

Opinion: CalPERS makes workers rich at taxpayers expense

By Larry Weitzman

Some CalPERS pensions are more “reasonable” than others. In El Dorado County, miscellaneous employees (all employees other than public safety employees) after 30 years receive an annual retirement pension of 60 percent (2 percent for a year of service) of their highest salary and public safety employees after 30 years of service receive as an annual pension payment of 90 percent of the highest annual salary.

EDC is one of the lower CalPERS pension paying agencies in California as many other counties and agencies for miscellaneous employees pay pension retirements of 2.5 or 2.7 percent per year of employment. Sutter County, because and at the insistence of Larry Combs raised its pension rate in 2005 from 2 percent to 2.7 percent giving Combs a more than 30 percent increase in his pension benefits. (The highest of any Sutter County miscellaneous employee. Can you say self-serving?)



Larry Weitzman

What this all means is that someone who is a public safety employee and who works 25 to 30 years and starts working for an agency in their early to mid-20s will earn more in total

compensation during their retirement than they earned while employed in their actual job. That is true for most early employed career government employees who work for 30 or so years and receive pension benefits of 75 to 90 percent (2.5-3 percent annual benefits) of their highest salary.

To confirm my facts, I contacted an expert, Robert Fellner of the Nevada Public Policy Institute, who gave me this simple example of a 30-year career employee with a 2.5 percent annual pension benefit who starts work at 25 earning \$30,000 annually and retires at age 55 earning \$100,000 a year. That person would receive an annual pension of \$75,000 (plus health benies) for life. By actuarial standards that person will likely live for at least another 26-29 (men/women) years. During that period the annuitant will also get cost of living increases from 2-4 percent annually.

Many government employees start low and work their way up in salary, say from \$30,000 to \$100,000. But their average annual earnings over that 30-years of working is about \$60,000, meaning their total working year earnings are \$1.8 million. In retirement, that same person will earn by age 80 after 25 years of retirement (an actuarial certainty) a total of \$1.875 million without COLA increases. With a minimum of a 2 percent COLA annually during retirement, the total retirement received would be about \$2.35 million.

For public safety employees, the riches are even greater. In 30 years, they receive a 90 percent pension based on their highest annual salary. Their total pension benefits based on current actuaries will be 150 percent of what they actually made while working. Then you can add on the COLA benefit. If a government employee started working at 22 upon completing four years of college, they can retire at age 52 with benefits ranging from 60 percent (as in EDC) to 90 percent of their highest salary plus COLA. The same person in the Social Security system needs to wait another 15 years to retire and then his benefits might be about 25 to 30 percent of his

highest salary and of his total work wages. And we all know Social Security can't sustain itself. How can CalPERS do so paying two to four time the benefits?

Can you say look to the taxpayers?

According to Fellner, two states have had massive public pension reform, Utah and Arizona. We need to do the same. More on that in a later column.

In a somewhat related subject, as reported in *Lake Tahoe News* **earlier this month**, ex-BOS members, Briggs and Santiago, lost their lawsuit for back wages. I wrote a column about this case **in February** in which I stated Briggs and Santiago had no case as all the raises they claimed that were not paid were barred by the California State Constitution Article XI, Sections 1 and 4 which says all compensation for county Board of Supervisors must be set by an ordinance, not by a resolution. Unfortunately for the ex-supervisors the raises they claim were set by resolution and therefore not applicable to members of the BOS. It was that simple of a case, other facts were irrelevant. As I said then it was a cut and dry matter of constitutional law. It was over before the case even started.

In its 26-page decision, the court went over all the contentions of B and S and then, in the last two pages, said the facts of the case cannot "escape" the California Constitution. Therefore, B and S lose, period, end of story. In reality, it was a simple case, which in fact was no case.

As a bit of irony Briggs and Santiago claim to be champions of EDC, its residents and taxpayers. But when it came to lining their own pockets, EDC taxpayers be damned. They had no case for back pay. Maybe they thought they could get a quick settlement, but their own greed has already cost EDC over \$62,000 successfully fighting their wonton lust for OPM (other peoples' money). The total legal bill will probably reach or

exceed \$100,000. Fifty thousand dollars of that money would fund an entire senior nutrition program for a year. If either Briggs and/or Santiago try again to become a county supervisor, you will know that their own well-being comes before that El Dorado County.

But there is still a rub that needs to be resolved and as mentioned in my prior column, what about the Terri Daly declaration under penalty of perjury filed on behalf of B and S in their failed lawsuit? By filing the declaration, Daly clearly violated the promises she made in paragraph 4 (a) of her severance agreement with EDC in which she was paid \$153,000 based in part on her written and binding promises which were "to assist the county in regards to matters in which she was involved during her employment including but not limited to assistance in connection with any actual or threatened claims, complaints, litigation or lawsuits in which the county and/or Daly, in her official capacity, are named as subjects or defendants ..."

EDC is entitled to a return of the \$153,000. EDC must demand return of the money paid to Daly and if not returned, file a lawsuit. It's a slam dunk. EDC is hard up for money and here is a chance to recover one sixth of a million dollars. You can bet the BOS won't lift a finger while EDC pot holes go unfilled breaking our resident's automobile suspensions. We have an election in about a year and a half. Choose your candidate carefully.

Larry Weitzman is a resident of Rescue.

Letter: Heavenly gang helps serve dinner

To the community,

Bread & Broth provides its Monday meal at St. Theresa Grace Hall thanks to the generous sponsors who host an Adopt A Day of Nourishment by donating \$250, which feeds anywhere from 75 to 110 hungry folks who come for a nourishing dinner.

B&B's Adopt A Day program was established in 2009 and is a way for individuals, organizations, churches and businesses to not only donate funding for the food, utilities and dinner supplies, but provide hands on participation volunteering at the sponsorship's designated dinner.

On Oct. 24th, thanks to Vail EpicPromise Grant funds, Heavenly Mountain Resort was the AAD sponsor for the evening. Representing Heavenly were Adam Turner, Liz Seki, Cassim Andrews and Nicole Alexandrovich, all employees from Heavenly's Vail Resorts retail division. These four helpful and caring sponsor volunteers assisted B&B's volunteer crew from 3-6pm, helping with packing food giveaway bags, serving dinner, drinks and desserts and helping with the dining hall and kitchen cleanup.

Since the AAD program inception, Vail's EpicPromise Grant has been funding 12 dinners annually. Initially, the sponsor crews all came from Heavenly Mountain Resort, but in the past two years, Kirkwood Mountain Resort has been alternating monthly sponsorships. B&B truly values our partnership with our local Vail resorts and it is always a special treat to have sponsor crews from Heavenly and Kirkwood Mountain Resorts join in helping to serve the folks in need who live in our community.

For more B&B information, contact me at 530.542-2876 or carolsgerard@aol.com.

Opinion: Expanded broadband key to Tahoe's future

By Chris Fajkos

When it comes to having access to broadband Internet, in this day and age it's absolutely essential in order for the Tahoe basin to flourish. Unfortunately for the Tahoe basin there are still pockets all around the lake that are either unserved or underserved. These underserved areas have download speeds under 6 Mbps and 1.5 Mbps upload, as per the California Public Utilities Commission's definition of minimum speeds.

To put things into context, the average broadband speeds in San Francisco are 75.92 Mbps down and 25.70 Mbps up. This deficiency presents a huge problem for the region because without access to broadband Internet our local businesses, schools, hospitals, and local government agencies are placed at a disadvantage, jeopardizing economic development, public safety, and overall regional prosperity.

The dangers that come with not having access to broadband Internet are extensive and all facets of our society are impacted. Public safety is placed at risk when they are unable to share critical emergency management information quickly and securely. Schools suffer because teachers and students are unable to use the online resources they need. Hospitals and medical offices require fast and secure access to broadband in order to send and receive medical files and other medical information. Economic growth slows to a crawl as local businesses struggle to remain competitive if their Point of

Sale swipers don't work.

Understanding that a "digital divide" exists in the basin, the Tahoe Prosperity Center applied for and received a grant from the California Public Utilities Commission to help carry out their Connected Tahoe Project. The funds received from CPUC's California Advanced Services Fund went toward the collection of local Internet speed data, assisting broadband infrastructure providers with applying for CPUC grants, and convening with applicable stakeholders to identify opportunities for broadband expansion in the Tahoe basin.

The information obtained from Tahoe Prosperity Center's initial work painted a disappointing picture for the region in terms of broadband coverage and service. Speed test results that were completed by basin residents clearly identified numerous problem areas, indicating that the problem is basinwide.

The next step in the Connected Tahoe Project will aim to facilitate broadband infrastructure projects in those problem areas. This will be done, primarily, by working with the CPUC to identify Internet service providers (ISPs) that are ready, able, and willing to provide infrastructure, as well as through TPC's push for a basinwide "Dig Once Policy."

The Dig Once Policy essentially means that when there's a public improvement project happening somewhere in the basin, such as a bike path improvement; then conduit for broadband fiber would be included in the project. This way there is no need to dig the same area up again later to install conduit.

The Tahoe Prosperity Center is the only organization focused on this issue for the benefit of Tahoe's residents and businesses and will stay focused on our Connected Tahoe Project. We hope that basin residents continue to speak up and draw attention to this issue.

Chris Fajkos is the project manager for Tahoe Prosperity

Center.

Opinion: Finding hope after Tuesday's election

By Kathryn Reed

Why. It's one of my favorite words. And it has served me well as a journalist; sometimes much to the frustration of those I'm interviewing.

After Tuesday's presidential election many are left asking – Why did people vote for Trump? It's time to listen to the answers because we weren't listening during the campaign. We were too busy criticizing Donald Trump to understand that for millions he represented something we didn't want to accept – that people are disenfranchised, they don't want the status quo, they wanted someone who talks like they do, looks like they do and isn't conventional.

I didn't want Trump because he scares me. His words and actions scare me. To want to deport Muslims, build walls to stop immigrants, to disband gay marriage, to say sexually assaulting women is his privilege – well, it's just mindboggling to me people can stand behind someone like that. His world views are opposite mine. His business ethics are opposite mine. I don't know if there is anything about him I like or agree with.

I readily admit my dislike for this man stopped me from listening to those who supported him because I had already made my mind up who I was voting for – or was it voting against?

I didn't want Hillary Clinton either. But she scared me less and I didn't believe she would unravel our country. I also didn't think she would make it great again or better than it is. I liked her experience and trusted she would do more good than harm.

I liked when Clinton on Wednesday said, "Our campaign was never about one person or even one election. It was about the country we love and building an America that is hopeful, inclusive and big hearted."

I want to remain hopeful, have tried and will try harder to be inclusive, and will strive to be big hearted.

Clearly, the country is divided. But I'm of the belief that most of us want the same basic things, but we just have a different idea about how to get there. That's my idealism kicking in. We aren't always going to agree on everything – which is a good thing. If we did, it would be a pretty boring world.

I would like to think we can agree about some basics – that we should all be treated equal no matter gender, race, ethnicity, religious beliefs, or who our significant other is.

Most agree the health care system needs more reforms. Most agree our infrastructure is aging and needs to be rebuilt. Most agree people should be treated with respect. Most agree we want to leave the world a better place than we found it. Most agree we want the next generation to be better off than we are.

We have choices. What are yours going to be? Let's be a country that learns to say yes, works together, and compromises.

Let's start a conversation about how to get what we want instead of digging our heels in and saying we won't work together. Congress – are you listening? American people – are

you listening?

Eight years ago so many people said “that man is not my president” in regards to Barack Obama. Now the other side is saying the same thing – after chastising those who said the same thing eight years ago. You can’t have it both ways. That divide only grew in the last eight years. Are we going to let the chasm get even larger in the next four years?

Trump will be our president in January. The public has spoken. Protests won’t change that. And protesters, where were you before the election? Do something constructive for a change.

If you don’t like the Trumps and Clintons of the world, now is the time to start doing something about it. Now is the time to get engaged so in four years you are not enraged.

For those who are feeling a bit lost in the post-election malaise, grieving is a process. Take the time to do so. But do it fast – the country needs you to re-engage. The last stage is acceptance – of course you have to work through denial-isolation, anger, bargaining and depression to get there.

And to those who sat out and didn’t vote for a presidential candidate: shame on you. This is one of the greatest gifts we have in this country – the right to vote. As citizens we don’t have that many things we must do. But I adamantly believe one of our obligations is to be civically involved – at all levels.

As Clinton said today in her concession speech, “Our constitutional democracy demands our participation not just every four years, but all the time.”

Opinion: We all should leave the country post-election

By Joe Mathews

Now that the election is over, are you leaving the country? If not, you should reconsider.

Before the election, only a few prominent Californians—from Samuel L. Jackson to Miley Cyrus —pledged to depart the U.S. to express their disgust with the election. And they're still here. But I do know one non-celebrity Californian who is taking his frustrations with American-style democracy to Europe this weekend: yours truly.



Joe Mathews

This is not my first such journey. Every couple of years for the past decade, I've helped bring together scholars, journalists, activists, election administrators and politicians who work on participatory democracy, including the initiative and referendum processes for which California is well known. Each gathering is in a different country—South Korea, Uruguay, Tunisia, Switzerland (and even San Francisco). This time our destination is San Sebastián, in Spain's Basque country, which has embraced participatory democracy after years of dictatorship and violence.

I don't particularly enjoy long-distance travel or organizing the events, which requires dealing by Skype at odd hours with

prickly foreign professors or officials.

But I do it because by listening to people from around the world explain their challenges I get a much clearer idea of what's wrong with our version of democracy, and how we might improve it.

I wish every Californian would do the same—travel outside the country to grasp how other places make democratic decisions, so that we might better comprehend ourselves. Goodness knows that such understanding is lacking; surveys show big majorities of Californians know little about the basic functions of their state and local governments.

Unfortunately, too many people here consider the very idea of looking for answers overseas as daft, even preposterous. I'm accustomed to watching California audiences tune out when I give talks describing how other countries do initiatives or elections or budgeting better than we do. Singer-songwriter Sheryl Crow has been mocked for circulating a petition to limit the poison of endless electoral politics and adopt a shorter election cycle, like those of Canada and Great Britain.

The resistance to foreign ideas is especially strong in Sacramento, where political staffers heap ridicule on those who make such suggestions (I speak from personal experience). Heaven help elected officials who dare go overseas to learn more about democracy—they are likely to be pilloried for taking an expensive “junket.”

I find this cynicism dispiriting—and surprising. Californians can be among the most open people in the world when it comes to embracing entertainment or technologies from around the world. But we have the opposite attitude when it comes to democracy and governance. We are convinced that our system is so singularly distinctive that the world has little to say to us.

It's hard to overstate just how wrong we are. Almost nothing in California government is a native invention. We borrowed our two-house legislative system from our British colonial masters, plagiarized our first constitution from Iowans and New Yorkers, took our top-two-runoff election system from the French-speaking world, and established our direct democracy system on the Swiss model.

Our reluctance to look overseas for fixes for our many democratic problems makes little sense in the aftermath of this election. Nearly every democratic institution in this country—the presidency, Congress, law enforcement, state election officials, the media—has lost credibility in 2016. In California, our first open U.S. Senate seat in a generation produced a desultory race, and we turned direct democracy into a bludgeon, littering ballots with 17 complicated and confusing statewide initiatives.

Despite widespread disillusionment with aspects of our democracy, there are few big ideas being advanced for reform. We're not looking far and wide enough for them, and so our insularity embitters us. As Mark Twain famously noted in "The Innocents Abroad", "Travel is fatal to prejudice, bigotry, and narrow-mindedness, and many of our people need it sorely on these accounts."

In San Sebastián, I'm looking forward to learning more from the world: about how Germans support grassroots groups that bring ideas to the ballot, how Tunisians are creating a new system of local government, how the cities of Seoul and Vienna have found smarter ways to engage citizens in local questions.

I wish I could transport a plane full of local and state officials overseas with me, so they could learn firsthand from their counterparts elsewhere, the way American businesspeople and scholars seem more comfortable doing.

"If I cannot add to my own level of understanding, I could ill afford to try to raise that of others," said the Basque

country's own Saint Ignatius Loyola. In these times of great anxiety and little understanding, leaving the country might be the most patriotic thing you could do.

Joe Mathews writes the Connecting California column for Zócalo Public Square.

Opinion: Why Mongolia and North Dakota aren't economic miracles

By Jerry Nickelsburg

Where does an economist who works in the Pacific Rim go on vacation? This summer, I chose Mongolia, and not only because it is remote and has beautiful glaciated mountains. I also chose it for its reputation for economic potential.

I went with some preconceptions. For one thing, I had read that ayrag, home-fermented horse milk, was widely consumed and not for the faint of heart. For another, I knew investors were high on the Mongolian economy, which has seen a tenfold increase in GDP since the fall of communism. The analysts are consistent: Mongolia is a great place to invest even though its GDP growth has slowed significantly since hitting double digits in 2014.

I arrived in the capital, Ulaanbaatar (UB), in early August. UB is a city of 1.4 million, half the population of the country, but it feels smaller. There are a few modern structures—like the famous blue taco, a high-rise hotel and office building that resembles its nickname. For the most

part, however, this is a city of yurts (one-third of the people live in them) and old socialist-style buildings. In the center is the government palace complete with a giant statue of Chinggis Khan (for Mongolians—no hard g) and a massive square reminiscent of Tiananmen.

So where was the supposed economic dynamism hiding?

My search would continue, but first it was time for some climbing. The trip to the Altai Tavan Bogd Mountains began with a three-hour flight on Hunnu Airlines to Ölgii, which, with 30,000 inhabitants, is the seventh largest city in Mongolia.

From Ölgii we traveled seven hours by Russian four-wheel drive over a maze of dirt tracks to the national park gate and then hiked into the mountains. Over the next nine days, thoughts on the Mongolian economy were drowned out by the mountains of western Mongolia, with its large glaciers, tundra, sweeping views, and snow fields.

In the Altai you feel you are about as far away from California, where I live, as possible. The region is home to nomadic Kazaks, and while they have some trappings of the Western world, they still work their herds on horseback and cut grass by hand with homemade scythes.

Once back in Ölgii I noticed that the stores had mostly Russian products. The people were poor, but not starving. I did find ayrag, the highly touted horse milk, in a little out-of-the-way shop, and it lived up to its reputation—strong with a sour and long-lasting aftertaste.

I also saw more clearly why this country, despite its dynamic economy reputation, didn't seem so promising on the ground. The problem lies in the engine of Mongolia's growth: extractive industries.

In boom times the few—the very few who work removing riches

from the ground— accumulate wealth and share some of it by spending in the domestic economy. But mines and oil fields employ lots of capital and not many people. If a country is largely rural, as Mongolia is, most of it may be untouched.

When commodity prices fall, as they did in 2015 (coal and copper were off by more than 30 percent), that growth turns on a dime (hence the fall in the rate of Mongolia's GDP growth). While starkly clear in Mongolia and less so in Texas and Louisiana, the phenomenon is present in all three.

Much has been written on how countries can be cursed by an abundance of natural resources. What I saw in Mongolia confirmed that if the windfall gains from natural resources are not turned into the building blocks of a diversified economy, like education and infrastructure, the promise of mineral wealth will be squandered.

Mongolians I met didn't complain about this much. I was treated generously, and I appreciated how absent modern stresses were from life there. But the lack of economic opportunity has a deep human cost; many Mongolian youth are working abroad.

As my departing flight to Beijing ascended over the glass buildings and sheepskin yurts of UB, it occurred to me that Mongolia can teach us much about economic miracles. A North Dakota or Texas miracle may be real, but it may also be ephemeral.

Also, now that I know how to ride a Mongolian horse bareback, if Chingis Kahn and the Golden Horde ever ride again, I have a fallback to working as an economist.

This is the first Pacific Economist column from UCLA Anderson School of Management economist Jerry Nickelsburg. He may be reached at Jerry.Nickelsburg@Anderson.UCLA.edu or via Twitter [@jnickelsburg](https://twitter.com/jnickelsburg).

Editorial: Important to vote on Nov. 8

This election cycle has created a divide that will take time to heal – locally and nationally.

No matter who or what wins-loses on Nov. 8, we must seek common ground for the greater good. The us vs. them mentality collectively makes us weaker. It is time to forge a path of strength. We can do this by listening, being respectful and building consensus. It will take compromise.

One of the wonderful things about the United States is our right to cast a vote for or against candidates and initiatives. Don't squander it.

We each have a voice, and it should be heard.

That is why it is important to vote on Tuesday. Your opinion does matter.

Lake Tahoe News earlier this fall came out with these local endorsements:

- **South Lake Tahoe City Council** – Jason Collin, Brooke Laine
- **Lake Tahoe Unified School District** – Annie Davidson, Bonnie Turnbull
- **Douglas County School District** – Keith Byer
- **Lake Tahoe Community College** – Nancy Dalton
- **South Tahoe Public Utility District** – Nick Exline, Randy Vogelgesang

- **Lake Valley Fire Protection District** – John Rice, Tony Sears, Leona Allen
 - **Measure P** – Yes
 - **Measure U** – No
 - **Measure T** – No.
-

Letter: Reilly is best choice for LTUSD

To the community:

It is imperative that Larry Reilly be elected to the LTUSD school board and serve as Trustee for Area 1. Larry is without question the most qualified candidate in this race. Our school district is facing some tough decisions over the next few years if it is to continue [Superintendent Jim] Tarwater's tremendous vision that he articulated years ago. This will require real leadership and a real knowledge of our community. A successful school board member must have his/her thumb on the pulse of the community he/she serves. And this connection can only be the result of years of living here.

Larry Reilly has been an active, involved, and model member of the South Lake Tahoe community for 37 years. For every minute of those decades of service, Larry has worked in education. And this work was not limited to the ethereal realm of ideas and testing and consortiums. Larry Reilly's experience was all that and so much more. Larry was hands-on working with students, parents, and administrators. Larry was part of an educational community that survived, and thrived, in some

tough times.

Larry Reilly's history of leadership as a teacher, coach, and athletic director is well documented. Few people in the South Lake Tahoe educational community can even compare to this man. Larry Reilly is the only sensible choice for the position of trustee 1 on the LTUSD school board. I hope you will join me, former students, parents of former students, business leaders, and educators in putting Larry Reilly's tremendous knowledge and experience to work for our children. Vote Larry Reilly for trustee 1 on Nov. th.

Derek Allister, South Lake Tahoe

Letter: Stop perpetuating us vs. them

To the community,

Duane [Wallace] "as one president to another" I'd hope your experience would tell you the professional way to introduce yourself to someone is not by insulting them. In your **Nov. 5 letter** your statement, "We locals, built this town when you were in college" is extremely arrogant and epitomizes one of the biggest challenges our community faces ... the inability to let go of the past. It has and continues to hamper efforts to attract human and financial capital and perpetuates the us vs. them mentality. I'd encourage you to recognize that many in this community, beyond you and whoever you define as your club of "locals" have taken risks to invest in this community and support our local businesses on both sides of the state line.

As an example, my family and I live in California, own

property in the city and have multiple business interests on the South Shore including in Nevada and in the city. As with many of my colleagues and members of the Tahoe Chamber, we recognize the South Shore's interconnected economy and need things to improve so we can expand our businesses, provide more living wage jobs and support our local schools and infrastructure. That is why the Tahoe Future 2020 Vision was created by the Tahoe Chamber and why it is the basis of key decisions, endorsements and direction for our organization and membership.

You make a number of other claims and accusations in your letter which need to be addressed. First, your claim of 1,600 members prior to the merger is significantly misleading. Given your involvement in the chamber at the time you are very aware that those numbers were inflated. Many entities had multiple chamber memberships from the same business. This is no longer a standard of practice in the industry.

Second, the Tahoe Chamber Independent Expenditure Committee raised money from the South shore community (California and Nevada) to support candidates who will best represent the interests of the business community and work toward the Tahoe Future 2020 vision for our interconnected economy and community. It is insulting to all our membership, but particularly our California members to purposely mislead the community suggesting otherwise.

Third, "Did Californians sue Nevadan's over ballot measures?" Accusing Nevada of suing California over Measure T and insinuating the Tahoe Chamber and the Tahoe Chamber IEC were involved is baseless, inappropriate and completely unprofessional. It is particularly disturbing coming from someone in a leadership position at a local business organization and an elected board member of a local utility district. Once again neither the Tahoe Chamber nor the Tahoe Chamber IEC have been involved in any aspect of the Measure T lawsuit. As you are aware, the lawsuit was filed by a

California resident on behalf of many in the community who feel disenfranchised by a ballot measure which proposes to take away governance powers of those City Council members they voted for.

Duane, I'd be happy on behalf of the Tahoe Chamber, our members and for the betterment of the community to sit down and identify how we can work together to improve our economy and build a sustainable community. I say this hoping you come with more professionalism and respect for my organization and myself than you demonstrated in your letter.

Jason Drew, Tahoe Chamber board of directors chair

Letter: Davidson is best candidate for LTUSD

To the community,

I am writing to endorse Annie Davidson for LTUSD school board. As coach of my daughter's soccer team, Annie showed true devotion to her athletes and was an incredible teacher and mentor for the girls she coached. She showed true patience and skill in coaching nine 7-year-old girls.

I got to know Annie during this time and was impressed with her enthusiasm for our youth and our community.

Annie has extensive experience in the realm of education. Her work has included education research, teaching, and policy.

We are lucky to have Annie and her family in our community. I am asking you to vote for Annie Davidson for the LTUSD school board this Tuesday.

Amy Anton, South Lake Tahoe physician and mom