

## **Andrea - Deputy Clerk**

---

**From:** Linda Talman <linda.talman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 31, 2022 7:43 AM  
**To:** Town Admin, Scott Thomas; Marna Hanneman; MaryLee Chamberlain; Mary Wohleb; Ivan Carlson; Bill Stokes; Jacques Brunisholz; Ken Stern, Publisher and Editor; Maria DeGoede - Deputy Clerk; Sandy Stokes  
**Subject:** Apology for the error in my research.

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

(Andrea, can you please make sure this gets to the Council and Marna)

The information that I found at Municipal Research had apparently not been updated re the legality of fully remote meetings. I apologize for that error and the consternation it may have caused. This letter has been updated to reflect the change.

On Fri, Oct 28, 2022 at 10:47 PM Linda Talman <[linda.talman@gmail.com](mailto:linda.talman@gmail.com)> wrote:

Scott and others.

The request of a group of ever hopeful residents to have a special meeting to look for common ground for the next year was the actual topic of the special meeting on 10/28. The PC would have set the agendas.

But a council person who wasn't at the PC meeting spoke as if he actually knew what had happened there (he didn't) and persuaded other members to vote his way.

The information quoted by this council person was misleading; He used preliminary information and not the prioritized final list. At the actual meeting the planner didn't bring a key for equipment needed to make the meeting a hybrid and therefore it is not recorded. Also as a result, people couldn't attend remotely - not even the newspaper. (Zoom links don't work without the

equipment. And no one knows what took place. Not even that council person.

What a perfectly orchestrated disaster.

The special meeting was supposed to have been advertised by the town but it was not. The council person said that the special meeting would have excluded the public. Is that why they had a special meeting today? Delicious irony, huh?

The regular chair would have set the agenda for the procedure. I believed we made that clear.

And what are the things bothering this council? Is it the Affordable Housing? Is it the parking ideas? Expanded community notices? I don't get what brought on this vitriol. I thought we were all on the same side.

It made me sad to have Chair pro tem marginalized since she is the Chair pro tem and the vote was legally taken. It made me mad to be insulted by the regular (but absent from that meeting) Chair - who had told us all at the meeting before the last that she didn't want to have two meetings a month because she could always hold a special meeting. And that she wanted us to stay involved. The group actually applauded you, Madame Chair, for that speech. And THAT meeting was recorded. Or should have been.

At the meeting today, Madame Chair stated that I should know better. Yes, I should have known better... to believe that we would be on a better path forward - where the pc would actually have a conversation about the future of the town-- a hope inspired by the community meeting of the last month. It would

have been the first time code ideas could have come from the community and been accepted or not. But discussed..

How deeply disappointing.

Linda Talman

--  
*The only real job of a public official is to make their grandchildren proud. That's called vision.....*

*Linda*

Linda Z. Talman  
PO Box 392  
La Conner, WA

360 840 1714

--  
*The only real job of a public official is to make their grandchildren proud. That's called vision.....*

*Linda*

Linda Z. Talman  
PO Box 392  
La Conner, WA

360 840 1714

