

District 99 Board:

Since you are now one of the few, probably only, local taxing bodies that expects citizens to sit through a two to three hour meeting before they can express their thoughts and concerns, (a strange position for an organization that should respect vigorous dialog and discussion), I will now primarily express my concerns about District policies via e-mail, Letters to the Editor, etc.

Three comments, in their condensed version, I would have made last night if conveniently allowed:

1. I don't recall ever seeing an organization communicate as many confusing and conflicting positions on an issue as you have on the Woodridge property. Such incompetence in the private sector would have resulted in some strategic re-assignments and downsizing weeks ago. Please just figure out what you need to do with the property and do it!
2. Shame on you for indicating that District 99's word is of little value unless one also obtains a detailed legal document codifying any agreement. That is a heck of a message to give the community.
3. I think you need to also re-examine your ethical standards relevant to your claim that any sale of the property must be analyzed based on its "highest use." Clearly District 99 leadership defines "highest use" as squeezing the last penny possible from the property so as to maximize relief for your ever deteriorating capital budget. I would suggest, however, that most citizens with a strong ethical compass would tell you "highest use" means best use of that property as it relates to the immediate community. That does not equate to the high density housing you are promoting! As such, I believe you have forfeited any moral authority to lecture students on making proper decisions. Start practicing what you preach!!

Sincerely, William Vollrath