

To: <cathy_jolly@kcmo.org>
cc:
From: Steven Glorioso <s_glorioso@hotmail.com>
Date: 01/19/2009 03:12:08 PM
Subject: RE: Council

this is disgusting. problem---all these emails on their personal accounts. I thought maybe kendrick's was city hall.

It is public record now that you have it on your city hall address.

Let's discuss.

Also, it raises the question of them using non-city hall email addresses to conduct public business. Ask galen if that makes them public record ? I think in the Karl rove case the court said they were now public record.

Subject: Fw: Council
To: s_glorioso@hotmail.com
From: Cathy_Jolly@kcmo.org
Date: Mon, 19 Jan 2009 14:44:36 -0600

----- Forwarded by Cathy Jolly/cc/kcmo on 01/19/2009 02:43 PM -----

Joe Miller
<gobodog@gmail.com>
>
01/17/2009 11:46 AM

Tocathy_jolly@kcmo.org
cc

SubjectFwd: Council

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **kendrick blackwood** <kendrick.blackwood@gmail.com>
Date: Sep 6, 2008 6:26 AM
Subject: Re: Council
To: Gloria Squitiro <birthways@kc.rr.com>
Cc: Joe Home Miller <gobodog@gmail.com>, Funk Funkhouser <mfunkhouser@kc.rr.com>

I don't know how this revelation changes the scenario.

This is about power, pure and simple. They think Funk has none.
So

they think he's insignificant and they think they don't need him.

That's why Jan got invited to be on the campaign committee and we

weren't even consulted on who would be on it.

That's why Deb and Bill are gone. They don't think Funk can help them.

That's why all of this crap.

Mark needs to show the council in a big way that he has power.

My middle of the night fantasy:

Wayne hatred is the common thread for Deb, Bill and Russ. (It may not

even be enough to break russ up from the new love of his life, Jan.

But it might be, if he's forgiven for all of this. Friday's campaign meeting was so enlightening to me about how far Russ has gone.)

Get Ajamu and Gwen Grant and whoever else to help convince Sharon to

introduce a resolution Thursday to fire Wayne. Get Deb and Bill and

Russ and John and ... cut whatever deal there is to get one more.

That's your seven cosponsors for the resolution. That's your seven

people that you will stand by no matter what happens the next three

years.

That's your new Housing committee, or maybe your reunited public

safety and neighborhood with Sharon at the helm (I know she didn't

like seeing Cathy's cute little face in today's paper). This change is

so easy to sell it's ridiculous. We just asked for another extension on the receivership. You showed a year ago that housing was

important
to you. You created a whole committee just to deal with this. You
are
disappointed with how little has really gotten accomplished. You
pledge to do all you can to fix it. Perhaps you pledge to hire a
staffer with some experience at HUD to help support Sharon. (we
would
have to find room, of course)

You say the city manager was the right guy to revive downtown.
But he
doesn't have the experience necessary to redirect the city's
services
to the neighborhoods. He doesn't have experience with housing.
There
must be other reasons you can cite that are not mean-spirited.

The seven will be intimately involved in picking the next city
manager. Maybe you assemble some of them as the search
committee. (I
don't know what Ajamu's resume looks like, but he could sure be
considered)

Maybe as a side note: These seven also support a resolution
directing
the city legal staff to develop specific guidelines for family
members
who want to help support their elected official spouses at city hall.

I know this is fantasy, but I think if Sharon is mad enough and
Melba
or Cathy or ... are self serving enough, it returns the order to the
city council and shows you are not only not weak, you are in
charge.

One other Sharon stick in the eye. The campaign committee I saw
included one single face that was darker than mine. It was

Leonard

whoever. Sly James was on the list of people supposed to make calls.

Maybe he's on the committee. The bus tax committee had a little bit of

color. This, to me, is damning evidence of the farcical nature of the

63rd street compromise and proof of the touristy frou frou nature of

the thing.

This of course relies on whether or not you think there is not nearly

the support for Wayne that there once was.

This seems like the kind of scheme I shouldn't be putting into an email, but I don't know when we'll be in a room again together.

I hope today's meetings are going well.

Kendrick

On Sat, Sep 6, 2008 at 8:14 AM, Gloria Squitiro <birthways@kc.rr.com> wrote:

> Funk just figured out why the council is pushing this bad legislation, and I

> believe he might be right.

>

> Since Funk is not privy to the backroom sessions regarding the lawsuit, he

> thinks that it must be what Skaggs told him three weeks ago after one of

> those sessions: Bates will not settle with the City unless I am

out of City

> Hall. And the council wants to settle their suit and Funk's suit.

They say

> that settling puts the tremendous embarrassment behind them.

They say we're

> going to lose the suit, even though Beufort says that it's a simple case to

> try and win.

>

> That's the face of all this at any rate. The face that they'll give to the

> media when the settlement comes about. The truth is that they're using the

> lawsuit to control his office and to take away his power. As Nutter says,

> they think he's crippled and they're going in for the group kill.

>

> It never made sense that what they were saying: I am a huge liability - I

> cost the city money by my actions. I have to be banned from his office

> proper, yet I can volunteer in any other department in the city, including

> city hall. So the question becomes, why won't I be a liability anywhere

> else in the city, why am I only a liability in his office? The answer is

> that Bates will only settle if I'm off of 29. Funk's right about this and

> at least we know what we're dealing with. I don't know what we do with this

> information now. Any suggestions?



> pic02634.gif