

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HAWTHORNE,
CALIFORNIA HELD OCTOBER 17, 2012.**

Mayor Juarez called the City Council meeting to order jointly and concurrently at 7:00 pm in the City Council Chambers of the City Hall, 4455 West 126th Street, Hawthorne, California.

ROLL CALL-Present: Councilmembers Reyes English, Michelin, Valentine, Vargas, Mayor Juarez.
Absent: None.

1.

Under oral communications, no one expressed a desire to be heard.

Mayor Juarez ordered oral communications closed.

Councilmember Valentine requested that her statement be **for the record**.

I cannot vote to approve the contract for the new city manager. From the beginning the process has been fraught with secrecy and lack of transparency. The selection of the city manager was done last Friday with the barest 24 hours notice in order to be legal. Most residents had no idea what was going on and they still don't. Tonight's meeting to approve the contract is again being done in a special meeting with only the barest 24 hours notice. Why the secrecy? There is almost no one in the audience because no one knows about this. Why isn't the public being advised of this contract? Why isn't this being done at the regular meeting which is in six days? The Council majority has moved forward with screening and with the hiring process inserting itself in every step of the process. If the Council majority cared about public perception, it would of tried to distance itself to some extent to appear objective. However, this was not the case. There is no pretense of objectivity by this Council majority. It is obvious that this process had been flawed and political. Some may ask if I do not agree with the process, why am I a participant? I am a witness to this process. The public did not elect me to sit out one of the most important hiring decisions the city makes. If I can't choose the selection process or the candidate, I have at least attempted to influence the process. On Friday, the date the city manager was selected, I advised that it had recently been brought to my attention that one of the candidates had done work for developers, land owners or business owners in Hawthorne. That person was Mike Goodson. I wanted to table this selection until this question was answered. I wanted the applicants to answer the question under penalty of perjury. Have you ever worked for, done business with or received payment from any business owner, land owner or developer in Hawthorne or who is doing business in Hawthorne and disclose each and every instance in which this took place. I wanted that question to be asked of each applicant under penalty of perjury. I was and am concerned that the selectee might not be a neutral party when it comes to evaluating projects submitted by his friends and associates. However, the Council majority voted me down and was apparently not concerned that their choice for city manager might be biased toward giving some developer's projects priority over others. And because of my concern for the people of Hawthorne, I was called a puppet in the press by the Mayor whose open intolerance for his colleagues who do not agree with him should only increase public suspicion. The selection of the city manager is apparently no surprise to most of the people of Hawthorne. I have been told since this process began by different sources for months that Mike Goodson was going to be the new city manager. How did they guess that? I naively went through the process believing that the best candidates would shine through. That was naiveté on my part. The people were right. They knew. This was a sham from the beginning. And the beat goes on.

2.

Mayor Juarez moved, seconded by Councilmember Reyes English, that the Contract of Employment with new City Manager Michael L. Goodson be approved as presented.

Mayor Juarez shared the process of what Council went through **for the record** as follows.

We started with 70 applications and each of us went through each one of them and I could tell by when we went through this that each one was looking for a different item, you know, in the résumé and we set up three columns. The three columns were exceeds, meets and the other one, I don't know how else to explain it, but what the heck were you thinking when you applied for this? So as a result of that, we all agreed on 17 applications or 17 candidates. That then was turned over to the personnel director and the

personnel director went on the public domain and was able to generate a report for each one of the candidates. As a result of that, and after lots of discussion, we narrowed it down to 11. And then so our initial job then was to interview 11 people. So everyone had their calendars. We looked at dates that were all available and we started to set the interviews up. As time went on, those that were from out of state thought that the city was paying for their travel and their accommodations. It was never listed on the employment brochure so those people opted out. Also in the meantime, there was some individuals that took other jobs. So then we narrowed it down to, I believe, it was nine. If I have that number wrong let me know, but I think it was like the nine. So what we did is, no it was down to seven. It was down to seven. So we had seven people that were actually going to interview. The staff, I think it was the personnel director as well as all of us, were given a list of 60 something questions and we narrowed it down to 30. Right, 30? Twenty. Down to 20 questions. And then so each one of us selected four questions and those questions were posed to each one of the candidates. There could have been some follow-on depending on how they answered the initial question, but we went through that process. As we're going through that process, the candidate was rated from one to ten for each one of those 20 questions. So then what we did is, and by the way, during this whole time we had either the former city attorney or the current city attorney in the room with us. So he was, you know, making sure that number one, that we weren't taking information outside of that room, that we weren't taking our notes outside of that room and we left everything there. So after we interviewed each one of them, we came back and we pretty much racked and stacked each one of the candidates, looking at their grading, seeing now that we have talked to everybody, seeing if there was any type of an adjustment that we had to make. So we verified their numbers and we gave them to the city attorney and then he racked and stacked and everyone verified that this is what we had done and then based on that, this is when we had a ranking of one to seven. And so what we did is we deliberated and we picked the top three. So everyone, you know, based on everyone's ratings, we picked the top three. Well, in this case, Mr. Goodson was one of the top three. This was an aggregate score by all of us. So no one was say he's going to get special treatment. It was a score by each one of the Councilmembers and that's how, you know, each one was brought in as the top three candidates.

After further discussion.

ROLL CALL-AYES: Councilmembers Reyes English, Michelin, Mayor Juarez.

NOES: Councilmembers Valentine, Vargas.

3.

Mayor Juarez adjourned the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Monica Dicrisci
Deputy City Clerk