

(Continued from page 3)

current board. This should be a direct and particular warning to Foster who received more recall votes than any other director. This is certainly quite an honor. It is obvious that the board is absolutely not justified in shrugging off the voices and concerns of the community activists as the rantings of a few disgruntled residents. These directors have played ostrich for years, claiming to know of no misdeeds and shutting out opposition. In this case, half the community disagrees.

The actions of this board toward director Curtis, from the first moment he took his elected position on the board, are simply shameful. He earned the support and votes of the community more than any other candidate in that election. More votes, in fact, than were given to any other director in all previous elections. And yet these self-anointed royalty turned their backs, read magazines when he spoke, refused to second his most simple and worthwhile motions, even before he had time to incur their enmity by any action.

The mandate given by this recall election is based on the actual numbers, 43-45% of the voting members supported the recall movement in spite of blatant and horrendous interference by outside forces including PCM (who were ever so helpful in arm-twisting, advertising and assisting people to request removal of their names from the recall petition along with receiving returned undeliverable ballots with every opportunity to tamper with the process, an apparent conflict of fiduciary duty.) Of course the most obvious conflict of interest was generated by the actions of several Third board members (Freshley, Muennichow, Robertson) who organized and led the opposition under the NO on Recall banner. It should be no surprise that these same directors (along with several Third board candidates, notably Noel Hatch and Mike Straziuso) have been, or are, board members or co-founders

of Friends of the Village, that awesome group that arose from the failed Positive Solutions group. (Remember, this is the group that double listed their members and even listed dead and cognitively impaired relatives in order to boost their apparent numbers to seem bigger and more influential.)

Curt Sproul, HOA expert invited by Third Mutual to speak to the community, said in his remarks that if you are the target of a recall and 42-45% voted for your recall, you should seriously think about the reason why. Half the people are mad. Are you really doing what is best for the entire community? An even more pointed question that Sproul did not address is, "are the directors (Foster, McNulty, Rubin, and Wilson) even capable of thinking in the first place (let alone capable of thinking for themselves.)"

Here is the mandate: restore Mike Curtis's rights, responsibilities, and full place as a director; apologize publicly to the community for only considering their own narrow self-interest and lack of responsible behavior by ignoring a large segment of the community; and apologize to Curtis as publicly as they have attempted to humiliate him; take back the oversight and control they have abdicated to PCM and start to operate in the best interest of the entire community; in fact take up their fiduciary duties of oversight and control. This is not a matter of social status within the community. This is not a matter of exercising power (sometimes for the first times in their lives). This is fulfilling a vow made to the constituency whom they represent. Again, during his remarks, Curt Sproul pointed out that directors owed their primary allegiance to the community which elected them; allegiance runs to the members, all of them, not just some. The board should not be acting like the new sheriff in town.