

was shamefully unprepared for the meeting. So when you launched off on your so well thought out and articulated objections I realized what I had missed and you won me over. Sorry I couldn't be of more help. Talk to you later, jed

— Original Message —

From: Jack Johnson

To: JEDeVilbiss

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 3:05 PM

Subject: an email I sent privately to mick

wanted you to see this too. I only sent it to the two of you.

Jack

Mick

don't mean to offend but I may. I need to get this off my chest.

1. I watched a portion of the Ord. 30 meeting I missed. It was my impression and confirmed by Chris that his frustration came because he was given direction by council to come up w/ a complete inventory of all properties in town and you insisted that they were told to do it in a particular way (30-50 first). Chris does not remember this and I don't remember this direction either. I definitely don't remember giving that direction.

I think his frustration and upset came because he came up w/ a plan to do what council wanted and then was chastised, yelled at (however we want to put it) for not doing it some other way.

He deserves a public TV apology as that was the forum the slight took place in.

2. There were what 12 people in that meeting? They are going to determine how this council acts on behalf of everyone else and for the future? Why are we giving them so much power? We have now attempted to do everything they've asked for and still they aren't satisfied. They can't be satisfied and I don't think we should attempt to.

3. I don't think we should change how we are acting on behalf of the many simply because a few threaten to sue. If we want to make changes to the ordinance, then let's do so but not out of fear of a silly lawsuit threat. We get threatened all the time and cannot act out of fear.

4. Let's not make our staff scapegoats or expect them to produce a great deal of work in a week or two simply because we feel pushed by a handful of

citizens. It's simply not fair, nor as they would say "good governance." And that's exactly what we've done. We've bent over backwards to do what this group wanted, to allow them to speak fully and often and met quickly and often to appease them. No more! Why do they get special treatment?

5. You took previous council to task over executive sessions, I was a member of that council and took some offense to the allegations, but chose to over look them. However last night we discussed a lawsuit that doesn't exist, mentioned possible proposals that staff might bring us and discussed a staff member that wasn't present. Hardly stuff for exec. sessions. Are these big deals? No. But it's unfair to criticize previous councils activities publically and make a big deal out of how you are going to do things differently and then not. This is mainly an observation not a criticism.

I'm only going to send this under separate email to JE. I don't want to make a big deal out of it but wanted you to know where I stand. As I said, it isn't my intention to offend, though I realize I may have anyway. For that I apologize in advance.

jack