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Matt -

Thank you for asking the board for their thoughts. I will now share mine:

In November, three of the board members were not consulted on your actions until after the fact. At that time I felt that you were not representing the entire Board, but were only working for the onshore directors that were in attendance in court.

In your document you brought up the Powell case which was not the Conflict of Interest you presented to the court. Your motion dealt with the Stine case.

In Section 5, you stated that “Sharon served 11 days prior to her resigning from the EFNLOA Board at your request.” As stated in the deposition, I resigned on the day you told me that being an officer was a conflict of interest. During those 11 days that I was an officer, there were no formal or informal EFNLOA board meetings, decisions, or interaction with Steve Snyder.

EFAC and EFNLOA **do not have any conflicting** actions regarding the judgments ruled from 1994 through today. As a matter of fact EFNLOA exists to see that the rights of offshore owners to use the easement, access the lake, and have piers are enforced per the judgement. If you have any evidence to support your point of view I would appreciate your sharing it with me.

I have a hard time accepting the statements you made in the document regarding delays and the expenses that they have cost. Judge Reed said this was a red herring and I agree with him. EFAC has to pay for your bill and court costs regarding this Conflict of Interest proceedings.

Finally, I am glad to see that no mention of an inaccuracy brought up in my deposition was made regarding a “meeting of Stines & Anson in Snyder’s office in 2015”. That was completely untrue.