

## Exhibit K — Member Statement on Bullying & Perceived Inaction (Context for Process & Proportionality)

**Purpose.** To provide contextual evidence of membership concerns about **bullying** and **perceived leadership inaction**, underscoring the need for rule-based, neutral, and proportionate discipline in this appeal.

**Provenance.** Excerpted from a member message to the “South End Rowing Club” Google Group.

**Author:** *Jeanine Du Bois* • **Date:** May 16, 2024 • **Time:** 3:34:15 PM PT

**Addressees (per header):** *craiga...@gmail.com, southendr...@googlegroups.com*

*(If desired, the author’s surname and addresses may be redacted to “J.D.” / “redacted” for privacy in the closed-session packet.)*

**Verbatim excerpt (emphasis added):**

“well, it’s obvious that you’ve never been the target of **bullying** at the south end rowing club. **It’s one of the reasons why I rarely go, and I will not participate in any functions.**

But we can let the thread die. We can further **cancel people**, when we don’t care for what they have to say, we can **bully** them like I’ve been bullied. Have a nice day. I hope that you never experience the **bullshit** that I have. **And the president didn’t do anything about it.**

**Jeanine Du Bois**

Sent from my iPhone”

---

### Relevance to this appeal (how the Board should use this)

1. **Process integrity & neutrality.** The statement reflects **member sensitivity to bullying/censorship** and perceived **leadership inaction**. In this climate, it is critical that discipline be grounded in **written standards**, with **transparent safeguards** (complainant identified; joint interview; complete record), to avoid any **appearance of retaliation or bias**.
2. **Proportionality.** Where **intent is ambiguous**, **no harm** is shown, and the conduct is **uncodified**, imposing a **60-day suspension** risks reinforcing perceptions of **overreach** or **selective enforcement**. A neutral reminder plus **prospective policy** provides a de-escalatory, compliance-oriented path consistent with the Code’s “**benefit of the doubt**” principle.

3. **Governance & reputational risk.** Member allegations of bullying/censorship—whether ultimately substantiated or not—highlight why decisions should **hew closely to the By-Laws/Procedures**. Over-penalizing in an uncoded area invites **reputational** and **legal** exposure and erodes trust.
- 

### **Requested handling (closed-session)**

- **Include** this Exhibit in the packet **as context**, not for the truth of any allegations.
- **Reaffirm** in the minutes that the Board's determination will rest on **cited written standards**, a **complete record**, and **proportionality**.
- **Disposition:** Withdraw the 60-day suspension; or convert to a **neutral, non-disciplinary policy reminder** and **adopt a prospective door policy** with signage and member notice.

*Note.* This Exhibit is offered **for context** regarding climate and governance risk. It is **not** an accusation by the appellant, **not** evidence of the truth of the matters asserted by the author, and **does not** expand the scope of the charged conduct. Inclusion admits **no identity, conduct, or intent**; all rights reserved.