

bbwilbur@frontier.com

From: "Sid Iverson" <iversid@cablespeed.com>
Date: Tuesday, October 16, 2012 12:26 PM
To: "Bob Wilbur" <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net>
Subject: Re: Yesterday's Board meeting

Bob,

What can one say? Somehow there is a strange disconnect between what seems to happen and what is perceived/desired to happen. I can recognize what you write and relate it to some degree of reality. On the other hand, there is too often a significant disconnect between what has happened and what is claimed to have happened. If there are comments related to shooting people, check out those made by R. Shaak recorded on Next Door on September 2, 2012.

It is not easy dealing with unique agenda individuals when they are so all over the map with their comments. Just to let you know, I am strongly supportive of the effort you, Carol, Gwynn, and Dustin are putting into the healing of this, our community.

Sid

On Oct 16, 2012, at 9:58 AM, Bob Wilbur wrote:

FYI.

From: [Bob Wilbur](#)
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2012 9:52 AM
To: [Dan'l Jones](#)
Subject: Re: Yesterday's Board meeting

Wow Dan, what can I say? So many twisted charges, and no they were not rhetorical. Not at all. Stalking? Really? Look, I'll just say you and I hear different drummers a good bit of the time, and leave it there. But I will respond to two of your notions.

1) "On-line stalking?" That verges on slander, Dan. The only online dialog I have had with Maria or Karen has been to respond to one personal email from each of them, and my responses were amicable and empathetic (would you like copies?).

2) Correction, there was nothing "defensive" in what I wrote; rather, it was *indignation*. Why *indignation*? Geez, Dan, I don't know. I guess it's just that most folks don't much like being publicly admonished as complicit in a crime simply because they were part of a large concerned-citizen group from, *maybe* (?) which, one person(s) committed an independent criminal act (as in lone wolf).

So, I politely, diplomatically, and with due sensitivity and respect expressed that justified indignation as best I could. As I corrected Maria at the meeting, this is

not the aftermath that one side created but is the result of missteps in which we all share some blame. My courteous indignation was expressed in the hope it would promote understanding that no one benefits by creating victims of victims and that it might be best to drop the undeserved rhetoric and try starting anew.

Which takes me to your bullet points and text that followed. Lacking specifics, we may have similar generic visions. However, your words, Dan: "The majority of the board would have welcomed you and the group to which you belong at any of the meetings at which the alternatives were discussed." *Welcomed* is very nice rhetoric, and we attended those meetings and we iteratively and politely asked for that ad hoc committee. We're looking now at 2 months or so of asking, but where is the motion on that committee? Where is the call for a vote? Long ago, you tacitly supported Dan Hall's suggestion for that committee with a sunset clause. Well, we're still waiting -- if you want to prepare that motion now, I'd love to help.

Bob

PS: Thanks for the remedial explanation of "tangent," albeit I think I meant, as in going off on a tangent, as in away from the circle, e.g., "tangential." Oh, and per your request, I will let you decide whether you want to share this with other directors.

From: [Dan'l Jones](#)

Sent: Monday, October 15, 2012 1:43 PM

To: [Bob Wilbur](#) ; [Jean Salls](#) ; [Maria Chamberlain](#) ; [Karen Shaak](#) ; [Carol Delahanty](#) ; [Dustin Frederick](#)

Cc: [Gwyn Staton](#) ; [Joanna Weeks](#) ; [Sid Iverson](#) ; hendrickcj@gmail.com ; [Dave Breining](#) ; whshed@live.com ; [Dan and Lisa Hall](#)

Subject: RE: Yesterday's Board meeting

Bob W,

Why do you think this is about you? Why the defensiveness? Why are you lecturing Karen and Maria? Did you know that one of the persons in your group was laughing while the letter was being read? Why are you so obsessed? Almost everyone else understands how to behave appropriately, the need for restraint, has expressed heart felt concern, and has shown basic human kindness toward Karen and Maria. Do you think that includes you? Why are you stalking them online?

You state that you were sure that everyone was horrified and empathized with with those threatened, but go on to act like it was no big deal, just a controversy that is part of life. Are you a psychologist? Why do you keep trying to confront Karen and Maria and rub their faces in this over and over? You need to understand that your message comes across as impolite, insincere, insensitive, inappropriate, and harassment. Do you believe Maria and Karen wanted or needed to receive this message . . . or anyone else? Do you think it helps anybody other than to make you feel good about yourself? Condolences are all that is required; no explanation; no defensive posturing; no psychological analysis; not even assigning blame.

I did not hear sternness in Jean's voice or even a reprimand when she read the letter; only an attempt to hold back tears as she expressed sincere compassion, true fear for the well-being of the victims, and a plea for members to tone down the inflamatroty rhetoric . . . all members. It was not about you at all. You are not the victim. The statement did not justify any defensiveness. Why are you compelled to be so critical, mimimize the importance of the crime, and mischaracterize the motives of someone who did nothing more than read a letter publicly that would have welled up emotion in anyone who was that close to the situation. Why must your messages make everything so personal?

As for Maria or Karen, it will not hurt you or anyone else to allow the true victims some lattitude to cope and heal, and if that means medical care, we should bear the cost. As Joanna pointed out during the meeting, no one signs up for or deserves this kind of abuse. No one knows the turmoil these two ladies encountered, including you. Why can't you leave them alone? They were robbed of their sense of security by this crime. The criminal or criminals who subjected them to to this crime, forced them to endure the abuse only because they agreed to serve as directors of our club. You do not know everything that has occurred and probably have no need to know while the investigation is open.

The "tangent points" you made go together with your circular arguments. (Tangent points are always part of a circle) The "I'm sorry, but . . ." arguments you post negate any apology or concern you might express; why waste the words? Ambiguity and obfuscation do not solve problems; they prolong or exacerbate them.

Controversy is not the problem here; it is scapegoating, threats, bullying, intolerance, insensitivity, avarice, meanness, hate, selfishness, gossip, malice, ignorance, panic, intolerance, arrogance, mistrust, fear, taunting, callousness, insincerity, mocking, hubris, misinformation, mischaracterization of the motives of others, and refusal to play by the rules. Too many people are driven by attit des rather than objectivity and a desire to formulate opinions based upon the evidence.

If you believe that your actions had no influence on the letter Maria and Karen received, there is no need to protest your innocence or to attempt to justify or minimize the severity of the crime. If you believe that you did, however little, admit it, apologize, and move on. The fact is, the person or persons who wrote and or mailed the letter are the criminals. Except for the criminal or crimnials, no one yet knows who they are, their true motive, or whether the letter was written to cast suspicion away from themselves. Although it is tempting to do so, we shouldn't try to place blame unless we have some evidence that would assist the investigation. In that case, please notify the authorities.

I think the way to "move ahead" is to stop hanging on to the things that hinder progress.

1. We must take responsibility for our own actions or inaction, and not fear being held accountable. That is how we improve ourselves.
2. When trying to solve a problem, filling our comments with quotes, puns,

similes, and metaphors may be cute to some, but often mask the meaning of the comments or make it difficult to glean any relevant information from them. (Try to avoid using adverbs.)

3. We must allow others to maintain their dignity, regardless of how much we disagree.
4. We should allow the words of others to speak for themselves without feeling compelled to cast a spin on them or interpret them for the benefit of others whom you believe are incapable of forming competent opinions of their own.
5. We should not accuse those with whom we disagree of having any particular motives or characterize them in an unflattering manner; just allow others to draw their own conclusions about someone else's motives. On the same note, we should acknowledge our own goals and motives.
6. We should address the real problem, not try to make people the problem. Pertinent facts should carry more weight than the perceived or imagined motives of others. If someone disagrees with you, it is unreasonable to employ threats, intimidation, force, or humiliation to get them to agree.
7. We should endeavor to approach problems from the perspective of our opponents to gain some understanding of their concerns and to help end stalemates.
8. We should not be too impressed with ourselves, no matter how awesome we may be.
9. Remember that in Greek philosophy, knowledge is the intersection of the universe of belief and truth supported by justification.
10. Don't fear a board that is willing to take action, and don't fear making a final decision, as much as it may distress you.

<http://info.xfactorllc.com/nonprofit-marketing-sustainability-board-governance/bid/109897/10-Tips-for-Better-Nonprofit-Board-Decisions>

Again, it is not about you (or anyone else), it is about demonstrating true compassion for our fellow human beings, a willingness to accept the facts, tolerance for other ideas, and a willingness to make a decision. We have to set timelines or nothing will ever get done. Boards and committees operate on an annual basis and then start over. We cannot put off decision making year after year, otherwise everything has to start all over again.

Bringing directors and committee members up to date is time consuming. There is a lot to learn when taking on a director's position, just to avoid breaking the law, which ACBC boards do on a regular basis, including this one. Problems like the condition of our pool are complex, require a lot of study, and do not just disappear. When a board is elected, our primary goal cannot be thwarting progress and delaying any action.

If this board had the money, the decision would have been made and the work on the pool would already have been done. The hours poured into insulting and impugning the motives and character of board members were such a waste. As our members start getting the true facts, I think it is becoming obvious that we should have moved ahead

and that the original cost estimates developed by dedicated directors were not unreasonable or out of line at all.

The specific wording of the ballot was never set in stone or agreed upon. The majority of the board would have welcomed you and the group to which you belong at any of the meetings at which the alternatives were discussed. The majority of the board voted to have the town hall meetings to encourage interest and to get feedback, not to ram a decision down anyone's throat.

Most of the directors anticipated getting more ideas about financing, but did not anticipate having to defend so many inaccurate accusations about the cost of rehabilitating our pool. Nor did we anticipate having to put off the decision once again so we could appoint someone to redo all the work we had already done. If the new board does not accept any of the work done by this board or respect the knowledge they have acquired, they will have to do it all over again including learning all the laws that apply. No one can do an effective job without doing the research. It is a lot to wade through and requires some guidance from someone experienced with them. We have had too many do overs. The sad part . . . they are never done over, they just never get done.

I am pleased to see that you are committed to rebuilding relationships and working toward finding a sound solution to fixing our pool. If we could fund this whole thing with donations, how great would that be?

- We still need a contingency plan to fund the work if the donation plan doesn't materialize or is insufficient, don't you agree?
- We still need to bring the dues to a level that we can afford to both operate the pool effectively and fund future replacements, repairs and upgrades by annually revising the costs to replace assets and segregating funds sufficient to cover repairs, replacements, and upgrades based upon the effective useful life of the assets that we must maintain, don't you agree?
- We cannot afford to drag this on for another year or we risk the very outcome that many of the most vocal members fear the most, don't you agree?
- If we cannot, as a community, afford to support this or any other project, we cannot be compelled to do so. The members have the final say and pay the bills, don't you agree?

Members of this board conducted the research and analysis to come up with these figures and the alternatives. Now it is all being thrown out and started all over again. I fear that we will lose our pool over all the delay at this critical juncture. The pool can no longer be operated. We now have to fix it or lose it and the decision may not be made in time. I believe this was our last chance to make a final decision, and I fear that we have made a fatal delay. I hope not. I am not sure that we cannot extend the repair over two seasons, but I know Bob Peetz and others believe we cannot.

Lets agree to end the practice of casting doubts about the motivations of others. It is self-

serving, non-productive, and takes the focus away from the real problems we are facing. We can disagree without being disagreeable.

We should not try to exclude any members from the decision making process just because they have opinions that differ from our own. In fact, it may be wise to appoint members who have not taken sides. When we begin to be more inclusive and share ideas with one another, I think we will find that we have more in common than we first thought. We may also find that someone has a better idea. The reputation of our club can be rehabilitated, just like our pool, if we let go of fear and decide to show more tolerance for ideas other than our own.

A little humility goes a long way. Defensiveness and recriminations waste valuable time and energy.

Thanks

Dan'l

PS:

Please do not reply to this message. The questions I posed are for you to ponder and require no answer. They are intended to be rhetorical. Please stop commenting on this crime. You are neither a detective nor a psychologist. I implore you to stop publicly obsessing over this crime when you have no evidence to solve it or comfort to offer the true victims. You are not the victim.

From: bbwilbur@broadstripe.net

To: jean_salls2000@yahoo.com; hermitanamaria@gmail.com; dan_serv@hotmail.com; karenschaak@gmail.com; caroldchina5@yahoo.com; dustin@local519.org

CC: gwynstaton1@msn.com; joanna.weeks@gmail.com; iversid@cablespeed.com; Hendrickcj@gmail.com; dave.breining@gmail.com; whshed@live.com

Subject: Yesterday's Board meeting

Date: Sun, 14 Oct 2012 10:04:49 -0700

Dear Board members,

At the Board meeting yesterday the threat incident was addressed initially by Maria and then with the reading of the threat letter by Jean, followed by a stern reprimand. In both statements was the clear implication that those on one side of the pool question had created the controversy and therefore were to blame for having somehow generated the threat, either directly or inadvertently.

However, as I listened to the reading of that letter, it was hard for me to surmise on which side of the pool issue its author was standing or whether he/she even had a position but was just looking to satisfy some sort of psychotic twitch. While everyone I'm sure was horrified by that threat and certainly empathizes with those threatened, I wish to make several tangent points.

1. Controversies occur in life. Our lives are full of them. Controversy spawned our independence from England; controversy is the very heart of our political process and quite active in the current election cycle; out of controversy came civil rights and equal rights; etc., etc. Generally, controversy moves the ball forward, albeit sometimes with unexpected and unwanted consequences.

2. The threat would certainly fall into the unexpected/unwanted category. As reprehensible and regrettable as that was, it should not be construed to mean that controversy can or should be avoided or disagreements swept under a carpet because it may unhinge someone with a disturbed mind.

3. Understanding the adrenalin-charged atmosphere created by that threat, perhaps we can all take a deep breath, let it out, give Maria and Karen a message of warmth and support, and wait for the authorities to uncover who actually wrote the letter instead of admonishing a large swath of our neighbors as somehow culpable simply because they were part of a controversy everyone helped to create and play a role in.

With 20-20 hindsight, perhaps we all would have done things a bit differently were we able to do a do-over. Yesterday, however, seemed to provide some footing for a new start; perhaps we all can help pick up the pieces and try rebuilding relations that will move this pool matter forward towards a sound resolution.

Thanks,

Bob Wilbur