

This is my public retort of the Board's statement regarding my expulsion and the incidents described therein.

Unlike the board, I took the time to pull evidence from the incidents and compile them once I became aware of what incidents I was supposedly expelled for. Due to having just purchased my first home, which along with work takes priority, I have not had much time to compile this response.

Not knowing what I was even defending myself against during my own board hearing (the board refused to tell me, I only learned when a member sent me the expulsion statement), I could not prepare any of this in advance.

The screenshots of timestamps folder shows that the document had outside of some cleanup, not been edited since my hearing. Additionally, the lack of board members viewing said documents in my defense (or their admission of violating the promises regarding concerns from witnesses not to make copies of the documents, leading to those witnesses being unwilling to put their names on the document due to open retaliation by multiple parties). Copies of the documents are present in the folder.

I do not expect the board to admit their mistakes; they've shown they would rather resort to presenting a false narrative because it is easier than actually seeking the truth, regardless of how easy it is to disprove their side of the story.

Rather, I share this for two reasons:

- First and foremost, I hope some members will step up to the challenge of the current problems at DMS. The mission is righteous, but current leadership has shown they are not up for the task. I hope I am successful in this endeavor.
- Second, I work in an industry where integrity is paramount. Unlike some other members that have been slandered by former leadership where they simply may lose access to the facility, I have impact in my life from libelous statements against me. I share this so anyone looking at what has transpired can see both sides of the coin.

As a note for those less familiar, many of the Directors and Officers (DnO) have carried recording devices for when we have to deal with incidents, rule enforcement, etc. It started to be more common after an incident in which a former member claimed an officer threatened them when the officer was enforcing a storage rule. Numerous witnesses and video helped show this was a false accusation, but as a matter of caution some of us started carrying devices for these situations to prevent "he said she said" arguments. In my case, I only generally turn mine on when I'm expecting trouble, as I'd often be at DMS for longer than the device's battery lasts. The board knows I carry this device, and explicitly refused copies of the data despite it's historical use and dependence in investigations when I was denied to know what incidents I was defending myself against.

These recordings are provided with only what is necessary, and more may be included at a time when I can filter. Without being told more details about some of the events, I have to sort through days worth of recordings.

My Response

I'm going to reply to each item in their announcement one at a time for simplicity's sake.

Timeline

06/??/2020 - Potential inappropriate Talk post from Freddy

06/03/2020 - Discussion from Freddy about Pride month

13 months later

Out the gate, they falsified this. These happened in **2021**

By claiming these were year+ old incidents they detract from the fact I'd been notifying them of his behaviour in both conversations and writing. In addition, they had been pushing back with assurances that "he was working on himself" to assuage concerns and avoid complaints as they were supposedly keeping an eye on things.

We additionally had a date for the talk post, witnesses, and evidence that not only was it made in 2021 on a known date, but that Freddy, or someone with administrative access, had deliberately tampered with evidence.

This information about the post, the timeline of events, and the visible deliberate scrubbing of evidence, can be seen in the report, "Background of my harassment by Freddy"

The admission by another board member that they were aware of his issues escalating can be seen in file `freddy_justin_notified_admitted_problems.png`

The board member acknowledged the timing of the incidents, and continued to assuage that he was working on himself and they were aware. This is in addition to various conversations on the matter.

07/07/2021

- Board meets with Charles concerning reported issues with metal shop. Note: Charles was elected chair without his knowledge at a meeting he didn't attend.
- Tails votes Freddy into COO position

I voted for Freddy as COO for two reasons; First, no one else volunteered and he's capable of the position. Second, I had private assurances that he was working on himself. This was additionally before things had escalated heavily. In addition, I did not want to publicly speak to my issues with the transphobic comments if he was supposedly working on himself, and it's a touchy subject personally.

Regarding the note Charles was elected chair without his knowledge, I have no idea why that was important enough to include here. He was told he did not have to accept, at the time we thought he was the best for the job since no one stepped up for it at the meeting. The complaint was additionally not only left open, but multiple additions to the complaint were added over the subsequent months.

07/10/2021 • Julie attends metal shop meeting, observes positive changes, accusations by Tails when there are technical difficulties with Google Meet

Charles had no problem acknowledging Tim on the virtual meeting, but refused to acknowledge myself nor Malcolm on the same call. This is critical, as the committee had previously voted that we were to research paths for moving forward with the oven. Charles was explicitly denying us the ability to present the results of this demanded research, to push his own solution that had already been found in electrical engineering analysis to be infeasible. In effect, by denying Malcolm the ability to speak to that matter Charles was able to continue to have no movement on replacing nor repairing the powder coating oven.

09/15/2021

- Tails recommends Freddy for formal board recognition
- Initial formal complaint about metal shop from Tails
- Begin having informal discussions with Charles and metal shop members to discern actual issues

Freddy was supposedly working on himself and I hadn't had an issue in the prior month; he additionally did good work with ending out dependence on Cintas. Regardless of any other issues, I strive to give credit when it is due. Funny thing is, the next escalation happened after this meeting and was acknowledged by other board members as being problematic.

This was additionally far from the initial formal complaint about metal shop; the metal shop complaint had been since July, and previously amended in August before bringing it up again this day in September. Prior complaints had never formally been resolved. This day was a push to further discuss the complaint and amend it with more information.

The board skips the next timeline item, which is a follow up to outstanding complaints against Charles and the Metal Shop sent on September 30th.

10/03/2021

- Receipt of letter from Charles Proctor re: Tails (AM)
- Tails initiates "Peanut" fight in the parking lot - conflicting reports as to content of argument • Complaint about Freddy from Tails (Evening)

I did not initiate the fight; I went up to say hi to him and Art. I didn't even bring up the peanuts until Freddy yelled at me about it. All I had done was post the equivalent of an "ugh" statement in the leadership discord with a photo of peanuts left out with the sentiment that people should know better with such a common allergen to at least put them in a container.

Notably, I immediately notified the board of the incident and filed a complaint. The board refused to even acknowledge it for three weeks (first mention it at all on Oct 27th), and even then waited until after a month had passed to interview any witnesses (only doing so after my open letter to the membership noted the complaint had been ignored).

Importantly, they had admitted they shelved the complaint rather than investigating the matter in the email James Henningson sent after the events of October 27th.

The witnesses, in a recorded statement, explicitly noted that they had trouble remembering details because of the inaction of the board by waiting over a month to speak about it.

As for a complaint about the morning of October 3rd or anything from Charles, I was not informed of one at any point of any complaints outstanding against me (and would not be until Oct 27th). Additionally, I have a recording of the Metal Shop meeting from that day in addition to my time trying to help Charles with minutes after he finally admits he needs help with them, which shows my actual tone during those meetings. Charles thanks me for sitting and talking with him. The tone is civil, and I continue to extend offers of help with getting the minutes and other matters in order.

10/04/2021

- Board began informal discussions with multiple members as to Metal Shop issues and Tails • Board began attempts for informal discussion with Tails

The board never made any mention of issues to me until Oct 27th.

10/25/2021

- Formal complaint against Tails from Charles
- Complaint from non-member as to Tail's behavior
- Tails responds directly to non-member without checking with fellow board members

Interestingly, I had not interacted with Charles since the October metal shop meeting (hardly had been at DMS at all), the meeting in which he thanked me for helping him, we paved a path forward, and the recordings show is cordial in nature. I still had not been informed by any board members about any complaints against me and would not be until the 27th.

The Non-Member was part of the Retro group, for which two other board members or officers have received the exact same complaint from the retro meetups previously within this year alone. We have issues with large groups every so often when a member hosts a large event without proper preparations for a large crowd. In this situation, as with prior group events this year, it was a large pool of non-members who were not only ignoring the waivers to enter, but doors had been propped open at multiple entrances. Similar to retail, those attending felt entitled to think that we were both at their beck and call and they could do whatever they wanted.

In the past, such complaints about being "rude" when a volunteer, often alone or maybe two of them, has to suddenly interrupt a large crowd with a raised voice because they're drowned out by the noise, we've always understood it to suck but it's what we had to do. The only difference in this event is that I was the *only* DnO member handling the situation, thus there wasn't another to "receive the complaint" as usual. Similar to retail, it's easier to acknowledge the non-members' concerns sometimes than it is to push back. My reply to their concerns was effectively this acknowledgement, and a copy of this reply and the initial email (with the non-member information redacted) is in the Supporting Documents.

Of note, Freddy was present during this incident, but sat idle rather than help manage the crowd and appears to have explicitly allowed the various non-members to enter without waivers and prop doors. When it was clear I was overwhelmed trying to handle the situation, he continued to sit by. Given my open complaint about him, I did not speak to him directly. I do however thank Captain for cleaning up a rubbish bin I spilled when moving a kiosk so I could try and get an efficient waiver line at the event itself rather than move a crowd of people across the building .

As for my reply, there is no rule about any member replying to any email from a non-member outside of government officials. Whether the incident genuinely had a bad tone on my part or not, per my previous notes about it being sometimes better to acknowledge the concerns regardless of merit, it was me apologizing and explaining how as volunteers we can be stuck in bad situations but that I would try to improve how I could handle it.

None of the other board members said a word to me about this, and I only even was made aware it was part of any issues justifying my expulsion *after* my expulsion actually took place.

Notably, they also said nothing when told during the event what was going on and what I was doing..

10/27/2021

- Formal complaint about Tails from Freddy
- After board office hours, board members talked alone with Tails to discuss directly the issues presented. Tails terminated call.

Notably, Freddy only filed this complaint after he had inserted himself into a welder discussion , one which was required by our rules and any member may start of their own volition, and escalated it into an argument because of the fact I opened the welder discussion.

The board did not talk with me “alone,” as this was the usual open Board work sessions where people could dial in, we had non-members in that day’s discussions (other makerspace leaders), doors were open, and I was projected on a large screen with speakerphone. This was far from a private discussion.

I terminated the call after breaking into tears, noting that I couldn’t have that discussion so suddenly and emotionally as I had been blind sided with what were apparently months worth of complaints, and their admission that they had ignored my open complaint about Freddy.

They had a large period of time to try and say “we need to talk, we have some concerns,” or any other way of handling it. This was the first time any of it was ever brought up. When being blind sided about complaints, on a public presentation where other members are present, in addition to finding out your own concerns had been ignored for the prior month, it’s an emotional response.

10/28/2021

- Email from James to Tails to reconcile w/ response from Tails

The email was a tone-deaf claim that “everything is your fault” basically. They additionally put in writing that they had ignored my serious complaint against Freddy, and refused to acknowledge that they had a communication problem by refusing to talk with me about any concerns for months. They blamed the inability to resolve the issues the night before on the fact it’s not in person, rather than the fact they had been withholding all these concerns for a long period of time and allowing them to fester.

The board refused to respond to my concerns in my replies about the tone-deaf nature of the response, the core problem being that I was never informed and the communication breakdown

amongst us, or otherwise. I additionally sent them two emails with concerns by members raised by the events of the call (again, it was not private) which were additionally met with silence.

11/02/2021

- Tails resigns from the Board

The only item with no factual rebuttal; I will note they could have tried to speak with me with any sincerity, or even reply at all to my concerns in my reply to James, but their admission they were ignoring my complaints and refusing to acknowledge core issues in the time between James' email and my resignation should not go untold.

Ultimately, my step down was decided based on their silence.

11/06/2021

- Direct conversations with various members on record about Tails' behavior
- Justin and Julie attended Metal Shop Election

The board glosses over the fact that after stepping down, I was banned from the metal shop never having received any warning nor discussions, and never having interacted with Charles in any meaningful instance since the meeting in which he thanked me for helping him try to resolve issues.

Charles had additionally sent bogus "complaint" notices to at least one member he knew would be voting against him. When he admitted the complaint was unsubstantiated and the board was notified, the board explicitly ignored the core problem of the situation. Charles has a previously documented history of voter intimidation dating back months (the most noteworthy was a threat that he'd make anyone who voted against his Vapor Hone proposal be required to service the machine without any help).

Furthermore, I have received private complaints from two members about Julie's behaviour at the meeting towards Shay and Malcolm, along with brash statements made by Charles regarding Shay. They noted she was aggressive to anyone that questioned the narrative of what happened involving my ban, or would vote against Charles.

11/08/2021

- After deliberations, decided to proceed with disciplinary hearing for Tails, Charles, and Freddy
- Tails requests neutral panel

11/10/2021

- Tails threatens “escalation” if panel is not used

The bylaws require that board members recuse themselves when said director has a conflict of interest, and the board refused to honour that. This has been done previously, such as when complaints involved candidates in the board election. The supposed “threat” is me pointing out that I have the actual evidence of everything and I have a right to share that with the membership in my defense.

The board had already broken several of its rules, the bylaws, and standard practice in how they normally handle complaint by not notifying me in a timely fashion of a complaint, immediately going to expulsion threats, false statements claiming they investigated my complaint about Freddy (which, in the recorded statements from both witnesses that were willing to speak, they did not speak with them about it until well after their false public statements that they had already been investigating it).

With the board having openly and, most importantly, *knowingly* been providing false information about the events, and myself having actual recordings and testimony for most things, I have a right to share that information.

This was the “threat” that was supposedly made. That’s not a threat, it’s common sense and nothing in either our rules, bylaws, nor law prevents me from sharing truthful information with the membership.

And, most damning, the board refused to tell me what I was even defending myself against for my own hearing outside claims of “aggression.” I only was made aware after my expulsion when a member shared the expulsion announcement as to what incidents were being discussed.

I had recordings of many of these incidents and, now knowing what they are, have included them here as I can do so appropriately.

11/12/2021

- Tails provides document with additional threat to release unrelated chats from Discord from a board chat used around Summer 2021.

The defense document I had started putting together had the following notice. I had already explained in the previous section that with the board intentionally spreading misinformation and the open retaliation against me, I had a right to post a public defense. These chat logs are part of that evidence as they admitted, in writing, that at least some of them were aware of Freddy’s Behaviour problems before my complaint, that they knew I was abstaining from making formal motions regarding Charles at the board level whenever I could, that they agreed Charles had been acting inappropriately with metal shop, and that they had not made any indication of any concerns regarding my behaviour.

This is the content of that statement, verbatim, that was in my document. As a note, I was given less than a week to prepare a broad defense of items I was not being told what or when they were, a board which had been openly and knowingly falsifying many facts of the events, and had my ability to gather evidence revoked by Freddy without permission of the CTO, whilst he was allowed to maintain access to the systems that could prove or disprove events which I was denied the ability to gather evidence from:

All evidence, including the board's written statements on Charles and the metal shop and written statement that they actively ignored the transphobe complaint, may be shared with the membership if the hearing neutrality matter is not resolved amicably. I have a legitimate fear of retaliation and abuse of this conflict of interest presented by the current board of directors. As a reminder, Texas is a 1 party state and I have made no contract of privacy from those communications.

11/14/2021

• Disciplinary hearing

I still am not told during the hearing what i am defending myself against specifically. Multiple members bore witness and agreed that the board was emotional and the hearing was not productive. James Henningsion made false claims that I called the police on someone during an incident a year prior on my own volition (as an officer, I called the police after being instructed to by the Board as the member ignored multiple warnings. A recording and video of the entire event exists however it is difficult to sanitize for this archive; if necessary I may make a redacted copy but this will take time to edit).

Justin shows emotion during the hearing and states that they don't care about the fact they are biased.

The board turned down multiple proposals from members, including former board members and officers, to mediate for us. Offers of mediation, which were explicitly rejected by the board, were made by:

- Pearce Dunlap
- Andrew LeCody
- Art Givens

One board member I shall not name was participating in the disciplinary process despite personal-life conflicts of interest with at least one party involved in the 3 disciplinary hearings. Since this conflict is not public information and sensitive, I am not naming the director nor the nature of the personal conflict. **To the members that have offered to speak about it or asked why I have not, and will not, name them publicly, I implore you to reconsider this action and not disseminate the details even if you have intimate knowledge or evidence. In**

addition to my belief that the facts and evidence supporting my defense hold water, it does neither myself nor DMS itself any good to publicly post this information.

The board spent the next several weeks trying to discuss the formal complaint with Tails, but Tails no showed multiple meetings where the discussions were to take place. To address the formal complaint:

The board made no attempts to speak with me. The “no shows” were meetings where I had asked if there was anything to discuss or told there was not or that other members were not attending and it was cancelled. There was never a mention that there was a matter to discuss, which is all that would have been needed.

The board was unable to find significant evidence regarding the “chick with a dick” incident because it happened more than a year ago. Per conversations that the board has had about the incident, it was an inappropriate meme that was not directed at Tails and the author immediately deleted it. Formal complaints need to be filed timely otherwise they become incredibly difficult to investigate. It is not reasonable to file a formal complaint months or years after an incident and expect the board to be able to find enough information for an investigation.

Again, this incident was only a few months old when the complaint was filed, not a year. The board has the dates in the screenshots and logs provided, as well as my statement as to the events which include that it was in 2021 and not 2020 as they claim.

There was plenty of evidence and witnesses, however the board refused to speak with the witnesses nor acknowledge the evidence provided that someone had tampered with the post database (which was clear and convincing that someone had, and Freddy is one of few people with access. By revoking my ability to pull logs, but not Freddy’s, during the process they themselves explicitly turned a blind eye to the evidence present)

The fact the board continues to falsify even the most basic, trivial to validate information such as the date of the incident shows that they have not actually conducted any investigation but rather are trying to create a false narrative.

Tails supported and voted for Freddy Calvert as COO on 07/07/2021:
https://dallasmakerspace.org/wiki/Board_of_Directors_Meeting_20210707#COO_and_Secretary_Appointment_.28Justin_W_alker.29

• Tails recommended Freddy Calvert for board recognition on 09/15/2021:
https://dallasmakerspace.org/wiki/Board_of_Directors_Meeting_20210915#Minutes

I responded to this, in detail, already in an earlier section of this document. TL;dr: I was given private assurances he was working on himself, and he's the only person that volunteered.

It was only after Tails escalated a disagreement over peanuts and the machine shop door that the board heard about the alleged transphobia.

This had been brought up with multiple board members previously in conversation, and in writing with others (one such example is the conversation with Justin included in this archive). Regardless, that doesn't make the complaint any less serious even if it were the first time brought up. It is a common problem that abuse and harassment complaints are difficult to talk about, especially for matters involving orientation or identity where bullying and harassment is a common problem for marginalized groups.

The board additionally claims I escalated this argument, when I only tried to say hi to Freddy and Art behind the building when Freddy started an argument about it. Interestingly, they claim that they cannot validate either parties' claims in prior statements in this announcement, but in justifying my expulsion make no qualms claiming they could determine I started an argument.

The board, by refusing to investigate the incident for over a month per recorded statements from the witnesses, has both claimed they couldn't determine who said what, and that it was supposedly my instigation. They use the former argument to wash away my concerns about Freddy, and the contradictory latter claim to justify my expulsion.

The board asked Tails repeatedly for current evidence of transphobia during a call on October 27 and again in the notice for the disciplinary hearing. Tails responded by providing a public argument on the unofficial Discord from June 2020. While the board disagrees with the opinions expressed by Freddy Calvert and was disappointed to read them, an argument from June 2020 is not evidence of current transphobia. Thus, the board did not have much to work with regarding the formal complaint of transphobia

The board made no such ask for evidence until well after my open letter of resignation was published, when they set a date for *my own* disciplinary hearing, and only even acknowledged that the complaint existed at all a short time prior to my open letter when James Henningson wrote to me in his email that they were choosing to ignore the complaint without even asking a single question.

I will concede this point if they can show any evidence of having started any investigation nor asked for evidence from me, but alas there is none because they never did ask for evidence.

The June 2020 discord rant was merely supporting background; I provided statements from witnesses and other incidents that the board chose to ignore. They, to this day December 17th of 2021, still have not interviewed some of the witnesses named for the incidents that took place in 2021.

In the next paragraph, Tails references a disagreement over peanuts left in the break room. Tails found peanuts left in the break room and arbitrarily decided that peanuts should not be allowed at Dallas Makerspace. Tails chose to escalate peanuts in the break room into a confrontation in the parking lot. The board has received conflicting statements concerning the parking lot incident but expects better from leadership and especially from board members. Board members do not have the authority to arbitrarily make new rules or harass other members for things that are not against the rules and should not be instigating arguments in the parking lot.

I never said they should not be allowed, it was akin to “be more thoughtful”. There was only a few words written at all, and it wasn’t even shared with a second thought as it’s akin to the “be thoughtful” like when someone leaves a mess around.

I did not start the argument in the parking lot, I never once proposed a rule to ban peanuts, never said we should need to ban peanuts, etc.

Again, the board has stated in one section of their announcement that they cannot substantiate my claims against Freddy in this argument because they could not validate what was said, but they again had no problem trying to make a contradictory claim in justifying my expulsion.

Most notably, they provided the screenshots without context nor the additional messages written by Freddy, who started the conversation below the images. Their juxtaposition of the images out of context is designed to make it seem that I started an argument with Freddy on Discord with my own initiation.

In the last paragraph, Tails complained that Freddy bought a window for a door that Tails told him to buy.

- Here are the board meeting minutes where Tails created an agenda item to purchase the window: https://dallasmakerspace.org/wiki/Board_of_Directors_Meeting_20210915#Machine_Shop_Door_.28Tails_Hartnett.29

I did not ask him to buy *that* window, let alone buy any window without doing proper research. Freddy had rage-bought a window that was, per its own manufacturer, against fire code for our use case because of his personal beef with me and the machine shop door, as the board voted in that meeting to close it unless the other options could be implemented. The manufacturer explicitly notes the window was not permitted to be installed on a door which did not previously have a window in its UL listing per NFPA.

The complaint was that to spite me he bought things that put our org at risk for known code violations rather than wait and do things right.

In the same conversation with Justin this can be seen in writing, as it was brought up in conversation with other board members and the treasurer.

The board is disappointed with the opinions expressed by Freddy Calvert and disagrees with them but could not find anything actionable regarding the complaint of transphobia. The board issued a formal warning to Freddy Calvert that deadnaming and misgendering is a violation of the Dallas Makerspace code of conduct and any incidents will result in loss of leadership/membership. However, we do expect more from our Directors and Officers. To that end, all directors and officers will be undergoing sensitivity training to be confirmed by our volunteer coordinator. We will also work on various initiatives in the upcoming weeks and months to help our LGBT+ members, specifically our transgender members feel more welcome at Dallas Makerspace and we welcome input from anyone who would like to be involved in this initiative. The Dallas Makerspace anti-harassment section of the code of conduct can be found here:
https://dallasmakerspace.org/wiki/Rules_and_Policies#Code_of_Conduct

Mere platitudes to try and save face. Per James Henningson's own statement during the call on October 27th, they're concerned about "Social Credit"
They had months to try and resolve issues, to notify me of concerns, and had themselves admitted that Freddy had problems previously and currently.,

They actively handled this in a way to deter any LGBTQ+ members from coming forward, as they explicitly ignored any complaints and when a complaint went public they went straight to expelling the member who made the complaint despite a far longer and more documented history of trolling, harassment, and transphobia by another member. They demonstrated a complete willingness to falsify the timeline of events despite clear and convincing evidence, resort to libelous statements, and contradictory statements to justify blaming one member in a conversation they themselves admit they cannot validate the contents of.

After my expulsion I had new members, *who had never even met me*, messaging me their support after seeing Freddy's sheer volume of clear and convincing harassment writings on Talk and Discord, the board using contradictory claims in justifying my expulsion but somehow

acquitting Freddy when they claim they cannot determine what was said, and wondering how he could get a pass yet I was expelled. It was clear to them in the board's announcement that Freddy was being given preferential treatment.

I have talked with other LGBTQ+ individuals who are afraid to join DMS, and others afraid to file complaints, because of the way the board has handled this.

Formal Complaint Received from Tails - Metal Shop

This was not the first complaint, this was merely the addition of yet another complaint regarding Metal Shop and Charles.

As for it being dismissed, they basically are trying to prevent a volunteer from walking. They talk about the new confluence and say "they're offering assistance" but explicitly leave out that he had been offered assistance for months prior and did not take any until October during the prior metal shop meeting.

Chat logs show that they're more concerned about a volunteer leaving or refusing to volunteer, even if they bring trouble in the process. We've been down this road with other problematic volunteers.

Metal Shop The board received numerous official and unofficial complaints and statements from members of metal shop, automotive and from Charles concerning harassment of metal shop, harassment of members and overstepping authority as a board member. Additionally, two board members were present to witness proxies used in the metal shop election:

I received notice from multiple members at the meeting of Julie being aggressive at this meeting for anyone in favour of ending my expulsion or voting against Charles. Additionally the board allowed Charles to make boldly inappropriate statements about Shay without saying a word. This was brought to my attention by multiple members present at the meeting as well as sanctioned harassment.

Prior to this meeting, Charles had threatened Malcolm Galland with knowingly false "complaint warnings" that, in writing, he himself admitted were unsubstantiated. This was done in kind with prior voter intimidation tactics that Charles had used at prior meetings and writings.

Recent Harassment of Members Board members are not authorized to arbitrarily make new rules and they do not have any more power than a regular member outside of a board meeting with the temporary exception of mask enforcement. Incidents reported recently (in addition to everything regarding metal shop and other past behavior before and during board term)

I never once made up rules, nor was I informed of these incidents prior to my expulsion to contest them. Additionally, in various committees the committee rules explicitly allow any member to enforce rules relating to safety and others without an explicit rule often have a history of committee members trying to correct unsafe behaviour or code violations per the DMS general rules, or to protect equipment from abuse and/or damage.

The DMS general rules place safety as the responsibility of everyone. I happen to have recordings of most of these which disprove what the board stated. They refused to investigate any of it, as they never even asked for the recordings knowing full well (and being told in writing in my disciplinary conversations) that I record all instances where I have to enforce a rule or expect trouble.

Per the Dallas Makerspace Rules:

https://dallasmakerspace.org/wiki/Rules_and_Policies#Code_of_Conduct

14. It is the responsibility of each member to help enforce the Code of Conduct. If someone is violating the Code of Conduct politely explain to them why their behavior is not acceptable. Egregious violations should be reported to a **Director or the **Officers**.**

Tails started yelling “we don’t compress like that, we don’t compress like that” to a member using automotive and argued with the member

I was not yelling; the only time I raised my voice in this “incident” was when the member stated they could not hear me, so I spoke louder to compensate for the loud machinery noises around us such as the laser blowers and other tools. The entire conversation was *less than one minute*.

The member was working on their vehicle effectively without jack stands, as they were trying to push a spring-constrained part upward using a jack causing the vehicle to lift substantially beyond what is considered safe for working underneath. I could have phrased the core problem better in my first sentences, but I later clarified the core problem that their vehicle was not on jack stands as we require for safety. But rather than solve the core problem of the vehicle being dangerously lifted, the member chose to argue about the statement of “spring compression” rather than the underlying problem of a dangerous situation caused by his desire to move parts with a jack (which, whether he realised it or not, he was trying to compress the spring affixed to that part which was the only way it would move)

The recording of this incident is present in this archive, “spring_incident.mp3”

Relevant automotive rule that all vehicle work be on jack stands

https://dallasmakerspace.org/wiki/Category:Automotive#Use_of_jack_stands_required_when_working_underneath_a_car_with_jacks.

2. Tails attacked another member using the parts washer and told them they were required to clean the part before using the parts washer

I did not attack this member. I was cordial in my concern, and when shown that I was mistaken apologised and explained myself. This happened a few minutes prior to the Spring incident, and a recording is included in this archive "parts_washer.mp3"

3. Tails escalated inappropriately when a member failed to honk (no one was using automotive at the time).

I actually have never called a member out for this in general, so I don't know what they're talking about. Unless someone is claiming to witness me shouting it as someone was driving in; I do this during my Lift training classes to students still unfamiliar with Automotive. Due to me typically standing behind the lift such that I can guide them onto the pads, and the noise of the laser blowers or other shop tools, I usually have to yell it so members can hear over all the shop noise and their own cars.

Honking when entering the bays is a safety rule that has been present in Automotive since before I became a member. It does not only apply to when people are in the bay, as the walkway behind automotive and table next to laser are blind-spots for drivers entering the bays.

Without knowing what the date or details of this supposed incident are, this is the most I can guess at might be what it is.

Tails harassed a member for bringing a vehicle inside for a few hours to thaw during a freeze.

On the contrary, I have a history of allowing vehicles inside for exceptional circumstances including weather (such as hail and severe weather such as high winds in tornado watches). Even recently I had arranged, coordinating with the logistics officer at the time, to allow a motorcycle to be parked inside so the driver could be safely taken home by a family member when they were not fit to drive.

I do not know what this incident is, so I cannot comment specifically. The fact that it supposedly happened during a freeze, which we had not had in some time as my hearing was at the start of November, tells me they've been sitting on this for several months if not a year+ and thus have no way of knowing what they're even referring to let alone contesting its veracity.

Tails made a member pull his car forward because "we don't have a carbon monoxide

scrubbing system”. When the member told Tails that the car wasn’t running, Tails told him to move it forward anyway.

I’ve never made a statement to move a car into a bay because of a “carbon monoxide scrubbing” issue; if the vehicle were running I would have asked them to turn it off. I only ask that members pull into the bays per the automotive rules and fire code.

Fire code requires that we leave the back walkway behind the auto bays unblocked and members commonly stop cars blocking that or not in the bays and I often ask them to pull forward for that. Fire code is law, and every member must follow it.

This is a rule that automotive has had since before I was a member and never been a problem to enforce; typically all that is said is “hey, you need to pull all the way into the bay” and that is the end of the matter.

And as the chair who the fire marshal had to meet with during a surprise inspection where the area was blocked by automotive for this exact reason, have been a stickler for it. Any member is entitled to ask another member to comply with fire code.

However since I have no clue as to when this was, who it involves, or any other details outside of this vague blurb I cannot comment on any specifics.

The board received a complaint about Tails from a nonmember at a PR event

I had spoken to this previously in this document in an earlier section regarding the feedback provided by the non-member; tl;dr other board members received the exact same complaint from the same group of non-members at the other, previous meetups involving these non-members at the space.

Nothing was said to me at the time, and historically we’ve all been in concurrence with the actions required to protect DMS, such as enforcing waivers and not allowing exterior doors to be propped unattended. A copy of the non-member’s feedback and my reply is included in this archive.

7. It was consistently mentioned that Tails escalates quickly, appears angry and that people felt disrespected and bullied by Tails.

Vague and unsupported by any of the incidents here; there isn’t anything for me to comment on such a vague statement. I have a history of trying to get help from other DnO when I feel I don’t have a handle on something and cannot walk away otherwise, and asking other DnO or chairs

to mediate disputes whenever I could. Sometimes I'd get an officer or a director on the phone, sometimes I'd find them in the building. It comes down to what was feasible at the time.

Of many of the members who said I had "escalated" things here is a sample of some of the times I supposedly "escalated" things:

- Members had already escalated with making physical threats of violence against me for asking simply things like to not block the fire egress or put a mask on ("Whoop my ass" is still my favourite reply for that one)
- Non-members and members ripping off their masks to scream in my face after asking them to either place it over their mouth/nose or put it on if they hadn't (one put it on, just to rip it off two seconds later as I walked off before the screaming about Bill Gates conspiracy theories), One of them even followed me around to take their mask down and try and yell within a few inches of my face.
- Members flat-out admitted they didn't like the fact that someone could tell them they're breaking a rule or doing something unsafe. As a chair this was the most common reason for banning from metal shop or automotive, as members would berate committee members for asking them to follow basic safety rules.

Whenever we are dealing with incidents that inherently start with someone breaking rules, there is a bias in reports from the rule breakers towards being mistreated just as there is a bias of the person enforcing the rules as to what happens. Like when false claims of violence were made against a former logistics officer before my role because the member didn't like the fact they were being denied exceptions to storage rules.

Witnesses resolved that particular incident, but afterward most of us started carrying recorders for these situations. The board has explicitly refused to actually gather the recordings of these events listed within the announcement of my expulsion in contravention of the standard practice that has been followed for some time.

A screenshot shows a sample of these events, in which a current board member admits that the subject of one complaint against me regarding tone had falsified what caused the event to escalate and that I had behaved appropriately. There are many incidents such as this across myself and others where such thing occur with members who have rules they break enforced. Enumerating all of them is not a worthwhile endeavour, however showing it is an occurrence, the board acknowledges it is, and that these recordings have been used to prove otherwise is tantamount to my defense that the board is not properly investigating these matters.

An electrician working on the metal shop referred to Tails as "that aggressive guy" and did not want to call back to perform the work

I've only met this electrician exactly once, back when I was chair of the metal shop in Winter of 2020/early 2021 before I was a board member. They were still doing work for us after the only time I'd met them, and even continued to send me part estimates for the work we were scoping involving the hand plasma. I was never informed of any concerns. When I noticed they still had not scheduled the work, the only answer I had from James Henningson in any conversations I asked pertained to the electrician being difficult to work with scheduling-wise. Without any supporting evidence of what I supposedly did involving this member, why they supposedly didn't have an issue even after they knew who I was and continued to do work, or incidents they supposedly mentioned I have no way to actually reply to this outside of stating they were still working with us after the only time I'd ever met them.

I have emails showing that they continued to work with us after our only meeting for at least some time.

The rest of the board made several attempts to have an in person conversation with Tails over several weeks in October. We also discussed with our attorney during this time. Tails no showed every meeting where an attempt was made

As previously stated, The board made no indication to me there were concerns or they needed to speak with me. They themselves had cancelled most of these meetings with other DnO not showing up, or stated when I explicitly asked that there was nothing important to discuss. Since I was buying my first house, if there was nothing to discuss I let meetings with my realtor take priority.

I again, ask the board to show a single iota of evidence that they actually tried to talk about any of this or indicated there was an important matter to discuss at any meetings I "no showed."

Then, the rest of the board had a call with Tails on October 27. We asked Tails for evidence of current harassment several times and expressed concern. Unfortunately the call was not productive. Then, James wrote the email below:

During the meeting on the 27th, they made no request for any evidence regarding the transphobia. They instead blindsided me in an aggressive tone about concerns they had been withholding from me, and I ended the call when I was in tears and unable to continue.

The next emails in the announcement I had already talked about, but tl;dr: they have an aggressive and indifferent tone to the situation they created by not mentioning any concerns prior to the call of the 27th.

James' email after the call notes they explicitly ignored my harassment complaint against Freddy claiming they believed it to be personal bickering. It was additionally tone deaf as to why the call

was unproductive and the communications problems they had by withholding all this information from me for months.

They made no attempt to ask for evidence regarding my complaint, and spent the email belittling me. When they replied pointing this out, they made no attempts to reply. The silence when asked why they ignored it for a month was staggering.

Tails has been given numerous warnings and chances and still chose to escalate inappropriately. Despite Tails' claims to the contrary, there have been three disciplinary hearings, approximately 150 pages of evidence collected and organized into reports, multiple meetings, many discussions with members, discussion with our attorney and around 100+ hours of director time spent on this. W

In summary of this entire retort:

- They have made no warnings to me,
- made no attempts to communicate the concerns here,
- asked for no evidence prior to my hearing notice,
- refused to even tell me what my hearing was about regarding “aggression” (which the audio recordings show is flat-out falsification)
- Not interviewed key witnesses to events they claim to have investigated (to this day, they still have not spoken with two of them named)
- The only information I've claimed I will share *with members* is evidence in my defense
 - There is no rule against this
 - The law explicitly permits me to do so
 - They supposedly banned in part due to this since the evidence shows they had been falsifying their “investigation” and sequence of events

We would have liked to be able to resolve the situation without disciplinary action and made many attempts to resolve this matter before it got to this point. If at any time, Tails had simply addressed their aggressive, hostile and inappropriate behavior at Dallas Makerspace the expulsion would not have happened. Instead, Tails chose to escalate the situation further with threats and continued abusive, hostile behavior.

As already discussed in this retort:

- They made no attempt to bring current matters to me for discussion
- I have evidence which disproves their statements
- The board escalated the situation by continuing to spread a false narrative to save the “social credit” they would lose with me having shown they ignored serious harassment complaints and their refusal to properly handle matters before them
- Noting I have a right to defend myself against libel isn't a “threat;” it's common sense
 - The board does not have a right to commit libel against a member