the public to use common areas. This is not a common action under Hoa's or common interest developments.

Property owners are also concerned with the amount of legal fees that they are being asked to pay. The LMA budget schedule

\$10,000 for legal fees and as of the last budget report, was \$8,000 over budget. Legal fees are currently approaching _20,000 which is almost 1/3 of the budget. There have been no closed sessions with the board of directors on how this money is being spent.

Under the Brown Act any legal action done should be brought to the full board's attention in a closed session.

The question of the 501c status, articles of incorporations, filed correctly or incorrectly and the compliance with the Davis Sterling Act regarding non property owners on the board needs a legal review

If this entity goes back to a straight HOA it would limit public access and limit the rights of business owners and renters because we would be considered invitees and would have no voice or public comments at HOA meetings. To remove that aspect would take away the rights of non property owners in the town to speak regarding how they are governed.

And could eliminate public funding being used to improve the failing infrastructure such as the sidewalks.

2 years ago the LMA was received \$100,000 in public funding to improve the failing wooden walkways. This was because of the public entity status. It is unclear if this goes back to a straight HOA, if it could apply for public funding.

Since none of these questions have been answered in regards to a 501c status, articles incorporations for either the Locke Management Association or Corporation, and the effects of the 2020 change in the Davis Sterling Act, I would recommend that Sacramento County or Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment, that created this entity and its documentation, assist in answering these questions.

This would assist directors, members of the public, renters, business owners and property owners to further discuss on how they should be governed.

Locke is an unincorporated area of Sacramento such as Walnut Grove, Cortland and Hood. Anyone that resides in these areas are governed by Sacramento County without the disadvantage of being called "invitees".

The options are

Continuing the board as is with the legislative seat and transparency of the Brown Act.

This is dependent on the question on whether the status of this board once clarified can be turned into a straight HOA or common interest development.

Funding for Legal counsel, in respect to HOA law and the Davis Sterling act requirements, needs to be appropriated either through Sac legal counsel or the budget of the LM or LMC

Consider the possibilities of a Community Service District.

Or dissolving the Association or Corporation. This would include turning all streets and lighting and landscaping maintenance over to the county and selling off excess common area properties. And analysis of the increase of property tax since 2003, that Sac County is now receiving.

I am making these statements as a business owner and an invitee in Locke.

But as a director on the Locke Management Association? or Corporation?, I would recommend that all of these issues be brought to the full board for discussion

Lisa Kirk

ITEM 3 LOCKE COMMUNITY MEETING PUBLIC COMMENT 002

From: kingtonylee@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2024 10:46 PM
To: Gonzalez. Manuel <gonzalezma@saccounty.gov>
Subject: Public comment

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, do not click links/attachments.
If you have concerns about this email, please report it via the Phish Alert button.

Also Manuel,
Add this to public comment and forward this to All
Board Supervisors and Ms. Evans.
Thanks,
Tony Lee

Questionnaire

Background: Supervisor Pat Hume wants to know if the Locke Management Association members want the Association, "Yes" or "No" to
Divide it and turn over all roads and streetlights in the Town of Locke to the County and sell the Garden land to the
Homeowners undivided and let them take over liability. **HOMEOWNERS ARE NOT REQUIRED TO PURCHASE LAND**

Sign: Yes or NO

| Printed Name | Signature | Address | Yes or No | Date |
|---|------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------|
| Larry Hall | Larry Hall | 13935 River Road | NO | 5/7/2024 |
| NING HOU | | | NO | 5/7/2024 |
| TONY LEE | | 1275 LEVEE | NO | 5/7/2024 |
| Ronnie Maiden | | 1292 Lake Rd | NO | 5/7/2024 |
| Martha Esch | | 13959 Main St Locke | NO "them" = County | 5-7-24 |
| Brack Alexander | | 13935 River Rd | NO | 5-7-24 |
| Charles McMillan | CHARLES McMILLAN | 13947 River Rd Locke | NO | 5-7-24 |
| Brack Alexander | | 13936 Key Street | NO | 5-7-24 |
| Elizabeth Allen | ELIZABETH ALLEN | 13936, 13937, 13939 KEY STREET | NO | 5-7-24 |
| Sandra Clark | SANDRA CLARK | 13932 KEY ST LOCKE | NO | 5-8-24 |
| Maria Souza | Maria Souza | 13928 Key Street | NO | 5/11/24 |
| Joy Kuo | Joy Kuo | 1265 LEVEE | NO | 5-12-24 |
| TL: Signed for Joy due to unavailability. | | | | |

Sent from my iPhone

ITEM 3 LOCKE COMMUNITY MEETING PUBLIC COMMENT 003

From: Tony Lee <kingtonylee@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2024 10:29 PM
To: Gonzalez. Manuel <gonzalezma@saccounty.gov>
Subject: Public Commet
Attachments: Locke 1 final.pdf

EXTERNAL EMAIL: If unknown sender, **do not** click links/attachments.
If you have concerns about this email, please report it via the Phish Alert button.

Dear Manuel,
Please submit my letter to Public Comment for mondays meeting on Oct 28
also forward my letter to All Board Supervisors and Ms Evans.
Thanks,
Sincerely,
Tony Lee

October 28, 2024

To Sacramento Board of Supervisors

Dear Supervisors,

What was happening in mid to late 1800s and 1900s America? The Civil War was raging on, and had ended. The Black slaves were freed from White Plantation slave owners. The Chinese were coming to California for opportunity to find Gold.

The Irish left Ireland by the millions due to the Potato famine and also came for the gold and opportunities that America had for a better life.

But when they arrived, the Chinese were not welcome as well as the Irish; both received racist harassment. As time went by, the Chinese were beaten and some were lynched and hanged. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and The Anti Asian Land laws of 1913 were meant to impoverish the Chinese and that devastated generations of families. The Irish were white, so they did not have racism as deadly as the Blacks and Chinese had to endure.

With all the hate and violence against the Chinese, the Chinese built Chinatowns across America, but what was the purpose of those Chinatowns? They were built for a safe haven for the Chinese such as Chinatowns in San Francisco and Chinatowns in Los Angeles and in New York city. About 200 Chinatowns were burnt down and destroyed by white racists. Not even in their own safe Chinatowns were they safe.

So what did these Chinatowns have in common with Locke? Locke was named by the Chinese for wealthy landowner George Locke who was not a white racist or a ku klux Klansman and made an agreement for the Chinese to build Locke in 1915 due to the Chinese Alien Land laws of 1913 prohibiting Chinese from owning land. This was their Chinatown.

By far, the worst white racism treatment happened to the Black slaves. When they were freed, they were promised 40 Acres and a Mule but White racist President Andrew

Johnson became President when Abraham Lincoln was Assassinated and he stopped the land transfer and took the land back.

So what does the 40 Acres and a Mule have to do with Locke? Land, In 2004 Sacramento Board of Supervisors and Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment agency created Locke Management Association but they said if you want your land beneath your homes you would have to sign into this Home Owners Association and if you did not sign into the Association you would not be able to buy your land.

The Chinese and other races and nationalities got their land, unlike the people promised 40 Acres and a Mule, but the Sacramento Board Supervisors are in control, just like the Whites from the 1850s, and want poor homeowners to pay for the maintenance of the roads and street lights and make way for tourists by the thousands to visit—with all the responsibility on the homeowners.

The Chinese could not own land according to racist laws from over 100 years ago, but in 2004 the Supervisors carried the torch for those racist politicians by creating this nightmare Home Owners Association. This is how communist China and Russia and Iran control their people. This is outrageous.

I am a descendant of those Chinese from the 1850s who could not own land, and I hereby request 1 million dollars for reparations from 2004-2024.

Sincerely,

Tony Lee

CC; Mr. Allen D. Hine, Ms. Florence Evans, All Homeowners.

ITEM 1 LOCKE COMMUNITY MEETING PUBLIC COMMENT 004

Public Comment For Oct. 18, 2024 Town Hall Meeting:

The governance of Locke could be easy if property owners paid their assessments, as they agreed to do when they purchased their properties, kept their properties clean, and followed rules stated in the LMA Bylaws, CC&Rs, and SPA guidelines.

A determined hand full of property owners refuse to pay the extremely reasonable assessments they agreed to pay when they purchased their properties.

If property owners and residents of Locke adhered to these procedures, Locke governance and maintenance would not be complicated, would reflect community involvement (and pride), and would require a minimum of involvement by Sacramento County.

However, if the County and Locke property owners (and non-property owners) feel it's time to change Locke governance, then so be it. We will find out who is willing to govern and maintain Locke after changes are made.

Stuart Walthall
Locke Property Owner