

records are confidential and not accessible or controlled by our governing boards, is well known.

Excuse me, Mr. Blodgett, the Managing Agent has repeatedly stated that, "PCM receives NO money from the mutuals other than the yearly Management Fees." The "PCM Incentive Plan" monies did not come from the yearly Management Fee during the 1996-2006 time period. This money came from our mutual corporate accounts, not PCM's accounts your statements are totally false, and, inaccurate. If it was done any other way it would be fraud on the part of PCM, and I don't believe that you are implying that. Or, are you?

By definition our Managing Agent manages the salaries paid to the employees serving LWV, however, the source of the incentive money was, OUR ASSESSMENTS, and we are entitled to have an explanation of how **OUR** money was used by PCM!

"Sale of Old Admin Bldg;" Mr. Blodgett's accusation that, "Fact checking is not a Rvoice forte," could find him looking in a mirror. His reference to comments in a Dec issue of "The Voice" is interesting. There was no reference to the Old Admin building in December, 2009 issue of "The Voice". There was reference to the Old Admin Building in the November 2009 Issue but there was no comment that the sale was "illegal."

If you are going to quote us, Mr. Blodgett, please do so accurately. The following comment was in the November 2009 issue of The Voice:

- **How** do we justify the sale of our old administration building site for approximately \$3 million dollars to Mayer Corporation who then sold it to Standard Pacific for approximately \$18 million dollars less than two years later,

Mr. Blodgett's reference that this was an "illegal" sale must have just been a Freudian Slip. It also ap-

pears that according to him, "The Voice" has something in common with the current health reform bills, per Frank Gibney, jr, "The patients' lack of education and the high cost of medicine make health care a **Sisyphean** task." This also explains the frustration that many LWV residents have when they see a letter like yours in the Globe. For close minded people, **education** can be a **Sisyphean** task.

"C&R's vs CC&R's;" With reference to CC&R's, Mr. Blodgett, did "dinosaurs" exist prior to 1841? According to you they did not. You see, the word "dinosaur" was first found in an 1841 dictionary. Prior to that, they were called "dragons" and by using your logic, dinosaurs did not exist prior to 1841.

In 1964 when Leisure Word was created, the legal term for one of our founding documents was "Conditions and Restrictions" (C&Rs). Subsequently, it became known as "Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions" (CC&Rs). The purpose of both names was to define a document with the same objective, and if you research this you will find that they have the same legal purpose.

Does the fact that the word "dinosaur" didn't exist prior to 1841 mean that there were no "dinosaurs" prior to that time? Does the fact that CC&Rs did not exist in 1964 mean that there was no legal document for that purpose in 1964? Foolish conclusions!

We would hope that by now, Mr. Blodgett, you would be familiar with the Seal Beach Leisure World litigation and are aware that CC&Rs apply to their GRF. When our C&Rs were written, they applied to both our Co-ops and GRF. In fact, there were no Condominiums in 1964 so why would we have had C&Rs if they didn't apply to Co-ops?

(Continued on page 3)