

Re: Access to Internal Waiting List

Michael [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Sat, 05 Jul 2025 16:38:52 -0400

To "Woodsworth Co-op" <[REDACTED]>

Tags WW

Hi Board,

I haven't heard from you for a while.

Could you please let me know your thoughts about my emails dated June 18, 2025, 12:16:38 (subject: "Display Case"), and June 18, 2025, 10:22:46 (subject: "Access to Internal Waiting List")?

I'm working on an article for The Weekly.

Thanks,

:) Michael

Michael [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Unit [REDACTED]

==== Forwarded message =====
From: Michael [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
To: "board" <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2025 10:22:44 -0400
Subject: Re: Access to Internal Waiting List
==== Forwarded message =====

Hi [REDACTED],

Thanks for sharing your thoughts.

I am always sorry to send long emails. This is against my common modus operandi. We seem to be struggling with our communication. Perhaps this is my fault. I don't remember if I've already let you know that I sometimes don't accurately predict how my words might be interpreted...

You mentioned that "The board doesn't manage the waitlists or their format." I understand that we don't manage the lists, but we must dictate the format(s) of our list(s). We have the right, and the obligation, to instruct our staff to provide us with lists that provide information that is discernible. We are the owners of our lists, and we will be held accountable for how we instruct our employees.

You wrote that you would share my ideas and concerns with the office. That could muddy the waters. I think The Board needs to instruct them to fix the problems, rather than debate how individuals feel about the facts.

You wrote "The office handles many administrative duties for the co-op." With all due respect, this is obvious. It should also be obvious that our employees don't have the right to restrict our access to our information. As you know, we own our information.

You wrote that property management and its employees are held accountable.

We need to make sure that our employees provide us with an Internal Waiting List from which we can derive relevant information. Accountability has nothing to do with it. They simply need to do it. There should be no need for a debate about this.

You wrote "The office staff are human beings who are acting in good faith, just as the board members are. There is no need to name and blame specific people."

Your statement in the paragraph above makes me wonder if you think that I've done something wrong.

1. Do you think that I believe that our office staff and The Board are not human beings who are acting in good faith?

2. Do you think that I have named and blamed specific people?

3. Do you think that I have done something wrong?

These three questions, above, are not rhetorical. Could you please answer them with specificity?

Did you have a look at the lists that I attached to my email dated June 17, 2025? I'm curious to know what you think.

Thanks again,

:) Michael

Michael [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Unit [REDACTED]

----- On Tue, 17 Jun 2025 08:21:17 -0400
<[REDACTED]> wrote ---

Hi Michael,

Thanks for the email.

The board doesn't manage the waitlists or their format. I'll share your ideas and concerns with the office regarding the waiting list data/format and work towards improving. The office handles many administrative duties for the co-op. There is always room for improvement.

The property management and its employees are held accountable through regular touchpoints and through a performance review process. The office staff are human beings who are acting in good faith, just as the board members are. There is no need to name and blame specific people.

Are the 6 examples you outlined in your email an official escalation to the board requiring a detailed investigation? If yes, I will get the Property Management Liaison involved and we will go from there.

Thanks

██████████ for the Board

On 2025-06-17 10:33, Michael ██████████ wrote:

Hi ██████████,

Thanks for letting me know that
"The board has instructed the office to put the waitlist back."
and
"It wasn't a good decision to remove them."

In the same email, you wrote:
"I'm not sure why the questions below are still relevant for your article."

You were referring to the following two questions:
1. What is the name of the person who decided that we no longer have access to our Internal Waiting List?
2. On what date was this decision made?

My article is not specifically about the Internal Waiting List. My article is about our apparent decision to allow our employees to control us.

The two questions, above, are still relevant because we need to know who made this decision. Was it us? Was it The Membership? Was it The Board? Was it a rogue employee? ...It appears to me that we don't know who made this decision, and

when they did so.

On April 30, 2025, you wrote the following:
"Are there other instances where you feel the employees are controlling us? Do let us know."

On May 4, 2025, I provided six examples (there are many more), and I wrote a paragraph describing how we could administer a proper assessment of our staff.

On June 15, 2025, I obtained a copy of the new (no date provided) version of our Internal Waiting List. There are significant problems with this new list.

1. The dates and times on the new document (attached to this email) are not complete. Each entry has a month and a number that consists of only two digits. I don't see how we can discern on which dates Members have applied for Internal Relocation.
2. Current Units are listed, but there is no information about the units for which Members are waiting.
3. There is no date on the document.

Presently, there is no way for us to understand our positions on the Internal Waiting List. And, more importantly, I see no way that we can hold our employees accountable for their administration of our list.

As well as our seriously broken list, I have attached a **SAMPLE** version that I believe that we should adopt. I trust that The Board will consider my example.

Democratically,

Michael

p.s. I see that I have received an email from The Board on June 16, 2025. I'll try to get to that soon.

Michael [REDACTED]

Unit [REDACTED]

----- On Sun, 25 May 2025 13:58:43 -0400
<[REDACTED]> wrote ---

Hi Michael,

The board has instructed the office to put the waitlist back. It wasn't a good decision to remove them.

I'm not sure why the questions below are still relevant for your article.

Best,

[REDACTED]

On 2025-05-25 13:38, Michael [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi [REDACTED],

Thank you for letting me know that "The list will be available to members again", and "[You] were working on reformatting the list."

I am grateful for the reformation of the list; it has been in need of help for a long time.

I wonder if you might not be aware of the following paragraph.

"While there may have been a communal copy of the internal waitlist in the past, Management is no longer providing this

On Sunday, April 27, 2025 at 11:42:45 p.m. EDT, Michael [REDACTED]

<[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi [REDACTED],

I'm working on an article, for The Weekly, about the fact that we no longer have access to our Internal Waiting List.

For the article, would you please answer the following two questions?

1. What is the name of the person who decided that we no longer have access to our Internal Waiting List?
2. On what date was this decision made?

I've also provided an opportunity for our Board of Directors to reply to these two questions.

Thanks,

:) Michael

Michael [REDACTED]

Unit [REDACTED]