

NOT NECESSARILY IN THE NEWS

A Public Policy Newsletter and Commentary August 30, 2024 - Volume 139

The main thing is to keep the main thing, the main thing.”

Stephen Covey

AMERICAN LABOR NEEDS TO BE HONORED- *Keep jobs in the U.S. and Americans employed!*



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

**Contact: David Jinkens, Good Government Advocate
(Retired South Lake Tahoe City Manager)**

Candidate for SLT City Council 2024

www.jinkensforslt.com

CELEBRATING AMERICAN LABOR AND LABOR DAY- SEPTEMBER 2, 2024

Labor Day is a significant opportunity for all Americans to celebrate the work and contributions that American workers make to keep our country safe, strong, and employed. We must do all that we can to ensure the government policy at all levels supports and promotes work and products made and provided by Americans. We must do all we can to ensure that government rules, regulations, and taxes encourages businesses to make products and provide services that are made in America. *We want to see Americans employed and empowered to be successful.* Locally, we must ensure that government purchases, to the degree possible, products sold by local businesses and made in the United States. We must endeavor to keep governmental purchases local.

We must focus on growing our economy in ways that protects our environment and encourages growth in opportunities for workers. We can protect our environment and create a strong local and regional economy. When we all work together, we can do so much good for our community and region.

Why is Labor Day celebrated?

As many people know, *“Labor Day recognizes the achievements of the U.S. labor movement in the late 19th century. During this time, American workers began forming labor unions to advocate for better working conditions, reasonable hours, and fair wages.*

The first Labor Day was observed on September 5, 1882, in New York City, organized by the Central Labor Union. In 1887, Oregon became the first state to pass a law recognizing Labor Day, followed by Colorado, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and New York later that year. By the time President Grover Cleveland signed it into law as a federal holiday in 1894, 23 states had already adopted the holiday.”

Congratulations to the American worker for your contribution to our Country and our community.

-30-

THERE MUST BE ONE STANDARD FOR VOTING IN LOCAL ELECTIONS – *Some Disturbing News*

Several residents and owners of second homes in South Lake Tahoe contacted me and shared with me letters they perceived to be threatening from EDC officials warning them about their decision to make their South Lake Tahoe house their domicile and place from which they want to vote. These people have been existing registered California voters who claim that South Lake Tahoe is their primary residence. State law tells us that for purposes of voting, the following must be true: It must be the intention of the owner of the house to make it their principal residence and place that they will return. It must be their intention to make their South Lake Tahoe home their domicile.

Backs Law Dictionary states that a domicile is: *“The place at which a person has been physically present, and that the person regards as home: a person’s true, fixed, principle and permanent home to which that person intends to return and remain even though currently residing elsewhere...”*

If a second homeowner who is a legally registered voter in California wants to make his/her South Lake Tahoe home their domicile, why should they be denied that right and receive an intimidating letter? Why isn’t their right to vote being protected and why aren’t election officials at all levels of government being advocates for protecting their rights? I understand that there are Federal Civil Rights laws in place that are intended to protect people’s voting rights. I am advised that if voters believe that they are being intimidated, they should contact the U.S. Attorney’s Office at:

United States Attorney's Office
Robert T. Matsui United States Courthouse
501 I Street, Suite 10-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: **(916) 554-2700**

In contrast, if one claims to be homeless and wants to vote in a local election, the **California Voter Foundation** states the following:

“Election officials and advocates for unhoused people say it’s not well known that people without a permanent address can register and cast a ballot. But over the past four decades, state and federal courts have ruled that homeless people cannot be denied the right to vote simply because they lack a roof over their head.



The courts have found unhoused residents can register by listing a shelter, landmark, park or street corner close to where they sleep as their address.”



AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Thus, the lesson here is if you own a second home in South Lake Tahoe you are challenged by officials if you want to make it your domicile. Yet homeless people can easily register to vote by using a street corner as an address for voting. I am not saying that someone who is unfortunately homeless does not

have the right to vote but so should second homeowners whose intent it is that Tahoe is their domicile. No fraud, just one vote.

There is something seriously wrong with this doubled standard for who can vote in local elections, and maybe it will take a Federal review to resolve the matter. Voters should not be intimidated if they want to register to vote.

Finally, in another blow fair elections, it is being reported by Center Square on that, “*The California legislature passed a bill banning local governments from adopting voter identification laws for local elections. California does not require identification to vote, but earlier this year, the City of Huntington Beach approved a voter ID requirement for municipal elections starting in 2026. This bill would override Huntington Beach’s policy.*” As a former City Clerk and local election official, voter ID is important and easy to comply to ensure that people voting are who they say they are and are eligible to vote. This is yet another example of the California Legislature tampering with fair election requirements. Their concern is political power, not election integrity and fair elections.

Disclaimer: I am not an attorney, and my comments are based on my professional municipal experience. Persons who have concerns about these matters should consult an attorney or contact the U.S. Attorney mentioned above.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING BUILT WITH CITY MONIES MUST GIVE LOCALS IN NEED A PREFERENCE ALL OF THE TIME – *if not, why build it?*

Several locals in need of affordable housing contacted me and told me that they applied for housing at Sugar Pine and have received no reply to their application. The owners of Sugar Pine are advertising this project statewide on their website, not a very locally sensitive thing to do with so many existing locals in need. As a result, I wrote the following letter asking a number of questions on these applicant’s behalf.

August 25, 2024

The John Stewart Company
1796 Tribute Road., Suite 200
Sacramento, California 95815

Re: Phase I Eligibility and Local Preference – Sugar Pine, South Lake Tahoe, CA

To Whom It May Concern:

I apologize for the impersonal salutation to this letter. Nowhere on your website is an individual identified as the contact person for matters relating to the project.

I have been and remain a supporter of the Sugar Pine Project from its earliest stages of planning and development. I did so because there are many locals in need in our diverse city who need quality and affordable housing. After raising the issue of a local preference for locals in need, I was pleased that the City Council stated its agreement with helping working locals and seniors in need first for available units.

My understanding is that in addition to private and other funding for this project City taxpayer dollars were contributed to make this project a success. When there is local benefits, I fully support and encourage such public/private partnerships.

Recently I learned that for Phase I scheduled for opening in September 2024 no existing locals in need preference will be given for the 67 available units. I do not understand this mishap in City policy direction nor the fact that locals in need will have to wait to get in housing until other phases of the project are opened. *Locals in need must come first*. The city government should not be giving public funds to housing developers and managers to support housing for other parts of California. This is not only bad public policy, but it would be unfair and done in very poor taste.

I am writing to you because locals in need who are inquiring about their status to be offered a unit are not getting answers locally and are instead being told to contact your company on the telephone number of some unidentified person (e.g. 916-561-0323). As an advocate for good government and them, I am writing to you to seek a correction to this dismal outcome and get answers.

I am no stranger to affordable housing matters in this city or other cities in California and I am pleading with you on behalf of locals in need to give the preference they deserve. The City Council direction for a local in need first policy must be followed.

Thank you for considering my request. I would expect to hear back from you at your earliest convenience.

Best wishes and regards, David Jinkens, MPA

**MEASURE N (VACANCY TAX)
NEEDS TO BE DISCUSSED BY ALL
PARTIES** (*republished from August 8
newsletter*) -**still waiting for an answer.**

For the record, I do not support in any way shape or form the proposed tax on second homeowners. I believe the proposed tax is not only unfair, but it is also likely illegal under



Federal and State law. Also, I, for one, do not want the City to defend an arguably illegal (not authorized in State law for a general law city) tax measure with public funds against people who are community members and supporters who do not live here full time. I do not want our City government to be forced to create a massive snooping bureaucracy to monitor every full-time resident's movement to prove their residency. *This tax apparatus applies to every homeowner.*

Lastly, I do not support the tax because there are other tools in California law that can be used to help finance **our city's share** of affordable housing and infrastructure programs *without raising taxes*, and these tools need to be used.

Having said this, I would like to see an organized panel of pro-tax and anti-tax residents debate the merits of the proposal to better inform voters of the issues. This can and should be done in a civilized manner. ***We do not need to hear propaganda or name calling, just discuss the facts.***

Can we have a civilized, open, and candid discussion among the differing parties on this issue? Can we treat the matter like adults and discuss the matter locally rather than in nationwide publications?

EVERY COMMUNITY IN THE TAHOE REGION AND MAJOR EMPLOYERS SHOULD DO THEIR PART...COME TO THE TABLE!

We all still need to know when governments making up the Tahoe Region and large employers are going to do their part to support the delivery of affordable housing to workers and their communities and bear their fair share of the cost for affordable housing. *The taxpayers of the City of South Lake Tahoe have already done their share. Now other public and private organizations need to do their part.*

GOVERNMENT AND SOCIETY NEEDS TO EMPOWER PEOPLE TO OVERCOME CHALLENGES, NOT BECOME DEPENDENT ON GOVERNMENT TO SOLVE ALL THEIR PROBLEMS



For most of us there are times in our lives when we need help, support and advice from our family, friends, or a government agency. We are grateful for the time spent helping us. Ideally, we can then move forward on our own toward our goals in life. People who care about us and/or concerned about our welfare want us to grow strong and achieve success and independence. The desire to overcome limitations and

challenges must be strong and reinforced. There are many examples in history of people who have done just that, overcoming discrimination, physical disabilities, poverty, bullying etc.

I was born with a physical condition called Poland Syndrome “a rare condition that is evident at birth (congenital). Associated features may be extremely variable from case to case. However, it is classically characterized by absence (aplasia) of chest wall muscles on one side of the body (unilateral) and abnormally short, webbed fingers (symbrachydactyly) of the hand on the same side (ipsilateral).”

At an early age some mean spirited children made fun of my hand and condition and hurt my feelings and self-esteem. My parents would have no part of my self-pity and told me that I needed to toughen up, focus, and overcome the condition. They told me that I could do anything I wanted to do and be whatever I wanted to be if I tried and worked hard. Their advice and encouragement and no self-pity approach was a valuable lesson in overcoming adversity and being modestly successful.

I tell you this because what we need more of are people who help people overcome adversity in their lives whether physical, environmental or discrimination so that they can grow independently and succeed as individuals We do not need people and governments who create dependency rather than independence for their own selfish purpose of gaining and keeping power. People will still need help from time to time, but weakness and dependence should not be the goal of government leaders who selfishly want power over your health and success so that you are dependent on them.

DAVID JINKENS, CANDIDATE FOR SOUTH LAKE TAHOE CITY COUNCIL

www.jinkensforslt.com

CANDIDATO AL CONCEJO MUNICIPAL DE SOUTH LAKE TAHOE

Espero que todos disfruten de buena salud y buena fortuna.

**David Jinkens, MPA
Good Government Advocate**

“SI, PODEMOS”