

April 9, 2015

Against SEC bylaws

After reading your reporter's coverage of the last board meeting two things struck me as being ironic. It was stated that the board meeting failed to meet the notice requirements of the open meetings bylaws passed by the members in 2010, which was later confirmed as proper by the district court.

The second was the observation by Mr. Greg Miller that the resolutions proposed by the membership in district meetings in the fall of 2014 were pending the decision by the membership during the regular annual meeting of the members which the board scheduled for May 16, 2015.

It appears to me that by placing the "special meeting" ahead of the already announced date of the Annual Member's Meeting is a deliberate attack by management to obstruct the cooperative's requirement of democratic member control. That maneuver violates the existing bylaws and betrays as false the advertising SEC management is circulating, which states that the Christensen bylaws will improve democratic control. Those proposed bylaws do just the opposite. The new bylaws propose that the members may propose bylaw amendments "by submitting a petition containing the verified signatures of 500 members to the board of trustees 180 days prior to the next annual meeting."

That process is extremely more rigorous than under the present bylaws, which allow a quorum of no less than 60 members at a district meeting to propose amendments by majority vote of those present and voting, which will then be presented at the next annual members meeting for majority approval by the entire membership, represented by a quorum of no less than 300 registered members.

If you read the minutes of the 2014 District 2 and District 3 meetings you will see why the co-op's management wants to disrupt the members' right to democratically control the co-op.

One of those measures would have given the membership the right to reject the renewal of the attorney's contract with the cooperative corporation. Considering how the board has used its attorneys at excessive cost to act against the members illustrates why I am voting "no" to the very unfair proposed bylaws.

In addition, I noted in a few places the language "The board may" is used where I believe the language should read "The board shall." The word "may" gives the board weasel room where it should not exist in my opinion.

If you take the time to read them you will probably agree with me. If you don't read them, go to the meeting anyway and vote "no" on principle. We should not reward dishonesty in those who manage our co-op.

Sincerely,

Bill Fuller

Magdalena