1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	TRANSCRIPTION OF RIVERSIDE CITY COUNCIL MEETING
8	JULY 22, 2014
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Transcribed by: Christine Aiello
23	Job No. J0523893
24	
25	



"CITY COUNCIL MEETING"

MAYOR BAILEY: It is 1 o'clock on this

July 22nd Tuesday council meeting day. And item one,

let me provide a preamble, so to speak, to this unique
hearing in front of the council today. I want to make
sure that everyone understands why we are here and the
process we followed to get here, the scope of this
hearing, and the roles of the parties involved. I also
want to remind the public of the council meeting rules
and the decorum expected while addressing the council
as well as the conduct expected while in attendance of
this hearing.

Our ultimate hope through this process is to ensure that the city hall, our city hall maintains a professional working environment where we respect each other, our city employees, and our city charter. We are further committed to ensuring that everyone's rights are respected and that we continue to be the most responsible and responsive local government in California.

First and foremost we're here to provide a transparent process to a sensitive and significant issue that was brought to our attention by the city manager on behalf of the chief of police and one of his

subordinates. Transparency is a democratic value that builds public trust and leads to more informed decision making. The intent of this meeting is to ensure transparency within city government and afford all parties the rights and fair treatment they deserve resulting in accountability for all parties involved.

Accountability, as humbling and uncomfortable as it can be, is a cornerstone for public service, especially for elected officials in a representative democracy. Upon receiving a hostile work environment complaint and evidence of a potential violation of the city charter for administrative interference, the mayor and mayor pro tem called the closed session to review the evidence and the exposure to litigation.

This closed session led to the city council unanimously with council -- Councilmember Soubirous excused and Davis absent, authorizing the mayor pro tem to hire an outside investigator as required by state law and city policy. We had a duty to investigate.

Today's hearing and agenda item were scheduled by unanimous vote of the city council with Councilman Soubirous excused after meeting in closed session with our special council and the outside investigator to review the evidence and facts of the completed investigation.



We are here today to review the findings of the investigation as presented by Mr. Gumport; listen to a response from Councilman Soubirous; encourage the public to comment; allow the council to ask questions; discuss, deliberate, and take -- take action if so desired. Councilman Soubirous may respond from the podium or from the dais. This is not a judicial proceeding and thus the formal rules of evidence do not apply, nor will there be a cross-examination -- a cross-examination of witnesses.

I will now remind the council and the public of pertinent sections inside city council Resolution 22676 approved unanimously by the city council establishing the rules of procedure and order of business for our meetings.

First off, whereas it is the intent and thedesire of the city council to conduct its business in
an orderly in fair manner, in whereas there are certain
basic rights of due process; an opportunity to address
issues with equity, fairness, and equal protection of
the law; and whereas certain parliamentary procedures
have been found to be useful in order to ensure that
the communication of process of government are fair,
reasonable, and just; and whereas the city has a duty
to proceed with the business of government in an

efficient and orderly fashion; and whereas the city council desires to establish uniform norms and procedures in order to accomplish these goals.

The city council acts in the public trust.

And city council staff shall recognize that stewardship of the public interest must be the primary concern.

City council will work for the common good of the -- of the people of Riverside. City council will ensure fair and equal treatment of all persons, claims, and transactions coming before the city council and boards and commissions.

Decorum, while the city council is in session, the members must preserve order and decorum and a member shall not, by conversation or otherwise, delay or interrupt the proceedings or the peace of the city council, nor disturb any member while speaking, nor refuse to obey the orders of the city council or presiding officer except as otherwise herein provided.

Role of the mayor and city council. Mayor and city council general conduct. Mayor and councilmembers shall treat everyone with courtesy. Inappropriate behavior is derogatory and damages the perception of the city. While the city council is session, the mayor, councilmembers, and city staff shall preserve strict order and decorum. Neither the



mayor nor any councilmember shall delay or interrupt the proceedings of the city council or interrupt -interrupt any member while speaking.

Councilmembers should use the speaker sequencing system to indicate to the mayor that they want to speak. The mayor will acknowledge them before they begin to speak. Any councilmember shall have the right to express dissent from or protest to or comment upon any action of the city council. Once a vote is taken on an issue, councilmembers will support the law made by the city council.

If a councilmember wants an issue to be reconsidered, he or she will make a motion to reconsider it. The mayor and city council shall publicly share substantive information which they may have received from sources outside the public decision-making process that is relevant to a matter under consideration by the city council; allow for everyone's opinion to be heard and respected, even if they did not win the vote for their own issue; strive for a win-win situation by respecting diverse opinions.

Councilmembers will allow room for dialogue. When discussing the agenda item, the city council will allow the opportunity to let -- dialogue with each other to build consensus on an item. Any member of the



ť

city council may move to require the mayor to enforce the rules in the form of a vote with a majority of councilmembers present. Mayor and city council conduct with one -- one and other. The mayor and city council will value each other's time. All councilmembers have the opportunity to speak and agree to disagree.

The city council will avoid negative comments that could offend other councilmembers during public meetings, in the press, or any other time. The city council will practice civility and decorum in discussions and debate. The mayor has an affirmative duty to maintain order. The city council will honor the role of the mayor in maintaining order.

Mayor and city council conduct with the public. The mayor and city council will make the public feel welcome. The mayor and city council shall not be partial, prejudiced, or disrespectful toward the public. The mayor and city council shall -- should not make snappy sarcastic comments to the public or each other. The mayor and city council should treat members of the public equally. The mayor and city councilmembers shall make no promises to the public on behalf of the city council.

The mayor and city council shall not argue with members of the public. The mayor and city council



shall listen courteously and attentively to all public comments before the city council.

The role of the public. Members of the public attending the city council meetings shall observe the same rules and decorum applicable to the city council and staff. All speakers must approach the podium when recognized by the mayor. Members of the public shall only speak from the podium. Stamping of feet, whistles, yells, or shouting and/or similar demonstrations are unacceptable public behavior.

Members of the public shall turn off or switch any electric equipment -- electronic equipment, such as pages -- pagers and cell phones to the silent mode while attending the city council meeting. If a member of the public desires to provide written correspondence, bring that material to the city clerk.

And lastly, addressing the city council. Any person desiring to address the -- the city council shall first secure the permission of the presiding officer to do so under the -- the following headings of business unless the presiding officer rules otherwise, speakers, a person may request to be heard on a public hearing item or a discussion calendar item by filling out and filing a form provided by the city clerk. They're on the table in the back. The request to be

heard must be submitted to the city clerk before the scheduled meeting time or at any recess called by -- by the preceding officer prior to the item being heard.

Requests will not be accepted during the

meeting so as not to disrupt the meeting. Each person addressing the city council shall step up before the city council and make -- and may give their name and address in an audible tone of voice for the record. All remarks shall be addressed to the city council, as a body, and not to any councilmember thereof.

So at this time, if you would, the council speaking -- speaker cards are in the back, this is your last call to fill out a speaker card to speak on this item in front of the city council at this time and bring it over to the -- the box on your right.

Let me now introduce Mark Meyerhoff --

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Mayor --

MAYOR BAILEY: -- our --

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- if I may. Pardon me for interrupting. I have to make a disclosure with violation of the law and ask for information for that violation of law and then unfortunately charge every member of this council in violation of the Brown Act.

So I need to do so --

MAYOR BAILEY: Well --



```
COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- under the State of
 1
 2
     California laws, under the Brown Act, the Ralph M.
 3
    Brown Act.
 4
               FEMALE SPEAKER: Recall.
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Prior to this discussion
 5
 6
     in here, we, as a council --
 7
               MAYOR BAILEY: Councilman Davis, you weren't
     recognized by the presiding officer, so I'm --
8
 9
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Well, I understand that.
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- going to have to ask you
10
11
     to -- to --
12
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: But I'm going to
13
     complete.
14
               MAYOR BAILEY: When -- when you are done --
15
     when I am done speaking, then you can --
16
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: I cannot --
17
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- speak.
18
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- participate in this
19
    because it would be a violation of the law, sir.
20
               MAYOR BAILEY: Let's ask our city --
21
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS:
                                     So let --
22
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- attorney for --
23
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- me finish, if I
24
    may --
25
               MAYOR BAILEY: No.
```



```
1
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- of what my statement
 2
     is.
 3
               MAYOR BAILEY: No, you may not, okay? As a
     presiding officer --
 4
 5
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Really?
 6
               FEMALE SPEAKER: You need (indiscernible).
 7
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- I just read the rules of
 8
    procedure. We haven't begun this --
 9
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Let's take a vote --
10
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- hearing.
11
           COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- of council then. T
12
     call for a vote of the council of whether or not I can
13
     speak that we did, in fact, violate the Brown Act and
14
     when we did it and how we did it before we proceed.
15
     This is allowed under the --
16
              MAYOR BAILEY: Councilman Davis --
17
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- emergency clause
    of --
18
19
              MAYOR BAILEY: -- you're out of --
20
              COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- (indiscernible) --
21
              MAYOR BAILEY: -- order.
22
              COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- and so forth.
23
              MAYOR BAILEY: You're out of order. You are
24
    not recognized to speak, because I went through the
25
    rules of procedure. So --
```



```
COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: I'm calling for --
 1
 2
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- at -- at the --
 3
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- a vote of council.
 4
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- right time, I will call you
 5
     to speak. Let me now --
 6
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Madam --
 7
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- introduce --
 8
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- madam attorney.
 9
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- Mark Meyerhoff, our special
     counsel, who will --
10
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: (Indiscernible)
11
12
     attorney.
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- explain the duty to
13
     investigate -- do -- do you really want me to recess
14
     this meeting?
15
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Yes, I do. We need --
16
17
               MAYOR BAILEY: Let me now introduce Mark
18
    Meyerhoff --
19
               COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Mayor, I --
20
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- our special counsel.
21
               COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: -- will -- I will
22
    second that motion to recess the meeting.
23
               MAYOR BAILEY: We -- we are not --
     this -- as -- as you heard the meeting rules, right, I
24
25
    have not recognized anybody to speak. So that is not a
```



```
1
     motion --
 2
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Point of order, sir.
 3
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- that's on the table right
 4
     now.
 5
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Point of order, sir.
 6
               COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Well -- well, I
     think there are a lot of important issues that we need
 7
    to discuss --
 8
 9
               MAYOR BAILEY: And --
10
               COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: -- before we
     proceed.
11
12
               MAYOR BAILEY: Yes. And that is --
13
               COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ:
                                         The --
14
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- why we have special counsel
15
     and our independent investigator and our city attorney
16
     to address those concerns.
17
               COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: I -- I think it's
18
     important --
19
               MAYOR BAILEY: So --
20
               COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: -- that we --
21
               MAYOR BAILEY: So -- so if you let --
22
               COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: -- at least clarify
23
     something.
24
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- me finish, I'm -- I'm not
25
     finished. So you interrupted --
```



1	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: (Indiscernible).
2	MAYOR BAILEY: your presiding officer.
3	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Mayor mayor
4	MAYOR BAILEY: So when
5	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Mayor
6	MAYOR BAILEY: I'm finished speaking, then
7	I will allow you to
8	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: One of the
9	MAYOR BAILEY: to address your
10	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: One of the
11	MAYOR BAILEY: concerns.
12	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: things that you
13	mentioned is that we are supposed to be considerate of
13 14	others' comments.
14	others' comments.
14 15	others' comments. MAYOR BAILEY: Yes, after
14 15 16	others' comments. MAYOR BAILEY: Yes, after COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Councilmember Davis
14 15 16 17	others' comments. MAYOR BAILEY: Yes, after COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Councilmember Davis had comments.
14 15 16 17 18	others' comments. MAYOR BAILEY: Yes, after COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Councilmember Davis had comments. MAYOR BAILEY: And and I did not recognize
14 15 16 17 18	others' comments. MAYOR BAILEY: Yes, after COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Councilmember Davis had comments. MAYOR BAILEY: And and I did not recognize him, did
14 15 16 17 18 19	others' comments. MAYOR BAILEY: Yes, after COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Councilmember Davis had comments. MAYOR BAILEY: And and I did not recognize him, did COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: And I
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	others' comments. MAYOR BAILEY: Yes, after COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Councilmember Davis had comments. MAYOR BAILEY: And and I did not recognize him, did COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: And I MAYOR BAILEY: I?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	others' comments. MAYOR BAILEY: Yes, after COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Councilmember Davis had comments. MAYOR BAILEY: And and I did not recognize him, did COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: And I MAYOR BAILEY: I? COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: have comments



```
MAYOR BAILEY:
                              I'm sorry, but this is --
 1
 2
               COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: -- we proceed.
 3
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- not -- this is not the
     council meeting rules that you all have signed and
 4
 5
     agreed to.
 6
               COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Understood, sir.
 7
               MAYOR BAILEY: So when your presiding officer
 8
     is --
 9
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: As a point of order, I
10
     request a --
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- finished --
11
12
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- vote on that.
13
               MAYOR BAILEY: There's no point of order.
14
     That's not the parliamentary procedure --
15
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Council makes the --
16
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- that we have.
17
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- rules, sir. You do
    not.
18
19
               MAYOR BAILEY: That's not the parliamentary
20
     procedure that we have engaged in this council meeting.
21
               COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ:
                                         Motion --
22
               MAYOR BAILEY: Let me now introduce --
23
               COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: -- has been made and
24
     seconded.
25
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- Mark Meyerhoff, our special
```



3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

counsel, who will further explain the duty to 1 investigate and answer the question of why we are here today. He's going to do that for you. He will be followed by our independent investigator, Leonard Gumport, who will present a summary of the findings. Councilman Soubirous will then be provided the opportunity to respond for as long as needed followed by public comment.

This is the final call again for speaker cards on this item. After speaker cards are collected from this call, no more speaker cards will be accepted as per the rules of procedure and order of business. After public comment is completed, the council will have the opportunity to ask questions, make comments, make motions and consider alternatives listed on the council report or otherwise.

Mr. Meyerhoff.

MR. MEYERHOFF: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. My name is Mark Meyerhoff of the law firm of Liebert Cassidy I have been assisting the city as special Whitmore. counsel for this matter. As the mayor mentioned, the complaints brought by the city manager on behalf of the chief of police and one of his subordinates alleged, among other things, claims of hostile work environment. Under the California government code, as part of the

Fair Employment and Housing Act, Section 12940 of the government code, employers, including the City of -- of Riverside are required to conduct fair, prompt, and thorough investigations into any claims of hostile work environment, and that was one of the reasons that council authorized the investigation by an independent third-party investigator.

The investigator also reviewed allegations that the city charter was violated, specifically charter Section 407. Based on this obligation, the council retained an impartial third-party investigator to conduct an investigation into the allegations that were made. The council is here today to publicly deliberate on the issue of whether any action should be taken as a result of that investigation.

Now, this type of meeting is authorized by California law and is within the authority of this council. I will now pass it to Mr. Leonard Gumport, who acted as the independent investigator in this matter.

MR. GUMPORT: Thank you. I'm Leonard Gumport of Gumport Mastan. I was hired by the city to conduct an independent investigation. I'm going to tell you how I did the investigation, what the investigation focused on, and my conclusions; but I want to start



with the conclusion. The conclusion I reached
basically as to all the allegations was that it would
be undue speculation to find that Councilmember
Soubirous committed any of the violations that were
alleged against him. That's -- that's -- okay.

And in -- in arriving at that conclusion, I found that essentially there are two different versions of what happened on a meeting that occurred on Valentine's day, February 14, 2014, at a Starbucks on Arlington between Councilmember Soubirous and Riverside Police Department sergeant Brian Smith, who is also the president of the Riverside Police Officers' Association.

And if one believed what Brian Smith said, one could conclude that something inconsistent with the Brown Act or the ethics code or the city charter Section 407 had occurred, but Councilmember Soubirous gave me responses and his version of -- of what happened, and I think it's simply a situation where there's nothing but speculation as to whose person's -- or which person's version of what happened is accurate.

Now having said that, let me talk about who I am and how I arrived at these conclusions. First of all, my background is I've done investigations and litigation for over 30 years. The way I conduct

(

investigations is a little bit different from the way some other people do it. I do think an investigation needs to be transparent, and therefore unlike many investigators, what I do is I interview all witnesses on the record.

And what that means is, either they put what they are going to tell me and I'm going to rely on in writing, that they know my client will see, and that may become available to the public; or when I interview them, there is a court reporter present and the court reporter takes down what the person says voluntarily. In other words, I tell all the witnesses, you can tell me anything you want to off the record, but I'm not going to rely on it. I'm not going to give it any weight, and it doesn't go to my client because it's meaningless.

on the record. And so as part of this investigation and an overlapping investigation involving another councilmember, there were over 15 interviews conducted. The -- the first investigation, which involved Councilmember Soubirous began on April 7th and concluded with my report on May 30th. And the second investigation concluded shortly afterwards.

And when the investigation was done, the city



attorney and the councilmembers received all the transcripts of all the interviews that I conducted. In addition as part of the investigation, I requested access to all emails of Councilmember Soubirous and his field representative on designated subjects to the extent that they were public records that could lawfully be produced to me. And they were produced to me, and they were reviewed by me.

When I wrote the report, I wrote the report.

Nobody else wrote the report. And I did all the interviews myself. So I -- I didn't rely on somebody's secondhand version of whether somebody seemed to be credible or not credible. In addition, one of the things that happened during the investigation was Councilmember Soubirous declined to be interviewed.

And he expressed through his counsel, Danuta Tuszynska, I believe that's how her name is pronounced, that he -- he objected to the investigation and for that reason he wasn't going to give an interview.

And I want to stress that my view was, under the circumstances, since Councilmember Soubirous was the subject of the investigation, no negative inference should be drawn by me or anybody else that he declined to be interviewed. Ultimately as the investigation progressed, through his counsel, Councilmember

Soubirous agreed to answer questions that I put to him in writing. And I gave him questions, and he answered all those questions on -- on or about May 15th or May 14th, 2014.

And all of my questions and all of his answers are an exhibit to my report. And -- and his answers were -- were different from the version given to me by Sergeant Smith concerning what happened on February 14th. And I attached what I regarded as the key transcripts and the key documents to my report, set forth in my report what I thought the -- the key facts were, and then gave my analysis and my conclusions. So that's how I did my investigation.

Now, let me summarize what I -- what I saw in terms of what appear to be the facts. And again, certain key facts are disputed. In November 2013, Michael Soubirous ran for councilmember of Ward 3, and he won that election. He ran --

MALE SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

MR. GUMPORT: He won that election. And he campaigned against a person who had a law enforcement background named Valerie Hill. And Councilmember Soubirous has an extensive background in law enforcement as well. And the Riverside Police Officers' Association had a difficult decision to make



because there were these two law enforcement officers -- people with law enforcement backgrounds running for to be councilmember from Ward 3, and they picked Valerie Hill to endorse. And they spent money supporting Valerie Hill's campaign.

And Michael Soubirous had discussions, one or more discussions with the union, specifically with Brian Smith and told them, you are backing the wrong horse. I'm going to out-campaign Valerie Hill, and I'm going to win this election. And this is coming from Brian Smith. This is not coming from Councilmember Soubirous.

And when Councilmember Soubirous won that election, there was tension, that's how I would describe it, between these two people who became key witnesses, namely Brian Smith and Councilmember Soubirous. Why? Because Councilmember Soubirous didn't forget that the union had backed Valerie Hill, and he reminded its members, I think somewhat to the dismay of Brian Smith, that they had spent something like \$40,000 backing his opponent.

And I -- I think it's -- I think it's reasonable to say that this caused some dissension within the ranks of the union according to Brian Smith.

In getting elected, Councilmember Soubirous very much

was concerned, based on his background and experience, with the issues of vagrancy, aggressive panhandling, things that in his view made Riverside, particularly Ward 3, not the highest and best place that he wanted, and had campaigned on.

Now, there's an issue with policing.

Whenever you set a priority for the police to go after some criminal problem or law enforcement problem, you are potentially taking away resources from other areas of enforcement. And one of the things that Sergeant Smith expressed to me in his interview was, there's a lot of patrol cars in neighborhoods other than Ward 3 because of priorities placed on preventing violent crime, that according to Sergeant Smith, is not as prevalent in Ward 3.

So there was also a tension between the Councilmember Soubirous' view on how law enforcement resources should be allocated and how the union or Sergeant Smith felt that law enforcement resources should be allocated. And in on or about December 31st or the first week of January, there was at least one homicide in -- in a city park. And it got a lot of attention and there was concern. And what developed from that was a discussion about whether or not possibly armed private security guards should be hired



1 by the city to make the parks safer.

And that was a controversial issue because typically law enforcement is done by armed trained peace officers under the authority of the chief of police who answers to the city manager. And there was a February 11th public council meeting on the subject of security in the parks, and many citizens expressed different views about the proposal to have these armed private guards as opposed to police officers.

What happened after that was the meeting on February 14th between Councilmember Soubirous and Sergeant Brian Smith. The meeting happened at a Starbucks, and according to Councilmember Soubirous, the purpose of the meeting from his standpoint was to make inquiry of Sergeant Smith concerning the union's position on various law enforcement issues including the use of private security in place instead of trained police officers.

And according to Councilmember Soubirous, essentially he asked questions and got information from Brian Smith. And -- and let me pause there, because this goes to how the City of Riverside and its councilmembers are supposed to deal with the staff of the city. I think many people have the misconception that when someone gets elected to the city council who

has expertise in an area, and -- and Councilmember Soubirous has expertise in law enforcement, that what they're supposed to do as an advocate for their constituents is to go to the department that they're concerned with and start training the employees to do a better job or to do a better job as the councilmember perceives it.

And the charter of the City of Riverside prohibits that kind of conduct, specifically Section 407 of the Riverside city charter, which is the like the United States of Constitution -- it's like the Constitution of the United States as far as the City of Riverside is concerned. It places limits on what councilmembers can do as individuals.

First, they cannot interfere on an individual basis with the performance by the city manager of his responsibilities, which is to do such things as run the city on a day-to-day basis. The chief of police reports to the city manager. The chief of police does not report to individual councilmembers.

And you could have Elliot Ness as a city councilmember here who knew everything about law enforcement, and he would have no business going to various police officers and telling them how to do their job. That would be interfering with the city



manager's conduct of the business. And one of the good things about that is it means that the administrative service of the City of Riverside, by and large, is -- is answering to someone who's just trying to run the city on an apolitical basis and not trying to do favors for -- perceived favors for one councilmember or another.

And this is the structure of government that the members of the City of Riverside have selected.

You may not think it's the best form of government, but it is the form of government that exists. Another thing that charter Section 7 -- 407 says is councilmembers shall not deal with basically city employees without going through the city manager except for the purpose of inquiry.

Soubirous, under his version of the facts was complete -- completely within his rights to go to Sergeant Smith and ask him questions. He didn't need the city manager's permission or going through that office to ask questions. And Councilmember Soubirous' version of what happened there is he simply asked questions and -- and -- and got information from Sergeant Smith.

Sergeant Smith's version is different.



And -- and let me make it clear, the city charter says councilmembers can only basically go around the city manager's office to ask questions of city staff. They can't go to city staff without going through the city manager's office and say, why don't you put more policemen here, why don't you -- well, and say put more policemen here or put more policemen there or don't do this or don't do that. They also can't issue orders in any way, shape, or form to the city staff.

Sergeant Smith's version of what happened is different, as I said. And so I -- I -- I'm going to read a little bit of what he said. I'm not going to read a lot of what he said, because again, I think it would be speculation to conclude that what he said is accurate. And -- and I'm going to explain that in a second, because I'm not saying that what Sergeant Smith said is untrue. I'm simply saying, there's no way, short of speculation, to decide whose version is more accurate.

Here is an example of -- of what Sergeant
Smith said, among other things, was -- was said at the
February 14th Starbucks meeting. Question, do you
recall Councilmember Soubirous saying to you at the
Valentine's day meeting that all the councilmembers
were disappointed with the city's response to the



homeless issue and that Soubirous had seven votes on the council to get rid of the city manager and chief of police. Answer, and this is Sergeant Smith talking, like I said earlier, my recollection of it was it's a seven-to-nothing vote.

The council is committed to get these things done, and if Scott Barber can't do it, then it's time for a new city manager, followed up very shortly with, the council is not happy with Sergio Diaz, the chief's response to these things, and they're tired of hearing how there's nothing we can do. And if he can't get it done, then maybe it's time to find a new chief of police.

Question, and by get these things done, you're referring to liveability issues, panhandlers and -- answer, transients. If that was true, that -- a person could conclude that -- that what was being said between Councilmember Soubirous and Sergeant Smith wasn't simply Councilmember Soubirous asking questions. It was Councilmember Soubirous telling Sergeant Smith about things that had to happen.

And that if they didn't happen, specifically with regard to transients, the city manager was going to go and that there were seven votes to get rid of him. And that shortly afterwards if -- if that didn't

work out, then the chief might go, the chief of police being Sergio Diaz.

Now, under the charter's Section 407, that could, if you believe that that happened, constitute violations. As I said, I think it's sheer speculation whether anything like that was said. And Councilmember Soubirous denies it. Now, here's why I think you -- I did not find that I could honestly conclude that one version's -- one person's version of what happened was necessarily more accurate than the other's.

First of all, Councilmember Soubirous feels very strongly and is on the record very strongly as caring about the problem of panhandling and the criminal element involved in the homeless. He certainly doesn't categorize all homeless as criminals, but he -- he believes firmly that there is a criminal element involved in panhandling and some homeless. And his ward, according to Sergeant Smith, has a particular priority as to that issue, because as a relatively affluent ward, and this is according to Sergeant Smith, the other kinds of crimes that may afflict other wards are not present.

And he walked -- and during his campaign when he walked his ward, he didn't see as many patrol cars.

Because the way the police force works is they



prioritize -- prioritize, and Ward 3 doesn't get as many patrol cars in -- in Councilmember Soubirous' mind as it should, according to Sergeant Smith.

And as I've described it, there was a history between Brian Smith and Michael Soubirous going back to the campaign when they backed the wrong horse, when the union in -- in -- in Councilmember Soubirous' eyes backed the wrong horse.

In addition, there -- there are some, what I would describe as emails where Councilmember Soubirous said things that resemble the things that Brian Smith said he said at the Starbucks meeting. And I -- I'll just give you a brief example. This is -- I'm reading from Exhibit H to my report.

This is an email from Michael Soubirous to one of his constituents. And I'll leave out the name of the constituent. But what he writes is, among other things is, I'm with you on this. I have seen and continued to see the same things you are seeing regarding the aggressive panhandling and our traffic officers. I watch RPD officers drive by panhandlers every day and night, no action, not even a look.

And he also says, "Please know that all seven councilmembers are committed to curbing our aggressive panhandler problem. It must stop." And he also says,

part of the problem has been our police department's lack of enforcing our city's ordinances relating to panhandling. This will stop, et cetera, end quote.

Now, all of these statements are kind of similar to the things that Brian Smith said that Councilmember Soubirous was saying to him at Starbucks, but Councilmember Soubirous says he didn't say those things. And given the history of these two individuals, Sergeant Smith and Councilmember Soubirous, it's just speculation to conclude that, for me, this -- this is my view, that those things that -- that Sergeant Smith said Councilmember Soubirous said are more accurate than Councilmember Soubirous' version.

Now, there were four kinds of violations alleged. And let me just go through them so we're clear on each of them. And when I say that they were alleged, there were really two complaints. There was one by the chief of police, Sergio Diaz, and one by the city manager. One -- and they didn't make identical complaints, but they all involved this, what was said between Sergeant Smith and Councilmember Soubirous on February 14th at the Starbucks.

One allegation was that it appeared that there had been a Brown Act violation. Now, the Brown



Act requires that generally the council conduct its 1 2 business publicly and as a group and that they not have secret votes on various matters. And the allegation 3 made was that, well, there was an indication by 4 Councilmember Soubirous that he had seven votes to do 5 6 something. And since there -- there definitely is no public record of any vote being taken through 7 February 14th on the issue of armed guards or -- or 8 9 increased security in the parks, there may have been a Brown Act violation. 10 Well, first of all -- first of all, there 11 12

was, again, just a conflict in what was said during the meeting. So I thought that there was no -- it was simply speculation whether there was a Brown Act violation. Also the allegation was made that there were seven votes to terminate the city manager. And I interviewed all of the councilmembers, they all made themselves available for transcribed interviews; there's never been a vote by the councilmembers to terminate Scott Barber as city manager. So there's -- there's been no secret vote that I could see and therefore no Brown Act violation.

Secondly -- I've already discussed the Section 407 alleged violation. Again it's what I would describe as a squaring contest and I don't doubt the --



13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the -- the accuracy of either story, I just don't think I can decide which one is accurate, it's just speculation. Secondly, there was an allegation that there had been an ethics violation on the grounds that perhaps Councilmember Soubirous had misrepresented a possible secret vote to terminate Scott Barber as city manager.

Well, again, I don't find -- I find it would be mere speculation to attribute those -- those words to Councilmember Soubirous, and therefore my conclusion was there's no likely ethics violation. Lastly on the harassment claim, that's similar to the ethics claim, it depends on crediting one version's -- one person's version -- version of what was said over another's, and I -- I just don't think it would be anything other than speculation to say that that happened.

I would also say, I would add that on the harassment issue, the claim made was that there was a hostile work environment. A layperson might understand that a hostile work environment is when your boss yells at you or treats you badly, but, in fact, there's a technical legal -- legal meaning to a hostile work environment and the -- the harassment or the hostility has to be based on a race, religion, something like that.

And while if what Sergeant Smith said was true, there might be some kind of hostile work environment -- environment the way a layperson would understand it. Under the technical requirements of the city's and the -- the state's anti-harassment laws, there was not a hostile work environment.

So that's the basic conclusions I've reached in this report. I would say it has been and should be a learning experience for me and for everybody else, because this could have been avoided.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. GUMPORT: Could have been avoided by multiple means, and the principle guidance appears in Section 407 of the city charter, which essentially says, well, look, except for purposes of inquiry, the councilmembers as individuals can't go to city staff without going through the city manager's office.

And -- and let me read the language, because it -- it's important not to change it. It -- what it -- what the second part of Section 407 says is, quote, except for purpose of inquiry, the mayor, the city council, and -- and its members shall deal with the administrative service under the city manager solely through the city manager. And neither the mayor nor the city council nor any member thereof shall give

orders to any subordinates of the city manager, either publicly or privately.

So how could this have been avoided? Well, sometimes as a lawyer, I will say to someone, you don't want to go to a meeting with that person, because I just don't know what that person is going to say when the two of you come out of that meeting and nobody else is there. In this case it was an accident. There was supposed to be a third person there, but he wasn't there.

But if Councilmember Soubirous had gone through the city manager's office or had a third person, somebody extra with him, there wouldn't have been this whole issue. And I think Councilmember Soubirous reasonably responded to the pressure of someone conducting an investigation concerning his conduct and said, look, I just am not going to talk to you, just not going to do it. I don't have to, and so I'm not.

And as I said, I -- I -- I don't draw any negative inference from that; but the result is, the city, after it got the complaint, had to go through this exercise of trying to figure out what happened because a councilmember met -- member met with -- with a city staffer, Sergeant Smith, and nobody else was



there and Sergeant Smith gave one version and Councilmember Soubirous had -- at -- at the time was not, did not want to respond.

And as I said, I don't fault him for that.

But I think one of the things I've seen is that cities can avoid this by utilizing the city manager's office for communications with staff and protect themselves against this kind of investigation, which at the end of the day, as I said, I don't think anybody knows what was really said and I don't fault either of the participants in those two conversations. I just wish that the situation could have been avoided, and I hope that in the future it will be. Thank you.

MAYOR BAILEY: Thank you for the thorough summary of the investigation. That brings us to response, if so chosen, by Councilmember Soubirous.

afternoon, everybody, and thank you for coming to this trial today. I really appreciate seeing you all out there. I think it's very important -- I think it's very important that, you know, we see this in the context for what it is.

You know, I didn't want to get into a whole lot of minutiae about the case, it's been stated, but there are a couple things that did get left out. And I

did post this on my Facebook page today. I don't have enough copies for all of you. But Mr. Smith, the union president, he stated that he deleted his text messages.

I was smart enough to keep mine.

MAYOR BAILEY: If you could keep the decorum,

I would appreciate that, and let him explain and -- and give his testimony.

COUNCILMEMBER SOUBIROUS: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

February 7th, 2013, 6:09 a.m., this was the prior contact, a year and two weeks before the February 14th, 13th thing. This is me, so very sorry to learn of the shooting and death, that was Officer Crain, please let me know if there's anything you need.

Thanks. We'll talk later.

And a year later on Thursday, February 13th at 9:51. Mike Soubirous here. Are you in favor of my suggestion to provide overtime monies for RPD extra patrols in parks versus guards. I'm asking a question. I didn't ask for a meeting. Mr. Smith, yes, guards send the wrong message and won't solve anything. I'm at traffic court this morning, but would like to discuss this park issue with you at length. So I said, you're welcome, looking forward to the dialogue.

I actually let him know that the city manager



wants to deliver results sooner than later so we better start talking so that you, Brian, can talk to the city manager. He said, yeah, I heard, et cetera, et cetera. We weren't able to meet that day, but we met the next day. By the way, I've met with Brian Smith before, and if this is the rule that you only meet with one -- or more than one, when I was running for county supervisor, we met like three times, he was all by himself.

And then about a month after this meeting, I met with Aurelio Melendrez, and he was by himself. You would think they would have learned the first time, don't go by yourself, because those councilmembers, boy. The problem is growing with the panhandlers.

We've got to take care of this. We met. I'm around the corner, because I get to things late. He says, okay, no problem. Also, too, he had expressed,

Mr. Smith expressed that he wasn't too happy about the union busting, as he called it, with the city manager.

And I said, you need to talk with the city manager. If I see him, do you mind if I broker a meeting? Which I did and I told Scott Barber, our city manager, I said Brian Smith has some concerns, I think he needs to talk with you. Yeah, that's a rogue councilmember that just operates on his own and he's



not, you know, considering the county -- the -- the position and power of our city manager.

If he has not already done so, I told Scott, are Scott Barber -- or Brian, Scott Barber says he will be calling you. Please stress, as you stated before, need for city attorney, mental health, et cetera. I think that will be very important for him to know that the officers want assistance and backing. Because that was the concern of the meeting from Mr. Smith is they didn't want to get sued taking on the panhandlers. It's right there. It's on my Facebook page. It's for all of you to read.

And one other little item is, in our charter under Charter 14, council requests. All council requests dealing with policy issues and those requests which may be construed as direction go through the city manager, except for general inquiries or questions, in which case the city council may go to the department heads or key staff in the city manager's office.

Councilmembers may also deal directly with the city attorney, city clerk, and other staff appointed by the council. That's in our charter.

In the administrative code that our city manager and staff follows, it talks about mayor -- this is 01.004.00, mayor and council's constituent complaint



management system. Purpose, to establish a uniform response procedure and tracking system for nonroutine mayor and city council constituent complaints, which will enable the council to provide the best possible outcome and service for their constituents.

And I don't want to bore you with all the details, but it talks about talking to a department head or a defined liaison or whoever. It doesn't mention anything about talking to the city manager. It actually has the city manager's role on here where he is supposed to set up a program where we can have identified people to talk to.

I do believe that my colleagues, this is who I learned from as a brand-new councilmember wet behind the ears, yeah, we go to different lieutenants for the different area commands and, you know, we ask them, can you take care of business; and they do, they're really good at it. They do a great job. So you know, Mr. Gumport didn't mention that part. It's really nice that, you know, he talked about that happened -- that accident that, you know, happened basically with just going down there and not knowing any better and you know -- I -- I just don't get it. I mean, I specifically went to the union chief.

You know, when I worked for the Highway



Patrol, the union president of the California 1 2 Association of Highway Patrolmen, and this is in the -the state law books, does -- this applies to the entire 3 city and county as well, is they tell you on all these 4 5 different employer-employee relationship manuals everywhere, and -- and this is rules and laws that we 6 7 have to follow that are empowered by our state 8 legislature, that these union chiefs are the 9 equivalent, when he operates as the RPOA president, 10 Brian Smith is the equivalent to our city manager. 11 Same with the association president, he is equal to the commissioner of the Highway Patrol when he represents 12 13 his troops.

On this dais, I asked Mr. Diaz, our chief, I said, chief, are you in favor, and I said, I don't want to put you between you -- and you can check these records and I've got the -- I've got the recording, I don't want to put you between you and the city manager, but, sir, are you for overtime versus these security guards and parks; and I didn't get a response. What did I do? Two days later I talked to the other boss, the guy in charge of the troops from the union aspect. I wanted to get an answer. I will record my conversations next time.

Now, I don't want to say anything further



14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CITY COUNCIL MEETING RIVERSIDE CITY COUNCIL MEETING

about the specifics of the investigation. The investigation concluded that the claims by the witnesses -- or the witness cannot be -- Mr. Smith, cannot be substantiated. And that was the outcome. The report shows clear bias, I believe, by the investigator. I mean, you know, he picked probably the -- the most horrible thing that I said on email, the rest of them were just, hey, I want to get this solved, but, you know, it's all this slanting.

Just like this thing costs more money supposedly in his comments because I didn't answer the questions right away. Well, we didn't have to have a stenographer. You didn't have to drive out from L.A. And I don't think that it's just going to cost a few pennies for Mr. Gumport to be here today extending this thing out any further, but yet I get the blame for it. I just think it's very biased.

You know, the Press Enterprise said that I was cleared. I really -- there's not much more point in defending that, so I'm going to drop that; but I do want to say that I believe this is nothing but an attempt by you, Mr. Bailey, to smear me, my reputation, my voice as a councilmember representing the people of my ward and greater Riverside. You know that I'm up for reelection in June of 2015 and you are doing



everything on your part to discredit me to make me look bad to the public. You have spent thousands of taxpayer dollars to do this.

I did not request this hearing. Numerous councilmembers have told members of the public, I've heard, that I requested this. I did not request it. Why would I request it when the vote has already been taken, from what I'm told? I was told this would occur. The manner in which it would occur was dictated to me.

And I want to know, what source of authority are we following regarding the terms and conditions set forth in my participation and limitations imposed upon me by this hearing? I cannot ask clarifying questions. I cannot bring witnesses. I can't present evidence. I'm not entitled to due process. How is this a fair hearing or trial? There's no lawful basis for this hearing, no authority -- authority under our city's charter or rules of procedure, order of business, not even under our code of ethics, which we failed to follow that procedure.

You have made me a great student of all those items I just mentioned. I have read them probably 50 times backward and forward. I can just about quote them. You have made me an expert at this, and I thank

you for that. This investigation and subsequent hearing is in direct conflict with charter Chapter 202, our city's code of ethics and conduct statement. It's the mechanism for all council conduct. It's also the mechanism for, not only your elected council, but for any of the appointed members of boards, commissions, or committees. It does not apply to anybody else. Just us.

So what is the source of authority to conduct this hearing? What source of authority did you follow to conduct secret meetings to plot, plan, and execute this investigation? And all you have to do is read the investigation. Some of the key players in here, they say that they met, they worked it out, they figured out what they were going to do, and then they went home and they wrote memos for their complaint. Wonderful.

What is the source of authority to prevent me from cross -- cross-examining, questioning the evidence, bringing witnesses? In a sense you're violating my due process rights. What charter chapter or source of authority allows you to all sit in judgment of me? I can't find it in our charter. I cannot find in our charter where any of the councilmembers can sit in judgment of me.

So, Mr. Mayor, by organizing this, you've put



them all at risk. You deny me of my basic rights, granted to me like any other citizen of this country and noncitizens, and that's guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. I swore down here to uphold the Constitution of the State of California and the U.S. Constitution, and I've done it. My crime so far is I've been doing my job.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

than a political witch hunt orchestrated by our mayor in collusion with willing staff, all while spending taxpayer money to achieve your agenda, sir. You want subservient councilmembers who will follow lockstep with you on every issue. I'm not going to be one of those. You are not Chicago's Mayor Daley. You are Mr. Rusty Bailey. You are not the legislative or executive leader of our city. The city charter gives you no such power. You are the ceremonial head paid full time to attend ceremonies and functions to represent the city, since us councilmembers are listed as part-timers.

I am truly disappointed in you, sir, in that you would sanction such as a process. And you are acting like a self-righteous person, who has stated to the people in our community, and I've heard it come



back to me, that you are out to punish the wrongdoers.

Punish the wrongdoers, what gives you such right if
you've said that? Are you playing judge? And have you
convened a jury to convict me even though the evidence
obtained through the course of this investigation shows
otherwise?

As mayor of this city, the power and the role you have is listed as ceremonial head. You moderate the meetings. You do not run them. It's the council's meeting. It's in the charter. I've read it over and over. You have the privilege of voting on an issue to break a tie vote should a member be unable to vote. You also have veto power, but you can be overridden. That's it, ceremonial head. This is a city council, city manager form of government. That's what our charter says.

The council sits as the policymaker. It is our meeting. It is our vote that grants money for you and for programs that we allow to be financed, period. This is what is listed in the charter. Last I checked Riverside was in the United States. It's not its own island where the rules can be made up by a dictator -- dictator mayor. Excuse me. This is not a monarchy. You have abused your position, sir.

You are exacting revenge against those who do



not share your vision, your vision to cause social engineering like street cars, bike lanes, et cetera. These all may be fine ideas to explore and I don't mind exploring them, but don't shove it down our throats. You have told me to stop campaigning and start governing. I've heard that from others as well.

Well, sir, I've proposed over a half dozen new ideas and plans that help make Riverside a more livable place. Many of these plans and proposals have already been voted upon by this council and are now policy. I've only been here seven months. I've done quite a lot to bring the people's voice and desires to city hall.

I know that you are actively recruiting residents of Ward 3 to run against me. I hear the talk. You have used taxpayer dollars to fund your desire to remove me from this seat. You have been the driving force to push this investigation from the start. Your fingerprints are all -- are all over this mess. Instead of being a uniter, you become a divider. Divide and conquer. Use city staff, city resources, public funds to accomplish your goal. I have printed proof, sir, that you've recruited --

Please pass this down to our mayor.

-- that you have recruited people or starting



to, to run against me. Actually you did it from the council dais one night.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Oh, my God. Wow.

COUNCILMEMBER SOUBIROUS: You replied to a text message sent to you by a Ward 3 resident seated at the dais that council just had voted on a nonemergency ambulance applicant. Sir, you are killing my ability to rightfully hold city staff accountable, which is my obligation as a policymaker and as a city councilmember. You have failed the people of the city. You have failed to follow the city charter, our ethics and conduct code, our rules of order and business.

You have been played by highly paid bureaucrats, you really have, who have a lust for power and money. They have played you, and you fell into your trap. You are indebted to them and you are their slave. You've sold yourself to them. They will stop at nothing to block anyone who stands up to their wants and desires. They do not answer to the people. We do.

Our city staff, they do not answer to you. I answer to you, but they don't have to answer to you. If they don't serve you right, I take the heat. And it's up to me to decide whether or not we take action on them. How do you think our chief police -- chief of police gets away with threatening a councilmember in

writing on an email that I did not solicit, or threatening a member of the public, telling him he better grow male parts before he speaks about against his department.

Give me a break. Where was your outrage,
Mr. Mayor, when this occurred? Nothing to prove or
investigate, he admitted to one, and the other was sent
by email. Just where was your outrage, Mr. Bailey?
You say you defend the city against those who would
harm it. This does not harm our city's reputation, the
chief of police acting like a rogue cop or worse,
almost like a street thug with no sanctions? This is
wrong.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Right.

COUNCILMEMBER SOUBIROUS: I understand he apologized to his troops. I didn't hear an apology. He didn't apologize to you. Maybe that's why you felt so empowered to follow through with his threat that was against me, it's politically unwise for you to declare war on your cops, is what the chief wrote to me. Well, Mr. Bailey, he followed through with that threat.

And where were you, Mr. City Manager,
Mr. Scott Barber, the chief's boss? Where were you?
You were busy having meetings with the chief and
plotting your revenge and isolating himself from



possible job action by setting the stage for a lawsuit by you and others to walk out the door with a golden parachute and a hefty settlement should the council turn on you. If you look up hostile work environment, it usually says to set up for a lawsuit. And the mayor was right there helping you both to do it, conspiracy. You orchestrated a wonderful plan, secret meetings, closed sessions all in violation of the State's Brown Act.

Then something happened that you all didn't plan for, that silly little councilmember being investigated behind closed doors all out of the public view, he made a public statement that he was being investigated. Suddenly the secret meetings slowed down, the reports began to see the light of day, and the people investigating the investigation became known.

I was told by our mayor pro tem and our city mayor outside a closed session that I was removed from, you are being charged by four people for violating charter Chapter 407, thereby creating a hostile work environment. And I said, hostile work environment? I work for the Highway Patrol. I said, is this sexual harassment? Oh, no, no, not at all. No, no, no. This is -- this has to do with 407.

Really? So am I going to get anything in writing? Nope. Am I going to know who my accusers are? No. They're covered under the Whistleblower Protection Act. That's what I was told. And I said, well, Whistleblower Protection Act, that's for people involved in -- I guess I know more than they know about that, because --

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

COUNCILMEMBER SOUBIROUS: -- that -- they don't have anonymity. You can look it up. I was also told I would never see a copy of the report. About three weeks later I asked the now no longer here city attorney, I said, so if I was outside that closed session, am I allowed to talk about this? Well, yeah, that's your obligation -- or that's your right to do so. I said, well, okay. So tell me where this whistleblower thing comes in. I can't find it anywhere where it applies.

He said, I never used that phraseology. I said, well, our mayor and our mayor pro tem did. He said, well, take it up with them. I never told them. I said, am I ever going to get a copy of this report?

Nope. Am I ever going to know who filed this against me, these four people? Nope. They will be protected so that you can't retaliate against them.



What happened? I get a copy of the report, and it's not four, it's two. Never, never ever I was told, will never ever -- well, Neverland came I guess, because here we are. So if we had to keep this behind closed doors because it was so private that I would never ever, ever, never ever get to know who and have a copy of the report, how did it become public? And if it could be made public, then why did we do this behind closed doors? You can't have it both ways. It doesn't work.

Even our former city attorney confirmed this all to me and said it would never see the -- be -- see the light of day, and now it saw the light of day. You know, my job as a councilmember is to provide legislative oversight and be an advocate for my constituents regarding problems or issues that come up or that the residents encounter. I am to be a problem solver and a policymaker.

I have a duty and a responsibility to do the very best I can for the people living in my ward and for the people working, living, and investing in the city. I swore to protect the U.S. and State Constitution. I've honored that oath, and I've done my job.

It's a lot easier for people to attack the



messenger than take on somebody that over steps their bounds. In no way, shape, or form was I talking to Mr. Smith as Sergeant Brian Smith. He was union President Smith. And by the way, they backed me up and endorsed me a year earlier for my run for supervisor, District 1. As a matter of fact, our chief of police wrote me a check, wanted to be the first one to write me a \$500 check.

And thank you, chief, I appreciate that for my run for supervisor.

What happened? What happened, I was elected to city councilmember by the people in Ward 3. And I take my job seriously. And I'm not going to swerve from that oath that I swore to uphold and -- and -- and hold true. This is nothing but retaliation against me by our chief of police, like I said, who made up his -- who made his good his -- his threat.

And I'd add one more thing, to quote Chief Vicino, the bread and butter of police departments used to be catching bad guys, prosecuting bad guys, and putting them in jail. Now we're asked to do things that have more of a social aura about them, trying to get homeless who want help, long-term help, and making neighborhoods more tolerable and livable to the residents. Wow.



Yeah, I'm guilty as charged on that one. I'm guilty as charged on doing the best job I can for each one of you in the City of Riverside. I am not going to be deterred by this. I don't care how hard that our mayor or any other members of this council, if they do, or anybody else, it's their right to put people against me to run; that's fine. That's our democratic process. That's great. Don't use the city's money and resources to do it. That's a crime.

And don't violate the Brown Act by having closed-door sessions on something that should have been out in the open and in front of the public. Our city charter says so. It says, at all cases, at all times err on the side of openness and transparency.

Mr. Mayor, do you recall after the third closed session of deliberating about my guilt or innocence, you said, are you still for openness and transparency? And I said, absolutely. And you said, then you won't mind having the outcome of the investigation made public. I said, I welcome it. What is it? Oh, I -- I can't tell you. You have to wait until we announce it at a meeting. I was never told there was going to be a hearing, a trial, not told that at all.

I started hearing it, and then I read it in



the -- in the agenda item. As a councilmember, I've got to tell you all, I'm usually the last one to find out things. Staff isn't really over the top at, you know, giving us information on things, because it's, you know, feed them what they need to know. So I'm working hard to improve that.

When I told Mr. Smith that there was seven councilmembers that were very united against this panhandler issue, I heard it from our city manager. When he talked about that security guard and park idea that I did not float and did not like the idea, because security guards in parks aren't going to take care of the panhandlers on 14th Street off-ramp. You know, it might be a park some day for panhandlers. I don't know, it's getting there. But the bottom line is, I heard it from him. And I told him, Mr. Smith, I said, they're all united. They want this resolved.

So anyway, again thank you all for coming out. I'll be happy to answer any questions. I will be on my personal website making the entire investigation as accessible as possible. The Press Enterprise put the first portion of it online and in the paper to find out where to get it. And I want to make the rest of it that I received later available to all of you. I am an open book. I will answer any of your questions.



The cell phone that I have listed on the city's website and on my Facebook page and everywhere else, that's my personal cell phone, it's been my personal cell phone for years. When you call me, whether it's Sunday night, Saturday, it doesn't matter, I answer that phone, I answer your texts, I answer your email. I work for you.

And as I pledged on everybody's doorstep when I was campaigning, once I'm elected, I don't work for city hall; I work for you and everybody in the ward. I have kept that promise, and I will continue to keep that promise. Thank you very much.

MAYOR BAILEY: As you mentioned, I had no vote in this matter nor any closed-session matters. That was the will of the council to conduct closed sessions, to vote in the closed session, and to bring this to a public hearing. And it was a unanimous vote to bring this to a public hearing for transparency purposes. So as -- as you so eloquently quoted from the charter, the mayor presides over the meeting and does not have a formal policymaking vote.

I -- I can't vote today unless there is a tie and to break a tie. And -- and I did not vote on any of the matters bringing this to fruition. The mayor pro tem signed the contract with the -- the

investigator. And so my hand in -- in -- was -- was 1 2 not, as you mentioned, pushing this by -- by any regard, other than responding to a hostile work 3 environment complaint and a charter violation from our 4 5 number one employee, the city manager, via the chain of command that he has, the chief of police and a police 6 7 officer. 8 And so our employees asked for the council's 9 help, through the mayor and the mayor pro tem, and we 10 are going through this duty to investigate and 11 listening to the investigator today and to -- to you. 12 And now we will listen to public comment and the council following that. We have 21 speaker cards on 13 14 this item, beginning with --15 COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Mayor -- mayor, I 16 believe we have a comment. I don't know if 17 Councilmember Davis would like to speak before we go to 18 the community. I also have a comment that -- that --19 that I would like to make before we go --20 MAYOR BAILEY: As is common --21 COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: -- to the public. 22 MAYOR BAILEY: -- practice, we'll let the 23 public comment first, and then the council will follow

25 COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ:

Well -- well, I



that --

24

1	think
2	MAYOR BAILEY: public comment so that we
3	can
4	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: I think the
5	comments
6	MAYOR BAILEY: include
7	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: are important,
8	that's why I'm I'm requesting that now.
9	MAYOR BAILEY: The the common practice has
10	been for the we have 21 people that want to comment
11	on this item. And and I think it's, again, for
12	for us to listen and to to be truly open and
13	transparent to to the people that would like to
14	speak. So
15	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: In in the past
16	what we've done is that if the council had any
17	questions, we could ask them. And then it goes to
18	the to the community. After the community, then it
19	comes back to us.
20	MAYOR BAILEY: So you have questions of
21	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Well, I have
22	questions
23	MAYOR BAILEY: The process.
24	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: with regards to
25	the process.



MAYOR BAILEY: Okay.

COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: And I believe
Councilmember Davis is first, unless he would allow me
to go first.

MAYOR BAILEY: Okay. Questions of the process, Councilman Davis followed by Councilman Melendrez.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Earlier the city's hired gun here quoted some statements that in the government code, it gives you the authority to conduct this hearing. Please quote me that specific section, sir.

MR. MEYERHOFF: Mr. Davis, what I said is that under the government code, the city has the obligation to conduct a harassment investigation. As for the authority to conduct this proceeding, there's a line of California cases, which recognize a council's ability to hold this type of a meeting, even in the absence of a policy that allows for it. Those cases include Westfall versus City of Crescent City. And I can give you the cite if you'd like for these cases.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Well, we do have a process, sir. That process is set and it is in part of our charter as voted by the people of Riverside. So in fact, you are wrong. That does not have anything to do with our charter, which supercedes. So a matter of --



if we continue with this, I -- I wonder how that would hold up in court, your statements. So you, in fact, are incorrect.

Our charter is set up. It is set up very specifically as voted by the people of Riverside. We have a process, and that process was overruled by our mayor and our mayor pro tem knowingly doing so. Your advice to them is bad advice.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

that comes forward to us, then we can just simply say, we're going to rely on what this fellow said, and we're okay. If I'm not mistaken, BB&K gave that same instructions to Bell, it's okay, and they're being sued. So you may not agree with me, and we're going to disagree; but I'm going by protecting the City of Riverside, the integrity of our charter, and our process. You are an outsider. You are not a citizen of Riverside. You really don't have any teeth in this thing other than the hired gun. Is that my understanding?

MR. MEYERHOFF: I was asked a question, Mr. Davis.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: And so then answer that.

MR. MEYERHOFF: And I was giving you the cases



```
that you asked for. And --
 1
 2
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Well, I'm sure --
 3
               MR. MEYERHOFF: -- I can --
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- that I can --
 4
 5
               MAYOR BAILEY: Please --
 6
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- have another --
 7
               MAYOR BAILEY: Please let --
 8
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- couple attorneys --
 9
               MAYOR BAILEY: -- him respond.
10
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- come up here. I'm
11
     not finished, sir.
12
               MR. MEYERHOFF: Okay. I -- I thought you
13
     asked me a question.
14
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS:
                                     Okav.
15
               MR. MEYERHOFF: So I was just responding.
16
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: I'm sure we can have
17
     another several attorneys come up here and dispute
18
     exactly what you're saying. That's what this law is
19
     about. Our charter is what we are here to uphold, not
20
     your looking for cases to try to determine or deter
21
     from what the mayor and the mayor pro tem has
     established. And yes, they are directing that.
22
23
     mayor did not tell you the truth.
24
               FEMALE SPEAKER:
                                Yes.
25
               COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: That is a complete
```



have an established charter process, it was not followed and has not been followed. You have bastardized this situation for our city, and I am disgusted. I'm here to protect the City of Riverside. I could care less about Los Angeles or any other city.

So you can use the -- the -- the government code and come up with these obscure things, you're going to quote some things, and that's fine, go ahead and quote them; because I'm pretty sure we can get other attorneys, you know, when the jury of our peers look at it, say wait a minute here, how does this really apply. I am not a city of this -- employee of this city and neither is he and neither are any of these people up here except for these three sitting up there, the city manager, city attorney, city clerk.

I am here to protect Riverside, not let some outsider take our codes and bastardize it for their own purposes on behalf of the mayor and the mayor pro tem to exact revenge. To exact -- as I said in my federal trial, they will retaliate, and they are.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: But this isn't about me.

This is about what's right and what's wrong. So please
quote us. I'm very interested in it.

MR. MEYERHOFF: And just for clarification,
Mr. Davis, I have no vote or say in how the council
decides to handle this action. I don't vote on whether
there's a meeting like this or not, but as for the
cases, which is what you asked for, Westfall versus
City of Crescent City; Rodriguez versus Jurupa Unified
School District; and Binkley versus City of Los -- of
Long Beach are three of the cases that allow councils
to conduct hearings such as this.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Right. And do those cities that -- or those processes have a charter with a defined process for these sort of complaints?

MR. MEYERHOFF: The city of Westfall case makes clear that there's no violation even if there is no censure policy within the city.

council and past city councils on the rules of order and operation in these matters 100 percent. And we only follow them when it's convenient to others.

That's interesting.

Okay. Second clarity, due process issues.

Madam city clerk, please explain to me the due process that my colleague has been afforded.



And -- and do you see any issues with that whatsoever? I'm very concerned in this action, in this particular case, that because of the due process issues that have not been afforded that we have -- we have committed such considerable liability on the residents that we are the -- the stewards of their taxpayer -- tax dollars, I don't get where we're authorized to do such a thing.

Can you explain to me this due process and that you believe that under your legal authority or knowledge that -- that we're okay here?

MS. TALLEY: Councilmember -- Councilmember
Davis, I am aware that in hearings such as this, due
process protections do apply, but they are -- those due
process protections are defined by state law and by
reference to the cases, California appellate court
cases, both at the Court of Appeal and then at the
Supreme Court that interpret the due process clauses of
both the state and the federal Constitutions.

I know that our independent counsel has done the research on the due process that's afforded in these hearings. He has shared that information with me and the authority. And I believe that the cases that he relies on and the due process protections that are set forth in those cases are accurate. I don't have

those in front of me.

I'm certain that Mr. Meyerhoff has the due process parameters that apply to this. And it's my understanding that based upon the law that those parameters that are applied in this proceeding today are appropriate.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: So then on behalf of the citizens of Riverside, by saying you have no right of cross-examination, you cannot have an interview with any of the witnesses to ask expanding or additional questions that were not covered by Mr. Gumport or provide evidence or produce witnesses. You -- you don't have a problem with that? You don't think that the law, under our constitutional right for my colleague, has a -- is -- is problematic?

MS. TALLEY: I can tell you that the -- the level of due process that is afforded is dependent in part on the nature of the proceedings so that the -- for example, the level of due process that is typically afforded -- afforded in hearings such as the hearing that is taking place this afternoon are different from the due process protections that are afforded in a criminal matter.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: But we have --

MS. TALLEY: And --



with a crime. Charter Section 407 is very clear, under 1401, it is a misdemeanor. And therefore under 1400, it says, you shall, which is mandatory. We charged him with a crime. There is no option to have this discussion under our charter. He has been charged with a crime, which fairly clearly states that upon conviction he will receive six months in jail or a \$1,000 fine or both.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Therefore, he does have due process rights, and this particular hearing is outside the scope of not even our charter, but also our code of ethics and so forth. And so why are we deviating from that? Is there something about us, that because we have been charged with a crime by the mayor, mayor pro tem, and our city manager, and our chief of police; we don't get due process because for some reason we're elected and sometimes we're employees and sometimes we're not?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: But the point of the matter is, my job is to protect the -- the steward of the citizens' money. He did not get and has not been afforded his due process under the charge of a crime,



ĺ

which is mandated as a misdemeanor through our charter. Believe me, through this process on my own, I'm very familiar with the charter. And as anyone else, I can quote it section by section and its application. So can you answer that for me?

MS. TALLEY: Well, the proceeding before -that's taking place this afternoon is not a criminal
proceeding. I do -- am familiar with the provision in
your charter that you're referring to, but the fact
that the charter states that the violation of a charter
provision constitutes a misdemeanor does not convert
this process into a criminal proceeding. The only
office that can charge and prosecute misdemeanor crime,
my understanding in the county -- in the County of
Riverside is the Riverside district attorney's office.

So if there were a criminal proceeding to be held, the charge would be filed by and prosecuted by the district attorney's office. This is -- this matter is not in the nature of a criminal proceeding, so the due process protections that attach to a criminal proceeding do not attach to this proceeding.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: So then why would the district attorney tell me differently? Why would the district attorney tell me that -- that the city attorney has the authority to prosecute charter and



1	municipal code violations?
2	MS. TALLEY: I
3	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Misdemeanor only or
4	infractions. And we do do that.
5	MS. TALLEY: Yes.
6	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: I think we have quite a
7	few right now. However, that then now makes it no
8	different.
9	MS. TALLEY: No.
10	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Where you as the
11	appointed now become the prosecutor, and you're sitting
12	on here on this dais providing information. This
13	proceeding is we cannot sit in judgment of my
14	colleague. We are not authorized to do that anywhere
15	in the charter or state law. It does not provide for
16	that.
17	MS. TALLEY: Now
18	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Who sits in judgment of
19	us is the people in Ward 3, that is the ones who sit in
20	judgment. We are only here to either uphold or deny an
21	appeal. That's in our charter. It's in our code of
22	ethics and conduct. However, because we we're
23	going to again bastardize what we're supposed to be
24	doing here, not protecting the city, and in the process

allow the mayor and mayor pro tem, the former, my -- my

25

apologies to the present, to do that they have done.

And they have done it.

We all have evidence, and it will be produced, but we can't produce evidence here.

MS. TALLEY: Councilman Davis, I -- I apologize. I did misspeak. I was speaking -- when I made reference to misdemeanors, I was speaking of state law misdemeanors. You are correct and the district attorney is correct that a city attorney, under state law, has the authority to prosecute misdemeanors when the misdemeanor is a violation of city law, of the municipal code. So you are correct in that respect. However, even with that authority, the city attorney has to bring a charge in criminal courts.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Yes.

MS. TALLEY: And so this is not what has happened in this particular case.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: But this is a pretrial, just as any others, he is facing charges, facing charges of violation of 407. The investigator, even though he unfounded it, he is still -- we -- apparently we haven't voted, which it would be an unlawful vote, we cannot sit in judgment of my colleague. Nowhere does it give any authority to do so, nowhere. So this is the same as going through a pretrial hearing, right?



Which means that he has right of due process, he has right to cross-examine, he has a right to have access to all investigative materials to prepare for his defense so that maybe it won't get to trial because of either technical difficulties or whatever.

The fact of the matter is we are here today. We are outside of our charter, state law, there's nothing that says we can sit in judgment of my colleague or any of -- whether it be Councilman Adams or Councilman Melendrez, we do not sit in judgment of them. We just went through that with Councilman Adams. We don't sit in judgment. It is not our job to judge one and other.

And for political reasons, that's why we changed it in 2011, so it did not take on that persona, but here we are doing it. So I'm -- I'm -- I know I'm grandstanding, and my apologies. I am here to protect the charter, to protect the process for the City of Riverside beyond that so that -- I -- I must profess, and -- and we have already deliberated this folks, behind closed doors to conclusion, each one of us took a vote of exactly how we felt after we deliberated on charter Section 407. We are in violation of the Brown Act. We have no authority to do what we did. It did occur.

And did the mayor influence? Oh, you better believe it. Was he involved with it? You better believe it. My colleagues wanted to charge me, do it, because we broke the law. I was a part of it unknowingly and later was advised by another municipal attorney that what you did was wrong and it is an illegal violation of the Brown Act. It should have been discussed in public, and you should not ever have taken an individual poll vote by name; and we did. It happened.

If I'm not mistaken, Mr. Gumport, you were there and so was this other fellow here from -- from -- and so was the city clerk. It's on tape. It is a violation of the Brown Act. I broke the law and so did all my colleagues with the exception of Councilman Soubirous. So I will submit myself to that process because we did do it.

And outside of the discussion on the harassment case, which went away real quick, we specifically deliberated the exact case that you just now heard, item by item, line by line. And oh, yeah, did we do it? You better believe we did it. And I voted. I made a vote. I was asked to make a vote, so was every other one of my colleagues here. Yeah. And they're going to -- and they're going to deny it? I



want to hear them deny it, because it happened absolutely.

Our mayor, oh, you better believe he was involved in the direct influence of what we're doing here today. Oh, he can't do this. So if I'm in violation of something, which I'm used to being charged with stuff by now, because people don't like what I do, because I'm going to tell you, if I do something wrong, we're going to -- we're going to deal with it and I'm going to own it. I'm owning it, folks. I broke the law. Unknowingly, but I did it.

So let's just -- here it is, secondly, where is the mayor's legal authority to set this -- to be involved directly, to direct our city manager and staff, including the city attorney's office, on how these proceedings will be conducted? Where is that legal authority? This is not a mayoral issue. This is a council issue. We run this city. The mayor does not.

Can you please provide me the legal authority under any portions of our charter that gives the mayor any legal authority to involve himself in the manner in which he has -- in the manner in which he has in directing staff to do anything? I can't find it.

MS. TALLEY: Councilmember Davis, I'm not



familiar with any procedure in the -- or any provision in the city charter that speaks to any member of council or the mayor's authority to set process. It's my understanding that the process --

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Uh-huh.

MS. TALLEY: -- that was established for this hearing is an informal process, not that it's -- it's not cast in writing in any particular city document. Hearings or proceedings of this nature under state law, there is no set practice under state law as well. So when the city --

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Right.

MS. TALLEY: -- conducts a hearing of this nature, the process is developed prior to the hearing.

And I have to tell you that I am not aware of who in the city developed the particular process for this meeting before it was set.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Well, I am. I have the

-- the letter from this fellow right here, what's his

name, Meyerhoff, signed by Rusty William R. Bailey, the

Third, the mayor, establishing just that. Would you

like to see it? Have you ever seen it? I have it.

It's also signed by Steven K. Adams and James Perry.

I never took a vote as a member of the council to establish this. What gave them the



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RIVERSIDE CITY COUNCIL MEETING authority to do so? The problem is that here it is, you know, the -- the mayor's role is -- the mayor's role is very clear, that he is ceremonial. He has taken it upon himself to seize the power. He's in violation of 300, 406, and 405 of the charter. FEMALE SPEAKER: Yep. COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: That is very clear and unequivocal. But we're -- we're here to protect the integrity of the charter. This report was, and it states, prepared by and signed by William R. Bailey, the Third, mayor; Steven K. Adams, mayor pro tem; and James Perry, incoming mayor pro tem. the presiding officer.

MS. TALLEY: Councilmember Davis, I -- I will refer to the -- the rules of the city council that the mayor read previously, and in those rules the mayor is

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Presiding.

MS. TALLEY: Right, presiding officer. And as the presiding officer, the mayor is responsible for the order of business of --

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Correct.

MS. TALLEY: -- the council. Right.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Right.

So in this particular matter, if MS. TALLEY: the mayor established the order of proceedings in this



hearing, and as I indicated --1 2 COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Well, our --MS. TALLEY: -- before --3 4 COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- charter makes it very 5 clear, madam, is that if, in fact, it is a conflict 6 with the charter, the charter supercedes, and therefore that would be a conflict of the charter. 7 8 MAYOR BAILEY: Well, the council directed this 9 meeting to occur and set the date and --10 COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Not the terms. 11 MAYOR BAILEY: -- (indiscernible). procedures of bringing --12 13 COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Not the terms. 14 MAYOR BAILEY: -- matters before city council 15 are on page --16 COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Sir --17 MAYOR BAILEY: -- 17. 18 COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- you're out of order 19 and you're interfering. Please let me finish my 20 statements. Thank you very much. 21 Beyond that I need to know that the legal 22 authority of Councilman Adams to sign and bind the City 23 of Riverside in a contract prior to the council hearing 24 it and appropriating funds without full authority of

the council under the manager's authority; I cannot



find anywhere in the law where that's legal, neither 1 2 can my own counsel, on this matter. The matter of the fact is, and I will restate that, please cite me the 3 4 legality of the mayor pro tem Steve Adams to 5 appropriate \$49,000 four times, not just once, four 6 times, prior to the council hearing the -- the -the -- the -- the complaint in closed session, under 7 8 the manager's authority. So he complained and now he's financing and 9 funding under public monies his own complaint without 10 11 the authority and appropriations in public view for the 12 City of Riverside. I need to protect the stewards of the -- the citizens. We got bound to a contract before 13 we even heard it. Where is the legal authority for 14 15 that? MAYOR BAILEY: There was a closed session that 16 17 the council authorized hiring an outside investigator. And it -- it was underneath the city manager's 18 authority in terms of fiduciary responsibility to do 19 20 just that. 21 COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: I -- I heard what the 22 mayor --23 MS. TALLEY: I --24 COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: -- said, thank you.

MS. TALLEY: I was going to tell you,



1	Councilmember Davis
2	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: I know.
3	MS. TALLEY: here during the proceedings,
4	so unfortunately
5	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: I know you got thrown in
6	this whole thing.
7	MS. TALLEY: I'm not
8	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: I I apologize
9	MS. TALLEY: in a position to tell you
10	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: for that.
11	MS. TALLEY: how this came up, but
12	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Right.
13	MS. TALLEY: so I'm going to rely on the
14	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: But the date of the
15	contract
16	MS. TALLEY: representations.
17	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: signature, madam, is
18	prior to the the council hearing this particular
19	issue. Unless there was an unauthorized council
20	meeting under the Brown Act and he was given authority
21	in that process where all of the members of the council
22	present at that time had an outside meeting either
23	through an intermediary or otherwise to sign that
24	contract, which the contract's date is prior to the

council hearing it, I -- I don't know where the legal



authority is.

I don't even know where the legal authority is even if the council did give authority under the manager's authority of \$50,000 without doing it in public -- in a -- in a public hearing on an appropriations to do so. We have some serious issues here of procedure and protecting the City of Riverside from these type of things. So if we're going to have a trial here, we need to make sure that the trial is fair and is equally applied in the rules and regulations that our past practices has been.

So other questions that I have is, you know, that's a big spending authority. So we -- we -- we've had some issues as a city that, well, since we're going to have this, well let's have it and sometimes it has to get a little worse before it gets a little better, and I understand that. I am here for the citizens of Ward 4, I report to them, as he reports to three and this gentleman reports to five, and so on and so forth.

Beyond that my ultimate responsibility is to all the taxpayers of the City of Riverside. And the bottom line is, is that we're doing this, and for my mayor to make the statements he did is outrageous. I have physical evidence, emails from people he's been emailing about this issue, about why he's involved, and

what he wants to do to us.

It's -- folks, don't be blindsided here. We are here for the citizens of Riverside. And I think all of us are here for the citizens of Riverside. It's unfortunate that our good officers have to get involved with this, it really is. I think they're fantastic. And I know most all of them. But this is a political process that we should not have drawn them into. And I -- I will apologize to all of you. It's an embarrassment to me and my city and -- and so forth.

Please understand it for what it is. We will get beyond this, the city will become a better city for this, but everybody has to be held accountable for their actions in this process and processes that are about to come. Thank you.

MAYOR BAILEY: Councilman Melendrez.

COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Thank you, mayor.

And my comments will be much more brief, perhaps a little bit more calm as well, but I -- I am concerned about how this whole thing has been handled and some of the processes that have been used. The concern here is that generally as a city, when you have a hostile work environment claim or a complaint, it's one that's given to a supervisor and then handled by our human relations commission or committee or our department, excuse me,



human relations -- human resources department; and then it's up to our city attorney to represent us as a city. It does not get to the council.

Why that process was changed, you've heard a lot of comments about this, I personally think that it was the wrong way to go. I also believe that there was questions about workplace -- going to employees and inquiring or not quite inquiring -- inquiring about how they -- what they should do and what they shouldn't do. I think it was important for us to be made aware of that and possibly refer to the code of ethics complaint, so that the individuals in that process would be able to address that.

Those are a couple of things that I think we are entirely off on in terms of what's happened here. I personally think that the matter could have been resolved privately, should the city manager come to the council and say, I have this issue, let's schedule an employee evaluation of my skills to see if it's accurate. Very simple. We could have done that in closed session. We would have said, yes, you're doing a great job; no, you're not doing a great job, this is the area that we'd like to see improvements on.

Unfortunately that didn't happen.

And as a result, here we are. The ball



started coming in this direction and started broadening and widening with the -- with the hostile work environment, also the -- the noninterference provision of 407, in addition to the -- the Brown Act. For myself, I -- I -- I feel very awkward in this position simply because I think this has been a comity of errors to this point. It's been a very expensive one.

I also believe that as a result of a huge lack of communication, that we're here. And it's truly unfortunate. It's not one that I'm happy to be involved in, nor am I happy for our city council and mayor and management to be involved in this. It's one that I believe that can be corrected, but I think this has really gotten way out of hand, and I believe it was unfair to -- to Councilmember Soubirous to get it to this point.

I also -- I also believe it's very telling of what's going on at city hall right now.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: And I think we need to sit down, add focus, and make this a city that I think all of us want it to be, whether it be our staff, whether our mayor, or city council. I think we really need to focus on the future of our city, but also increase our communication if we are going to be



successful. Again, I think that in this case we have not gone about it well. And at this point, the -- I -- I think this is a great learning lesson for all of us, I think, and also a point where we can start discussing where we want to be in the next year or the next five years.

With that, I'll terminate -- terminate my comments, mayor.

MAYOR BAILEY: Councilman Adams.

COUNCILMEMBER ADAMS: Just a quick comment on the process. It was my turn to be mayor pro tem. I was contacted by the city attorney that a complaint was coming forward and was told that by government code if that complaint happened, we would have to take action. We had a closed-session meeting. The council voted to approve to hire an outside investigator to see if there were any grounds for the complaint, and the city manager advised what he was willing to pay.

There is, to my knowledge, just an investigation to find out if there is any wrongdoing. Nobody has been charged with anything. There was no intent today to charge anybody with anything. And this was to open it up. But as the mayor pro tem, each and every one of us serves at that at a different time and if they're brought -- and if it's brought to them when

it's their turn, they would have to do the same thing.

So it's not something I went out and looked for, it came before me, and I followed the directions I was given by legal counsel. And we took a vote with the council before every step. So Mr. Davis was wrong in that. It was approved before we signed any contract, and it was approved that it would be within the city manager's financial limits. And if he went over the limits, he would have to come back and get approval from the council.

So each of the members here with the exception of Mr. Soubirous, I think Mr. Davis may have been gone that evening, did vote unanimously. We did on two different occasions. So that -- that's how we got here. That's the process that was brought to me as the mayor pro tem. And I'm following the directions and the guidelines I was given. That's where we got that.

MAYOR BAILEY: City attorney, can you address the question from Councilman Melendrez about why HR did not investigate?

MS. TALLEY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Councilmember Melendrez, in the normal course, you are correct that when there is a complaint of hostile work environment, it is the responsibility



of the human resources department to investigate these claims. However, there are occasions when the human resources department will seek the assistance of an independent investigator. And there are a couple of reasons why that might happen. And one of those reasons is where there could be an apparent -- or an appearance of a conflict.

And in this particular case, although I was not here at the time that this happened, certainly if there is a complaint of a hostile work environment by the city manager, the human resources director works for the city manager, and that person, that director would be in the untenable position of having to supervise an investigation relating to a complaint by her boss against one of his.

And because of that situation, this would be an appropriate case where an independent investigation would have been conducted.

COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: I -- I believe a statement like that at the very beginning would have been extremely helpful. Unfortunately that's not the way we were provided the information. I certainly do understand your explanation of things. I -- I -- I do believe that in this case we are not in court, where I believe the case should be heard, and -- and going in

that direction.

I don't believe it should have been one that we were hearing here at city council. If there was a hostile work environment, it's a matter that's generally resolved outside of the -- the council arena. You know, I -- I -- again, you know, we're -- we're in this, it's a new, not even a new process, it's really kind of an unexplored process, but I believe that at this point, perhaps tonight or our next council meeting, I will be making that recommendation to start looking at processes that would take care of this matter, because I believe that we've -- we've taken the very wrong direction in this particular case.

It's not helped our city. It's been, for me, frankly a bit embarrassing to -- to work through this.

And I -- I -- I believe that we need to set up certain structure for our upper management, our city manager, city clerk, and city attorney as well.

But thank you for that explanation.

MAYOR BAILEY: Now we'll go to public comment beginning with --

One more question from Councilman Davis.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: One more issue I forgot to bring up. In the -- in the history of our charter ethics complaints have been filed from August 30th of



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2010 to March 15th, 2011, three 407 charter violations have been filed by members of the public against one of our councilmembers. And in all three of those cases, we did not have an investigation of this sort. It went through, in all three of those cases, went through the adjudicating body, which means that we would have accused -- or the person accused, that particular member of the council, of a crime. 407 is a misdemeanor, and it shall be handled as a misdemeanor.

It's very clear in the charter, shall, it is

mandatory, 1400, read it. Believe me, I know the charter like the back of my hand. Through this process on my own, I'm -- I'm pretty good at it, I'm not an expert, but a lot of money later, you become a little bit of an expert. So my question is, is I'm -- I'm sorry for this deputy city -- or the city attorney to be in this, if Mr. Gumport would have investigated this, why was this not turned over to the adjudicating body as we normally have it through the process and let them look at that evidence and then hear that process -- hear it through that process and then if my colleague decided to appeal whatever the results of that, we came here and we are to sit on judgment of the appeal and only the process and procedures that which got them to this point?



Meaning that did they violate some procedure of -- of rule that's been established and it did -- it tainted the -- the -- the investigation or the -- the hearing in any way and it had and could have had a different outcome should they have that information.

It's very, very similar to an appeal process in civil or -- or criminal court, yet we went from point A to point Z. We didn't care what it said. We made up our own rules as we went along.

So I mean, there's my question there is -- is to, I don't know who made up these rules now and how we got to this process, because our mayor says he didn't do it. Councilman Adams says he was given direction by our city attorney, which is interesting, he's not here to defend himself or answer the questions. So the only question -- I -- there's no way for anybody to even address this. He quit. He walked away.

yet in those three separate times, we went a different process. Why? It wasn't charged by the city manager, who has power, authority. Where even if it's charged by the city manager, we have a process set up, a process, so that we don't end up in the place we are today. That's why the system is broken, and that's why I said it before, some of my colleagues agree, it must



1 be fixed immediately.

Because why? Folks out there in -- in TV land and the audience here, you all are going to eventually pay for it with your taxpayers money. So you cannot violate anyone's due process and constitutional laws. We have to protect your funds as stewards, and we have to protect our Constitution so that it isn't bastardized and we end up in these places today.

MAYOR BAILEY: And, Councilman Davis, so what was the question? There isn't?

FEMALE SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) question.

MAYOR BAILEY: Mr. Meyerhoff, could you respond to that question? I think part of it is the difference is the hostile work environment claim versus just the charter violation.

MR. MEYERHOFF: Well, again, I wasn't involved in the decision to -- to investigate it, so I don't know how much of the information I have, but just to reiterate, the moment that this was determined to go to hearing, the issue was, how is the hearing conducted; and the city looked to caselaw and California law and what the cases say about holding these type of proceedings, and it -- it provided that process. The process is not included in the charter.

It doesn't conflict with the charter, because the charter simply doesn't say how to conduct these type of processes. So the city looked to California caselaw to set up the procedures which are being utilized here today. I don't know if that -- I don't know if that answers your question, Mr. Davis. I apologize, but --

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: I have the code of ethics and conduct complaint process and procedures right here, sir. I'm holding them.

MR. MEYERHOFF: I -- I believe that the complaints were not under the code of ethics.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: That's not relevant.

Any. It is not relevant, sir. Any, that's the whole point I'm trying to make. We can't just say, oh, gee, you know, it's the city manager making the complaint and the city manager is better than this gentleman sitting right here.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: He is no better than this gentleman in this case. He is a complainant, and therefore we follow the process. It doesn't give him another -- I get -- believe me I've been doing it 30 years in labor, I get the -- the harassment, but once that is concluded, and it was very early on, that



it is unfounded, then we get to the 407. Here's the 1 process, the process was not followed. And to say that 2 you're going to use state law to do that is not 3 4 correct. It is wrong. 5 So I know you're going to disagree with me, 6 you're an attorney, so I'm not an attorney, you know, 7 but we can all lawyer up and find that one out. FEMALE SPEAKER: 8 Yep. 9 COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: But do we want to do Is that within the best interest of Riverside? 10 No, it is not. Please, everybody, follow the process 11 we have established. 12 MAYOR BAILEY: Public comment beginning with 13 Brian Smith followed by Aurelio Melendrez. Twenty-one 14 speaker cards today. Please once again, we're here to 15 16 listen and respect every individual that comes to the 17 podium, give them their three minutes. 18 SERGEANT SMITH: Okay. Brian Smith. 19 Obviously the president of the Police Officers' Association and employee with the city for the last 20 17 years. A couple things come to mind, and I -- I 21 brought this up to several of you, but I'll start with 22 23 Mr. Gumport's characterization of the report being

inconclusive, him not being able to draw a conclusion;

I -- I think at best he should be able to call it



24

incomplete, and he should state why it's incomplete.

If Councilman Soubirous answered questions in writing but only answered a couple of questions and there wasn't a back and forth question and answer like other people participated in, then I think he has to draw that it's incomplete. He doesn't get all the answers that he's looking for.

The he said, she said portion of this, I brought it up early on, probably about the third comment I made to Mr. Gumport was, I know how this is going to play out. I've been in this game for 17 years. I know exactly how this is going to be, this is going to be a he said, she said with nobody there, with nobody recording things to anyone's knowledge that it was recorded or not recorded, to nobody having a cell phone on and somebody listening on the other side. It was going to be a he said, she said.

Of course he tried to allay my fears and say, don't worry about it, we're going to take care of it as far as let the investigation run its course and then we'll go. I gave him a couple of opportunities, I think, to -- to verify the comments I made about Councilman Soubirous' interaction with me that day. And not once, but twice did a reporter from the Press Enterprise, Ms. Alicia Robinson, discuss with me the --



the 7-0 vote to have the city manager removed or if Sergio Diaz's job was that and in jeopardy.

And I haven't seen all of the reports, I haven't seen all of the investigations, all of the -- the transcripts that have been done. I understand some are redacted and -- and for whatever reasons that might be, but I don't see one in there where we followed up with Ms. Robinson to find out if that was, in fact, a comment that was made to her, which she said to me weeks after Mike and I had our conversation. And so I think that's something that should have been looked at.

I don't believe that you get an opportunity to say, I want transparency, and not participate in an interview and go ahead and do it on your website. I don't think you blog it on Facebook. I don't think you get messages out that you want to get out only through the means of getting it out your way. I think the opportunity was provided -- provided for people to ask questions and answer them. Some of us elected to do it. Some of us elected not to. But don't go screaming on your personal web page or anywhere else that, you know, this is happening to me or that's happening to me. I -- I don't think that's fair.

It's your right to have not participated, that's absolutely right, but don't hold the court of

1.1

public opinion on your website if that's the route that you want to go. The last thing that -- that I wanted to say was that I -- you know, this has been painted as a political issue. The reality is, is everyone on this dais has been on one side or the other with the RPOA, whether we backed you when an incumbent ran against you or you ran against an incumbent that we supported.

We've been able to work with everyone on the council in any way, shape, or form that we've been able to. So this isn't a public issue -- or I'm sorry -- a political issue on our court.

MAYOR BAILEY: Thank you, sir.

Aurelio Melendrez.

MR. MELENDREZ: Good afternoon. Getting back to the focus of why we're here, it's really over the comments that were made between Mike and Brian. And I think we've kind of lost the way. And I agree, this shouldn't have been handled here. I think it should have been sent over to the public integrity unit of the DA's office. I 100 percent agree, because the investigation wasn't complete. I -- I get that, and I see that.

And there's certain things that need to be followed up on that haven't been followed up on, but what Mike is being accused of -- and -- I hope the



residents of Riverside hear this -- was a crime. In police work we call it extortion, when you're exerting -- you're exerting your will or authority over somebody. And I -- I don't for a minute doubt that it happened. I've known Brian a long time. I trust him. I trust him implicitly. He called me as soon as this conversation took place.

Our organization is not one that's responsible for striping streets or putting up streetlights. While they all have a place and things are important, you're talking about an organization where men and women are instructed on how to enforce the law. And if you choose that you'd like to be a commissioner or a chief, you shouldn't have retired from law enforcement.

Our police chief is not in charge of following up on campaign promises that were made by you as you walk the streets, each individual person. I would like to see our -- our agency remain operating autonomously. If there's an issue, absolutely it needs to be addressed by the council, if there is an issue with the way things are being done, but not in this way. You don't get to make comments and then back away from them and go, I didn't say that and then refuse to cooperate.

Thank you for having the hearing. I appreciate the transparency. As you know, police officers, we are subject to complaints all the time, and we get -- we get looked at twice. We get looked at internally, and then it gets sent to the CPRC to make sure we are looked at appropriately. I don't think it should be any different for elected officials. Thank you.

MAYOR BAILEY: Thank you.

Jerod Herringsma (phonetic) followed by John Fisher. Is Jerod not here? We'll move on. John Fisher followed by Darrel Terrell.

MR. FISHER: Wow. Honorable mayor, members of city council, I want to start off with something positive for just a moment. I do believe that each and every one of you that has been elected actually love your city and that you are actually good people, but I want to make a couple of facts known. Councilman Mike Soubirous and Paul -- Councilman Paul Davis were elected by their constituents to be city councilmembers. And some people may have a problem with that. Get over it. They are not leaving.

They have been elected by their constituents.

They are the ones that brought them into the office.

They are the ones that are going to take them out.



Very important, okay?

Also, in this situation we've had with the two councilmen there has cost us, and I've gotten several different numbers from this, \$100,000. Whoa. That is a lot of money to me. Maybe it's chump change to you guys, but for us that's a lot of money. I've heard other figures of 70,000 or 30,000. Even that is a lot of money to be spending on this, okay? Also keep in mind, this is really embarrassing for our city, okay?

So we got the money, and we got the embarrassment. We need to stop this. We need to be adults. We need you all to act like leaders, run our city, get rid of the egos, and let's run our city. Thank you.

MAYOR BAILEY: Darrel Terrell followed by Art Castle.

MR. TERRELL: My name is Darrel Terrell, and I don't live in your city, but I am I product of your community. I attended UCR, I graduated. I called -- I called Riverside my home when I was here. And I've been actively a part in it when I was here, but I'm here today. As I was passing, entering the chamber, I passed a statue of Dr. King and I'm reminded of what he once said about justice, unity, and character; and this

is what has brought me here today.

Dr. King said, injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. He also said the ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in a moment of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at the time of challenge and controversy. Councilman Soubirous embodies that spirit of that. He's a -- he's a leader of great character and integrity. He has the courage to stand up against the status quo. He's a champion and a fighter for his neighbors, whether you voted for him or not.

He fights passionately with conviction to ensure that the streets are fixed, make sure that you're safe in your home and in -- in your parks. Councilman Soubirous has done nothing wrong except, like he said and everybody else said, doing his job; but not only doing that, he's asking the tough questions and -- and demanding answers. Like anybody who was on the city council, you would do the same thing that he would -- he would do.

And the problem I see with this process is it needs to be reformed. Because as an outsider, as I call myself, I see the city is coming apart. It needs to be to bring together, because you guys have a lot of potential, a lot of great potential. Because reforming



this process would bring, not only the mayor and the council together, it would bring this community together.

And I feel that you guys -- this process just has been -- it just seem like it's bamboozled and hoodwinked the public in thinking that something is wrong, but it should be -- it should be reformed if it's something did -- is wrong, then it should be investigated -- investigated appropriately, but not here, but and where it's supposed to be in the DA's office. That's what I think.

But I feel you guys have -- have -- have a lot going for you guys, but you guys have to come together. That's what -- when I was part of this -- this community, that's the kind of things I did. Even though I -- I -- I came from Moreno Valley, I care, too, because I'm a citizen of the world. So you guys work together and do something great for this city and for the people here. Thank you.

MAYOR BAILEY: Thank you. Art Castle followed by Errol.

MR. CASTLE: My name is Art Castle, and I live in Ward Sphere. I've been appearing at city hall since Ab Brown was mayor. I've always come down here with praise for your city while telling you that the

residence of my community, Mockingbird Canyon, have no interest in being annexed into the city. Today I have no praise for you. I believe this city has become a tangled web of lies, deceit, and conspiracy. You should be ashamed of yourselves.

You conducted a witch hunt against a fellow councilman who is guilty only of living up to his campaign promises and not going along to get along. He's been told by many of you that he needs to get out of campaign mode. That's backwards. You guys need to get into campaign mode and start living up the to the promises you made and your fiduciary duty to the taxpayers of this city.

You just squandered well over \$60,000 on a charge that probably should have been investigated under the code of ethics and conduct, where it would have no doubt never seen the light of day. One party claims something inappropriate was said, and the other party totally denies it. I've known Mike Soubirous for over 10 years and we've gone through a barrel of salt together. Mike is not a liar. That leaves me to believe that the other party to the alleged conversation, Brian Greg -- Brian Smith, is.

Mike and I had many conversations at the time of this meeting with -- with Brian Smith. I clearly



remember him telling me that Brian had thanked him for being the only person that had reached out to the RPOA. And my response was, good, maybe they'll contribute to you next time. I see how that worked out.

There are dirty fingerprints all over the testimony. Much discussion with an attorney, probably one recently departed from this city, as in the depositions where people quote specific articles and paragraphs from the charter in a way people giving unscripted testimony never would. The involvement of the mayor in an issue in which he has no standing or influence, lies about dates, lies about things that were told Councilman Soubirous, lies about almost everything involved.

How about four employees filing charges against him and that it was a whistleblower case and he'd never know who filed the charges and exactly what they were? Is there one of you up there willing to refund the taxpayer money you wasted on this investigation? The people in the city know who the guilty parties are, and most are right in front of me.

What happened to the promises you made to your constituents when you ran for office? Like everything about these allegations, they went into the dung heap. I also take exception to Mr. Gumport's



1	comment on the effect the effect of this is what
2	happens when electeds talk to employees. Nobody at the
3	dais abandoned their constitutional rights when they
4	took the oath of office. Every councilman deposed
5	stated that they spoke to RPD area commanders about
6	issues in their wards. It's called dialogue. Just
7	like Mike, they didn't order them to do anything, nor
8	did they threaten anyone.
9	At the end of your staff report, by one of
10	your accusers, you have a list of actions taken against
11	someone accused of hearsay.
12	MAYOR BAILEY: Thank you very much.
13	MR. CASTLE: By the way, what happened to
14	MAYOR BAILEY: (Indiscernible) speaker Errol
15	
16	MR. CASTLE: (indiscernible). Are there no
17	(indiscernible)?
18	MAYOR BAILEY: followed by William Herring.
19	MR. KASHOWITZ: Yeah, my name is Errol. I'm
20	in Ward 5. I wanted to say today about Mike, everybody
21	loves you, Mike, at the Janet Goeske Center, all the
22	seniors for coming down to the barbecue and having
23	hamburgers with all the people down there. And you
24	know it was busy. I feel that seven of the nine of you

men up there actually should be in jail, and that's not



including Mike and Paul. They're out of this, but seven out of the nine men should be in jail for embezzling.

I really don't think -- sooner or later somebody is going to have to come down here and investigate all the money that you guys have let this guy write a check on. The board of supervisors is worse than I've ever seen before, but he should actually go to jail. I -- I mean --

MAYOR BAILEY: Could you focus your -- your comments --

MR. KASHOWITZ: Okay.

MAYOR BAILEY: -- to the council?

MR. KASHOWITZ: Okay. Scott Barber -- or Scott Barber one time, I can't -- you want to talk about transparency, Rusty, I asked one time for an overhead here so we can give out information, all the money that you guys have taken from these people, I've asked for an overhead here since last year. Scott Barber has refused me to have an overhead put in over here so I can get information, because the people of the citizens of Riverside need to know how much debt you guys have put us in.

All right. I -- I won't point at him, and I'm sorry for pointing at him. He said as long as he



was city manager, that would never happen. Well, he disrespected me as a citizen of Riverside. He told me that as long as he was city manager, that would never happen, an overhead here so I can let people know exactly what kind of information and what you guys have done here. I would like to put up -- I have so many public records of what you guys have done, that I want the citizens of Riverside to see what you guys have done. I feel that I should have an overhead.

Rusty, you've told me three times, I've heard all day today, transparency, transparency. Why can't I have an overhead about information, Rusty? That's all I've asked for. For two years now since you've been in office, I've asked for transparency. Let's have some transparency. Let me have an overhead so I can rebut everything you guys said before. I want an overhead, Rusty, for Christmas. Is that what I can do? Put it on a bond. Put it on a bond so I can put it up there so everybody can see what you guys have done, Rusty. Put it on a credit card.

MAYOR BAILEY: Again, focus your comments to the council. They're the ones --

MR. KASHOWITZ: Put it on a --

MAYOR BAILEY: -- that make the decision.

MR. KASHOWITZ: -- credit -- put it on a



- credit card, Rusty. That's all I want for Christmas.
 Have a good day.
- MAYOR BAILEY: William Herring followed by
 Christina Zeragoza.
- MR. HERRING: Good afternoon, council. 5 Before I got here I was proud to be someone from 6 7 Riverside. Boy, I -- I don't want to reiterate. 8 Everybody has been up here complaining. Here's the 9 thing, I'm here representing no one but myself, I'm a 10 citizen, I vote. And you guys are put into office to 11 listen to what we ask for. And it seems like Congress has forgotten it. They're at, well, 77 disapproval 12 13 rating. It seems like you guys have gotten off on a

We pay you. We pay your staff. This is embarrassing. Unfortunately I sell real estate in Riverside. This doesn't do us any good. I -- I -- I'm appalled. I mean, I had someone call me up going, well, maybe I should move to Moreno Valley because all their crap is over with. That's pretty sad. That's very sad. So I think we need to stop this, stop the good ole boys.

step that -- that you're forgetting who's behind this.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. HERRING: Start listening to your constituents and do what we ask. If we ask for the



14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

panhandlers to be gone, get them gone. You can get other things done. You sure don't have a problem with code enforcement finding a brown lawn. I mean, this -this is really appalling to me. And I hope this is a wake-up call to the City of Riverside, because you know what, we're not going away. The citizens, most citizens love this city. I moved here because of this city. And now we've got this going. Please, pull your heads out, let's get this going, and get this behind us.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

MAYOR BAILEY: Christina Zeragoza followed by Gary Christmas.

MS. ZERGOZA: My name is Christina Zeragoza. I have been a City of Riverside resident for 16 years. It is my understanding that today's hearing is the first ever hearing of its kind in the City of Riverside. The fact that this complaint and investigation is being handled differently than others is seriously concerning to me. Why is my city councilman being treated differently?

Why wasn't this allegation filed and handled pursuant to Chapter 202 of the city's charter and Resolution 22676? Resolution No. 22676 states in part that the city council desires to establish uniform



norms and procedures in order to accomplish these goals. It appears the city council and/or mayor handled this issue outside the established norms, which not only has violated Chapter 202 of the city's charter and Resolution 22676, violations of the city's code of ethics and conduct number 1, 2, 4, and 6 have occurred.

It could be argued that city council and/or the mayor took unprecedented actions against Councilman Soubirous and those actions were and are harassing in nature and thus has created a hostile work environment for Councilman Soubirous. The investigation into violations of the city charter and the city's harassment policy in which Councilman Soubirous was the subject was based on a conversation between two people. There were no witnesses to the conversation.

The complaining parties, as well as Sergeant Smith made this clear. The investigator stated in his final report, "It appears that nobody other than the participants of the February 14th meeting will ever know with a certainty what happened at that meeting."

As Sergeant Smith stated in his interview, and I quote, "It is a he said, she said."

When an allegation such as this is made, consideration should be given to the probability of whether a definite outcome can be achieved. Over



49,000 plus of hard warn -- hard earned taxpayer money has been spent on this investigation. Those individuals or individual -- individual responsible for approving to move forward with this investigation made a gross error in judgment because they either knew or at least should have known this investigation would result in an inconclusive finding.

So again I ask myself, why is my councilman being treated differently? Could it be that someone or a group of people is trying to intimidate Councilman Soubirous in an effort to silence his voice? I truly hope that is not the case, because trying to silence my councilman's voice is no different than trying to silence my voice. Gentlemen, the evidence gleaned by this investigation weighs more in Councilman Soubirous' favor than not.

Furthermore, I would like to know in what codified document does it give any of you the authority to judge, let alone punish, Councilman Soubirous? I don't see such authority given to the city council or mayor in the city charter, code of ethics and conduct, or in Resolution 22676; therefore I believe your only choice in this matter is to take no action against Councilman Soubirous.

MAYOR BAILEY: Gary Christmas followed by



Kathy Allavie.

MR. CHRISTMAS: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, members of the council, city staff. I'm here as a resident of the City of Riverside. I've lived in Riverside

33 years. I'm active in a number of civic groups, but my comments today are entirely my own. I read the entire report from Mr. Gumport, and it seems that his comments backed up his report as well today in that there were two credible witnesses that he either interviewed or received comments from and that because of that there's really no way to determine conclusively if there's any guilt with either individual -- I mean, guilt with Mr. Soubirous.

And it does not reflect on Mr. Smith's comments to say that the findings are inconclusive and incomplete. Therefore I believe that the only action the council can take is -- is no action against Mr. Soubirous. I don't want to comment on the other matters, whether or not the hearing was appropriate; but I do want to say that we have a great city staff, we have a good city manager. We're one of the premier cities in California.

And it's disappointing to me as a resident, a long-time resident and a person who enjoys this city and likes the amenities that this city offers, that --



that we end up in these type of debates. So I would hope the council in the future can figure out a way to resolve these issues so we don't end up in hearings like this and that we all abide by the charter. So thank you.

MAYOR BAILEY: Kathy Allavie followed by Andy Bodewin.

MS. ALLAVIE: Mayor, city council people, my name is Kathy Allavie, and I am the current president of the Raincross Group, a group of citizens who unite around a vision for Riverside that includes effective accountable leadership. We know that good governance leads to good management, good performance, good stewardship of public money, good public engagement, ultimately good outcomes for all of our citizens; but all of this cannot happen in the current atmosphere in city hall.

We ask that you put aside bickering and petty -- pettiness and concentrate on, one, implementing a vision for Riverside, which can't be done unless you all adhere to the city charter and immediately schedule a strategic planning session; two, that you -- that you together work towards a common purpose with clearly defined functions and roles; three, that you promote the values of good governance



by upholding high standards of conduct and behavior,
which means agreeing to the code of ethics and working
within it; and finally that you make informed and
transparent decisions which are subject to scrutiny and
not set meetings and conduct business at which other
councilmembers are not included.

In other words, we need you to get on with the business of the city. Riverside has too many critical needs to be wasting our time with such small-town shenanigans. Thank you.

MAYOR BAILEY: Andy Bodewin followed by Vivian Moreno.

MR. BODEWIN: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayor, members of the council. Andy Bodewin. I've been here all my life, 60-plus years and have never witnessed a city council meeting like this and I've been here between 50 and a hundred times easily. First I wanted to comment on Sergeant Smith's statements and -- and the reports in general. Keep in mind none of the statements that were made were under oath. No one is under oath here. They can say whatever they want. It's not like being in court where you're under oath.

Second, if Mike Soubirous had said anything to Sergeant Smith that the city manager was going to be gone or Sergio Diaz was going to be gone, well, they're



still here. So that aside, I've known Mike Soubirous and his family for over 10 years. They've been neighbors of mine, friends of mine. We fellowship the same church together. Mike has worked with me many times in Christian volunteer service.

I've witnessed him deal with all types of people in all different situations. When he actually told me he was going to run for public office, I tried to discourage him because this is the type of thing that an honest Christian man can experience when he gets in public office.

We have a lot of egos. We need to put our egos aside. We need to think the best for our citizens, not for ourselves. Mike didn't take this job to pound on his chest and try to impress everyone. He did it to help those people in his ward. And those people are here today and they're out in the street and they're the people you're going to see every day.

I'm not going to poke fingers at the city manager or the mayor or any of the council people right now. It's obvious what's occurred here. We don't need to go through this again. This is a great city to live in. We have some great people here. We would like to have more people who care about our community run for public office, but why would you want to run for public



office and go through something like this? Thank you 1 2 very much. MAYOR BAILEY: Vivian Moreno followed by Jason 3 4 Hunter. MS. MORENO: Good afternoon. Vivian Moreno. 5 Wow. The morale on the seventh floor must really be 6 I can't even imagine you guys all working 7 8 together. You can find all the transcripts and a play by play on thirtymilesofcorruption.com. And I want to 9 10 ask all of you, how did we get here? You got here 11 alone because your city attorney left like a coward, 12 like the coward he was, you left. 13 MAYOR BAILEY: Keep your comments to the 14 council. MS. MORENO: Okay. I'm talking to you, 15 Mr. Bailey. He left. Your -- your buddy, he left. 16 Okay. In the short time that Mike Soubirous has been a 17 councilmember, he has displayed a natural leadership 18 19 ability that stands out. And his dedication to his constituents and all the cities -- citizens of 20 21 Riverside is apparent. And that is why the citizens of Riverside 22 23 love you, Mike Soubirous. 24 How embarrassing to the city and its

citizens, especially the constituents of Ward 3. How

1	can you all possibly think that the issue before you
2	would be worthy of a closed-session vote and an
3	investigation of this magnitude? This was nothing but
4	gossip, and I can't believe that Mike Gardner, Andy
5	Melendrez, Jim Perry, Steve Adams, and Rusty Bailey
6	supported this nonsense. Is this the public speak
7	the public spanking for all of you that I personally
8	have been waiting for?
9	Rusty Bailey, you have no respect for your
10	councilmembers, and you have already been soliciting
11	people to run against Mike Soubirous. And if you
12	think
13	MAYOR BAILEY: Make your comments to the
14	entire
15	MS. MORENO: I'm
16	MAYOR BAILEY: council
17	MS. MORENO: not I'm talking to you.
18	MAYOR BAILEY: not to the mayor or a
19	councilmember.
20	MS. MORENO: I'm talking to you, Mr. Bailey.
21	MAYOR BAILEY: The decorum
22	MS. MORENO: And if you
23	MAYOR BAILEY: of this public meeting
24	MS. MORENO: think
25	MAYOR BAILEY: is to speak to the entire



1 MS. MORENO: -- you're going to put --2 MAYOR BAILEY: -- council body. 3 MS. MORENO: -- Reynaldo Fierro against Mike Soubirous and embarrass him, I think not. You can make 4 sure that I will include myself on the race with 5 Mr. Gardner. And believe me, I will be a pain for this 6 7 This investigation was nothing -- there was nothing transparent about this. This is nothing but 8 9 gossip, jealousy, disrespect for each other and our government. There will be an ethics complaint on most 10 of your desks next week. 11 MAYOR BAILEY: Jason Hunter --12 MS. MORENO: Thank you very much. 13 14 MAYOR BAILEY: -- followed by Raychele Sterling. 15 16 MR. HUNTER: Jason Hunter, Ward 2. Here's my 17 review of the investigative report and to allegations made into councilman Mike Soubirous. The investigator 18 19 looked into four possible issues, charter violations, 20 Brown Act violations, ethics violations, and a hostile 21 work environment. The findings were as followed, unsubstantiated, unfounded, unsubstantiated, and 22 23 unsubstantiated. I take issue with three of the four of these 24

findings. All should have returned as unfounded.



(

issue number three with the ethics violation should not have been under review by the investigator at all. Additionally and somewhat perplexingly, it has come to my attention that Mr. Bailey, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Perry would like to discuss whether Mr. Soubirous violated Resolution No. 22676, rules of procedure and order of business.

I'll take a look at the charter violations first, Mr. Gumport has detailed Section 407 for us already and as well as parts of Section 601 detailing the powers of the city manager. It is clear from the statements by RPOA President Smith himself to the investigator that Councilman Soubirous gave no orders to Mr. Smith, nor did he attempt to interfere in the city manager's administration of the city affairs.

However, even if he had made the indirect attempt to influence Mr. Smith's marching orders, Mr. Smith, as a sergeant only, was in no position to effectuate these orders and thereby undermine the chief -- chief of police nor city manager. Councilman Soubirous, if we are to believe Mr. Smith, offered his opinion that liveability issues weren't addressed to the satisfaction of the council, both the city manager and chief of police, who is a subordinate of the city manager would be terminated.



News flash. This is called being at-will in the real world and should come as no surprise to anyone. Councilman Soubirous also allegedly offered his opinion on the police department's presence in this ward, which he is certainly entitled to do under his First Amendment guarantees. All Mr. Smith's testimony is considered hearsay and has no value as actual evidence as even Mr. Smith admits to the investigator.

Complaints of this nature fall under the jurisdiction of the city attorney's office to bring formal charges. In light of the obvious conflict with that, the more appropriate avenue -- avenue should have been to bring forward this issue with the local district attorney's office for review as would have been the only option available to the general public based upon the numerous charter violations that many concerned citizens have brought to this city's attention over the past several years.

To my knowledge, no such complaints were made by Mr. Diaz or Mr. Barber. I'll skip to the end here. I -- I had all the rest of the charges, but I'm not going to get time in my three minutes. I'll -- I'll just wrap up here. The other charges were lesser than the 407 violations.

The investigator's main takeaway can be found



in this sentence, the February meeting and its fallout, 1 2 including the time and expense of the investigation 3 demonstrate the cost and disruption that can occur when 4 city councilmembers directly deal with subordinates to 5 the city manager instead of dealing with them through the city manager. This statement is simply outlandish. 6 It contains no legal standing. 7 8 Of course our councilmen can speak candidly 9 to the president of the Riverside Police Officers' 10 Association. In fact, we should encourage 11 Mr. Soubirous to continue doing so, although I can see 12 where he might feel a bit betrayed and hesitant. 13 so, then Mr. Barber and Mr. Diaz have accomplished, 14 what, in my opinion, they set out to do, hinder the 15 council from finding out what really goes on within the 16 echelons of city manager. More and not less direct 17 communication is exactly what's needed in --18 MAYOR BAILEY: Ravchele --19 MR. HUNTER: -- this (indiscernible). 20 MAYOR BAILEY: -- Sterling followed by Donald 21 Gallegos. 22 Ms. Sterling: Please don't interrupt me, 23 I am going to -- Mr. Bodewin spoke about being 24 a good Christian. And, Rusty, I think that when I read

Dante's Divine Comedy, at the very depths of hell was



1	for people like you blasphemers. The curse of the Lord
2	is in the house of the wicked, but he blesses the
3	habitation of the just. Surely he scorneth the
4	scorners, but he giveth grace unto the lowly. The wise
5	shall inherit gory glory, but shame shall be the
6	promotion of fools; and that is what I'm seeing here,
7	absolute fools.
8	You have been made fools by Rusty Bailey.
9	Even you, Steve Adams, I couldn't believe you
10	kept it together when he
11	MAYOR BAILEY: Keep your comment
12	MS. STERLING: was sitting there
13	MAYOR BAILEY: Keep your comments to the
14	MS. STERLING: throwing you under the
15	MAYOR BAILEY: council as whole.
16	MS. STERLING: bus.
17	MAYOR BAILEY: Not as an individual
18	MS. STERLING: Do not interrupt me.
19	MAYOR BAILEY: in here.
20	MS. STERLING: You are infringing on my First
21	Amendment rights.
22	MAYOR BAILEY: You're breaking the
23	MS. STERLING: Do you want me to sue you
24	like
25	MAYOR BAILEY: rules of procedure that I



1 outlined before the meeting. 2 MS. STERLING: Okay. Cite those to me and 3 don't use my time. What am I breaking? I'm addressing Mr. Adams. He's an elected official. I'm addressing 4 5 you. 6 MAYOR BAILEY: As --7 MS. STERLING: You're an elected official. 8 MAYOR BAILEY: As was mentioned and the --9 MS. STERLING: Did you interrupt anybody --10 MAYOR BAILEY: -- rules of procedure --11 MS. STERLING: -- from the police department? 12 I don't think so. So I'm going to continue. 13 MAYOR BAILEY: You're going to keep your 14 comments --15 My comments will be in MS. STERLING: No. accordance with the First Amendment, Rusty. Didn't you 16 17 teach government? Maybe you ought to review your 18 books. Anyway, as I go on, it's interesting --19 MAYOR BAILEY: Your time is not going yet, because you asked me a question. 20 21 MS. STERLING: Okay. Well, it's very 22 interesting that the --23 MAYOR BAILEY: And I'll respond to that. 24 MS. STERLING: -- only people that are 25 interrupted --



MAYOR BAILEY: All remarks shall be addressed to the city council as a body and not to any councilmember thereof.

MS. STERLING: Okay. As a body, I have a problem with your mayor. I think that this was all orchestrated by him. I think that I cannot wait to get a copy of this tape. I mean, he wants a projector, like I already got my Christmas present, it's going to be the tape of Mr. Rusty Bailey's ranting. And I mean, I've seen less fit out of my prepubescent daughter. That was just embarrassing. I mean, I wanted to crawl in a hole for you.

So when you look at that tape, you're going to want to really think twice about when you're up for election. But anyway, this was all orchestrated, I'm sure, by Rusty Bailey, Greg Priamos. What happened, this is what I think probably happened, you know, Smith heard something and he blew it by Diaz. Diaz blew up and went to the city manager. The city manager went to Greg. And Greg's like, oh, you know, I am in control here. We can get -- we can get Mike Soubirous.

He orchestrated this whole thing, Rusty and Steve signed the documents, and then you brought this just fiasco forward and you have embarrassed yourself, you have embarrassed the city. This law firm, I feel

1 sorry for them. I mean, I really think this may have 2 impacted your reputation, too. And I hope you already 3 cashed the check, because the city has no money. feel really sorry for the city attorney. You seem like 4 5 a very standup woman and you have been put in such a 6 horrible position because you're following such a --7 MAYOR BAILEY: Focus your comments --8 MS. STERLING: -- horrible -- I am --9 MAYOR BAILEY: -- the city council as a body. 10 MS. STERLING: I am complimenting her. I compliment you for hiring somebody 11 12 competent who actually understands the law and doesn't That is -- that is really the, you know, a 13 break it. 14 good thing, okay? 15 Rusty, you need to stop embarrassing -- and 16 interrupting me. And if I see you not interrupt other 17 people that are off comment, I'm bringing a lawsuit. 18 And you know I will. So I think that Rusty Bailey has 19 put all of you in this position. He sits up there and 20 says, I don't have a vote, I didn't do this, my hands 21 are clean. He's throwing all of you under the bus. He 22 orchestrated this and --MAYOR BAILEY: Donald Gallegos --23 MS. STERLING: -- he's making you take the 24



25

fall.

MAYOR BAILEY: -- followed by Jackie Rawlings.

MS. STERLING: Remember that.

MR. GALLEGOS: I just want to concur that mayor, city council, I agree with Andy Melendrez's comments, this matter could have been handled without this big mess and expense. And the reason that people are seeing this for as a political motive is because of the -- just that and because of how much money was spent to okay this investigation.

You know, everybody up here deserves to be here except for, I think, one of the things that we need to do, I think to get -- clear this matter is it's been proven already, Sergio Diaz, our police chief, and Scott Barber, our city manager, who are not elected officials, and they really need to go. They have no care for the concern for these residents, the expense that this caused, and they're the two ones that filed this complaint. Thank you.

MAYOR BAILEY: Jackie Rawlings followed by Collette Lee.

MS. RAWLINGS: My name is Jackie Rawlings, and I thank you for giving me the three minutes to speak. First of all, I'm not here to blame anybody. Mike is a great guy. He's proven it. That's beyond a reasonable doubt. I appreciate the chief of police

(

because he has a boss. Like all of us, we follow the orders of our boss. I was lucky to move in the area where Mike is my council, but I had a great one in Ward 5. I think Mr. Diaz -- Chief Diaz deserves a little more respect because he does try to do what basically is what an officer does, at least from what I've seen and I've experienced.

To the mayor, I can only say, you're as good as the people you hire. Like any of us, if you don't have a good councilman, city manager, chief of police, it -- it falls on you. We have already seen throughout the years what happened to our chief of police, our DA, our city councilman charged with interfering with police work. We saw that. Every -- we're not fools. People getting license plates that are illegal and then saying they didn't know, but yet they're police. I didn't understand that one. But it still falls on you.

I respect you because you are an elected official by every citizen in this city. I elected Mike, but everybody elected you. And I believe in democracy, so I'm asking you, could you please get qualified people. Law is not that hard. It isn't.

MAYOR BAILEY: Again, keep your comments to the council --

MS. RAWLINGS: Okay.



MAYOR BAILEY: -- entire council. 1 MS. RAWLINGS: No problem. They know law, 2 too. Well, Mr. Davis does. 101, follow it. That's 3 what they tell you in school to everybody, and you, 4 5 too, follow it, but I recognize you need good legal 6 staff. That's what you need, a city. Thank you. 7 MAYOR BAILEY: Thank you. Collette Lee followed by Mary Shelton. 8 9 MS. LEE: Good afternoon, Mayor Bailey, city 10 councilmen. This is a very sad day for Riverside. 11 truly upsets me as a person who loves Riverside to have this type of council meeting. It shouldn't have taken 12 place. I would just like to share with you a little 13 14 bit of the bigger picture. There are three components 15 of a modern political order. 16 You must have a strong and capable city. The 17 city must subordinate to the rule of law, which we 18 have, our city charter. The city's leadership is accountable to the citizens of Riverside. Now, I know 19 20 that when all of you took that office, you did it with 21 the intent of making the city better. We're not.

It saddens me greatly to spend the last three hours listening to this kangaroo court. I respect all of you. I respect our police chief. I expect all of



We're not.

22

23

24

you to put your differences behind you to work together as a team for the betterment of this city. My family is here. Your families are here. Let's go forward together. Let's put this behind us.

What's going on next in September with Councilman Davis, stop it, work it out, focus on what's best for the city, please.

MAYOR BAILEY: Mary Shelton followed by Chuck Matahatse.

MS. SHELTON: Hello. This reminded me of the 1920s when we had a Klan mayor, a corrupt city government with financial mismanagement, an intoxicated police chief who was arrested in public. And I stopped and thought about the last decade and thought of how many -- much history had repeated itself. And it was that era during the 1920s, which is why we moved away from having a strong mayoral system to our current council, city council, city manager system.

I picked that tidbit up in the last charter review process that we do every 10 years. I would like to say that none of this is new. I mean, the only thing new here is the faces. This is something that's been going back for decades. And I know because I've been doing my research. I mean, the same thing over and over again.



You have the same city government doing the same thing, the same, you know, agencies within the city have the same dysfunctional patterns that reassert themselves every so often like in -- in the same way, including the top floor of city hall and the police department and some of the other agencies. They just go through these turmoil issues over and over and over again and then they somehow right themselves and then history repeats itself down the road.

So none of this is a surprise to me. And it's -- it's just too bad that the senior member of -- who -- who knows, has been participating in this broken process the longest, the city attorney, as is someone said, unable to be available for comment in this important proceeding today. But that's -- I -- it's just what I'd like to say.

I -- I don't understand how this investigative process even started. I mean, I seem to recall -- now I can't mention any city councilmembers, so I'll just refer to the one who shall not be named, and one of you up there which one it's -- who it is; but this individual was also suspected of charter interference, the same provision, administrative interference some years ago involving the police department and several promotions.

I didn't see any process like this in place back then. I didn't see these attorneys here reviewing it. I didn't see the city council even really care about it except maybe a couple members. I had saw two lieutenants who had to do a lawsuit and practically had to do their own investigation to get out where the citizens even knew about it. And look what happened to them.

So I -- I just -- I -- I mean, I'm kind of baffled as to why this is going on today when -- when in the situation involving the city councilmember without a name, we didn't have anything like this. We didn't have any investigation at all. And then when we come along all this time and we have a process that's not -- may not even be legal. And even if it's a Brown Act violation, it still moves on forward like -- like a runaway train.

And I'd like to say that I would have hoped to seen something better and I would hope to see everyone up here remember what you're here for, and that's to serve the public. And I think some of you need more reminding of that than others. Thank you.

MAYOR BAILEY: Chuck Matahatse followed by final speaker card Rick Gay, unless Jerod, is Jerod here in the room? Did Jerod come back? Jerod



Herringsma.

Chuck.

MR. MATAHATSE: Thank you, councilmembers,
Bailey -- Mr. Bailey, and other members of the board.

I'm not here to condemn anyone, but to voice my
concerns about some of the issues and behaviors that
have been happening in the city government, and I'm
sure everybody is aware of. And I probably can't speak
as eloquently as other -- others have and I'm not as
knowledgeable, but I'm also not here -- but I'm also
not only here to voice my support of Mike Soubirous,
but I want to support any one and every one of you that
do the right thing.

And that right thing is, but not limited to -- limited to what's in the best interest of the City of Riverside, its residents, and businesses and acting in a professional manner and treating each other with respect and performing your duties within the scope of the law. Doing that right thing does not have to be difficult and petty disputes, and personality conflexes are not be -- conflicts are not becoming behaviors of our city leaders and its representatives.

I believe that you will -- and will find and get more community appreciation and support if you do the right thing. The right thing seems to be a common



thread in my -- in my statement here. But anyway, this may sound cliche, but let's all try to get along, work together, and get the things accomplished that need to be. After all we don't want any federal agencies getting involved in our city. Thank you.

MAYOR BAILEY: Rick Gay followed by Jerod Herringsma if he is here.

MR. GAY: Good afternoon, counsel, Mr. Mayor. My name is Rick Gay. I'm a veteran. I took an -- an oath to uphold the Constitution, and I thank you for giving me the opportunity to exercise my freedom of speech. The people of the State of California are watching these shenanigans. They're putting Riverside in the same context of Moreno Valley, San Bernardino, and the City of Bell. And I know this because my cousin called me last night and he's a -- he's a dirt farmer from San Luis Obispo and he wanted to know what's going on in -- in Riverside.

Mike is not a political or a politician.

He's not political. He's an honest. He's a -- he's a representative. He's concerned for the welfare and the wellbeing of his constituents.

These proceedings are tantamount to a kangaroo court and muck raking to damage Councilman Soubirous' very good character. The \$49,000



1	investigation was found to be inconclusive. The
2	politicians in the room are at a turning point. What
3	you decide here may have far reaching ramifications.
4	The constituents of Ward 3 will not forget this day. I
5	strongly recommend no action against Mike Soubirous.
6	When I walked the precincts on behalf of you,
7	mayor, and behalf of Councilman Soubirous, the
8	constituents the constituents said, if they are
9	honest men, the council would run them off.
10	FEMALE SPEAKER: Yep.
11	MR. GAY: Or they will turn against them and
12	they will turn against their constituents. And here we
13	are.
14	FEMALE SPEAKER: Yep.
15	MR. GAY: Thank you, Michael, for all your
16	hard work.
17	FEMALE SPEAKER: That's right.
18	MAYOR BAILEY: Is Jerod Herringsma? No Jerod.
19	That completes public comment, which brings us back to
20	the council for questions of of individuals that are
21	here and the staff members, whether it's the city
22	manager, Brian Smith, Aurelio Aurelio Melendrez, the
23	chief of police is here to answer questions you might
24	have of them, questions of the individuals that

conducted the investigation or special counsel or



1 otherwise.

So it is time for the city council to question -- questions, comments, deliberation, and any action.

Councilman Soubirous.

COUNCILMEMBER SOUBIROUS: I just want to make it real clear in case it hasn't been stated that I completely respect the job that the Riverside police officers do, being that I came from the cop world, I understand the difficulties of their job. And being married to a line-of-duty widow, I understand the circumstances that can happen when things go wrong. So this is, you know, my criticism of a union president or my comments towards him in no way, shape, or form reflects how I feel about all of the others.

And I think all of you know that that work for the RPD that I've known for years, including Brian. We've known each other probably about 18 years now. I'm sad to see things turn out the way they did, but I got to say that, you know, the men and women of the RPD, you know, I speak with you all quite often and -- and I've known you all for quite a long time and, you know, nothing has changed in my book as how I view the job that you do. And I'm very appreciative.

And the same with staff, too. You know, when



I made my comment about staff keeping us from knowing what's going on, I don't direct that to staff other than the top managerial staff. I want to see more openness in what we know as far as background information. I've been demanding it politely of course with pretty please on top, demanding it in a sense of, I've got emails to prove it, I've been demanding it in sense of like, you know, for instance we were asked to approve something that I believe had \$100,000 price tag, and it had no background; and so I asked ahead of time, I said, well, where's the background on this? What -- why am I voting on a hundred grand when I have no background?

Those are the things that really bother me. You know, we need to start working on this. We -- that's why I ran for office. We need to start working on this openness and transparency. And council needs to be council. They need to stand up, and I believe they want to, and staff needs to know that they work for this council. That's the bottom line. Thank you.

MAYOR BAILEY: Councilman Davis.

COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: I'd like to move that we close this discussion without a vote because we have no authority under the law or a charter to do any vote, whether it be take no action or otherwise, and that we



put this behind us and learn from this lessons, and certainly the lessons that we had, which is going to come up in September again, folks, so hopefully we've learned from today and we close this hearing.

MAYOR BAILEY: Motion on the table.

COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Second.

MAYOR BAILEY: Motion and a second on the table. Councilman Perry.

COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: I'm sorry. First couple of questions are for Mr. Gumport. When you were doing your investigation, and one of the things that has troubled me a little bit about the investigation from its entirety was that there are parts of it that I do feel are incomplete. And -- and I guess my first question to you is, at any point did you ever consider going back and re-interviewing people for additional information or while you were doing your interviews, asking additional questions seeking further clarification?

MR. GUMPORT: Yes. And I asked additional questions of Brian Smith. I -- I think you'll see on the transcript of his interview that there was a follow-up interview that same day. So when I -- I think what I'd say is, besides follow-up questions, it became apparent fairly quickly that the -- there were



two additional pieces of the puzzle besides what Brian Smith had told me on the first day of the interviews, which was April 15th, 2014.

One was what Councilman Soubirous had to say about it. And as I've discussed, he simply until May 14th -- the investigation began essentially on April 15th, until May 9th he wasn't going to answer any questions. On May 9th or May 8th he said he would answer written questions through his counsel. And the -- I gave a set of submitted written questions and I got his written answers and at that point it was fairly clear that it was a swearing contest.

It -- it wasn't even a swearing contest until -- until Councilmember Soubirous responded. All I had was what really Brian Smith's side of the conversation was and what he had said to other people, which seemed to corroborate that at least he was walking around telling other people, this is what happened at the Starbucks on that day.

The other person who was identified as someone who might know was Alicia Robinson of the Press Enterprise. And what you will see when you read the transcript of my interview of Brian Smith is, I first say, well -- well, do you -- you think that she would talk to me? And he says, I don't know, but I think she

has a tape-recording of something. I think she's talking to someone on the seventh floor.

And towards the end of the interview what I say to Brian Smith is, actually I think it would be counterproductive. I -- I -- I don't think a journalist is going to talk about what her sources told her. And I think the investigation should be kept confidential and this is not going to help get -- keep it confidential.

So yeah, I did think about follow-up questions and really, you know, it -- once I heard from Councilmember Soubirous, it -- perhaps if I had heard from him on day one, the investigation might have stopped on day one.

COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: Did -- at any point during your investigation, did you ever ask any of these individuals if there was any potential witnesses or did you ever go out to Starbucks and -- and walk the area to see if there was any potential witnesses?

MR. GUMPORT: I didn't walk the area of Starbucks, no, I did not.

COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: Okay. Thank -- thank you.

Okay. And then, Sergeant Smith, if I can ask you a couple of questions.



And, Councilmember Soubirous, I've been asking questions here, feel -- feel free to respond to them afterwards.

MR. GUMPORT: (Indiscernible).

COUNCILMEMBER SOUBIROUS: Yeah, I just want to make it clear the reason why I didn't respond to any verbal questions is a matter of trust. When I'm told four people, I'll never know the report, I'll never know who filed against me. It's like, give me a break. My attorney asked for things in writing, nope, you can't have anything in writing. Nope, you can't know anything. Well, if I'm not going to know anything, then how am I going to talk about it? And that just wasn't right.

So finally I thought, you know what, I owe it to the people of Riverside, I didn't like the idea of not answering, but I didn't trust, that's why I put it in writing. And I think I've more than explained myself at this point.

COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: Just follow along. I want to go back to the day that the two of you had a conversation. Like I said, I think there's a lot of questions that weren't asked. And I -- I fall back on many years of experience of investigating over -- investigating, supervising, and managing -- managing



1	investigations. And that's where a lot of my questions
2	are coming from.
3	When you guys met at Starbucks, by chance, do
4	you do you know any of the employees there?
5	SERGEANT SMITH: No, I don't.
6	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: And if my memory serves
7	me right, in that same complex where Starbucks is
8	located, there's several small businesses. Do you know
9	any of those business owners or employees that work for
10	those businesses?
11	SERGEANT SMITH: No.
12	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: And when you guys
13	arrived at Starbucks, were you guys seated inside,
14	outside?
15	SERGEANT SMITH: Outside.
16	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: Across from one and
17	other, next to one and other?
18	SERGEANT SMITH: He was to my left.
19	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: Okay. Was anyone else
20	sitting in close proximity to the two of you?
21	SERGEANT SMITH: There were two males that
22	were at the table, which would be to our left. They
23	were there prior to Councilman Soubirous' arrival.
24	When the councilman arrived, he I took it as he knew
25	somebody, I think it was a retired CHP officer,



1	something, they had exchanged pleasantries and then
2	Mike sat down and they were there for a period of time
3	while we were there.
4	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: That was going to be one
5	of my questions, at any point in your conversation, did
6	anyone interrupt you even to say hi
7	SERGEANT SMITH: There
8	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: break into the
9	conversation.
10	SERGEANT SMITH: There there was a point
11	that while we were there someone did walk up to go into
12	the Starbucks, stopped to talk to Councilman Soubirous.
13	I don't I don't remember what it was about, but I
14	I thought it was something along the lines of maybe a
15	student or something of that matter, and they exchanged
16	business cards.
17	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: And what part of your
18	conversation what part of the conversation that you
19	guys were having, what part of it was it? If you
20	remember?
21	SERGEANT SMITH: I'm going to I think it
22	was probably within the first 20 minutes.
23	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: Okay.
24	SERGEANT SMITH: It was unremarkable for me

because it wasn't someone that was coming to me to



1 speak to me, so perhaps the councilman has a better 2 recollection of the timeframe. 3 COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: Did you see anyone else 4 there that you personally know? 5 SERGEANT SMITH: No, I did not. 6 COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: And approximately how long did your guys' meeting last? 7 SERGEANT SMITH: About an hour, an hour and 10 8 9 minutes maybe. 10 COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: And during your 11 interview, you -- a couple times you used the term, he 12 tried to big league me. Can you -- so we all -- so 13 we're all on the same page here, can you define big leaque me? 14 15 SERGEANT SMITH: Well, I thought it was pretty clear in -- in my statement, it's just a term in an 16 17 essence he was letting me know his position versus my 18 position. That was how I felt. 19 COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: So when -- going back to the interruptions again, was it just the one time that 20 21 there was an interruption during your conversation? 22 SERGEANT SMITH: To the best of my 23 recollection, it was just the -- the one time in the 24 middle of our conversation.

COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: Okay. And you also said



during -- during your conversation you guys had a spirited conversation. Can you describe that conversation again and was it interrupted?

SERGEANT SMITH: The -- well, the spirited conversation, I would say was the back and forth between him and I as to the needs to carry out what he intimated that council wanted done with relationship to panhandling, transients, et cetera, that it was a larger project and problem than just the police department's and the council couldn't leave the police chief and the police department holding the bag on it, there needed to be public works involved. I mean, you have transcripts. So --

COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: Okay.

SERGEANT SMITH: -- rather than rehash it, that -- that was the comments that were made. And then we weren't interrupted because of the conversation, it was just an interruption from somebody walking, like I said, through the parking lot. I think he made eye contact with Councilman Soubirous. They appeared to know each other, exchanged pleasantries and business cards.

COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: Okay. And while you were at Starbucks that day and there -- because there's talk of texting and cell phone calls, is that your



1	personal cell phone or is it a city cell phone?
2	SERGEANT SMITH: Oh, that's mine.
3	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: And did anybody ever ask
4	you for your phone records?
5	SERGEANT SMITH: No one asked me for my phone
6	records. I was asked if I had kept text messages. And
7	my response then as it is now is no, I don't save text
8	messages. I don't see the need to do so.
9	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: And if you were asked
10	if you were asked during this investigation for your
11	phone records, were would you have provided them?
12	SERGEANT SMITH: Depends on what they wanted.
13	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: Okay. And after your
14	meeting, who was the very first person you contacted?
15	SERGEANT SMITH: I I contacted two people.
16	I don't recall the exact order at this point it was so
17	long ago, but I know one was my vice president, Aurelio
18	Melendrez, and the other was the assistant chief, Chief
19	Chris Vicino.
20	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: And do you remember
21	where you were when you made those those phone
22	calls? Were you still at the Starbucks?
23	SERGEANT SMITH: I was walking to my car from
24	the front of Starbucks.

COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: And the meeting you had



1	with Alicia Robinson, who initiated that?
2	SERGEANT SMITH: That was an impromptu
3	meeting, I think, as I described. I showed at the RPOA
4	office and Alicia was there, for the first meeting she
5	was there at the office talking to the office staff.
6	And then she asked me if I had a few minutes for her.
7	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: And she told you she had
8	a source on the seventh floor?
9	SERGEANT SMITH: She didn't mention the source
10	on the seventh floor until the second conversation that
11	her and I had. And I think that's pretty clear in the
12	transcripts, but she intimated that the source that
13	the seventh floor, there was there was a concern
14	about the city manager's job and Sergio Diaz's job.
15	That was in the first conversation that her and I had.
16	She didn't ask me if I heard that. She just wanted to
17	bounce those scenarios off of me.
18	COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: And do you know if that
19	conversation was recorded?
20	SERGEANT SMITH: I think the I know the
21	second one she asked if she could record record it.
22	I don't know if the first one was recorded. Only she
23	would be able to answer that.

COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: Okay. I have no further



questions for you. Thank you.

24

MAYOR BAILEY: Councilman Gardner followed by Councilman Soubirous.

COUNCILMEMBER GARDNER: Sergeant Smith, while -- while you're here, would you repeat for us to the best of your recollection just one more time the words that you recall Councilmember Soubirous using in terms of the view of the council or -- or whatever action the council may have taken or the view of the council, however you want to characterize it, about implementing a process to deal with vagrants and transients and how that might affect the city manager's position or the chief's position?

SERGEANT SMITH: Well, I've reviewed the written transcripts, and I stand by them. If you want somebody to read it verbatim into the record or ask me to read it verbatim, I'd be happy to do so. My -- my concern with regurgitating things now, what are we at, five months --

COUNCILMEMBER GARDNER: Yeah.

SERGEANT SMITH: -- past, a slight inconsistency is going to be an issue.

COUNCILMEMBER GARDNER: Right. And I'm not -not looking for that. What I'm -- what I'm trying to
get to is whether your perception was a firm perception
that Councilmember Soubirous said that if something



wasn't done that the city manager would be replaced. 1 2 SERGEANT SMITH: I don't -- I don't understand 3 what it is that you're -- you're asking specifically. 4 COUNCILMEMBER GARDNER: Well, I --SERGEANT SMITH: Okay. My perception was as I 5 said at that day. My perception was he was intimating 6 7 that the seven council folks wanted these things taken 8 care of. And if they couldn't be, then the city 9 manager could be replaced. And if Sergio Diaz couldn't get the police department operating the way they 10 11 should, there would be a potential for him to leave as well. 12 13 COUNCILMEMBER GARDNER: Okay. Where -- where I'm trying to go with all this, and I was going to ask 14 Councilmember Soubirous right after this, I -- I think 15 16 this may be a case where a set of words were used and 17 the speaker meant one thing and the hearer interpreted something slightly different. 18 19 SERGEANT SMITH: If that were to be a 20 possibility, then Councilman Soubirous would have to 21 say, that's what I said, and Brian took it out of 22 context. And to my knowledge that has not been said. 23 It has been, Brian is just grousing over spilt milk

COUNCILMEMBER GARDNER: Yeah.

because he backed Valerie Hill and not me.



24

SERGEANT SMITH: So if he's going to say that, then -- then there's a possibility that maybe I did interpret what he said differently, but to my knowledge he hasn't acknowledged saying that or anything even remotely close to that.

COUNCILMEMBER GARDNER: Okay. If -- if I may,

Mike, may I -- may I ask you a question, Councilmember

Soubirous?

COUNCILMEMBER SOUBIROUS: Yes, absolutely, any question. And I'd be glad to answer that response.

COUNCILMEMBER GARDNER: Okay. In your introductory remarks, you said something along the lines of you were trying to make it clear to Sergeant Smith, as president of the RPOA, that you felt the council was united in a desire to get a handle on the street people issues.

COUNCILMEMBER SOUBIROUS: Yeah, there's a reference to that in Mr. Gumport's quote of my email that I said all seven councilmembers were behind this issue of resolving the panhandler problem. And that's because I heard it from the mouth of our city manager. He said, all of you are really behind this wanting to get it resolved, and I've got to take action. And that's where the idea of the, I assume, because I wasn't party to the conversation, about the -- the

security guards in parks.

COUNCILMEMBER GARDNER: Did -- do you recall, did you say something along those lines to Sergeant Smith in the meeting in Starbucks?

COUNCILMEMBER SOUBIROUS: Oh, I believe I had and that all the councilmembers were united, devout, wanting to resolve the panhandler problem. That's, like, I think pretty much common knowledge to everybody on this dais and most people in the city of Riverside.

MAYOR BAILEY: Okay. As -- as you remember, did you go beyond that in saying that if it doesn't happen, we might get a new city manager or a new police chief or anything like that?

absolutely that did not happen. And actually I thought it was about a 20-minute meeting, and I thought we had a great meeting. And we talked about how is Linda, how is everything. My wife has known the folks at RPOA for quite a long time with bringing volunteers there. And I thought it was quite pleasant. I was really surprised to read the transcript.

And like I said, I thought it was about a 20-minute meeting and I thought it went quite well and the concerns from the RPOA president was basically having backup. They were afraid or hesitant to take on

some of the homeless issue and panhandling, my focus has really been the aggressive panhandling, unless they had the city manager onboard, the Department of Mental Health, and others. And my text messages -- text messages chronicle that. So I thought we had a good meeting. I was actually quite happy about it. We hadn't spoken in a long time.

And I've got to tell you, you know as a candidate when I've got different folks that didn't necessarily support me, only one did up here for election, you know that very night that it looked like I was going to be over the top on the numbers, I had phone calls from everybody. It may have been the next day for, between the city manager and city attorney and city clerk, but they all called me and offered their congratulations and how much they wanted to work with me.

And I said, absolutely, great. Looking forward to working with each of you. And you know, as somebody that sits in a political office, you immediately embrace those that didn't support you, because those that didn't vote for me in Ward 3 and even those that didn't vote, most of them didn't, only about 18 percent voted, I serve all of you, resident, nonresident. I don't ever like to use the word



citizen, it always bothers me because I serve a lot of noncitizens, too.

So bottom line here is I thought we had a great meeting. We hadn't talked in a long time and the last thing I'm going to do is start slapping -- I mean, what did he call it, big leaguing. I'm not going to big league, I don't even know what that means, but I'm certainly not going to go slapping around an RPOA president when it's my first opportunity to make peace and -- and make happy and where can we grow and go from here. So I found that to be kind of unusual.

Most people in my shoes wouldn't do such a thing, and I certainly did not, and I will stand by that, I'll swear by that, and I will even take a lie detector test.

SERGEANT SMITH: I will, too.

COUNCILMEMBER GARDNER: I don't know if this -- I -- I don't know if this resolves anything or not, but I -- I have a suspicion that Councilmember Soubirous said something intending to imply that he thought there was strong support amongst the council to deal with an issue and possibly Sergeant Smith heard the words a little differently or interpreted them -- them a little differently than Councilmember Soubirous may have meant them.

Things like that have happened to me, 1 2 probably to all of us. So I'll just -- I'll just leave 3 it at that. Thank you both. MAYOR BAILEY: Councilman Perry. 4 5 COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: One last question. Since the time of this investigation, have the two of 6 7 you had phone calls, tried to get ahold of one and 8 other, emails, text messages? 9 SERGEANT SMITH: No, sir. 10 COUNCILMEMBER PERRY: All right, thank you. MAYOR BAILEY: Any other questions, comments 11 12 from the council? Councilman Gardner. 13 COUNCILMEMBER GARDNER: Just one -- one last question. If -- if I could, could we repeat the motion 14 15 that is before us? CITY CLERK NICOL: The motion is to close 16 17 discussion without a vote. 18 COUNCILMEMBER GARDNER: Okay. And -- and if I -- I could, I'd like to just make sort of a quick 19 20 closing remark. Yeah, I -- I think we can learn three 21 things from today and everything that led up to today. 22 The -- the first is that this process is irretrievably 23 broken, and it does more harm than good; second is that 24 the process and the way that we all have implemented it

is tearing us apart as a council and as a city; and the



25

third is that we, as elected officials, have to be really careful in what we say and in choosing the words we use.

So words take on a weight beyond what they really deserve, simply because of the position that we hold. And it gives us weight that as regular people we don't -- we don't carry. Our challenge is to fix the process and to find a way to move forward together for the good of our city. And I request that each of us, me too, is that we will put aside our differences and work hard to make that happen.

MAYOR BAILEY: Well said, Mike.

In summary, I think you all have heard that we had a duty to investigate, and that's what brought us here today. The council was unanimous in -- in bringing this hearing to the public. And I think that that was out of a leadership position. In uncertain times, leaders step up. I think instead of having the investigation go to the Press Enterprise who asked us for the public records request and allow the investigation to go into the blogosphere and the court of public opinion, the council decided to bring this to the public in this type of format so that individuals that were listed and named in this investigation had an opportunity for their equal treatment and voices to be

heard.

And so that the city council could then also ask questions and have this conversation, so to speak, with the public. And so ultimately I -- I believe that that's what the council decision was about, it was about transparency in government and to -- to air out some of these issues. And so at the very least, we have communicated. We have established that conversation.

I think there are plenty more conversations that we need to have going forward. I think that the strategic planning process that is ongoing, right, that we've all started individually, we can -- we can use to come to the table and create some consensus. And so I would hope that you all would participate in that strategic planning process.

As was mentioned earlier by the public, that's the expectation of them for us to come to the table and -- and go through that process together. You know, I -- I think that -- that definitely from the employees' perspective, that they, this was a significant and sensitive issue and they brought that to the attention of their superior officers and they brought that to the attention of the mayor and mayor pro tem and -- and we tried our best to assist those

employees to -- to again bring some type of light to the darkness that was out there, to the uncertainty that was out there.

And so I do believe it's a commitment by the council to move on from here and continue to be transparent and -- and accountable here in Riverside.

So thank you, Mr. Smith, for answering the questions, for stepping up to the podium. For all of you coming today, being a part of this process. And it looks like we are not going to -- to take a -- are we going to take a vote to not take a vote? That's the motion?

MALE SPEAKER: We vote not to vote.

MAYOR BAILEY: Vote not to vote?

Councilman Melendrez, do you have something

16 to add?

COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Thank you, mayor.

I -- I do have one more comment. You know, we have another one of these coming up, and I think we need to decide before that date as to whether we're going to hear it or not. I -- I think -- I -- I believe that's something we need to discuss more thoroughly. I think we're going to hear a rerun of what we have here because the charges are very similar.

I know this is a little bit off topic, but I



1 felt it was important to mention it. And --MAYOR BAILEY: Okay. Work with the city 2 3 attorney towards --4 COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: And if we could 5 calendar it once more --6 MALE SPEAKER: In open session. 7 COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: -- to discuss it. 8 MAYOR BAILEY: Work with the city attorney on 9 that, on that process? 10 COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Well, I would like -- I would like to hear from Councilmember Davis. 11 Well --12 13 MAYOR BAILEY: It's not on the agenda, so we 14 can't make any decision or --15 COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Understood. 16 MAYOR BAILEY: -- talk about an issue that 17 is --18 COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Correct. And --19 MAYOR BAILEY: -- not on the agenda. 20 COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: -- I know that this was off topic, you know, because it's a separate case, 21 but I think we need to at least discuss it prior to --22 23 to us going through this again. 24 MAYOR BAILEY: City attorney, is that legal? 25 MS. TALLEY: It's my -- maybe I'm



1	misunderstanding, I thought what I'm understanding
2	Councilmember Melendrez Melendrez's request is that
3	at some time the council needs to address whether or
4	not you're going to go forward on the next the other
5	matter, but that discussion cannot take place this
6	evening, but it you're requesting that it take place
7	at sometime; is that correct?
8	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: At at least just
9	bringing it up so that we can
10	MS. TALLEY: Right.
11	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: maybe calendar it
12	at a maybe at the end of the meeting I can make that
13	request, not this meeting, but this
14	MS. TALLEY: To
15	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: evening's
16	session.
17	MS. TALLEY: To place it on a future agenda?
18	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Yes.
19	MS. TALLEY: Okay. That that's how I
20	understood it, but
21	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Yes.
22	MS. TALLEY: you're correct. You're both
23	correct.
24	COUNCILMEMBER MELENDREZ: Okay, great.
25	MS. TALLEY: It can't be discussed tonight,



1	and you can request it in a future agenda.
2	MAYOR BAILEY: Good, is that clear?
3	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Madam city attorney, can
4	I make a comment on that as far as what I have done so
5	the people of Riverside know?
6	MS. TALLEY: Well
7	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: It has nothing to do
8	with
9	MS. TALLEY: Right.
10	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: discussing going
11	MS. TALLEY: The
12	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: forward.
13	MS. TALLEY: The matter is not on the agenda,
14	so it really would be inappropriate to engage in any
15	kind of
16	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Would it then be
17	MS. TALLEY: discussion about it.
18	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: legal for me to go on
19	the other side of the dais and take three minutes then
20	and comment on what I have done?
21	MS. TALLEY: During public comment, I think
22	there's no nothing to
23	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Very well.
24	MS. TALLEY: prohibit you from doing that.
25	COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Very well. Thank you.



MAYOR BAILEY: All right. So we have the --the vote to -- to not vote on this matter, that's the motion in front of us is to take a vote to not vote on any of the alternatives listed, which includes no action. There is a 6-1 approval of a vote not to vote. FEMALE SPEAKER: Love it. MAYOR BAILEY: We'll take a five-minute recess and come back for public hearings. (Conclusion of the Council Meeting)

