

## Bob Wilbur

---

**From:** "Suzy Palmer" <suzyalmer1@me.com>  
**Date:** Monday, September 09, 2013 10:17 PM  
**To:** "Bob Wilbur" <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net>  
**Subject:** Re: Opening of bids at a special meeting

You sure make me smile...clever and sarcastic as we can be there is something very satisfying in the thought of doing this exact thing. I think I will write it up and talk to Ed so he will 2nd it. We need to make certain we have some supporters in the audience who will sit in the front and keep their eyes on Jean. Wouldn't it be fun to see their faces. I think I could muster up the courage and then just smile as I watch the explosion.

Have you noticed how quiet Del has been on ND? Where did he go? Jean wrote a letter to the board that they have not been in communication for the last 6 months...really? Why did he keep stirring things up and why has he been given access to ND? I think I will ask Karen about this tomorrow night at the meeting. Double standard, heh? Incredible!!?!?!?

Suzy

Suzy Palmer  
 195 Perry Dr.  
 Coupeville, WA 98239  
 suzyalmer1@me.com  
 Cell: (847) 902-4922  
 Home: (360) 639-6050  
 Email: suzyalmer1@me.com

On Sep 09, 2013, at 09:33 PM, Bob Wilbur <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net> wrote:

If you have the mustard, Suzy, I would love to see you make a motion after intro of the slate, something like, *"Given that the current committee attempted to remove its competition with fallacious reasoning that is not even remotely compatible with the bylaws and is a blatant attempt to ensure their own re-election, that the committee members in so doing have shown themselves to be undeserving and unfit for office and of questionable motive and should withdraw immediately, and short of that, the Board should act today to replace them on the slate with those who were wrongfully removed.*

And after seconding (Ed?, but first ask for a re-reading) request the motion, as submitted in writing, be part of the record. The discussion could address that it is up to the members, by their vote, to select the new Board members, not the committee.

I think it could become evidentiary – one more nail showing this Board's incredible fixation on manipulation and control.

Hoisting one to mustard...bob

**From:** [Suzy Palmer](#)

**Sent:** Monday, September 09, 2013 8:53 PM

**To:** [Bob Wilbur](#) ; [Carol and Ed Delahanty](#) ; [Dustin Federick](#) ; [Ed Delahanty](#)

**Subject:** Re: Opening of bids at a special meeting

Thanks for the agreement. Again, it's all the small stuff that builds the barriers that makes moving forward so tedious. I just don't get their game unless it's all about control.

I do think that there were three candidates that were removed from the slate in opposition to the current bylaws. I believe that we should somehow be able to bring this up. I would be okay doing that because I was on the committee. I noticed in the current bylaws it says that those filing applications can also be on the committee. In the revised bylaws being presented in October it has been changed and nominees cannot serve on the committee. BUT for this year I believe that the individuals should have asked Jean to be replaced as committee members when they decided to run. Very inappropriate for them to vote no for others submitting their applications and thereby eliminating their competition for the election. Bylaws or not...if the applicant is in good standing I believe they should be listed on the slate presented to the board.

There are so many issues, but this is just blatant Chicago politics at it's worst.

Suzy Palmer  
195 Perry Dr.  
Coupeville, WA 98239  
[suzypalmer1@me.com](mailto:suzypalmer1@me.com)  
Cell: (847) 902-4922  
Home: (360) 639-6050  
Email: [suzypalmer1@me.com](mailto:suzypalmer1@me.com)

On Sep 09, 2013, at 06:00 PM, Bob Wilbur <[bbwilbur@broadstripe.net](mailto:bbwilbur@broadstripe.net)> wrote:

Hi Susie,

Thanks for the good response to Jean and Karen, albeit it I suspect they will hold dear to their belief that the tail wags the dog, and the dog doesn't care. Wrong.

Nowhere was I more disturbed than by Karen's apparent assumption that the job of the nominating committee is (to her view, I guess) to select the slate. Double duty Wrong. Their only task remotely resembling that is to remove candidates not in good standing, as you said. Anyone could do that in a minute or less--it doesn't need a freaking committee. No, their real job is to recruit candidates, and

that is where the work comes in. By the way and in that regard, when someone is not in good standing, they really should be ineligible to be a candidate for some period of time, like maybe a year after payment – let's get that in the bylaws (Jean).

And nowhere was I more otherwise disturbed than with Karen's statement, *"I am fine with being transparent but making statements about some applicants that may seem like public ridicule to those eliminated is never a good idea."* How in the hell does she figure reading a bio would embarrass a candidate given they wrote the bio. Or does she think the committee has editorial purview enabling them to add or eliminate information in their discretion? Incredible.

Do any of you think a question should be asked on Saturday as to which candidates were eliminated from the slate--other than those eliminated for not being in good standing (which should be anonymous, other than maybe a tally/total number)—and why? (That is, assuming they aren't on to us and have put them back on the slate)

The TRO is to be filed tomorrow, it seems, late afternoon, and at that point we have 15 days to get it converted to a permanent injunction until resolved.

I think we have somewhere between \$7 and 8 k but have been out of the loop on that since we left on Wednesday. Need to get a tally from Carol (also Carol I need the account number so I can deposit the check I have).

...Bob

**From:** [Suzy Palmer](#)

**Sent:** Monday, September 09, 2013 11:38 AM

**To:** [Dustin Federick](#) ; [Bob Wilbur](#) ; [Carol and Ed Delahanty](#) ; [Ed Delahanty](#)

**Subject:** Fwd: Opening of bids at a special meeting

Thought you would like to see my response to Karen. I only sent it to she and Jean, but have copied Ed on this email. Carol mentioned that we have collected over the \$5,000 needed for legal costs. If that is true we have a core group that can work together to develop a plan for the future.

Have a great Monday...

Suzy

Suzy Palmer

195 Perry Dr.  
Coupeville, WA 98239  
suzypalmer1@me.com  
Cell: (847) 902-4922  
Home: (360) 639-6050  
Email: suzypalmer1@me.com

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Suzy Palmer" <suzypalmer1@me.com>  
**Date:** September 09, 2013 11:15:07 AM  
**To:** "karen shaak" <karenschaak@gmail.com>,"Jean Salls"  
<jean\_salls2000@yahoo.com>  
**Subject:** Opening of bids at a special meeting

Hi Karen,

Hope you are enjoying this beautiful weather. Thank you for responding to my note to Jean. I will make some comments below in red so you can see my response in context. I have only responded to you and Jean. I also want to invite you to give me a call if you wish to discuss further. I am trying to focus on the "big picture" as well as answer some of the concerns our members have expressed in order to be inclusive and open as a board member. I don't have the history with this community which you have therefore I believe I can offer a fresh view. I have no problem if you disagree with me and appreciate your point of view as well.

Respectfully,

Suzy

Suzy Palmer  
195 Perry Dr.  
Coupeville, WA 98239  
suzypalmer1@me.com  
Cell: (847) 902-4922  
Home: (360) 639-6050  
Email: suzypalmer1@me.com

On Sep 06, 2013, at 06:37 PM, karen shaak  
<karenschaak@gmail.com> wrote:

All,

I think this is an interesting opinion and some of it can be adopted.

Jean provided 5 days notice of this meeting (else we could have done it last week) to ensure everyone could attend. There is no requirement to do review bids in a public setting. It may not be required, but our situation with the community has been contentious at best, and my experience during the last 40 years of working with non-profits has always included the opening of bids for capital improvements as an agenda item and in an announced meeting. Many times the bidders are present and taking notes for their own information. The RFQ/RFP process is typically NEVER conducted in a public venue. I believe that my experience in and around the Chicago area does this because the appropriate use of funds is a very sensitive issue, as board business has become with ACBC. I do this for a living and did this for another non-profit for 20 years. To protect the actual details of a bid both for the vendors or in case of a fallback need, these are details that are not given public notice (most negotiation is based on this lack of detail). I don't understand why the vendors need to be protected and feel that any fallback should also be publicly noted. This does not mean it isn't above board but rather that the board is doing its job in working for the community. I disagree with your thinking that it is the board's job to negotiate privately for a fallback position with a vendor. On the contrary, I believe that doing this privately makes it appear as if the board is hiding something or giving preferential selection. I do think that a step in the right direction would be to publicize the specific agenda items at some time before the meetings, not just to the board, but also to the community. This gives community members the opportunity to decide if they wish to attend the meeting. I also believe many will not attend, but it serves the board well by appearing very transparent in the conduction of their business transactions. I think you are confusing secrecy with the job we are elected to perform. I believe I was elected to serve the community in an open and inclusive manner.

Regarding nominations, there is no requirement that says we have to notify the public that we are

reviewing the applicants' they are not nominees. I will not quibble about terminology, but I think you know I was referring to "applicants". Those running have never had their bios read at a public meeting in the past 10 years that I know of; mine certainly wasn't and we didn't read them last year. I believe you misunderstood me...I did mean that their bios would be available to be read by the public. I do think that we need to inform the public why some applicants were considered "disqualified". My understanding of the bylaws is that the only job of the nominating committee is to check compliance for "membership in good standing" and determine if the appropriate time previously served on the board has passed. None of the reasons to disqualify any one individual should be personal on the part of the committee or the applicant. Although I am not against this and would be happy to do so, it is a departure from the past. I am fine with being transparent but making statements about some applicants that may seem like public ridicule to those eliminated is never a good idea. Who would ever make personal statements about the applicants? All that needs to be said is the reason they were disqualified, which should be regarding their standing as members in the organization. The bios accompany the ballot.

The meetings we have been having are not listed as the bylaws committee meeting. The Tuesday meeting notices sent by Jean have listed the meetings as ByLaw Committee Meetings. The addition of board business is mentioned separately in the email and not posted for the membership to see. The opening and review of the bids for the pool decommissioning or the board review of committee submissions of applications for board positions has not been given notice to the community. These meetings are a review of what was submitted by the bylaws committee to the board. Same as we did last year. The board reviewed and accepted, rejected and amended recommendations of the committee. The membership need not be notified, it is the responsibility of the board. I agree except that there was no notification to the members that we were meeting as a board to do this business. There is a

distinct difference of what the board is responsible for and what the membership is required to participate in as a process. What you describe as a requirement and a 'have to' is not a fact but rather your opinion and preference. **It is my understanding that any time the board meets the membership should be notified and may attend unless it is a legal issue or involves personnel. It is not an emergency meeting so I can't think of any reason the membership shouldn't be notified that we are meeting. They may not be given the option of participation, but they can attend, take notes, and ask to be on the agenda at the next meeting.** There is no requirement to allow the membership to participate in any meeting listed as a board meeting. **I believe all meetings are to be open to the public unless it is a closed meeting as mentioned previously.** We do this to encourage membership but there is no requirement to even have a member forum except for those meetings listed as 'members meetings'. If everything required membership interaction **(If the board is doing it's job then the committees should ensure membership participation and interaction in these meetings. I believe that board meetings should always have a membership forum and should always be open to the public. It is in all of our best interest to be open and transparent.)** there would be no need for a board and the dilatory actions of the membership would ensure nothing would get done. **I guess we disagree about this as well. I feel that we represent the community, but need to hear all sides of an issue. We all struggle with our own prejudice and feelings, but need to carefully listen to the public concerns.**

Karen

On Fri, Sep 6, 2013 at 4:00 PM, Suzy Palmer  
<[suzypalmer1@me.com](mailto:suzypalmer1@me.com)> wrote:

Jean,

I have been thinking about our opening of the bids last night for decommissioning the pool and building facility. I believe that this should have been done at a "special board meeting" that is

posted for the public or at a regular board meeting. Posting for this meeting should be done at the Shelter, on Nextdoor and also on the web site. The discussion and decision about which bid to be accept should be made at the regular board meeting next week. This is accepted bidding procedure for any public/membership group. It all has to be done above board and the public should be notified ahead that the bid opening and final decision must be on the agenda. When a bid is refused because it is too high or doesn't meet our specifications then we need to state these reasons in public. I'd be happy to discuss this with any of you. If you have questions just give me a call.

We also have to notify the public that we are reviewing the nominations for board positions in the "special meeting" next week. Those running expect that their bios will be read and available to the public. The board needs to make it clear to the membership why individuals are qualified or disqualified to form being named on the slate. We need to be transparent about this procedure so we are understood as running a free and open election. We cannot build trust if we make decisions in closed meetings.

The meetings where we have been making these decisions are listed as Bylaw Committee meetings and the membership has not been notified that we are meeting to discuss bids or the slate for board positions.

Have a great weekend?

Suzy

195 Perry Dr.  
Coupeville, WA 98239  
[suzypalmer1@me.com](mailto:suzypalmer1@me.com)  
Cell: (847) 902-4922  
Home: (360) 639-6050  
Email: [suzypalmer1@me.com](mailto:suzypalmer1@me.com)