

The 3-Minute Summary

-Mayor Mick, other elected officials and City staff purposely mislead voters in May 2005 with fabricated and false information in order to secure a vote in favor of Burlingame Phase I. These actions likely violated local and state election laws.

-When Mick's tax-exempt GoBurlingame.com website supporting information was questioned, the 3-year-old website was suddenly pulled down.

-City officials knowingly understated the anticipated taxpayer subsidy by approximately \$85 million when asking voters to approve Burlingame.

-Barwick claimed that the City never used the \$14.7 million or \$62,500 subsidy numbers, and that those numbers were result of "sloppy journalism" by The Aspen Times. Then the City-produced brochure surfaced, exposing his misrepresentations.

-In anticipation of the Burlingame ballot measure, City officials gave interviews and were quoted numerous times in the media claiming the total cost to taxpayers would be \$14.7 million in preparation for their votes in the May 2005 election. Despite the considerable written and electronic evidence to the contrary, in May 2008, the City falsely claimed that the misstatement was made "only" in the City brochure.

-City officials defended their lack of responsible financial disclosure claiming that voters did not care about the cost of Burlingame, only its density!

-In March 2008, Council selected Burlingame II/III as the best value, highest priority affordable housing opportunity available, based on staff reports that per unit subsidies would be \$159,000. 45 days later, under public pressure to disclose the facts, the staff estimates increased to approximately \$375,000 per unit. Council never reviewed the original Burlingame priority decision after the new cost information was delivered.

-I informed Mick of my concerns in March, April and May 2008, requesting personal meetings to go over the controversial information so that **he** could announce it to the public and provide leadership to find solutions. He refused to meet with me or to discuss the troublesome data, and shirked his leadership responsibility.

-Mick now claims that the maximum number of units at Burlingame was consistently stated to be 236 during the 2005 campaign, despite the fact that his website shows that he was promoting up to 330 units for the May 2005 vote. He purposely misrepresented the facts again for the November 2008 ballot question on Burlingame density.

-From 2005 to 2008, apparently neither Council ever asked for the complete budget or actual spending report on Burlingame.

-The City's senior manager, who had almost complete financial and development authority over Burlingame, was simultaneously being terminated, and retained his Burlingame authority for months until he found other employment. City Manager Barwick was so reckless with this \$140 million project that he assigned it to a manager in whom he had little confidence.

-There was no budget to control Burlingame spending, which was later estimated to be over \$140 million. City Council and City management saw no problem with this obvious lack of fiscal control. There is still no final number for Burlingame I.

-Mick and Jack verbally attacked me for arranging the filming of a pertinent public Council work session. They feigned surprise at the filming, although they had been previously informed several times. 20-30 minutes of personal, outrageous and false accusations ensue. No Council member or the City Attorney intervened to stop the personal attacks, or correct their obvious misrepresentations about not being informed.

-Mick and Jack claim that public has no right to film without their approval, despite the Colorado Sunshine laws, which specifically provide for this.

-Mick engaged in series of bizarre emails, fabricating charges against me of illegal fund-raising, political motives behind Burlingame disclosures, surprising him with Grassroots TV filming, and a host of absurd attempts to deflect scrutiny of his unethical behavior. (He then puts his false accusations and personal attacks into the public record.)

-Council makes no attempt to censure Mick or Jack for their unethical behavior, the verbal tirades or the false accusations in the emails.

-Council refuses to open an independent legal investigation despite the clear evidence of known misrepresentation to the voters.

-Mick, Jack and Barwick falsified reports of the Burlingame audit results in formal public communications.

-Council did not move to censure Mick for falsifying audit findings, or discipline Barwick for his egregious attempts at a cover-up.

-City belatedly discloses that they granted Burlingame I homeowners a density veto costing approximately \$15 million,(my estimate), despite previous promises to voters that the development could be expanded.

-Council approves a \$4 million budget line item for Burlingame II/III planning in 2009, without addressing the underlying management issues of credibility and competence that created the mess that is Burlingame I.

These are CLEARLY not the actions of leaders who care about employee housing. Hardly. The fiasco of Burlingame I is the result of bloated egos, corruption, the perception of a bottomless pot of housing money, reckless decision-making, a lack of leadership and ethics, no oversight and despicable behavior. Aspen, its workers and its taxpayers deserve far better. A certain way to get more is to demand more. Make your opinion known and your voice heard at the polls. The next City of Aspen election (for Mayor and two City Council seats) is on May 5, 2009.