

Herron, Susan

From: Matthew Dent
Sent: Saturday, January 30, 2021 5:56 AM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: Fwd: Whose Idea Was It to Come Up With the Retaliatory Provisions of the Committee's Proposed Whistleblower Procedure for Financial Matters?

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please add this to the correspondence received for next meeting and distribute it the AC. Thank you, Matthew

Matthew Dent
775.530.1345

From: s4s@ix.netcom.com <s4s@ix.netcom.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:26:41 PM
To: Dent Matthew <dent_trustee@ivgid.org>
Cc: Schmitz Sara <schmitz_trustee@ivgid.org>; Dobler Cliff <cfdobler@aol.com>; Ray Tulloch <raytulloch@munrotulloch.com>; Aaron Derreck <DCA2319@yahoo.com>; ISW@ivgid.org <ISW@ivgid.org>; Joshua.Nelson@bbklaw.com <Joshua.Nelson@bbklaw.com>
Subject: Whose Idea Was It to Come Up With the Retaliatory Provisions of the Committee's Proposed Whistleblower Procedure for Financial Matters?

Dear Chairperson Dent and Other Honorable Members of the Audit Committee -

So I'm going through the Board packet and I'm reading the proposed whistleblower procedure. Whistleblower policies/practices are supposed to provide protection for employees - not trustees, not audit committee members, not members of the public, but employees.

So why does it purport to extend to areas where IVGID has no power over? And whose idea was it?

The protections for employees are guaranteed by statute.

Statute also allows for disciplinary actions for employees for making false claims. Those should be among IVGID employee policies and practices, not Audit Committee procedures.

Second, since whistleblower statutes apply to employees, not publicly elected trustees, or Board appointed audit committee members, or members of the public, IVGID has no power to make up its own disciplinary actions against anyone other than an employee. Audit Committee members can be removed by action of the Board.

Third, since whistleblower statutes are designed to protect employees, attempts to discipline members of the public have no place in this procedure. Members of the public are guaranteed free speech. There are other remedies for false statements made by them.

So why has someone raised punitive provisions in a whistleblower procedure, and then extended those provisions to members of the public? Was that you Josh? Or how about you Indra?

Specifically I refer to the following language under "acting in good faith" at page 5 of the committee packet:

"Any allegations that prove to be made maliciously or knowingly false(ly) will be viewed as a serious disciplinary offense. For employees this may result in termination AND FOR COMMUNITY MEMBERS, IT MAY RESULT IN SUSPENSION OF THEIR RECREATION PRIVILEGES."

What government, anywhere in the U.S., retaliates against its citizens by depriving them of public services and facilities made available to all citizens, because of the words which come out of their mouths? And BTW, who is going to make the determination of what is false and what is malicious? And since when do public agencies "discipline" community members?

The focus of this practice should be how to handle complaints, no matter what the source, not on how to handle false claims or exact punishment.

Finally, since what I say here is knowingly true, I trust no one at IVGID will take away my recreational privileges.

Aaron Katz