

Correspondence & Timeline

Contents

Timeline.....	3
Appendix A – Emails between Working Group and SNAP board	10
Original letter to SNAP Board 9/19/24 7:56AM:.....	10
Shaun’s response 9/19 12:38PM.....	12
Dan Response #1 9/20 6:59AM	13
Dan response #2 9/20 11:55AM	14
Dan Response #3 – 9/21 12:07PM	15
Dave follow-up to Shaun 9/22 8:36AM	17
Dan Response #4 9/23 11:14AM.....	17
Dan Response #5 9/23 12:06PM	18
Shaun Response/Request 9/24 7:59AM	19
Dave Response to Shaun 9/25 8:26AM.....	20
Dave second Response to Shaun 9/26 8:21 AM	20
Shaun Response #1 9/30 9:42AM.....	20
Shaun Response#2 10/6 8:23PM	21
Dave Follow-up 10/24 1:44PM.....	21
Shaun letter 10/26 9:44AM.....	21
Dan Letter 10/28 5:23PM.....	22
Shaun email attachment 10/30.....	23
Dan’s email of 11/3 6:20 PM	25
Dan email of 11/4	27
Dan email of 11/5	28
Dan email of 11/6	28
Dave Email to Shaun 11/21/24	29
Dan email to Dave 11/27	29
Dave reply to Dan email 11/27/24.....	31
Dan’s letter 12/9/2 9:43PM	31
Dan’s email 12/10/24 3:2AM	33
Email from Dan 12/18	34
Email from Dan 1/13	35

Email From Shaun 1/21.....	35
Dan’s email from 3/5 to Frank	36
Dan’s email from 3/13 to Frank	36
Appendix B Background emails.....	38
Curtis Dismissal Letter (8/19/24)	38
Becky Letter to Board (8/29/24) & Dan Response	39
Tim Lennon request to board that when unaddressed	42
Dan McNevin letter to Mark Fuller RE: Draft letter to BOD 9/16/24	43
Dave letter to Shaun (see email 11/21)	44
Letter from Shaun to Teresa Lancaster	48
Dan email to Melanie on or about 10/21	49
CCR Policy statement	49

Timeline

This is the timeline as best recollected by David Lorenz

8/15 - Leaders meeting in Houston.

- Shaun provides status. Dave L question about searching for new exec director. Ans from Shaun is that they are not looking until they have 3 years salary in reserve
- Dan (remotely) provides unreadable spreadsheet on finances and then takes questions. Questioners must move across the room to the one computer. One question – does SNAP provide support for survivors of abuse not associated with religious institutions. Dan answers in the negative, i.e. SNAP only provides support to survivors of religious institutional support. (This is contradicted by the Bylaws)

8/17 – After somewhat floundering set of breakout sessions without any feedback slips (which have been used in all past conferences), a group of us (Myra, Curtis, Sally, Dave) schedule meeting with Shaun to express some concern with the direction of the organization at 8:30PM on Saturday. At ~8:45 Shaun texts and says he is too busy does not suggest new time. We respond and arrange to meet with him the next day immediately after the conference. At ~12:00 he again says that he is too busy and does not provide alternate time. The 4 of us also discussed numerous concerns with the conference.

8/19 – Receive word that Curtis is summarily relieved of leadership position. No explanation given to Curtis and letter cuts off further communication with the board (see email [here](#)). Raised serious concerns among us about procedure/process used to dismiss Curtis. Also heard that dismissal related to interactions with Jane Doe and that Jane Doe believed that she was harassed by Curtis

8/23 – received the following email from Shaun (NB have never received promised statement about Curtis. Also incorrect understanding of executive committee):

Hi David

Mike reached out to me to inform me that you're requesting information about the decision to terminate Curtis as a leader and that you would like a copy of the SNAP Bi-Laws

I have instructed our staff to forward all inquiries as to the Board Executive Committee's decision on Curtis to be forwarded to me as the staff was not involved in the decision making process.

The Board Executive Committee will be releasing a statement on the matter soon to our Leaders describing the situation and our reasoning for letting Curtis go. I will first let our statement speak as to our decision.

As per your request for a copy of the Bi-Laws I will search through my emails from Julianne to find my digital copy and forward it to you. I carry a printed copy with me. If I am unable to track them down Julianne will be back from her vacation on Monday. She will easily be able to forward our Bi-Laws to you then.

Thank You

Shaun Dougherty
Board President

8/24/24 – A small group of leaders decided to meet and discuss our concerns and what we might do to address them. (Minutes from this meeting are available). This was primarily a chance for everyone involved to express their primary concerns and have a chance to discuss them openly. Most of the concern was over the events of the conference and the leaders meeting and the general feeling of lethargy about the BOD. We agreed to meet more times to continue airing our concerns and develop a plan of action of how best to address them.

8/28/24 – A second meeting that drew in a few more people. This is where the issue of the resignation of Becky Ianni and Zach Hiner became more prominent and explained our general feeling of discontent with the BOD. Discussed [letter](#) from Tim Lennon to BOD which has gone unaddressed. There is mention of Becky's [letter](#) to Dan and Dan's response. Decided to meet regularly to discuss our issues and also formulate course of action.

9/11/24 – questions raised over budget discrepancy. Dan had indicated that NO conference had ever made money. This flies in the face of that fact that the conference used to be the primary source of revenue for SNAP. While the cost of registration may not have covered the cost, fund raising during the conference was the major source of revenue. More discussion about the conference: Drunken and abusive behavior by board members. Events held in the bar. Kosher needs were not met. Accommodations were not good – bugs in rooms, facility had many negative reviews, no public transportation, unsafe neighborhood, broken elevator with no attempt by staff to accommodate people on higher floors, long walk to conference from rooms. Judy agrees to generate a draft letter to the board and will distribute it for comment. Letter should: 1) point out concerns but also discuss solutions and that opportunity exists 2) emphasize the need for healthy relationship between board and leaders 3) recognize that we are all survivors of trauma and that we can react to 'situations' in unhealthy ways.

9/12-9/16/24 - The draft is shared using google docs in an effort to be collaborative. Unfortunately, the **draft** is released accidentally to people who were not part of the meeting group.

9/16/24 – Dan McNevin sends an abusive [email](#) to Mark concerning the draft and threatens him with legal action. This threat causes Mark to stop working with us as he cannot bear the strain. We find it very disconcerting that Dan resorted to legal threats and intimidation rather than just asking Mark what this was about.

9/18/24 – Reviewed and updated the draft letter and generated final version. Dave agrees to send it to the 6 board members first thing the next morning at [7:56 AM](#).

9/19/24 12:38PM Shaun [responds](#) that he would like to talk with the board the next day and he would get back to me.

9/20/24 Dan responds at [6:59](#) making it clear he does not speak for the board and never once changes that stance. A second letter from Dan was received at [11:55AM](#) providing corrections to our letter and indicating that he knew there was a shuttle (though he wasn't at the conference) and then accuses other at the conference of not really knowing what happened at the conference and we are acting on hearsay. It needs to be clearly stated that Dan was also not at the meeting.

9/21/24 Dan sends a 3rd [letter](#) at 12:07PM. Telling us that we should engage in a constructive conversation – that is exactly what the original letter asks for but it appears that Dan wants us to converse with him but since he is not the board president nor can he speak for the board, that doesn't seem useful. Then he proceeds to tell us that the Wyndham hotel had no complaints. Then accuses us of hearsay. His conversation with Wyndham is, in fact, hearsay. Then he throws the old exec director under the bus. He ends by stating the board is willing to meet with us but this has not happened since September 19. We do not see any reason to form a discussion with just Dan via email or in person.

9/22/24 Dave Lorenz sends a follow-up to Shaun letting him know that we are eager to proceed and suggest a possible day (date?) to have a call with the board. Also clarifies that there is much to discuss and one meeting is probably not adequate

9/23/24 Dan responds at [11:14AM](#) and again 52 minutes later at [12:06](#) PM. In the first letter, He informs us that he will not attend a meeting without an agenda. We believe the letter of 9/19 was basically an agenda (ie we want to talk about these topics). Then he provides an odd example of crisis which made no sense to anyone and leaves us concerned about Dan's mental state. Then he seems to want to engage in an email conversation on our original letter – the agenda. Then he accuses us of giving a 3 day deadline presumably based on the following statement from Dave's response the day before "We would like to recommend Wednesday evening at 8:30 – 10:00 ET ..." In the second letter Dan removes the board from distribution and informs us of the death of Paul Peterson's son. Though we were not aware of this and we were very sorry, this seemed unrelated to anything. Nothing in our original letter was a "jab" at Paul. If only Dan (and the board) would have talked with us. They would have known that.

9/24 7:59 – Shaun [responds](#) and indicates they can't meet until the end of October because he is so busy. (If only he had an executive director to handle the load) We are supposed to suggest a few dates and times.

9/25 8:26 Dave [responds](#) and informs Shaun that he will provide dates and times by the next day. WG meets and settles on 4 possible dates. WG also realize that they would like some financial information. WG also agrees that responding to Dan's emails would not be productive to anyone. Significant discussion on Dan's missive on 'looming crisis' and hostages. Some members feeling triggered by what they perceive to be gaslighting

9/26 8:21AM Dave [provides](#) Shaun with 4 possible dates and times along with request to receive financial info.

9/30 9:42 AM Shaun [responds](#) with promise to follow-up

9/30 Shaun sends out letter to all of SNAP

10/2 WG meets and has concern that there seems to be delays in responding to dates.

10/5 Susan Hurt feels the stress of Dan's emails and asks to not participate any longer. She is simply too triggered by the events and concern over direction of SNAP.

10/6 8:23 PM Shaun [responds](#) and conveys that the board is concerned about agenda but no specifics. Indicates that he is very busy and then informs us that his brother has passed away.

10/9 WG recognizes that the death of Shaun's brother is awful and many feel compelled to send condolences to Shaun – some already have. Recognize that proposed dates are probably not attainable

10/16 and 10/23 WG continues to meet to discuss plans and how best to organize our thoughts for meaningful conversation with the board. We form committees to hammer out details.

10/15 Sally reaches out to Guila (member of the board) to see if she can help with the impasse. She seems unaware of any proposed dates and seems to have not read all of the emails that have been sent over the past weeks.

10/16 Sally meets with Guila and promises to talk with BOD

~10/21 Dan sends [email](#) to Melanie berating her for allowing Curtis to be a member of SNAP.

10/22 Guila suggests Sally meet with Dan and Shaun alone

10/24 1:44 PM Dave [reaches](#) out to Shaun asking if it's time to proceed.

10/26 9:44 Shaun [response](#) explaining how busy he was and is. Seems to think we need an agenda (the agenda was in the original letter). He will get back to us.

10/28 :23PM Dan sends [email](#) accusing me of lying about Guila because Guila received all of the emails and that I should check my own email. It seems never to occur to him that perhaps Guila has not read all of the email (The emails do start with "Shaun,").

10/29 WG meets and seems genuinely confused and hurt by the vitriol in Dan's missive. Again more triggering is occurring and Dorothy Small seems to want to step away because of Dan's emails and the unending delays.

10/30 Teresa receives email from Shaun with [attachment](#) about possible meeting. In the attachment the following salient points are made: 1) P&L reports are confidential (no non-profit that we are aware of considers P&L reports confidential. They should not be. 2) That concerns over leaders behavior was not properly reported. It was reported to board members at the conference and no action was taken 3) Persons made leaders after 5/20 are not properly vetted and are not considered leaders in good standing. They must be vetted according to procedures in Bylaw. There is no [procedure](#) in the bylaws for vetting. 4) The treasurer authorized background checks on multiple leaders. Background checks not authorized by the individual being checked is a violation of the law

11/30 Shaun sends [email](#) to Teresa Lancaster with attached letter from Dan (?) thanking her for working as mediator.

11/3 Dan sends [email](#) notifying the WG that he and others are being harassed by Curtis. He states that the WG 'support his being returned to SNAP'. Nothing in our emails have advocated for that. Dan is simply wrong. He conveniently does not include Dave Lorenz on the distribution.

11/4 10:0 AM Dan email telling the WG that he and Shaun are being harassed by Curtis on FB. Doesn't understand how we are endorsing Curtis's behavior. He makes inaccurate assumption that we are.

11/5 Dan sends [email](#) stating that someone at SNAP has empowered Curtis's abusive behavior insinuating it is us.

11/5- Dan sends benign email with bylaws and leader manual. WG has been studying bylaws since September. Clearly the board has not since they believe the executive committee does not include the entire board, that the executive director cannot be related to anyone on the board and that SNAP's mission is only to survivor's of religious institutional abuse.

11/6 – Dan [email](#) demanding that any contact with the board be accompanied with some kind of pledge that we are not working for Curtis. Mentions outline of agenda that Dave should have received but he did not receive them. He also cancels promised zoom meeting with Shaun. We do not understand why Dan is cancelling the meeting with Shaun rather than Shaun doing it. We wonder who really is in charge.

11/20(?) Dave meets with Shaun and Teresa acts as mediator. Shaun sends out email with agenda attachment 1 minute prior to start of meeting. When the meeting starts, Dave tells Shaun he is not willing to discuss the agenda with only one minute notice to review it. Ultimately, we try to walk through the agenda and it is not very successful. During this meeting, Shaun states, without equivocation, that he is not in violation of the bylaws by being both executive director and board member because he is not related to himself. While not stated, Dave's impression is that Shaun was not aware of the provision in the bylaws that states the XD cannot be related to anyone on the board.

11/21 Dave reaches out to Shaun with [email](#) and [attachment](#).

11/27 Dan [responds](#) to Dave's email

11/27 Dave [responds](#) to Dan and states that we will not be drawn into a conversation using email.

12/9 9:43 PM Dan sends [email](#) to the entire group accusing us of encouraging Curtis and holding us responsible for knowing that Curtis posts on FB, when he posts and that we should be contacting the FB owner and apologizing. We see this as complete gaslighting!

12/10 3:32AM Dan sends a follow-up [email](#) ~6 hours later threatening us with legal action.

12/11 Dave meets with Shaun and Melanie acting as mediator. Shaun agrees to meet with the entire group as executive director. (this promise is later rescinded). Shaun clearly states that the executive committee is only composed of executive officers on the board. This is clearly wrong according to the bylaws. It is clear that Dan and Shaun are not familiar with the nuances and restrictions of the bylaws.

12/6 Melanie sends email trying to set up meeting with Shaun and members of the WG.

12/11 WG meets and is aghast at Dan's emails and threats. We don't encourage Curtis, we don't follow his posts and we are not responsible for his behavior. We are triggered by Dan's threats but even more resolute. Some wonder why Dan (and Shaun) simply don't block Curtis on FB.

~12/10 Frank Schindler volunteers to open a dialogue with Dan. The WG agrees that this would be a good thing and perhaps keep Dan from sending the threatening and corrosive emails to the rest of us. Dan seems open to it and begins email dialogue with Frank.

12/17 Zoom meeting with Shaun and Melanie. Mostly it goes well but there are issues that we have difficulty getting through. Shaun does agree to meet with the WG as exec dir ... not as president.

12/18 Dan sends [email](#) to Frank denying that he ever authorized background checks and then asserting that someone in our group made it up. (see email attachment 10/30)

1/13 Dan sends [email](#) to Frank (after Frank reaches out in concern over the California fires). In this letter Dan expresses his desire that Frank be involved in the mediation as he has a level head. (During the mediation Frank and 7 others are unexpectedly excluded from the mediation)

1/21/25 Email from Shaun indicating that the BOD is engaging a professional mediator in talking with us. We are disturbed by the fact that the BOD has yet to even try to talk with us and yet is now employing (at great expense) a professional mediator. JUST TALK WITH US! Instead of disparaging us with incessant emails.

2/3 Receive final commitment from the Chicago based Center for Conflict Resolution that we will meet with the board for two 4-hour sessions on 3/1 & 3/8 from 10-2 CT. These are the dates proposed by the BOD and we assume that this means the entire BOD is available for those dates.

3/1 On the day of mediation, most of the WG shows up at 11 ET. Some of us changed travel plans to accommodate this meeting. We are placed in a holding room in zoom and are briefed about what will happen and asked to sign a document outlining the responsibilities of CCR. While expected, this takes a lot longer than anticipated. Over the next 3 hours, we are left in our own separate breakout room with an occasional input from the CCR staff stating that they are working out some details with the BOD. We are not told what the delay is or why we are not meeting with the board after 3 hours of waiting. Finally the CCR staff comes on and states that since some of us have not been vetted (or ratified – the CCR staff member was not sure what the correct word was) by the board as leaders, they, the BOD, would only meet with the 4 people who were leaders prior to the adoption of the current Bylaws on 5/20. The 4 who were grandfathered in were David Lorenz, Judy Lorenz, Susan Vance, and Mary McKenna. The ones who were excluded were Sally Zakhari, Nancy Fratianni (leader since 2018), Myra Russel, Teresa Lancaster (SNAP leader since 2007 but never listed as leader on web site. Teresa was asked to be on the BOD by Shaun and Dan), Karen Lowart, Claude Leboeuf, & Frank Schindler. Frank is the only person in attendance who was never recognized as a leader within SNAP. All others have been recognized as leaders either at the start of conferences and/or on the SNAP web site. Now suddenly, without warning, these prominent SNAP associates have been relegated by the BOD as not worthy to even associate with the BOD. This despite the [email](#) from Dan McNevin (1/13) to Frank Schindler telling him that he hopes he is involved in the mediation. We are given the option of only 4 of us meeting with the BOD and the others could be placed in a holding room. After a lot of discussion and emotional venting and given that we only had about 30 minutes left, we chose to end the mediation without ever having talked with the BOD. They pulled a very classic bait and switch. They pretended to meet with us, but when it came down to actually

doing so, they simply wasted 4 hours of 12 people's time. We also found out that only 4 members of the BOD actually were in attendance Shaun, Dan, Judy and Paul. We also found out that Paul would not be able to attend the following weeks meeting. So only half the BOD was ever available for the second meeting despite the fact that these were the dates given to us by the BOD. AS an aside, the only mention of leaders being approved in the Bylaws is as follows (there is no mention of the process to be used for approval):

The assignment of the title Leader is made by resolution of the Board of Directors upon recommendation of the Executive Director of SNAP (Article VII. Executive Director) or other Board Director. Leaders report to the Executive Director who coordinates the day to day activities of SNAP.

3/5 Dan sends [email](#) to Frank following the disaster of 3/1. He makes an illogical attempt to explain why 8 people were excluded . (They were not ratified, He had never spoken to them in the past (other board members had), says they never went through the ratification process even though they had gone through a process used by the previous board. They have not signed the leaders manual and they have not gone through a background check. Apparently the new vetting process will require a background check which must be approved by the candidate leader). In this letter he throws in a lot of distractions that are unrelated to the issue at hand. He has a recording from Curtis using bad language insinuating that we are at least peripherally responsible. Uses this as proof that the helpline is working. But since has never talked with us, he doesn't understand that having volunteers answer the hotline makes it more dependable and provides a sense of belonging to some members. He then says that we have obviously broken confidentiality in talking about the mediation. We were NEVER asked to keep the proceedings confidential. CCR was bound by confidentiality but not the participants. Dan should have read the agreement that he signed. The CCR policy statement that we were asked to sign is [here](#).

3/13 Dan's send am [email](#) where he states that the board will be rolling out a new vetting process and that this process is not open for discussion.

Appendix A – Emails between Working Group and SNAP board

Original letter to SNAP Board 9/19/24 7:56AM:

September 19, 2024

Dear Board of Directors,

Recently, we as SNAP Leaders gathered on several zoom meetings to discuss various issues. During the August 2024 SNAP Conference, several Leaders had concerns they wished to discuss in person with Shaun. Two meetings were set, but Shaun was too busy to attend. Because of this, we chose to meet with each other first and then bring any issues forward to the entire board. We met to discuss our concerns about the direction and leadership of SNAP and to have a post-conference assessment. The health and growth of SNAP require that there be a strong relationship between the Board and the Leaders in SNAP and we are concerned about the development of a disconnect between the two groups.

After one or two sessions of hearing each other out and focusing on the difficulties we are having as Leaders, we are ready and willing to move forward. We recognized that we are broken and we are in need of healing. SNAP is made up of broken people. We acknowledge that. We react to trauma in many ways including rage, addictive behaviors, controlling behaviors. The list goes on. Although we suffer from trauma and occasionally might lapse into behaviors that are part of the symptoms, we each are responsible for our actions. Abusive behaviors toward one another is unacceptable.

Can we recognize that these imperfections are present in all of us? Can we come together to realize that SNAP for the most part, has brought out the *best* in us? And, it has helped us to help countless others!

This is the SNAP we want to save. This is the SNAP that has kept us coming back to conferences year after year. That SNAP is an organization that we are proud to be associated with and say to the world, "We are survivors and we want accountability!"

If we as an organization are to be better than the institutions we confront, then we must be accountable ourselves. Perhaps there are some clear explanations from the Board on some of the issues the Leaders are expressing, but there seem to be signs of woefully inadequate decision-making by the Board. We believe we can rise above this moment, but it must be a joint effort. We fear that there is a looming crisis; a crisis that implies both danger and opportunity. We want to minimize the danger and maximize the opportunity.

We would like to meet with our friends on the Board of Directors through a zoom call to address these and other serious matters. All Board members and Leaders (listed below) will be invited. It may be best to have only a few people as designated speakers for clarity and time constraints. The topics up for discussion are listed below.

Thank you,

SNAP Leaders:

David Lorenz

Judy Lorenz

Susan Vance
Sally Zakhari
Dorothy Small
Nancy Fratianni
Mary McKenna
Susan Hurt, MD
Frank Schindler
Frank McKenna
Myra Russell
Karen Lowart

General Concerns:

- Mission of SNAP is not being fulfilled
- Need for a permanent Executive Director. An interim XD may sometimes be necessary but it is not 'interim' if SNAP is not actively searching for a permanent XD. We do not need to have multi-year salaries stashed in the bank before hiring.
- Web site update is significantly overdue and requires ongoing maintenance
- Need for financial transparency with account ledgers, audits, financial committee as specified in bylaws; such information should be shared with leaders annually in a comprehensible, written fashion. (e.g. Conflicting information on cost of 2023 conference.)
- Poor communication with Leaders and all SNAP members.
- Frequent complaints that phone calls to the SNAP helpline are not being answered or returned. This situation is urgent and requires immediate resolution.
- Concern over dismissal of Becky.
- Concern over dismissal of Curtis. Waiting for a board statement as promised by Shaun email (8/23/24).
- Executive committee makeup? Financial Committee makeup?

Conference issues:

- Board members did not attend Leaders meeting
- Inappropriate choice to hold events in the bar

- Board member inebriated at the conference, verbal altercations
- No Support Group Breakouts were offered. This has been standard practice at all previous conferences with good reason. While there was a 'Survivors Speak/Mixed Support Group' at 5PM on Saturday, it really was not a survivor support group and was cut short after only two people spoke. Caused more than a number of issues during and after the conference.
- Entertainment did not appear to be optional. Every event at a SNAP conference should be considered optional. (see SNAP support group rules)
- No evaluations were given for the breakout sessions, the keynote sessions or even the conference itself.
- Accommodation issues:
 - Roaches in rooms, mold ...
 - Elevator broken
 - Long walk to conference room from hotel rooms
 - Expensive ride to/from airport (did not save money overall)
 - No accommodation for kosher Food

How can we help?

- Increase number of Board members
- Establish a search committee including Leaders for an executive director – perhaps part-time
- Establish Leader Committees where necessary. There is lots of talent in the leadership and it is not being utilized. (e.g. IT, peer-to-peer training ...)

Shaun's response 9/19 12:38PM

Hello Everyone

We have a Board Meeting scheduled for tomorrow afternoon. I will discuss your proposal letter with them and get back to you with a few dates and times that the whole board can be Available to meet with you.

Please be patient with us. We are quite busy at the moment. I am just today finishing up a four day work trip to Chicago to renew a lease for the Chicago support group and addressing a few other pressing financial matters. I fly home tonight.

Tomorrow morning I have a review meeting with the Alphawood Foundation. They are one of our current grantees. We are negotiating for a \$50,000 grant for SNAP. In the afternoon tomorrow I will hold my board meeting.

I am also in the middle of three other negotiations with our other current funders for renewals. I am due to travel to a nonprofit training summit offered by the Focus Health Foundation from October 7-9.

I would like to hold this meeting sooner than later if possible. I will get back to you at some point tomorrow evening with possible dates and times.

Thank you

Shaun Dougherty
Board President

[Dan Response #1 9/20 6:59AM](#)

Hello everybody,

I read your letter, and I am speaking for myself and not the board.

I'm not going to attend any zooms in a group until the letter is redrafted to be respectful, accurate, is clarified, and each redrafted question or area of conversation has a purpose to a goal we collectively support.

If you each write me an individual letter with your specific areas of concern, I am happy to schedule an individual call with anyone who makes that effort, and we can tailor a conversation to your needs. We will use your letter as the basis of an agenda.

As to my needs for clarity and respectfulness if I am to be on a group zoom with you and whomever on the board decides to attend, here are some examples of what I am after and why the issues require reworking.

"Board members did not attend leaders meeting"

This on its face is a false statement. Shaun led the meeting, and he is a board member. Once you clarify, tell me the purpose of this inquiry.

"We do not need to be to have multi year salaries in the bank...."

This is somebody's opinion, and in any event is mistaken. A better way to say this would be: "how much money do we have in the bank, and how long will it last given current trends? I'm the treasurer and I'm happy to answer the question I've drafted. I did answer it at the leader's meeting.

"Mission statement of SNAP is not being fulfilled".

This is an opinion and too limited. Please reword it to be respectful, neutral, descriptive, and accurate. For example, "The Mission of SNAP is: _____. We believe we are falling short in the following areas _____. We believe we are succeeding in the following areas _____. (The use of the word "believe" indicates reasonableness.)

"Poor communications with SNAP leaders and all SNAP members."

Please reword this and narrow this assertion to be factual. First, you can only speak for yourselves. You could say "the 12 of us are having poor communication with the Board...". I've had long conversations with at least three of you, so the statement on its face seems to be false. In addition, the opposite is true; I've put in communications to Judy and David with no return email from them. Dorothy and I at times have robust exchanges. I've had one very nice conversation with Susan.

And, I've had conversations with members who are not leaders. I had several yesterday. One new survivor called me, and a supporter/donor talked with me on Monday. I know the other leaders also are actively engaged with many of you and with many of our "members".

"Frequent complaints re.... helpline".

This is an unsupported statement that I believe is false. Where did this allegation come from? I know that Shaun carries the help line phone with him, because he has hung up on me to take a call. Shaun told me he has passed along 15 survivor names to Melanie since he fixed the phone.

"Concern over dismissal of Becky".

This is falsely crafted. Becky resigned voluntarily; she wasn't "dismissed". If you have concerns about her voluntary resignation, let me know.

"Concern over dismissal of Curtis".

Please articulate your specific concerns. Do all 12 of you honestly have a concern about this? I voted for his termination and can answer when you can be more specific.

"Need for financial transparency...".

I don't understand this question. We had an hour-long finance presentation at the leader's meeting. What do you specifically need, and for what purpose? Our books are open to you subject to Julianne's time constraints and the reasonableness of your request. How many of you attended the conference where finances were discussed? I'm happy to send you the presentation I made.

In Closing...

If you can revise your letter along the lines of the above, so that the questions are sensible and the conversation respectful, I'll consider joining the zoom. If you need my help in revising the letter, give me a call. The above are only examples, most of the bullets you developed are not clear, factual, or, in my opinion, worded to invite a respectful exchange.

I appreciate that the references to sexual harassment, abuse, and the suicidal person were removed from the draft I saw. It was wise of you all to remove those harmful and potentially defamatory narratives.

Best,

Dan McNevin

Dan response #2 9/20 11:55AM

Hi Everybody

Following up my previous email, I went through [your document](#) to help you create more clarity.

About six months ago, the board created some working groups that are basically what you say you want to form in your note. At the conference, Shaun talked about them at the leader's meeting and at the

general assembly. So this draft attached incorporates those. If you want to volunteer, the opportunities already exist and we'd love to have the help.

I also smoothed out some language to create a more collaborative tone, and where things were inaccurate, I endeavored to make them accurate. There are some blanks that you'll see. These require you to be more specific in the concerns. General concerns are really impossible to address. The more specific, the better.

It looks like the four of you who attended the conference may not have known about the shuttle SNAP rented to get people from the rooms to the conference space. I put that in there. The shuttle also was used to get people to and from the airport for me. I'm sorry you didn't hear that announcement.

Because 8 of you did not attend the conference and could not have first person experience of things, I tried to be specific when issues raised were based on personal observations.

No pride of authorship. This is a draft for your consideration. I can send around some Excel worksheets that might answer some of your numbers questions as soon as today if you request them.

Best,

Dan

[Dan Response #3 – 9/21 12:07PM](#)

Dear Group of Twelve,

I haven't received any response to my last two emails. In them I have suggested ways to make your letter clearer and more accurate. Clarity and accuracy are crucial for constructive dialogue.

I think any reasonable person can agree that things can always be better, and things can always be worse. SNAP wants things to always get better, so attempting to address any reasonable concern is important. This third outreach is an attempt to encourage the twelve of you to either as a group, or individually, engage in a constructive and fair conversation.

I contacted the Wyndam Hotel with the venue-centric concerns you expressed. They say they have no record of complaints anywhere in their hotel for mold or cockroaches. Did all of you personally see or experience cockroaches and mold? Did any of you lodge a complaint?

If you have a written complaint that was lodged, or other evidence like photographs, please provide a copy of those so that SNAP can return to the hotel to advocate for you.

If any of you have not personally seen mold and cockroaches, the complaint is known as "hearsay". Hearsay is a form of gossip. It generally isn't constructive to engage in matters of gossip.

When any group signs a letter, and lists demands or concerns, all signers endorse all the points in the document. I have asked you to either contact me with your individual concerns so that I can meet with each of you individually, or, to have you address my suggestions for improved clarity and accuracy of the group letter. If you don't respond in either way we cannot make the progress you cite you want to achieve.

For example, you allege “Poor Communication”. I am sure there has been poor communication, so your concern on its face is reasonable. But I responded with evidence that I personally have had direct communication over the years with members of your group. I also have polled other board members, and each reports direct conversations with members of most of your group. Melanie Sakoda, who works for SNAP, is in constant communication with all leaders, and she is in constant communication with the Board. The word “Poor” is general and subjective. It would be helpful for you to better explain this concern.

Moreover, is the communication issue you cite part of a “looming” crisis. Someone from your group must tell me why poor communication is contributing to a looming crisis for me to take steps to address the crisis you fear.

There are elements of your letter we agree with wholeheartedly. Our website is inadequate. We’d be happy to explain the history of a former Executive Director’s effort and failure to complete the website project. That problem was undertaken well before the current SNAP president was elected. We are not happy about that failure. We would welcome your help or expertise in executing that stalled project. So, let’s talk about that.

Under “conference” concerns you have a list of issues, including the mold referenced above. Some of those concerns are subjective, some are objective. All probably have some level of legitimacy, at least for some.

A general solution for improving the conference in the future is for some part of the Group of Twelve to join our Conference Working Group. Help us plan the next conference. In your role on that working group, your concerns from this year can be used to make future conferences better.

I want to point out one small example from the “Conference Concerns” category that might be a misunderstanding on the part of the Group of Twelve. You expressed a concern about the distance from the rooms to the venue. That is an objective, reasonable concern. We agree with you.

The Conference Working Group recognized that issue before the conference started, and SNAP rented a mini van and ran a shuttle service. Shaun announced the availability of the shuttle at the conference and dozens of people took advantage of the shuttle. Some used it to go to the airport, which addressed another of your concerns (expense of rides to the airport).

Four of you attended the conference, eight did not. Obviously, the eight were not impacted by this concern. Now that you all know we addressed that issue in real time, does this concern fall off your list? I think it should because part of a fair, constructive dialogue is to acknowledge when solutions were offered.

Under “general concerns” you cite “frequent complaints that phone calls to the SNAP helpline are not being answered or returned.” This complaint is objectively false. Shaun carries the phone with him and has been answering it. Melanie has been receiving Shaun’s output. It is not fair to SNAP to allege complaints that are objectively false. Those stir the pot of gossip and gossip is destructive.

The board is willing to meet with you as a group. I am willing to meet with any of you individually. In either case, we should ensure we have boiled these issues down to those that are of the highest priority to you, that are accurately portrayed, and that address the “looming crisis” you believe is coming.

Please respond to this and my earlier unanswered correspondence. We all care about the same things, and so we (the board) retain our interests in moving forward in good faith.

With respect,

Dan McNevin

[Dave follow-up to Shaun 9/22 8:36AM](#)

Shaun,

We wish to move forward with you and the entire board on the letter that we wrote. We look forward to receipt of the dates you propose for the Zoom call with us. We would like to recommend Wednesday evening at 8:30 – 10:00 ET as this time is a compromise that allows for both east coast and west coast people to attend with minimal difficulty. I want you to be aware that there is much to discuss and we seriously doubt that a single meeting will suffice. Breaking this up into multiple sessions also will give the Board and the Leaders group a chance to thoughtfully respond to what has been said.

Thanks

[Dan Response #4 9/23 11:14AM](#)

Dear Group of Twelve,

I'm sure Shaun will respond for the board when he can. You probably know he is out of pocket. I provide my personal take below.

As I said earlier, I personally will not attend a meeting without a clear, accurate agenda. I need to know how I am going to spend my time. Most people are like me in this respect.

A "looming crisis" is obvious when an oil tanker runs aground and is leaking oil. Everyone knows the crisis is the impending environmental impact. In such a situation, nations put aside their differences and cooperate to mitigate the damage.

A different "looming crisis" is when someone with a rifle says they will kill children if their demand for money and a private jet to Yemen are not honored. That is a threat. Reasonable parties deal differently with threats; no one shoots bullets at the people cleaning up the oil mess.

The reason I would appreciate understanding the looming crisis you've cited is to understand if you believe we are dealing with an oil spill or a rifle. Because you have not explained the looming crisis, I'm sensing the rifle. My next logical question would be, who wants the private jet?

As an example: if your agenda is to fact find about John Curtis Garrison's termination with the only purpose being to gain clarity about a board decision, we will do what we can under the law to explain

the decision to you. If you intend to demand Garrison's return and you don't respect the board's authority to terminate him, we will be wasting time. If you are not simply fact finding for clarity, it would you're your fingers are on the trigger over Garrison.

I also want the agenda to be reasonable. I've already said the help line is being answered. So. if you are still concerned about the phone, respond to this email and tell me how a working phone is part of a looming crisis if that is your good faith belief. This same comment applies to many of your individual points. I would suggest the twelve of you each inventory the issues you have endorsed and double check they are still viable concerns.

There also are things on your list that can be handled in advance of a meeting to either save time or eliminate a concern. For example, if you want 2023's restated conference budget, I can authorize that to be sent to you if you agree to not distribute the information beyond your group. I can explain why you need to promise confidentiality if you wish.

Finally, you've given a three-day deadline. No one reasonably can expect a three-day clearance of a schedule. That short time frame seems like a pretext to blame us for the failure of this meeting to come off. Such a pretext would be obvious to all others.

I am willing, in good faith, to cooperate with you to refine your agenda so that it becomes mutually acceptable while we find a time much farther down the line to address the agenda.

Best regards,

Dan

[Dan Response #5 9/23 12:06PM](#)

Dear Group of Twelve,

I've removed the board from this email. This is for your consideration as you discuss the agenda and you consider how you might express your concerns so that they are as respectful and collaborative as possible.

Paul Peterson's 14 year old son Pike died around June 1, 2024. Paul slept in the hospital on a cot next to him for four months until Pike died.

One of your listed concerns was "board members didn't attend leader meeting". The way that is worded reads as an indictment of any who didn't attend the leaders' meeting. Paul was excused from this conference, for obvious reason. Shaun in fact, on behalf of all of SNAP, flew to Dallas to attend Pike's funeral.

You'll also read that Paul and his wife both have battled cancer in the last three years. Paul has been a diligent leader and board participant all of that time.

I am deeply saddened that Paul had to read this apparent jab in your letter. What part of "looming crisis" has anything to do with a board member's personal decision to skip a meeting? Why do you feel it is your business to pass that judgement?

I sincerely doubt any of you wished upon Paul or his family any pain. However, you must think carefully about what is motivating all of this, and how you are approaching gaining the end result of whatever is is you wish.

Moreover, eight out your group, according to the registration records I have seen, did not attend the leaders meeting. Is it not hypocritical to apply on standard to one group, but a different standard to another? There are other manifest contradictions in your letter.

Dan

<https://obits.dallasnews.com/us/obituaries/dallasmorningnews/name/pike-petersen-obituary?id=55212691>

[As Texas family waits for donor match, father of 13-year-old battling cancer says 'our faith has sustained us'](#)

Shaun Response/Request 9/24 7:59AM

Good Morning Everyone

Thank you for your ongoing patience. September, October, and November, are three of the busiest months of the year for the board and Executive Director.

In these months we meet regularly with, then apply with our funders for the following year's grants. In addition the SNAP Fall/Winter Appeal must be arranged and mailed out. We then need to write the SNAP Budget for the following year based on whatever funds the Foundations grant to SNAP. Not counting the many unexpected surprises that happen regularly.

In addition a few of the board decisions that you would like to be discussed require me to seek legal counsel for clarification as to what I am legally permitted to discuss based on the SNAP Bi-Laws. My hope is for full legal transparency.

Having met with the Board and discussed a meeting we can be available on a date and time toward the end of October. We are attempting to schedule 18 people for a robust and hopefully a productive meeting. I need to be respectful of everyone's personal time.

In the meantime let's all take a breath to recognize that we all on this email chain are survivor/volunteers doing our best to serve the greater survivor community.

Please work within your group of leaders to pick three dates and times during the weeks of October 20th and Halloween that will work for all twelve of your group and then I will find out which date and time works best for the board.

While we work to schedule a date for our meeting I will in a follow up email, address a few of the concerns that you have in your letter as I announced several of them at the conference as being initiatives of the board while we undergo a full systems/Data upgrade and internal audit over the next six months.

Everyone's time is valuable. I feel that the better our meeting agenda is defined and agreed too by both parties the more quality of discussion can be had by all involved.

We all can agree that we want the best for SNAP.

I'd like everyone to understand that the Board takes our fiduciary responsibilities very seriously.

The goal of this meeting should be about better serving our greater community of survivors.

[Dave Response to Shaun 9/25 8:26AM](#)

Shaun, Thanks for the response. I think we can get you some dates by tomorrow.

David Lorenz

301-906-9161

[Dave second Response to Shaun 9/26 8:21 AM](#)

Hi Shaun,

Here are some possible dates where most or all of us can make it. We believe that we will need more than an hour but probably less than 2. We also think that there will likely be a need for a follow-up meeting

10/20 2 PM

10/21 7 PM

10/24 start anywhere between 5 and 7PM

10/30 7 or 8 PM

All of these times are ET.

Prior to the meeting we would like to get copies of the following financials:

- 1) The most recent audit report
- 2) Statement of position
- 3) recent financial P&L statement

Thanks

David Lorenz

[Shaun Response #1 9/30 9:42AM](#)

Thanks David. I'll double back with you soon.

Shaun Dougherty
Board President

Shaun Response#2 10/6 8:23PM

Hello Everyone

I have shared your proposed dates with the Board. I will return when I hear back from the whole board with a consensus.

I have though heard a few concerns from a couple of the board members as to the agenda for the meeting. I have asked them to share their concerns with me via email and I will convey them to the group.

I again appreciate everyone's patience as this is our busy time of year. I depart tomorrow for the three day Focus For Health Foundation's Summit Training in New Jersey. On Thursday I have my site visit with our Oak Foundation Representative for next year's grant.

In addition, I unfortunately learned of my eldest brothers passing this afternoon. My family just lost our Mother this past March, so this loss so soon will be difficult for us.

Thank you for your understanding.

Dave Follow-up 10/24 1:44PM

Hi Shaun,

I do hope that you have had time to grieve for the loss of your brother and that you were able to celebrate his life this past week as you laid him to rest.

Unfortunately I do need to turn your attention back to our request for a meeting. The dates we offered are below and, of course, 3 of those dates have now passed. I understand your need to deal with your brother but the last thing that I heard from you is that you were running those dates by the rest of the board and would get back to me. Having made contact with Guila, she was unaware of these proposed dates. We would like to address these issues sooner than later. Could you please let us know the best way to proceed in a cooperative manner?

Thanks

David Lorenz

Shaun letter 10/26 9:44AM

David

Thanks for the condolences. As I said before this is a very busy time of the year for SNAP administration.

I learned of my brother's passing late afternoon on Sunday October 6th. The next morning I flew to New Jersey for a three day training summit with Focus For Health Foundation. They grant us \$30k per year and I was there to also secure next year's money.

I arrived home at Midnight on Wednesday the 9th. The following morning I had our on site visit with the Alphawood Foundation. That meeting was for an additional \$30k-\$50k grant for next year's budget.

On Friday October 11th I had to catch up on all of the emails and signatures on documents that Julienne sent to me during the week to keep our nonprofit status up to date and legal. On Saturday I was finally able to visit with some of my family.

The following Monday- Tuesday October 14th & 15th I worked with the several departments within the Illinois State government to renew the lease agreement for the Chicago support group meeting facility. A state owned building. A long standing location that needs to have the lease renewed every five years.

On the 16th I met with the Oak foundation in anticipation of a \$100k grant for next year.

The 17th & 18th I met with a company that provides grant writing for nonprofits and a number of other services that we are looking to update. I am in the introductory phase of that ongoing negotiation.

Sunday morning October 20th I met with Guila, & Dan so that Guila could inform Dan and I about her meeting with Sally. That afternoon I attended my brothers viewing. I took the next two days Monday and Tuesday off to lay my brother to rest and spend time with my family.

On Wednesday October 20th Dan and I met with representatives of the finance systems data specialists at Oracle to hear what system that they offer to nonprofits free of charge.

On Thursday I met with Teresa Lancaster about possibly working more closely together in the future.

Yesterday I began the process to seek out a new communication director.

As you can read I have had an extremely busy month so far and quite a bit is being accomplished.

I understand that you want to meet sooner than later but as Sally and Guila discussed some meeting agenda items that you propose will need to be agreed upon by both parties before a meeting date is set.

I too need to set up our Fall/Winter Appeal fundraising letter and get it out early November. I spoke with the company that handles that for us yesterday.

I will be in touch on Monday to work on an agreeable agenda for our meeting.

I will be off this weekend.

Thank You

[Dan Letter 10/28 5:23PM](#)

Dear David,

Shaun passed along your email of last week where you say Guila didn't receive your original proposed dates. Shaun thought that statement purportedly came from Sally so was second hand information to you. Your email below isn't clear as to how the information came to you. Did you speak with Guila or are you referring to a second hand conversation with Sally or someone else?

As you can see from this string below, you, Sally, and everyone including all of the board received your dates on September 30th, 2024.. Above that email (just below my email here) is your email of last Thursday pasted here for reference.

You say in your email of last Thursday: "having made contact with Guila...She (Guila) was unaware of these proposed dates." Your statement in your email to Shaun last Thursday is false. Perhaps that is an honest mistake, perhaps someone is creating gossip. I don't know.

If you have spread the rumor that Guila did not know of these dates, while the email below was sent to you and her, you'll need to contact the people who have been misled by your statement because your statement isn't true and paints the board in a bad light it doesn't deserve.

What disappoints me in all of this is that you've have the email that shows Guila was aware. Why would you not check your own paper trail before believing an unfounded, second hand statement?

This process with the Group of 12 has suffered from many rumors and gossip that have emanated from your side. I've sent you a couple of emails asking for clarity, and clarifying the record, seemingly to no avail.

One of your original statements in your original letter to the board dated September 19th, 2024, says: "Concern over Becky dismissal". That statement is also patently false and I wrote you and the whole group a note making that correction. Becky admits in writing she resigned as a leader, and I sent you that email where she makes that admission. Do you need me to resend that email? I'd be happy to if it clarifies an issue, eases a concern of yours, and removes an item from the agenda that is not factual.

Let me know,

Dan

[Shaun email attachment 10/30](#)

NB: this email was to Teresa and forwarded to WG. (Dave received second forward on 1/20)

Dear Theresa,

Thank you for offering to help resolve what appears to be misunderstandings with some leaders. The board's hope is that between the recent letters from the President and Treasurer and the announcement that David Clohessy is being retained to manage SNAP's communications, that many topics of concern for the group of individuals ("Group of 12") have been clarified.

SNAP's by-laws stipulate that the Executive Director (ED) supervises staff and leaders. Because Shaun Dougherty currently has the dual roles as ED and board president, the board decided to establish an ad hoc committee to oversee the ED's interaction with leaders. I'll refer to "Leader Committee" for the remainder of this letter when referring to the board's committee that will oversee the ED in this matter.

In the event a meeting may still be required, and you are willing to act as a moderator, attached is an initial outline of what the Leader Committee requests you and Shaun pursue with the Group of 12. The information and clarifications will help to establish a common base of information which the board hopes can lead to a fruitful, transparent discussion.

At the outset of any efforts with the Group of 12, please express that SNAP is governed by a set of by-laws, the leader's manual, employee agreements and fiduciary obligations. Each board member weighs these inputs, and privacy concerns, when making or announcing decisions. For the sake of accurate record keeping and for ease of reference for the greater community, the original Group of 12 letter is attached to this email. You are free to circulate this letter and

the outline below to the Group of 12 and others.

With respect,

Whoever the chair

Ad Hoc Oversight Committee, Leaders & Executive Director

_____ Leader

Outline of information needed for the Leader Committee:

1) The board cannot discern from the Group of 12 letters the proposed agenda. Please work with the Group of 12 for clarification. Refining the agenda will help board members understand the scope of the proposed meeting and how board members can prepare for the meeting.

2) There are items that seem to be informational and lend themselves to brief factual exchanges. Resolving some issues now will simplify the meeting agenda.

Please clarify the Group of 12's concerns around:

A) The help line

B) Board attendance at the leader's meeting

C) The creation of working groups for finance, governance, and communications

D) The board's budget related to hiring an Executive Director

E) Board member recruitment

F) Its conference concerns.

3) As to any conference concerns that persist, please compile the Group of 12's remaining concerns and submit that list to the Conference Working Group with a copy to the board. We'd welcome more 2025 conference volunteers if that helps to ease any Group of 12 concerns.

4) Please provide Group of 12 participants with a copy of SNAP's by-laws and leader's manual; those govern confidentiality and contain the organization's guidelines and standards. We believe that most of the Group of 12 have not received those documents.

5) **Some Group of 12 demands, such as the demand for a mid-year P&L, are confidential.**

The most recent Form 990, which contains an audited version of a profit and loss, can be shared. All of SNAP's Form 990s dating back to 2003 are public.

6) Leadership issues, such as those involving the two former leaders listed in the Group of 12 letters, are governed by the by-laws. Let us know about specific questions regarding these two former leaders so we can decide what information is appropriate to divulge.

7) Please attempt to correct the perception of the Group of 12 that one former leader was "dismissed" by the board, when in fact that leader left voluntarily. Share the written proof the board has if that can help assuage suspicions.

8) **There are statements of opinion and speculation in the Group of 12 letters. For example, an opinion that someone was inebriated is hearsay. Please communicate that any complaints about any leader should be tied to the standards in the by-laws and the leader's manual. The Leader Manual has a grievance procedure.** Utilizing it is more efficient than an ad hoc process such as this.

9) More than half of the Group of 12 did not attend the conference, but all signatories signed on to all grievances. Please try to discern first-hand concerns of those non-conference going Group of 12 individuals so that board has a better understanding of

individual concerns.

10) Most of the signatories have not been brought by staff to the board for leader ratification. This is an unfortunate oversight by SNAP staff. Although the board welcomes all candidates, these unratified candidates are not leaders in good standing until they are ratified pursuant to SNAP's by-laws. Ask each unratified leader if they'd like to complete the ratification process. Explain staff's misunderstandings in not properly managing the vetting process so the Group of 12 understands the genesis of this issue.

In connection with this paragraph, the board treasurer recently authorized background checks of several unratified leaders in connection with potential litigation. Those checks found a variety of concerns that would disqualify those unratified leaders from being leaders. The results of those background checks demonstrate the importance of the leader's ratification procedures.

11) Below is a quote from the SNAP Leader Agreement regarding healthy communication:

"If I have concerns or disagreements with SNAP leaders, I will bring those to the attention of those involved in a direct, healthy, and straightforward manner."

Please ask the Group of 12 why some signatories have never reached out to express their concerns in a direct manner. The board's hope is that this discussion results in greater adherence to established protocols for communicating and resolving disagreements.

12) In reviewing the list of signatories, we note that one unratified leader joined the leader corps about a week before the 2024 conference, and no one on the board is familiar with them. The Leader Committee is curious how such a new leader is already disenchanted with SNAP. Pursuant to the statement in paragraph 11, please reach out to this leader candidate and try to answer the board's question.

13) The statement below is taken from the harassment policy of the Leader's Manual. Ask the participants of the Group of 12 if they support this written policy or if they are proposing to ignore it.

"Harassment can take many forms, including but not limited to touching or other unwanted physical or sexual contact, requests for sexual favors, posting offensive, suggestive gestures, cartoons or pictures, using slurs or other racial and derogatory terms, telling offensive or lewd jokes and stories, demeaning and dismissive comments, and sending email messages with offensive content."

The board believes the above policy is important to uphold. Being respectful and kind are core values of this current board. Separately, the Leader Committee will forward screenshots concerning emails and social media which violate SNAP core values. It is possible that not all members of the Group of 12 are aware of these out of compliance behaviors. Perhaps the information will help all understand that things are not always as they seem, or as some say they are.

Dan's email of 11/3 6:20 PM

November 3, 2024

Dear Shaun,

I appreciate the verbal report to me on 10/30/2024 regarding a phone discussion amongst yourself, David Lorenz, and Teresa Lancaster. I'm copying the board, and all connected to this issue.

The Leader Committee, under separate cover, will respond to your verbal report with some thoughts. To encourage transparency, that response will be shared with all interested parties, as this one is.

The purpose of this memo is to alert the Group of 12 that members of the board of directors are being threatened and harassed by Curtis Garrison. He has posted dozens, if not hundreds, of messages on various social media such as Twitter, Facebook and direct messaging in the past week. Some of those posts contain incendiary language and profanity and are published widely on platforms and under aliases. Mr. Garrison is posting on photos and comments of family members and friends of board members as well. A small sampling of online activity from June to the present is attached in the PDF. The last screen capture allegedly implicates David Clohessy. That was posted this morning, although the date of the twitter exchange between David and Mr. Garrison is over a month old. David did not write what is in the blue bubble. However, some leaders are confused and believe David is the author in blue.

Mr. Garrison met with members of the Group of 12 at the conference. He is cited in the September 19, 2024 Group of 12 correspondence as a person the Group of 12 wishes to discuss and we understand the members of the Group of 12 support him being returned to SNAP. He was terminated for cause by the board of directors. His online behavior violates SNAP's standards outlined in the Leader Manual. Below is the language in the SNAP Bylaws related to leader termination:

Section 3. Resignation and Termination

Any Leader may resign their SNAP Leadership at any time, without notice being given or required. *The Board of Directors may remove any Leader at any time if in their judgment the best interest of the Corporation would be served thereby.*

Below is language from the Leader Manual Harassment Policy:

It is our policy and our responsibility to provide our volunteers with an environment free from harassment. Harassment on any basis undermines morale and our commitment to treat each other with dignity and respect. Accordingly, harassment will not be tolerated by SNAP.

Harassment can take many forms, including but not limited to touching or other unwanted physical or sexual contact, requests for sexual favors, *posting offensive, suggestive gestures, cartoons or pictures, using slurs or other racial and derogatory terms, telling offensive or lewd jokes and stories, demeaning and dismissive comments, and sending email messages with offensive content.*

The board will not permit you to meet with the Group of 12 if Mr. Garrison's attacks continue and members of the Group of 12 are simultaneously supporting Mr. Garrison's actions or candidacy for a return to SNAP.

Once the attacks stop, and if each Group of 12 participant states that they individually are not coordinating with Mr. Garrison, the board will permit you to reconvene your efforts with Teresa Lancaster as moderator.

Respectfully,

Daniel McNevin, 11/3/24

Dan McNevin

Leader Committee member

CC: Paul Peterson, Leader Committee Chair

SNAP Board

Teresa Lancaster, moderator

Group of 12

David Lorenz, Group of 12 representative

[Dan email of 11/4](#)

All,

Following up yesterday's email about the way the board is being harassed. The three screenshots are from Shaun's FB when I opened his page this morning. In one, about sour dough bread, you see one Garrison Alias.

In the Halloween post with his wife you see another alias.

The third image is an embedded conversation and on one of the replies Garrison pops up again with a different alias. There are dozens of comments in each of these conversations. A concern I have is that Shaun has young children in his life. There is no assurance an abusive comment from Mr. Garrison won't wind up on a child's reply to Shaun.

Even if Shaun blocks an alias, another gets created. I've counted a dozen or so aliases so far. One is new to me as of this morning.

The bylaws have established protocols for communicating and for replacing board members. All you would need to do is join the board with a group, and replace any member you felt was not serving SNAP. These tactics below not only are contrary to SNAP's ethos and Leader Manual, but they are actually harmful to the recipients and their families and support circles. I don't understand how any of you can endorse these behaviors or this approach to problem solving.

Also attached is a letter from the Leader Committee chair to David Lorenz and Teresa Lancaster. Teresa has graciously offered to help moderate a discussion. My concern is that all of you are not receiving all information from the board that we want you to receive, and I want to be sure our side of this is as transparent as possible. If you have not seen this letter I suggest you get into tighter communication with David. He is purporting to represent your collective viewpoints.

In the event David hasn't shared the memo with you, you can review it and consider for yourselves how the board views the way forward.

One final point for clarity and transparency. In the attached memo. David Clohessy is mentioned as having been retained to handle communications for SNAP. As of this morning, he and Shaun haven't closed that understanding. That element of the letter should have been redacted when it was given to David and Teresa last week, but the intent and hope is that David will agree to take on that role. If he does, we'll need volunteers to support him as part of the Communications Working Group.

The Leader Committee owes you one more bit of communication which we hope to get out to you sometime today or tomorrow. Both committee members have full time jobs so sometimes these volunteer efforts suffer.

Best regards,

Dan McNevin

[Dan email of 11/5](#)

All,

This is happening everyday to the board members who are active on social media. Thankfully, I don't engage in social media.

You can see that when a friend of Shaun's engages with Garrison he gets flamed as well. Garrison is using an exchange with David Clohessy that has been manipulated to appear that David is calling for Shaun's resignation. David has requested that anyone who is confused by the post reach out to him and David will set things straight.

At some point, someone from the SNAP network who has empowered Garrison needs to speak up about the bullying and stalking.

I've never met Garrison, but some of you have spent many hours with him. Is this the type of discourse you want for SNAP?

Dan

[Dan email of 11/6](#)

Dear David and All,

Shaun forwarded your email to the Leader Committee. You should have received two emails in the past few days from me, along with one from Paul that Shaun provided to David and Teresa, outlining how we want to proceed. If you have not seen those emails, I've attached the one sent yesterday without the Bylaws or Leader Manual attachments.

As we outlined to Shaun, we don't want him meeting with your group unless each member confirms they are not collaborating or otherwise fueling Curtis Garrison's online behaviors. All of you should have examples of what Garrison has been writing on social media. We think it is unproductive to meet if Garrison is working at your behest.

We also wish to refine an agenda, and an outline of those refinements went to you and Teresa Lancaster yesterday from me. Paul and I are equipped to answer any question you raise, and we also are available to Teresa to help her resolve an agenda both sides can view as productive and reflective of your concerns. We both work and it may be one of us and not the other who can quickly respond to Teresa.

So, no zoom meeting tomorrow (Thursday).

Two other things – Dorothy Small wasn't on your cc list. If she was overlooked please forward this email to her.

And Sally, Guila briefed us on your call with her. Shaun and I told her we'd be happy to meet with you about your specific concern. Where I think it was left is that Guila was to let you know our openness to you, and to ask you to reach out to us at your convenience. I understand Guila sent you a second note checking in with you and inviting you again to contact Shaun or me.

I hope all are doing well after such an intense election season.

Teresa Lancaster is copied.

Best regards,

Dan McNevin

[Dave Email to Shaun 11/21/24](#)

Shaun,

I know that we have been through a lot but it is necessary to bring this issue to an end. [Attached*](#) is my attempt (and mine alone) to reach out to you and try to make some progress on this impasse. I fear for the future of this organization that I have spent decades working for.

Regards,

David Lorenz

301-906-9161

[Dan email to Dave 11/27](#)

Dear David,

Shaun forwarded elements of your note to him so that I can clarify some information for you. The purpose of this is to try to prevent misinformation from spreading during a time of distrust.

Audit misunderstanding:

First, I think you've conflated the annual tax return audit with an internal audit I am conducting. My audit is not required by the governing docs and is reviewing 20 years of finance and governance practices. It commenced in April of 2024 and is ongoing. The purpose of that internal audit is to develop insights into past and present practices.

The annual tax audit is required by our governing documents and is conducted every year. Kindly retract the information if you've spread a conflation.

To be clear, SNAP has 22 years of Form 990's, including 2023's, that are public. All are based on outside audits. The internal audit I am conducting isn't required by the bylaws.

2023 Conference misunderstanding:

Second, the 2023 conference lost money. You can contact Melanie Sakoda to confirm what follows. My email trail with her regarding this matter is extensive.

Conference revenue is comprised of Ad book sales, conference registrations, sponsorships, miscellaneous minor product sales, and a raffle. The sponsorships are recognized with an ad in the ad book. 2023 had no sponsorships according to our records.

About \$17,000 of donations were inexplicably called conference registrations. In addition, some ad book purchases were called registrations.

Becky was on the SNAP board and had complete control over the reporting of conference revenues and expenses, and of course we took her word when she reported. Because she was formally the treasurer, we also assumed that she understood how the annual 990 audit recognized donations and conference revenue separately in the Form 990.

According to July 2023 meeting minutes, Becky reported to the board 188 registrations, but when I audited the 2023 conference registration database in 2024, we found only 143 actual registrations, and not all of those attended the conference. We discovered some registrants were counted 2 or more times. We found about a dozen donations called registrations. Melanie herself was counted 3 times in the summary database. As we tried to solve this puzzle with Melanie, we discovered a cash registration attributed to Melanie was actually the sale of some bracelets.

In addition, zero expenses were attributed to the leader's meeting conference cost. So, the conference P&L reported to the board included leader registrations revenue, but did not include leader meeting expenses. My review of past conference practices indicates that 2023 was anomalous in these respects.

I have no idea why Becky reported 188 registrants or if she is the person who conflated donations with registrations, or if she instructed the bookkeeper to assign leader meeting costs to general expenses instead of as an offset to conference revenue. The "188" is a puzzle to me because the database shows 176 entries for conference revenues transactions, including all the misplaced donors and double and triple counts of individuals who paid registration fees. I can only guess that Becky added 12 nonpayers who would attend (such as keynote speakers) to report 188 to the board. The board took her statement to mean we had 188 paid registrants signed up to attend the conference. Because of that statement, at the time, it seemed plausible that between the ad book, registrations, and some explanations from Becky about ad buys being registrations, that the \$41,000 in conference revenue could be plausible. In actual fact, we had about \$23,000 in legitimate conference revenue.

You are a data specialist, so I am sure you appreciate data corruption and data mistakes that get amplified until caught.

According to audited form 990s, SNAP has invested about \$920,000 in conferences and leader meetings since 2003. In that same period, it received about \$470,000 in revenue. The conference has always been a loss leader.

Both of these misunderstandings – of the audit conflation and the conference P&L – are examples of the importance of withholding judgement until all the facts are available. I think a better way to approach these questions if their answers or descriptors don't make immediate sense is to say "I have this information, and I'm not sure it is correct. Can you help me understand it?". I would have gladly answered that question had it been posed.

If you've circulated inaccurate information about the conference, kindly retract it.

I hope your Thanksgiving is relaxing and restorative,

Dan

[Dave reply to Dan email 11/27/24](#)

Dan,

I find it interesting that this email is a wonderful illustration of why a CONVERSATION needs to take place rather than the email stream of consciousness that you have been bombarding us with. I don't think you understand our issue around audits, I can, from my own personal experience, possibly explain the discrepancy in the conference attendee numbers but more importantly, if it's a puzzle to you, why didn't you ask someone? Having a net loss over 20 years is NOT the same as having a loss every year and there are other factors that I think you are not accounting for. Your extrapolation from the data set is completely invalid.

I have no intention of carrying on this conversation through email. We simply want to talk. Perhaps there are simple explanations but perhaps there are deeper issues than those that you have assumed. We simply want to talk and YOU have made us an enemy. A little give and take through dialogue with concerned parties that's it.

Please be assured that I will not be responding to any other emails that try to lead me into having an email conversation without others present unless that email proposes a solution to this impasse. I will NOT discuss the issues through email-period.

Thanks

[Dan's letter 12/9/2 9:43PM](#)

All,

In these screen shots fresh from today, Curtis Garrison is using an alias and has attacked an advocate who is not part of SNAP but posted a story about David Clohessy. If you decide to read the details you'll see the advocate is also a survivor and is attacked by the alias for having the temerity to push back against the hateful post, and you'll read of the trauma he inflicts on the survivor with his words.

You'll also read that the alias has named me and two other board members in the attack (not the first time). I've never met Curtis Garrison, and yet he is smearing me. So a question I naturally have is why me? What has been said about me that causes him to target me?

I've read commentary where some of you don't believe Garrison is your creation. However, in this iteration of him, I think you've empowered him. Even after similar, earlier attacks, David Lorenz wrote to Shaun last week and made the statement that he and you all believe Shaun "abused" his authority when terminating Garrison. That statement was made despite the fact that the SNAP bylaws explicitly give the board or the executive director the unilateral authority to terminate leaders, when in its judgement that is best for SNAP. We did our jobs as best we could. Garrison's attacks subsequent to his termination validate our decision. Please bear in mind that David is ignorant about the Garrison context at the time we terminated him. David does not have all the information the board possessed. but, Melanie, as an employee, had it at the time we made our decision.

How would any of you feel to be targeted in smear campaigns like this? How would it feel to you if your spouse was threatened, or if your children or parents read of these attacks? If you can imagine those feelings you can begin to appreciate how I feel, how my wife and step children feel, how my dad and brothers feel. Some are angry, and some are worried that this will escalate to physical violence, with Garrison or someone finding out where I live. Even if I don't fear violence, if someone who cares about me does fear that, our lives together are harmed, our tranquility is disrupted.

What is equally concerning, however, is that I have not received a single note of support, caring, or sorrow from any of you, and those who love me know that. Shaun has only received one public support notice I'm aware of - from Mary McKenna. Garrison is a person who was a leader for four months, did less than a handful of sidewalk conferences, and has not contributed one dime to SNAP. I've been with SNAP for 22 years, have done dozens, probably hundreds of sidewalks conferences, have spoken with hundreds of survivors, lead meetings for five years, and have donated thousands of dollars to SNAP. My reward is that the Group of 12 is watching me get pummeled while a guy with just about zero history at SNAP gets a pass.

I've sent to David Lorenz an email chain from Becky Ianni dated August 29, 2024 where she writes that she resigned as a leader of SNAP. She didn't say she was dismissed, which is what your letter says. Who created that false statement in your letter? Her, or one of you? She calls me an "Asshole" in the same email chain, a patent violation of SNAP's harassment policy. A personal insult. A form of emotional abuse. No one should be abused by her or anyone in writing, in an email that was widely circulated, and which circulation was intended to shame as broadly as possible.

I used a version of the following example with Gail Howard about this issue: A bunch of white supremacists, the Klu Klux Klan, sowed hate and worse, physically harmed and killed black people. The people who observed what they did without standing up to them were complicit in those crimes. Many even applauded. People from that shameful era either were on the side of terrible wrongdoing or on the side of the victims. On the side of aggressors were cops, judges, politicians. Purported leaders and protectors of society. So it is here. SNAP purports to be an organization that speaks for the survivors who have no voice. Our leaders - you, me - are supposed to have the strength of character to speak out against hate and lies. Yet the Group of 12 is observing Garrison's hatred without saying a peep. You have promulgated a demand to meet about a letter that is based on a lie someone told - either Becky's lie or one of yours'.

David said in his note to Shaun that all 12 of you agree about all of the points in your letters - that he speaks for you. Do all of you endorse hate speech? Do you endorse a leader and volunteer being called an Asshole, and worse? Do you endorse a letter that lies about Becky's decisions to resign?

Here are some of the consequences of what has transpired. I used to do sidewalk conferences with, and join, Dorothy Small in press statements. I have no interest in doing those with her now. I drafted a press statement on behalf of Karen Lowart when she first went public in support of her deceased son, who was molested by Fr. Don Flickinger. I am uninterested now in attempting to develop trust with Karen. I prepared excel data sets regarding Baltimore and David's childhood diocese in Kentucky. My work was used in Baltimore by David and SNAP. I'll never contribute that effort again. I've read texts and emails among Melanie, Becky and others that make fun of me with cartoons and disparaging links. I have no interest in working with Melanie anymore. Thankfully, Shaun supervises her and I do not.

Even if you truly believe that Garrison isn't of your creation, and isn't emboldened by whatever it is you all discussed with him, what he is doing to me and SNAP is wrong. If Becky lied to you, she is wrong. If someone else lied about her circumstances in that letter you signed, they are wrong. Why don't you speak up?

Dan McNevin

[Dan's email 12/10/24 3:2AM](#)

Dear Group of 12*

Below are salient definitions of hate speech, hate crimes, incitement of hate crimes, physical and emotional damages, and legal remedies. I am in California, so my remedies in the law would be here to alleged attacks or impacts I am experiencing or may experience. What is supplied below is excerpted and is not exhaustive.

I am advised that the person (or people) who incite "hate speech", "hate actions", and "hate incidents" can be folded into these remedies. Because I've never met Mr. Garrison, and he is targeting me specifically as a member of a group (the board of directors of SNAP) I (if a civil remedy) or law enforcement (if a criminal remedy) would need to determine who incited him to target me. The most obvious is someone(s) who is or was involved with your draft or final letters, a member of the Google Docs group, or someone associated with the Group of 12 who hasn't signed the letter but has engaged in any strategies involving Mr. Garrison, his inclusion in your letters, etc.

As you'll read below, the hate speech, actions, and impacts can be either criminal or civil, based on certain thresholds. I sincerely wish for no more hatred toward me, and certainly no violence, but I am concerned about his mental state, intentions, and motivations, and I am taking protective steps, including the issuance of this letter to all of you.

If any of you are currently engaged in egging on Mr. Garrison, please stop. If any of you have in the past participated in some behavior that may have caused Mr. Garrison to target me, please contact Mr. Garrison and convince him to stop targeting me.

As you know, Mr. Garrison has broadened his social media behavior beyond SNAP volunteers. He has already apparently frightened at least two women with his uninvited posts and allegedly aggressive engagements to their social media accounts. One of the other alleged victims is not associated with SNAP but has posted articles associated with SNAP. Positively framed SNAP related material seems to be one of Mr. Garrison's triggers. Melanie Sakoda has the relevant screenshots of those posts and the reactions of the other alleged victims. I am advised that those alleged victims have civil and criminal remedies in their states like the remedies I have in California.

Whatever your agenda regarding your letter(s), it should not include accomplishing your goal(s) through the incitement of violence or hate speech.

You have this letter now, and you can do with it what you please. But you should be aware that forwarding it, or any part, to Mr. Garrison could cause other negative consequences for me and others.

This email and related information are from me personally and are not SNAP board correspondence.

Dan McNevin

*"Group of 12" is comprised of: Judy and David Lorenz, Frank and Mary McKenna, Susan Vance, Sally Zakhari, Dorothy Small, Myra Russell, Nancy Fratianni, Susan Hurt, Frank Schindler, Karen Lowart

The UN definition of Hate Speech

To provide a unified framework for the United Nations to address the issue globally, the UN Strategy and Plan of Action on Hate Speech defines hate speech as... *"any kind of communication in speech, writing or behavior, that **attacks** or uses **pejorative** or **discriminatory** language with reference to a person or a group on the basis of **who they are**, in other words, based on their religion, ethnicity, nationality, race, colour, descent, gender or **other identity factor**."*

California criminal code

hate speech can lead to other crimes, such as assault, murder, arson, vandalism, or threats to commit these crimes. These crimes are considered hate crimes, and California Penal Code §422.6(a) makes it illegal to interfere with someone's rights based on their protected characteristics

Hate Incident/Civil lawsuit recourse

A bias-motivated act that does not rise to the level of a crime is called a "hate incident." Hate crimes are prosecuted by city attorneys and district attorneys under California's penal code, while hate incidents can be the subject of civil lawsuits under California's civil code.

Legal remedies as the victim of a hate crime or the incitement of a hate crime by another.

https://calcivilrights.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/32/2017/12/Ralph-Fact-Sheet_ENG.pdf

Email from Dan 12/18

The statement below "the treasurer has authorized...." is not true. I would need to see what was written and if by Shaun. Be sure the statement didn't originate with one of your group. I will ask Shaun as well. I've already read the same allegation that was written in a note *to* Shaun *by* David.

I have discussed the need for background checks with staff regarding the vetting of leader candidates. Background checks will be a basic safety measure for SNAP going forward if I remain a fiduciary. Garrison was not vetted at all. Melanie has said she has no file on him. That was a massive failure by our staff, in my opinion. I was gob smacked to hear about him sleeping on a lobby couch, and then reading his 1000 word text tirade, to learn that Melanie had nothing on him but called him a leader. the board had no idea he was named a leader, a direct violation of our bylaws

Email from Dan 1/13

Thanks Frank,

I'm up in Northern California, so out of harm's way, but it seems everyone has a one or two degree of connection to those fires, at least around here. We all have some sort of collective trauma as well, because this year it is LA, and a couple of years ago it was Santa Rosa, near me. Members of my family were burned out of their homes back then, and wound up moving out of the state. I can't help but reflect on their experiences, multiplied by the many down in Los Angeles facing similar decisions. I wish the news and the rhetoric was as politicized as it is.

I've had a couple of discussions with Shaun and it might be best to hold responses to the mediated sessions just so everyone benefits equally from the information exchanged. Of course that is up to you; I'll read what you send, for sure, and will forward what is appropriate to forward.

Shaun is trying to engage a mediator who was recommended by SNAP's primary funder. As this winds towards that resolution I hope you have the bandwidth and health to be involved. I think we'll need some level heads.

Take care for now,

Dan

Email From Shaun 1/21

Good Morning David

I have received the proposal from the Center for Conflict Resolution.

I will be informing the Board at our upcoming board meeting on Thursday that I have contracted with a mediator.

A Representative from the mediation center will be contacting you at some point this week to explain the process and seek your willingness to participate.

Have a nice day.

Shaun Dougherty

Board President

SNAPSurvivors Network of those Abused by Priests

814 341 8386

On Thu, Jan 16, 2025 at 6:39 PM Shaun Dougherty <sdougherty@snapnetwork.org> wrote:

Conflict Resolution | Center for Conflict Resolution | Chicago

Hi David

I've spoken with a representative of this Chicago based nonprofit that handles mediation.

I am awaiting their estimate and proposal. I expect it early next week. I will let you know as soon as I hear back from them. Please see the attached link to their website.

Have a nice weekend.

<https://www.ccrchicago.org/>

Dan's email from 3/5 to Frank

Hi Frank,

I hope you are well.

Because you and I have a rapport, I've decided to reach out to you directly. The attached voicemail came to the SNAP hotline on February 25, 2025 so a few days before the attempted mediation. We gave it to the facilitator but he said they don't pass information back and forth; that is up to the principals.

The VM is from Garrison though he doesn't use his name; Melanie confirmed it originated with his cell phone. I suggest you forward this to the others who wish to mediate so that everyone can hear the sort of vitriol Garrison brings. He is a personnel matter for the board, and the board cannot discuss him. The same is true of Becky. I sent to you all her email admitting she resigned as a leader. I could send that because she wrote it and sent it to a large group of people including non board members. The board has liability when discussing personnel, so we won't. It appears to the board that your group supports Garrison. That is affecting your credibility as a group.

One of your letters' complaints is that the hotline doesn't work. Because Garrison's voice message was left on the hotline, that is evidence that the line works. Whatever the final list of items on the agenda, it should not include complaints that are not grounded in fact.

The issue of meeting with unratified leaders is problematic for the board. Garrison also was not ratified and with the exception of you, I've never had a conversation with any unratified leader still part of your group. My suggestion to the facilitator was for the unratified to get their own break out room and work through the ratified members to have your concerns aired.

There is a ratification process a leader is now supposed to go through that hopefully filters out bad fits. I encourage you to get ratified, and I would support your candidacy based on what I know of you. I hope you and the others can appreciate the risk we perceive when considering sharing SNAP business with those who have not signed our leader manual or have had their backgrounds reviewed.

As it stands, Becky is posting oblique Facebook commentary that seems to comment on this mediation effort, which would mean the mediation confidentiality has been breached. I suggest you speak with your colleagues about the importance of honoring the confidentiality pledge. The perception we have that she is being fed information about this is undermining confidence.

This attached voicemail contains crude language and threats. I am sure in your life as a psychologist you've heard worse, but heads up nonetheless.

Dan's email from 3/13 to Frank

Dear Frank,

We all appreciate that the Help Line issue and The-Person-Stalking-the-Board issue came off the list of topics. To further simplify the conversation, supplied are some limited responses to several proposed

agenda items. I'm happy to speak with you about these before the meeting so that you have additional context, but these three topics will not be addressed in a meeting. We also won't be discussing the proposed new topic referred to as "leader vetting". It would be premature to discuss that procedure with your group prior to a community wide roll-out.

In addition to your proposed agenda topics, some board members wish to engage in a transparent discussion about the two September, 2024 letters that were circulated to recruit signatures, and other topics. Attached is a revised agenda including both sets of discussion ideas. There are six topics suggested by your group, and four topics the board is adding.

There are evident misunderstandings about the board. We want any discussion to be grounded in the bylaws and the leader manual. They contain standards that provide frameworks for behavior, lines of authority, and duties.

Using the example of the group's proposed topic: "**Leadership – not open to discussion or suggestions from members**" to clarify a point of confusion. When you write "members" we presume you mean "leaders" because under the bylaws, SNAP has no members. We then presume "leadership" means the board of directors, and not a complaint about other SNAP leaders. We also presume this complaint example is a first-hand complaint of some portion of the twelve of you, and that you are not putting words into the mouths of others who haven't signed the letter. Kindly let me know if that interpretation is mistaken.

Below is a screenshot of the "Nonprofit Purpose" of SNAP as outlined in the bylaws. Board members operate as fiduciaries according to this document, and this description is the standard the board considers as it endeavors to support SNAP's work. While SNAP's mission statement is "Protect the vulnerable, Heal the wounded, Prevent the abuse," the description below is the more specific mandate board members endeavor to facilitate.

Although only a few of you attended the conference, at the conference the board discussed a six month need to pause and "rebuild" SNAP. Shaun reiterated that plan in a community-wide letter after the conference. That pause period is coming to a close and the board, along with paid staff and Working Group volunteers, have done (and are doing) most of what it set out to do for the initial period. There still is work to be done. It would be fantastic if this discussion with your group results in additional volunteerism as the transition continues.

I will forward this to Ethan for his information as he tries to facilitate the next meeting.

Thanks

Dan

Appendix B Background emails

Curtis Dismissal Letter (8/19/24)



★ **Shaun Dougherty**

To: Curtis, Melanie, Eduardo, Judith, McNevin >

12:40 PM

Termination Notification

Mr Garrison

Having been sent several concerning messages about your willingness, in writing, to communicate disparaging, counterproductive, and many blatantly untrue statements about SNAP to multiple SNAP Conference attendees this past weekend I am removing you as a SNAP Leader effective immediately.

You are currently being removed from our platforms. You are no longer permitted to trade on or represent the SNAP Brand in any way effective August 19th, 2024 at 12:28pm Central Time.

This will be the last communication from the SNAP Executive Committee on this matter.

Sincerely

Shaun Dougherty
Board President/Interim Executive Director
SNAP
Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests
[814 341 8386](tel:8143418386)



Becky Letter to Board (8/29/24) & Dan Response

8:18



Re: Question



On Thursday, August 29, 2024 at 09:14:17 AM PDT, snapvirginia <snapvirginia@cox.net> wrote:

Dear Board members,

I have been told by several leaders that when they contacted you about my resigning my leadership position from SNAP they were told they didn't know the whole story and that the board couldn't share it to protect my confidentiality.

Since this directly involves me I would like to know what you were referring to when you mentioned my confidentiality.

I thought all this was in the past but it keeps coming up and I want to clear up any misconceptions.

Thank you,

Becky Ianni

Hide trimmed content



Me

8:04 AM



To: djianni@cox.net & 1 more ▾



Delete



Reply



Reply All



Forward



More

8:18



Re: Question



Hi Becky,

Soon after you resigned I had a handful of conversations with folks who you had asked to contact us, so I am probably best placed to respond to you now.

I have no idea what you are referencing and I'll need more context to possibly be helpful - who the leaders are, what they say was said, when it was said to you, when it was said to them, etc. I'm guessing this line of inquiry by you may be associated with very old conversations that everyone has moved on from.

This note you've written to us today seems to be a form of not leaving "all this in the past" and it might be worthwhile for you to think about your motivation for initiating this. The "since this directly involves me..." line looks like a rationalization for an email using somebody's hearsay, or for creating hearsay.

I've learned that if a person wants things to stay in the past, its best for that person to not initiate, revisit, or obsess about the past. Having said that, if you want to pursue this, give me more information and I'll try to help you.

Best,
Dan



Delete



Reply



Reply All



Forward



More

Note Well that Shaun (president) nor Eduardo (VP) did not choose to respond. Only the treasurer responded

Tim Lennon request to board that when unaddressed

On Wed, Jun 19, 2024 at 6:58 AM Shaun Dougherty <sdougherty@snapnetwork.org> wrote:

Hi Tim.

Thanks for this information. I will look into it. Looking forward to catching up with you in Houston.

Shaun Dougherty
Board President
SNAP
Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests
814 341 8386

On Tue, Jun 18, 2024 at 2:08 PM Tim Lennon <tlennon@snapnetwork.org> wrote:

Hi Mike, Melanie, and Shaun,

The We Protect Global Alliance has assembled an impressive list of government, NGOs, and agencies to fight child sex abuse. I noticed that The Army of Survivors and the Thorn project are part of this alliance.

I think that SNAP should join this alliance--the reasons are many:

~building contacts with allies

~establish SNAP as a world organization and increase the "visibility" of SNAP

~establish and foster connections to foundations (there are dozens on the list)

~being part of an international organization gives SNAP credibility and 'voice' in the fight for justice

~when we are part of an international community, we expand our influence and 'presence'; enabling SNAP to both give and receive solidarity with projects of mutual benefit.

SNAP has been the leader in fighting sexual abuse for 36 years. We were the first to go to the UN, make connections internationally, Ireland, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, etc. SNAP is a valued resource in the fight for justice.

Links:

~We Protect Global Alliance, <https://www.weprotect.org/>

~Civil Society joins government agencies and corporate allies <https://www.weprotect.org/alliance/civil-society/>

I look forward to seeing you all at the Conference.

Tim

Dan McNevin letter to Mark Fuller RE: Draft letter to BOD 9/16/24

NB: 9 attachments, including snaps of our meeting minutes, included in original email

From: McNevin Daniel <dmcnevin_94123@yahoo.com>

To: mfuller@snapnetwork.org <mfuller@snapnetwork.org>

Cc: Melanie Sakoda <msakoda@snapnetwork.org>; Shaun Dougherty <sdougherty@snapnetwork.org>

Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 at 10:21:41 AM PDT

Subject: Suggestions for your letter

Dear Mark Fuller,

Several leaders have recently sent me versions of a text from you and others, and the attached proposed letter to the SNAP board. They have informed me that they are not signing your letter. There are issues with the letter and addendum that I think you should consider fixing and be mindful about. I will refer to the letter and addendum as "letter" going forward.

Of primary concern to me is your reference to a suicidal person. Even if that person has agreed to permit you to discuss their private matters, if they were recently suicidal, they likely are not of sound mind. It is never a good idea to outline a person's health issues in a public document. As I understand it, your letter will go to one hundred or more leaders, and from there it could be forwarded many more times and it will exist forever. It could wind up on social media in whole or in part and be out of your control to take back.

It isn't a good idea to expose this person's health circumstances for a couple of reasons. First, reading about their situation, even if their name isn't mentioned, could trigger another suicidal episode. If that episode results in a death, the family of the deceased may read your letter, or perhaps a suicide note, and tie the death back to the letter you've signed and distributed. Anyone who signs the letter could be liable for a wrongful death and could be sued by the decedent's family.

Second, even if the person isn't triggered to the point where they attempt suicide, they still may regret that their story is being described and talked about in public and they might feel exploited by the letter writers. Even if you do not use their name, people may piece together the identity and cause the person you are describing undue stress, which can have unexpected, negative consequences. I suggest you eliminate this element of your letter to protect the person to whom you are referring. You might save somebody's life by doing so.

In addition, there are elements of your letter that are not supported by facts, and some of those unsupported elements may cross into defamation. When you allude to abuse or sexual harassment, the targets of those labels will have the ability to seek to hold accountable anyone who signs the letter. Usually holding someone accountable involves a civil lawsuit, demands for financial damages, and expensive and invasive legal discovery processes.

The allegation of sexual harassment is a first person claim. The only person who should be raising that claim is the alleged victim. If you and others who have no direct knowledge of that purported claim sign a letter implying something is true, in effect spreading an allegation that in time may be proven false, rescinded, or abandoned. you and any other signer could be in the line of fire for a defamation lawsuit. My question is: why would you make a statement about sexual harassment in writing that you personally

could never support with your first person testimony? Your lawyer would probably ask you that same question.

There are other problems with your letter. For example, you talk about needing financial transparency that the letter writers allege hasn't been offered. At the leaders' meeting on August 16, 2024, the SNAP board treasurer gave a one-hour presentation with a Q & A about the finances of SNAP. SNAP's budget, with revenue and spending data were displayed on a large screen for most of that presentation. Some members of the group sponsoring this letter were at the leaders' meeting. Have you talked to them about that presentation? The treasurer offered to send the presentation to whomever asked for it. No one has contacted him. Allegations about a lack of transparency, when there has been patent transparency, are easy to rebut. Many of your informational needs stated in the letter were, in fact, covered at the conference and if you were not there, you should consider rethinking some of what is alleged in the letter.

Because of my concern of the harm your letter could do to the potentially suicidal person, I've copied Melanie Sakoda and Shaun Dougherty. Melanie informed me recently that she has requested to be "kept away" from your actions. She cannot give you legal advice because she isn't a practicing attorney, but I think she should consider intervening on behalf of the person who you say took those pills and is being referenced in your letter. Shaun is copied because he is Melanie's supervisor.

I will close by stating I am writing you this note directly because I received the letter. SNAP's board hasn't vetted this letter I've written to you. I can also state that SNAP's board of directors has no control over your actions, or the actions of any leader, regarding this letter. The suggestions above are for your consideration and should not be construed as board approval or direction. The board has had nothing to do with the drafting or dissemination of the attached texts or letter. The board is not part of the Google Docs group that is involved with this letter. No SNAP staff member has been given direction by the board or the interim executive director to participate in the drafting or dissemination of your letter or your efforts to recruit signatures. It is up to Shaun to speak with Melanie about her participation in this going forward.

Best regards, and good luck with these decisions you must make.

Dan McNevin

[Dave letter to Shaun \(see email 11/21\)](#)

Shaun,

We have been trying to have a collegial chat with you and/or the board for months now and we have not made much progress. I will accept some of the blame for that as I did not respond well to having an agenda dropped on me 2 minutes before our last conversation. Things have gotten even more complicated with Curtis's postings but I assure you that I (or any of the group) have not had anything to do with that. There has been some effort to discourage that behavior but to no avail apparently. I (and the leader group) have been trying to communicate with you and unfortunately those efforts have been frustrated by other events. We also feel attacked and threatened by Dan's unending emails that seem to latch onto irrelevant and diversionary points. He also seems to have a tendency to erroneously extrapolate our motives based inadequate information. I'd like to try to start anew but first let me outline the series of events that have led us to this point:

During the conference, a group of us had concerns that we wished to discuss with you in a collegial manner. While we understand that confrontation can be challenging, it is also a necessary skill for a leader to handle conflict productively and dispassionately. Regrettably, you chose to avoid arranging a time to address our concerns. It appears you hoped the issues would dissipate after the conference and that may have actually happened. However, the following day, we learned of Curtis's dismissal. I was unaware of any egregious actions warranting such a decision. The dismissal letter, which provided no opportunity for Curtis to present his side, suggested a severe misuse of authority by the executive committee. The letter also stated that the matter was closed and not open for further discussion. Regardless of Curtis's actions, I believe strongly that he should have been consulted, even if you preferred not to handle the confrontation personally. More on this later as I am trying to follow the sequence of events.

This incident initiated a chain of events leading to the formation of a group requesting to be heard. We all have significant concerns, and, for the most part, we have not sought to recruit others. Our aim was to keep our efforts relatively discreet, maintaining a collegial approach, even if the issues were difficult to address. Consequently, we sent a letter outlining our concerns and our strong desire to ensure the organization's stability. Your initial response was promising and hopeful. Unfortunately, this was followed by stalling tactics. What truly generated hurt and anger among our group were the multiple letters from Dan, which were condescending, contentious, gaslighting, threatening, and intimidating. Several individuals withdrew from our efforts due to the threatening tone of Dan's communications. Although Dan frequently references the code of conduct necessary for SNAP members, he should reflect on the tone and content of his own emails. His communications have been particularly distressing for those who have suffered abuse by a narcissistic institution. This is no way to manage an organization like SNAP.

From the outset, I chose not to engage with Dan. Engaging in email discussions with him would almost certainly result in prolonged and irrelevant debates over minutia rather than addressing the pertinent issues. Additionally, as the president of the board, it is ultimately your responsibility to engage with members. I have always been able to approach and talk with past presidents whenever I felt the need and they always took my call (They still do). I do not wish to have my concerns mediated through a third party. I seek a direct discussion with you, the president of SNAP, along with the board as you deem appropriate.

According to the bylaws, a special meeting of the board can be called by a group of 20 leaders. While our current number is less than 20, we already have more than half that amount without actively recruiting anyone. Personally, I believe it wouldn't be difficult to find 10 more individuals to endorse the call for a special meeting. However, I've refrained from doing so to avoid exacerbating any internal discord within the organization.

I am aware that Dan might argue that not all of us are ratified leaders and point out that one of us is a new leader. Yet, this is a diversion from the core issue. Secondly, all but one of us received green lanyards at one or more conferences. At the beginning of these conferences, a board member had us stand and announced that we were SNAP leaders. This announcement should serve as de facto ratification by the board. The critical point here is not whether our small group meets the technical definition of 'leader,' but rather the serious concerns we, as members, have about the direction of SNAP and the manner in which the conference was conducted. Unfortunately, Dan's focus on technicalities diverts attention from these genuine issues that need addressing.

Dan attempted to divert attention from the issue by claiming that, since not everyone attended the conference, some of our group's concerns are hearsay. Then he contacted the hotel to check for accommodation complaints and was told there were none, presenting this as fact. However, this null outcome qualifies as hearsay from a financially interested party. To illustrate why people who did not attend the conference might have some concern, I'll use the following example. If several neighbors inform me that their cars were vandalized and advise me to park my car in the garage, I would act on their warnings. Ignoring their reports as hearsay would be foolish. Similarly, our group's concerns are based on multiple reports and warrant attention, not dismissal as irrelevant distractions or legal jargon.

Dan's condescending emails implied we haven't read or understood the bylaws, urging us to read them before progressing. Contrary to his assumption, we've been studying the bylaws for months and can cite numerous instances where they aren't being followed, such as the lack of annual audit reports. This implication is not only condescending but irrelevant. Our primary objective is to discuss our concerns, not to be subjected to patronizing demands. Our group is genuinely concerned and seeks answers, not irrelevant distractions. Your attention to these matters is crucial for maintaining the integrity and unity of the organization.

Within a week of our request for financial documents (e.g., P&L reports and annual audit reports), SNAP leadership received a letter acknowledging lax accounting practices and corrective measures by the current treasurer. Interestingly, Dan has been the treasurer for years and had it seemed he never noticed that the bylaw requirements for annual audits were not being followed until our inquiry highlighted this oversight. He laid blame on the previous board for being too loose. Dan has also indicated that the P&L reports are confidential, a stance I find perplexing as I have never encountered a non-profit organization that keeps these reports confidential. They may not publish them but will make them available to anyone who requests them. Financial transparency is a cornerstone of a healthy non-profit organization.

During the financial reporting part of the leader's meeting (one of the parts that you chose not to attend), a question was raised by one of the leaders whether SNAP's mission was to serve all survivors of CSA or just those harmed by religious intuitions. Dan's unequivocal answer was that we only work with religious CSA survivors. You should have heard the gasp in the room. I even said to myself that I must be in the wrong organization as I have heard opposite statements from past board members. Imagine my surprise when I read (and comprehended) the following statement in the bylaws: "In furtherance of the foregoing corporate purposes and as part of its charitable duties and obligations, the Corporation will: provide self-help healing and support for victims of religious **and institutional** sexual abuse and their family members through various means including..." (bold and underline are mine). Notice the 'and institutional' adjacent to the word 'religious'. Now I, personally, have a fairly broad interpretation of the word 'institution' that maybe others don't share but the sentence clearly indicates that our mission is to provide support to others beyond just religious organizations. The lack of clarity during the financial report further complicate matters. I waited for Dan to mention bottom line numbers but none were forthcoming and the spreadsheet displayed was unreadable and unintelligible. No specific numbers were mentioned; instead, a vague statement that "No conference has ever made money" was made, which is demonstrably false. A spreadsheet prepared by the SNAP bookkeeper shows a profit of nearly \$9,000 for the 2023 conference. I have been a member of SNAP for nearly 2 decades and I know that when I first started, the conferences included a fundraising session in the middle of Saturday. At that time, the conferences were considered one of the primary fundraising activities for SNAP. I am truly supportive of removing that fundraising session from the conference agenda but to say that conferences never made

money is demonstrably false. Again – it a shame you were not in attendance during the treasurer’s report. You may have recognized the error in Dan’s broad statement. I was dumbfounded by the broad generalization and the arrogance with which it seemed to be stated.

It’s also concerning that the website, a vital resource for survivors, has been neglected. Despite understanding that SNAP was swindled during the attempt to update the site, maintenance should have continued.

Additionally, we have concerns about the hotline. While you mentioned that an unknown contributor funded the hotline and you couldn’t track down details, a simple call to Becky or a phone service provider could have resolved this. Taking sole control of the hotline puts an unnecessary burden on you and disenfranchises those who previously fielded calls, despite your efforts to manage it effectively.

It has come to our attention that Curtis has started making inappropriate comments on your Facebook page and on those of other board members. Dan, without any evidence, has decided that we are either encouraging Curtis in this behavior or, at the very least, should be actively discouraging him. We received another threatening letter from Dan, essentially accusing us of wrongdoing and stating that in order to meet with anyone on the board, we must swear an oath to condemn Curtis’s actions. This accusation lacks evidence and fairness. Do you require this oath from every member who tries to contact you? Do you insist that they disavow Curtis before you will take their call? If not, why is this demanded of us? We have been deemed guilty by default. Dan stated that we are partially to blame for Curtis’s behavior. Let me make one thing very clear—Curtis is solely responsible for his actions. We had no knowledge of what he was doing. Dan even blamed us for not seeing Curtis’s post on Shaun’s Facebook page, which was made at 3 AM. Asserting that we should have prevented this is utterly absurd. It appears Curtis was dismissed without ever being given the opportunity to present his side of the story. In other words, he was found guilty based on hearsay from a third party and was not allowed to defend himself. I am also led to believe that Curtis has exculpatory evidence that would shed light on what occurred. But no one bothered to ask him first before dismissing him. While the bylaws permit this, it is not only deplorable but also unjust and there is a complete lack of due process. Even if Curtis’s actions warranted dismissal, he should have been contacted first. If we are to understand the actions that may have driven Curtis to his current behavior, we should look not at our leader group, but at the apparently unjust actions of the board. However, let me reiterate that Curtis is responsible for his actions. Dan chose to blame us instead of addressing the underlying issues that may have led Curtis to act as he did. Shaun, you promised me that a public statement would be forthcoming regarding Curtis’s dismissal. Now, you have reneged on that promise without explanation, except that Dan said so. This situation is both disappointing and sad.

Dan’s letters have attempted to isolate us from each other, implying that we couldn’t all share these concerns and asking each of us to identify which concerns are ours individually. This approach is misguided, devoid of fact, and irrelevant. We all share all of these concerns jointly and unequivocally, though our priorities might differ. Dan is simply wrong in his assumptions.

A new concern has arisen from one of Dan’s emails, where he mentioned conducting background checks on some SNAP members and/or leaders. I can only assume he obtained written permission from these individuals. If not, this constitutes a serious violation of FTC law and could put both Dan and SNAP in legal and financial jeopardy.

I must also address a critical issue regarding the bylaws. As we have discussed, the bylaws do not allow you to serve as both Executive Director (ED) and a board member. The bylaws state: “No two members of the Board of Directors related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership within the second degree of consanguinity or affinity may serve on the Board of Directors at the same time.” Shaun, you are the zeroth order of consanguinity to yourself. Legally, zero is less than two, which means you cannot serve on the board and are not allowed to vote. Whether you like it or not, you are related to yourself for legal purposes. I am aware that Dan has made several comments on this matter. Firstly, he argues that this provision is to avoid nepotism. However, Illinois state law concerning non-profits suggests that the purpose is to avoid conflict of interest. Since the ED is answerable only to the board, having a relative (yourself) on the board clearly constitutes a conflict of interest. Secondly, Dan states that the board is comfortable with you acting as ED at times and as Board President at other times. This is irrelevant, as the bylaws explicitly prohibit this arrangement. Finally, Dan suggested that the board could change the bylaws. While the board can amend the bylaws, doing so simply to suit current members is inappropriate and undermines the integrity of the organization. Furthermore, as the current president cannot vote on bylaw changes, the board does not meet the minimum requirement of six voting members, making any changes invalid.

Shaun, this group consists mostly survivors who have been ignored and dismissed by the Catholic Church and now that we approach the leadership of SNAP we are being ignored and dismissed once again. That is no way to run an organization that “provide self-help healing and support for victims of religious and institutional sexual abuse and their family members”. What could possibly prompt you (and the board) to ignore our pleas of concern and our offers of help. I fear for the future of this organization and only wish the best for it. I hope that you reconsider your position and meet with these concerned members who have years and decades of experience in SNAP advocating for survivors and who only want to help.

[Letter from Shaun to Teresa Lancaster](#)

Dear Theresa,

Thank you for offering to help resolve what appears to be misunderstandings with some leaders. The board’s hope is that between the recent letters from the President and Treasurer and the announcement that David Clohessy is being retained to manage SNAP’s communications, that many topics of concern for the group of individuals (“Group of 12”) have been clarified.

SNAP’s by-laws stipulate that the Executive Director (ED) supervises staff and leaders. Because Shaun Dougherty currently has the dual roles as ED and board president, the board decided to establish an ad hoc committee to oversee the ED’s interaction with leaders. I’ll refer to “Leader Committee” for the remainder of this letter when referring to the board’s committee that will oversee the ED in this matter.

In the event a meeting may still be required, and you are willing to act as a moderator, attached is an initial outline of what the Leader Committee requests you and Shaun pursue with the Group of 12. The information and clarifications will help to establish a common base of information which the board hopes can lead to a fruitful, transparent discussion.

At the outset of any efforts with the Group of 12, please express that SNAP is governed by a set of by-laws, the leader’s manual, employee agreements and fiduciary obligations. Each board member weighs these inputs, and privacy concerns, when making or announcing decisions.

For the sake of accurate record keeping and for ease of reference for the greater community, the original Group of 12 letter is attached to this email. You are free to circulate this letter and the outline below to the Group of 12 and others.

With respect,

Whoever the chair

Ad Hoc Oversight Committee, Leaders & Executive Director

_____ Leader

[Dan email to Melanie on or about 10/21](#)

" Melanie is on this email and Mike of course is not. Melanie should think about her early interactions with him, and assess how he tricked her - what part was his charm (or whatever), what part may have been herd-mentality, and what part was something else. These sorts of scammers usually have a pat set of lines they use. Learn from this."

On Mon, Oct 21, 2024 at 1:58 PM Melanie Sakoda <melanie.sakoda@gmail.com> wrote:

...which is similar but not quite as insulting as the earlier one.

"I think at this point the more salient question is around why you were inclined to support him. The HR lesson that can benefit SNAP is most likely there. I'm curious what about him made you support the decision instead of being against it, or indifferent. I've witnessed you being against some people, and indifferent to some people, in the past so you are discerning. I cannot imagine you would support a person who trolls and attacks like he does, had you known he did that. Is it fair to say that element of his personality surprises you? If so, consider how he kept that from you until he was given the power he needed to get what he was after. I'd like to know how he fooled you so that we can all put in place safeguards."

[CCR Policy statement](#)

CCR Facilitation Policy Statement

The Center for Conflict Resolution (CCR) is pleased to assist you in facilitating your dispute. In order that all parties understand the facilitation process and in an effort to maximize the likelihood of a positive and successful experience, CCR provides the following information:

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

- Facilitation is a type of mediation process in which a neutral third party facilitates communication between parties to assist them in resolving their dispute and is a process that enhances group effectiveness by structuring and guiding the communication in a manner that allows each member to contribute meaningfully and purposefully.
- Your participation is voluntary.

- Your facilitator is a trained mediator and is impartial - they will not take sides or favor one party.
- Your facilitator does not decide who is right or wrong.
- Your facilitator will not give legal or other advice.
- Your facilitator is not acting as anyone's lawyer. A lawyer can provide legal advice and represent a party's point of view. Your facilitator will not give legal advice or represent any point of view.
- Your facilitator is required to let the parties know if they have prior knowledge of, or acquaintance with, a party. If your facilitator feels that they can still be neutral, and the parties are comfortable, the facilitation will continue. If not, a different facilitator will be appointed.
- Lawyers are welcome to participate but are not required.

2. SETTLEMENT AUTHORITY

- Parties must have full authority to participate in the facilitation before the facilitation begins.

3. CONFIDENTIALITY

- CCR and its facilitators consider all facilitations to be confidential.
- CCR and its facilitators respect the privacy of the participants and consider what is discussed to be their business and will not willingly disclose (outside of CCR) anything that is said during the facilitation.
- Your facilitator will not willingly testify on behalf of any party.
- CCR does not allow any person to record in any manner (video, audio or other electronic means) any part of a facilitation.

EXCEPTIONS TO CONFIDENTIALITY

- If your facilitator learns anything that causes them to be concerned about serious imminent harm to any person, inside or outside of the facilitation, they may disclose that to the appropriate persons.
- Your facilitator may have professional mandatory reporting requirements that would require reporting of specific information to the appropriate authorities, such as misconduct by an attorney that violates attorney ethical rules.

4. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS, YOU SHOULD CONTACT AN ATTORNEY.