

RESOLUTION NO. 6709

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GARDENA, CALIFORNIA, CENSURING COUNCILMEMBER WANDA LOVE FOR UNPROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR TOWARDS CITY STAFF

WHEREAS, in 2024, multiple City employees made allegations that Councilmember Wanda Love made false and misleading statements about the Department of Recreation and Human Services and its Director, discussed concerns about City Manager Clint Osorio with a subordinate employee, and disclosed and discussed with City employees her concerns regarding a previous investigation into complaints about her made by other City employees, including revealing the names of the employees who had previously complained about her; and

WHEREAS, the allegations were investigated by Attorney Jeffrey Love, an independent investigator who interviewed witnesses and reviewed relevant documents; and

Whereas, on May 27, 2025, investigator Jeffrey Love submitted his final report regarding the allegations levied against Councilmember Love. The Investigator concluded that a preponderance of the evidence supported the allegations that Councilmember Love made false, misleading, and damaging comments about the Department of Recreation and Human Services; discussed concerns about the City Manager with another employee; and expressed frustration about employee complaints filed against her including revealing the names of the employees who had previously complained about her. A redacted copy of Investigator Jeffrey B. Love's May 27, 2025, confidential investigation report is attached hereto as *Exhibit A*; and

WHEREAS, Councilmember Wanda Love's conduct towards multiple employees created unnecessary strain on the work environment and undermined the ability of employees to perform their duties effectively; and

WHEREAS, at the June 24, 2025, City Council meeting, the Council voted 3-1 in favor of setting a censure hearing for Councilmember Love at the August 12, 2025, regular Council meeting. The motion was made by Mayor Cerda, seconded by Council Member Henderson, and supported by Mayor Pro Tem Tanaka. Council Member Francis voted in opposition; and

WHEREAS, a censure is generally understood to be "an official reprimand or condemnation; an authoritative expression of disapproval or blame" (Black's Law Dictionary (10th ed. 2014)); and

WHEREAS, the United States Supreme Court has long recognized the practice of censuring legislative body members, which has been more commonly observed at

RESOLUTION NO. 6709

the state and local level, and as early as 1833 (*Houston Community College System v. Wilson* (2022) 595 U.S. 468, 475); and

WHEREAS, public officials have the authority to censure an individual member of a legislative body (*Braun v. City of Taft* (1984) 154 Cal.App.3d 332, 347-348); and

WHEREAS, censure is used to demonstrate that the City Council does not condone or endorse a council member's behavior or conduct and that the City Council is taking steps to prevent the conduct from continuing. It serves as a statement to the public that certain behavior is unacceptable; and

WHEREAS, a council member subject to censure has to be afforded some due process, which may consist of simple notice of the potential censure and an opportunity to be heard before the imposition of the censure. *Rodriguez v. Jurupa Unified Sch. Dist.* 2010 Cal. App. Unpub. LEXIS 6352, 38; and

WHEREAS, there was sufficient notice provided in light of the motion that was made and reported out of the June 24, 2025, closed session, wherein the Council approved a motion to set a censure hearing for Council Member Wanda Love at the August 12, 2025, council meeting, and notice of the resolution of censure was also listed on the agenda for the August 12, 2025, regular City Council meeting; and

WHEREAS, it is essential that City Council members demonstrate respect when they interact with City staff; and

WHEREAS, the City Council hereby reaffirms its commitment to protect City staff from unprofessional behavior from fellow council members; and

WHEREAS, the City Council determines that adoption of this Resolution of Censure is necessary to affirm that the conduct of Councilmember Love described in Investigator Jeffrey Love's May 27, 2025, report (*Exhibit A*) will not be tolerated and such conduct shall be prevented from being repeated.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GARDENA, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY FIND, DETERMINE, AND RESOLVE, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The City Council finds that the Recitals set forth above are true and correct, and are hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and are hereby adopted as findings in support of this Censure Resolution.

SECTION 2. That the Redacted Confidential Investigation Report (*Exhibit A*) attached to this Censure Resolution, the Staff Report prepared for this Censure Resolution, and all documents referenced herein are hereby incorporated herein by this reference and are hereby adopted as findings in support of this Censure Resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 6709

SECTION 3. That the intent and purpose of this Censure Resolution is to express the City Council's opinion that Council Member Wanda Love engaged in unprofessional behavior toward multiple City employees and it is not to be interpreted as a formal legal finding.

SECTION 4. That Council Member Wanda Love's unprofessional behavior toward multiple City employees is unacceptable and detrimental to the City of Gardena.

SECTION 5. That Council Member Wanda Love participate and complete three (3) sessions of training provided by the City's Special Labor Counsel, Liebert Cassidy Whitmore, paid for by the City. The training shall be completed within (90) calendar days following adoption of this Resolution of Censure.

SECTION 6. In 2000, the City of Gardena established a Community Discretionary Fund, allowing each Council Member to allocate up to \$2,000 to community organizations of their choosing per fiscal year. Upon adoption of this Resolution, Councilmember Wanda Love shall no longer have access to or authority to distribute funds from the Community Discretionary Fund. This action shall remain in place until a majority of the Council votes to rescind it.

SECTION 7. That this Resolution shall be effective immediately.

SECTION 8. That if any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this resolution, or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portion of this resolution or any part thereof. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase be declared unconstitutional.

RESOLUTION NO. 6709

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Resolution; shall cause the same to be entered among the original Resolutions of said City; and shall make a minute of the passage and adoption thereof in the records of the proceedings of the City Council of said City in the minutes of the meeting at which the same is passed and adopted.

Passed, approved, and adopted this 12th day of August, 2025.

Tasha Cerda, Mayor

TASHA CERDA, Mayor

ATTEST:

Mina Semenza

MINA SEMENZA, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Carmen Vasquez

CARMEN VASQUEZ, City Attorney

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) SS:
CITY OF GARDENA)

I, **MINA SEMENZA**, City Clerk of the City of Gardena, do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of said City is five; that the foregoing Resolution, being **Resolution No. 6709** duly passed and adopted by the City Council of said City of Gardena, approved and signed by the Mayor of said City, and attested by the City Clerk, all at a regular meeting of said City Council held on the **12th day of August 2025**, and that the same was so passed and adopted by the following roll call vote:

AYES: MAYOR PRO TEM HENDERSON, COUNCIL MEMBER TANAKA, AND
 MAYOR CERDA
NOES: COUNCIL MEMBERS LOVE AND FRANCIS

ABSENT: NONE

Becky Romero
City Clerk of the City of Gardena, California

(SEAL)

CONFIDENTIAL

**ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION
REPORT OF FINDINGS**

IN THE MATTER OF

Councilmember Wanda Love



JL GROUP, LLC
WORKPLACE SOLUTIONS

INVESTIGATED BY:

Jeffrey B. Love, Esq.
Attorney Fact Finder

CONFIDENTIAL

May 27, 2025

TO: J. SCOTT TIEDEMANN
Attorney for the City of Gardena
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore

FROM: JEFFREY B. LOVE
Attorney Fact Finder
JL Group, LLC

SUBJECT: ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION – *Wanda Love Matter*

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
SCOPE OF THE INVESTIGATION.....	4
METHODOLOGY	4
INVESTIGATIVE STRATEGY.....	5
SOURCE OF THE COMPLAINT	5
ACCUSED/FOCUS EMPLOYEE	5
RULES	6
WITNESSES	6
CREDIBILITY OF THE WITNESSES	6
INVESTIGATION/FINDINGS.....	9
SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS	24
EXHIBITS.....	38

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This matter is related to an administrative investigation undertaken on behalf of the City of Gardena (City). The scope of this investigation was to determine whether a Council member, Wanda Love (Council Member Love), made false and misleading statements about the Department of Recreation and Human Services. Added to this, the fact finder was to determine whether Council Member Love had discussed with a City employee her (Council Member Love's) concerns about City Manager, Clint Osorio (Mr. Osorio). Finally, this fact finder was to determine whether Council Member Love had disclosed and or discussed with various employees at the agency issues and concerns regarding a previous investigation and complaint against Council Member Love

CONFIDENTIAL

lodged by [REDACTED] and, or [REDACTED].

This fact finder reviewed various documents related to this matter and interviewed relevant witnesses, including Council Member Love. This investigation was conducted to make determinations based on the greater weight of the credible evidence.

Based on the facts determined in this investigation, the greater weight of the credible evidence showed that Council Member Love has, in the past, made false, misleading, and damaging comments about the Department of Recreation and Human Services. It was clear, based on the evidence, that Council Member Love dislikes the Director of Recreation and Human Services, [REDACTED]. Council Member Love has voiced this opinion to others and has generally been critical of this department for a number of years.

The facts determined that, more recently, Council Member Love had discussed with [REDACTED] that she felt that it was a, "slap in the face" because the City did not partner with her for a "Dia de Los Muertos" event held with the Roosevelt Cemetery. The facts demonstrate that Council Member Love had specifically identified Mr. Osorio in this conversation with [REDACTED] and indicated that Mr. Osorio had initially stated that the City was not going to partner with Roosevelt Cemetery but later did.

The facts in this matter further demonstrated that Council Member Love had discussed with [REDACTED] administrative complaints by City employees against Council Member Love. Specifically, Council Member Love told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had both filed complaints against her. Council Member Love indicated that [REDACTED] complaint related to Council Member Love's questioning of contracts awarded by the City; however, she did not disclose any specific information about [REDACTED] complaint.

The facts further showed that Council Member Love had spoken with employee [REDACTED] and had expressed her frustration about complaints filed against her by various City staff. [REDACTED] recalled that Council Member Love had specifically mentioned [REDACTED] as one of the complainants against her. [REDACTED] also recalled that Council Member Love expressed surprise that [REDACTED] had felt harassed by Council Member Love. No further information concerning the complaint was disclosed by Council Member Love to [REDACTED] or other employees identified in this investigation.

In summary, the greater weight of the evidence demonstrated that Council Member Love had made false and misleading statements about the Department of Recreation and Human Services and specifically disliked its director, [REDACTED]. Further, Council Member Love had discussions with various employees in the agency concerning complaints made against her by [REDACTED]. As such, these allegations are, therefore, sustained.

CONFIDENTIAL

SCOPE OF THE INVESTIGATION

The scope of this investigation was to determine:

1. **Whether Council Member Love has made false and misleading statements about the Department of Recreation and Human Services? If so, what were the facts and circumstances, including to whom such statements, if any, were made, when, and to what effect?**
2. **Whether Council Member Love discussed with [REDACTED] that she felt like it was a “slap in the face” because the City did not partner with her for the “Too Cute to Spook” event? If so, what were the facts and circumstances, including:**
 - a. **Whether Council Member Love specifically identified City Manager Clint Osorio in this conversation?**
 - b. **Whether Council Member Love revealed additional details about the nature of her complaints about Mr. Osorio?**
3. **Whether Council Member Love discussed with [REDACTED] that she had learned about City employees who had filed complaints against her? If so, what were the facts and circumstances, including:**
 - a. **Whether Council Member Love specifically identified [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] as employees in this conversation?**
 - b. **Whether Council Member Love revealed any details about the nature of any complaints being made against her?**
4. **Whether Council Member Love discussed with [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] that she had learned about City employees who had filed complaints against her? If so, what were the facts and circumstances, including:**
 - a. **Whether Council Member Love specifically identified [REDACTED] as one such employee in this conversation?**
 - b. **Whether Council Member Love revealed any details about the nature of any complaints being made against her?**

METHODOLOGY

This investigation involved the review of documents, as well as conducting interviews of City employees. Once factual evidence was developed, the various statements of the witnesses were compared and contrasted with one another as well as other evidence and determinations of credibility were established. Once credibility was established along with a factual framework of the alleged events, conclusions were formed based on the greater weight of the credible evidence. For the purpose of findings, direct and circumstantial evidence may be given equal weight. The investigation also may involve:

- A. Reviewing applicable City rules and regulations;
- B. Reviewing applicable personnel documents, including relevant personnel file and any related investigation records;

CONFIDENTIAL

- C. Interviewing co-workers, supervisors and witnesses;
- D. Following-up on other evidentiary leads; and
- E. Providing additional services as may be requested by the Client.

INVESTIGATIVE STRATEGY

The strategy of this investigation was to determine, based on the greater weight of the credible evidence whether the allegations made against the accused were true. This fact finder determined that the best practice here would be to review relevant documents associated with the allegations and then to conduct interviews with relevant witnesses. Findings would be made based on the greater weight of the credible evidence (preponderance) standard of proof.

The following points constitute the desired scope of the investigation:

- A. Identify the factual bases for each allegation;
- B. Identify the absence of factual bases for any such allegations;
- C. Identify factual bases for any responses/counter-allegations raised by witnesses or accused individuals;
- D. Identify the absence of factual bases for any responses/counter-allegations raised by witnesses or accused individuals; and
- E. Assess the credibility of the complainant, accused individual and witnesses.

The fact finder used the following terminology to describe the findings in this report:

- A. Sustained – A preponderance of the evidence is that the alleged conduct occurred.
- B. Not Sustained – A preponderance of the evidence is that the alleged conduct did not occur.
- C. Unfounded – The investigation clearly established that the allegation is not true.

The fact finder used the preponderance of the evidence standard to determine whether it is more likely than not that the conduct alleged occurred or did not occur.

SOURCE OF THE COMPLAINT

- A. This complaint was internally generated.**

ACCUSED/FOCUS EMPLOYEE

- A. Wanda Love**
City Council Member
City of Gardena

CONFIDENTIAL

RULES

This matter related to fact finding. The relevant rules of the City are attached and incorporated herein by reference.

WITNESSES¹

A. [REDACTED]
Director of Recreation and Human Services
City of Gardena

B. [REDACTED]
City of Gardena

C. [REDACTED]
City of Gardena

D. [REDACTED]
City of Gardena

E. **Wanda Love**
City Council Member
City of Gardena

CREDIBILITY OF THE WITNESSES

The analysis of the credibility of the witnesses is an important aspect of a fact-finding investigation. As an accepted rule of evidence, a fact finder can disregard the statements of a witness who has been found to have provided false or unreliable information during their testimony in a matter. Those witnesses' statements can be disregarded in their entirety and not believed unless there is compelling evidence to conclude that individual statements otherwise are true.² Concerning the witnesses' statements, this fact finder considered:

- (a) The witness's demeanor while providing a statement and the manner in which he/she provided the statement.
- (b) The character of the witness's statement.

¹ Witness statements derived in the previous investigation concerning Wanda Love, dated November 18, 2024 are used in this investigation. The previous investigation is attached and incorporated herein by reference.

² See *California Civil Jury Instruction* Section 5003.

CONFIDENTIAL

- (c) The extent of the witness's capacity to perceive, to recollect, or to communicate any matter about which he gave a statement.
- (d) The extent of the witness's opportunity to perceive any matter about which he gave a statement.
- (e) The witness's character for honesty or veracity or their opposites.
- (f) The existence or nonexistence of a bias, interest, or other motive.
- (g) A statement previously made by the witness's that is consistent with his statement during the fact finding investigation.
- (h) A statement made by the witness's that is inconsistent with any part of his statement during the fact finding investigation.
- (i) The existence or nonexistence of any fact given in statement by the witness.
- (j) the witness's attitude toward the fact finding investigation in which he gave a statement or toward the giving of a statement.

Discussion

A. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] was a credible witness in this matter. [REDACTED] statements to this fact finder tended to be corroborated by other credible evidence, such as emails, as well as corroboration by other witnesses, who were deemed credible. It was clear that Council Member Love disliked [REDACTED], and this dislike seemed to permeate Council Member Love's complaints about [REDACTED] department in general. There was no evidence to conclude that [REDACTED] had provided any unreliable or false information during the course of this investigation.

B. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] was a credible witness in this matter. [REDACTED] statements to this fact finder tended to be corroborated by other credible evidence and witnesses. For instance, [REDACTED] recalled Council Member Love telling [REDACTED] that [REDACTED], [REDACTED], had made a complaint against Council Member Love.

[REDACTED], another employee at the City, also had a similar conversation with Council Member Love and recalled similar information. There was no evidence to conclude that [REDACTED] provided any unreliable or false information during the course of this investigation.

CONFIDENTIAL

C. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] was a credible witness in this matter. Like [REDACTED], [REDACTED] recalled Council Member Love speaking with [REDACTED] about complaints made against her. Specifically, [REDACTED] heard from Council Member Love that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had both filed complaints against her.

It is unlikely that [REDACTED] would have learned this information from any other source than Council Member Love, and Council Member Love acknowledged that she had had some discussions with employees in the [REDACTED] concerning prior complaints against her by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. There was no information to conclude that [REDACTED] had provided any unreliable or false information during the course of this investigation.

D. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] was a credible witness in this matter. [REDACTED] recalled that [REDACTED] had a brief conversation with Council Member Love regarding a complaint filed against Council Member Love. [REDACTED] recalled that Council Member Love mentioned that she was preparing to attend a meeting related to this complaint but did not provide any other details. [REDACTED] did not recall that Council Member Love had identified any specific employees as complainants. There was no evidence to conclude that [REDACTED] had provided any unreliable or false information during the course of this investigation.

E. Wanda Love

Council Member Love was not a credible witness in this matter. Like in Council Member Love's prior investigation, her credibility was suspect. Council Member Love specifically denied having discussions with [REDACTED] concerning complaints against her lodged by employees in the agency. Council Member Love specifically denied that she had ever mentioned [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] name in such a conversation.

Council Member Love acknowledged she may have had discussions about this previous investigation with staff in the City Manager's Office but did not recall discussing it with anyone in the [REDACTED]. Council Member Love also denied making any comments concerning any specific individuals filing complaints against her to [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED].

However, [REDACTED] recalled that Council Member Love specifically mentioned [REDACTED] in one of her discussions about the complaints that had been filed against her. Specifically, [REDACTED] alleged that [REDACTED] felt harassed by Council Member Love. Council Member Love's denial to this fact finder that she had identified any specific City employees as complainants in her discussions with either [REDACTED], or [REDACTED] is untrue.

Council Member Love also denied that she had made any specific, false, or unfounded comments about the Department of Recreation Human Services. Council Member Love characterized that she has been the victim and has been mistreated and that any sort of criticism

CONFIDENTIAL

alleged by others had merely, been her questioning the operation of that department. Council Member Love also indicated that she did not dislike [REDACTED]. However, previously, facts demonstrated that Council Member Love had expressed her dislike of [REDACTED] to employees.

Based on the greater weight of the credible evidence, Council Member Love's credibility in this matter was poor, and her statements to this fact finder could not be believed unless there was corroborative evidence from a credible source.

INVESTIGATION/FINDINGS

Background

This matter related to an administrative investigation undertaken on behalf of the City of Gardena. This matter specifically related to Council Member Love allegedly making disparaging and untrue remarks concerning the Department of Recreation and Human Services, as well as discussing a previous investigation with various employees, in addition to naming the identity of the complainants and potential specifics about the nature of the complaint.

Timeline

Date	Incident
November 26, 2024	This fact finder is retained to conduct a fact finding investigation into alleged misconduct by Council Member Love.
December 6, 2024	The scope of investigation is supplemented to include additional alleged misconduct by Council Member Love.
July 21, 2025	This fact finder concludes his investigation with this Report of Findings.

Allegations(s)

1. **Whether Council Member Love has made false and misleading statements about the Department of Recreation and Human Services? If so, what were the facts and circumstances, including to whom such statements, if any, were made, when, and to what effect?**

Short Answer: **Sustained (Yes). The greater weight of the credible evidence demonstrates that Council Member Love has made false and misleading statements about the Department of Recreation and Human Services.**

Discussion

[REDACTED] is the Director of Recreation and Human Services. [REDACTED] told this fact finder that Council Member Love has often made open remarks questioning the fairness and consistency of the Department of Recreation and Human Services. [REDACTED] provided explanations to this fact finder that [REDACTED] noted contradicted these claims, emphasizing that [REDACTED]

CONFIDENTIAL

departmental decisions were based on established procedures rather than personal bias. ██████ stated that it is clear that Council Member Love dislikes ██████ and will seize upon any opportunity to undermine ██████ publicly and with ██████ staff. ██████ had written an email to Mr. Osorio on October 7, 2024, to voice ██████ concerns about Council Member Love's behavior.³

██████ stated that when Council Member Love initially took on a dual role with overlapping authority as both a City Council Member and the Director of the Chamber of Commerce, it created a nearly impossible working dynamic and blurred the lines between official City responsibilities and Chamber interests. ██████ believed this was the catalyst for the friction between ██████ department and Council Member Love, as well as the alleged biased treatment often claimed by Council Member Love. ██████ explained,

"She still represents the chamber, so she wants things through the chamber and then wants things as a councilmember. So as the chamber, there is no MOU with the City anymore. That MOU was basically, um, put to an end because of her behavior. And so now, when she wants something as, as the chamber, we treat her like anybody else because there is no MOU, which means she should follow the process, she should follow the requests the way that anybody would, but of course, she doesn't or she'll say she didn't know."

██████ further emphasized that this dual role often resulted in Council Member Love expecting City staff to prioritize Chamber initiatives outside of established procedures, which created additional conflict. ██████ explained that Council Member Love has a pattern and practice of trying to do things without going through the proper process and following procedures, and then, when she was told no, it became a problem. ██████ noted that this led to increased tensions when ██████ department insisted on ██████ following standard City policies.

██████ emphasized that the Chamber of Commerce does not have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City of Gardena, meaning it is treated like any other vendor under the City's established procedures. Without a formal agreement outlining the terms of collaboration, the Chamber is required to follow the same procurement, event coordination, and service request processes as external vendors. However, ██████ noted that Council Member Love continuously expected her Chamber-related requests to be expedited and treated differently than other external vendors, which caused friction when they had to enforce standard City procedures. Council Member Love attempted to use her influence as an elected official to skirt normal City rules.

Despite this, Council Member Love, in her dual role as both a City Council Member and Chamber Director, often operated as though the Chamber held a special status, expecting expedited approvals, fee waivers, or direct involvement from City departments without following standard protocols. ██████ further stated that when Council Member Love requested something from ██████ department, Council Member Love would make a statement that it should be an easy yes or an automatic approval. ██████ responded that without an agreement in place, they had to treat all vendors the same. This situation tended to cause conflict.

³ See the attached email from ██████ to Mr. Osorio dated October 7, 2024, Subject: Councilmember Love Concern.

CONFIDENTIAL

█████ thought that this discrepancy and double standard created administrative challenges, as City staff were put in difficult positions when asked to accommodate requests that fell outside standard operating procedures. █████ reiterated that, in the absence of an MOU, the Chamber was not entitled to preferential treatment and had to adhere to the same guidelines and requirements as any other external organization conducting business with the City.

One example █████ cited occurred in October 2023, during discussions regarding the Trunk-or-Treat event. Council Member Love insisted that the Chamber of Commerce should receive special accommodations, including waived fees and priority access to City resources. When █████ upheld City policies requiring all organizations, including the Chamber, to follow standard vendor procedures, Council Member Love expressed frustration and told █████ that █████ made everything difficult for the Chamber. █████ responded that there are procedures that █████ has to follow, and █████ has to be consistent with all organizations. She further emphasized that without an official MOU between the Chamber and the City, the Chamber could not receive preferential treatment.

A similar incident took place in March 2024, when Council Member Love sought to involve the Chamber in organizing the Cinco de Mayo celebration. Council Member Love allegedly bypassed █████ and communicated directly with █████ City staff in an attempt to secure Chamber involvement. When █████ reiterated that all external organizations, including the Chamber, had to submit formal proposals, Council Member Love responded with frustration by alleging that █████ was the only █████ with whom Council Member Love was having an issue with █████ procedures on doing things. █████ maintained that █████ department followed clear policies to ensure fairness and transparency.

Additionally, █████ recalled an open-session City Council meeting in July 2024, where Council Member Love publicly questioned why the Recreation and Human Services Department had denied a Chamber proposal related to the Christmas Parade sponsorships. Council Member Love suggested that the denial reflected a personal bias against the Chamber. █████ stated that █████ had to clarify on the record that the City could not fund additional sponsorships beyond the allocated budget, and the Chamber, like other entities, was required to secure its own funding. *"This wasn't about bias; it was about the budget,"* █████ explained. █████ emphasized that █████ department's decisions were guided by established City policies and fiscal responsibility, *not* personal bias.

█████ remarked that Council Member Love's fluctuating expectations and demands caused inefficiencies and difficulties in managing City operations. Furthermore, █████ believed that Council Member Love's inconsistent interactions with █████ department and her tendency to circumvent established procedures—particularly when requesting event participation or department involvement—reinforced the perception of expected preferential treatment and a lack of accountability.

█████ recalled an incident in July 2023 where █████ felt "ambushed" by Council Member Love during a Chamber of Commerce meeting. █████ stated that she was invited to attend the meeting under the impression that it would be a routine discussion between █████ and Council Member Love about City partnerships with the Chamber. █████ stated that Council Member Love

CONFIDENTIAL

did not mention if they were going to discuss a specific event or anything specific about the meeting. However, once she arrived, [REDACTED] quickly realized that Council Member Love had turned the meeting into a public interrogation of [REDACTED] department's operations, specifically regarding the back-to-school event. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] felt [REDACTED] was being targeted in that meeting.

During the meeting, Council Member Love repeatedly questioned the allocation of funds within the Department of Recreation and Human Services, specifically pressing [REDACTED] about staffing levels and budget decisions. [REDACTED] thought it wasn't a constructive conversation—it was an attempt to undermine [REDACTED] in front of the Chamber board members. [REDACTED] noted that instead of providing a space for dialogue, Council Member Love continued to press with leading questions that painted her department in a negative light amongst the other Chamber board members present. The incident left [REDACTED] feeling that Council Member Love was actively working against [REDACTED] rather than collaborating for the betterment of City programs and attempting to put [REDACTED] in a false light.

From November 2023 onward, [REDACTED] noticed a distinct change in Council Member Love's behavior toward [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] recounted multiple instances where Council Member Love deliberately ignored her during City-related discussions and meetings. Despite being the Director of the Department of Recreation and Human Services, [REDACTED] stated that Council Member Love would go out of her way to avoid addressing [REDACTED] directly. [REDACTED] recalled that there were times when [REDACTED] would be standing right next to her, and Council Member Love would act as if she weren't even there.

[REDACTED] provided a specific example from a December 2023 City event where several department heads were present. As they discussed logistical arrangements for upcoming programs, Council Member Love engaged in conversation with every other department head in the room except for [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that Council Member Love would acknowledge everyone but [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] had to interject [REDACTED] into the conversation just to ensure [REDACTED] department's role was considered in the planning.

A further instance occurred at a January 9, 2024 during a City Council meeting where [REDACTED] attempted to provide input on a policy affecting community programs. Council Member Love reportedly ignored [REDACTED] raised hand and instead directed questions to other staff members who were not directly involved in the program.⁴ [REDACTED] felt as if Council Member Love thought [REDACTED] expertise and [REDACTED] department's contributions did not matter. [REDACTED] noted that this sort of dismissive demeanor by Council Member Love during public meetings have happened on a number of occasions. This behavior has caused stress to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] employees who are scheduled to present during various public meeting who fear being demeaned by Council Member Love or ignored by [REDACTED], as a form of discourtesy or to put [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] department in a poor light.

[REDACTED] expressed frustration that the Department of Recreation and Human Services was consistently overlooked during City Council open-session meetings, despite the department's significant contributions to public programs. [REDACTED] specifically cited a June 2023 council meeting where multiple departments were publicly commended by Council Member Love for their efforts

⁴ See the attached City Council agenda for January 9, 2024.

CONFIDENTIAL

in organizing community initiatives, yet [REDACTED] department received no acknowledgment. [REDACTED] said, *"She doesn't even acknowledge my department in most council meetings, you know."* [REDACTED] felt that [REDACTED] department had worked tirelessly to put these programs together, but when it came time to acknowledge departments publicly, [REDACTED] department was left out.

A similar situation occurred in November 2023 following a citywide holiday festival. [REDACTED] department played a crucial role in coordinating vendors, logistics, and community engagement for the event. However, when Council Member Love addressed the festival's success during an open session, she praised the Public Works and Finance Departments but failed to mention the Department of Recreation and Human Services. [REDACTED] stated that it wasn't just about recognition—it sent a message that [REDACTED] department's work wasn't valued, even though they were the ones ensuring these events ran smoothly, yet their efforts were completely ignored.

[REDACTED] added that this pattern and practice of exclusion had a demoralizing effect on her staff, who felt that their contributions were being disregarded. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] team noticed it too and often asked [REDACTED] why they were always left out, to which [REDACTED] didn't have a good answer for them. [REDACTED] told this fact finder that [REDACTED] staff often voiced concerns about Council Member Love's criticisms concerning [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] department, generally. For instance, in 2024, during a National Night Out event held at the City Hall location, Council Member Love voiced complaints to Department of Recreation and Human Services employee [REDACTED] concerning the location given to Council Member Love for [REDACTED] booth position. During previous conversations with [REDACTED], Council Member Love complained about [REDACTED] and indicated that she did not like [REDACTED].⁵

During this National Night Out event conversation between [REDACTED] and Council Member Love, Council Member Love essentially threatened [REDACTED] that she felt that the position of her (Love's) booth at the event was intentionally selected to somehow demean Council Member Love and that the issue was going to be aired during a City Council meeting. This caused [REDACTED] grave concerns that [REDACTED] reputation would be attacked or that [REDACTED] employment would be put at risk due to Council Member Love's disdain for [REDACTED]. This caused tension and concern for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], alike.

[REDACTED] cited another concern that occurred on February 23, 2025. [REDACTED] reported:

"Today, we hosted a parade. Councilmember Love posted a video stating that the time was 9:11 am stating that her and other community members had been waiting for 45 min waiting for a shuttle. Our department provided the shuttles for the parade. We informed participants that the shuttle came around every 45 min in an email prior to the event(I will forward separately). We said that to ensure people knew there was a wait. We also suggested that they get dropped off at the start and not the end of the parade. Her post is a way to criticize our department which is what I have mentioned to you in the past. Also, she could not have been there as long as she stated because I spoke to a [REDACTED] who called me to ask about the shuttles at 8:41 am asking about where to take the shuttle then I called her back and she said the shuttles were there around 8:46 am.

⁵ See the previous investigation concerning [REDACTED] complaint related to Council Member Love, dated November 18, 2024.

CONFIDENTIAL

There is also an accidental VM, and I can hear them refer to the other shuttle. This is a 25 min time difference from the reported time of Councilmember Love. If she was there for 45 min she would have seen the shuttle. Her posting this isn't accurate and also is a form of her constant criticism of our department without merit.”⁶

This incident, though seemingly small and unimportant, serves as another example of criticisms of the Department of Recreation and Human Services and of [REDACTED] status as a [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] that places the department and [REDACTED] in a false light. [REDACTED] that these numerous and varied criticisms of [REDACTED] department has had a corrosive effect on the department, [REDACTED] reputation amongst [REDACTED] coworkers, elected officials and the public and has had a negative effect on [REDACTED] employee's morale and workplace satisfaction.

Yet another example of subtle undermining of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] department to [REDACTED] superior, City Manager Clint Osorio by Council Member Love occurred in an email exchange beginning on April 15, 2024. In this instance, Council Member Love sent an email to Mr. Osorio related to requesting a tent location at an upcoming Jazz Festival. In the email, Council Member Love writes, in relevant part:

“Can you please reserve my same tent location from last year so I don't run into the same debacle as last year?”⁷

Here, [REDACTED] pointed out that previously Council Member Love did not have an issue with getting a tent. Instead it was an issue with a table request. [REDACTED] pointed out that the terminology used of a “debacle” was overstated and meant to give the illusion that there had been a much greater issue than had occurred. Additionally, this comment was directed to [REDACTED] superior, Mr. Osorio with others in the department copied.

During the previous Jazz Festival in 2023 where the alleged “debacle” occurred, as described by Council Member Love, [REDACTED] provided a July 24, 2023 email that put context to this issue. In [REDACTED] email to Mr. Osorio on July 24, 2023, [REDACTED] wrote, in relevant part:

“Back in April Councilmember Love was advised that Jazz tables were not being sold at the time. We let her know that we had tables for sale beginning May 1. She wanted to be in the Sponsor area, but we advised her that the tables were not set yet and they were based on sponsorship levels. We usually don't issue tickets until mid-August. When sales started (May 1) she came in and decided not the purchase the table and would speak to Clint. Yesterday, she asked staff about her table. The same applies. The tables are not set yet as they are dependent on sponsor level. She does receive two free tickets so if she would like to purchase a table its \$600 dollars and would be in the general area but not guaranteed next to [REDACTED] as we have several 10k and 5k sponsors that are issued tables at the front by the stage.”⁸

⁶ See the attached email and attachments, dated February 23, 2025.

⁷ See Mail Attachment 6, as an Exhibit to this report.

⁸ See Mail Attachment 7, as an Exhibit to this report.

CONFIDENTIAL

█████ pointed out that this 2023 issue was not a “debacle” as described by Council Member Love but her (Love’s) lack of understanding of the process of sponsorship table availability and location of placement.

An example of Council Member Love confusing her role as a Gardena Council Member and that of her position as Director of the local Chamber of Commerce occurred during the *Food, Wine and Brew Festival 2024* when Council Member Love on September 11, 2024 requested to have a vendor booth at the event. As █████ pointed out in █████ email to Mr. Osorio on September 11, 2024,

“Clint:

Does the Chamber not follow the process? Just want to make sure that Council booths can’t just be interchangeable with other organizations to ensure consistency and impartiality. Should another Councilmember want to do the same will we be allowing them to do the same?

How do you want me to proceed?

We had a process for external vendors to apply for a booth and have already selected vendors. It was advertised on social media on August 12, 2024, with a deadline of August 28, 2024.

*Thanks,”*⁹

Here, Council Member Love seems to be trying to use her position as a Council Member to obtain special treatment for her Chamber sponsorship when she had clearly gone past the deadline for vendors, such as the Chamber of Commerce, to register for the event. █████ pointed out that the City does not have any special relationship nor MOU with Council Member Love’s Chamber of Commerce and they (the Chamber) are required to follow the same rules as other vendors wanting to participate in any City event.

Regarding the alleged mistreatment on social media, █████ provided an example from June or July 2023 during the Community Care Day event, which Council Member Love attended but later expressed dissatisfaction with on social media. Council Member Love posted a comment stating, *“It’s like I wasn’t even there,”* referring to the event pictures posted by the department.¹⁰ The implication being that █████ department had intentionally excluded Council Member Love.

█████ explained that the department follows consistent social media posting policies, ensuring that all council members are fairly represented. █████ stated, *“Even when she does come to events that are mine and she doesn’t talk to me, if I have a picture of her, I always tell our*

⁹ See Mail Attachment 8, as an Exhibit to this report.

¹⁰ See the attached screenshot of this post by Council Member Love.

CONFIDENTIAL

employees, like, hey, make sure to post everyone so it's consistent. We don't just post, if we take pictures of all the council members, we post the pictures. We try to make sure that everyone at least has some kind of presence."

██████████ found it inappropriate that Council Member Love would air grievances publicly, stating that such concerns should have been addressed directly to ██████████ or ██████████ department. ██████████ stressed that ██████████ department makes a conscious effort to be inclusive and impartial in its public materials. Generally, ██████████ cited the following recent events as a partial list of events where Council Member Love caused issues with ██████████ department:

State of the City Event – March 2023

- ██████████ recalled that Council Member Love, acting as the Chamber Director, attempted to take control of the planning and execution of the State of the City event.
- Council Member Love expected City staff to prioritize Chamber-related tasks without following standard City procedures.
- When ██████████ insisted on adhering to City guidelines, Council Member Love reportedly became frustrated and attempted to bypass ██████████ by reaching out directly to other City officials and departments.

Cinco de Mayo Event – May 2023

- Another major issue arose when Council Member Love wanted the Chamber of Commerce to play a leading role in the City's Cinco de Mayo celebration.
- Council Member Love allegedly bypassed ██████████ in communications, working directly with other City staff to influence event planning.
- When ██████████ reiterated that the Chamber must submit formal proposals like any other organization, Council Member Love reportedly expressed frustration and accused ██████████ of being uncooperative.

Trunk-or-Treat Event – October 2023

- ██████████ detailed an incident involving the Trunk-or-Treat event, where Council Member Love pushed for Chamber involvement and attempted to secure special accommodations.
- The Chamber expected waived City fees and priority access to resources without going through the formal approval process.
- ██████████ had to reinforce that, without an MOU, the Chamber must be treated as an external entity and follow the same vendor regulations.
- This created tension, as Council Member Love felt she was being singled out or treated unfairly, while ██████████ emphasized that City protocols had to be followed.

CONFIDENTIAL

Christmas Parade Sponsorship Dispute – December 2023

- [REDACTED] recalled a dispute where Council Member Love attempted to secure a sponsorship deal for the Christmas Parade through the Chamber but expected the City to cover additional costs.
- [REDACTED] clarified that the City could not provide funding beyond what was already allocated, and the Chamber needed to fund its own sponsorships.
- Council Member Love reportedly saw this as an obstacle and suggested that [REDACTED] was deliberately making things difficult for the Chamber.

Council Member Love was asked about her relationship with [REDACTED] and the notion that she had made negative comments to others relating to [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] department. Specifically, Council Member Love was asked if she had told others that she disliked [REDACTED]. Love responded, *"I don't have to state that, no, it's obvious."* She acknowledged that she had *"no relationship"* with [REDACTED] and had not interacted with the Recreation Department since being elected. However, she denied ever stating to others that she disliked [REDACTED].¹¹ Council Member Love emphasized that she had concerns regarding her treatment at community events, citing incidents where she felt disrespected.

Council Member Love specifically referenced the recent MLK parade, where she was *"placed behind a trash truck"* while other council members were assigned better placements. She also noted that at the National Night Out, her booth was *"placed in the back of the row of vendors"* while the [REDACTED] was positioned *"front and center."* Council Member Love stated, *"When I'm, I feel like I'm being mistreated, I have the right to question that, and if my questioning is interpreted as harassment, then I, I don't know what to say, but when the treatment is consistent, then it does raise concern."* Council Member Love stated that she did not make any complaints to the Department of Recreation and Human Services but rather posed her grievances by questioning the decisions made by the Department of Recreation and Human Services.

Council Member Love explained:

*"Wanda Love: Well, it, to me I think there's as difference between a complaint and a question. I question why my booth was placed in a certain place. I question why I got a ****, I questioned why I was put behind a trash truck, I question these things and that was like my questioning is turnin' into a complaint. I don't complain about anything, I will bring to your attention what concerns me.*

Jeff Love: Right.

Wanda Love: Or what I'm aware of or what I notice. What you do about it is up to you, so have I complained, it all depends on your definition of a complaint. Did I bring to your attention that I did not like the fact that I was placed behind a trash truck, or in a convert, in a hard top, or, yeah, so I need to understand the difference between a complaint and a question, 'cause I mean, I think I have the right to question certain things"

¹¹ During a previous investigation concerning Council Member Love, [REDACTED], a [REDACTED], told this fact finder that Council Member Love specifically told [REDACTED], *"You know I don't like your boss [REDACTED] and I don't handle anything with your boss."* [REDACTED] Transcript, Page 75, Lines 21-22.

CONFIDENTIAL

Council Member Love described her concerns as *"questions,"* rather than *"complaints."* When asked if she had brought these issues to employees, she responded, *"No, those questions are not asked to those staff members, because those staff members are the, the same staff members that continue to do the same, same behavior. So why would I ask the question to the perpetrator?"*

Regarding allegations of being excluded from event photos on social media, Council Member Love stated, *"Well, let's just say that you could scroll through the City's social media and tell me how many times you see me in the photo."* She asserted that the Parks and Recreation Department oversees the majority of community events and suggested that her exclusion was deliberate, adding, *"If I am there, I'm usually stuck on some end of the photos."*

Although Council Member Love positioned herself as a victim of unfair treatment by [REDACTED] and members of [REDACTED] staff at various events and claimed that she did not complain but merely asked questions about her treatment, the greater weight of the credible evidence demonstrates that Council Member Love has, in fact, engaged in undermining behavior toward [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] department. Council Member Love seems to have used her position as an elected official to try to sidestep City policies related to the Chamber of Commerce's involvement in City events.

When Council Member Love is dissatisfied with not being provided special treatment, she has vocalized her complaints, ignored key staff members, and made false and misleading comments about [REDACTED], [REDACTED] staff, and [REDACTED] department. Council Member Love has made it known to the Recreation and Human Services Staff that she does not like [REDACTED] and will not work with [REDACTED]. The effect of this treatment has been to the detriment of the reputation of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] department. Council Member Love has falsely cast herself as a victim of intentional disparate treatment at the hands of [REDACTED], yet the credible evidence demonstrates that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] department has endeavored to treat all elected officials equally. Even though Council Member frames her interactions and comments about [REDACTED] as innocent concerns and/or legitimate oversight questions, the credible evidence demonstrates that Council Member dislikes [REDACTED] and has endeavored, on many fronts, to hold [REDACTED] out to opprobrium through unfounded criticisms, grandstanding comments and rhetorical questions meant to harm [REDACTED] reputation, while, at the same time, falsely claiming that she (Council Member Love) is a victim of uneven treatment by [REDACTED] department. This allegation is, therefore, **Sustained.**

2. **Whether Council Member Love discussed with [REDACTED] that she felt like it was a "slap in the face" because the City did not partner with her for the "Too Cute to Spook" event? If so, what were the facts and circumstances, including:**

Short Answer: *Sustained (Yes), in part. The greater weight of the credible evidence demonstrated that Council Member Love discussed with [REDACTED] that she felt like it was a "slap in the face" not because the City did not partner with her for the "Too Cute to Spook" event but because the City did not partner with her concerning the Dia De Los Muertos event at Roosevelt Cemetery.*

CONFIDENTIAL

- a. **Whether Council Member Love specifically identified City Manager Clint Osorio in this conversation?**

Short Answer: *Sustained (Yes). The greater weight of the credible evidence demonstrated that Council Member Love specifically identified City Manager Clint Osorio (Mr. Osorio) in the conversation about the partnership with Roosevelt Cemetery concerning the Dia De Los Muertos event.*

- b. **Whether Council Member Love revealed additional details about the nature of her complaints about Mr. Osorio?**

Short Answer: *Sustained (Yes). The greater weight of the credible evidence demonstrated that Council Member Love specifically identified City Manager Clint Osorio (Mr. Osorio) in this conversation in that Council Member Love claimed that Mr. Osorio initially told her that the City would not partner with Roosevelt Cemetery but ultimately did. This is what Council Member Love referred to as a "slap in the face."*

Discussion

The facts in this matter demonstrate that there had been a number of recreation programs conducted in or about the City that Council Member Love has had difficulties and, or complaints about. One such event was the Halloween event called "Too Cute to Spook." During this event, Council Member Love was displeased that a banner had not been placed on her booth during the event. Previously, Council Member Love had been upset and concerned about the positioning of her booth at the City Hall. This matter led to a previous investigation by employee, [REDACTED].¹²

Another event that had occurred in 2024 was the "Dia de Los Muertos," event at the Roosevelt Cemetery. Council Member Love was found to have discussed with [REDACTED] that Council Member Love felt like it was, "slap in the face," that City Manager Clint Osorio (Mr. Osorio), had advised Council Member Love that the City was not going to partner with Roosevelt Cemetery, but ultimately did.

Here, Council Member Love claimed to [REDACTED] that Mr. Osorio, the City Manager, had reversed himself concerning the City's involvement with the Roosevelt Cemetery for the Dia de Los Muertos event and had seemingly left Council Member Love out of the information loop.

Council Member Love denied making any specific comments concerning the lack of partnership in the "Too Cute to Spook," event as a "slap in the face." She indicated that she had questioned why the Recreation Department did not have her banner up at the event. Council Member Love expressed concerns about what she referred to as a, recurring pattern, where the City Recreation and Human Services Department sets up City Council booths at community events but does not display her City Council banner, nor was she allowed to place her own banner at the booth.

¹² A copy of this investigation is attached and incorporated here and by reference.

CONFIDENTIAL

Council Member Love recalled bringing this issue to the attention of the [REDACTED] and City Manager, Mr. Osorio, as well as [REDACTED]. When asked if she had ever voiced any concerns or complaints about City Manager Osorio in these conversations, Council Member Love indicated that she had not. When further pressed about whether she had complaints or concerns about Mr. Osorio, Council Member Love stated, "*None that I want to talk about.*"

[REDACTED] indicated that Council Member Love's complaint concerning her banner at the "Too Cute to Spook," event was unfounded, in the sense that Council Member Love had not specifically made that request. [REDACTED] provided this fact finder with images and photos from social media that show that Council Member Love's banners had been placed at specific events.¹³

[REDACTED] said that Council Member Love never seems to be pleased with the location of her booth and often attempts to skirt City procedures for making requests at these various events. [REDACTED] said that Council Member Love seems to blur her position as a City Council member with that of her role at the Chamber of Commerce. [REDACTED] noted that the City does not have an MOU with Council Member Love's Chamber of Commerce and that the Chamber of Commerce has to follow the same procedures as any outside organization.

Here, the greater weight of the credible evidence tends to demonstrate that Council Member Love did use the expression "*slap in the face*," in relation to an event that occurred at the Roosevelt Cemetery, where the City had partnered with the cemetery for a *Dia de Los Muertos* event. This, "*slap in the face*," comment was not attributed to the Too Cute to Spook event. However, Council Member Love complained that her banner had not been placed properly at the Too Cute to Spook event.

The evidence further demonstrated that Council Member Love had specifically identified Mr. Osorio in a conversation with [REDACTED] concerning the partnership with Roosevelt Cemetery in relation to the *Dia de Los Muertos* event. Council Member Love's reference to Mr. Osorio in this conversation with [REDACTED] was negative, as Council Member Love claimed that Mr. Osorio had initially told her and Council members that the City would not be partnering with the Roosevelt Cemetery for the *Dia de Los Muertos* event but ultimately did. This is what Council Member Love referred to as a, "*slap in the face*" to her. This allegation is, therefore, sustained, as to the *Dia de Los Muertos* event.

3. **Whether Council Member Love discussed with [REDACTED] that she had learned about City employees who had filed complaints against her? If so, what were the facts and circumstances, including:**

Short Answer: *Sustained (Yes). The greater weight of the credible evidence demonstrates that Council Member Love discussed with [REDACTED] that she had learned about City employees who had filed complaints against her.*

¹³ See the attached photographs and other items provided by [REDACTED].

CONFIDENTIAL

- a. **Whether Council Member Love specifically identified [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] as employees in this conversation?**

Short Answer: *Sustained (Yes). The greater weight of the credible evidence demonstrates that Council Member Love specifically identified [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] as employees in this conversation.*

- b. **Whether Council Member Love revealed any details about the nature of any complaints being made against her?**

Short Answer: *Sustained (Yes). The greater weight of the credible evidence demonstrates that Council Member Love revealed any details about the nature of any complaints being made against her.*

Discussion

This issue concerns whether Council Member Love had discussions with [REDACTED], in which she (Council Member Love) had learned about City employees, who had filed complaints against her. The facts in this matter demonstrate that Council Member Love had specifically identified [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], [REDACTED] employee, as employees who had filed complaints against her. This was told to [REDACTED] during a conversation with Council Member Love.

In addition to identifying these two City employees as having filed complaints against Council Member Love, Council Member Love further identified that [REDACTED] complaint related to contracts and Council Member Love's questioning of those City contracts. The facts demonstrated that Council Member Love had only mentioned [REDACTED] as a complainant but did not disclose any specific facts concerning that complaint.

Council Member Love denied discussing any of these complaints made against her in any conversations with [REDACTED]. Specifically, Council Member Love denied ever mentioning [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] in any such discussion. Council Member Love specifically claimed that she did not discuss these prior investigations or complaints with [REDACTED] or any other employees in the [REDACTED]. She did acknowledge, though, that she "May have mentioned it to the ladies in the City Manager's office."

Here, the greater weight of the credible evidence demonstrates that Council Member Love did, in fact, have a discussion with [REDACTED], in which she discussed prior complaints against her that were lodged by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The facts demonstrate that Council Member Love specifically identified these employees to [REDACTED] as being complainants against her and further went on to say that [REDACTED] complaint concerned the issues of City contracts.

Even though Council Member Love did not specifically identify the nature of [REDACTED] complaint against her, it was clear, based on the greater weight of the evidence, that this discussion occurred between Council Member Love and [REDACTED]. Here, [REDACTED] demonstrated

CONFIDENTIAL

good credibility. However, Council Member Love's credibility was poor. Based on the greater weight of the credible evidence, these allegations are, therefore, **Sustained**.

4. Whether Council Member Love discussed with [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] that she had learned about City employees who had filed complaints against her? If so, what were the facts and circumstances, including:

Short Answer: *Sustained (Yes). The greater weight of the credible evidence demonstrates that Council Member Love discussed with [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] that she had learned about City employees who had filed complaints against her.*

- a. Whether Council Member Love specifically identified [REDACTED] as one such employee in this conversation?

Short Answer: *Sustained (Yes). The greater weight of the credible evidence demonstrates that Council Member Love specifically identified [REDACTED] as one such employee in this conversation.*

- b. Whether Council Member Love revealed any details about the nature of any complaints being made against her?

Short Answer: *Sustained (Yes). The greater weight of the credible evidence demonstrates that Council Member Love revealed any details about the nature of any complaints being made against her.*

Discussion

This matter concerns whether Council Member Love had discussed with [REDACTED], and, or [REDACTED], that Council Member Love had learned about City employees who had filed complaints against her. Here, the evidence demonstrates that Council Member Love did, in fact, have conversations with both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], concerning personnel complaints that had previously been made against Council Member Love.

[REDACTED] recalled that [REDACTED] had been present during a recent conversation in which Council Member Love expressed frustrations about complaints filed against her by City staff. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] did not actively participate in this conversation but distinctly recalled Council Member Love mentioning that "staff had complained about her." These comments were made inside the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] recalled that Council Member Love specifically mentioned [REDACTED] in one of her discussions about these complaints against her.

CONFIDENTIAL

██████ recalled that Council Member Love allegedly expressed surprise upon learning that ██████ felt harassed by her. ██████ stated that Council Member Love did not provide details about the specific nature of ██████ complaint. ██████ stated that it appeared to ██████ that Council Member Love was attempting to rationalize her behavior, stating that she was merely "*asking for help*," and could not understand why such a comment or request could be interpreted as harassment. ██████ stated that these conversations took place around August or September 2024.

██████ further indicated that Council Member Love frequently visits the ██████, often requesting agenda items before City Council meetings. ██████ has previously advised ██████ staff not to engage in personal conversations with Council Member Love but to only be courteous, listen, and respond to a request as necessary. ██████ indicated that Council Member Love's behavior is unique in this regard and that ██████ does not have to give similar instructions to ██████ staff concerning the other City Council members, who do not engage in these sorts of inappropriate conversations.

██████ recalled that there had been a brief interaction and conversation with Council Member Love regarding a complaint that had been filed against her. At the time of this conversation, ██████ recalled that Council Member Love mentioned that she was preparing to attend a meeting related to this complaint but did not provide further details concerning the nature of the matter. ██████ did not recall Council Member Love identifying any specific employees as complainants. ██████ stated that ██████ has deliberately distanced herself from Council Member Love regarding these sorts of conversations, and in this case, ██████ did not inquire further as to Council Member Love's allegations. ██████ confirmed that ██████ was present during the conversation when Council Member Love spoke about the aforementioned complaint.

Council Member Love admitted to discussing a previous personnel investigation related to ██████ and ██████ with ██████ and ██████, stating, "*I was just referenced that I'd thought it was, a waste of time that the allegations were made. They were false.*" Council Member Love clarified that this conversation took place at the same time with both individuals and did not involve any further details about the complaints. Council Member Love denied that she had specifically identified any City employees as complainants during this discussion with ██████ and ██████. Council Member Love characterized the complaints made against her as a, "*Waste of time*," and, "*False*." Council Member Love emphasized that she made a general comment to ██████ and ██████ rather than discussing specific details of any complaint or investigation.

Here, the greater weight of the evidence demonstrates that Council Member Love did, in fact, disclose during a conversation with ██████ and ██████ that there had been previous personnel complaints made against her and that ██████ recalls Council Member Love referring to ██████ as one of those complainants. Additionally, Council Member Love recalls telling both ██████ and ██████, that the complaints that were made were, "*False*," and that they were, "*Waste of time*." Here, the allegations are **Sustained**.

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS

A. Summary of Interview with [REDACTED]

On January 12, 2025, this fact-finder conducted a Zoom-recorded interview with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] is the [REDACTED] for the City of Gardena. [REDACTED] served as [REDACTED] in 2018 before officially assuming the role in 2019.

[REDACTED] understood that [REDACTED] was being interviewed solely as a witness and was not the subject of this investigation. [REDACTED] acknowledged [REDACTED] obligation to answer all questions completely and honestly to the best of [REDACTED] knowledge and recollection.

[REDACTED] stated that Council Member Love made remarks questioning the fairness and consistency of the Department of Recreation and Human Services. However, [REDACTED] provided explanations that contradicted these claims, emphasizing that department decisions were based on established procedures rather than personal bias.

[REDACTED] stated that when Council Member Love initially took on a dual role with overlapping authority as both a City Council Member and the Director of the Chamber of Commerce, it created an impossible working dynamic and blurred the lines between official City responsibilities and Chamber interests. [REDACTED] believed this was the catalyst for the friction between [REDACTED] department and Council Member Love, as well as the alleged biased treatment claimed by Council Member Love.

[REDACTED] explained, *"She still represents the chamber, so she wants things through the chamber and then wants things as a councilmember. So as the chamber, there is no MOU with the City anymore. That MOU was basically, um, put to an end because of her behavior. And so now, when she wants something as, as the chamber, we treat her like anybody else because there is no MOU, which means she should follow the process, she should follow the requests the way that anybody would, but of course, she doesn't or she'll say she didn't know."*

[REDACTED] further emphasized that this dual role often resulted in Council Member Love expecting City staff to prioritize Chamber initiatives outside of established procedures, which created additional conflict. [REDACTED] explained that Council Member Love tried to do things without going through the proper process and following procedures, and then when she was told no, then it became a problem. [REDACTED] noted that this led to increased tensions when [REDACTED] department insisted on following standard City policies.

[REDACTED] emphasized that the Chamber of Commerce does not have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City of Gardena, meaning it is treated like any other vendor under the City's established procedures. Without a formal agreement outlining the terms of collaboration, the Chamber is required to follow the same procurement, event coordination, and service request processes as external vendors. However, [REDACTED] noted that Council Member Love continuously

CONFIDENTIAL

expected her Chamber-related requests to be expedited and treated differently than other external vendors, which caused friction when we had to enforce standard City procedures.

Despite this, Council Member Love, in her dual role as both a City Council Member and Chamber Director, often operated as though the Chamber held a special status, expecting expedited approvals, fee waivers, or direct involvement from City departments without following standard protocols. [REDACTED] further stated that when Council Member Love requested something from [REDACTED] department, Council Member Love would make a statement that it should be an easy yes or an automatic approval. [REDACTED] responded that without an agreement in place, we had to treat all vendors the same.

[REDACTED] thought that this discrepancy created administrative challenges, as City staff were put in difficult positions when asked to accommodate requests that fell outside standard operating procedures. [REDACTED] reiterated that, in the absence of an MOU, the Chamber was not entitled to preferential treatment and had to adhere to the same guidelines and requirements as any other external organization conducting business with the City.

One example [REDACTED] provided occurred in October 2023, during discussions regarding the Trunk-or-Treat event. Council Member Love insisted that the Chamber of Commerce should receive special accommodations, including waived fees and priority access to City resources. When [REDACTED] upheld City policies requiring all organizations, including the Chamber, to follow standard vendor procedures, Council Member Love expressed frustration and told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] made everything difficult for the Chamber. [REDACTED] responded that there are procedures that she have to follow, and [REDACTED] have to be consistent with all organizations. [REDACTED] further emphasized that without an official MOU between the Chamber and the City, the Chamber could not receive preferential treatment.

A similar incident took place in March 2024, when Council Member Love sought to involve the Chamber in organizing the Cinco de Mayo celebration. Council Member Love allegedly bypassed [REDACTED] and communicated directly with City staff in an attempt to secure Chamber involvement. When [REDACTED] reiterated that all external organizations, including the Chamber, had to submit formal proposals, Council Member Love responded with frustration by alleging that [REDACTED] was the only department head whom Council Member Love was having an issue with Council Member Love procedures on doing things. [REDACTED] maintained that [REDACTED] department followed clear policies to ensure fairness and transparency.

Additionally, [REDACTED] recalled an open-session City Council meeting in July 2024, where Council Member Love publicly questioned why the Recreation and Human Services Department had denied a Chamber proposal related to the Christmas Parade sponsorships. Council Member Love suggested that the denial reflected a personal bias against the Chamber. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had to clarify on the record that the City could not fund additional sponsorships beyond the allocated budget, and the Chamber, like other entities, was required to secure its own funding. *This wasn't about bias; it was about the budget,* [REDACTED] explained.

[REDACTED] emphasized that [REDACTED] department's decisions were guided by established City policies and fiscal responsibility rather than personal bias.

CONFIDENTIAL

█████ remarked that Council Member Love's fluctuating expectations and demands caused inefficiencies and difficulties in managing City operations. Furthermore, █████ believed that Council Member Love's inconsistent interactions with the department and her tendency to circumvent established procedures—particularly when requesting event participation or department involvement—reinforced her perception of preferential treatment and a lack of accountability.

█████ recalled an incident in July 2023 where she felt "ambushed" by Council Member Love during a Chamber of Commerce meeting. █████ stated that she was invited to attend the meeting under the impression that it would be a routine discussion between █████ and Council Member Love about City partnerships with the Chamber. █████ stated that Council Member Love did not mention if they were going to discuss a specific event or anything specific about the meeting. However, once █████ arrived, █████ quickly realized that Council Member Love had turned the meeting into a public interrogation of █████ department's operations, specifically regarding the back-to-school event. █████ stated that █████ felt that █████ was a target in that meeting.

During the meeting, Council Member Love repeatedly questioned the allocation of funds within the Department of Recreation and Human Services, specifically pressing █████ about staffing levels and budget decisions. █████ thought it wasn't a constructive conversation—it was an attempt to undermine █████ in front of the Chamber board members. █████ noted that instead of providing a space for dialogue, Council Member Love continued to press with leading questions that painted █████ department in a negative light. The incident left █████ feeling that Council Member Love was actively working against █████ rather than collaborating for the betterment of City programs.

From November 2023 onward, █████ noticed a distinct change in Council Member Love's behavior toward █████. █████ recounted multiple instances where Council Member Love deliberately ignored █████ during City-related discussions and meetings. Despite being the Director of the Department of Recreation and Human Services, █████ stated that Council Member Love would go out of her way to avoid addressing █████ directly. █████ recalled that there were times █████ would be standing right next to █████ and Council Member Love would act as if █████ wasn't even there.

█████ provided a specific example from a December 2023 City event where several department heads were present. As they discussed logistical arrangements for upcoming programs, Council Member Love engaged in conversation with every other department head in the room except for █████. █████ said that Council Member Love would acknowledge everyone but █████ and that █████ had to interject just to ensure █████ department's role was considered in the planning.

Another instance occurred in early January 2024 during a council meeting where █████ attempted to provide input on a policy affecting community programs. Council Member Love reportedly ignored █████ raised hand and instead directed questions to other staff members who were not directly involved in the program. █████ felt like Council Member Love thought █████ expertise and █████ department's contributions didn't matter.

CONFIDENTIAL

█████ expressed frustration that the Department of Recreation and Human Services was consistently overlooked during City council open session meetings, despite the department's significant contributions to public programs. █████ specifically cited a June 2023 council meeting where multiple departments were publicly commended for their efforts in organizing community initiatives, yet █████ department received no acknowledgment. █████ said " *She doesn't even acknowledge my department in most council meetings, you know.* "

█████ felt that █████ department had worked tirelessly to put these programs together, but when it came time to acknowledge departments publicly, █████ department was left out.

A similar situation occurred in **November 2023** following a City-wide holiday festival. █████ department played a crucial role in coordinating vendors, logistics, and community engagement for the event. However, when Council Member Love addressed the festival's success during an open session, she praised the Public Works and Finance Departments but failed to mention the Department of Recreation and Human Services. █████ stated that that it wasn't just about recognition—it sent a message that █████ department's work wasn't valued, even though they were the ones ensuring these events ran smoothly, and that their efforts were completely ignored.

█████ added that this pattern of exclusion had a demoralizing effect on █████ staff, who felt that their contributions were being disregarded. █████ said that █████ team noticed it too and often asked █████ why they were always left out, to which █████ didn't have a good answer for them.

Regarding the alleged mistreatment on social media, █████ provided an example from **June or July 2023** during the **Community Care Day event**, which Council Member Love attended but later expressed dissatisfaction on social media. Council Member Love posted a comment stating, "*It's like I wasn't even there,*" referring to the event pictures posted by the department.

█████ explained that the department follows consistent social media posting policies, ensuring that all council members are fairly represented. She stated, "*Even when she does come to events that are mine and she doesn't talk to me, if I have a picture of her, I always tell our employees, like, hey, make sure to post everyone so it's consistent. We don't just post, if we take pictures of all the council members, we post the pictures. We try to make sure that everyone at least has some kind of presence.* "

█████ found it inappropriate that Council Member Love would air grievances publicly, stating that such concerns should have been addressed directly to █████ or █████ department. █████ stressed that █████ department makes a conscious effort to be inclusive and impartial in its public materials.

Special Events and Issues

State of the City Event – March 2023

CONFIDENTIAL

- [REDACTED] recalled that Council Member Love, acting as the Chamber Director, attempted to take control of the planning and execution of the State of the City event.
- Council Member Love expected City staff to prioritize Chamber-related tasks without following standard City procedures.
- When [REDACTED] insisted on adhering to City guidelines, Council Member Love reportedly became frustrated and attempted to bypass [REDACTED] by reaching out directly to other City officials and departments.

Cinco de Mayo Event – May 2023

- Another major issue arose when Council Member Love wanted the Chamber of Commerce to play a leading role in the City's Cinco de Mayo celebration.
- Council Member Love allegedly bypassed [REDACTED] in communications, working directly with other City staff to influence event planning.
- When [REDACTED] reiterated that the Chamber must submit formal proposals like any other organization, Council Member Love reportedly expressed frustration and accused [REDACTED] of being uncooperative.

Trunk-or-Treat Event – October 2023

- [REDACTED] detailed an incident involving the Trunk-or-Treat event, where Council Member Love pushed for Chamber involvement and attempted to secure special accommodations.
- The Chamber expected waived City fees and priority access to resources without going through the formal approval process.
- [REDACTED] had to reinforce that, without an MOU, the Chamber must be treated as an external entity and follow the same vendor regulations.
- This created tension, as Council Member Love felt she was being singled out or treated unfairly, while [REDACTED] emphasized that City protocols had to be followed.

Christmas Parade Sponsorship Dispute – December 2023

- [REDACTED] recalled a dispute where Council Member Love attempted to secure a sponsorship deal for the Christmas Parade through the Chamber but expected the City to cover additional costs.
- [REDACTED] clarified that the City could not provide funding beyond what was already allocated, and the Chamber needed to fund its own sponsorships.
- Council Member Love reportedly saw this as an obstacle and suggested that [REDACTED] was deliberately making things difficult for the Chamber.

Allegations of False and Misleading Statements

- [REDACTED], stated that Council Member Love had repeatedly made statements that [REDACTED] believed were false or misleading regarding [REDACTED] department.
- One specific incident involved an allegation that the department had intentionally assigned Council Member Love an unfavorable placement at the National Night Out event. [REDACTED]

CONFIDENTIAL

- █████ asserted that the placement of booths was determined fairly and with consistency, and no intentional slight was made against Council Member Love.
- █████ noted that Council Member Love spread these claims widely, reinforcing a perception of favoritism and inconsistency within the department, which █████ denied.

Claims of Targeting and Scrutiny

- █████ reported that Council Member Love had made statements indicating that she was not a fan of █████ and had gathered information from employees to assess █████ job performance.
- █████ stated that Council Member Love had reached out to employees, including custodians, seeking feedback on department operations, which █████ felt was an attempt to undermine █████ authority.
- One incident involved an accusation that █████ improperly stored alcohol in █████ office. █████ clarified that the alcohol was for City events and was stored securely. █████ believed Council Member Love's statements on this matter were intended to damage █████ credibility.

Claims of Procedural Inconsistencies

- █████ reported that Council Member Love made inconsistent or misleading claims about event organization. One instance involved Council Member Love's dissatisfaction with banner placement and event organization at a harvest festival, despite procedural adherence by the department.
- Council Member Love reportedly submitted conflicting requests for City-sponsored events, which led to misunderstandings and accusations against the department for failing to meet her expectations.

Personal and Professional Dynamic

- █████ described a strained professional relationship with Council Member Love, citing that Council Member Love ignored █████ in public settings, did not acknowledge █████ department's work in council meetings, and selectively engaged with City officials.
- █████ stated that Council Member Love had removed █████ request from the consent calendar, where █████ had proposed the creation of a manager position within █████ department due to concerns about excessive workloads for staff. █████ interpreted this as Council Member Love's attempt to hinder the department's progress.

Social Media Complaints

- █████ provided an example in which Council Member Love attended a City event but later complained on social media that she had been excluded from event photos.
- █████ emphasized that the department follows consistent social media posting policies, ensuring all council members are fairly represented in public materials.

CONFIDENTIAL

B. Summary of Interview with [REDACTED]

On January 6, 2025, this fact-finder, conducted a Zoom-recorded interview with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] is the [REDACTED] for the City of Gardena and has been employed by the City for over eleven years.

[REDACTED] understood that [REDACTED] was being interviewed solely as a witness and was not the subject of this investigation. [REDACTED] acknowledged [REDACTED] obligation to answer all questions completely and honestly to the best of [REDACTED] knowledge and recollection.

Council Member Love's Statements Regarding Employee Complaints

- [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] had been present during conversations in which Council Member Love expressed frustration about complaints allegedly filed against her by City staff.
- [REDACTED] stated that while [REDACTED] did not actively contribute to these conversations, [REDACTED] distinctly recalled Council Member Love mentioning that "*staff has complained about her.*"
- These comments by Council Member Love were made while she was inside the [REDACTED].

Identification of Specific Employees

- [REDACTED] recalled that Council Member Love specifically mentioned [REDACTED] in one of her discussions about complaints.
- Council Member Love allegedly expressed surprise upon learning that [REDACTED] felt harassed by her.
- However, Council Member Love did not provide details about the specific nature of [REDACTED] complaint.

Details About the Complaints

- Council Member Love did not provide specifics about the complaints beyond stating that staff accused her of harassment.
- She appeared to rationalize her behavior, stating that she was merely "*asking for help*" and could not understand why that would be interpreted as harassment.
- The conversation took place around August or September 2024.

Additional Observations

- [REDACTED] indicated that Council Member Love frequently visited the [REDACTED], often requesting agenda items before City Council meetings.
- [REDACTED] had previously advised [REDACTED] staff to avoid engaging in personal conversations with Council Member Love but only to listen and respond to her requests as necessary.
- When asked whether [REDACTED] had given similar instructions regarding other Council members, [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] had not, implying that Council Member Love's behavior

CONFIDENTIAL

was unique in this regard, while other Council members typically did not engage in personal conversations.

- [REDACTED] did not recall hearing Council Member Love make any derogatory remarks about the Department of Recreation and Human Services.

Based on [REDACTED] statement, Council Member Love expressed awareness of complaints filed against her by City employees and specifically mentioned [REDACTED]. However, she did not provide details about the complaints beyond her assertion that she was being unfairly accused of harassment nor did she mention other complainants.

[REDACTED] said that Council Member Love's visits to the [REDACTED] involved frequent discussions about City matters but also occasional expressions of frustration regarding staff complaints against her. However, [REDACTED] maintained that, except for [REDACTED], Council Member Love did not mention any other City employees by name, nor did she provide specifics about the nature of the complaints.

C. Summary of Interview with [REDACTED]

On January 9, 2025, the fact-finder conducted a Zoom-recorded interview with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] for the City of Gardena and has been employed by the City for 30 years, with the last 15 years as a full-time employee. She confirmed that [REDACTED] supervisor is [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] understood that [REDACTED] was being interviewed solely as a witness and was not the subject of this investigation. [REDACTED] acknowledged [REDACTED] obligation to answer all questions completely and honestly to the best of [REDACTED] knowledge and recollection.

Council Member Love's Statements Regarding Employee Complaints

- [REDACTED] confirmed that during a conversation at the "Too Cute to Spook" Halloween event, Council Member Love mentioned that she was under investigation and that certain individuals had filed complaints against her.
- [REDACTED] was taken aback by this disclosure, as [REDACTED] felt it was inappropriate for a council member to discuss an ongoing investigation with [REDACTED].
- Council Member Love did not provide specific details about the nature of the complaints but expressed frustration over the situation.

Identification of Specific Employees

- [REDACTED] stated that Council Member Love specifically identified [REDACTED] and another employee, [REDACTED], as individuals who had made complaints against her.
- Council Member Love implied that [REDACTED] complaint was related to her inquiries about City contracts but did not elaborate further.

CONFIDENTIAL

Complaints About City Partnerships

- [REDACTED] recounted that Council Member Love expressed frustration over the City's partnership with Roosevelt Cemetery for the *Día de los Muertos* event, stating that it was "a slap in the face" that the City collaborated with an external entity while failing to engage with her and the Chamber of Commerce.
- Council Member Love conveyed that she was unaware of the partnership with Roosevelt Cemetery and felt slighted, claiming she was not given the same consideration for City collaborations.
- Council Member Love's concerns appeared to be centered on the perception that she was being excluded from certain City-sponsored events.

Banners at City Events

- During the "Too Cute to Spook" event, Council Member Love confronted [REDACTED] about the absence of a City Council banner at her booth.
- [REDACTED] explained that the event required themed decorations, and the oversight regarding the banner was unintentional.
- Council Member Love expressed that she felt this issue was part of a pattern of mistreatment, stating that such things "always happen to her."
- [REDACTED] noted that other council members present at the event, including [REDACTED], also did not have banners but did not raise concerns.

Council Member Love's Comments

- [REDACTED] described that Council Member Love would make comments that would tend to portray herself as being at odds with the majority of the City Council.
- [REDACTED] recalled that Council Member Love made statements indicating she believed the City Manager, Clint Osorio, treated her unfairly compared to other Council members.
- Council Member Love claimed that Mr. Osorio had previously informed her that the City would not partner with Roosevelt Cemetery, yet the City proceeded with the collaboration, further fueling her belief that she was being excluded.
- [REDACTED] relayed this conversation to [REDACTED] supervisor via text message, noting that [REDACTED] believed Council Member Love was "fishing for information" and sharing details that should not have been discussed with [REDACTED].

Based on [REDACTED] statement, Council Member Love disclosed that she was under investigation and identified [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as complainants. Council Member Love did not provide explicit details about the complaints but expressed frustration about being investigated.

Additionally, Council Member Love voiced her concerns over the City's alleged partnership with Roosevelt Cemetery and her perceived exclusion from City collaborations. She also raised concerns about not having a banner at a City event, attributing it to unfair treatment.

CONFIDENTIAL

██████████ statement suggests that Council Member Love feels isolated within the City government and believes she is being treated differently than other Council members. However, ██████████ confirmed that no efforts or actions were directed or undertaken to exclude Council Member Love from any City activities.

D. Summary of Interview with ██████████

On January 7, 2025, the fact-finder conducted a Zoom-recorded interview with ██████████. ██████████ is the ██████████ for the City of Gardena and has been employed by the City for approximately eight years.

██████████ was represented by ██████████, an attorney with ██████████. ██████████ understood that ██████████ was being interviewed solely as a witness and was not the subject of this investigation. ██████████ acknowledged ██████████ obligation to answer all questions completely and honestly to the best of ██████████ knowledge and recollection.

Council Member Love's Statements Regarding Employee Complaints

- ██████████ confirmed that ██████████ had a brief interaction with Council Member Love regarding a complaint filed against Council Member Love.
- ██████████ stated that Council Member Love mentioned ██████████ was preparing to attend a meeting related to a complaint but did not provide details beyond that.
- ██████████ recalled that this conversation occurred at least a month prior to this interview, though ██████████ could not provide an exact date.

Identification of Specific Employees

- ██████████ did not recall Council Member Love identifying any specific employees as complainants.
- ██████████ was unsure whether Council Member Love herself knew who had filed the complaint at the time of their conversation.

Details About the Complaints

- Council Member Love did not provide specifics about the complaint beyond mentioning that it had been filed against ██████████ and that ██████████ had a meeting regarding the matter.
- ██████████ stated that ██████████ deliberately distanced ██████████ from the conversation and did not inquire further.

Additional Observations

- ██████████ confirmed that ██████████ was present during the conversation where Council Member Love mentioned the complaint.
- ██████████ did not recall any other conversations where Council Member Love discussed the complaint or an investigation related to it.

CONFIDENTIAL

Based on [REDACTED] statement, Council Member Wanda Love mentioned being the subject of a complaint and preparing for a related meeting. However, Council Member Love did not disclose specific details about the complaint, the complainants, or the nature of the allegations.

[REDACTED] statements indicate that [REDACTED] intentionally removed [REDACTED] from the conversation and did not seek additional details.

E. Summary of Interview with Wanda Love

On February 18, 2025, Jeffrey Love, the designated fact finder, conducted a zoom interview with Wanda Love (Council Member Love), a council member with the City of Gardena. Council Member Love was represented by attorney Felton Newell.

Council Member Love was aware that she was the subject of this investigation and acknowledged her obligation to answer all questions completely and honestly to the best of her knowledge and recollection.

Issue: Whether Council Member Love told [REDACTED] [REDACTED] that she felt it was a "slap in the face" that the City did not partner with her for the "Too Cute to Spook" event

Council Member Wanda Love denied ever requesting a partnership with the City for the "Too Cute to Spook" event or any other event. When asked whether she made comments referring to the lack of partnership as a "slap in the face," she explicitly denied using that phrase or any words to that effect. She stated, *"I questioned why my City Council group didn't have my banner up."* Love expressed concerns about a recurring pattern where the City's Parks and Recreation Department set up the City Council booth at community events but did not display her City Council banner, nor was she allowed to put up her own banner.

She reported bringing this issue to the attention of the [REDACTED]. When asked if she voiced concerns about City Manager Clint Osorio in that conversation, Love stated, *"No."* When further pressed about whether she had complaints or concerns about Osorio, she responded, *"None that I want to talk about."*

- Council Member Love denied ever requesting a partnership with the City for this event or any other event.
- She also denied using the phrase "a slap in the face" or any similar expression when discussing the event with [REDACTED].
- However, Council Member Love acknowledged questioning why her City Council banner was not displayed at the event.
- Council Member Love stated that she had raised this issue with the [REDACTED], the [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], as well as possibly with staff members working at events.
- When asked whether she had made any comments about City Manager Clint Osorio regarding this matter, Council Member Love denied having such discussions.

CONFIDENTIAL

Issue: Whether Council Member Love discussed with [REDACTED] that she had learned about City employees who had filed complaints against her

Council Member Love denied discussing any complaints made against her with [REDACTED]. When asked if she specifically mentioned [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] in such a discussion, Council Member Love responded, "No." She also stated that she did not discuss prior investigations regarding these complaints with [REDACTED] or any other employees in the [REDACTED]. However, she acknowledged that she "may have mentioned it to the ladies in the City Manager's Office," referring to a prior investigation.

- Council Member Love denied ever discussing with [REDACTED] any complaints made against her by City employees.
- She specifically stated that she had never mentioned [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] in such a conversation.
- Council Member Love acknowledged that she may have discussed a previous investigation with staff in the City Manager's office but did not recall discussing it with anyone in the [REDACTED].

Allegation: Whether Council Member Love discussed with [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] that she had learned about City employees who had filed complaints against her

Council Member Love admitted to discussing a previous investigation with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], stating, "I just referenced that I thought it was, it was a, a waste of time that the allegations were made. That they were false." She clarified that this conversation took place at the same time with both individuals and did not involve any further details about the complaints. When asked if she could recall when the conversation took place, she responded, "I do not remember."

- Council Member Love confirmed that she had a conversation with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED], during which she referenced a prior investigation.
- She characterized the complaints made against her as "a waste of time" and "false."
- Council Member Love denied that she identified any specific City employees as complainants.
- Council Member Love emphasized that she made a general comment rather than discussing specific details of any complaint or investigation.
- She stated that she did not recall exactly when the conversation occurred.

Allegation: Whether Council Member Love made false and misleading statements about the Department of Recreation and Human Services

When asked if she had told others that she disliked [REDACTED], Council Member Love responded, "I don't have to state that, no, it's obvious." She acknowledged that she had "no relationship" with [REDACTED] and had not interacted with the Recreation Department since being elected. However, she denied ever stating that she disliked [REDACTED]. Council Member

CONFIDENTIAL

Love emphasized that she had concerns regarding her treatment at community events, citing incidents where she felt disrespected.

She specifically referenced the MLK parade, where she was *"placed on a trash truck"* while other council members were assigned better placements. She also noted that at National Night Out, her booth was *"placed in the back of the row of vendors"* while the Mayor was positioned *"front and center."* Council Member Love stated, *"When I'm, I feel like I'm being mistreated, I have the right to question that, and if my questioning is interpreted as harassment, then I, I don't know what to say, but when the treatment is consistent, then it does raise concern."*

Council Member Love stated that she did not make any complaints to the Department of Recreation and Human Services but rather posed her grievances by questioning the decisions made by Department of Recreation and Human Services.

She explained:

*"Wanda Love: Well, it, to me I think there's as difference between a complaint and a question. I question why my booth was placed in a certain place. I question why I got a ****, I questioned why I was put behind a trash truck, I question these things and that was like my questioning is turnin' into a complaint. I don't complain about anything, I will bring to your attention what concerns me.*

Jeff Love: Right.

Wanda Love: Or what I'm aware of or what I notice. What you do about it is up to you, so have I complained, it all depends on your definition of a complaint. Did I bring to your attention that I did not like the fact that I was placed behind a trash truck, or in a convert, in a hard top, or, yeah, so I need to understand the difference between a complaint and a question, 'cause I mean, I think I have the right to question certain things"

Council Member Love described her concerns as *"questions,"* rather than *"complaints."* When asked if she had brought these issues to employees, she responded, *"No, those questions are not asked to those staff members, because those staff members are the, the same staff members that continue to do the same, same behavior. So why would I ask the question to the perpetrator?"*

Regarding allegations of being excluded from event photos on social media, Council Member Love stated, *"Well, let's just say that you could scroll through the City's social media and tell me how many times you see me in the photo."* She asserted that the Parks and Recreation Department oversees the majority of community events and suggested that her exclusion was deliberate, adding, *"If I am there, I'm usually stuck on some end of the photos."*

- Council Member Love denied making any statements to others that could be considered false or misleading about the department.
- When asked if she disliked [REDACTED], she responded: *"I don't like or dislike [REDACTED] not a factor."*
- However, Council Member Love expressed frustration over what she perceived as consistent mistreatment by the department, including:
 - Being placed behind a trash truck at the MLK Parade.

CONFIDENTIAL

- Her City Council booth being placed in the back of the park at events.
- Not being allowed to display her own banner at community events.
- Being assigned a hard-top vehicle instead of a convertible at a parade, unlike other council members.
- Council Member Love stated that she had raised these concerns with the [REDACTED], the [REDACTED], and fellow [REDACTED].
- Regarding social media representation, Council Member Love claimed that her presence in City event photos was minimal and suggested that an investigation into the City's social media pages would show how infrequently she appeared. She stated *"Go look at the City's social media pages and tell me how often I'm in those pictures. I bet it's barely at all."*

Council Member Love denied making statements about the City failing to partner with her for events, discussing complaints filed against her with [REDACTED] employees, and expressing explicit dislike toward [REDACTED]. However, she acknowledged questioning her treatment at events and stated that she had raised these concerns with the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. She also admitted to discussing prior complaints with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] but stated that she only referred to them as *"a waste of time."* Council Member Love expressed frustration over what she perceived as differential treatment in City events and social media representation.

CONFIDENTIAL

EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Number
Report of Findings	1
Transcript of Interview with [REDACTED]	2
Transcript of Interview with [REDACTED]	3
Transcript of Interview with [REDACTED]	4
Transcript of Interview with [REDACTED]	5
Transcript of Interview with Council Member Love	6
Email from [REDACTED] to Mr. Osorio relating to Concerns about Council Member Love's Treatment of [REDACTED] and her Department – October 7, 2024	7
Scope of Investigation	8
Scope of Investigation	9
Report of Finding – Love Investigation - November 18, 2024	10
Social media Screen Capture – Council Member Love writing, “ <i>Wow, as if (sic) was never there.</i> ”	11
Photo Images Provided by [REDACTED]	12
Emails Provided by [REDACTED]	13
Audio/Video Interview Files	14