

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA



9.13

During the oral communication section of the agenda for Tuesday, January 26, 2010, Robert Mabee read his statement into the record.


**ATTACHMENTS FILED WITH
CLERK OF THE BOARD**

**AGENDA NO.
9.13**

OVER A YEAR AGO WHEN I FIRST CAME BEFORE THIS BOARD 1-20-2010
SUPERVISOR STONE SAID ON VIDEO THAT I COULD SPEAK BEFORE THIS BOARD
AS MANY TIMES AS I WANT, BUT THE BOARD WOULD TURN A DEAF EAR. ARE
YOU DEAF AND DUMB MR STONE OR SIMPLY A IGNORANT, CORRUPT POLITICIAN.
IF SO I WILL REPEAT MY STATEMENT EACH WEEK UNTIL YOU UNDERSTAND.
I HAVE BEEN BEFORE THIS BOARD 73 TIMES AND HAVE GIVEN TO THIS BOARD
OVER 90 PUBLIC DOCUMENTS THAT BRAND YOU FIVE SUPERVISORS AS
THIEVES OF THE PUBLIC TRUST. AS RETIRED SHERIFF BOB DOYLE SAID IN THE
PRESS ENTERPRISE FEB-16-THE STENCH OF CORRUPTION IS IN THIS ROOM.
I HAVE 4 DOCUMENTS TODAY THAT SHOW FRAUD AND COVER UP IN STONES
DISTRICT-EVEN YOU FIVE SUPERVISORS IN YOUR LIMITED MENTAL CAPACITY
SHOULD BE CONCERNED-NO-1-CERTIFIED ENG DRAWINGS BEFORE AND
AFTER THOUSANDS OF CUBIC YDS OF DIRT WAS PLACED OVER A LEVEE IN
PROJECT NO-4-0-030 FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL-DOCUMENT NO
2-A PICTURE SHOWING THOUSANDS OF CUBIC YDS OF DIRT PLACED OVER THE
LEVEE AND ALSO ENCRANCHING INTO BAUTISTA CANYON ACCESS ROAD.
EVEN YOU FIVE AS DENSE AS YOU ARE CAN UNDERSTAND PICTURES-DOCUMENT
NO-3-A MEMORANDUM TO COUNTY COUNSEL PAMALA WALLS FROM LINDA
HERNANDEZ STATING THAT AFTER RESEARCHING THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS
THAT UNDER CIVIL CODE 26528 IF DIRECTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY MAY BRING A CIVIL ACTION IN THE NAME OF THE
PEOPLE TO REMOVE THE ENCRANCHMENTS IN THE PUBLIC ROAD. HOWEVER THEN
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, WHO ALSO ARE THE FLOOD CONTROL BOARD WOULD
EXPOSE THEMSELVES AS LIEING, CORRUPT, INCOMPETENT BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
AS THE WORK WAS DONE WITHOUT ANY PERMITS IT WOULD REQUIRE PERMITS,
COUNTY-STATE, FEDERAL TO REMOVE THE ENCRANCHMENTS IN THE PUBLIC ROAD.
AS FLOOD CONTROL DIRECTOR WILLIAMS HAS SAID-IT WILL COST A LOT OF MONEY.
YOU HAVE THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY IN YOUR POCKET-NO-4-A REPORT BY THE
U-S-CORPS OF ENG DATED MAY-27-08 DESCRIBING THE COMPROMISE OF
A LEVEE CRITICAL TO THE WATER FLOW IN THE BAUTISTA FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL.
THE REPORT STATES THAT THE FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL COULD FAIL BECAUSE
OF THE FILL PLACED OVER THE LEVEE. THE REPORT EXPLAINS IN DETAIL
HOW THE CHANNEL COULD FAIL IN TERMS THAT EVEN A FOOL OR A SUPERVISOR
CAN UNDERSTAND. ALONG SIDE THE CHANNEL THAT COULD FAIL IS THE NEW
VALLE VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-610 CHILDREN AT RISK-WOULD YOU
HAVE PUT YOUR NEW 80 MILLION DOLLAR ANIMAL CONTROL SHELTER
ALONG SIDE THE CHANNEL-YOU FIVE CORRUPT INCOMPETENT SUPERVISORS
ADMIT COVERING OVER THE LEVEE, BUT HAVE TOLD THE CORPS OF ENG
THAT YOU HAVE NO MONEY TO RESTORE THE LEVEE TO THE ORIGINAL SAFE
DESIGN-OVER 4 YEARS AGO SUPERVISOR STONE PROMISED ME A INVESTIGATION
AND AUDIT-THE SAME PROMISE THAT I RECEIVED FROM COUNTY AUDITOR
ROBERT BYRD-YOU HAVE ALL BEEN UP TO THE PUBLIC TROUGHT TO LONG.

ROBERT MABEE
3086 MIBUEL ST
RIVERSIDE-92506
951-788-4858

8



PLAN

15' SECTION LAYOUT ADAPTED TO MICHEL PROPERTY

EXTENDS TO SURVEYED BY 1966-5

REFLECTION DICE

DISTRICT 22

MAP 1

UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS ROUTE

DISTRICT PROPERTY

DISTRICT 22


SECTION 2

BAUISTA CO.


ACQUISITION OF 22

1966-5

10 100' OF 100'




WORK IN PUBLIC
ROAD BY FLOOD 20
AND CONTRACTOR APT
- MAY - 1958 - R.O.A.
RECEIVED - MAY - 12 - 1
PERMITS REQUIRED



- 1. INSTALL FLOOD LINE FENCE FOR 250 FEET, WITH
- 2. INSTALL GATE DAMPS FOR 250 FEET, ON DRAIN.
- 3. REMOVE EX. GATE DAMPS.
- 4. REMOVE & REPLACE EX. DAMPS WITH FENCE &
- 5. ALL POSTS
- 6. REMOVE & REPLACE EX. FENCE WITH 250 FEET, WITH
- 7. INSTALL 10' DOUBLE FENCE GATE FOR 250 FEET, WITH
- 8. INSTALL TYPE "T" OBJECT MARKER PER DRAINAGE
- 9. SET FENCE POSTS AT 7' INTERVAL FROM TOP
- 10. OF SLOPE
- 11. PROTECT EX. GATE DAMPS IN PLACE.
- 12. PROTECT EX. GATE DAMPS IN PLACE.
- 13. CORRECT GATE DAMPS, REPLACE FROM STA 13+00 TO
- 14. STA 14+00, PER DRAINAGE, ON DRAIN

PROJECT NO. 4-0-030		BAUTISTA CK. CHANNEL	
SHEET NO. 4-507		MODIFICATION OF SIDE DRAINAGE	
SHEET NO. 5 OF 15		STA 13+00 TO 14+00	
DATE: 1958		BY: [Signature]	
CHECKED: [Signature]		APPROVED: [Signature]	
DESIGNED: [Signature]		DRAWN: [Signature]	
SCALE: 1" = 20'		SCALE: 1" = 20'	

JUL 29-1958



MEMORANDUM



RIVERSIDE COUNTY COUNSEL

May 1, 2008

TO: Pamela J. Walls, Assistant County Counsel

FROM: Linda M. Hernandez, Paralegal II

RE: Statute of Limitations on Public Nuisance

Pursuant to your request, I have researched the statute of limitations on a public nuisance as it relates to both public entities and private individuals.

Pursuant to *Govt Code* §26528, the DA may bring a civil action in the name of the people of the State of California if he is directed to do so by the Board of Supervisors. *Govt Code* §26529 authorizes County Counsel to bring civil actions in counties where there is an appointed County Counsel. *Civil Code* §3490 provides that there is no statute of limitations on a public nuisance (i.e. there is no prescriptive right). It has been construed to mean that the statute of limitations is not a defense if the action is brought by a public agency (*Mangini v. Aerojet-General Corp.*, (1991) 230 Cal.App.3d 1125). However, if a private person wants to bring an action on a public nuisance, then the statute of limitations is be found in *CCP* §338(b).

Beck Development Co., Inc. vs. Southern Pacific Transportation Co., 44 Cal.App.4th 1160 (1996) clearly states:

“While there is no statute of limitations in an action brought by a public entity to abate a public nuisance, there is a three-year statute of limitations in a nuisance action brought by a private party.”

CA Civil Code §3479 indicates that “if a nuisance is of such a character (i.e. blocking a road) that it will presumably continue indefinitely, then it is considered permanent and the statute of limitations runs from the time the nuisance is created.”



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

LOS ANGELES DISTRICT CORPS OF ENGINEERS

P.O. BOX 532711

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90053-2325

May 27, 2008

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

Mr. Steve Stump
Operations and Maintenance
Riverside County Flood Control and
Water Conservation District
1995 Market Street
Riverside, CA 92501

Dear Mr. Stump:

On May 13, 2008, in response to a citizen concern, two engineers from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, Hydrology and Hydraulics Branch, conducted a field investigation of Bautista Creek Channel in Hemet, Riverside County, California. The purpose for the field investigation was to evaluate whether "drainage levee" modifications within the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD) right-of-way in the Bautista Creek Channel have compromised the project's original design performance. The Field Investigation Report is enclosed.

Based on the field investigation, we concluded that one of the modifications within the RCFCWCD right-of-way may compromise the project's original design performance. In addition, two of the modified "drainage levees" need maintenance.

We therefore recommend: 1) For the "drainage levee" at channel station 244+25, either a) the excess fill be removed and the original "drainage levee" be exposed; or b) the existing concrete spillway be extended upstream 50 ft and the low spots in the fill be raised to prevent sheet flow from undermining the sideslope paving and cause channel failure and, 2) For the "drainage levees" at channel stations 196+50 and 208+00, the vegetation on the levees be removed and the stone revetment be inspected to ensure that the size and thickness match the as-built construction plans.

If you have any questions or concerns about this matter please contact either Mr. Van Crisostomo or Mr. Rick Andre of my staff at (213) 452-3558 or (213) 452-3564 respectively.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Koplin, PE
Chief, Engineering Division

Enclosure

20 May 2008

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Field Investigation, Bautista Creek Channel, Right Bank, From the Fairview Avenue Bridge to Station 246+25, Hemet, California

1. References:

- a. Email from LTC Anthony G. Reed, Subject: Mr. Mabee's Two Concerns, dated 19 April 2008
- b. *General Design for Bautista Creek Channel, Design Memorandum No. 2, San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek Improvements*, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, dated September 1959
- c. *Bautista Creek Channel, As-built Construction Plans*, File No. 172, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, dated October 1961
- d. Letter from the Corps to Riverside County Flood Control District, Subject: Approval of Bautista Creek Channel Levee Modification (EE88-23), dated 14 December 1987.

2. On 13 May 2008, Messrs. Van Crisostomo and Rick Andre of the Hydrology and Hydraulics Section inspected the subject site pursuant to a request by LTC Anthony G. Reed, Deputy District Commander, Los Angeles District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Ref. 1a). The purpose for the field investigation was to evaluate whether "drainage levee" modifications within the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD) right-of-way in the Bautista Creek Channel have compromised the project's original design performance.

3. Mr. Crisostomo and Mr. Andre were met at the project site by Mr. Robert Mabee, a local resident, who acted as their escort for the site visit. The inspection focused on a 1.7 mile reach of the right bank of the channel from the Fairview Avenue Bridge to approximately station 244+25. Mr. Mabee claimed that RCFCWCD altered several "drainage levees" and changed the drainage pattern of the sheet flow entering the channel.

4. This reach of the Bautista Creek Channel is an incised, trapezoidal concrete-lined channel. The basewidth is 25 ft and the sideslopes are 2:25 to 1. The channel depth is between 11.5 to 12 ft. The design flow rate for this reach is 16,500 cfs. The flow is supercritical with a velocity of 45 ft/s. The concrete channel itself is well-maintained. Along the right bank (looking downstream) of the channel are three "drainage levees" that direct sheet flow towards the channel.

Enclosure

CESPL-ED-HH

SUBJECT: Field Investigation, Bautista Creek Channel, Right Bank, From the Fairview Avenue Bridge to Station 246+25, Hemet, California

5. The Design Memorandum (Ref. 1b) and as-built constructions plans (Ref. 1c) were checked to determine if the "drainage levees" are original project features and to confirm their intended function. According to the Design Memorandum, "Side-drainage investigations indicated that large side flows would reach the channel along the right (northeast) bank. Because the top of the channel would be at or near ground level, these flows would be discharged over the top of the channel banks for nearly the entire length of the channel. Therefore, the maintenance roadway along the right bank would be paved to prevent undermining of the side-slope paving. Low cross dikes may be required at intervals to divert the flow into the channel; the specific locations of these dikes would be determined before contract plans and specifications are complete." Furthermore, the as-built construction plans confirm that the "drainage levees" were constructed as part of the Bautista Creek Channel project. In addition, concrete spillways were constructed at the end of these "drainage levees" to prevent the undermining of the concrete sideslope when sheet flow from the surrounding drainage areas flows into the channel (Attachment 1).

6. Per Reference 1d, the Corps approved a permit for the RCFCWCD to modify these "drainage levees". Except for the "drainage levee" at station 244+25, the proposed modifications were followed, i.e. the "drainage levees" were truncated approximately 20 ft to widen the maintenance road and then the existing concrete spillway extended to the end of the truncated "drainage levee" (Attachment 2). At station 244+25 the "drainage levee" was not truncated as indicated in the approved permit plans. Instead, it was buried with miscellaneous fill (it is unknown who placed the fill). This fill alters the sheet flow drainage pattern and causes the flow to enter the channel over parts of the right bank not protected by a concrete spillway. This could potentially undermine the sideslope paving and cause channel failure. Originally, the side inflow from the surrounding drainage area was wide and shallow, confined at the downstream end by the "drainage levee" and the upstream end by high ground (Attachment 3). Now, because of the fill, the sheet flow is now concentrated, and the fill may not be high enough to direct all the sheet flow towards the channel. There are low spots along the fill that would likely be overtopped during high flow events and may cause sheet flow to go over parts of the right bank not protected by a concrete spillway.

7. In addition to concerns about the construction of the "drainage levee" at station 244+25, Messrs. Andre and Crisostomo observed that the "drainage levees" at station 196+50 and 208+00 are overgrown with vegetation. Also, the stone revetment for these "drainage levees" is thin at some locations.

8. Based on the field investigations, we concluded that one of the modifications within the RCFCWCD right-of-way may compromise the project's original design performance. In addition, two of the modified "drainage levees" need maintenance.

CESPL-ED-HH

SUBJECT: Field Investigation, Bautista Creek Channel, Right Bank, From the Fairview Avenue Bridge to Station 246+25, Hemet, California

9. For the "drainage levees" at station 196+50 and 208+00, we recommend that the vegetation on the "drainage levees" be removed. We also recommend that Geotech Branch inspect the stone revetment to determine if the size and thickness match the as-built construction plans.
10. For the "drainage levee" at station 244+25, we recommend that either 1) the excess fill be removed and the original "drainage levee" be exposed; or 2) that the existing concrete spillway be extended upstream 50 ft and the low spots in the fill be raised to prevent sheet flow from undermining the sideslope paving and cause channel failure.

Encl



Rick Andre
Hydraulic Engineer



Van Crisostomo, PE
Hydraulic Engineer

**Riverside County Board of Supervisors
Request to Speak**

Submit request to Clerk of Board (right of podium),
Speakers are entitled to three (3) minutes, subject
Board Rules listed on the reverse side of this form.

SPEAKER'S NAME:

Robert MABEE

Address:

3086 Mibuel St

(only if follow-up mail response requested)

City:

Riverside

Zip:

92506

Phone #:

788-4858

Date: 1-26-2010

Agenda # _____

PLEASE STATE YOUR POSITION BELOW:

Position on "Regular" (non-appealed) Agenda Item:

_____ **Support**

_____ **Oppose**

_____ **Neutral**

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Note: If you are here for an agenda item that is filed
for "Appeal", please state separately your position on
the appeal below:

_____ **Support**

_____ **Oppose**

_____ **Neutral**

I give my 3 minutes to: _____

BOARD RULES

Requests to Address Board on "Agenda" Items:

You may request to be heard on a published agenda item. Requests to be heard must be submitted to the Clerk of the Board before the scheduled meeting time.

Requests to Address Board on items that are "NOT" on the Agenda:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of these rules, member of the public shall have the right to address the Board during the mid-morning "Oral Communications" segment of the published agenda. Said purpose for address must pertain to issues which are under the direct jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors. YOUR TIME WILL BE LIMITED TO THREE (3) MINUTES.

Power Point Presentations/Printed Material:

Speakers who intend to conduct a formalized Power Point presentation or provide printed material must notify the Clerk of the Board's Office by 12 noon on the Monday preceding the Tuesday Board meeting, insuring that the Clerk's Office has sufficient copies of all printed materials and at least one (1) copy of the Power Point CD. Copies of printed material given to the Clerk (by Monday noon deadline) will be provided to each Supervisor. If you have the need to use the overhead "Elmo" projector at the Board meeting, please insure your material is clear and with proper contrast, notifying the Clerk well ahead of the meeting, of your intent to use the Elmo.

Individual Speaker Limits:

Individual speakers are limited to a maximum of three (3) minutes. Please step up to the podium when the Chairman calls your name and begin speaking immediately. Pull the microphone to your mouth so that the Board, audience, and audio recording system hear you clearly. Once you start speaking, the "green" podium light will light. The "yellow" light will come on when you have one (1) minute remaining. When you have 30 seconds remaining, the "yellow" light will begin flash, indicating you must quickly wrap up your comments. Your time is up when the "red" light flashes. The Chairman adheres to a strict three (3) minutes per speaker. ***Note: If you intend to give your time to a "Group/Organized Presentation", please state so clearly at the very bottom of the reverse side of this form.***

Group/Organized Presentations:

Group/organized presentations with more than one (1) speaker will be limited to nine (9) minutes at the Chairman's discretion. The organizer of the presentation will automatically receive the first three (3) minutes, with the remaining six (6) minutes relinquished by other speakers, as requested by them on a completed "Request to Speak" form, and clearly indicated at the front bottom of the form.

Addressing the Board & Acknowledgement by Chairman:

The Chairman will determine what order the speakers will address the Board, and will call on all speakers in pairs. The first speaker should immediately step to the podium and begin addressing the Board. The second speaker should take up a position in one of the chamber aisles in order to quickly step up to the podium after the preceding speaker. This is to afford an efficient and timely Board meeting, giving all attendees the opportunity to make their case. Speakers are prohibited from making personal attacks, and/or using coarse, crude, profane or vulgar language while speaking to the Board members, staff, the general public and/or meeting participants. Such behavior, at the discretion of the Board Chairman may result in removal from the Board Chambers by Sheriff Deputies.