

Member comment 12/14/13 –

In re: Milton Ulibarri's thesis on SEC's quorum dispute (December 12, 2013 edition, page 4).

About this, Mr. Ulibarri asserts: (1) It (the need for a quorum) prevents the democratic process from being hijacked by just a few members and (2) that the (SEC) by-laws need to be reworked with the MEMBERS BY-LAWS COMMITTEES AND ATTORNEYS to develop a set of amendments that will fix the inconsistencies and line them up with New Mexico state law..... One can't argue with those two assertions.....HOWEVER, it all boils down to, "just who is doing the hijacking".

Up until 2010 when SEC REFORM became a hot issue eleven miscreant trustees had for decades used the then existing "by-law machinery" to retained control of SEC affairs to their own financial advantage. And, after the April 2010 member/owner vote, those trustees fought tooth and nail (financing their fight with member owner funds) to thwart reform.....to their advantage. Not liking the outcome they cried foul, filed a lawsuit and lost.

So, if miscreant trustees are allowed to "pick" persons favorable to their interests to serve on such by-law committees and "attorneys", favorable to same, the effect is to nullify the entire process.

About QUORUMS.....If there is no meeting quorum to begin with, our trustees win by default. And if there is an initial meeting quorum allowing a proper meeting our trustees bore people with their "pompous rhetoric" and "show" to the point that those bored people leave in disgust thereby killing the meeting for lack of quorum. Again the trustees win by default. No doubt all is calculated.