



Stefan Sharkansky

question about today's editorial

Jim Vesely <jvesely@seattletimes.com>
To: theshark

Mon, Aug 27, 2007 at 10:00 AM

Dear Stefan: Respectfully, I can't find a lapse in the careful wording of the editorial. I think you're misreading "said as much" as content instead of opinion. I don't see the need to do either of your suggestions. Best, Jim.

From: Stefan Sharkansky
Sent: Sunday, August 26, 2007 5:02 PM
To: Jim Vesely
Subject: question about today's editorial

Jim,

Could you kindly explain something that appeared in today's editorial "Orderly transition to elections director"? I respectfully disagree with the opinion that is expressed. But I question the factual basis of this assertion:

Much fuss has been made about how the elections director is not accountable to the public and how if the elections director had been directly accountable to the public in the 2004 governor's race, election mistakes would not have been made.

This is by now trumped up hoey, and a judge in a Republican county said as much after a lengthy trial on behalf of Republican Dino Rossi.

I have read Judge Bridges' oral decision (<http://www.seattleweekly.com/2005-06-08/news/borders-et-al-v-king-county-et-al.php>) pretty carefully, but I am unable to find any reference, direct or indirect, to the question whether the King County elections director should be elected or appointed. Would you be kind enough to either explain the basis for citing the court case to support your editorial, or retract the statement as unfounded.

thank you
Stefan Sharkansky
