

(email from a former member of the TWG).

First, let me tell you NOBODY mentioned Moore living at Patti's until late last month. The information may have been available in a round-about way, but I bet far less than half the TWG had knowledge. I would give big odds that the venerable Mr. Berman not only knew of the Mr. Moore/Ms. Shock relationship, but was likely privy to details of the entire plan.

I also believe that Ms. Shock (and likely Berman and Sansing) knew the LR proposal content before joining the TWG and establishing their elaborate committee system. I say this because at the very first meeting of the Feasibility Committee (our first TWG formal meeting), early on I suggested that we gather professionals possessing knowledge in the restaurant business; interview them and learn from the discourse. Patti, seated next to me, immediately stated that she knew a former student who "has great ideas for Trumpets." I then, innocently, told her to invite him to discuss his thinking with our committee. That was the first of many times Patti went silent or gave a negative reply to most suggestions. The committee, instead, was then steered by Patti into a "plan" whereby she would gather a sizable group of her students who would secret-shop most eateries in the area. The selected list of these places to dine was culled from about twenty mentioned by committee members, to ten or so. Our next three meetings or so was spent almost exclusively on Patti's "plan". It never got off the ground because, somehow, some other professor at UNLV nixed the scheme...My hopes of having quality individuals help guide us was rebuked by the Chair and others as improper. The reason? We could not carry out any such idea due to the fact the Survey Committee had not yet completed their work. I said there was no logic in that. Patti worked her way around my suggestion. If I knew then what I know now...!

As far as the canard of her "offering" to resign: That was all part of the theatrics under the guidance of the Good Hands People, Berman and Co. Shortly before one early TWG meeting we were informed the "esteemed" professor (as the ringmaster, DB, described her when he proposed her as a candidate at our very first gathering) would not attend. Through her mouthpiece, legal-beagle Berman, we were told of her torturing situation: Because she "knew" one of the applicants, we were told, the Group might think an appearance of conflict might develop. Therefore, we would have to vote to accept her return. Only one member, Kathy Matson voted "Nay". As Patti had stated to us when presiding, even an appearance of conflict of interest could not be accepted, for if we were to do the work our community wanted us to do, we had to be completely trustworthy and always above board. I now wonder what the vote would have been if we were told the chair lady not only "knew" David Moore but that HE LIVED at Patti's? Somehow she failed to think informing us of that important fact had any importance when she needed us to believe she was torn by the appearance of impropriety. Of course, no one other than her cohorts could have possibly known the truth back then. The smile of great joy on David's face and a strange behavior by David of rapidly rubbing his knees together (I observed from nearby) as he pronounced the triumph of our retention of so valuable a leader is still memorable. His behavior, plus Kathy's lone vote against, set me to wondering.

Enough about me, already. The simple answer to your request for guiding information is that Patti DID NOT allow us to know what we should have been told. Telling us she KNEW a candidate who was offering a proposal is very far from her intentionally NOT telling us about his residence when she asked us to ask her to stay on AND was the ONE person who insisted, FROM the beginning that even the appearance of the type of behavior she and her cohorts ACTUALLY engaged in from the outset, was totally unacceptable.

This community was (mis)led into a lease situation that we ALL KNOW was highly flawed and never enforced. Our community suffered greatly because of it. Some of the advocates for that failed situation are back again, promoting their own fair-haired boy as we attempt to do right on behalf of our fellow residents. Do SCA residents want to lead AGAIN into having another operator who, by all appearances, was put into the running unfairly, and then manipulated into the final selection process? Please don't let these underhanded know-it-alls "SAVE" us again! Our neighbors expect and, surely, deserve better."