

Nancy Kramer

From: Stephen N. Flanders <hopsonroad@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2015 9:20 PM
To: Layton Mary; Ashley Christopher; Cook Linda; Goulet Dan
Cc: Neil Fulton; Nancy Kramer
Subject: Re: Requested agenda item

In reference to Mary's suggestion to review the CATV tape, I offer the following:

I did look at the tape and Linda clearly says that the questions will be prepared "in time for the packet," which they were not. There's no mention of proposing that material wouldn't be included in the packet or an agreement that they shouldn't or couldn't be.

My offering was a response to both your and Dan's express desire at that meeting to know what the current terms of employment are. Yet on Tuesday the board chose to ignore that offering on what can only be regarded as a technicality.

This is not a game of *Jeopardy*, where it's a wrong answer if not in the form of a question or a wrong question when it's in the form of a statement. I feel that it was callous to ignore my offer to clarify what appears to be so difficult for the board to understand. At least it gives a framework for counsel to consider and the potential to save a lot of time having counsel start *de novo*, doing research and running up an unnecessarily large bill.

Sincerely, Steve

On Nov 12, 2015, at 7:03 PM, Mary Layton <marydlayton@gmail.com> wrote:

I will not support the inclusion of this agenda item.

We all agreed to supply questions for counsel and that Linda Cook and I would consolidate the questions so that there was no redundancy.

Steve, if you will review the CATV tape you can refresh your memory as to what we agreed to do.

Linda and I felt it would be wrong to change the language of your statements into questions. As no questions were asked we could not use your information.

Mary Layton

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 12, 2015, at 4:39 PM, Stephen N. Flanders <hopsonroad@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Colleagues,

I was disappointed in two ways, at Tuesday's 10 November selectboard meeting:

1. Contrary to our custom and practice, a memo was discussed for adoption without having been included in our package. This practice has been the subject to strenuous objections in the past, but suddenly appeared to be acceptable at the last meeting, despite the absence of any particular urgency to address the subject matter. The correct approach would have been to include everyone's input in the package for discussion and then approve its being compiled. Apparently, there was some input that we didn't see. Also, the input never became visible to the public, either in the package or in the meeting.
2. My memo, titled "Town Manager Current Terms of Employment," received no consideration as part of the quest to understand the town manager's current terms of employment. It was ignored for the stated it wasn't presented in question form, although it addressed the facts that the board seeks to answer by spending an unspecified and unlimited amount of money on legal services. This was discourteous to me and doesn't reflect good teamwork of the board. It would have been easy to accommodate by asking me to frame a question related to my memo, e.g. "are there any statements in this memo that are not correct?"

Therefore, I request an agenda item, Titled "Additional item for counsel— (discussion, action)" at our next (18 November) meeting to consider one motion:

"Move to request counsel to identify any statements in Flanders' November 5, 2015 memo, 'Town Manager Current Terms of Employment,' that are not factual."

Sincerely, Steve F.

Stephen Flanders, Member of the Norwich Selectboard
317 Hopson Road
Norwich, Vermont 05055

802-649-1134 (Home)

Any response or reply to this electronic message may be subject to the Vermont Public Records Act. Any views expressed in this e-mail are mine and may not reflect those of the board. Vermont statutes confer no special powers to individual selectboard members. Statutory selectboard powers arise from actions of the body at warned, public meetings with a few exceptions.