



View

Fwd: Cal-Am Ad

Fred Meurer to you

8:11PM Show Details

Stoldt ad

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "stoldt@comcast.net" <stoldt@comcast.net >

Date: October 3, 2018 at 8:04:13 PM PDT

To: meurer@meurermuni.com

Subject: Cal-Am Ad

Hi Fred,



Saw your wife's TV ad. Sorry to suggest that she is a pawn and misinformed, but that is obviously the point of this email. So sorry to see your family's impartial history now biased.

Dave

Sent from my iPhone



Fred Meurer <meurer@meurermuni.com>

Ad

2 messages

phylmeurer@cs.com <phylmeurer@cs.com>
To: stoldt@comcast.net

Wed, Oct 3, 2018 at 8:38 PM



Pawn? Misinformed? Interesting comments from a supposedly neutral agency general manager. I'd be happy to debate you anytime. Circulating petitions saying there would be 'cost savings' when the court told them 4 years ago they could not say that is misleading at best and it doesn't seem unreasonable -or misinformed -to think that people should be able to vote after the feasibility study is done. Claremont.

Phyllis Meurer

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail

stoldt@comcast.net <stoldt@comcast.net>

Wed, Oct 3, 2018 at 9:22 PM

To: phylmeurer@cs.com

Cc: Fred Meurer <meurer@meurermuni.com>, Steve Thomas <steve@tbccommunications.com>, locke@mpwmd.net



Thank you Phyllis. I understand your response.

Sent from my iPhone

[Quoted text hidden]

Re: Ad

phylmeurer to stoldt + 3 more

10:13AM Show Details

Dave— if you disagreed with what I said in the ad you could have called and offered to explain your point of view. Your use of the word 'pawn' to describe me in your email to Fred was offensive. The fact that your response email to me last night was also sent to your district's paid PR firm and a district employee is even more questionable and inappropriate.

Phyllis Meurer

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail

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

From: stoldt <stoldt@comcast.net >

To: phylmeurer <phylmeurer@cs.com >

Cc: Fred Meurer <meurer@meurermuni.com >; Steve Thomas <steve@tbccommunications.com >; locke <locke@mpwmd.net >

Sent: Wed, Oct 3, 2018 09:22 PM

Subject: Re: Ad

Thank you Phyllis. I understand your response.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Oct 3, 2018, at 8:38 PM, phylmeurer@cs.com wrote:

>

> Pawn? Misinformed? Interesting comments from a supposedly neutral agency general manager. I'd be happy to debate you anytime. Circulating petitions saying there would be

'cost savings' when the court told them 4 years ago they could not say that is misleading at best and it doesn't seem unreasonable -or misinformed -to think that people should be able to vote after the feasibility study is done. Claremont.

>

> Phyllis Meurer

>

> Sent from AOL Mobile Mail



AOL: Mail, News, ...
AOL Inc.
★★★★☆
FREE - On the App Store

View

TV Ad

Dave Stoldt to you

9:33AM Show Details

Phyllis,

As you are a respected thought leader in the community, I did not expect you to react the way you did. Hence, I anticipated that I might have created a public outreach issue for the District, so I looped our internal and external community liaisons into the situation. Then I discussed it with them, because the District should be viewed separately from a personal opinion expressed by one of its employees. At this point, I simply apologize to you that I made my personal feelings known to you.

Regards,

Dave

David J. Stoldt
General Manager
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
5 Harris Court - Bldg G
Monterey, CA 93940


831.658.5651

Re: TV Ad

phylmeurer to dstoldt + 3 more

1 day ago Show Details

This is getting a bit ridiculous. You thought it was appropriate to send Fred an email labeling me as a “pawn”. Did you really think that pejorative word and your very condescending message would not elicit a response?

 This is not my problem — it is yours because you chose to send that first email. You are correct that you might have a pr problem on your hands. You probably should have thought of that before you sent that email and your subsequent email trying to make my reaction the issue.

You are the person in charge of overseeing a feasibility study if Measure J passes. This string of emails alone (and I suspect there might be others) truly bring into question your alleged neutrality and impartiality. These are all things you should have thought of before labeling me as a “pawn” for stating in the ad two things that are absolutely true: the court said the ballot measure could not include ‘cost saving’ in its title AND there is no district wide vote after the feasibility study is done.

We are considering how to handle what we find to be this inappropriate communication string of yours.

Phyllis Meurer

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail

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

From: Dave Stoldt <dstoldt@mpwmd.net >

To: phylmeurer <phylmeurer@cs.com >