

Co-op has no right to censure

The accusation prompting the SEC board's censure seems to mean that neither the board nor its attorneys are up to speed on the requirements of New Mexico's Open Meetings Act (OMA).

The e-mail in question was addressed to a quorum of the board of trustees.

Communications among them constitute an open meeting as I understand the law. In addition, communications among a quorum of a governing body, to qualify as an exception to OMA must discuss items the law allows to be treated as "confidential." Nothing in Ms. Dorough's e-mail would meet that criteria, and there was no prior notice of her intentioned action.

It is August, and the Dorough administration has no strategic plan for the co—op. That means business assets wasting as usual. The two previous administrations had no announced plans either and seemed to follow the suggestions of the Wiggins attorneys to continue to violate bylaws, prevent members from voting at meetings and other wise resist efforts of the membership to democratically control their co-op.

I believe the only people who want to retaliate against me through punishment are the attorneys, the general manager, Ms. Dorough, Mr. Wade and Mr. Cordova. The problem is the authority to punish a trustee is exclusive to the members who elected her/him. Ms. Dorough and company want to usurp that power from the members also.

Can any of them face reality?

Charlie Wagner
District 2 Trustee