



coventurer · brooks@forethought.net | Group Owner - [Edit Membership](#)

[Start a Group](#) | [My Groups](#)

**ECRF · Elbert County Republican Forum**

Search for other groups...  [Search](#)

- [Home](#)
- [Messages](#)
- [Pending](#)
- [Spam?](#) [\[Delete\]](#)
- [Post](#)
- [Files](#)
- [Photos](#)
- [Pending](#)
- [Links](#)
- [Database](#)
- [Polls](#)
- [Members](#)
- [Pending](#)
- [Calendar](#)

[Promote](#)  
[Invite](#)

[Management](#)

**Messages**

[Messages Help](#)

Message #  [Go](#) Search:  [Search](#) [Advanced](#)

[Start Topic](#)

**2004 Commissioner Race**

[Message List](#)

[Reply](#) | [Forward](#) | [Delete](#)

Message #441 of 1797 < [Prev](#) | [Next](#) >

**Re: [ECRF] 2004 Commissioner Race**

Fri Mar 26, 2004 3:33 pm

[Show Message Option](#)

Thank you Mr. Chairman for the substantive and well-written response.

Mr. Chairman, neither incumbent "pulls my strings." I have looked at the field objectively and concluded that our incumbent commissioners are reasonably competent and represent a good bargain to the county. I don't see any parties in the wings who present a compelling case to change the status quo. Quite the contrary in fact.

**"Brooks Imperial"**  
**<brooks@forethought.net>**  
[coventurer](#)  
[Offline](#)  
[Send Email](#)

[Remove Author](#) | [Ban Author](#)

My questions at the meeting were directed at the challengers because they have a duty to convince me that they can do a better job than the incumbents have been doing. We've all observed the incumbents in action over the past couple years. They represent known quantities. I think we get pretty good service from both of them. They work hard and give the county much more than their paychecks warrant. It is

### Yahoo! Groups Tips

#### Did you know...

Something new just for moderators. [Experience Moderator Central](#).

### Best of Y! Groups



Check them out and nominate your group.

the challengers who are the unknown quantities in the analysis.

You may have the requirement of diplomacy in your function as chairman. That is not my strong suit. Here are my impressions.

Pennewell seems like a genuinely likeable guy. I can't fill in the blanks, however, between that positive impression on the one hand, and on the other an awareness of all that the incumbent commissioners are doing for the county. There's too much unknown space between those two ends, so I don't have enough to go on to support him. I like Mr. Pennewell, I just don't see a compelling reason to trade in an existing well-trained commissioner for him.

Duke sounds like a trust-fund baby to me. While he brings the "vision thing" to the table, I don't think he's an assertive leader. I think the county would walk all over him if he were in a leadership position. Whatever benefit of the doubt one is inclined to give the new guy, I thought his refusal to contrast what he would do differently from what the current commissioners are doing in order to achieve his vision showed me a real lack of mental follow through. Those commission jobs are for scrappers. Duke sounds like he would attempt to hide behind a regulatory zoning plan and a no-growth pre-disposition, and let things just sort themselves out. That is an abdication of responsibility before he even begins the job - more than sufficient cause to warn me off supporting him.

Donato is more difficult to analyze. She appears to be quite competent at least by her own claims, but she also appears to be extremely dictatorial. I like to see a sense of civic duty and statesmanship in my elected officials, but I get the sense that Ms. Donato is looking out for number one. While she seems quite tough, and that is certainly a quality when it comes to dealing with crusty old ranchers, she has moved around the country an awful lot and appears to not remain dedicated to any one place or thing long enough to make a real career out of it. That flighty quality leads me to question her ability to commit and follow through.

When asked about a regulatory master plan - she came down squarely and assertively on the fence. Yet in the same response, called for a complete rewrite of zoning and a more professional and rigorous zoning dept. Shortly before that she had called for strict contractor licensing by the building department.

What would it take to implement strict contractor licensing? It would take the development of licensing standards, educational materials, compliance monitoring, remediation, prosecution, etc. It would require hiring expensive professionals in the field to conduct all of these specialized functions. We would need office space and infrastructure just to house all of the new bureaucrats in our big new building department. And at the end of it all, what would actually be accomplished? Would we all be saved from predatory contractors? Would nanny government have rescued us from the bogey man? Nope. All it would result in is another monument to market regulation that would strangle another segment of our fragile local economy and raise costs to consumers and taxpayers.

So on her main issue she is all over the place. More regulation here, maybe more there, and no thoughts about unintended consequences. This mental state kind of parallels her disparate life she described. She seems very adaptable but pragmatic to a fault. "All things to all people" is not a prescription for good government. Once again, I feel we get a much better bargain with our incumbent commissioners.

Lastly, I apologize if I implied that you were in favor of increased taxes. I can see how I could have given that impression. I believe, however, that you ended your comments about increased taxes Wednesday night with the warning, "It's coming." It is a reasonable question to ask that since you "did not speak up" to oppose increased taxes before the Dispatch Committee, why on earth would you bring the subject up and leave the Republican Central Committee hanging on that closing remark? Where a majority in the room are tax & spend liberals, that was a not a good place to leave the discussion.

Thank you again for joining the dialog on these matters.

Sincerely Yours,

Brooks Imperial

Citizens For Voter Choice

**Reply to Mr. Imperial**

Mr. Imperial you continue to flabbergast me. I think you have some good things to say, but rather than talk about it publicly you hide behind your computer.

I personally have things I would like to say, but I am not as “trained” as you are at manufacturing, but here it goes:

I do not believe that the Chairperson of the Party should make the political decisions for the committee, as that would be a dictatorship and not a representative democracy. Decision-making is what precinct committee people are elected to do, and they should each do what is best for the entire Republican Party and not a special interest subset. The ECR members should not go along like a flock of sheep and vote everyone in who is brought forward through the nomination process. I only

remember hearing one negative vote during the meeting – and it did not come from your direction. Blind acceptance of those wishing to join the ECR is where things started going wrong five years ago, and in my opinion, last Wednesday night was a prime example of this problem continuing.

True Republican Party members do not welcome tax and spend liberals. This is one of the many reasons that I encourage all candidates to go thru the caucus system. Some candidates like to skirt the caucus system and not have direct contact with their constituents in this grassroots atmosphere where their beliefs, positions, and platforms can be questioned and criticized and evaluated and voted up or down.

The agenda distributed said “announcements.” Announcements are always included on the agenda. I thought that some candidates would like to attend and make their intentions known about running for Commissioner. (When the call/agenda for the meeting was mailed out 3 weeks ago, most of those now running for Commissioner had not even announced their candidacy.) These “announcements” would also provide an opportunity for ECR members to meet and question the candidates. You did ask questions of some of the candidates, but why not all?

Mr. Imperial you are so used to working with some in politics that always have an ulterior motive that you believe everyone does. That is exactly what is wrong with most of our Elected Officials; they come into office with an ulterior motive that no one knew about until after their election.

If Mr. Neumann wants to prepare questions for the candidates, that is good. Either he or someone else should put together a program of “Meet the Candidates” meetings throughout the County. This is how we as residents find out ahead of time, meaning before the caucuses, county assembly, primary, and general election, what each candidate believes in, stands for, and opposes. Wednesday night one person approached me about setting up this kind of public awareness event, and I of course said that it was a great idea. True Republicans, not the infiltrators, should put this

foreword and assure that it happens in a manner when/where a large percentage of the county residents can attend. We do not need, and I do not want, any more of the dirty politics that took place at the last county assembly.

You talked about the candidates discussing raising taxes and increasing the level of government intrusions into the private sector. You pointed out that I did not say anything until the end of the meeting about the fact that and that “I had been involved in governmental discussions to increase taxes.” Brooks, YOU DO NOT LISTEN VERY WELL, and then you fabricate statements and falsely attribute them to others. What I did say was that I was at a meeting of the Dispatch Committee, which was put together by the Commissioners, and the subject of raising taxes or a mill levy came up. However, I did not speak up. Check with the Commissioner that pulls your strings and gives you your marching orders if you doubt me. Moreover, you neglected to state that I said, at the ECR meeting, that I am against raising taxes and that something has to be done; meaning for the dispatch area, of which I am quite sure, you know nothing about.

I thought the “Democrat thinking” of some of the candidates came out just the way I hoped it would – plainly obvious. Now, it is your responsibility as a precinct committee person to make sure that all of your constituents are informed and made aware of what you believe you heard – unless you are your only constituent.

One additional point I would like to make regarding the agenda at our meetings: you and all other members of the ECR are encouraged to contact me if you have items that you believe should be on the agenda. Just remember you have to submit the requests at least 16 days before the meeting.

Dale Goetz

[Reply](#)[Forward](#) | [Delete](#)Message #441 of 1797 < [Prev](#) | [Next](#) >[Expand Messages](#)**2004 Commissioner Race**

Yesterday evening, March 24, 2004, at the Kiowa Lions Hall at 7:00 p.m., the only event in this electoral season, where ALL commissioner candidates for Elbert...

Author

[Sort by Date](#)Brooks Imperial  
[coventurer](#)Mar 25, 2004  
7:26 am**Re: 2004 Commissioner Race**

Interesting, too bad you were not able to write a verbatim question and answer from each candidate to show how diverse they each are....

Neumann, Joseph  
[joseph.neumann@dexmed...](#)Mar 25, 2004  
7:48 am**Re: 2004 Commissioner Race**

First, the 29th member was Norm Happel, who showed up after the roll was initially taken. Second, I thought far too much time was allowed to each candidate for...

Tedd Lipka  
[Tedd\\_Strange](#)Mar 25, 2004  
10:47 am**Re: 2004 Commissioner Race**

Brooks, Thanks for the synopsis. The attendees count increased from 28 to 29 upon Norm Happel's late arrival @ 7:40 p.m. I totally agree with your statement...

Calhoun, Clay  
[Clay.Calhoun@qwest.com](#)Mar 25, 2004  
9:33 am**Re: 2004 Commissioner Race**

Clay (et. al.), People are mercurial - they will go whichever way they can. The ECR continues to welcome tax & spend liberals with open arms and reward them...

Brooks Imperial  
[coventurer](#)Mar 25, 2004  
3:00 pm**Re: 2004 Commissioner Race**

Brooks: I read your e-mails with a good degree of amusement. Seems as though your group fits people into two basic categories: tax and spend big government...

Suzanne O'Neill  
[soneill@fgn.net](#)Mar 25, 2004  
3:31 pm**Re: 2004 Commissioner Race**

Suzanne, I did not arrive at my characterizations of the 3 challengers by so tortuous a path as you took to reach your conclusions. The candidates told me, and...

Brooks Imperial  
[coventurer](#)Mar 25, 2004  
4:27 pm**Re: 2004 Commissioner Race**

Thank you Mr. Chairman for the substantive and well-written response. Mr. Chairman, neither incumbent "pulls my strings." I have looked at the field...

Brooks Imperial  
[coventurer](#)Mar 26, 2004  
3:33 pm

- ⋮ **Re: 2004 Commissioner Race**  
Brooks, there is, I believe, one additional group that needs to be identified. That group is "government employees", who in many cases tend to act together as...
- geormrty@wmconnect.com  
Mar 27, 2004  
12:44 pm
- 
- ⋮ **Re: 2004 Commissioner Race**  
Ted, It sounds like we've come to the same conclusions regarding the commissioners race with regard to the challengers, albeit through different reasoning. I...
- Brooks Imperial  
coventurer  
Mar 27, 2004  
12:48 pm

[< Prev Topic](#) | [Next Topic >](#)

Message #   Search:   [Advanced](#)

[Start Topic](#)

#### SPONSOR RESULTS

[No Time for School? Graduate Online](#)

[www.ClassesUSA.com](#) - Get a Degree in as Few as 2 Yrs- Graduate Faster with Online Classes.

[See Today's Mortgage Rates](#)

[www.LowerMyBills.com](#) - Calculate Your New Mortgage Payment. See Rates- No Credit Check Req.

[Online Degrees](#)

[www.NexTag.com](#) - Get Your AA, BA, Masters or PhD at a Top Online School. Start Now.

---

Copyright © 2008 Yahoo! Inc. All rights reserved.

[Privacy Policy](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Copyright Policy](#) - [Guidelines](#) - [Help](#)