



CORRIN SPIEGEL

13 January 2024

Dear Alderman Dunn,

It is with great disappointment that I am providing this letter to you.

When I submitted my letter requesting an amicable separation on September 15, I knew that action would forever change my relationship with the city, its elected leadership, and many fellow employees. However, the devastating impacts to my physical and mental health, along with the instability of my emotional well-being could no longer be ignored. As you are aware, the city and I reached an amicable resolution on Friday, October 6. Between then and November 17, I continued to fulfill my duties, consistent with the modified scope of responsibilities and authority as directed by the elected officials. This was done in spite of the compounding issues associated with my health that occurred as a result of my continued presence in a workplace that had become increasingly volatile.

When I left the office with the remainder of my personal effects on Friday, November 17, I sincerely believed that the following six weeks until my official last day of employment would remain amicable as the transition occurred. Sadly, that was not the case. On the morning of Wednesday, November 29, I received a call from a former city employee distraught that they had just been contacted by the media. The reporter stated that they had been provided a complete version of the former employee's demand letter, which had not been redacted in any form. In my professional experience working for the organization for nearly a decade, it was my understanding that the letter should have never been released. I advised Corporation Counsel Warner of the issue, and subsequently logged into my city work email and sent an email to Mallory Merritt, Brian Heyer, Alison Fleming, and Brian Krup advising of the issue. I never received a response to that email.

The following day, a letter from Lane and Waterman was transmitted to my city work email. That letter is attached for reference. To my knowledge, no special meeting of the council was held between

November 17 and November 30 to alter my employment status. I believe that any reasonable person would construe the statement "potential conflict of interest that may arise through your continued employment" the same way I did. I had been terminated. As was common knowledge at that time, I had an executed separation agreement and was already on administrative leave consistent with the terms of that agreement. Taking an action to amend my employment status in a form that violated the terms of the separation agreement appears to be motivated by intentions that I am currently unaware of.

The action taken by Lane and Waterman, on behalf of the city with authorization from one or more persons, is a clearly defined act of retaliation, further exacerbated by the violation of city code and state law. In addition to the aforementioned November 30 letter, I am attaching the email communications received from the city's outside counsel. I believe this further demonstrates the acts of intentional retaliation given the attempted intimidating and hostile tone.

At this time, I have not retained legal counsel, nor is it currently my desired outcome to pursue litigation against the city. I am not currently seeking any form of financial compensation from the city as a means to resolve this issue.

I believe a written acknowledgment of wrong-doing and a corresponding apology by those involved would suffice as an acceptable resolution at this time.

Respectfully,



Corri Spiegel

Attachments

