Glenda Wiles

From: Jeff Burrows
Sent: Tuesday, January 8, 2019 11:39 AM
To: 'D Jossi'; Ravalli County Commissioners Office
Cc: Greg Chilcott; Chris A. Hoffman
Subject: RE: Hughes Creek Decision Response

Debra,

The attachments you sent have been read many times. The answers to your questions were in the body of the email I sent to you on November 29th 2018 (see below). I have not gone through the evidence from the previous cases and compared them page by page to the evidence that was presented to us in our hearings to provide you with the "new evidence" and will not do this as it is not necessary. The Commissioners denied the landowners petition to abandon the road beyond the gate, which is consistent with the Commissioners decisions from 1982 and 1984.

If you do want "new evidence" that did not exist in 1988 and 2009 when the referenced memos were written, it would be that there was a new petition by the landowners to abandon a county road beyond the existing gate, which precipitated the hearings. The decision was based on the evidence presented to us during that hearing.

If you have any new questions, I would happy to try and answer them.

Jeff

From: D Jossi <montanajossi@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 7, 2019 3:01 PM
To: Jeff Burrows <jburrows@rc.mt.gov>; Ravalli County Commissioners Office <commissioners@rc.mt.gov>
Cc: Greg Chilcott <gchilcott@rc.mt.gov>; Chris A. Hoffman <CAHoffman@rc.mt.gov>
Subject: Re: Hughes Creek Decision Response

Hi Jeff-

Thank you for finally responding.

Email communication works amazingly well if it does not go unanswered for 30+ days with no response.

Have been doing business locally and internationally by email for two decades and find email communications gives each person the opportunity to do research and answer questions with the ability to include/attach information that backs your statements.

On December 3rd we attached letters, w*hich you can include as new evidence as they were not in the court files,* from two Ravalli County Attorneys that show that in fact that past cases were dropped due to insufficient evidence. Did you read the attachments? By your response, it seem you may have overlooked them.

We are attaching these letters once again to continue this communication. As you can see, these letters directly refute the response you gave us and lead back to the questions asked in our last communication.