

# COMMITTEE AGAINST RECALL ỦY BAN VẬN ĐỘNG CHỐNG BÃI NHIỆM

## WESTMINSTER UNITED SO-CALLED LIST OF REASONS TO RECALL -- DEBUNKED

Westminster United's listed reasons for recalling the council majority are meritless, basing on half-truths and outright lies against the current council majority.

Below are our responses, backed up with facts and law, to each and every one of WU's so-called reasons for the recall.

1. Tri Ta, Kimberly Ho, and Chi Charlie Nguyen operate as if they are above the law, overseeing a City Council repeatedly accused of corruption, nepotism and favoritism.

**ANSWER:** The iconic Wendy's Hamburger commercial is applicable here: "Where's the beef!?" Allegations and accusations are easy to toss around and yet, WU can't offer a shred of real evidence to back up or corroborate its reckless claims.

**FACT:** There is no inquiry or investigation against any members of the city council being targeted by WU. The three council members are reputable professionals who have spent years contributing to the betterment of Westminster.

2. Mismanagement by Tri Ta and Kimberly Ho, allies on the City Council, has cost taxpayers millions of dollars in discrimination, retaliation and other lawsuit claims and litigation expenses.

**ANSWER:** Once again, WU freely dispenses irresponsible and wild allegations, while revealing that its members do not truly understand the operations or management of a city government.

**FACT:** None of the council members targeted by WU is individually named, nor personally involved in these litigation disputes. City-related lawsuits primarily revolve around employment or work-place disputes among city employees, or by other third parties filing claims against the city. None of these legal claims, if prevailed, stems from any of the council members' personal conduct or activity with the city.

3. As Mayor, Tri Ta has repeatedly operated like a dictator, misusing our city police to pressure local businesses and punish political enemies.

**ANSWER:** A loaded label such as "dictator" levied against a duly elected official by the residents of Westminster does not dignify a serious response when WU resorts to childish name-calling and polemics. But again, a Westminster resident has to wonder that if these allegations have even a grain of truth, then why was there NO investigation to know of, or any legal action taken against the Mayor? None whatsoever with a mayor who has served over 13 years on the Westminster Council.

**FACT:** A mayor cannot be a "dictator" as WU has falsely asserted, if he has only one vote on the council, when at least three votes out of five are needed to move any policy forward. Mayor

Ta has been elected and re-elected in six different elections by the citizens of Westminster, twice as a council member and four times as mayor.

4. Tri Ta, Kimberly Ho and Chi Charlie Nguyen have refused to adopt a strong Code of Conduct for City Officials that denounces ethical violations like nepotism and abuse of public resources.

**ANSWER:** The three above-referenced council members DID vote and pass a Code of Ethics for Westminster, while WU's remaining two council allies voted "NO" against and, "Abstained", from passing the Code! It is rich for WU to complain.

**FACT:** Local elected officials, including city mayors and council members, are required by state law to complete ethics courses every two years and at the time of orientation for newly elected officials. Elected officials are also required to comply with numerous political and financial reporting requirements with the state, and as public figures, not to run afoul of any criminal and election laws governing the same.

5. Tri Ta, Kimberly Ho and Chi Charlie Nguyen passed a new rule giving themselves complete power over City Council agendas, silencing opponents by barring other council members from adding items for discussion.

**ANSWER:** Another false allegation. The new rule is designed to reduce political grandstanding and abuse of city resource by members of the city council, which now requires three council members' assent prior to having the item placed on the council agenda. This process induces the council members to work collaboratively together if they want to move a council item forward with a simple majority, while reducing conflict and wasting staff time and resource.

**FACT:** No council member is being silenced by the new rule and can freely speak on any council issues and items. The rule will reduce political abuse of the council hearing as a campaign platform for certain issues that has little or no merit, other than to waste city resource. With the new rule, collaboration is an imperative for any council member who wants to get his/her issue on the agenda.

6. Instead of spending the funds to fight homelessness, make housing more affordable or increase public safety, Tri Ta and Kimberly Ho voted to spend over half a million dollars over the next three years on pay raises for his upper management employees, increasing one employee's pay to \$304,015 a year in salary and benefits.

**ANSWER:** Westminster is on the front line of fighting the plague of homelessness and partnering with other cities and the county to deal with this region-wide issue. Westminster is building as well as allocating for more affordable housing units in the city for senior residents and low income families in light of rising home prices and rental rates.

**FACT:** With well over 300 employees serving 100,000 Westminster residents, WU is niggling dollars over a three-year contract with those employees who are trying to take care of their families and earn a living wage in light of annual cost increases and inflation. The labor

contracts negotiated with city employees are serious, detailed and thoughtful, taking into account the need to balance the budget and saving money for the city's tax payers.

7. As Council members, Kimberly Ho and Chi Charlie Nguyen have engaged in nepotism by appointing each other's children to City commissions and not disclosing this to the public or even the other City Council Members before the vote to approve.

**ANSWER:** Collins Dictionary succinctly defines "nepotism" as "the unfair use of power in order to get jobs or other benefits for your family or friends". Again, WU is crying wolf over a spurious issue. The appointment process is open to public scrutiny and all written records are available for anyone to review. One has to wonder about the double and triple standard WU is imposing on its current council targets. Where was WU when many other council members appointed their relatives to city commissions and boards, among them Margie Rice, Mayor Ta's predecessor? Where was the complaint then?

**FACT:** Clearly, the claims don't fit the facts. All appointments made by council members Ho and Nguyen must go through an application and interview process, in which interested residents must submit their written applications. Council members Nguyen and Ho appointed Westminster residents who care about the welfare of the city, while possessing qualified credentials and needed experience to serve in these positions, which are non-compensated, voluntary and without any employment benefits.

8. Chi Charlie Nguyen placed the City at risk for an Age Discrimination lawsuit for his failure to contact applicants for Planning Commissioner who indicated they are retired or semi-retired. Chi Charlie Nguyen stated on video that he wanted someone "young and energetic" for that appointment.

**ANSWER:** This charge is most laughable but for its devious intent – to stir up the resentment of senior residents of the city against council member Nguyen, who is at an age to qualify for AARP membership himself! The board and commission application process is open, transparent and process-oriented. Any resident, regardless of age, color or creed, is welcomed to apply and participate in the activities of the city, and council member Nguyen would endorse more participation from all residents.

**FACT:** WU is nitpicking and misinterpreting council member Nguyen's intent so to squeeze through its own petty interpretation for the recall. Council member Nguyen would interview any interested applicant for the position and would make a recommendation based on many objective factors, including their ability to perform the duties and their enthusiasm for the same.

9. Tri Ta and Kimberly Ho railroaded the approval of a Westminster Welcoming Center to one organization without offering any second bidders, doing it in only one meeting without proper planning documentation, approving to lease our city land to them for only \$1 per year for a minimum of 10 years.

**ANSWER:** Similar to other baseless aspersions against the council majority contained in this list, WU first inclination is to resort to name-calling and engaging in pejoratives to express its

disagreement with the council, all without any logic or facts to back up its assertions. Located at Freedom Park, the Vietnam War Memorial was offered the construction of a small museum and welcome center, which it sorely lacks since the opening of the Memorial over 15 years ago. This offer is a not a public works contract nor does it involves any city funds, since the applicant proposed to fully fund the structure's construction and operation, all with private money. In this case, there is no requirement for public bids.

**FACT:** The permit issued to this private organization is preliminary and only the first step in the many legal and logistical steps to be completed prior to the construction of this project. There are a number of phases and many procedures that the organization has to satisfy per the city's requirements even before receiving permission to lay the first brick on the ground.

10. Tri Ta willfully abused the power of Mayor for personal gain by granting a City Resolution to a Vietnamese actress for a movie made in communist Vietnam to support his existing family business as a self-proclaimed screenwriter and producer of Vietnamese movies, while not notifying other City Council Members using their names.

**ANSWER:** Speaking of a movie, this fantastic allegation comes straight out of Fantasy Land -- full of cynicism, falsehood and exaggeration. Resolutions are dispensed on a regular basis by the mayor and council members to distinguished individuals or guests visiting Westminster. The mayor, as the elected head of the city, is vested with the full authority, as in tradition and by law, to present resolutions to recipients on behalf of the entire city council and for the city. This is done in the normal course of Mayor Ta's official conduct as the representative of the city.

**FACT:** The recipient of the resolution is a well-known Norwegian of Vietnamese descent, who starred in a move with a laudable theme of combating against child trafficking and slavery. Over the years, the Westminster Police Department and Mayor Ta have been involved with local law enforcement in preventing these crimes from happening in the city, given its high immigrant population and the number of newcomers working in the city.

11. Tri Ta's incompetence has wasted taxpayer money on litigation settlements and complaint payouts, and the loss of public confidence due to a series of accusations against the city and/or city council that go uncorrected, while he approved hiding behind non-disclosure agreements that encourage copy-cat lawsuits.

**ANSWER:** Trying to scape-goat Mayor Ta for legal settlements on behalf of Westminster so to fit WU's twisted version of truth really smacks of bias and unfairness. Mayor Ta, along with his council colleagues, may have saved Westminster millions of dollars by settling legal disputes that should be settled so to prevent costly and protracted litigation, further burdening the city. As one member of the city council, Ta cannot settle on a single case if there are no other council members concurring that would comprise a majority.

**FACT:** Legal settlements, confidential or otherwise, are common tradition and practices in the American judicial system, for which the courts encourage the parties to do so to save money, further reduce stress and save court resources. If Ta lose so much confidence of Westminster's

residents, as WU falsely alleged, then how was he able to get elected and re-elected Mayor 4 times, and had served in such capacity for over seven years?

12. While maintaining a large home in Yorba Linda, Kimberly Ho listed her home address as a UPS P.O. Box in Westminster when she completed her application for Westminster's Planning Commission. To this date, Kimberly and multiple immediate family members have cars registrations to the same Yorba Linda home, although she now claims that she also lives in a small apartment.

**ANSWER:** Why does WU has a problem with Dr. Ho, a successful businesswoman, owning property in another city while residing in Westminster? Her children are educated adults and they are free to live wherever they chose, in Yorba Linda or anywhere else. It is silly and frivolous to include this reason for recalling Dr. Ho, which makes little sense. An attempt by WU to make an issue of Dr. Ho's residency has no traction.

**FACT:** Dr. Ho is a resident of Westminster and she is registered in the city as a voter, with businesses in the city as well. As such, she has complied with all residency laws and has no issue with any government agency.

13. Tri Ta, Kimberly Ho, and Chi Charlie Nguyen refused to implement a 12-page Code of Ethics and Conduct once they realized that they had already broken multiple points in that code, voting to implement a watered-down 1-page Code of Ethics instead, which omitted nearly all of the Code of Conduct.

**ANSWER:** The council majority refuses to engage in the game of self-sanctimony and grandstanding by freshman council member Tai Do, whose own personal conduct is not exactly stellar, just to be kind. The council majority passed the Code of Ethics, adopting the contents of the Code from other neighboring cities, which worked just fine with their identical versions. Fundamentally, ethics are values and morals deeply held and internalized by each individual, based on that person's life experience and the positive lessons learned from others, not from a 12-page guideline that is full contradictions, off-based assumptions, and impractical restrictions that borders on violating an official's First Amendment right to free speech and association.

**FACT:** The Council refuses to play freshman council member Tai Do's game, knowing that it was a publicity stunt used to shield some of his own ethical shortcomings from the public. He failed miserably. Please refer to our "Answer" and "Fact" portion in Number 4 above for more information, which essentially addresses WU's hollow claim.

14. Tri Ta and Kimberly Ho wasted over \$68,000 of tax-payer money to promote a four-year term for Mayor on a special election when had they waited only three to five months later the cost would have been less than \$1,000. They continue unethical actions and voting for selfish admission rather than the best interest of the city.

**ANSWER:** Another lie conjures up by WU. The voters of Westminster saw fit to vote for the extension of the Mayor's term from 2 to 4 years in a regularly scheduled election called the

primary Election, which was conducted in June of 2018. This ridiculous allegation comes from the very same people who may cause Westminster taxpayers to foot for a special recall election bill estimated to be over \$372,000.00 this coming year!

**FACT:** Mayor Ta and Vice-Mayor Ho supported the extension of the mayors' term from two to four years and city voters overwhelmingly agreed with them. Westminster voters were so confident in Mayor Ta's ability and leadership that they increased his mayoral tenure to four years and re-elected him to the position. Point made.

15. When another Council Member requested a discussion for Term Limits, Tri Ta, Kimberly Ho and Chi Charlie Nguyen spoke against Term Limits. To bury the discussion, Kimberly Ho made a substitute motion that a committee be made to discuss the issue without the other Council Member. It has been buried and has never resurfaced.

**ANSWER:** This allegation is dead on arrival. Term limits discussions are ongoing since the beginning of this year and the council majority is interested in tackling this issue head-on, despite the attendant controversy. As with many public issues, there are pros and cons to each side. Some cities in Orange County have terms limits while others do not, but the council majority did, in fact, pass a term-limit proposal, scheduled to be voted on at the next election.

**FACT:** In its September 11, 2019 hearing, the council majority approved a proposal to impose a straight life-time limit of 12 years for council members and mayor, without the option of coming back for election after a grace period of two years. This proposal will be up for a vote in next year's election. Interestingly, freshman council member Tai Do, an ardent supporter of the recall against the council majority, voted "NO" on the term limits proposals! The word hypocrisy comes to mind.

16. When another Council Member requested a discussion to develop a Code of Ethics and Conduct for the City Council, again Kimberly Ho made a substitute motion to bury his participation by making a committee without him to develop the draft code. Ultimately, the draft created was rejected by Tri Ta, Kimberly Ho and Chi Charlie Nguyen anyway.

**ANSWER:** WU must be really scraping the bottom of the barrel to dredge up this ridiculous assertion, questioning a council member's motive without any fact to back up the claim. Again, after reading this particular question, does WU seriously believe that voters will recall the council majority for this?

**FACT:** The draft created by the subcommittee was rejected because one of the members on the subcommittee had a conflict of interest and was biased. Moreover, the draft submitted was rightfully rejected because its contents went beyond the scope of topics and activities set for coverage by the council, while many of its provisions are tied the hands of council members from doing their job, contradictory in language, and overreaching.

17. Kimberly Ho threatened a lawsuit against another City Council Member explaining that he is new to the council and should maintain "status quo".

**ANSWER:** Let's call a spade a spade. Freshman council member Tai Do has proven to be a divider and a negative force even before he got on the council. He speaks out of turn, improperly questions other council members' motives and intentions, and loves to grandstand on the dais as if he is still campaigning for city council. His conduct is unbecoming and unprofessional and he has been formally condemned by the city council for defaming Westminster on his own Facebook account as "Ho Chi Minh City"!

**FACT:** In one council hearing, Dr. Ho admonished freshman council member Tai Do for repeatedly impugning on his council colleagues, calling on him to stop before crossing the line of libel. As a newly minted council member who has never been elected to anything else, Do has plenty of time in his four-year tenure to sit back and learn the legislative process and consult with his council colleagues on the ins-and-outs of the city during his first several months in office, instead of being a "bull in the china shop", creating political turmoil and division on and off the council dais.

18. Chi Charlie Nguyen has repeatedly justified his daughter's appointment to a Commission stating multiple times that Commissioners are just volunteers. He has been corrected many times by the city's administration that Commissioners are part-time employees, paid, and receive modest benefits too.

**ANSWER:** City commission/board members are indeed volunteers who wanted to serve Westminster. They receive no real compensation, 401-K contributions, or pension and insurance benefits. If there is any monetary dispensation to a commission/board member, which most do not get, the modest allowance barely covers for reimbursement for out-of-pocket costs for the commission/board members to perform their duty.

**FACT:** WU selectively likes to pick on council member Nguyen's daughter, who is a highly qualified young professional desiring to contribute her time and energy to the city. She went through an application process like any other applicant and was duly appointed based on her experience and ability to serve her home town. Again, it's just puzzling that WU would hold council member Nguyen to one particular standard, while it went on indefinite and complete radio silence with its own supporter, Margie Rice, when she appointed her daughter to a commission when Rice served on the council. The refrain, "Cry me a river" comes to mind.

19. Tri Ta appointed a local journalist to a Commission, even though he knows it is a conflict of interest. A national association of journalists made it an ethics policy that journalists shall not be appointed to government positions. The California Superintendent of Education disqualified the same individual from a commission for the same reason. Yet, the Mayor refused to correct the issue.

**ANSWER:** The journalist in question is a long time resident of Westminster and he is passionate about serving his home town. Equally important, he is experienced, professional, and proves to be an asset to the commission that he serves on as he understands the local process and the issues involving the city. There is no conflict whatsoever when he does not write stories or cover subjects that he has jurisdiction on or having to consider as a commission member.

**FACT:** Another false and desperate canard lobbed by WU. The local newspaper has no issue with the journalist serving on a commission in the very city in which he resides in. He does not write on topics or issues that he has a vote on, or vice versa. As a matter of fact, WU and its members cannot show a single instance or incident in which this journalist in question has actually violated a conflict of interest guideline or law by voting on or discussing at a commission hearing on a project or issue that he has direct jurisdiction over. Just like all the other wild claims and baseless allegations, WU blows a lot of smoke but always come up short with a single example of wrongdoing to back up its own allegations. WU played these unsubstantiated accusations like a broken record, but full of bad songs.

20. When a Council Member asked the city to follow policy and procedure, Kimberly Ho criticized him for not having a law degree insinuating that he should not request proper protocol.

**ANSWER:** Seriously? WU listed this as a reason to recall Dr. Ho? WU would have a more defensible, but not necessarily better, argument for recalling Dr. Ho for expressing her emotions on the council dais. This recall reason does not deserve a serious response and it will not get one because it is plain silly.

**FACT:** Dr. Ho did not insinuate anything other than to tell Freshman council member Tai Do, who had barely served 4 months on the council at the time, for not understanding the legislative process and procedures, which are based in law. For Freshman council member Do, Dr. Ho is correct in saying that he does not have a law degree because he possesses little, if any decorum as a local elected official, or does he fully comprehends his role as a council member. Not that a law degree is required to be a council member, but in Tai Do's case, the legal credentials could help him with his job and substantially improve his knowledge.

21. In the press Kimberly Ho insinuated that she, Mayor Tri Ta and Council Member Charlie Nguyen always vote as a block. To date she is correct. They never vote differently from each other and have created a minimum 3-2 majority on all items.

**ANSWER:** Alright. This reason is the definition of silliness, times ten. This is absolutely not a reason to recall a council member. City councils cannot move a pebble if there is not at least a simple majority supporting the move, which is usually 3 out of 5 votes in most small and medium-sized cities in California. There is no prohibition or legal violation if these council votes came out 3-2 on many issues. Is it also block-voting, by WU definition and standard, when its political allies came out on the short end of "2" very time? Also saying that they never vote differently is totally a false accusation. The meeting minutes and the recording videos are the proofs for the actions taken during the meeting.

**FACT:** This reason retains a deeper meaning for WU and its allies. Some of its candidates lost the election last November and are now eating sour grapes, instigating a meritless recall of the council majority because its candidates could not win at the polls. The voting block argument, which is a non-issue and spurious, simply reveals the harsh truth that WU and its members can't build a mandate in Westminster. Elections do have consequences!

22. Tri Ta blatantly intimidates critics, especially those who don't speak English well. For example, during a Council meeting he intimidated residents by asking them to state their full address when speaking publicly (so everyone will know where you live, steaming live when you are not even home). This is not a government requirement.

**ANSWER:** Nice try WU for your cynical attempt to pit Mayor Ta, an immigrant whose English is a second language, against other Westminster residents. WU stoops pretty low with this one reason, which reeks of desperation. Asking a speaker at the podium to state his/her address to determine whether the speaker is a city resident, or not, is intimidation? Mayor Ta has the right to ask and take into account where the speaker resides, in or outside his city, prior to the speaker's comments.

**FACT:** Under Oral Communications, part 2 of the agenda, clearly stated that *“any person wishing to address the city council should complete a green speaker slip that is provided at the entrance to the council chambers and submit the card to the city clerk. **When your name is called, please step to the podium at that time and state your name and city of residence for the record**”*. Note that the city clerk reads the statement above at every meeting before the first speaker approaches the podium, and the agenda is always posted at least 72 hours before each city regular meeting; and the hard copies always provided to everyone at the meeting.

Even if it's not a government requirement to give one's address when speaking before the city council, but nor is it a prohibition for a mayor to ask the speaker where he/she lives so to determine the quality and relevance of the comment. That is not intimidation. It's common sense. The speaker does not have to answer but that does not preclude the mayor from asking.

23. For personal reasons unrelated to city business, Tri Ta moved a meeting to 5 pm instead of the regular 7 pm and limited public speaking to only two minutes instead of the regular five minutes. This was a meeting when he knew there would be a lot of public disagreement with his agenda item, thereby limited those who cannot attend after work at 5 pm and limiting speaking time as well.

**ANSWER:** Only if WU's non-stop whining and complaining has some truth in them, it may mean something, but never enough of a reason to recall three council members. Council hearings, which are bi-weekly, are scheduled to start at 7:00 PM. Closed session usually starts half to an hour before and it is confidential. Speakers have ample time to speak and present their opinions, including bi-lingual translations which are accommodated with more time. There are no serious time constraints for the speakers at the public comments part of the agenda and there has been few if any complaints from the public, and only from WU. One wonders.

**FACT:** Recent council meetings have run well past midnight, despite starting on time. Even with a 2-minute speaking rule, one meeting passed 1:00 AM, not exactly an ideal time for clear thinking and freshness of thought and energy. If there are many speakers and the council agenda is packed, not only Westminster, but any other cities in California, will use its reasonable discretion to set the time rule and procedural order so to manage the hearing much more effectively. This prerogative is fully legal.

24. The Political Action Committee (PAC) that financially supports Tri Ta, Kimberly Ho and Chi Charlie Nguyen has accepted tens of thousands of dollars from a developer who wants to redevelop the Civic Center for other purposes, stating in meeting with Seniors that he wants to remove the Senior Center as well. They accept “pay to play” contributions.

**ANSWER:** Again, this is no reason to justify a recall, far from it. Elected officials from local to federal level regularly solicit campaign contributions from numerous sources and individuals. As long as these contributions are legal and the official complies with all reporting laws and the Election Codes, there is nothing wrong with accepting political donations. In fact, it is a common practice and a fact of life for candidates and elected officials to receive donations from PACs. There is nothing illegal with this. Recipients must submit contribution reports in a transparent and timely manner, as required by law. As for council member Nguyen, the decision to redevelop the Civic Center was decided by the previous council members before he joins. Again, this clearly stated that WU has no idea of what they were talking about.

**FACT:** There is no “pay to play” politics in Westminster as the council majority knows that this is against the law, exposing violators to criminal prosecution. This is Politics 101 and the council majority respects this prohibition, as it curbs corruption and abuse of power. There is no evidence of any improper exchange and WU is well aware of this, as it could not produce a glint of evidence to back up its wild and unsubstantiated charges.

25. As seen in a picture dated June 4, 2019 from a news article, the Mayor Tri Ta and Council Members Chi Charlie Nguyen and Kimberly Ho meet together to discuss city business which is considered a direct violation of the Brown Act making their actions illegal. Social appearance together are ok if they are not discussing city business, but this meeting as well as others addressed city business with members of the public and press present. This particular event took place at Kimberly Ho’s place of business with her skin care products on display.

**ANSWER:** At this stage, WU is very well practiced in the dark art of twists and contortions to justify any reasons for its ill-fated recall campaign against the council majority. But the facts are still the facts. There was no Brown Act violation or any other legal issues related to this meeting, as no policy or future contemplated action by the council majority discussed on any matter related to Westminster. It was an informational-based community meeting on the issue of accessory dwelling units, also known as “granny flats”. No secrets were held. No city policy considered, and no vote taken, verbally or otherwise.

**FACT:** If there was a serious Brown Act violation, as WU alleges, then what is the disposition or action from the local District Attorney, whose office has jurisdiction to enforce this law? There is none. Enough said.

**CONCLUSION:** As a result of their lack of critical thinking, servant leadership and effective management, the city’s troubles have grown in visual blight, vacant businesses, reduced police force, multiple employee and police lawsuits, vagrant encampments in our parks, and financial struggles that forced a tax increase.

**COUNTER CONCLUSION:** In its 25 so-called listed reasons for recalling the council majority, WU offered up a stale dish full of unsubstantiated accusations, selective complaints bordering on racial prejudice, exaggerated complaints, and contradictory claims. Even worse, not a crumb of hard, independent, verifiable evidence is offered to back up the wild allegations made against the council majority. WU's recall attempt is meritless and politically suspect.

Despite the political harassments and threats, the council majority is doing a diligent job representing Westminster. Mayor Ta, Vice-Mayor Ho and council member Nguyen are long-time locals who have contributed money, time and energy to build Westminster into a better place to work and live. They are dedicated servants duly entrusted with your vote to represent the best interest of the city, and they have done a good job for the residents of this city, balancing the budget, providing the needed public safety resource, fixing the roads and infrastructure, and keeping taxes low.

Westminster United should be more appropriately named as "Westminster Divided". Given the group's divisive activities over the past several months throughout the city and at city council hearings, the residents of Westminster should strongly reject this meritless recall to send a clear message to any political agitators to pack their bags and get out of town.