

Bob Wilbur

From: "Gwyn Staton" <gwynstaton1@msn.com>
Date: Monday, August 26, 2013 12:55 PM
To: <cove_man@comcast.net>; "Bob Wilbur" <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net>
Cc: "Al Stensland" <agstensland847@gmail.com>; "Alex Greco" <alex@torrvac.com>; "Bob and Joan Pickerill" <thepicks2@cablespeed.com>; "Bruce Devereaux" <bjdever@comcast.net>; "Carol Del" <caroldchina5@yahoo.com>; "Chris Hendrickson" <hendrickcj@gmail.com>; "Corey" <cvan593@gmail.com>; "Daniel and Laura Kutz" <relaxonwhidbey@gmail.com>; "Darla Allen" <dartallen@coupeville.net>; "Doug Smith" <smidouglas@gmail.com>; "Dustin Frederick" <dustin@local519.org>; "Elinor Guinn" <elinorg@comcast.net>; "Fred Salmon" <pheffy@aol.com>; "Janet Orso-Allen" <jorsoallen50@comcast.net>; "JoAnna Weeks" <joanna.weeks@gmail.com>; "John Klasell" <jabcklasell@juno.com>; "Jon Cooper" <islandmaniac@msn.com>; "Kurt and Jackie Blankenship" <kblankenship@bluewilliams.com>; "Lee Hart" <lee@hart.net>; "Lindsay Blackner" <lindsayb@frontier.com>; "Lydia Bartholomew" <lbart58@hotmail.com>; "Margaret Davis" <dmargret@broadstripe.net>; "Margaret McCrath Stiles" <midgemcs@gmail.com>; "Mark Harmon" <markcharmon@msn.com>; "Michael & Anne Marie Griffin" <annemb@microsoft.com>; "Mike Brice" <mike@briceconsulting.com>; "Nate Palmer" <natepalmer36@gmail.com>; "Patricia Duff" <patriciajeanduff@gmail.com>; "Reed Greenwood" <reidcgreenwood@aol.com>; "Richard Kerr" <the.kerrs@comcast.net>; "Rick Karjalainen" <rkaj78@gmail.com>; "Robin Bridge" <rjbridge@gmail.com>; "Sandi Hull" <sandihull@comcast.net>; "Mary Riggins" <smriggins@earthlink.net>; "Sid Iverson" <iversid@cablespeed.com>; "Tim Dahl" <tdahl@shorelinefire.com>
Subject: RE: Support now requested

Court filing fee is \$250 or so, not a lot.

The way it works is you get a TRO which is ex parte based on the potential for irreparable injury. That TRO lasts two weeks. Then you have your next hearing on the injunction, but my thought would be the TRO should be enough to get us through the Sept 14th Board meeting, remove the Board and elect new Board members at the 14th meeting, and if that can be accomplished hopefully the lawsuit would not be necessary.

So Bob please tell Chris we do not want to file the motion and order to show cause to have the return date until well after the 14th so we should not file the case until the first week in September (but we should be ready if the bulldozers appear to do it sooner).

Gwyn Staton
 7506 34th Ave NW
 Seattle, Wa. 98117
 206-784-6044

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521, and is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure dissemination, copying, forwarding or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

Date: Mon, 26 Aug 2013 17:19:14 +0000

From: cove_man@comcast.net

To: bbwilbur@broadstripe.net

CC: agstensland847@gmail.com; alex@torrvac.com; thepicks2@cablespeed.com;
bjdever@comcast.net; caroldchina5@yahoo.com; Hendrickcj@gmail.com; cvan593@gmail.com;
relaxonwhidbey@gmail.com; dartallen@coupeville.net; davidandlindadennis@hotmail.com;
smidouglas@gmail.com; dustin@local519.org; elinorg@comcast.net; pheffy@aol.com;
gwynstaton1@msn.com; jorsoallen50@comcast.net; joanna.weeks@gmail.com; jabcklasell@juno.com;
islandmaniac@msn.com; kblankenship@bluewilliams.com; lee@hart.net; lindsayb@frontier.com;
lbart58@hotmail.com; dmargret@broadstripe.net; midgemcs@gmail.com; markcharmon@msn.com;
annemb@microsoft.com; mike@briceconsulting.com; NatePalmer36@gmail.com;
patriciajeanduff@gmail.com; ReidCGreenwood@aol.com; The.kerrs@comcast.net; rkarij78@gmail.com;
rjbridge@gmail.com; sandihull@comcast.net; smriggins@earthlink.net; iversid@cablespeed.com;
bspettersen@earthlink.net; tdahl@shorelinefire.com

Subject: Re: Support now requested

You say in paragraph three your seeking to "[submit a motion for temporary injunction](#)". Just what happens after you get a temporary injunction? How much more will it cost to convert the temporary injunction into a permanent one? Will any contribution I make now have to be followed up with one many times greater to finish the job? You say nothing about total costs. All you give is the cost of the initial filling fee of the lawyer. What are court costs?

Ray Richard

From: "Bob Wilbur" <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net>

To: "Al Stensland" <agstensland847@gmail.com>, "Alex Greco" <alex@torrvac.com>, "Bob and Joan Pickerill" <thepicks2@cablespeed.com>, "Bruce Devereaux" <bjdever@comcast.net>, "Carol Del" <caroldchina5@yahoo.com>, "Chris Hendrickson" <Hendrickcj@gmail.com>, "Corey" <cvan593@gmail.com>, "Daniel and Laura Kutz" <relaxonwhidbey@gmail.com>, "Darla Allen" <dartallen@coupeville.net>, "David & Linda Dennis" <davidandlindadennis@hotmail.com>, "Doug Smith" <smidouglas@gmail.com>, "Doug Smith" <smidouglas@gmail.com>, "Dustin Frederick" <dustin@local519.org>, "Elinor Guinn"

<elinorg@comcast.net>, "Fred Salmon" <pheffy@aol.com>, "Gwyn Staton" <gwynstaton1@msn.com>, "Janet Orso-Allen" <jorsoallen50@comcast.net>, "JoAnna Weeks" <joanna.weeks@gmail.com>, "John Klasell" <jabcklasell@juno.com>, "Jon Cooper" <islandmaniac@msn.com>, "Kurt and Jackie Blankenship" <kblankenship@bluewilliams.com>, "Larry Rosenthal" <Cove_man@comcast.net>, "Lee Hart" <lee@hart.net>, "Lindsay Blackner" <lindsayb@frontier.com>, "Lydia Bartholomew" <lbart58@hotmail.com>, "Margaret Davis" <dmargret@broadstripe.net>, "Margaret McCrath Stiles" <midgemcs@gmail.com>, "Mark Harmon" <markcharmon@msn.com>, "Michael & Anne Marie Griffin" <annemb@microsoft.com>, "Michael & Anne Marie Griffin" <annemb@microsoft.com>, "Mike Brice" <mike@briceconsulting.com>, "Nate Palmer" <NatePalmer36@gmail.com>, "Patricia Bernacki" <patriciajeanduff@gmail.com>, "Patricia Bernacki" <patriciajeanduff@gmail.com>, "Ray Richard" <Cove_man@comcast.net>, "Reed Greenwood" <ReidCGreenwood@aol.com>, "Richard Kerr" <The.kerrs@comcast.net>, "Rick Kajalairn" <rkarj78@gmail.com>, "Robin Bridge" <rjbridge@gmail.com>, "Sandi Hull" <sandihull@comcast.net>, "Sean and Mary Riggins" <smriggins@earthlink.net>, "Sid Iverson" <iversid@cablespeed.com>, "Susie Petersen (preferred)" <bspetersen@earthlink.net>, "Tim Dahl" <tdahl@shorelinefire.com>
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2013 12:58:55 PM
Subject: Support now requested

All,

Okay below is a paraphrased explanation our case and costs as Chris Skinner has laid out to Dustin and me yesterday. A core group of us have decided to move forward on this, but we need your support and contributions. We are asking for contributions of \$500 or \$250 which will keep accounting easy should we need to calculate refunds, which is likely. We would greatly appreciate at this time knowing if you are willing to contribute, and any thoughts you might have regarding the injunction.

At the moment we are still figuring out the best way to handle those funds, whether it's Gwyn's trust account or some other special account. Will get that out to you all later today.

In the meantime, I will be delivering my personal check for \$5000 to get Chris started, and then getting \$4500 back as contributions allow.

Thanks much and back to you soon...Bob

Chris Skinner has drafted a complaint that outlines what he thinks is a viable cause of action both for injunctive relief and damages. He is not asking for declaratory judgment as part of the lawsuit since the court will necessarily have to determine the meaning and significance of the articles and bylaws in order to make a decision on our claim that the board exceeded its authority to try and decommission the pool.

He is taking a very specific approach to the lack of authority argument which is related to the fact that the board did not follow the members wishes and directions expressed in the motion that was approved in October. He is pursuing a more general claim that the board lacks authority to remove the pool no matter what kind of vote it gets

because the bylaws only permit it to operate the facilities – not close them or remove them. When you take into account the purpose of the association and the fact that the swimming pool was an express part of the consideration received when deeds were conveyed, he thinks we have a reasonable argument that the pool should be retained to fulfill the purpose of the association and the owners' expectations. Under that theory, the only thing the board should be considering is how much to request in the way of a special assessment for operating the pool – not tearing it down.

The argument that a 2/3 vote was necessary to approve the proposed may not be as strong because the pool is not referenced specifically in the bylaws even though I understand the thought. Since the pool was the primary facility in existence, taking it out seems to fly in the face of the stated purpose of the organization. He may still make that argument but at this point he thinks a general complaint that suggests that the board did not follow the membership's direction, created a confusing and misleading ballot, and lacked authority to decommission in the first place, will get us to the point where we can submit a motion for temporary injunction.

Also, we are adding the specific claim that your property interest is adversely affected if the pool is removed. I think Gwyn feels that way as well. You bought your lots with the idea that ownership in this association created a unique and valuable element to its location. Seems like the board shouldn't be able to take that away through its actions without paying monetary damages to each lot owner. At least that is the theory. None of these theories are specifically identifiable in other cases but I think they do fit within the general principles of the law. I can't promise that these claims will make it past a summary judgment motion because they are rather unique and fact specific, but I believe they are defensible and will help further your cause without being deemed frivolous or unsupported.

He has not prepared that document yet since he wanted to make sure he could think his way through a defensible claim, which he now thinks we have. Also, he wants to be sure we are ready to proceed before he invests the additional time.

A budget for this case is hard to estimate because we don't know if a trial will be necessary. He is assuming that we will have to prepare for

and conduct a hearing on a motion for a temporary injunction at a minimum and that could take approximately \$5000-\$6,000 in time based on experience in other cases that start with restraining orders and temporary hearings. Once the judge rules on the temporary injunction though, we will know whether the case is going forward or not – and the odds are the board may change course if the judge grants that motion after a hearing.

In order to take your case, he requests payment of a \$1500 retainer and a \$3500 fee deposit for a total of \$5000 to start. The retainer is applied to the time and services already provided and other factors that he considers when deciding to take a case. The fee deposit is held in trust and used to apply against time charges that I will incur going forward. He has spent about 4 hours on your case thus far. That is incorporated in the retainer. Time charges at hourly rates would apply from this point on. Chris charges \$325 an hour, his paralegal is billed at \$125 an hour when doing work other than clerical matters, and he has associates in the firm who may work on the case and they are billed at \$250 an hour. If we elect to retain his firm Chris will send a formal engagement letter that outlines the details.

The next step will be the preparation of a motion and declaration for temporary restraining order and order to show cause. That should be something we can get assembled by Wednesday of this week assuming we go forward today, which a core group is doing.

This communication is private and confidential and may constitute attorney "work product." Additionally, it is intended to constitute an electronic communication within the meaning of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510. Its disclosure is strictly limited to the recipient intended by the sender of this message. This communication contains confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient and receipt by anyone other than the intended recipient does not constitute a loss of the confidential or privileged nature of the communication. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact the sender by return electronic mail and delete and destroy all copies of this communication.