

From: "Tim Connor" <tconnor@cforjustice.org>
Subject: RE: Followup
Date: July 3, 2008 12:38:43 PM PDT
To: <tjccamas@comcast.net>

Tim Connor
Communications Director and
Open Government Project Coordinator
Center For Justice
35 W. Main, Suite 300
Spokane, WA 99201
(509) 835-5211
www.cforjustice.org

From: Tim Connor
Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2008 10:08 AM
To: 'Richard, Mark J.'
Cc: Bonne Beavers; 'tjccamas@comcast.net'
Subject: RE: Followup

[Commissioner Richard,](#)

Thanks for getting back to me and I will at least link to your email in full with the new article. Truly, my purpose here was to give you an opportunity to address some of the unanswered questions raised by Mr. Emacio's response to Ms. Beavers. I thought this was the reasonable a fair approach, and I thought I explained that well enough to you in our brief conversation before Tuesday's meeting.

regards, Tim Connor

Tim Connor
Communications Director and
Open Government Project Coordinator
Center For Justice
35 W. Main, Suite 300
Spokane, WA 99201
(509) 835-5211
www.cforjustice.org

From: Richard, Mark J. [mailto:MRichard@spokanecounty.org]
Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2008 9:46 AM
To: Tim Connor
Subject: RE: Followup

The reason I will not respond to your questions (i would like to see this in your update) is because I find it more than a conflict of interest that both the client and the attorney for cfj are major donors to my opponents campaign and my confidence in legitimacy of the inquiry of this two year old incident or an objective outcome of this questioning is zero. If I felt you personally were after the truth such as you have shown in the past then I might respond differently.

In my letter to Sr. Brown I indicated a policy was being developed; but that was never brought to the board and I lost track amongst the many issues we deal with. Today; after connecting the political dots of the client and cfj attorney, and in recognizing we had never before nor since had ANY incidents where the public has been challenged about recording, photographing or attending public meetings held by Spokane County beyond the one involving your client whom we reported at the time was exhibiting aggressive behaviors that appeared intentional intended to incite (and in the meeting I was present at, did so in the presence of two federal officials) I see no pending need for enacting new policy on the matter.

Will you report my response unedited Tim?

Mark

-----Original Message-----

From: "Tim Connor" <tconnor@cforjustice.org>

To: "Richard, Mark J." <MRichard@spokanecounty.org>

Cc: "Bonne Beavers" <bbeavers@cforjustice.org>; "tjccamas@comcast.net" <tjccamas@comcast.net>

Sent: 7/2/08 9:24 AM

Subject: : Followup

Commissioner Richard:

Good to visit with you yesterday before the Commissioner's meeting. What I gathered from our brief conversation is that you are "reluctant" to respond to the questions I've posed in my 6/27 email (below) but that you are in agreement with Mr. Emacio's view that promulgating a policy now is unnecessary given the fact that there have been no further complaints (since Mr. Hamilton's complaint) about county officials discouraging or interfering with attempts to record county public meetings.

If that's not accurate, or if you would like to add or modify this explanation, please respond to me by 5 p.m. tomorrow. Of course, if you'd like to answer the questions in the 6/27 email that would still be most welcome.

I plan to post a followup story with Mr. Emacio's letter Thursday evening.

sincere regards, Tim Connor, Communications Director, Center for Justice

From: Tim Connor

Sent: Friday, June 27, 2008 10:57 AM

To: 'MRichard@spokanecounty.org'

Cc: Bonne Beavers

Subject: Followup

Commissioner Richard:

We recently received the attached letter from Jim Emacio in response to Bonne Beavers May 27th letter on behalf of our client, Don Hamilton. As you know, the purpose of Ms. Beavers's letter was to elicit a copy of the "policy to clarify that public meetings are open to the public and can be recorded" that you mentioned in your April 19, 2006 email to Sen. Lisa Brown.

In simplest terms, what Mr. Emacio is reporting is that while he prepared a "working draft policy" that no policy was ever actually promulgated. Moreover, he is reporting to us that he is now "reluctant to recommend the adoption of a policy of this topic."

I'm planning on doing a followup article on this for our website and thought, in fairness to you, that I should seek further comment from you, as you are the person who conveyed to Senator Brown that a policy had been "initiated."

So, here are my questions for you.

1) Do you concur with Mr. Emacio's account that while a working draft policy was prepared, it was never promulgated?

2) Was your statement to Sen. Brown based on a misunderstanding, or do you believe you were misinformed about the status of the policy?

3) Do you concur with Mr. Emacio that such a policy is unnecessary?

4) If so, when did you reach that conclusion?

5) Finally, what would be the downside to the county if it were to have gone through and implemented the policy you described to Senator Brown?

I look forward to hearing from you.

sincere regards, Tim Connor, Communications Director, Center for Justice