

In response to Dr. Moore's letter about our positions at the April 13 meeting of the PRC: Since Dr. Moore conflated our individual comments, we thought it best to respond to them individually below, since our comments were made individually.

Reg Brown

Dr. Moore has characterized my comments as "spoke at length to goad the PRC" to legal actions regarding current disagreements. Review of the video of the PRC meeting shows that my comments on this subject were about two minutes long and recommended an assessment with their attorney of the option of legal action. I was not "goaded" the PRC to begin legal action. I was encouraging them to get an assessment of the viability of legal action.

My approach has consistently been to urge the BOT and PRC to peacefully try to resolve their differences if possible through communication, mediation or otherwise working together through a public joint meeting. This is borne out by my open letter published in the Sentinel on April 11 and in the comments I made during public comment at the BOT meeting on April 12. "Civic decency and good citizenship require that we communicate, negotiate or mediate in a good faith effort to resolve our differences. If that does not resolve the matter, our democracy provides us with excellent tools to help. We have the ballot box. We have the rule of law. We have the courts. And ultimately, if the dispute comes before a judge, the first thing that judge will do is order the parties to go back and make a good faith effort to resolve their differences. It

will be hard for citizens to understand why, if you do not simply make that good faith effort now." What I have addressed is the working relationship between the BOT and the PRC. I have not made comments about the activities and disagreements specific to the Lost Lake acquisition. I do, however, recognize that Dr. Moore has concerns and I'm confident that the Parks Commission will address them. - Reg Brown

Cam Mannino

Wednesday night at the Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) meeting, it was not our intention to encourage the PRC to pursue a court action against the Board of Trustees [BOT] at this time. Dr. Moore misunderstood our intent. What I wanted to encourage was that the PRC get, as I said last night, "written legal opinions" from their lawyer concerning a series of recent actions taken by the Board. Repeatedly at Tuesday's meeting, the BOT was able to turn to their lawyer, Dan Kelly, for his legal opinion. The budget of the PRC does not allow for a lawyer at every meeting and that has not been necessary in the past. But at this juncture, we think it is necessary to solicit legal opinions from the PRC's legal council, just as the BOT has repeatedly been doing in closed sessions for the last 3 months. There are generally two sides to every issue. We think it would be useful for residents to understand the PRC lawyer's legal opinions as well as the BOT's.

Of course, this could also be accomplished in a public joint session of the PRC and BOT with lawyers of both sides present. Members of the Parks Commission have requested such a

meeting multiple times in the last few weeks. The BOT has never responded to this request.

I apologize for the length of my comments at the PRC on Wednesday night. and will try to adhere in the future to the new instructions about comments passed during the April 13 meeting.

We thank Dr. Moore and the Sentinel for giving us an opportunity to clarify our position. -- Cam Mannino