

Item 5.1
8/11/2026 BOS meeting

From: Stetler Brown <stetlerbrown@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 1:10 PM
To: District 5
Cc: Clerk/BOS
Subject: 8/11/26 Meeting, Closed Session Item 1 (Initiation of Litigation)

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Supervisor Magsig,

I am writing to express my opposition to initiating litigation against the State of California regarding AB 1923. The last time that the County sued the State in 2023, the County was ordered to pay attorneys' fees for the State, and the judiciary found that the County, a legal subdivision against the State, did not have standing to sue regarding the Yokuts Valley name change. This cost the County several thousands of dollars, paid out of the District 5 office funds. Those funds could go for community events, special projects to support the District, and invest further for the good of the County.

Given the millions in deficits that the County is projected to face due to the tax reconciliation bill, repeated losses in the courtroom will continue to exacerbate the precarious budget situation the County finds itself in. As an elected official with responsibilities to the fiscal health of the County, supporting litigation like this while a fiscal crisis looms ahead appears to be a decision that would be ill-advised.

Cordially,
Stetler

Stetler Brown, MA / CWY/   : He/Him/His ([what is this?](#))
stetlerbrown@gmail.com
(559) 905-4650

Clovis, CA - Indigenous Residence: Yokuts

Item 5.1
8/11/26 BOS Meeting

From: Rachel Youdelman <rachel27@berkeley.edu>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2026 7:00 PM
To: Clerk/BOS
Subject: CORRECTION Fwd: Agenda Item 5.1 -- Comment Aug 11 2026 Meeting

CAUTION!!! - EXTERNAL EMAIL - THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK

[Report Suspicious](#)

[I've corrected a typo in my original message. Below is the corrected message.]

As a resident of Supervisor Magsig's district, I write as his constituent to express my particular disappointment in the action he took against the "Better Roads, Safe Streets" measure at the July 14 meeting, and to comment on the Aug 11 agenda item (5.1) regarding litigation against the state government.

As Supervisor Pacheco said on July 14, it was not the time for debate on the substance; the Board should have simply ratified the county clerk's work and sent the measure to the ballot.

Supervisor Magsig took an hour to ask disingenuous questions, some of which were preposterous—his query about demolishing bridges to rebuild them with bike lanes was rehearsed; it was one he raised at an earlier meeting and appeared to find it clever enough to repeat on July 14.

Though he's had the deferential support of Supervisors Magsig and Mendes, Supervisor Bredefeld bears most of the responsibility for the unnecessary delay and conflict surrounding the measure, as Bredefeld's open hostility and vows to "make it fail" drove the disruption of the process initially and subsequently led to the ill-advised "review," designed to delay the matter indefinitely, effectively ending it.

Thankfully the Board's efforts to scuttle the measure--which most of our county mayors, county leaders, and residents support--have been thwarted owing to the urgent action of state representatives.

Finally, regarding AB1923, I strongly oppose the county's initiation of litigation against the state government. Such action is imprudent for many reasons, not least because of the cost amid a critical budget shortfall and likely lack of standing to sue.

But most of all, for saving Garry Bredefeld's face, it's an unconscionably high price to pay.

Rachel Youdelman, Clovis 93612