

(TWG member Fred Waldman to TWG member David Stevenson)

From: Fred Waldman <howgr8@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2008 at 3:12 PM
Subject: Re: Missed message
To: david and barbara <dstevensb1@cox.net>

Dave:

Not only does your well expressed communication make a great deal of sense, it made me realize how far we have drifted from rational thinking. You have hit the nail on the head. This idea of "easing" into catering is the best suggestion ever put before our group. It takes all the pressure off them and us.

My only differing comment is based on my optimism. I think a good restaurant; well managed; with food and prices we appreciate, will be overwhelmingly supported by our community. It, thereby, will most assuredly make lots of money for the operator AND our community.

As everyone knows well, I strenuously oppose LuvRules. That I felt it necessary to raise issues, speaking loudly, was precipitated by what I saw as an effort to squelch dissent. In that pursuit I never called anyone names. I merely stated my thoughts on what those opposing my right to speak out were doing to our process. Mr. Berman, for all his pretense of civility, when told privately by me, speaking in a moderate tone, that I didn't want his advice, responded by repeatedly screaming loudly, "You're a BIGOT!". Maybe you were one of the four or more group members that witnessed his behavior following our meeting a few weeks ago.

The reasons for believing we have failed to do what our group wanted: to produce a favorable, resident-satisfying outcome are simple:

- * LuvRules was the ONLY choice Ms. Shock considered actually worthy of selection. Her behavior and attitude was a major reason for our failure to give fair consideration to ALL respondents. I could explain my thinking and knowledge of this in a face-to-face meeting any time if, and when, you like.

- * Other than amassing "employees" who, in LuvRules' opinion, can and will give us a superior operation, they have no real credentials or existing financial, operational or technical skills which could reasonably establish credibility and consideration.

- * I believe it is probable that members of TWG had prior knowledge of mr. moore's candidacy and, from the outset, were allied with Ms. Shock to further his candidacy.

- * SCA residents were screwed over last time by an orchestrated presentation, a farcical approval by a show of hands, followed by board members (old and new) that for more than four years neither acted responsibly on behalf of our community in the ongoing lease violations nor let the word go out how bad the situation was.

- * In the words of our chair lady, "Even the perception of conflict of interest is unacceptable".

Why is this last statement, coupled with her own behavior, which easily allows such perception to surface, enough to place our group's failure to act in a way that could be characterized as improper, enough to disqualify her close friend for consideration?

If so, isn't it possible we could be held personally responsible? Once again, satisfying the residents' desires is our goal. The importance of that, which, following the survey results, Ms Shock loudly proclaimed when she said "The people have spoken"

We should not allow those desires to be ignored, nor ceded to a favored candidate who produced an impressive tasting using more than two days and over a dozen people to prepare. You can bet LuvRules will very likely repeat this action by, once again, giving us a theatrical production designed to overwhelm. That action, on it's own standing will, like the tasting, cause a lot of favorable responses. All the more reason to not trust them. In her last resignation, Patti proclaimed that LuvRules would just pack up and go somewhere else. My question is: Why haven't they already done just that? Sun City doesn't want or need an experimental operation. Again, why, when a "proposal" that appears to be written years ago never been submitted in a more suitable venue?

We can, and should have the good food, good price restaurant we want. I am never, ever a nay-sayer to good thinking. I honestly believe it is a hell of a lot simpler than those who scream at me as being "mean" and "sad" in their e-messages for being "against" something as questionable as LuvRules when in fact, all I know and believe in, tells me we positively CAN do the RIGHT thing.

May I remind you again, the last lessee gained acceptance via a "good" presentation by his supporters. It is imperative we do not allow a repeat of a similar occurrence.

We can get what the residents deserve. Perseverance, good thinking and good-heartedness will make it so.

Gratefully,
Fred Waldman