

Letter: SLT nonprofit helping treat dogs with cancer

To the community,

Max was just a tiny puppy when he was found wandering the streets of Houston. Lucky for Max some kind hearted South Lake Tahoe residents who were visiting on vacation found him and took him from the mean streets of Houston back home with them to Lake Tahoe, where he found his forever home with DeAnn Forman.

She saw Max on a rescue website for animals and it was love at first sight.



Max

The goofy puppy from Houston fit right in. Not only did DeAnn adopt him, but the entire neighborhood fell in love, taking turns visiting him when they had spare time to walk and exercise the energetic puppy, and checking in on Max when DeAnn was working long shifts.

DeAnn first noticed a mass when she took 18-month-old Max to

get him neutered. After the surgery Max continued to spot pale red tinted urine. DeAnn knew her perfect, fun loving puppy needed to head back to the vet. At Sierra Veterinary Hospital, Dr. David Monroe diagnosed Max as having transmissible venereal tumors, a canine STD that produces cancerous tumors. Left untreated this cancer would spread and end Max's short life.

Enter Wild Blue Dogs, a canine cancer nonprofit that provides funding for treatment and research. We are funding Max's chemotherapy treatment and his prognosis is excellent.

Wild Blue Dogs is delighted to announce that after six weeks of chemotherapy, Max has finished his course of treatment with great results. All of his tumors have been killed by the chemo and there is no evidence of any metastasis (spread). His veterinarian will follow up in a few months with blood work to make sure all the cancer has been eradicated, but Max's prognosis for a full recovery is excellent.

Without Wild Blue Dogs, the Sierra Veterinary Hospital, and the generous support of Wild Blue Dogs donors, Max would have died from his tumors. Instead he is looking forward to a long and happy life.

Special thanks to South Lake Tahoe residents and visitors who donated the money that saved Max's life and kept a family together.

Nicole DiAngelo, Wild Blue Dogs

Opinion: Civics should make students squirm

By Sarah Cooper

In many conversations, the topic of civics education comes with its own halo. The conventional wisdom is that it's good, clean medicine, and if our children just get enough of its inoculation, the American body politic will be healthy enough to survive another generation.

But after nearly two decades as a middle school and high school history teacher, I've come to understand through teaching civics—and studying how it's taught—that learning how to be a citizen doesn't work like that. Indeed, civics education is best when it's messy and uncomfortable.

That's especially true in times of conflict and transition, like the ones we are living in now.

Approaches to teaching civics have been as volatile as the country's history.

Horace Mann, common school advocate in the mid-19th century, believed that schools should teach only those values that everyone agreed with, such as charity and justice, recounted the educational historian David Tyack in "Seeking Common Ground: Public Schools in a Diverse Society." At the time, "everyone" meant people like Horace Mann—white, wealthy, Protestant, and native-born, not the immigrants who poured across the Atlantic.

Later in the 19th century and into the 20th, the government waded into programs of Americanization, trying to replace the influence of the family with the power of the state in teaching how to be an American citizen. Such inculcation through schools included Native Americans early on and

Japanese Americans later, after World War II. In contrast, with the cultural upheavals of the 1960s and '70s, many school districts began treating each culture as something to be celebrated rather than repressed.

Regardless of the era, civics education over the past two centuries has been driven by social upheaval. As Tyack observed, "During periods of sharp demographic change, or war, or ethno-religious conflict, or economic challenge, for example, foundational principles of civic education came into sharper relief because they were less taken for granted."

Today we live in a period of such conflicts, and I take absolutely nothing for granted in teaching civics. So I try to mix traditional and contemporary approaches.

On the traditional side, I ask my students to memorize lines from the Declaration of Independence and Lincoln's speeches, especially those that focus on difficult compromise and principled revolt. I hope that phrases such as "We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth," and "it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government," will ring in students' heads well into adulthood, inciting them to action.

When I first taught eighth-grade history, I required students to memorize a lot more. On tests they had to regurgitate names that educated Americans barely remember, such as John O'Sullivan with his Manifest Destiny theory or Frederick Jackson Turner with his frontier thesis. For women's suffrage, students had to spit out a litany of names rather than just a few who could serve as touchstones, such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Ida B. Wells, or Alice Paul.

With civics and the Constitution, I also used to include details that no longer matter as much to me, because they mire students in minutiae at the expense of deeper understanding. My middle schoolers no longer have to know the exact number of

the amendment that limits presidential terms, but rather why it happened and in response to what.

Broad educational shifts, such as evolving state standards, have definitely influenced me to focus more on depth and less on breadth when teaching both civics and history. Even Advanced Placement history exams have been overhauled in the past several years to emphasize thematic understanding over disconnected details.

Yet even this kind of conceptual focus on the broader picture has not always felt like enough.

In the past several years, to get students to engage and think like citizens, I've found that I have to do a heck of a lot more than ask them to understand the past and dissect the present: I need them to create the future in my classroom, right now, through discussion and debate. I need them to be leaders in the classroom, not just participants, so that they can imagine presiding over boardrooms, civic groups, and family conversations in the future.

And so, on the best days, these eighth-grade U.S. history students conduct discussions on their own, pose questions that provoke and unsettle, and challenge authority—including and especially mine—with respect.

After all, the laws of a country mean little without the ability of leaders and citizens to listen to other views and believe that our laws mean something. The Constitution remains powerful only in that citizens have gifted it that power over two centuries and counting.

As Horace Mann foresaw, open dialogue breeds discomfort. When we examine Black Lives Matter or gun control, some of my students lean in, while others squirm and slouch. I tell them that these discussions are supposed to be uncomfortable.

And each Friday in my classroom, several students bring up

such uncomfortable issues in their weekly current events presentations. The presenter summarizes a news article and gives the reasons he or she chose it. Everyone writes down a question or comment—and then the floor opens for discussion.

The presenter fields questions on everything from how to prevent nuclear war, to why there are so many homeless people in Los Angeles, to what abortion looked like before *Roe v. Wade*. Week by week, we work on solving problems together.

When I first started teaching, students did these weekly presentations, but we talked about their articles only for a few minutes, and the questions came largely from me. In an attempt to make my classroom feel more democratic, I realized a few years ago that more of the power needed to be in students' hands, at least one day a week.

And so I sit back and listen, to questions they ask of each other: "So is the government doing anything yet to help with the recent flooding?" or "Why has the homicide rate gone up in that country?"

In describing such "maximally open classroom climates," education Professor Meira Levinson in "No Citizen Left Behind" offers questions that students can ask themselves and each other while engaging in discussion, such as "Why do people care about this topic?" and "Is this person making an argument, or just talking for the sake of talking?"

In our national discourse, Levinson's kind of metacognition might inspire those who talk too much to listen more, and those who don't talk enough to speak up already.

By fostering such reflective questions about how we talk, civics education can also create new lenses through which students can view the world.

I see kids change their perspectives in my classroom every week. For instance, once they understand how a concept such as

federalism relates to marijuana or immigration laws in California, they begin to ask about how people in other states are affected by these issues. The thought that someone in Texas might possess entirely different rights than someone in Los Angeles shocks them. They sputter at what seems to them the unfairness of it all.

If we've just discussed the road to Civil War, I'll link civics to history—ask them to imagine what it might have felt like to be bound under even more serious state-to-state conflicts, such as the Fugitive Slave Law.

Not all of these discussions come easy. Sometimes the political opinions that the presenters express, in our majority but certainly not entirely liberal school, land the wrong way for a student who believes in pushing tax cuts or loosening gun restrictions. Sometimes I worry that those in the ideological minority don't even want to talk because they don't feel it's worth it. And so I occasionally step in to play devil's advocate for whichever side is not getting enough airtime on an issue, to remind students that our classroom bubble is not the world's bubble.

The ultimate perspective that I hope for my students is that they assume a little more humility than adolescents (or adults) typically do. When I ask them what they don't know about an issue, I want these eighth-graders to remember that they need to rely not only on themselves for answers to civic problems, but also on the people around them. Often I'll bring in a historical primary source to make a point like this, such as a speech that the not-always-humble Ben Franklin gave to the Constitutional Convention in September 1787.

Franklin, after four months of difficult deliberations, asked each delegate in Independence Hall to accept that the draft of the Constitution was good enough. Then he asked each man to do even more, to leap beyond mere acceptance and “doubt a little of his own infallibility.”

Franklin's ability to step back from the debate is the real inoculation I'm looking for as a civics teacher and a citizen. Not a syringe filled with terms such as ratify and suffrage, but one packed with a heavy dose of self-doubt. And it should be a big enough dose for our children to understand that raising citizens, and being citizens, can be as messy and pungent a process as four months of sitting in a hot Philadelphia summer, until you're ready to call something good enough, for now.

Sarah Cooper teaches eighth grade U.S. history and is dean of studies at Flintridge Preparatory School in La Canada, just north of Los Angeles. She is the author of "Creating Citizens" and "Making History Mine."

Letter: Grant a boon for homeless group

To the community,

Tahoe Coalition for the Homeless is grateful to the Sierra Health Foundation for awarding a grant of \$15,000 for the operation of the South Lake Tahoe Warm Room in 2017-18. The Sierra Health Foundation is an independent foundation committed to supporting health-related activities in Northern California. The South Lake Tahoe Warm Room is an overnight emergency shelter that operates only during the winter months in our community.

This grant will go a long way in helping us get up and running this winter. We appreciate the Sierra Health Foundation for their acknowledgement that the health of community individuals is improved by having a safe and warm place to sleep at night.

The South Lake Tahoe Warm Room is in its third season. The warm room provides a refuge from Tahoe's harsh winter elements. In 2016-17, over 200 individuals and businesses supported warm room operations. The warm room was open 137 nights, served 136 individuals, and provided over 5500 shelter bed nights. In addition, TCH provides emergency motel rooms for families with children under 18, and did so for seven families with children last winter.

The majority of guests were Tahoe locals when they became homeless, and 26 percent were employed. The average guest stayed 25 nights last winter. In addition to shelter, the warm room provides light food and drink and referrals to resources. Last season guests received referrals to the mental health department, substance abuse programs, medical appointments, job boards/job training information, and more.

Marissa Muscat, Tahoe Coalition for the Homeless

Opinion: Feds exploit fire tragedy to promote logging

By Chad Hanson, Sierra

In the wake of the October 2017 fires in Northern California, which resulted in the loss of so many lives and homes, people affected by the tragedy are grieving and bewildered. Many people are searching for answers about what caused the fires, and a way forward to prevent similar loss of life and property.

It's frustrating, then, to watch Republican leaders in Congress and the Trump administration politicizing the recent

tragedy as they push for a sweeping elimination of environmental laws on our national forests and other federal public lands to increase logging and backcountry fire suppression under the guise of community protection. On Nov. 1, the House voted 232-188 to allow for more “salvage logging” and other forms of tree-cutting on federal properties. According to the Associated Press, House Speaker Paul Ryan said the bill was needed to protect the nation’s federal forests “from the kind of devastation that California experienced.”

Wrong. Even a cursory examination of the science of forest ecology reveals that this plan would not only destroy vast acreages of public forests, but would also put communities at even greater risk.

Read the whole story

Opinion: How anthem became central to U.S. sports

By Bryan Armen Graham, Guardian

The playing of the “Star-Spangled Banner” is so familiar and perfunctory a trapping of sporting events in the United States that few Americans even bothered to consider what it means and why it’s a tradition until last year when Colin Kaepernick chose to take a knee in protest of police violence and racial inequality.

The stakes were redoubled this September when President Trump called on NFL owners to fire any players who kneel, recasting Kaepernick’s movement as not a protest of social injustice but

an affront on patriotism and an insult to the military soldiers who paid the ultimate price for freedom.

But how did a song about the War of 1812 that wasn't even adopted as the national anthem until the 1930s become so indelibly bound to the American sporting experience? It didn't happen overnight.

Read the whole story

Opinion: Working to solve SLT's water contamination

By Jennifer Lukins

In South Lake Tahoe we take pride in having, hands down, some of the best drinking water you can find. Around town folks carry "Drink Tahoe Tap" water bottles. We turn our noses up at bottled water.

The primary source of drinking water in the South Shore area is groundwater. Unfortunately, few residents realize that this precious resource is threatened by contamination from the man-made chemical tetrachloroethylene, or PCE, an ingredient in dry cleaning solvents. The state of California has designated PCE as a chemical that is known to cause cancer and has established a regulatory limit for how much PCE can be in drinking water.



Jennifer
Lukins

The PCE groundwater contamination plume in the South Y area is a major problem facing the entire community. The plume extends north from the South Y Shopping Center up to the Tahoe Keys, and is continuing to migrate toward the lake itself. Since 1989, when the state first required PCE to be sampled in drinking water wells, numerous public and private wells in the South Y area have been contaminated with PCE at levels above state and federal drinking water standards.

Three providers of public drinking water to South Lake Tahoe – Lukins Brothers Water Company, South Tahoe Public Utility District and the Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association – have all been harmed, in one way or another, by the PCE groundwater contamination. During the 1990s, South Tahoe PUD installed a treatment system to remove PCE contamination from groundwater pumped from four of its drinking water wells. In 2009, Tahoe Keys POA installed a wellhead treatment system to remove PCE contamination at one of its wells.

As for Lukins Brothers, in July 2014, we discovered PCE in two of our groundwater wells at levels above state and federal drinking water standards. To protect our customers, Lukins Brothers immediately stopped using the contaminated wells and began to supplement the water produced from our one remaining well with water purchased from South Tahoe PUD. While this has allowed Lukins Brothers to continue to provide our customers with safe, reliable drinking water, it has unfortunately increased their water bills and placed additional stress on available drinking water from the South

Tahoe PUD system. Lukins Brothers is now in the process of completing engineering and design plans for a PCE treatment plant at one of our contaminated well sites. Construction of this plant will be an important first step in getting Lukins Brothers back to being self-reliant, though it still will not put us back to where we were before our groundwater supplies became contaminated with PCE.

So, while the South Lake Tahoe water providers did not cause the PCE contamination problem, we have joined forces and worked tirelessly to develop and implement short-term fixes and plan for long-term solutions that will allow us to continue to provide clean drinking water to our community.

Turning now to the cause of the problem; in the three decades since the South Y PCE plume was discovered, the state regulatory agency with oversight over the cleanup, the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, has conducted numerous investigations to determine the source of the PCE. After all of their efforts, the only confirmed source of PCE groundwater contamination in the South Y area is the site of the former Lake Tahoe Laundry Works dry cleaning facility, which operated during the 1970s in the South Y Shopping Center. On May 12, 2017, the regional board issued a "Cleanup and Abatement Order" directed to the parties responsible for the PCE contamination at that site. Unfortunately, after decades of study, the order requires neither cleanup nor abatement of the regional PCE plume, only further investigation. Of even greater concern: while prior drafts of the order confirmed that the Lake Tahoe Laundry Works responsible parties are also responsible for causing the regional PCE plume, the final draft left out this significant staff finding.

One result of this omission is that there continue to be no plans in place for stopping or limiting the continued movement of the PCE plume from the South Y toward Lake Tahoe, aside from the voluntary efforts undertaken by the Groundwater

Stakeholder Advisory Group. This group, which includes Lukins Brothers, South Tahoe PUD, the Tahoe Keys POA, and representatives from other local agencies, is currently working to secure grant funds from the state to develop a feasibility study that will help to identify potential alternatives for addressing the regional PCE groundwater contamination problem.

As for the ongoing regulatory investigation, under the regional board's recent order, the Lake Tahoe Laundry Works responsible parties are directed to investigate and determine the total extent of the PCE groundwater contamination plume originating from their facility. It will now be up to the regional board to ensure that this investigation actually results in responsible parties being held responsible for the costs of cleaning up contaminated drinking water supplies.

Jennifer Lukins runs Lukins Brothers Water Company in South Lake Tahoe.

Opinion: A dilemma has parked in Placerville

By Larry Weitzman

Placerville has a major ongoing problem. Illegally issued parking tickets, and it's not like they didn't know. Because the 2000-01 El Dorado County Grand Jury considered the legality of how parking tickets were issued, to say the city "fathers" didn't know, is like saying "I didn't know it was illegal to steal," which may be exactly what the city of Placerville is doing, stealing from you if you pay those nasty parking tickets.



Larry Weitzman

Some background. During that 2000-01 Grand Jury term an investigation was done with respect to private contractors issuing parking tickets and their validity. For a parking citation, which is an infraction, to be valid, according to California Vehicle Code Section 40202 it "must be issued by a peace officer or person authorized to enforce parking laws" and such a person is further described as the "issuing officer."

Because the California Legislature in CVC 40200.5 expressly allows cities to contract with private companies to process parking citations, which is a process that takes place after the issuance of the parking citation, by clear inference, it means that cities (and other local jurisdictions) must have express legislative authority for private contractors to issue citations pursuant to California law. There is no such express legislative authority, for California General Law cities, which P'ville is.

By now you have already figured out that P'Ville uses a private company, Espy Parking Service to issue parking violations. P'Ville police officers do not issue parking violations. I have confirmed this fact with Placerville City Manager, Cleve Morris, that Espy Parking Service is the private contractor that does the job of parking enforcement including the issuing parking citations. The P'Ville city budget shows that the prior company, Banner Parking Service contract costs for the 2016-17 fiscal year is \$143,828. Morris didn't know, off hand, the revenue from the tickets, but believes they are below \$60,000 annually.

Making matters worse, EDC County Counsel Louis B. Green, around the time of the GJ investigation requested an opinion from the California Attorney General's office asking the question of whether a general law city can enter into a contract with a private security company authorizing the company's employees to issue citations for Vehicle Code parking violations?

On April 23, 2002, such an AG ruling was issued, No. 01-1103 answering this exact question. The ruling, which was five pages of legal reasoning, had the following conclusion: "A general law city may not enter into a contract with a private security company authorizing the company's employees to issue citations for Vehicle Code parking violations."

While AG opinions do not have the force of law, they are considered substantial authority which a court will usually rely on when making decisions. This AG ruling is much like a legal court ruling and the case law and legal reasoning upon which it relies on for its conclusion is quite clear. There is no authority within the CVC giving cities the ability to contract with private companies for the issuance of parking citations.

In a discussing the parking enforcement issue with, Cleve Morris, the P'Ville City Manager on about November 14, 2017, remarked that he has been doing it for years, even in other cities. He was unaware of the Attorney General ruling "prohibiting" the practice.

In reviewing the financials of Placerville, it contracted with Banner Parking Service (now SP+), a private company, to enforce its parking regulations and issue parking citations at a cost of about \$144,000 annually, which City Manager Morris, confirmed. The revenue is still being determined, but Morris thinks that it might be somewhere around \$60,000 annually or less. That would equate to an average of four citations a day. If the Attorney General ruling is upheld by a court of law and

a three-year statute of limitations is applied, the City would have to refund approximately \$200,000 to people who paid the “illegally” issued citations. And there may be extensive legal fees as provided by the California private attorney general law.

Hiring perhaps two people to enforce the 60 hours a week (8 am-6 pm daily except Sunday) of when there are parking regulations and limitations in effect within the City might be less expensive than the cost of the \$144,000 private contract and give the City much better control and more appropriate enforcement. At \$17 an hour the cost would be about \$1,000 a week which is about \$52,000 annually plus 40 percent or about \$21,000 for benefits. That is less than \$75,000 annually. Even with 10 hours a week of supervision and administration, it would still come in at under \$100,000 annually. And the law regarding the proper issuance of parking citations would be pursuant to the Attorney General opinion.

As with the Mitigation Fee Act litigation which I have written extensively about government either not following the law or being above the law, here is another cut and dry example of a government misdeed. They knew the law. It would be surprising to think that this parking issue wasn't discussed at some government conference/junket. It was our own County Counsel who requested clarification via an AG opinion. Government chose to ignore it, thinking perhaps no one would notice. “Hey, we are the government we can do anything we want.” Their ignorance is going to potentially cost Placerville taxpayers about a quarter of a million dollars, maybe more. It's about time that consequences are enacted against government officials for such malfeasance.

We will see how fast this potential problem is rectified.

Larry Weitzman is a resident of Rescue.

Letter: Ameriprise helps at Bread & Broth

To the community

Ameriprise Financial Services Inc. has a legacy of giving back to the community and annually sponsors a corporate wide National Day of Service in November with the goal of ending hunger.

This year the South Lake Tahoe Ameriprise Financial Services office once again chose to join with Bread & Broth in its efforts to feed the hungry by sponsoring an Adopt a Day of Nourishment on Nov. 13. This is their fifth November Adopt A Day in the last five years.

“A wonderful way to support the spirit of Thanksgiving,” said office manager and Ameriprise Financial private wealth advisor Rick Gross. “We are humbled and honored to participate every November and appreciated the opportunity to be of service.”

Joining Gross were Elizabeth Palmer, client services manager, and Melissa Stefani. The Ameriprise crew had a busy evening helping the B&B volunteers bagging the giveaway food items, serving heaping trays filled with pork roast, sauerkraut and mashed potatoes and assisting with the dinner’s take down.

B&B would like to thank Ameriprise Financial Services Inc. and the local Ameriprise

office members for their generous monetary and time contribution to seeing that over 90 meals were served to the less fortunate members of the south shore community.

Carol Gerard, Bread & Broth

Editorial: Fee hikes at national parks would limit access

Publisher's note: *This editorial is from the Nov. 24, 2017, San Francisco Chronicle.*

As the Trump administration threatens large cuts to the National Park Service, federal parks officials have an idea: Just charge a whopping \$70 to enter some of America's most beloved national parks, including Yosemite, Joshua Tree, Sequoia and Yellowstone.

The proposed fee increases, which were announced in October, have come under fire by nature enthusiasts, outdoors groups and, now, California Attorney General Xavier Becerra and 10 of his counterparts from other states.

"For every dollar the punitive fee increase raises from families, the Trump administration intends to cut more than 4 dollars from the National Park Service's budget – almost \$300 million," Becerra said, in a statement. "That backdoor math simply does not add up. It's a cruel deception for millions of hardworking families."

Read the whole story

Opinion: Another reminder there's no free lunch

By Dan Walters, CalMatters

It's doubtful whether more than a relative handful of Californians have heard of the Unemployment Insurance Fund.

It is, however, one of state government's largest activities – and a case study in political mismanagement.



Dan Walte

Currently, California employers pay about \$6 billion in payroll taxes into the UIF each year. And currently, the state Employment Development Department annually pays almost that much to jobless workers.

Superficially, that would appear to be a sustainable equation, but in reality, it's not.

During periods of high payrolls and low unemployment, such as this one, the UIF should be building reserves that could cope with an economic downturn, when claims for jobless benefits increase.

That's the way it used to work – until political expediency and recession undid it.

In 2001, the UIF had a \$6.5 billion positive balance. But the governor at the time, Democrat Gray Davis, owed big political

debts to unions that financed his battle with two very wealthy Democratic rivals in 1998.

Davis repaid his debt to public employee unions in 1999 by sharply increasing pension benefits for state workers – a move later emulated by most local governments – on assertions that investment earnings would pay for them without more taxpayer money.

Similarly, Davis repaid his debt to the private sector unions in 2001 by backing a sharp increase in unemployment insurance benefits on the assertion that the UIF, with its \$6.5 billion reserve, could easily afford it.

Both backfired when recession clobbered the state's economy twice in the new century's first decade.

Eventually, the California Public Employee Retirement System sharply increased mandatory "contributions" to make up for investment losses and pay the increased benefits.

Meanwhile, the first recession in 2001, coupled with the increased benefits, quickly depleted the UIF and by 2004 the state was borrowing from the federal government to keep checks flowing.

The UIF regained solvency and reached a \$3.6 billion reserve as the state emerged from recession, but when the economy declined again with the bursting of the housing bubble, that cushion quickly evaporated.

By 2009, with the UIF once again in the red, the state once again tapped Uncle Sam for loans, and when it could not repay the nearly \$10 billion debt, the feds indirectly raised payroll taxes on California employers.

Employers will have paid about \$9.5 billion in those extra taxes by next year, when the loans will be retired. A new report on the UIF, issued last month, says it should have a

\$1.8 positive balance by the end of 2018.

All good? Not by a long shot.

Because payroll taxes are only barely keeping up with unemployment insurance outflows now, during a period of low joblessness, the fund cannot build a healthy reserve. Or as, the new report puts it, “the current financing structure leaves the UI Fund unable to self-correct and achieve a fund balance sufficient to withstand an economic downturn.”

There are four ways to make the UIF truly solvent – raise the payroll tax rate, widen the wage base on which the rate is paid (it’s now \$7,000 a year), reduce benefits and/or tighten eligibility for benefits.

The first two draw resistance from employers while labor unions and other employee groups oppose the latter two.

However, as we’ve learned from the pension crisis or the years of neglected maintenance on state highways, there’s no free lunch.

Short-term expediency, such as boosting benefits without putting aside money to pay for them or letting maintenance slide because raising gas taxes is politically difficult, just makes the eventual days of reckoning that much more difficult.