# Letter: Alpine County receives state award

**To the community,**

The California State Association of Counties is honored to recognize Alpine County in our 2014 Challenge Awards program, which recognizes the most innovative, cost-effective programs developed by our 58 counties.

In March of this year, Alpine County and the Washoe Tribe created an unprecedented memorandum of understanding in order to provide child welfare services to families of the Washoe. Having this agreement in place allows the Alpine County Child Welfare Social Worker to work with all children and families within the county. This ensures that everyone can receive the full, comprehensive child welfare services available in California.

Congratulations to the county's Board of Supervisors and Health and Human Services staff for developing this program. Innovation is alive and well in Alpine County.

Sincerely,

**Matt Cate, CSAC executive director**

***LTN* note:** Alpine County Health & Human Services has won two awards in the last three months, one from the National Association of Counties and another from the California State Association of Counties.

# Letter: Measure F is LTCC's future

**To the community,**

Our journey toward Measure F began in May 2013, when Lake Tahoe Community College enacted "Investing In Our Future," a fiscal stability plan to ensure the sustainability of LTCC for the next 40 years. The first step in this plan was to build a shared vision of the future.

In September 2013, LTCC leaders brought community members, faculty, staff, students, K-12 educators, and elected officials together to develop that shared vision.

This fiscal stability plan was developed in response to an enrollment drop caused by new state regulations regarding repeatability of classes, years of state budget cuts, the loss of the good neighbor policy with Nevada, and other factors. The combination left LTCC at a pivotal crossroads.

The choice was to either downsize the college dramatically by reducing more programs, services, and employees, or to embark on a well thought-out strategic plan to build sustainable enrollments based on a shared vision, diversified revenue sources, our current program strengths, and better serving of our community's needs. LTCC's board of trustees and college leadership made a choice, and that choice was to move the college forward toward a realistic shared vision.

During the last 17 months the students, faculty, staff, board, and college leadership has done exactly what it promised the community: to become "California's Premier Destination Community College" and to ensure the college serves the South Lake Tahoe community for many years to come.

To that effort, LTCC has:

• Restored its full-time equivalent students from 1,464 FTES to 1,870 FTES in FY 2014-15.

• Launched a successful intercollegiate women's and men's soccer program.

• Grown our international student base from two to 33 students.

• Conducted a statistically valid survey to assess our community's support for a general obligation bond, and to understand the community's priorities. Those priorities include transfer to four-year schools; modernizing classrooms, labs, and technology; a University Center; and maintaining the current college campus.

• Provided more than $2 million in federal financial aid and more than $90,000 in scholarships to LTCC students.

• Developed and submitted over $42 million in capital project proposals to the California Community Colleges Capital Outlay Program to fund facilities and technology upgrades and modernizations for LTCC. This includes an initial project proposal for a Public Safety Training Facility with two-thirds paid for with state funding, and one-third from local funding. In order to access this funding source, local matches are required. We can then leverage $55 million into a $100 million, 10-year building program.

• Diversified LTCC's revenues, with over $2.6 million coming from outside our community to fund our local college. This was accomplished by leveraging our existing, outstanding Fire Science and Academy curriculum and program.

• Reduced budgets and benefits costs by $2.5 million over the past three years.

• Built a strong relationship with the Lake Tahoe Unified School District to ensure the successful transition of its

students into LTCC, and to save money by sharing facilities.

• Completed a comprehensive facilities assessment.

• Incentivized and solicited private developers to build student residence halls on LTCC's beautiful 164-acre campus.

In response to our local community's priorities, LTCC continues to work on the following:

• Launching a new Environmental Technology and Sustainability certificate and associate of arts degree. This is in response to the plethora of environmental jobs in public, private, and nonprofit sectors here in South Lake Tahoe.

• Developing a proposal for a baccalaureate degree and soliciting colleges and universities to participate in a university center at LTCC.

• Developing an adult education program in partnership with LTUSD in hospitality.

The college's student body, board of trustees, faculty, staff, foundation Board, and leadership are committed to the long-term viability of our local community college, and to leading the way to a vibrant and sustainable South Lake Tahoe economy. We are doing what we said we'd do based on the community's priorities and input. We are asking our community to invest in our college by voting yes on Measure F this November. Please stand alongside over 400 community members in supporting Measure F for our FUTURE. Measure F is a strong investment for education and our local economy.

Sincerely,

Friends of LTCC – Yes on F 2014

# Opinion: Truckee has a drinking problem

**By Adam McGill**

As your police chief, I’m frustrated. More than a year ago, I wrote to you regarding our community culture surrounding the use of alcohol. I received a great deal of positive remarks and many people have shared with me they changed their behavior in light of learning more about our alcohol use and its impacts.



Adam McGill

I was encouraged and remained committed that we can do more. Yet the symptoms of this issue continue to cross my desk almost daily. I can’t ignore that rarely a day goes by that we do not arrest a local resident for driving under the influence or drunk in public. Just in the last few days: One local overturned their vehicle while DUI, somehow escaping serious injury. Another local was driving in excess of 80 mph in the Glenshire Drive construction zone, passing vehicles, all while under the influence with two children in the vehicle, one of which not even belonging to the driver. A third was so drunk inside a downtown bar that officers had to carry the individual out.

These examples are not rare. Similar situations have occurred throughout 2014. Somehow, none of this year's events has led to serious injury or death. Our luck will run out.

Despite an enormous effort in prevention and education by Truckee Police Department and many others in the community, arrests for alcohol related offenses continue to climb. We are on pace for more than double the number of DUI arrests in 2014 as compared to 2013. The same is true for people arrested for being so drunk in a public place that they cannot care for themselves. Most of these arrests are locals, your neighbors, people you know and care for. The police cannot solve this issue through arrests alone. Only a community can change this cycle.

Several studies show residents of Truckee-Tahoe are healthier and happier than most of the U.S. population. We exercise more, we smoke less tobacco, we have better nutrition, and we're outdoors more. These same studies indicate we also consume 25 percent more alcohol and in higher amounts than the average U.S. population. The people here are tough, resilient, and fully capable of enacting change to our culture surrounding the use of alcohol. What is preventing us from doing so?

You can start today to enact change by discussing this issue with your friends, neighbors, co-workers, and children. Did you know Truckee kids report the No. 1 reason they choose not to drink is because they don't want to disappointment their parents? Did you also know that Truckee kids report they frequently drive in a vehicle with an adult who has been drinking alcohol? What adults say and do matters.

Contrary as it may seem to some, I am not against drinking alcohol. I am not advocating for prohibition to return in Truckee. Alcohol is perfectly acceptable and even enjoyable at the right time and place, but drinking in excess or getting behind the wheel of a car isn't just your issue – your choices

can have consequences for everyone else and it is my job to do all that I can to protect everyone, including many times, people from themselves. Calling attention to a community safety issue is my obligation.

What will be our tipping point? Will it be the death of an innocent child? The time to act is now, before the tragedy. The police will continue to arrest people but that will not change the culture of our community. Let's work together. Let's make it nearly impossible for my officers to find a DUI. Let's make arrests a rarity and not the norm. Only we can make a fundamental change of what is acceptable behavior and what is not. There is no middle ground on this issue.

Will you stand with us and say enough is enough? To learn more go online.

*Adam McGill is Truckee's chief of police.*

---

# Editorial: Novasel for EDC supervisor



Sue Novasel

**Publisher's note:** ***Lake Tahoe News convened an editorial panel***

***of seven community members to come up with this endorsement.***

Who is going to genuinely represent the constituency the best?

While that question is good to ask in every race, it was the deciding factor for us when it came to who should be the next El Dorado County supervisor representing District 5.

We kept coming back to Sue Novasel.

Experience trumps the guy you want to have a beer with. The listener wins over the talker. We want substance not hot air. We want someone who will work and not call in sick on a powder day.

Being on a board requires the ability to count to three to get your measure passed. Novasel has demonstrated the ability to do so on the various boards she has been on, most notably to the elected board of Lake Tahoe Unified School District.

There is a give and take to being on a board. It equals working together.

But what we can’t tolerate is another four to eight years of a District 5 supervisor who is led and is not a leader. And being president of a board does not make a person a leader. Leadership is a trait we hope is inside Novasel that she has yet to demonstrate.

Novasel’s experience with such varied endeavors as Soroptimist International of South Lake Tahoe and Lake Tahoe Wildlife Care give her a glimpse into working in different group dynamics. This could aid her as she joins a board that is mostly inexperienced at least at the current job.

When it comes time to act the supervisors represent the entire county, not just where they were elected from. While the East and West slopes are dramatically different, it is still one county. We need someone who will take an interest in all the issues that come before the board.

We trust Novasel will be prepared at each of the weekly meetings, that she will use the time of staff wisely and that she will be more of a presence in the district than the current supervisor.

There is no doubt Kenny Curtzwiler, the other contender, is passionate about his community. He talks a good game until the knowing listener seizes the opportunity to punch holes in his diatribe. The problem is with the unknowing listener who wants to believe Curzwiler's tales. His spoken word is no different than his writings – full of nuggets of wisdom saturated in half-truths (or less) that amount to a hill of beans.

We need someone in office who looks at all sides of a topic, understands hard topics and gets the answers; not someone who is unprepared, acting on emotion and fails to truly grasp what the job entails. We believe Novasel is the best choice voters have for El Dorado County District 5 supervisor.

---

# Letter: Prop. 47 should be defeated

**To the community,**

With in-your-face audacity, Proposition 47 is misleadingly titled "The Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act." Here's what it actually does:

- Allows for the release of nearly 10,000 criminals from prison
- Downgrades many felonies to misdemeanors
- Shifts financial burden away from the State to local government.



Brian Uhler

I cannot imagine how anyone’s neighborhood or school will be safer by releasing thousands of known violent offenders from prison. A better title might have been, “Locals Pay for the State Problem Act.”

Our criminal justice system often relies on convicting very dangerous people for crimes that Proposition 47 downgrades to misdemeanors. Proposition 47 downgrades crimes like possession of date rape drugs, stealing guns, forgery, and identity theft. Dangerous and violent gangs rely on some of these so-called minor crimes to get guns and money. If you like the idea of enabling people who commit these crimes, then you might want to vote for this proposition.

In your California Official Voter Information Guide, those who prepared the argument “for” Proposition 47, in bold face state, “PROPOSITION 47 IS SUPPORTED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT.” While there may be some strange law enforcement fringe element that supports it, the major law enforcement groups in California vehemently oppose Proposition 47. These include: California Peace Officers Association, California State Sheriffs’ Association, California Police Chiefs Association and California Fraternal Order of Police.

I hope this weird and dangerous utopian dream will be thwarted by people with common sense. Releasing 10,000 convicted felons doesn’t make anyone safer. Don’t be fooled by the misleading name of this proposition and the false claim that it is “supported by law enforcement.” Schools and neighborhoods will not be safer. I urge you to vote no on Proposition 47.

Thank you,

**Brian Uhler, South Lake Tahoe chief of police**

---

# Editorial: Vote no on Measure F

**Publisher's note: *Lake Tahoe News convened an editorial panel of seven community members to come up with this endorsement.***

For 40 years, Lake Tahoe Community College has served the needs of the community through excellent programs, outstanding educators and what are now adequate or subpar facilities.

But we believe the leaders need to go back to the white board, crunch the numbers again, perhaps even take an analytics class to come up with another bond.

It's great to dream, have aspirations and a vision for the future. But if they are not shared dreams, aspirations and visions, then they likely will never come true.

*Lake Tahoe News* dreams of a successful, viable two-year institution that continues to thrive in South Lake Tahoe. We want students to have state-of-the-art equipment and roofs that don't leak. We want the college to be a centerpiece of the South Shore. We want the college to succeed and even be more than it is today. But Measure F is not the way to get there.

The $55 million bond on the Nov. 4 ballot is the gold-plated version. It's a pie-in-the-sky approach to getting things we are not convinced the college or community need. We don't believe that just because you build it, they will come.

There is more than $5 million in the bond project list for an environmental studies and sustainability center. Clearly, the environment is a big deal here – so is studying it based on all the agencies that call the basin home. But where is the proof that this discipline needs its own multimillion-dollar facility? (The total price is nearly $16.8 million; with the rest of the money coming from the state.) Where are the statistics to prove we are losing enrollment by not having it or the figures that show LTCC would gain enrollment by having it?

If the college wants $5.7 million of bond money to be spent on an $18.5 million regional public safety training facility, maybe it should be working with the Legislature to get some of the fire tax money that was hijacked by the state. Maybe the college should explain how its much heralded fire academy would benefit. And with the city of South Lake Tahoe recently upgrading its emergency operations center and the ability to use the police station (which is across the street from LTCC), the need for such a facility has not been demonstrated.

With online education growing, do we need more brick and mortar?

LTCC has many wonderful programs. Enhance and grow what is working before becoming more than you are. There is room for improvement for what exists today.

Officials say they want LTCC to be a destination college. How is this even possible when there is no housing for students? Student housing is not part of the bond despite the fact that in September 2013 during a daylong visioning session dorms were at the top of the list of desires from the community.

We are not convinced more buildings and programs will bring more enrollment. And if enrollment doesn't increase, what would be the point of such a significant outlay of money?

It's alarming that $2.25 million of bond funds are allocated

toward planning, including state and federal documents, and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency permits. Bond management is another $1.75 million. We realize there is a cost to doing business – especially here – but that is 7 percent of the bond. And that $4 million doesn't even account for the bond financial advisory services and bond legal counsel.

We believe the college should come back to voters with a downsized bond that looks less like a wish list and more like a needs list. We want to know our money is going for substance and not fluff.

We know the college needs to upgrade its technology, science lab and work on safety issues. These needs we believe are things the voters should invest in.

While getting matching money from the state is great, sometimes it's OK to say no thank you.

We can't justify spending more taxpayer money on facilities when the college has clearly demonstrated it cannot maintain what it has. The college needs to get its house in order before it starts building new facilities.

For these reasons we urge voters to vote no on Measure F.

---

# Letter: Time for DCSO leadership change

**To the community,**

Sheriff [Ron] Pierini's campaign cheerleaders have been working hard to broadcast the mantra that the Douglas County Sheriff's Department isn't broken and doesn't need fixing.

They wouldn’t have to work so hard if the sheriff would just answer a couple of simple questions:

How come your department’s budget went up fivefold in 28 years – from $3 million to over $16 million – yet you field the same number of patrol cars now as then? Before you answer, recall that in May 2013 you confirmed that DCSO currently fields five area cars, plus a supervisor, the same as in 1986, even though the county population has doubled.

How do you justify the $192,460 your salary and benefits costs the county taxpayers when you have failed to proactively plan for completely predictable law enforcement challenges in our community?

The answer is that Sheriff Pierini doesn’t have a good answer for either of these questions or any of the other issues the Brady for Sheriff campaign has raised. The incumbent would rather hide behind an ever-growing forest of political signs and hope to coast to re-election.

Both of these questions took on fresh relevance recently when, just two months into a new budget cycle, the sheriff placed an order for a brand new $245,000 patrol boat (to be custom made in Canada) and discovered that he’d failed to set aside the full cost of this long known about expense in his $16 million budget. So he sent his undersheriff to the Douglas County Commission a couple of weeks ago to clip the taxpayers for his $100,000 shortfall. This type of amateur slip-up is particularly ironic coming from this sheriff, who claims fiscal discipline is one of his strong points.

The escalation of gang activity and the hard drug trade may not be an issue for the majority of county voters yet, but street patrol resources – the tip of the street crime spear – are dangerously inadequate to address these growing problems.

The sheriff’s campaign’s response to all this has been to acknowledge that while Dave Brady’s law enforcement experience

is extensive, it’s less that what the incumbent has. That misses the point: in spite of the incumbent sheriff’s experience, Douglas County’s law enforcement operations are not being properly managed and our taxpayer money is funding a budget that’s out of control.

Dave Brady has a master’s in public administration, a typical education requirement for the chief law enforcement officer for a department the size of DCSO. More importantly he has the financial training and experience to manage a large budget, the public sector experience to create and execute a proactive plan to meet upcoming law enforcement challenges, and the leadership skills to efficiently utilize the human resources within DCSO.

**Lynn Muzzy, Minden**

---

# Opinion: Props. 45-46 not resonating with voters

**By Dan Walters, Sacramento Bee**

By any measure, health care is now California’s largest single economic sector, churning well over $200 billion a year in private and public funds each year, and growing fast.

Obamacare, the aging of the population and other factors expand demand for medical services and pump more money into the system. Health care is also a major – and very fast-growing – employment field, with 450,000 new jobs expected in California over the next decade.



Dan Walters

It was once ignored by Capitol politicians, but it’s now big business involving big money – as well as a personal priority for 38 million Californians – and sparks high-octane political conflict.

Divvying up health care dollars generates countless bits of legislation each year, and, not surprisingly, a steady stream of ballot measures, including two this year.

However, Propositions 45 and 46 may turn out to be busts because even before the full-bore campaigns have begun, as voters appear to have soured on both.

**Read the whole story**

---

# Letter: Measure F makes financial sense

**To the community,**

My wife and I bought a retirement home in Tahoe in 2002, in part because there was a college in South Lake Tahoe. I have been on the LTCC Foundation Board since 2009. I am writing to urge everyone to support Measure F to modernize Lake Tahoe Community College and increase the educational opportunities offered there.

Right now, South Tahoe High School has better labs and facilities than our college does. LTCC's current campus is 25 years old, and after years of state cutbacks, the maintenance and replacement of roofs, heating, and other physical systems cannot be done without your help. We need to repair, upgrade and modernize the college so we can prepare students for transfer, or support them in earning their associates degrees, and possibly one day we may be able to graduate them with four-year degrees earned right at LTCC.

Community members who participated in LTCC's long-range planning process last year said they wanted to see our college become a true "destination" college. Tuition at a California community college is about $1,300 per year, while at UC Berkeley it is $12,972 and at Stanford $44,184. A community college is simply the best buy for two years of college.

Many students graduating high school want to be away from home when going to a college. We are a great destination community, which is what drives Heavenly, stores in the Stateline area, restaurants, hotels, sports shops, bike shops, etc. It makes sense to have the college support this in a similar way, but our students will stay here throughout the year, and not just on weekends or vacations. We offer all that Tahoe itself has to offer and LTCC can better attract students from around the state and beyond if it's modernized, has the latest technology, has up-to-date classrooms and labs, and looks as appealing as the rest of Tahoe does.

As the college expands thanks to Measure F, so do significant jobs for our community – faculty, administrators, and facility maintenance and servicing, and support businesses we use in the community – injecting significant ongoing money into our economy.

In addition, Measure F will also directly help our community in that:

• The college plans on spending $107 million in construction from Measure F including matching funds from the state. All Measure F funds will be used for construction projects – none for the college administration or faculty salaries.

• Fifty percent of students graduating South Tahoe High School who go on to pursue higher education attend LTCC. It is essential to keep the college up to date so that our young people can lower their costs in the first two years of higher education.

• Under the new California rules, locals can take a course once, but with the College's Connect Education program, the college will continue to increase the number of courses for the community, and these courses can be repeated.

• A vibrant college also increases the prestige and desirability of our community for both professional careers and the retirement community. My wife and I would not have retired here without the college.

Measure F will cost $25 per $100,000 in assessed valuation. For the average assessed value of a house in South Lake Tahoe, the annual cost will be under $70 per year, or around $5.90 per month. Not a bad return on a small investment for all the benefits to our community.

Please join me in voting yes on Measure F this November.

**Bob Cliff, LTCC Foundation board member**

---

# Editorial: Laine, David, Sass

# for S. Tahoe council



Brooke Laine

Wendy David

Austin Sass

**Publisher's note:** ***Lake Tahoe News convened an editorial panel of seven community members to come up with this endorsement.***

An elected board, while comprised of individuals, ultimately is a team. They don't have to agree – in fact 5-0 votes are not necessarily a sign of a healthy board – but they do need to play nice together.

The current South Lake Tahoe City Council is not always respectful of one another. They don't all look each other in the eye or actively listen. Their body language, at times, is atrocious.

Too often the same subject matter is revisited over and over again because a vote didn't go someone's way. This keeps the city from being able to move forward. The vote on the plastic

bag ban is just one example.

While technically the recession ended years ago, the fallout from it is still being felt in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Not everyone has recovered in terms of jobs or the housing market. Summer was good to many, winter bad for most. But when 60 percent of Lake Tahoe Unified School District's students receive a free or reduced lunch, clearly the people here are not doing well. That translates to 60 percent of the people with school-age children not being able to provide their child with lunch. Who knows what those families are eating the rest of the day.

South Lake Tahoe needs jobs that pay a livable wage. The town – and region – needs to attract people here who will spend money. We need infrastructure. We need businesses to invest in their product, including modernizing their buildings and signs.

First, we need to take care of more than 20,000 people who call South Lake Tahoe home. Then we can worry about the greater South Shore, the basin and those who visit.

Government can only do so much to help. A few ways the City Council can help include creating regulations that encourage redevelopment, not charging outrageous fees, enforcing the rules on the books so the town doesn't look like a flea market, bringing like-minded businesses-residents together to form community service districts, marketing the area and not relying solely on the primarily Nevada-funded tourism agency, realizing recreation is more than a bike trail (though we like bike trails), and investigating new and different industries to supplement tourism beyond minimum wage jobs.

We believe the continued efforts of Brooke Laine, and the infusion of newcomers Wendy David and Austin Sass will help South Lake Tahoe be a more progressive town by the time their terms are up in 2018. We believe they are already leaders who

have like-minded goals, though different approaches. We believe they comprise the team that will take South Lake Tahoe out of its morass of conflict and backpedaling and into a world of progress and prosperity for all, while bringing compassion and understanding to the process.

Laine has demonstrated her ability to be a voice of reason since being appointed in January 2013 to the unexpired term vacated by Claire Fortier. Laine was elected to serve on the council from 1998-2002.

One thing that makes her unique is she is and would be the only councilmember who has a full-time job where she is an employee not working for herself. She is more like most people in town – working for someone else. Laine has demonstrated the ability to do the city's work efficiently and effectively. She is always prepared, having read the council packet.

As someone who was born and raised here, Laine brings a breadth of experience others cannot. She also has the institutional knowledge that is critical.

She can see both sides of an issue, does not come to meetings with blinders on, and truly cares about the town and residents. She is thoughtful in her approach to decision-making, is not swayed by whoever talked to her last and is not climbing a political ladder.

David has demonstrated she is a consensus builder. We need that now.

She is the only one who has the life experience of working with the less advantaged in our community through her endless volunteer and paid positions. She is the one interacting with those who are working three jobs to barely survive. She will bring to the council a depth of knowledge from a sector of the community that is not currently represented.

We expect she will be well versed in the rigors of the city in

short order. She has the time and intelligence to be a contributing member of the council from Day 1.

Her tenure on the Lake Tahoe Unified School District board is an asset – she understands a board is a team. Plus, the district is an integral component of future recreation plans. She could be a bridge between the entities, as the city and district have not always seen eye-to-eye.

As with our 2012 endorsement of Sass, we're still wary of his arrogance. It has not been tempered since he last ran. Still, we believe his strengths outweigh his weaknesses. We hope he embraces the team concept quickly.

Sass does his homework as evidenced by his thorough responses to *Lake Tahoe News'* questions and depth of answers at forums, he cares about the economy, he understands numbers and he is without question the candidate who recreates the most. This last fact is important as the area puts more of an emphasis on recreation.

Plus, he has worked for major players like Heavenly Mountain Resort and Aramark. He is the candidate with the most big-business experience. We need that type of diversity on the council.

*Lake Tahoe News* believes Laine, David and Sass will be a strong team on the South Lake Tahoe City Council who will represent the best interests of residents and the concerns of the greater South Shore area for the next four years. We also believe they will complement the remaining two council members whose terms expire in two years.

*Lake Tahoe News* could not endorse the other candidates for the following reasons:

• Angela Swanson: She would be better off working outside of Lake Tahoe for the betterment of the basin or being an employee and not an elected official where there is a light

continually illuminating her ethics, judgment and political aspirations. At some point she needs to take ownership for having said before the June supervisorial election that she would not seek to retain her council seat, for having taken money in a paper bag for a charity from someone who is now in prison, and for quitting her term on Lake Tahoe Unified School District and then immediately collecting a paycheck for her work as a consultant with the district.

• Tom Davis: His decisions are not rooted in good public policy. Look at past decisions on the Chateau project, redevelopment as a whole, and the plastic bag ban as examples. He is a follower and not a leader. He is not forward thinking. He can be argumentative and dismissive to the public.

• Matt Palacio: He needs to get more experience before jumping right onto the council. We can't afford to wait for him to catch up to speed. At a candidate forum he mentioned the town doesn't need another car parts store, which spoke volumes about his lack of knowledge of zoning and free market issues. He is good at pointing out a need for younger people on the council, but besides being in his 30s, we don't see that he has anything else to bring to the table. He is lacking vision. And the fact he eliminated a question on *LTN*'s form (which we reinstated) instead of writing "no comment" or the like points to a character flaw of taking the easy road, or perhaps not being straight forward and honest.

• Bruce Grego: He was voted off the council in 2012. We believe the public has already spoken. He has done nothing in this time to change our opinion of him when we did not endorse him two years ago.