

Subject: What's Reasonable??

From: John D Roth <jroth4@comcast.net>

Date: Thu, 24 Sep 2009 22:52:03 -0400

To: Margot Chappell <Parkdreams@lycos.com>, LAWRENCE BERUL <LBERUL@yahoo.com>, LULUP722@aol.com, John D Roth <jroth4@comcast.net>, Judi Segermark <judiseg@hotmail.com>

That's a legitimate question. When I read Annette's email, I asked myself the same question. Then I saw that she was replying to my email. My email suggested that we consider consulting our attorney. I think it's a reasonable assumption that she meant that my suggestion sounded reasonable.

Are we going to wait for a while to see whether the BOD reacts? In a word, yes.

I had no intention of running to our attorney with every little thing until you played the "attorney card." The BOD decreed and I agreed that we wouldn't involve our attorney until the end of the process - then only to confirm that our recommendation(s) were legitimate. Your frivolous assertions that the by-laws allow dogs of any size as long as they stay for fewer than 30 days and that the by-laws don't mean what they say question the very basis of the project. They also come at a time just after I had indicated a willingness to support a "grandfathering" process that would have solved the large dog issue over time.

Here's a suggestion. Send me an email withdrawing you comments interpreting the by-laws for us. I'll post it and then we can forget about contacting our attorney and go back to September 20. We'll even delete from the website everything posted for Sept 22, 23, 24 (except Grayce's note and this note.) We can then restart as of Sept 20 without prejudice on my part even though the genie is probably out of the bottle.

JR