

The following transcript is provided for your convenience, but does not represent the official record of this meeting. The transcript is provided by the firm that provides closed captioning services to the City. Because this service is created in real-time as the meeting progresses, it may contain errors and gaps, but is nevertheless very helpful in determining the gist of what occurred during this meeting.

>> Mayor Reed: We are the Rules and Open Government Committee meeting for March 15th, 2012. First question is, is there any change to the agenda order? No, then we'll go through in order starting with the March 20th. Council agenda. Anything on page 1? Noting again that we're back to 9:30 start time for a while anyway. Anything on page 2 or 3? Page 4 or 5? Nothing on page 6, 7 and 8 are land use items, the evening hearing. Anything to discuss on those? Page 9 is housing authority City of San José housing authority, fiscal 2012 -- 2013 annual plan. I have a request to have that heard no earlier than 2:30.

>> Ed Shikada: Mr. Mayor, in terms of some of the logistics for the afternoon, we do anticipate the housing authority item to receive some testimony and also item 6.1 will have an extended, this is the minimum standards for development on the West side of the airport have an extended presentation by staff so that could take some time as well. So as the committee's considering the time-certain and amount of time and sequence to hear those items, we'll let you know.

>> Not before 2:30.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: I think we'll get there.

>> Mayor Reed: I think that will be okay.

>> Ed Shikada: So one option might be to push that back a little further. If all the items are taken in order, the airport item would be heard the last of the regular agenda and we may not be before 3:00 or 3:30 by the time that comes up.

>> Mayor Reed: My guess is, the airport item's going to take 45 minutes. We had a presentation at the ad hoc committee on airport competitiveness and presentation was 20 minutes, plus there's undoubtedly going to be some testimony. So not before 2:30 I think is certainly easy to make. Better about 3:00, 3:30.

>> Dennis Hawkins: The challenge if you push it out too far.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Not before 2:30.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. I have a couple of requests, commendation to Jessica Luna. How many ceremonials do we have in the afternoon?

>> Four in the afternoon and three in the evening.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, I think that's the max so if anybody shows up with anything else --

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Is that the official max?

>> Mayor Reed: Not the official max, it's just practically the max. Unless you want to move that to not before 3:00 and just have a whole bunch of ceremonials to fill in. Any other requests? I have a request to add an item, 2012 COPS hiring program grant application and we need a sunshine waiver on that I think.

>> Dennis Hawkins: Yes.

>> Mayor Reed: That's the authorization to apply.

>> Councilmember Constant: Yes.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Accept the general and the additions and the sunshine waiver request on the COPS grant.

>> Councilmember Constant: Second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to approve with the amendments and the sunshine waiver. No cards to speak on that. All in favor? Opposed? None opposed, that's approved. March 27th. Council meeting. Anything on page 1? Page 2 or 3? Page 4 or 5.

>> Councilmember Constant: Only 36, wow!

>> Mayor Reed: Page 6 orsen. Page 8 or 9. I have some requests for additions. A commendation for some volunteers.

>> Councilmember Constant: Mr. Mayor, that's actually me not you on that one.

>> Mayor Reed: That's 1 X the first one?

>> Councilmember Constant: Yes.

>> Mayor Reed: I'm glad it's you not me. I have no idea. Some volunteers, two outstanding volunteers.

>> Councilmember Constant: I'm keeping it confidential. I'll let you know that day.

>> Mayor Reed: All right, and then a commendation for National Hispanic anniversary, for 30th anniversary, any other changes?

>> Councilmember Constant: Motion to approve as amended.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: That would be a second.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion to approve as amended, all in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Upcoming study session agendas I believe our next study session is the retirement issues on March

29th. Okay, we've already talked about that I think for that. Public record. Anything from the public record to be considered? Some requests to speak on the public record? Mr. Wall.

>> Good afternoon, sirs. Item E, I would like to commend San José police officer Denny Pfeiffer, 3961, deters vandalism of city hall, just to thank you. A guy was -- he disrupted a meeting, not the police officer, but the person he deterred from vandalism of city hall. He really did a good job, that was deranged. I would like to thank you, Mr. Mayor and all the councilmembers and the office of the City Attorney and especially office of City Manager for item F. I think the review will help out in a lot of areas, pertaining to contracts in general. And item im, is a thank you for San José fire engine company 1C. They were the ones that saved the life of a marine corps veteran in my neighborhood who received a stab wound to lower abdomen on the date referenced incorporated in that letter. Thank you again.

>> Mayor Reed: Anything else on public record?

>> Councilmember Constant: Motion to note and file.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion to note and file the public record. Second?

>> Councilmember Oliverio: We did.

>> Mayor Reed: On the motion, all in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Nothing under boards commissions or committees. Next item is G-2, request from Councilmember Oliverio, there's a memorandum requesting the administration to meet and confer with the unions, to allow union negotiations to be held in a public meeting. Do you want to speak to your memo, councilmember:

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Thank you, Mayor Reed, and Councilmember Constant. During my tenure here, and much of it's overlapping yours, all I've seen is a process that due to its nature of having closed-door meetings, the externality and effect of that has caused a lot of stress to the organization, both internally and

externally. Although I believe we have a good labor relations team, and we have done a lot better than other cities as far as posting information on the employee relations Website, offers, et cetera, it still lacks the ability to see what's happening. You couldn't see more of how would you say, for lack of better words, tragic political theater than we've gone through in the past few years, and I truly believe it's because we're not able to see the process that's occurring. So whether you're a retiree that doesn't know what's happening, a city employee who's not maybe getting -- having the information disseminated, our own city residents, and in fact the council, I think there's a perception from the residents, I believe that councilmembers are actively involved in this process, and clearly we give guidance to staff, but we're really not in that process. There is a cost to this. We certainly have city staff that works at this time and time and again, going through the process of negotiations. And I really, truly believe that if, you know, these meetings where the public could attend, that we would get to yes a lot faster. Because it would not have the posturing or the brinkmanship or some of the tactics that are needed in the strategic negotiation. I believe instead that we would get to yes faster because it's just the reality of what it would be, if -- knowing that people are observing the situation. A year ago, our attorneys union, ALP, decided to have public negotiations, and I attended all except one. And I really enjoyed that process. I was able to see both sides speak, I was both able to see unfiltered what was said, and I very much came to the perspective that I agreed with the points that were brought up in that conversation. I also respected the process. I didn't write on that particular meeting -- meetings observations that I had. And I really thought that it was a good model, and it is a precedent model. And let me explain what my idea is not. It is not making the mediation process public, that is by its nature confidential. It is not a process where the public would speak. It's simply the ability to observe the interactions of our city negotiations team and the union representatives. You know, I think, you know, if being allowed the opportunity to have a discussion with the units, to see if i.e. one or all may look to engage in that perspective would be fine. I think it's an important-enough issue that, you know, if not, then I would certainly consider, you know, having the residents have a say in it. But I really believe it is something that would be fair to all that are involved in this process. I think, I mean, mayor and Councilmember Constant, you've heard me discuss this multiple times in the council meeting, as we just went through the last process, you know, could it be any -- you know, I mean, how could it be any, for lack of better words, worse? I mean, if you come to this organization from the -- to the City of San José, I myself coming from private sector, and you look at this process that we have and that it causes all this chaos, then why continue? Why not offer a way that would be, you know, much more

conducive to a conversation that could get to yes much faster. So I'll stop it there. I believe, mayor, you've heard me speak on this topic prior.

>> Mayor Reed: I have.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: But I felt it necessary, after attending the last meeting where we saw a roomful of people that may or may not have had the correct information. And we see the externality of this effect, and the idea is, my goal is to resolve labor conflicts.

>> Mayor Reed: Thank you. I appreciate your explanation. We have discussed this before a time or two. I know you strongly believe in the correctness of your position, and I just as strongly believe that your position is wrong. That we could make things worse, and this would be one way to do that. Because in all the negotiations I've been through now, I've got more than ten years, there comes a time when reasonable people need to sit and have a discussion in private if you're going to come to a resolution and having public negotiations means there will be more political fear, more political stunts, more things that go on rather than less. Not there there's not a role for that stuff to go on, and people certainly have their rights to do that as part of their negotiating and bargaining tactics. But eventually you have to reach a point where you can have a private conversation, to see if there's common ground, to see if there is a resolution, that people can agree to. And I think you have to have those confidentially. San José has the most open, the most public process of any city in the state. We post everything online, anybody that wants to see an offer that was made, rejected, communications, it's all available. So the public has a huge opportunity to see what's going on, before it happens. Now, when I first came into office, it used to be the negotiations were all in private. The council would consider it in closed session. In the morning. And the results would be announced at about 11:00, and the council would vote at 2:00. So the public had no chance to find out what was going on before it happened. So we've moved from that to a very open process. But I don't think having open negotiations is the answer to the problems. The difficulties we've had over the last couple of years, driven primarily by concession bargaining. Because when you're having a discussion of shall we give a 3% increase in pay or a 3.5% increase in pay that's just different than shall we take a 10% pay cut which is what we've been through. So it's been very difficult. I don't think having had open negotiations would have been any

better and I do think it would have made things a good deal worse. Going back to my practice before I went on council, public negotiations just aren't going to get you anywhere. It is going to be position bargaining. Each side will present their position, then you're kind of stuck. Your position, my position, you are never going to find that common ground until somebody has an opportunity. And if we have public negotiations then that opportunity is going to -- we're not going to have the opportunity, or it's going to happen in someplace else, instead of in the public eye. Because it doesn't work, I don't think, in the public eye. So I can't support this. Of course, any union that wants to pose ground rules that would include public negotiations, the council could consider that. We're not prohibited from it. We would have to evaluate it at the time. As we have in the past. The ALP negotiations that you mentioned was the -- I think the one and only that we've had that was all sessions were public. But we didn't get a deal with the public sessions. We didn't get a deal with ALP until afterwards when we had a reasonable person private conversation in order to come up with a solution to that particular discussion. So I can't support this. I think it could make things a lot worse than they already are. Councilmember Constant.

>> Councilmember Constant: So I have some concerns about this, as well. I know that Alex who's here with us today, has brought several times to us in closed session deals that were worked out, almost in the middle of the night, you know, late-night discussions, things that happened via phone calls. And that last-minute scrambling to be able to work out a deal. So I think what we would have is an incentive for more things to happen outside the official negotiations. And the last couple of years, in particular, we've seen a lot of that posturing and maneuvering outside of the official negotiations. And I don't want to do anything that would contribute to that. I have always supported and unfortunately I haven't had too much additional support in this endeavor but in the past I've brought up I think everything should be recorded. And then once the need for confidentiality expires, those tapes could be made available, so people can see the inner workings of things. We only do that for real estate negotiations. I wish we quite frankly did that for all of our closed session discussions and all of our negotiations. So that probably would be the only thing coy support because I just don't want to do anything that gives another crutch to bring something outside of the official negotiation session. And I think we've all seen negotiation by press conference and press release and that's really no way to negotiate and I think we'd just be contributing to that.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: May I ask?

>> Mayor Reed: Certainly.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: I appreciate the comments, and Mayor, I know that where we just see the issue completely differently, which has happened before on a variety of topics between elected officials or members of the public. It's just how life is. But you know on another factor when you think of that, you know, we now because of measure V that passed in November 2010, now if and when we end up going to arbitration, those are going to be public meetings, and you know, should we get there, I'll be interested in attending, as I'm sure as well as others. But I think that's a yearning for something that we don't do today. And Councilmember Constant, that was one of the other items I forgot to mention, and concur that you know, is there the potential then to have some type of recording of labor negotiations? So at least then, you know, we start moving in a direction of, you know, someone else can hear what you're saying. And it might not be, from what I read from the committee, that the committee doesn't want to allow the public to see it live for a variety of reasons. Where we agree or disagree. But what about the opportunity, then, to be able to have an archive, you know, these things don't cost a lot of money now with just a recorder and a small piece of memory that you know then we could see what was said. I think there would be value there, to understand how did we get to that deal? I mean there's been a lot of things that we've looked in the past where it's whatever the topic is that we require a contract, and wouldn't it be interesting for people to know how did we arrive at that. I'll throw that out as a conversation piece if that carries the committee's interest.

>> Mayor Reed: Let me say that's equally a bad item, because in the next political campaign there will be clips of you speaking in closed session, posted and used in a political campaign.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: But I would be comfortable with that.

>> Mayor Reed: You probably would be. I would not be. And I would probably eliminate any real communication in closed session, other than very general discussion. So I just think that's a bad idea. We discussed that when we did some of the open government reforms and Reed reforms three years ago. We talked about that

extensively and that's how we came back to well for real estate negotiations we'll record it but not for labor negotiations. Because that would reveal all kinds of things that I'm sure the City Hall unions would like to know about the next round and the next round and it would chill, has a chilling effect on the staff's ability to relate to us what's happened in negotiations and their recommendations. So that's why the council at the time decided that we wouldn't go that far with the recording but we would do it for real estate discussions. So that's why --

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Understand.

>> Mayor Reed: -- we do record those. On the arbitration I do think that should be public. That's one of the reasons I put it into measure V. But that's a trial. And that is position. Everybody's got their position. It's not negotiations. Although sometimes, in those arbitrations, the arbitrators do take people aside and try to get them to negotiate a solution, rather than have the arbitrator make a decision. But the trial and the hearing itself is just like going down to superior court, you ought to be able to watch that. I think that's a different category for me.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Then mayor what about the category of simply recording a bargaining unit's negotiation? Not the council but the bargaining unit's discussion for archive purposes later?

>> Mayor Reed: I don't know, I haven't thought about that one.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: And if we want to table that one and bring that one back, think about it a week --

>> Mayor Reed: Well, we have 11 bargaining units and they don't necessarily always agree on topics the same way or have the same view. So if you're recording one and releasing that, that has the potential for having an impact on other negotiations that are going on. So I haven't had a chance to think about the implications of that. And I would certainly want to hear from our professional staff after you --

>> Councilmember Oliverio: We record property negotiations, when would those ever be revealed and under what circumstance would they be revealed? For a graduate student doing research 20 years if now?

>> City Attorney Doyle: Yeah, I think once a deal is consummated and if there's some question as to whether or not there are ground rules, and I think it really gets to the legal question of whether it was proper closed session discussion and a proper topic for closed session, and we didn't go beyond the scope of the permitted -- what's permitted by law.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: And it's kept in a secured environment?

>> City Attorney Doyle: It's kept in a secure environment.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Someone's door?

>> Mayor Reed: In a lock box. They went into real estate negotiations and discussing terms of a deal, and they went trying to avoid.

>> City Attorney Doyle: And the sunshine task force, that was their concern, to make sure that the scope was what was allowed by law only.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Well, perhaps then I could make a motion to refer to staff to see what the pros and cons might be of recording a particular bargaining unit's negotiation if that's a mutual agreement.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, I think we will let staff think about that.

>> Councilmember Constant: Second.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Unless staff wants to comment right now.

>> Mayor Reed: Although Alex Gurza is here. Alex has probably already thought about it, at least for a couple of minutes.

>> Alex Gurza: Good afternoon, Alex Gurza, Deputy City Manager. I heard the committee discuss, there was two different things being discussed, the recording of closed session discussions on labor and real estate, versus the potential recording of actual negotiations. So I don't think actual real estate negotiations themselves are recorded.

>> City Attorney Doyle: No. They are documented frequently but they are not recorded, just like your negotiations are documented but not recorded.

>> Alex Gurza: That's right. So then I think my understanding from Councilmember Oliverio is suggesting potentially recording negotiations themselves, audio recording the actual negotiations. I think the same issues that the mayor mentioned would still apply, it's not precluded from within ground rules discussions, between a bargaining unit, whether or not they would -- there's the discussion about should they be open, should they not be open, should they be recorded, should they not be recorded. But I think the same issues that could be handled in the same way, and that issue has come up. I have been asked once to record a particular meeting. And so I think the same sorts of issues that you raised about public apply whether they should be recorded or not.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Alex, would there be an amount of time where it would be okay for it then to be revealed? I mean, even the presidential memoirs get revealed over time, you know, or we release things at the federal government level that once top secret and classified.

>> Alex Gurza: No, I completely understand, and you know, I've been doing labor negotiations here for quite a while and the mayor made a good point about there's a very significant difference, when we were in an environment where we were granting benefits and pay raises versus the could be concessions. It has been extraordinarily painful for everyone. And so that's part of the reason the discussion is being here. Because at the time previously, the issue really didn't come up. Part of the concern was, if you're going to make everything

available to the public I think there is a lot of lack of understanding of how the negotiations actually work. In one of the negotiations that I did and successfully negotiated with the bargaining unit the 10% reduction, it is a good example of how it actually worked. And when you start saying well everything actually has to be recorded. How would that actually work? The agreement was actually reached not in mediation but also by some subsets of the bargaining team setting down and talking. Well the question would be, well wait a minute should that be recorded that I'm talking, it continued late into the night, as the Mayor indicated, but not in person, over the phone, working out the last details of an agreement. So what would happen is there would be a concern if you then didn't record all those conversations are you somehow hiding something? So I think there are a lot of issues that would have to be thought through in terms of how agreements are actually reached. And what gets recorded, what doesn't get recorded. But if a bargaining unit was interested in that, as the mayor said, that could all be discussed in ground rules if the council authorized us to do so.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: So based on that city staff is the city comfortable this being looked at a little bit more and Alex coming back to Rules Committee and saying, officially these are the pros and cons, or would I be comfortable with it, you paraphrased it but said there's more to think about.

>> Alex Gurza: I think it really becomes from the council's perspective a policy direction from the council to us in a particular negotiation, do you want us to explore in a particular bargaining unit recording or public or whatever the case may be. We're not precluded from entering into and actually we're obligated to meet and cover per over ground rules. Even if the city didn't want to do that but a bargaining unit brought forward in a ground rule discussion we would like to conduct these negotiations in public or whatever, or record them, saying there will be those opportunities, we can't preclude that issue from coming up and the city could also raise it. So it's still an issue that could be decided by this council or a future council.

>> City Attorney Doyle: And there's also a legal issue, it's a difference between getting consent to tape-record on both sides as opposed to the city requiring it as a condition to engaging in negotiations, and that would be arguably an unfair labor practice if you set it in stone that the city will only bargain if it can record. So I understand

the council would have a policy, we could look at that, but those are issues that need to be looked at in order to come back and give a complete assessment.

>> Councilmember Constant: I'm willing to look at it, have the full assessment and have the discussion but I just want to be clear. I don't want to do anything that would compromise our ability to protect the taxpayers, and to create strategies and negotiations that are in the best interests of the residents of the City of San José. So I'm willing to discuss it and look at how we might do it but I do have concerns. And I think it's important to note that when the Brown Act was created, there was a specific reason they exempted labor negotiations. And I think that that was clearly so that the taxpayers' interests could be represented properly. So I'm willing to discuss it and see how we might be able to do it during the ground rules process. And see where we go from there.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Okay.

>> Mayor Reed: So if we refer this to staff, come back in a couple of weeks, there are a couple of legal issues that certainly requiring it would be problematic I think as the City Attorney has pointed out.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: You know along those lines could the city attorney's office do just a little bit of look-at around the country to see if there's any public negotiations or and/or recordings, or something like that?

>> City Attorney Doyle: Including Missouri?

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Including Missouri.

>> City Attorney Doyle: We will look at that.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: I've heard of some things in some states, but I'm sure you have better look at LexisNexis or something like that. But yeah, if it came back in early April, that would be fine.

>> Mayor Reed: We have a request to speak on this item, David Wall.

>> I would like to thank Councilmember Oliverio for looking at another way to streamline government. This is a decades old process, Mr. Mayor. And I can understand your position as a trained and articulate lawyer, why you would want to do things in private. With our good friend from office of employee relations, this is hiding something vs. hiding everything. Well, as a retiree I would like to know what's going on. Okay? As a former employee, I think one of the things you don't want from my perspective is employees knowing what's going on in these negotiations, because all of a sudden, they might just decide to decertify their unions and form into one big powerful union with that information. Case in point: It was the two councilmembers about year 2009 that opted to try to take away the family health care benefits for unit 99. The result was, that did not happen. But you then formed, then was formed the most powerful, potentially the Moss powerful union in the city, the association of legal professionals. So I understand both positions here. But the unions and the city employees are just wanting the same information that you're getting on the -- protected by decades-old laws or political skulduggery. I say thanks to Councilmember Oliverio for prying open this process and only goodwill come from it, I believe, just like everything else that's open and transparent. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: That concludes the public testimony. I just would like to note that anybody who wants to know what's going on. Go to the Website, every offer, every response, every request for information, every request for anything, every communication is posted on the Website. So it's very easy for anybody to find out what's going on because that's the way we do it. I know it's a lot of extra work for our staff to do that, but there's a huge amount of public information, and you don't have to take anybody's press release or media version of anything, you can look it up for yourself and make your own decisions. And that's one of the beauties of the web, it's easy for people to do. So we have a request to refer this idea of recording the union negotiations to staff, and bring it back in a couple of weeks or so to talk about after staff has had a chance to think about it.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: That's correct.

>> Mayor Reed: Pete agrees, so that's the referral. Next item would be a couple of Vietnamese flag ceremony and a Cesar Chavez flag ceremony as city sponsored event.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Motion.

>> Mayor Reed: Is there a second? There is a second. On the motion, all in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved. Transportation and environment committee work plan, amendment for that committee to add a review of a San José -- got, I don't even know what this is. National disaster to the work plan.

>> Councilmember Constant: I will make the motion, I'm not on the committee, so give them as much work as you want.

>> Mayor Reed: Motion is to modify the committee's work plan on -- add national disasters, not just anything, but taming national disasters. That should be fun. On the motion.

>> Councilmember Constant: If it's a natural disaster, I'm not sure we have the strength to tame it but apparently --

>> Mayor Reed: Apparently there is hope, we'll see. All in favor. Opposed, I'm sorry there's a card for this, Mr. Wall wants us to help us tame natural disasters.

>> Really not natural disasters I'd like to tame, it's more like the political ones that sit before me. But I'm here to give thanks to Christopher Godley and for what he does for the fire department and for what he does for the city. I would also request Mr. Mayor that you utilize your bully pulpit that you've got accustomed to utilize quite frequently that you inform the public about keeping enough water at the house for a couple of weeks, enough foot, in certain neighborhoods, enough ammunition. Mr. Mayor, these disasters, we've been lucky here in San José for a long time. And it's nothing to be making fun of. These folks that Mr. Godley looks after, he's doing a good job. And the public needs to be reassured that he's doing a good job and the fact that they have to get off their

butts to protect themselves in a natural disaster. The political ones we can care of with a vote. These natural ones can be catastrophic. So please think about quarterly, having him to come back here to rules or whatever, and talk to the Mercury News editorial board, whatever, and get people informed to have enough emergency supplies and whatnot on hand.

>> Mayor Reed: There will be food water and medicine enough for three days.

>> Councilmember Constant: Chris does a great job, he comes to the Public Safety committee and tells us all about it. Be assured we will let political disasters to be unfettered and we will do our best to continue those.

>> Mayor Reed: All in favor, opposed, none opposed, that's approved, open forum I think is the last item, Mr. Wall.

>> Before you is another document considering the water pollution control plant with reference to the capital improvement budget. Document speaks for itself and it's a public record request information that's pending. This Mr. Mayor is something that's gone through TPAC, not this request per se but there's a lot of problems that the treatment plant advisory committee which I contend is nothing more than a social club. And with the exception of the honorable assistant City Manager who does not accept the \$100 stipend the rest of the members that I know clip the taxpayers for voting on things they relatively don't even understand or know about. And this business about raising rates, is justified for a plant rehabilitation. But if the money is just parked in an account, or projects are not being done properly, at some point in time one has to ask, why did you raise the rates? Or do we get a refund? And I think that -- I think your administration is starting to ask questions and I'm pleased with that. I'm pleased with the City Manager's office starting to look into this. But if you find what I believe to be true, consequences should be severe. They should be swift. And they should be sweeping. Because you have to rely on these people. And if you can't rely on them, and a citizen has to come up and show you this stuff, there's a problem there. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: That concludes the open forum, concludes our meeting, we're adjourned.