

Montague: A City In Chaos

SUMMARY

The Siskiyou County Civil Grand Jury (Civil Grand Jury) investigated the City of Montague's leadership, administration, and the operations of several City departments. The investigation focused on issues involving:

- 1) A City official holding simultaneous incompatible offices as both a Mayor/City Council Member and as the Department Head for the City of Montague Fire Department.
- 2.) Serious training and safety issues identified within the City Fire and Code Enforcement Departments.
- 3.) Numerous Conflicts of Interest, some involving City contracts with a City Council member's private pest control business.
- 4.) Problematic City Council seat vacancy practices.
- 5.) A disorganized records management system impacting City operations.

Based on a review of City ordinances, records, meeting agendas & minutes, policies and procedures, witness interviews conducted, financial records, contracts, applicable State agency guidance and law, the Civil Grand Jury found evidence of organizational weaknesses including a City officer holding simultaneous incompatible offices and contracting with the City that warrant corrective action, a desperate need to overhaul the City Fire Department's training and safety policies and procedures to comply with applicable State law.

This report also finds that the absence of clear structural controls and documented procedures may increase the risk of non-compliance with applicable law, operational confusion, and loss of public trust and confidence as well as public safety.

BACKGROUND

The City of Montague, California, is a general law city located in rural Siskiyou County, California. The City is governed by a five-person City Council whose members are elected and serve four-year terms. Pursuant to City ordinance number 2.20.040, the City Council votes to appoint one of its Council members as the City Mayor. The mayor is not an independently elected position, as the mayorship rotates among the City Council members. The City Council holds its public meetings once per month. Those meetings are recorded and are stored electronically and available to the public. The City Administrator, supported by City Department Heads and staff, is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the City. The City Council hires the City Administrator and Department Heads, who serve at the will of the City Council.

METHODOLOGY

The Siskiyou County Civil Grand Jury reviewed the following materials during this investigation:

- Review of City financial records, contracts, invoices, policies and procedures, ordinances, municipal codes, and other relevant documents and materials concerning the City of Montague.
- Review of recordings of the meetings of the City Council, including copies of agendas and minutes.
- Interviews with subject matter experts on the issues addressed in this report. The Civil Grand Jury conducted in-person interviews of more than 30 individuals, including current and former City employees, fire department personnel, City Council members, county officials, fire service personnel from other departments, and

residents. (Names and titles of interviewees are not disclosed in this report to protect confidentiality.)

- Statements and letters of no confidence, City practices, staffing concerns, and administrative actions.
- References to municipal governance statutes, Conflict-of- Interest provisions, public meeting requirements, and privacy laws.
- Descriptions of City operations, City Fire Department management practices, and website or records-posting issues.

DISCUSSION

A. INCOMPATIBLE OFFICES

One of the problems this Civil Grand Jury found in its investigation into the City of Montague was the issue of possible incompatible offices with the City Fire Chief position being held simultaneously by the City Mayor/Council member. The City Fire Chief is the Department Head of the City Fire Department and serves at the pleasure of the City Council. The Mayor/City Council member position exercises supervisory, auditing, discipline and removal powers over the position of City Fire Chief, where holding both positions simultaneously creates a seemingly significant conflict of interest, clash of duties and divided loyalties between the two roles. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 1099, it is improper for a public official to hold two incompatible offices simultaneously when the duties, loyalties, and interests between the two roles are conflicted as such. A consequence of not complying with Government Code Section 1099 is that, if a public official accepts a second, incompatible office, they are automatically deemed to have forfeited the first office. This means that as soon as the second incompatible office is accepted, the first office is automatically vacated, and the first position is forfeited.

The Mayor/City Council member automatically assumed the role as the Montague City Acting Fire Chief after the former Fire Chief's was put on administrative leave on April 26, 2024. Prior to holding the City Fire Chief position, the Mayor/City Council member held the position of Assistant Fire Chief from 2020 until the day the former Fire Chief resigned on April 2, 2026, **he then became Fire Chief**, pursuant to City of Montague Fire Department by-laws 7.5.2, which states that the Assistant Chief shall assume the responsibilities of the Chief in his or her absence and the Assistant Fire Chief shall take complete charge of the City Fire Department and be invested in the same authorities and duties while doing so.

The moment that the previous Fire Chief separated from the City on April 2, 2026, the Assistant and Acting Fire Chief **became the Fire Chief** pursuant to City of Montague Municipal Code Section 2.12.070, and at that juncture he should have resigned his office of Mayor/City Council member to the City Council pursuant to California Government Code section 1099.

Additionally troubling, when asked by the Civil Grand Jury during this investigation, the City was unable to produce a city organizational chart. It is unclear whether the lack of an organizational chart has led to confusion as to which offices and positions are incompatible within the City, however, having such an organizational chart would possibly provide clarity to City decision makers when considering appointing themselves to positions to which they supervise and control. Competent legal guidance and conflict-of-interest training would also be beneficial to the City of Montague City Council members to avoid such serious conflicts of interest in the future.

B. ABSENCE OF PROPER TRAINING AND SAFETY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

After the Mayor/City Council member assumed the duty of the department head position of Acting Fire Chief on or about April 26, 2024, the City received several letters of no confidence filed against the new Fire Chief, citing his lack of professionalism. Firefighters indicated that they feared for their lives due to his lack of adequate safety training, his inability to perform under pressure, and canceling a mutual aid agreement with another Fire Department due to what the firefighters saw as personal issues.

During the course of the Civil Grand Jury's investigation and witness interviews, the issues of lack of adequate training and safety policies and procedures for the City Fire Department were raised numerous times. The Civil Grand Jury learned during those interviews that the Fire Chief/Mayor/ City Council member oversaw safety and medical training and getting the firefighters certified for such. The Civil Grand Jury also discovered, through relevant State Agency (Sierra Sacramento Valley Emergency Medical Services Agency) (S-SV EMS) that the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member was himself providing medical training and was not properly certified or licensed to provide such training to the firefighters. As part of its investigation, the Civil Grand Jury contacted the State agency, (S-SV EMS) in charge of certifying firefighting trainers and discovered that the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member was not authorized to provide medical training, even though, when interviewed by the Civil Grand Jury, the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member testified under oath he was certified to provide such safety and medical training, which State Agency, (S-SV EMS) officials have contradicted. The Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member also told the Civil Grand Jury that he hired a certain instructor

to provide additional medical training, however, when we interviewed that individual and contacted the State Agency (S-SV EMS) to verify their certifications, that individual was also not qualified, licensed or certified to provide such training since 2023, through Sierria Sacramento Valley Emergency Medical Services Agency (S-SV EMS).

Based upon what the Civil Grand Jury learned from the State Agency (S-SV EMS) and various witness interviews, the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council appears to not be properly certified, licensed or trained to instruct others in the medical training in compliance with State laws and guidelines, which, such lack of proper training has revealed itself over and over, as we will discuss.

In one such instance, on November 30, 2025, according to eyewitnesses, the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member donned his City Fire Department Personnel Protective Equipment (PPE) without first checking the air pressure in his air tank and proceeded to enter a burning structure. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) mandates that employers ensure firefighting equipment and PPE are inspected before use and maintained in a safe, reliable condition. It turns out, his air tank was not filled adequately. He ran out of air in a smoke-filled structure resulting in the risk of asphyxiation, bodily damage or death, not to mention, putting at risk other firefighters who were on scene saddled with the duty to rescue him.

Upon exiting the burning structure, he collapsed to the ground, leading to his inability to do his job safely and putting his crew consisting of one other City Firefighter from his Department at risk of harm. Another fire department that had arrived at the fire scene had to take charge of the fire in their stead. The Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member's failure to follow required safety checks to his equipment going into a fire endangers both himself and his fellow firefighters, in addition to

endangering the public. This training and safety failure could have possibly led to exposure of litigation to the City, if someone were to have been injured or harmed due to such failures. His lack of responsibility and not following proper safety and training protocols as Fire Chief, to ensure safety equipment is checked daily, demonstrates incompetence. Failure to follow proper safety and training procedures during firefighting events could potentially endanger human life, risk property damage and expose the City to possible liability.

On another occasion, April 30, 2026, the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member showed up at a grass fire, reported by a neighbor, in his private truck. He was without any firefighting equipment when he showed up at the scene according to eyewitnesses. Once on the scene, the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member failed to check with the person doing the grass burn as to whether they had a valid burn permit to burn grass that day. After reviewing the scene without inquiring about a burn permit, the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member left the scene declaring it was “all good”. A short time later, the neighbor called CalFire stating the fire was getting out of control, CalFire responded as the fire got near a structure to get the fire under control. The fire was approximately one acre, also known as the Spring Fire. No permit was identified for this burning incident by the Civil Grand Jury during the course of its investigation.

On May 12, 2026, City of Montague Fire Department firefighters were called out to a fire, only to find that none of their radios were in their fire trucks. Again, it turns out, the Fire Chief/ Mayor/City Council member failed in his duty to assure the radio equipment was checked daily and ready to use. National Interagency Fire Center rules dictate operational checks (NFPA 1802). The inability to communicate or call for back up

assistance or help while on a fire or emergency call could endanger the lives of the public, law enforcement and the fire crew.

These and other safety issues and lack of training such as this mimics the complaints in the no confidence petition of the Acting Fire Chief (at the time) by the City's firefighters. The no confidence petition was signed by 16 firefighters, given to the City Council members, the Fire Chief was also a City Council member and Mayor presiding at that City Council meeting, where they asked the City Council to remove the Acting Fire Chief (at the time). Here is where a glaring conflict of interest really reared its head! Although the Acting Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member held simultaneous incompatible offices at that time, based upon eyewitness testimony, the Civil Grand Jury's investigation reveals that the City Attorney allegedly advised the Mayor/City Council members there was not a conflict of interest if the mayor did not recuse himself and participated in the matter concerning himself as Acting Fire Chief. According to the Fair Political Practices Commission website, facts were readily present that day to identify the possible issues concerning the prohibition of incompatible offices pursuant to California Government Code Section 1099, and both City Council, the City Attorney and the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council failed to take proper action.

On December 5, 2024, the firefighters petition of no confidence was voted on by the City Council where the Mayor/City Council Member/Fire Chief presided over that City Council meeting. The Civil Grand Jury found in the minutes of that meeting, the City Council went into closed session to hear an item entitled "EMPLOYMENT, PERFORMANCE EVALUATION DISMISSAL of the Assistant Fire Chief, Acting Fire Chief, Firefighter- No action taken." There was no reportable action coming out of closed session. The minutes of the

meeting do not reflect that the Mayor/City Council Member/Fire Chief stepped down from his position as Mayor/City Council member nor did he recuse himself.

After the letter of no confidence was submitted to the City Council members and voted upon, several firefighters were terminated or placed on administrative leave, which resulted in a number of the remaining firefighters resigning from the City of Montague's Fire Department.

Thereafter, several City firefighters filed hostile work environment complaints against the City through its City Administrator. According to the Civil Grand Jury's investigation and witness interviews, it appears the City Administrator did not initiate hostile work environment investigations stemming from those complaints.

Other conflicts of interest and misuse of City property and resources have been found by the Civil Grand Jury under the watch of the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member. According to eyewitness testimony, the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member would routinely wash his private business and personal vehicles at the City Fire Department using City public water and resources. The Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member also didn't stop other City Fire Department personnel from doing the same. This conduct could be a possible misuse of taxpayer funds not in compliance with Article XVI Section 6 of the California Constitution and City of Montague Municipal Code 3.32.130.

Last, the Civil Grand Jury asked the City for a copy of the City of Montague's active firefighter roster. The Civil Grand Jury discovered the City doesn't have a roster created of its active firefighters. During its investigation, the Civil Grand Jury found that due to the absence of a firefighter roster, the number of active firefighters is undetermined. During his interview, under Oath, the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council Member said that the roster is unofficial and "he keeps it in his head",

refusing to create a roster citing an alleged and unspecified potential danger it would pose to the firefighters. When the Civil Grand Jury asked other local fire departments for their rosters, every other fire department not only has a roster but is required to have one pursuant to their insurance company's requirements.

C. OTHER SERIOUS CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Civil Grand Jury investigation and witness interviews uncovered that the Mayor/City Council Member/Fire Chief also appears to have entered into a contract between his personal business, "Shasta Valley Pest Control", and the City of Montague to provide pest control services to the City of Montague Fire Department from according to city records, invoices were submitted by the Pest Control company to the City from 2020 to 2024. The Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member was paid by the City of Montague for pest control services rendered to the city by his business for 4 years. After Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member got elected to the city council office in 2020 he maintained a paid contract with between the City and his "Shasta Valley Pest Control", business until 2024. This likely means the Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member either voted on or influenced a contract he was personally and financially interested in while he was a City Council member. The Fire Chief/Mayor/City Council member testified under oath to the Civil Grand Jury that once he realized that this was improper, he stopped charging the City for the services and donated them instead from 2025 to the present. He failed to return the money he derived from the City from approximately 2020 to 2024. In addition to this contract being a likely violation of California Government Code Section 1090, which prohibits public officers and employees from being financially interested in any contract they make, approve or influence, such a conflict of interest in in

possible violation of City of Montague Municipal Code 3.32.140 as a conflict of interest.

D. OTHER INAPPROPRIATE CONDUCT BY CITY OFFICIALS & STAFF

The City Administrator also holds the office of City of Montague Public Works Director. While a City Administrator may hold other positions so long as they do not create an incompatible office concern under Government Code Section 1099, the Civil Grand Jury received citizen complaints regarding the City Administrator/Public Works Director, that resulted in an investigation

According to a citizen complaint and further investigation, on December 1, 2025, the City Administrator/ Public Works Director dispatched/euthanized a deer within City of Montague limits, on private property in a residential neighborhood, discharging of his personal firearm while on duty with the City, under a child's bedroom window.

City of Montague Municipal Code 9.08.020 prohibits discharging a firearm within the city limits. The Civil Grand Jury questions whether such conduct adheres to safety protocol training the City Administrator/Public Works Director would have received in the safe use of a firearm in his PC 832 firearms certification training, which he holds a certificate for.

According to eyewitnesses, the City Administrator/Public Works Director then removed the deer's horns without a permit or permission from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. This is a possible violation of California Fish and Wildlife Code Section 4304 prohibiting such conduct. The Code Enforcement/Animal Control Officer for the City was present at the scene, yet she did not stop, admonish or cite her supervisor, the City Administrator/Public Works Director. When

interviewed, the Code Enforcement/Animal Control Officer admitted she was not provided with adequate training for her position, and she did nothing in light of o the City Administrator/Public Works Director's conduct.

In another instance, after investigation and witness interviews, the Civil Grand Jury found that on February 3, 2026, the City Clerk failed to secure employees' confidential social security numbers from the public view which were published and made visible on their mailed W2 clear envelope windows, showing the full confidential social security numbers of numerous persons receiving a W-2 from the City of Montague. This breach of confidentiality of sensitive personally identifying information likely puts City employees at possible risk of identity fraud and other identity crimes. The City failed to provide any notice or identity protection to the employees or public affected as a response to the confidential data breach. This confidential data breach and inadequate response is possibly exposing the City to liability.

The City or City Clerk should have properly responded to the confidential data breach by providing prompt notice to the victims and provided civil protection and remedies pursuant to California Civil Code section 1798.82, requiring the city to notify the victim of a confidential data security breach placing their personal data at risk. Pursuant to California Civil Code sections 1798.85-1798.89, disclosing more than 4 digits of the social security number, triggers such **protections and remedies**. California Civil Code Section 1798.85 (part of the Confidentiality of Social Security Numbers Act) prohibits businesses and public agencies from publicly posting, displaying, or printing Social Security Numbers (SSN's) on ID cards, mailed materials, or documents, possibly leaving the city subject to litigation by the victims.

Last, the City's website has not consistently posted minutes for meetings until very recently. This Civil Grand Jury noticed that on or around August 2025, the City's website just started to list agendas, packets and minutes, as required by California law, but not all such minutes, agendas and supporting documents were posted up on the City's website until months later, approximately January of 2026.

E. FAILURE TO FILL OPEN SEATS ON CITY COUNCIL

The City has failed to properly fill the vacant seat on the City Council by either appointment or by election. Ninety days after the November 2024 election, on February 3, 2025, the Montague City Council then tried to appoint to the open Council member seat an individual who had submitted their qualifications for consideration to be appointed. According to interviews with the elected City Councilmembers, and the Mayor's testimony, no one could be nominated, as their views would not line up with the Mayor's views. So no one was appointed to fill the open seat.

The City council appears to not have complied with Government Code sec. 36513, in not filing a vacant seat by the City Council within 70 days and also failed to put it on the 2024 ballot. When the City Council adopted a resolution calling their 2024 election to fill the open Council seat, they omitted from their resolution any language identifying the open seat on the City Council, thereby rendering their resolution in effective at calling an election and placing those open seat on the ballot, as required by law. The Civil Grand Jury interviewed and reviewed election material given to the Civil Grand Jury by the County Elections Office. The material showed the resolution calling their election was not properly submitted because it was missing information regarding the open Council seat. In accordance with California Elections Code Section

10229(a), the City of Montague may adopt one of the following courses of action:

- (1) Appoint to the office the person(s) nominated.
- (2) Appoint to the office an eligible elector if no one has been nominated.
- (3) Hold the election, if either no one, or only one person has been nominated.

The open seat on the Montague City Council went unfilled as of the date of this Report.

FINDINGS

Finding 1: The City does not have an organizational chart.

Recommendation 1: (Montague City Council): Adopt and publish a current organizational chart, together with written descriptions of reporting relationships, supervisory authority, and departmental responsibilities. Within 90 days.

Finding 2: The Mayor/City Council member is also simultaneously holding the office of City Fire Chief, which is a department head position, supervised, controlled, audited and disciplined by the City Council which appears to be a conflict of interest in violation of the doctrine of incompatible offices contrary to California Government Code Section 1099.

Recommendation 2: (Montague City Council): Conduct a formal review of all current appointed and elected City positions to determine whether any incompatible offices, supervisory conflicts, or overlapping authorities exist, and eliminate any impermissible or imprudent role combinations. Within 90 days.

Finding 3: The City Fire Department lacks proper safety and equipment training and does not have a written roster listing the names of all active City firefighters.

Recommendation 3: (Montague City Council, the City Fire Department and City Administration) Establish written policies for Fire Department officer and management appointments, personnel status tracking, official roster maintenance, disciplinary procedures, and administrative leave or review processes. Within 90 days.

Finding 4: The City has not investigated numerous complaints of a Montague Fire Chief creating a hostile workplace/environment within the City of Montague Fire Department.

Recommendation 4: (Montague City Council and City Administration): Create a Human Resources office, position or path. Provide ongoing training for city officers and employees on personnel management, provide for conflict resolution policy, harassment prevention and training, and management training for supervisors. Within 90 days.

Finding 5: The Montague Fire Chief suspended a mutual aid agreement with another local fire department.

Recommendation 5: (Montague City Council): Restore and honor all mutual aid agreements other local and State agencies. Immediately.

Finding 6: The City Fire Chief does not appear to be properly licensed or certified to provide certain medical and safety training to the City's firefighters, and yet, has been doing so contrary to State Agency

requirements; and has failed to properly perform equipment safety and maintenance checks on fire equipment.

Recommendation 6: (Montague City Council) Establish procedures to ensure the City Fire Department leadership and its firefighters and staff receive properly licensed and certified training. Within 90 days.

Finding 7: At a City Council meeting on December 5, 2024 the Mayor/City Council member who also simultaneously held the office of Acting Fire Chief, sat on City Council and did step down from the City Council or recuse himself as a member of the City Council, when hearing and presiding over an agenda item regarding his position held as the Acting Fire Chief, after hearing a Petition of No Confidence submitted to the City by 16 firefighters asking the Montague City Council to remove him as the Acting Fire Chief. This demonstrates that there is an issue of incompatible offices here, the Mayor/City Council member heard and discussed an issue regarding himself while on the City Council dais, for a performance evaluation for Montague Fire Assistant Fire Chief.

Recommendation 7: (Montague City Council) With the vast issues discovered in the Civil Grand Jury investigation, receive conflict of interest training, receive competent legal counsel and consider removal of the Fire Chief. **Immediately.**

Finding 8: The City of Montague has received ineffective legal advice from their city attorney concerning conflicts of interest.

Recommendation 8: (Montague City Council) Obtain competent legal counsel. City Council needs to ensure they are making informed decisions that are legally sound and that exposures to litigation are reduced or avoided. Within 30 days.

Finding 9: From 2020 to 2024, the Mayor/City Council Member/Fire Chief has contracted between the City and his private pest control business to provide pest control services to the City Fire Department for compensation contrary to the provisions of California Government Code Section 1090.

Recommendation 9: (Montague City Council): Adopt or strengthen written conflict-of-interest and public-resource-use policies requiring disclosure, required recusals where appropriate, and legal review of all contracts, transactions or business arrangements to avoid having the City do business or provide compensation to City officials' involving their private business interests. Within 90 days.

Finding 10: City officials and employees have used public taxpayer resources to wash their private vehicles at the City of Montague Fire Department facility.

Recommendation 10: (Montague City Council/City Administration/City Fire Department) Cease and desist of the private use of city/fire department resources. **Immediately.**

Finding 11: The City's practices relating to Council vacancies, public meetings, records posting and fire department are not in compliance with state and local laws.

Recommendation 11: (Montague City Council/Administration): Review, update and correct policies and training procedures related to Brown Act compliance, council vacancy procedures, records retention, posting agendas and minutes, employee privacy protections, and incident reporting. Within 90 days.

Finding 12: The City Administrator/Public Works Director discharged a personal firearm within the city limits at a private residence in violation of City Municipal Code to dispatch a deer, then removed the horns of the deer without a permit or authorization from the California Department of Fish & Wildlife.

Recommendation 12: (Montague City Council) Provide Firearms safety training for City Administrator and Code Enforcement officer, if carrying and using firearm is part of their job duties. Within 90 days.

Finding 13: Code Enforcement/Animal Control Officer failed to carry out her duties.

Recommendation 13: (Montague City Council) Provide training on the Montague Municipal Code and State Regulations. Within 90 days.

Finding 14: The City Clerk disclosed City employee Social Security Numbers in W2 mailings, with no required remedies offered to the victims pursuant to California data breach laws.

Recommendation 14: (Montague City Council): Establish a process to ensure data breach victims of are properly notified and aware of the civil remedies available to them as required by law. **Immediately.**

Finding 15: The City has not consistently posted their City meeting agendas or minutes to be made available to the public on their City website as required by law.

Recommendation 15: (Montague City Council) Comply with state laws regarding posting of meetings, agendas and minutes on the City website. Within 30 days.

Finding 16: The City of Montague Fire Department firefighters need proper training provided by a certified licensed instructor approved by the correct State Agency (S_SV EMS).

Recommendation 16: (Montague City Council/Fire Department) Recommend the Fire Chief and all fire personnel be trained by licensed, certified and qualified instructors where certification is required.

Immediately

Finding 17: The Mayor/City Council/Fire Chief testified under Oath to the Civil Grand Jury that he is properly certified, licensed and trained to provide medical and safety training to the City of Montague Firefighters in contradiction to the testimony of the State Agency in charge of such licensing and certification. The Mayor/City Council Member/Fire Chief appears to have perjured himself to the Civil Grand Jury multiple times regarding his qualifications to provide medical and safety training.

Recommendation 17: (Montague City Council/Fire Department) Recommend the Fire Chief and all fire personnel be trained IMMEDIATELY by licensed, certified and qualified instructor where certification is required.

REQUIRED RESPONSES

Pursuant to California Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, the following agency is required to respond to the findings and recommendations in this report within the time period specified by law. Each response shall indicate whether the agency agrees or disagrees with each finding and whether each recommendation will be implemented, partially implemented, will not be implemented (with explanation), has already been implemented, or requires further study.

Responding Agency

Montague City Council, City Administration, City Fire Department

Findings Addressed

Findings

1-17

Recommendations Addressed

1-17

Response Due

As required by Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05

APPENDIX A --- Key Legal and Policy Authorities Referenced in this report

This report references the following authorities as potentially relevant to the concerns under review:

- California Government Code section 1090 Conflict of Interest
- California Government Code section 1099 Incompatible Offices
- Article XVI section 1-23
- California Government Code section 36513.
- The Ralph M. Brown Act.
- California Civil Code sections 1798.82 through 1798.89. Data Breach

- Montague Municipal Code 9.08.020
- California Fish and Wildlife Section 4304
- California Government Code Section 12940
- Montague Municipal Code Section 3.32.130
- Montague Municipal Code Section 3.32.140
- California Penal Code Section 2052
- California Penal Code Section 118
- California Penal Code 832