

Interview of Barry Graham MARKED

[Speaker 1]

You report directly to you work directly with Rachel or somebody else. We have a lieutenant.

[Speaker 2]

Yeah, we have a lieutenant. So this is Detective Dan Peckham, badge number 752, Maricopa County Attorney's Office.

[Speaker 3]

Joined by Detective Michael Lane, 838, County Attorney's Office.

[Speaker 2]

And then Barry, if you could just give your name for the recording.

[Speaker 1]

Councilman Barry Graham, City of Scottsdale. And we're here together at a little after 1 p.m. on February 27, 2025.

[Speaker 2]

Located on Hartford Drive in Scottsdale, Arizona. Yeah, Hartford and Perimeter. So do you mind if I call you Barry?

[Speaker 6]

Yeah.

[Speaker 2]

Okay, so... No, I don't mind. Yes, go ahead.

Okay, so as I told you just a little bit, we both work for the Maricopa County Attorney's Office as detectives there. Obviously, we have a background in law enforcement for close to 30 years each. What we do with the County Attorney's Office, and we're attached to a unit called Special Prosecution 2.

And we handle a lot of different crimes. So crimes and allegations of crimes, I would say. And inquiry type things.

Okay, which is kind of like where we're at on this situation. Trying to determine if it's something that our office would handle based on the facts of the case. We also deal a lot with identity thefts, forgeries, fraudulent schemes, terrorism.

We run the gamut of everything that everyone else doesn't do. It's kind of like what we do in our unit. So, what we're doing is basically just gathering as much information, especially from the three of you.

Because the three of you are the ones that brought things forward, I think, through Rachel Mitchell, the County Attorney. So, we're just kind of...

[Speaker 1]

I think Jan did. And then, yeah, I was reached out to. And I think Adam was reached out to.

Okay, okay.

[Speaker 2]

Yeah, so basically what we're kind of looking for is if you could just give us like a brief kind of synopsis of your background. Educational background, how you got involved with the City of Scottsdale, or in politics in general. And then how you arrived at the assignment of being involved with the City Council.

[Speaker 1]

Okay, so I'm from Arizona. I'm from Scottsdale. Grew up in Scottsdale.

I went away back east for my undergrad and grad school. I got a master's in accounting, undergrad in economics. And then I moved back here and I started my career as a CPA.

And around 2014, I got interested in wanting to serve on commissions and boards. So, I started serving on boards and commissions for the City of Scottsdale in 2014. And I did that for about 10 years.

And there was what I saw. And I noticed sort of a deficit in city leadership, or, you know, an erosion of public trust in city leadership. And so in 2022, I became a candidate for City Council.

And I ran a campaign for City Council. And that's when I was elected. And I've been on the council since January 2023.

So, you know, a little, just slightly more than two years. It's a four-year term. And it's been a lot of fun.

I really enjoy it. The end of 2024, you know, so the way the council works is there's seven members, six council, one mayor, and three, so presidential election years, three of them plus the mayor are on the ballot. And then on midterm years, the other three.

So I'm kind of a midterm council member. And so this last cycle, the first two years, you know, I enjoyed them. But there was very widespread dissatisfaction with the majority council.

And so the voters threw the entire council out. It's never happened before. All four people were thrown out of office.

Well, that's not true. One of them chose not to run. The other four did not, were defeated at the ballot.

And so we have a whole new, this has never happened in Scottsdale. No, that's not true. It has happened.

That, what I just said, has not happened. But then we got four new people starting this year. So which is the majority of the council that are all brand new.

And so that's where we are today. About a month into that, you know, a month and a half into that. Okay.

[Speaker 2]

And who are, and so the four that you're referring to that are brand new are who?

[Speaker 1]

Jan, Adam, Lisa, and Marianne. Okay. Yeah.

Now, Jan and Adam and Lisa used to be a council member on city council for one term. I think, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think it was from 08 to 12. And then Adam was a legislator in the state legislature.

And Jan ran for state legislature a couple of years ago. And she's, you know, she's attuned to a lot of, you know, you know, so. Okay.

She's very knowledgeable. Right. Yeah.

Okay. Mike, anything so far?

[Speaker 2]

I'm sorry, I can't offer you any water right now. Oh, you're fine. We're good.

We're good. Yeah, I appreciate it. Anything, question?

Okay, go ahead. So that's my background.

[Speaker 1]

Okay. Yeah.

[Speaker 4]

Okay.

[Speaker 1]

Is that satisfactory?

[Speaker 4]

Anything else? Sounds interesting. Yeah, it's okay.

[Speaker 1]

It's fun. No, it's really fun. I really enjoy being on the council and it's, you know, it requires a different set of skills and interests.

Sure. That, you know, because you're always thinking about like maybe, you know, who could I ask to run and serve with me? And it's just really hard because you have to, you have to find people with such a variety of skills and strengths.

Yeah. Public speaking, fundraising, but can they understand not? Can they understand, can they understand and master policy?

Right. You know, can they work well with others? Can they play in a sandbox with others?

You know, it's just.

[Speaker 2]

So what is, so with your background as a CPA, does, what is your like main thing within council? Obviously you're a voting member of council. I understand that.

Um, but what is, uh, like when it comes to financial stuff, are you looked up on to kind of answer the questions around like finances of what you're voting on?

[Speaker 1]

I don't, I don't answer the questions. I ask the questions. Okay.

So I use my skills to ask the questions. Okay. Because it's, I'm not, I'm a board of directors, you know, on a, on a \$2 billion organization with 2,700 employees, you know, 400 cops, 400 firefighters, civil servants across, you know, 30 acre or 30 mile city doing all different types of departments.

So I have to ask questions. I am the last line of defense on council for residents when they have questions or when, you know, what their, what is their government doing for them or to them? So I have to ask questions.

And so one of the, one of the ways that I have sort of, um, I think stood out public to the public is that I've asked questions and exposed cost overruns. Okay. Yeah.

Good.

[Speaker 4]

All right.

[Speaker 2]

Um, then let's, let's go into kind of what this, the whole, the crux of the whole thing is about here.

[Speaker 4]

Yeah.

[Speaker 2]

Um, and then kind of, kind of just give it, give your version of, from your point of view, what you've, you're in.

[Speaker 1]

So the, yeah, I guess the issue is that this is about a parking structure in downtown Scottsdale and the parking structure in 2019, the council, the then council referred to the ballot bond package for \$319 million of spending, which included, there were four questions, which included in question two, a community facility or something like that, \$21 million for, for a parking structure in old town, Scottsdale, 16% supported it. So, okay.

Yeah. So this is this parking structure in old town. The way I see it is the fulfillment of the, of the, what the voters told us to do and what they authorize us to sell bonds to be able to have the money to build.

Okay. So that's what this is about. So at the end of, I don't remember the exact dates, but the, the last session at the prior council at the end of 24, we voted on, I think to approve setting out for bid for design, for the, for the public, for the parking structure.

And that was, I don't remember the exact vote on that, but that was with the prior council, but that passed. And then so on, we had a vote this year, so now fast forward on January 28th, 2025, we had the vote to approve the bidding company to just go out and design it because we had spent a lot of time with the past council on site selection. That was the, you know, the, the, the, the ballot didn't specify exactly where the parking structure should be, but we worked it out as a council, you know, on record, like we looked at different options.

So this spot at Brown, you hear it called the first.

[Speaker 4]

Yeah.

[Speaker 1]

Well, it's, it's, it's on Brown between first and second. Okay. So some people, when they say, when they call it Brown and first, they want to emphasize that it's closer to old town because that's next to main street, main street first, when people say Brown second, it's kind of like sort of emphasizing it like it's a bigger, you know, or it's maybe not as close.

So it's a, it's a, the farmer's market. It's not even, that's just, it's a localism, you know, that used to be called something else. I always called it the Brown first or Brown second parking lot.

[Speaker 3]

But was the, the site choice challenges why maybe it took 60 months or community input or there was, so the ballot language said old town parking facility structures that pluralized it.

[Speaker 1]

And so there was another project called the artisan, which was over at Buck board and Indian school right next to coach house. If you know, you've heard of coach house. Yeah.

Yeah. Yeah. There's a park, there's an empty lot just to the east of that where they're, where we approved these, like, I don't know how many 30 or 40 condominiums, like kind of wedge in there.

And then we, um, with the, with the, with the developer, they're going to dig out and put in some public parking underneath that. And so a couple million, a million and a half, whatever went to that. So we were kind of like, that was kind of one of the things leading up to that.

And then, okay, we secured that. And then the city owns other parking lots in the downtown. There was a push from councilor Tammy Caputi, who was not reelected to, to

what I thought was a breach of what the public was asking for, which was to put it over in the bar entertainment district.

And, um, we also owned, we own, uh, which we, we've, we've fought that hard when I say we, I mean, like Kathy Littlefield and me, and I think it was a majority of the prior council. We also own the parking lot. That's where the Panera is at Indian school in Hayden, just behind that where Fudd Rutgers used to be.

And, um, so we, we looked at that as an option. So it just took a while for us to like figure out the artisan thing. And then after that, see how much money you have left over and then where we can get the most bang for our buck.

Sure. So the council liked that spot. Okay.

And, you know, the farmer's market. Okay. I'm brown between first and second.

[Speaker 2]
Yeah.

[Speaker 1]
I know it's very nuanced.

[Speaker 3]
Why don't parking is a big thing with the merchants down there?

[Speaker 1]
Well, we've, you know, we've, we, when I say we, the city, we've removed tons of parking from down there when we expanded giant stadium, we built, I mean, we, they, we, I mean, I say we, but it was like the, we before me. Right. And so it was like, they put a visitor center on giants at Osborne and Osborne which I think has kind of been a waste of money.

I don't think that's really worked out. But that ate a lot of our precious downtown parking. So yeah, we need to get more parking down there.

And so it's like, it's been six years or whatever it's been since the bond election. We still haven't delivered. So the bond election you said was in 18, 19, November, 2019, 68% passed for that question too.

So here we were approaching January 28th and the meeting was on January 24th. We didn't, I find, I found out that the item was been, was removed from the agenda inexplicably, you know, just tied and removed. And I couldn't, I reading from the notice, I couldn't tell that it was like, was it just deferred to a specified date?

It was just like, no, it didn't specify. And so on the, in the January 28th meeting, we held the meeting and I commented on the record about the deferral, the inexplicable deferral. And I commented that the project was very important.

It's a very important project because I made the motion to accept the consent agenda with the modification that item was removed. So I just said, yeah, I just want to make a quick comment. There was item or the number, but that was removed.

And I hope we get that back on. I hope we get that back on the agenda because it's a very important project. Okay.

Yeah. The next day is a Wednesday and the mayor calls me around noon. I'd called her like two or three times before that.

She's just, sometimes she's just hard to get a hold. She's 29. Yeah.

[Speaker 6]
Okay.

[Speaker 1]
She calls me back around noon and instead of asking for the reason why for my calls, first topic she brings up is the parking structure. She expressed a strong distaste for the project. And basically the project, like, because it hadn't been voted on yet, but hiring chassis and to design it, which is kind of hard to, I think it's kind of weird to have a distaste for something that hasn't even been designed, but she expressed a strong distaste for the project.

That old town deserves something progressive. That was a term she used three times. I remind her of the parking structure was voted approved.

The council had spent substantial time on site selection. It had been delayed for several reasons. One of which was her predecessor, mayor Ortega, who also had inexplicably opposed it.

And he, and he was a, and he was a max donor recipient from the Hovi, which I'm sure you knew that, right? I asked her about, so on the phone, I just, this is, I'm just starting. It hasn't really dawned on me what's going on still.

And so I said, well, what is your alternate idea? Like, just tell me what, maybe I can get behind, maybe I'll like it. Maybe I'll love it.

Like, maybe I can get behind it. Can you just share it with me? And she didn't have an idea.

She just basically was just, you know, kind of trashing this idea. She mentioned some vague, some vague idea about, no, maybe we could do like underground parking. And I said, well, the farmer's market already has underground parking.

And I said, the farmer market already has underground parking. And this is how few people pass through here. They're like the only one.

And I said, I said, plus like, I said, plus like underground is very, very expensive. I said, plus my wife hates a lot of people like that. I don't like underground parking.

She's like, oh, well, I don't feel that way about underground parking at all. And so I remember my notes here. She became very frustrated.

And she basically accused me of not wanting to work with her at that point. And she said, she's like, so why did you call me? And I said, well, I called to ask how we can work together and like, you know, what we're, what you want to work on and how I can be a resource.

And she says something to the effect of like, why would you, why would you call me to do that, to say that if you're just going to tell me what to do? And then we just ended the conversation because I was, she saw me as like criticizing and shutting her idea down for the alternate parking garage. So that was Wednesday, the 29th on February 4th, which is a Tuesday.

Without warning, I received an invitation on Outlook from her chief of staff, Terrence Thornton, requesting a meeting for the fifth Wednesday from 11 to noon titled David Hovey parking solution. And it invited her, Terrence, Greg Kane, the city manager, and then Jeff Walter, the assistant city manager. At 4 p.m. I emailed, I got that during the day on Tuesday, and then at 4 p.m. the same day, I wrote back in an email on my government or my city email account. I said, I received your invitation for tomorrow at 11 a.m. titled David Hovey parking solutions. Unfortunately, I won't be able to attend in person. I can attend virtually if a Teams link can be set up.

Slightly, I didn't hear back the next day, Wednesday around before 11 a.m., I speak with Terrence, who tells me that they invited Councilwoman DeBoskus just to avoid open meeting log issues that I didn't have to attend. And so then at 11 a.m. I email Terrence and the mayor and I say, Terrence asked me not to attend at 11 a.m., which I will respect. On Friday, February 7th, I worked from the city hall.

And when I was making my lunch in the break room, so now this is like, that was Wednesday, now it's two days later. I was preparing my lunch in the break room and Terrence comes in and he asked me, he says, so what are we going to do about this boondoggle? And I asked him, I said, well, what do you mean?

And he clarified that he was referring to the David Hovey parking structure design. And he was talking about how it was just impractical. And it was like, I mean, you saw the renderings with the trees and the lush canopy.

Because Janice said that to me and I looked at that. I'm like, how do I get water? How do I get trees up there?

Like, what about the parking? And that left me with the impression that Terrence had very strong doubts about the mayor's recent and firm push for the Hovey parking design. Okay.

Yeah. Later in the afternoon, Councilman Dabowskis was at my office and we were talking about a number of topics when Terrence comes by. And we were just talking about several more topics, one of which was the subcommittee assignments.

After Councilman Dabowskis leaves my office, he brings up the parking garage where he describes that. He describes a little bit more. And he uses phrases like, look, Dave Hovey is a donor.

And things like, we're trying to help him out. Terrence and I acknowledge that the mayor and I weren't on the same page, the parking structure and a couple other projects. Oh, yeah.

We were kind of acknowledging, we're not on the same page with the parking structure and other projects or other topics. And I asked him, I'm like, well, you know, after that topic, I'm like, what can we do to mend fences and work better together? And he says, you know, you just have to bend the knee a little.

Fast forward to the next Friday. And I was working from the next Friday. It was Valentine's Day.

So at around 2 p.m., he stops by again. And we discussed several topics, like where he was going, taking his wife to Valentine's dinner and all that, what I was doing on Valentine's Day. And then I could tell he was stressed.

He was kind of worked up and stressed. And he finally brings up the old town parking garage. And he says, I remember he wrote, he said verbatim, come on and work with me.

And that this garage, this parking garage is eating up my life. The irony is that the next day was when all those flyers were handed out for farmer's market, like to save the farmer's market and stuff. So, I mean, it left me with the impression that he had either been working behind that or maybe he had been, he might have been part of the effort to kind of coordinate that market push.

He stated that Lisa was pressuring him about the parking garage and delivering for donors. He then brings up another, I should have the case number for you. I'm sorry, I don't.

But then he brings up another item that's on an early March agenda. It hasn't happened yet. But it's for a text amendment to one of the overlays for the old town Scottsdale.

And it's basically a zoning restriction that prevents people from putting gyms in our tourism historical town. Because gyms are very parking intensive and it's like you would detract from the tourism. And so he kind of brings that up gently.

And he's like, so you have a hard no on that? I'm like, I don't even know about it. But we'd had a similar very case, identical case about that at the end of 24 that I had voted against because I'm like, we got to protect our old town from, you know, I like gyms and all, but like, we can't put them in our historical town.

And to that, he basically says the applicant is a donor. So we want to help them out. So that's my test.

[Speaker 2]

Is the app is the applicant on that? That's not Hovi, right? Different, different.

This is the March 4.

[Speaker 1]

Yeah, I'm going to pull it. I'm going to pull it up here. I should know that.

Not off the top of your head. I mean, it's, it's the next, it's literally, it's literally the next meeting. Yeah.

I wouldn't know like the ordinance number, but I would kind of like, by the way, are these, are these notes in conversations, public record or will they know it's an ongoing investigation? I don't know how that works.

[Speaker 4]

March 4th. I think it's, let me see if it's. I remember the date.

It's one of my son's birthdays. It's March 4th. How many sons do you have?

I have three boys. Oh wow. That's good.

Oh yeah. I'm looking for it here. Maybe it's not on the March 4th.

Maybe it's March.

[Speaker 2]

And all that is public record, right? Yeah, everything that you guys vote on and stuff and your meetings are on YouTube. They're on YouTube.

And yeah. And probably the city of Scottsdale site, I would imagine.

[Speaker 4]

Maybe it's, I can check real here real quick here on the, maybe it's the March 18th.

[Speaker 2]

Did he say, did he say anything like, was there ever anything said as far as either you do this or something, or there will be some sort of, I don't know how to, how to put it up. Like it would end in a result, which would be bad for you. If that makes any sense.

[Speaker 1]

No, it was just a pressure. I just felt pressure. I see, you know, basically it's kind of like, it just left me with feeling like, like we need to deliver for our donors with a pressure to me.

[Speaker 3]

So did the mayor also make it feel like that as well? In the conversation when she felt like you weren't working with her?

[Speaker 1]

You know, it was after the phone call I had with her on, what date was that? She called me on, after the, after the conversation I had with her on January 29th, I worked strictly with Terrence. With Terrence, her chief of staff.

[Speaker 3]
Yeah. Right. Okay.

But since the mayor took over on all of you, it's pretty inflatable in your roles. Is this the first discourse that you've had with her about aiming?

[Speaker 1]
No, I've talked to her a lot. Okay. Yeah.

[Speaker 3]
What about during the time you, because you served under Ortega, right? Yeah. Did you have any experience, anything like this with him?

I'm trying to understand the rhetoric between the council member and mayor when there's phone calls.

[Speaker 1]
I didn't, I had, I had a very frosty relationship with Mayor Ortega because we just had political differences and so.

[Speaker 2]
And it sounded like that was kind of like the same between with the other people that were, were aware of him, that there was kind of like this.

[Speaker 1]
Yeah.

[Speaker 2]
I guess rift within the kind of between him and other council members. It wasn't like, oh, you know, it wasn't, it didn't seem like from what I've heard, like everyone has a role in mind to make good for the residents of Scottsdale.

[Speaker 1]
But the system's not designed for people to, in my mind, the system is not designed for people to work together necessarily. It's designed for basically like, if and only if you guys can agree, can you do this? Like it's designed to be unwieldy.

So, but I mean, like, I mean, it was weird that Ortega received a lot of donations from and then he was chanting these exact same phrases as Borowski. Yeah. And I always found that bizarre.

[Speaker 2]
And that's kind of like what the other people, the other two that we've spoken to said the same thing.

[Speaker 1]
It's bizarre.

[Speaker 2]

But, but was there, I mean, if, if she does, is there anything wrong with, if, if something has passed to begin with through in a bond hearing, like, like you guys did with this parking garage? Is it completely uncommon for someone to bring forward prior to final approval, which this meeting was for to bring something forward and say, Hey, maybe we should look at doing this instead, like do a different design.

[Speaker 1]

No, completely. No, people do that all the time.

[Speaker 2]

Okay. So, so then why is this so different with the mayor? And I understand your point.

I'm not, I'm not lost on the point of the donor. The donor part of it, I'll be just kind of tearing out the thin air with this.

[Speaker 1]

Well, yeah. What's totally different axiomatically different is that she has an idea with letterhead and all that stuff with city staff sitting there from what I heard from Jan, because I was invited to the meeting too, but I couldn't go saying, saying things like you're going to hire this company. When I, like the city is going to hire this company to do this project.

That to me is, I've never seen that before. To me, that's the departure from the norm. Like making promises already.

Yes. And then put yourself in staff's position. It's like, he's going to be like, I, you don't tell me who to hire.

Like we have a procurement process for that. And now I'm like, here I am sitting here, like, here I am sitting here, like feeling pressure from my boss to, you know, tip the scales in the procurement process to get her to favor her, to favor this person. And my concern about that is that I, you know, I want to protect my staff from improper influence.

Like, cause I look at like, it's like somebody like the city manager, it's like, if he goes and reports this, you know, whether he feels like it's a violator, maybe it's a, it's on the line foul or something. Then, and that gets out like that, that could affect his higher rehire prospects. So instead of reporting it, you know, and exposing it for the public good, somebody like that who may just feel like they're being improperly pressured would just resign and find employment elsewhere.

Say, I got to get out of a toxic situation. And so I don't want him to feel pressured to, I don't want him to feel pressured to do something improper for a boss. And I don't want him to feel pressured to lead the organization because he doesn't feel like he has a place to, an outlet to share his, you know, his observations.

Right. Okay.

[Speaker 3]

Is, would it, I'm trying to think how I can phrase it. She called that meeting and she had the bidder there or potential bidder there. Right.

Is that the part itself that is maybe not the norm? Would it, would it be less odd if she just called the meeting to talk to you guys or one of you to talk about, hey, let's maybe look at. Oh yeah.

Or beautification. Yeah.

[Speaker 4]
Yeah. Okay.

[Speaker 3]
So maybe that's where part of it is coming from is the fact that they actually had the potential architect or bidder in the meeting.

[Speaker 1]
Yeah. Yeah. And here's the thing though.

I think even if she would have just met with us and even had the potential bidder, who happened to be a donor. Right. With just the city council, like one or two city council members.

But here she is. She has, she's in a position of authority over city staff, over the city manager because she hires and fires him. Okay.

She is the only person that can fire him and fire and hire him and promote him or not promote him, but you know, adjust his compensation. So that is where you go enter a different realm because you're, you know, it's like a teacher to a student almost. It's like, it's a manager to a, you know, to, to a supervisee.

So she's basically saying, I have a different idea for this. I'd like to use this potential bidder and somebody who could potentially influence the procurement process feels obligated or improperly influenced or pressured. And the bidder is in the room.

He's sitting right there. Yeah.

[Speaker 2]
But the second process, the second point of the, of going back to council for the final approval, isn't that the checks and balances of it all? And I understand, I understand your point as it relates to the city manager. Okay.

But isn't that the kind of the checks and balances of the whole process? I'm just asking.

[Speaker 1]
So, okay. So imagine this. Imagine if she were to convince three colleagues, me or three others to delay it or whatever.

Now, where does that put the city manager? Now the city manager feels like he has to go and carry out the idea that she wanted. Like, put yourself in his shoes.

She convinces three people and now he's going to be like, well, if I read the tea leaves correctly, we want to make sure that she's influencing me to make sure that he gets the bid, wins the bid. You could argue that theoretically. That's where it departs from anything I've ever seen before.

[Speaker 3]

So in your experience, what do you see as the benefit by voting? Like what's the perception?

[Speaker 1]

I mean, I, I don't know. I've, I've, I've heard that they've been close for many years. Um, I mean, everybody knows that they gave, they max donated to her.

Um, I have been, I've heard from several, multiple source unrelated sources that they've been close for a long time. So there could be kind of a familial or, you know, friendship, you know, closeness. That could be, you know, motivation.

Most of these ideas, it's like you would, you would debate, like you would debate the ideas and abstract, you know, abstractly like, no, I think we should do a, we should use, you know, like I, we should use this lot over here. We should do, but you're not like, Hey, we're going to do this rendering with this guy and city staffs in the room. Never seen that.

It feels incredibly wrong to me.

[Speaker 2]

I think, I think you've answered my question as far as like, you know, I'm just trying to gain an understanding. And obviously what, what we have to look at is, um, you know, we have to go through like, you know, what we do with hard facts. It's not about an idea of what's taking place.

And I don't know if you have any documentation of like anything that she has, where she has said, um, like made statements, made statements, either written or in correspondence to where you would think pushes it a certain direction.

[Speaker 1]

Yeah.

[Speaker 2]

You know what I mean? So it's not an idea of like, I think, I feel like this shouldn't have happened. That's why I have a feeling like it shouldn't have happened.

Yeah. But, but, but where does it come to a point where it's, it's actually, um, something that's provable in, in court, you know? Um, I, I think that's the way that I kind of look at it.

Um, I'm sure there's a lot of things that are improper that takes place in government that we would probably be astounded by, you know, like what the heck, you know, um, that's just my own personal, personal opinion, of course. Yeah.

[Speaker 3]

But, um, have you seen your experience, um, just how uncommon or common is it for a favorable donor to then get contracts or things?

[Speaker 1]

I mean, it's, it's, here's the thing. I have no idea who we picked for, for, for, uh, bidders. It is supposed to be whole and separately separate or whole and separate from the city council, which this process was up until the point of that final of her attempted intervention.

[Speaker 3]

And you're not aware of whether he was one of the last bidders for the contract with Chassie or Chassie if he was, I don't know.

[Speaker 1]

I don't know. It's a good question.

[Speaker 2]

Because the way we understood it talking to, um, Jan was that there were two other, there were two bidders and he wasn't either one of those at the very beginning.

[Speaker 6]

Yeah.

[Speaker 2]

Is that the way you understood it?

[Speaker 6]

Yeah.

[Speaker 3]

Kind of, um, it was Chassie and the other one. I guess what I was wondering on that, because we're, so to speak, midnight hour, suddenly the new bidder comes in when something has already been agreed upon in the 2019 vote that you guys were just waiting for the site to have your consent.

[Speaker 1]

Well, so the vote happened in 2019, but we didn't decide the site until 2024. And then in 24, we voted to authorize somebody, you know, to get a bid for design. And that's, and so we, that's what we voted to accept that, that bidder, um, did Hovey ever contemplate bidding on that?

I don't know. I don't know. And, you know, it's, it is interesting because Hovey, I mean, if you look at the, if you connect the dots, he had an influence on the prior mayor because they were chanting the same talking points about, you know, not basically not doing it.

I don't, there's, there seems to be like a motivation to like stop it from going into that farmer's market that maybe like, I don't know, but, um, or maybe this is the only motivation.

I don't know. But, um, typically I never have any knowledge about who bids, who gets a contract until it arrives on the, you know, packet of council.

I've never even questioned. The only time I ever questioned a bid is if I feel like the bid is high and I'm like, how many bids did we get? Like, are we getting any offers from people?

Like, that's the only time I've ever questioned a bid. So.

[Speaker 3]

Are you aware of at all, the mayor is aware that the three of you have significant concerns or main concerns?

[Speaker 1]

So I haven't, I haven't really spoken. I haven't had an in-depth conversation with the mayor since January 29th. And I, uh, I did not report this, but I think, I think it was Jan, but I was aware of Jan's concerns and her intention to report it.

So I had comfort knowing that it wasn't going to be reported and knowledge of that. So does the mayor, does the mayor know that like the three of us are participating in this? No, no, unless you've told her.

[Speaker 3]

Well, I think, I think what I was getting at was just confirming that since that date, you haven't gotten any further communications from her of her disdain or her name or anything like that.

[Speaker 1]

No, I mean, there's been a, you know, there's been nuanced, subtle stuff, but you know.

[Speaker 2]

No emails or anything like blaring that.

[Speaker 1]

No, she, um, she just raised her voice at me on that day, you know, basically demanding like, well, how dare you? She's like, well, so why did you call me then? I said, well, I called to, you know, see how I can be a resource and see what we can work and try to work together.

And then she says, well, how, how we do that if you're just going to tell me what to do. So, and her idea of definition telling her what to do was, was not getting on board with her amorphous idea for departing from what was on the agenda for the parking structure to move forward with that. So, okay.

[Speaker 2]

Do you have anything else you want to add before I go off record here? Um, what's your email that I can, I'm going to give you, I'm going to give you a business card. It has everything on there.

[Speaker 1]

Mike's information here. Cause then I can just, I can just email this to you for sure. You guys do these interviews all the time like this.

[Speaker 5]

Not too often in this setting. Yeah. This building is like more than half empty.

[Speaker 1]

It is unbelievable.

[Speaker 2]

That is pretty crazy. Sitting here. Yeah.

It's a nice building too.

[Speaker 1]

It's very nice building that parking structure just behind me. They literally built that parking structure and they finished building it like January 2020 and then COVID hit like a month later. And like, cause it was like, and it never, it's never been used.

[Speaker 2]

This interview is concluded at, uh, 1 55 PM, February 27th, 25.

[Speaker 1]

If you guys would personally.