

## Rebuttal to Memo from Councilmember Largo Wales Dated 3/15/18

Largo Wales' letter to Bob Baggett dated 3/15/18 was ruled a public document and subject to public request. As you have requested and received this memo, allow me to provide a rebuttal or at least a different point of view. Largo is providing a red herring defense of her use of profane language at a council meeting.

As a police officer, when I would contact a traffic violator, often the driver would point out that others were speeding, making incomplete stops, or committing some other traffic infraction. Inferring that I should have stopped them and not him. It is a spurious argument. I would politely tell a violator he was free to use that as a defense in court.

Largo claims that communication is not balanced nor are members given equal opportunity. Who talks most at Study Sessions or Regular Council meetings? Seems to me the majority of talking is from Largo and Bill Pelozo. It is a bit like FOX News' tag line of fair and balanced. If something happens that is factual and you report it, you do not need to balance it with something that is irrational and inaccurate. Alternatively, as Sgt. Joe Friday of Dragnet said "All we know are the facts."

I cannot speak to phone conversations between Largo and Bob. I did not participate.

"Members of your council feel the council meetings are where, against a few, "Robert's [sic] Rules of Order," are not used as a tool to aid in communication but to limit discussion." That is true. Perhaps Largo Wales and Bill Pelozo feel their ability to dominate the conversation is being infringed upon. The example she uses to illustrate her assertion of bias was that I did not use a "Point of Order" to interrupt Bob Baggett at a past Study Session. At the Council meeting in question, I used Rule 7.1 from Auburn's City Council Rules of Procedure. It states. "Speaking to the Motion. No member of the council, ... shall speak more than twice on the same motion..." The operative word to note here is **MOTION**. Motions can only be made at City Council meetings and cannot be made at Study Sessions. Yes, I did not declare a point of order at the Study Session, as there was no motion made or even the possibility of a motion. This is just more obfuscation of fact. Study Sessions are less formal and more conversational.

Last night's Study Session was typical. Wales and Pelozo did the majority of talking by Council members. Not once did anyone try to mute or interrupt them by a point of order or any other method.

I have no idea what ... "previous attempt by Holman to shut down communication" ... she is referencing. However, a motion to limit debate can be properly overruled by a majority vote. Moreover, if done so, it is proper and good for the order of the debate. I would not object.

## Rebuttal to Memo from Councilmember Largo Wales Dated 3/15/18

The next to last paragraph is particularly deceitful. I have direct knowledge of the bit about ...“councilmembers walking out of meetings”... It was I. Baggett, Peloza and I were in an Ad Hoc meeting to decide on a proposal for seating at council meetings. Ad Hoc meetings are not public and therefore must consist of no more than three members. Four or more is a quorum and requires public notice and an open and recorded format. As we sat down for the meeting, Bill Peloza announced that he had met with Trout-Manuel and Wales and would represent their views. Our Ad Hoc now constituted a serial meeting of five and under Washington State law would have been illegal. I try very hard not to break the law. An old habit continues to serve me well. I explained my objections to my colleagues, advised them that I would not participate in any meeting that was counter to the laws of Washington State and walked out. I went directly to the City Attorney’s Office and confessed.

In the same paragraph, Wales accuses D/M Baggett of deliberately disregarding a request for a discussion item to be held over. We are a council of seven equals. Baggett polled the council and the majority wanted to finish the matter. Wales, Peloza and Trout-Manuel wanted it held over. That action to continue did not disregard anybody; it was merely the majority preference.

Finally Largo’s assertion that Baggett stated: ““two women” shouldn’t sit together.” is probably spurious or constructed out of context. I have to use probably because I have not been with Bob Baggett every minute of the day. However, I can say I was in the room when Baggett was trying to explain to Peloza that Largo and Yolanda should not sit together because of all the “faces”, exaggerated eye rolling, various facial expressions and whispered conversations they engage in. Baggett did not refer to gender. He was describing behavior that Largo sometimes engages in. The current problem occurred in a similar exchange.

Largo’s last paragraph states, “We need to review transcripts and minutes of...meetings”. OK, throw up more smoke and mirrors. The fact remains that in a Regular City Council meeting with an open microphone and a bunch of Cub Scouts in the front row, Largo Wales made an obscene comment toward a colleague. That is in violation of section 20.1 of the Auburn City Council Rules of Procedure.

My personal advice is that Largo simply apologize to the public and get back to the work of the city. The city council does not need to be preoccupied for another week over a petty, profane comment that went out over an open mike. Largo Wales is intelligent, educated and has much to offer the Council and the city. Let us not get wrapped around the axel. We need to get this distraction behind us.