

Attachment A

Caryn Ann Harlos

Posted May 24, 2025 at 04:18 PM

Author

...



Members

734

Location: Colorado

On 5/24/2025 at 12:09 PM, Dan Honemann said:

I should hope not, since that is not the reason for rules protecting absentees. If it were, they would apply even if all members attend.

You have it right when you say that these rules are designed "to allow members enough information to decide whether they need to attend".

And if they all attended, they certainly felt they needed to. I cannot possibly see how this is an invalid meeting outside of a technicality that protects no one.

Dan Honemann

Posted May 24, 2025 at 04:31 PM

...



Moderators

Staff

11.5k

Location: Timonium, Maryland

On 5/24/2025 at 12:18 PM, Caryn Ann Harlos said:

And if they all attended, they certainly felt they needed to. I cannot possibly see how this is an invalid meeting outside of a technicality that protects no one.

You haven't been paying attention.

Caryn Ann Harlos

Posted May 24, 2025 at 04:35 PM

Author

...



Members

734

Location: Colorado

Merely hand-waving me away "well you haven't been paying attention" - I have, I just don't agree which is not the same thing - is certainly your right. And it is my right to deem that supremely unhelpful to the discussion.

Dan Honemann

Posted May 24, 2025 at 05:33 PM

...



Moderators

Staff

11.5k

Location: Timonium, Maryland

On 5/24/2025 at 12:35 PM, Caryn Ann Harlos said:

Merely hand-waving me away "well you haven't been paying attention" - I have, I just don't agree which is not the same thing - is certainly your right. And it is my right to deem that supremely unhelpful to the discussion.

Yes, that is indeed your right.

But when one holds herself out to be a parliamentarian while plainly evidencing a lack of understanding of what is said in RONR, and a refusal to learn, I feel compelled to call attention to it.