

It is within the purview of any member to call for a vote of no-confidence. As a member of the board being called out, I am responding to that call with my personal rebuttal. I am speaking for myself and not the board. The information I give is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and recollection. This may turn out to be a lengthy response.

Early in 2019, an incident requiring EMT response resulted in a follow-up by a fire department inspector. Prior to any citation being issued, the board at that time decided to vacate the premises and sell off the furniture (which was not theirs to dispose of. Records of sales and locations of furniture have never been submitted). There was no discussion with the landlord in spite of the fact that we still had two years on our lease. In order to inform the membership of some of what was going on, some members of the board and several other members of the club proceeded to discuss the business on a public podcast. In all the years I have been a member of Threshold, the policy has been that no Threshold business is to be discussed in a public forum (the terms "rules, bylaws, policies" have been used interchangeably and incorrectly causing much confusion. A committee has been formed to review, revise, and clarify the guidelines by which Threshold will be governed in the future. For the purposes of this rebuttal I will attempt to use the word "policies" when referring to governance). As a result of the discussion held on a public podcast, a member filed a complaint that they had been non-consensually discussed and outed by those people. The board at that time chose to ignore the complaint for over six months.

In June 2019, the newly elected board inherited the complaint and attempted to resolve the situation as quickly as possible, as according to the policies previously practiced. (A bit of history: in the past, the way complaints were handled was that three members of the board sat at a hearing wherein the one bringing the complaint could state their charges and the one being complained about could rebut or refute that charge. It was done as privately as possible in order to maintain the confidentiality of all members involved. Each person had the right to call in personal witnesses with knowledge of the incident. Their confidentiality was also a prime consideration. These hearings were not held in secret, they were held with a concern for the members privacy. At no time in the past had the entire Threshold membership been invited to a hearing, especially without the consent of all involved.) Three members of the newly elected board were impaneled to hold a hearing. Because of the delay since the original complaint, and in an attempt to adhere to timelines which were dictated by certain directives, the panel tried to expedite the situation. In hindsight, there were mistakes made and some of their actions led to confusion and misinterpretation. As a member of that panel, all I can say at this time is that the attempt was to be fair and accommodating to both sides within the directives we had been given. I was not told that the previous board had changed the policies concerning public discussion of Threshold business until six hours into the hearing.

I was never given a date for that change. I never saw any minutes of the meeting where that happened. The change was never posted on the Threshold website. I didn't understand why, if that (the change in policy) was the case, the member making the complaint wasn't told, early on, that the change had been made allowing for appearance on the podcast to publicly discuss the

situation, and ending the process right there. The hearing itself, the emotional responses, the misinformation and misinterpretations which occurred, the pain and divisiveness and mistrust which has resulted since then, have been a source of distress for me since my election to the board in May.

My concern then, as it is now, is the continuance of Threshold as an organization. The board I am on has been accused of doing nothing since our election to benefit Threshold. In point of fact, we have added to the Threshold calendar:

- one new members only party
- one women's only partyone diversity discussion group
- one "recovery in the lifestyle - 12 step program"
- one LGBT QX party
- a women's rope class
- a party dedicated to bondage and restraint
- twice a month upkeep munches
- the continuation of Submissions Newsletter
- several other co-sponsored "member special events" (MSE)

All of these things represent additional time and presence commitments by the board since at least one board member must be present. The programs dedicated to diverse inclusion are a direct response to requests by the membership and our care for the growing community.

I appreciate the opportunity this rebuttal gives me to say things I have been wanting to say for a while. I appreciate being able to explain my position. I appreciate the hard work and love for Threshold expressed by the many members and volunteers on an ongoing basis which has kept this organization alive for over 37 years. My request is, of those of you who are planning to vote, please know what you are voting for, and come to the business meeting on January 5, 2020 or send as your proxy someone you trust.