

2024 BYLAWS AND RULES COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES OCTOBER 5, 2023

Meeting called to order at 9:04 PM ET

MEMBERS	ALTERNATES
SYLVIA ARROWWOOD	1 CHUCK MOULTON
PAUL BRACCO	3 DAVE ROBERSON
NICHLAS CIESIELSKI	5 ROGER ROOTS
CARYN ANN HARLOS	7 DEAN RODGERS
ROB LATHAM	
FRANK MARTIN	
KEN MOELLMAN	
TOM ROWLETTE	
MIKE RUFO	
MICHAEL SEEBECK	

Full Complement

GUESTS DAVID BENNER TRAVIS BOST DUSTIN COFFELL JEFF DOUGLAS DAVID HYNES WILL HOBSON J. J. JACOBS MARRION KAUFMAN	TARA KELLEY NATHAN MADDEN ADRIAN MALAGON ANGELA MC ARDLE KAT MC ELROY ADAM MOTTESHEAD LARRY SILVER STARCHILD oOo	TOTAL 16
--	---	-----------------

PUBLIC COMMENT: MC ELROY: Want to speak on proposal that would expand the LNC. Don't have enough people to fill our committees all across the country and do not know how we could spread our people that thin and take away focus from the states with everyone trying to fill seats at national level; that is my concern.

MALAGON: Same proposal, also have a couple issues. Too big of a board is actually dysfunctional. This has been tried in California and it was tried ten and maybe twenty years ago. Was a complete disaster and overturned quickly because you cannot get people to meetings. When you did have quorum, nothing got done. This would be a absolute disaster and an unmitigated disaster in every respect. California is looking to trim down. MOELLMAN did not bring this up prior which was brought to my attention. He was not clear about putting this forward as part of this committee and there was nil

chance he would have been voted onto this committee had he been forthright about his intended proposal here. Will lobby against this very hard and don't think California will take much convincing -- and we do have over 100 delegates and that will be 100 votes lost give or take on this particular proposal.

STARCHILD: Also from California and support the proposal. Think it is important for future of the Libertarian Party. We are a bottom-up party and not an up-bottom party. Think we need bigger team in the leadership. Too many people now filling multiple roles and that includes some of those present here. No disrespect to any individual. A lot of you work very hard. But one position is enough for any one person. Any one of those jobs could be a full-time task. We need more than the usual suspects. We should be a bottom-up party.

BOST: I echo having more input from the bottom up. Seems like we are appealing the 17th Amendment but getting rid of the Supreme Court. Also echo it's too big.

HYNES: Lifetime member from Idaho. Making sure every state is represented on the LNC is understood. However, smaller boards are a little bit better; more efficient and accountability is more concentrated; board members can create committees and delegate responsibility as they see fit so they are not spread too thin. That's what committees are for. A very large LNC would be quite unwieldy and less productive. If anything LNC should move to a smaller board.

BENNER: Would speak in opposition to that bylaw amendment to drastically expand the size of the LNC. My understanding is MOELLMAN was the architect of this and he's a great guy full of integrity but in addition to some of the points raised, I personally asked Jim Cantrell what he thought of the size of this board and some previous boards he served on and he's the founder of Space X and been on many boards. He flat out said that our board was way too big to be efficient. Current size is too big and expanding it would exacerbate that. With all that said, I would take his opinion with credence.

MC ARDLE: As to board size, it's difficult to get everyone on the same page. There are often people who are not pulling their weight. Like BENNER says, it's too large. I offered a counter proposal to shrink the board and if you think that is controversial perhaps you should look into the subject of effective boards. Jim Cantrell said the board is too big. So did Roger McCafferty who is a long-time board experienced guy in the liberty movement and conservative circles. So did two other gentlemen who have had tons of board experience. One is a top executive at Monsanto and another who has been in private non-sector for about 35 years. Both stated a board of about 7 to 9

people is a reasonable size. Ours is too large and bumping it down to 12 people would be better. If you are not comfortable with that, probably what should be done is postpone considering my offer and postpone and look into it later after we do effective research on how to make our organization more effective. We need to do that for future LNC's. We don't need to hamstring them and make the work harder.

HARLOS: Any further comment? (No Response)

There is a lot of comment both for and against the restructuring proposal. I move to amend our agenda as this has caused a lot of angst in the party one way or another and everyone wants to know whether this will be considered by this committee. It's obvious there are people here who want to hear about it. There is appetite to put it at the very end. Because of stress this has caused in the party, do not want to put it to the very end. But, it's up to the committee. Will be making a motion to that end after our house-keeping.

MINUTES APPROVAL: HARLOS: September 7, 2023, any corrections to be made to those minutes? (No Response) These are quite informal and if you ever find anything, you can always let the secretary know and she will change it.

HARLOS: Early on it was asked that there be no debate in chat. Asking that people on the mic do not respond to comments in chat and asking that we keep debate in chat to a minimum. However, since ARROWWOOD can only communicate that way, will relay what ARROWWOOD says verbally so we have it on the record verbally. If that does not work out, we will count ARROWWOOD absent and MOULTON (A1) will sit in her place.

Unto the minutes. Is there any objection to approving the minutes? (No Response)
Minutes of 9-7-23 are APPROVED WITHOUT OBJECTION.

Making motion to amend our agenda. Left off in middle of a proposal but it's very clear where we were at. It's my proposal and do not mind it waiting. Moving to amend the agenda to move Item 5 up to before No. 2. (Seconded). It is debatable if anyone wants to debate. Going to assume there is an objection but maybe there is not. Is there any objection to amending the agenda in that manner? Amending agenda to move up MOELLMAN'S proposal and to include the alternate proposal, up from No. 5 to No. 2. Also want to say for MC ARDEL'S reference, the proposal you had sent over to me is almost identical to a proposal made by ROWLETTE, very similar. Just want you to know that. Is there any objection to amending the agenda in that manner? (No Response)
ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.

No. 5 is now moved up before No. 2. There are several proposals that people are very passionate about in one way or another. Everyone gets to talk in committee even if there is a motion to postpone indefinitely. It is a debatable motion. Everyone gets to talk because you cannot call the question in a committee. Ask that we not give five-minute speeches. Asking that as a favor.

Will pull up MOELLMAN'S proposal. Sure you want to speak to it. The mic is yours.

PROPOSAL X–MOELLMAN–AMEND BYLAWS ARTICLES 6, 7, 8 11, 12 & RULES 2 & 8.

MOELLMAN: As to quorum, when there is lots of notice, the quorum goes down. The more notice, the quorum goes down. Has an automatic basic resignation if you are tardy all the time or missing, absent. While LNC itself grows to a much larger board, the point of that board is not to govern the party day to day. The point is to appoint or to hire. A small board of seven people – and someone else has proposed nine – I'm fine with seven or nine. Agree party is too large. Was discussed years ago that our board is too big to be a small board and too small to be a big board and our party is a weird, awkward size. What I'm saying is "both". The small board runs the party day to day but they are immediately accountable to the larger board. Larger board has opportunity to overturn anything they do. Larger board has authority to fire them. One of key things of this large board is to hire and fire the executive committee, to approve the annual budget and to undo any decisions of the executive committee if necessary. That is the vision/point of a larger LNC than a smaller LNC, that it hires. Do not envision that these would be the same group of people. Do not limit that because if there happens to be someone on the LNC who is qualified, why limit it?

Fairly certain that when people hear what is actually happening here, the point of this is decentralization. Instead of one election happening at convention ever two years and that being only mechanism for accountability other than the LNC deciding to kick someone off – and that actually is what inspired this is the removal of HARLOS this last term. Who has the right to remove someone? In this case, the board of 51, would be hiring and thusly be able to fire the executive committee or any member of it. Likewise states would be able to appoint their person to the LNC and they have authority based on their state's bylaws to hire and fire that person. We would create accountability from a smaller board. It could be nimble and fat but it needs to be accountable to a larger board who is immediately accountable to the members in the states. That is the vision; that is the point. It could be wrong way but believe – and there are a bunch of reasons sent out in an email. But those are the reasons and the main reason in my opinion is that it decentralizes the party while making it more stable.

HARLOS: Don't think this decentralizes because it takes things out of hands of the delegates and then puts the party in the hands of hired staff. If we want a smaller board, we can do with structure we have now rather than this absolutely radical restructuring that will hobble the next LNC right after the nomination of a presidential candidate which is the first thing you have to worry about after a national convention and scrambling to make sure that the party is prepared to do this in two years. Absolutely opposed to this proposal no matter what year it was proposed. To propose in an election year and totally crippling the next LNC is completely and utterly irresponsible. Consolidating the day-to-day operations, making decisions down to people who might just be hired – then you are saying they can fire them on the whim or reason of allegedly 50 plus one chairs – and know from working with state chairs, there will be about 15 of them that are going to be actively participating. This is taking attention away from them running their states and know MOELLMAN will say they can appoint someone else from their state. We all know how that goes.

This is actually centralizing power in the hands of a few states that care to pay attention to it. Taking things out of the hands of the delegates is absolutely killing our mid-term convention because people are not going to go to a convention just to vote for bylaws. They go 'cause they want to elect an LNC and that's the biggest fund raiser that the party has and this will utterly destroy it. This is completely unwise, untested; and we should not be playing dice with the party in this way. If we want the LNC to be more immediately accountable rather than through removal, let's have a recall position that puts it in the hands of the delegates where they can petition to recall an LNC member. That is decentralization. More to say but will yield the floor to debate. **31:32**

MOULTON: Do not support this proposal in general. Agree with members who think the board is too big, not too small. My ideal size would be somewhere between 8 and 12 ideally all at large selected with perhaps a single transferable vote. Don't think we should ignore this proposal or postpone indefinitely or kill it. Think that underestimates the popular support of this proposal. Think this committee should do its best to perfect this proposal, vigorously debate it and make it better. Think this proposal will make it to the convention floor whether or not it comes from the Bylaws Committee. We should take this proposal seriously.

Misunderstood the proposal when initially read it. Having talked more with MOELLMAN and some others about it, think parts are mislabeled. What is referred to as "executive committee" is really "staff". He wants these to be paid positions. I don't think it's appropriate to pay committee members. It is entirely appropriate to pay staff. Has been a long-sanding debate in the party about whether the chair and CEO or president

in corporations or in non-profits are paid; there's nothing inappropriate about that. Don't think it's bad or the end of the world if the chair of the party is different from a CEO of the party, if we have a COO of the party or a paid treasurer or a paid secretary. Don't think those are necessarily terrible things. Those could be staff positions. The proposal as written could confuse some people. Most people are confused when they see "executive committee" they think about volunteers and question: why are we paying volunteers? The proposal could be clearer if we took every instance of "executive committee" and we substituted "executive staff". These are not volunteers. This is staff. Am an alternate and cannot make that motion. Would encourage someone on the committee to make that amendment.

Have a question for HARLOS. If this committee were to adopt instead of this proposal, the alternate proposal, ROWLETTE proposal – which I do in fact support – would it be proper for MOELLMAN'S proposal to be a minority report?

HARLOS: Answer to inquiry: Yes. Only time you can have a minority report is if something were to pass out of committee. If nothing touching the structure comes out of the committee, then no minority report is appropriate. If something comes out of committee that touches the LNC, yes, anything can be a minority report.

(DEBATE)

HARLOS: No cross-talk, please.

(CONTINUED DEBATE) ***45:29*****

HARLOS: This proposal could have come up first but it was not proposed right away. This committee has spent ten months now on a ton of proposals that will be moved if this were to pass. There was considerable talk on the list about respecting everyone's proposals. We have four hours. This proposal alone on the floor will take at least two. Are we saying as a committee that one person's proposal for something that does not – don't know if it has majority support on this committee -- but it certainly does not have more than majority support and don't think it actually has majority support to take up all of our time on this when we have other very systematic problems in the bylaws. This does not create more stability because there is no method at all if 20 states don't send anybody – which is going to happen. There was talk about removing staff. There is no method to remove state representatives who don't show up or don't do their job. This is inherently way more unstable. It is going to lead to a handful of states controlling everything. It's going to be a lot more opaque. Where we are on a bylaws committee where we might be the type who will go a convention for other purposes, that is not your average member. That's why presidential conventions are so much bigger because

people want to go to nominate the presidential candidate. People will not go to convention and spend that much money and travel that far. People in surrounding states would go and you could have the bylaws being controlled by that. Heard a lot of hope and change. Not willing to risk this party on hope and change. There are much less extreme ways to solve perceived change. We can make the LNC smaller. Can do that with another proposal. Cannot see how a recall would work. Would you make it a very high percentage of the delegates or the sustaining members? How would that make it less ripe for abuse than by state chairs or state reps? No proof of concept here. From my experience in the party, this would cripple the LNC. That's just the facts.

We could spend the rest of our time together as a committee amending this proposal. Don't think that is respectful to the rest of the committee. Don't think something so massive should be imposed upon the time of everyone on this committee. However, MOULTON had a good point. If there is a feeling that we don't want to spend the next ten meetings talking about this but we want to give MOELLMAN the opportunity to perfect this with whatever group of supporters he can get, then let's pass the alternate. The alternate proposal is simple. It solves half of the prestige problem and if someone wants to come up with a recall one, have language from whatever years before; but to me two years is not that long. People will just elect a new LNC.

Am going to encourage the committee to just stop debate and vote it down. Don't want to pass either proposal. Don't want to pass alternate either. But will pass alternate to get that as primary rather than this. Recommend that we have a lot of work to do and wish we would just go to a vote and would like to hear from anyone who wants to get to the mic that if a vote were had on this right now, how would you vote? We could see if there is even majority support for the idea. Do not think there is and we should not be wasting our time if there is not even a majority support for the idea. I am a "No". Perhaps we should hear from other committee members what their vote would be?

LATHAM: Parliamentary inquiry. Could we have a two-year or a six-year proviso? Could this be brought up in 2026, mid-term convention? Could we say this is not going into effect until 2030?

HARLOS: Yes.

LATHAM: In the "No" camp. Not because there are not some good ideas in these proposals but think the timing is not good. Could take this up later. It does not need to be a huge distraction if we don't let it. If we have time in the committee's work, we could take it up again and as MOULTON said maybe have something in the report if there is an appetite there for it. But it's just not good timing for this coming convention.

HARLOS: It could be postponed to another meeting. Would like to see it ended.

ROWLETTE: Ideal outcome would be for my proposal to be the main motion and for MOELLMAN'S proposal to be the minority report. Reason is this has got people kind of riled up. This is going to come up on the convention floor regardless whether or not we propose it. If it does not come from us, it's going to come from somebody saying they want to suspend the rules to debate a restructure of the LNC; then we will have to deal with that. Rather have it be from us than from some rando on the convention floor. Like my proposal best of course. Both of these ought to be considered by the delegates. Don't think they will debate it for two hours. This is a big deal. It's a bigger deal than a good 75 percent of the other proposals in our lineup here. If we do this and three or four other things, that's better than if we knock out a whole lot of the little stuff. Am strongly opposed to kicking this down the road 'till January and seeing if we can take it up then. Think we should deal with this now.

(CONTINUED DEBATE)

HARLOS: From what has been said in debate, do not believe this proposal will go forward. Let you know I would vote for the alternate proposal only as a survival technique. Do think this proposal is an existential threat to our organization Don't want us to touch the structure of the LNC at this coming convention but the least destructive way to do it is just to reduce the size. This is not going to be heard from the floor. Not a snowball's chance in hell there is going to be a 2/3 vote. Printed this out and it's 50 pages long and this is not going to get heard from the floor. What might get heard from the floor is eliminating regionals and replacing them at larges in a lesser number because it's simple and people can understand that. That may get moved from the floor if we don't move it out of committee. Don't want to move either out of committee but if had to choose between the two, would choose the other. If someone wants to move the other one as a substitute, they can. Otherwise, moving we vote this down and move on.

MOELLMAN: Glad we got to hear what this is about. That was really my purpose in proposing it. More than anything it was to inspire people to consider ways that the organization can be made better by known structure ways as to problems we have known about for at least a decade if not longer. Not saying my way is the right way. Not saying my way or the highway. Saying that what we have now, and we have 20 years of history to prove it, is not the right way. We do need to do something. What that is, I don't know. Like every Libertarian personally have my own pet things, accountability and checks and balances and Rube Goldberg devices. Just glad that we are having the conversation and glad that most folks were respective this evening and

thank you all for your time. If I could move to a vote, would but can't do that in a committee. That is all.

HARLOS: Goes to a vote when debate is done. We will go to a vote if there is no further debate. Is there any further debate? (No Response). Vote is to move the proposal of MOELLMAN.

VOTE TAKEN BY BRACCO. ARROWWOOD VOTING IN CHAT. TO CONTINUE THROUGHOUT MEETING.

ARROWWOOD	NO	
BRACCO	NO	
CIESIELSKI	NO	
HARLOS	NO	
LATHAM	NO	
MARTIN	NO	
MOELLMAN	YES	
ROWLETTE	NO	
RUFO	NO	
SEEBECK	NO	FAILED VOTE 1-9-0

MOELLMAN PROPOSAL X WITHDRAWN.

HARLOS: When Done with No. 5, will go back to No. 2.

ROWLETTE: Move the substitute.

HARLOS: Similar to the member submission we received from MC ARDLE. Will invite her comments in chat if she desires.

ROWLETTE: Proposal to shrink the LNC down to 11 people, four officers and then seven at larges. Gets rid of regionals. There are pros and cons to that. Do not want to go into too much detail about that. Think by doing this, will make the organization more effective generally. Not campaigning but see someone might move this from the floor if we do not put it into our report. Vote your conscious. Do you think the status quo is better or better if it were 11 people, four officers and seven at larges?

MOELLMAN: Rather see seven regionals than seven at larges.

HARLOS: Encourage the committee to vote it down. Don't want to get into a minority report with that other huge proposal. It would bog down the committee with the other proposals but if it gets moved from the floor, fine. Then there would not be a minority report. Don't want to see having this as a back-door way to the other one taking up

time. Opposed to this and will not be voting on this but asking committee to vote it down and let it come up from the floor if it needs to.

Is a regional owing to the party or to the region? You might have a regional that is torpedoing the LNC. A region might be absent. The regional system has never worked. Do have the old proposal for recall. Could need a high threshold for delegates but to kind of work in other MOELLMAN proposal or it could be a certain number of state chairs. How about a certain number of state chairs could remove somebody? That is not a bad idea. Then you have direct accountability. Majority of all state chairs is 26. That will put in accountability. Someone might want to bring that proposal up. Am suggesting we vote this down. If it comes up from the floor, fine. We have other things to worry about like electronic voting and notice. Both of those are going to eat up a lot of floor time.

(DEBATE) **1:14:34***

BRACCO: Amend with proviso: “The regional representatives and alternates elected by the final adjournment of the 2024 National Convention or the replacements according to the regional agreements will serve until the adjournment sine die of the 2026 National Convention under the rules of the National Bylaws as existed when the original representatives and alternates were elected. No regions will be formed in 2026.”

HARLOS: Any objection to that proviso? (No Response). Proviso ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION. **1:19:21***

(DEBATE CONTINUED)

ROWLETTE: If cumulative voting passes, then we go to this. **1:29:34*****

HARLOS: Approval is conditioned upon the committee passing a cumulative voting proposal. Then committee will put the cumulative voting proposal prior to this proposal in the report – and this is just for us – and only move this proposal if the cumulative proposal passes. Can perfect wording. This is internal instructions.

ROWLETTE: Don’t care what type of voting you use. Everyone else does, so go for it.

HARLOS: Is there any objection to this internal proviso?

SEEBECK: Objection.

HARLOS: There is. Will go to debate.

SEEBECK: Seems to me we are just hammering a dead horse here. This is getting down to rabbit hole absurdity. Understand wanting to get rid of the regions and making the

LNC more efficient with a smaller size. It has to be exactly right to do this when it frankly is going to confuse everybody. Not a fan of at large seats in general. Reality of it is that we have been spending all this time in this meeting to discussing these two proposals and I'm going to vote against this one for reasons that the chair brought up and the possibility it would create a mess on the floor. This is not something we are going to resolve in this committee with the amount of proposals we have and the amount of time left on the ones unheard. Let's set this aside; let's look at it some other year; let's get the rest of our business that we got to do, done and figure out what we have to do wean up our way-too-many proposals and get a report organized for the convention that is something that is actually allowable to be done within the four hours we have within the convention time we have rather than piling on and keep piling on.

HARLOS: Will continue debate. **1:33:00***

(DEBATE CONTINUED)

HARLOS: Going to a vote on the internal proviso. Other proviso passed.

ARROWWOOD	NO	
BRACCO	YES	
MOULTON (A1)	YES	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	YES	
MARTIN	YES	
MOELLMAN	ABSTAIN	
ROWLETTE	YES	
RODGERS (A7)	YES	
SEEBECK	NO	ADOPTED VOTE 6-2-2

HARLOS: Back to main motion. Am requesting we vote this down. When we get done with everything, going to encourage the committee to give the chair a cumulative voting proposal to have in her back pocket in case this gets moved and passed from the floor. Just thought of problem with internal proviso: what if we pass cumulative voting and then this fails and we end up with two cumulative voting for the at larges and still have regionals? Not too sure like that. Encouraging everyone to vote this down but to give me a tool in case it is moved from the floor. **138:25***

(DEBATE)

BRACCO: If this were to fail – parliamentary inquiry – and a similar proposal were to be moved later on that included not only this change to make it at larges but also a

cumulative voting proposal as part of one proposal, would that count as reconsideration?

HARLOS: Yes. Would have to reconsider. In order to preserve reconsideration rights, you have to not be on the losing vote side. You could be an abstention. On committees you have to not be on the losing side.

No further debate. We will go to a vote with both provisos passed – aware there is objection because I’m a “No” if I were to vote.

ARROWWOOD	NO	
BRACCO	NO	
MOULTON (A1)	YES	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	NO	
MARTIN	NO	
MOELLMAN	NO	
ROWLETTE	YES	
RODGERS (A7)	NO	
SEEBECK	NO	FAILED VOTE 2-7-1

PROPOSAL U & V– HARLOS/LATHAM – CLEANUP AFFILIATION LANGUAGE & RESPONSIBILITIES

HARLOS: Back to No. 2. We had a primary and a substitute. Will perfect substitute first. Substitute was from LATHAM.

LATHAM: There is another substitute.

HARLOS: You can’t amend a substitute to a substitute.

LATHAM: Okay with that. There was concern that substitute was going after state level items. Replaced ~~state~~ with jurisdiction. Made some plurals singular. This is Proposal U? It’s in Notes.

HARLOS: Yes. Already two levels deep. No further amendments. This is substitute for a substitute.

BRACCO: Question. Currently have main motion and substitute. If we were to dispense with however it goes, could the new main motion then be substituted at that time?

HARLOS: Yes.

BRACCO: Could that substitute be amended?

HARLOS: We have a substitute for a substitute. No. We have a main motion and a substitute – forget about the substitute for the substitute – you have to perfect both of them now. Once you pass for instance the main motion over the substitute or the substitute over the main motion, it cannot be amended further other than adding to it. A substitute is a strike out and replace. It is not adding to it. They need to be perfected now. Don't see any value added in either of the substitutes. Original is fine. Sometimes we are majoring on the minors when we have a lot of major things to be dealing with. Problem was solved by the original. Only purpose was to make sure these folks give us their constitution and bylaws. We spent like an hour on weird language. It would not be take all-comers. Needs to be sustaining members. Why would we be doing all this other potential wording, when problem is solved by first one? Urge we vote for the first one. We can amend first one; don't need to substitute for the substitute. Don't have to take all comers if we put "may" in there. One of the duties of National is to charter state affiliates.

(DEBATE)

HARLOS: The more red and blue delegates see, the less likely they are to pass. That's reality. We are getting near time. Delegates don't like fooling around with grammar. Wish we had a style committee but we don't. We are to vote on whether the substitute shall become the substitute? Is there an objection?

SEEBECK: Let's take a minute to see what we are looking at. It's hard to read. Can you blow it up just a slight bit on the screen?

LATHAM: Bottom one is substitute for substitute?

HARLOS: Yes. (Screen Enlarged). Is there an objection to making the substitute to the substitute the substitute? (No Response) Substitute for the substitute ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.

Now substitute for main amendment is up for amendment. Is there any amendment? (No Response) Then primary is up for further amendment; is there any further amendment to the primary? There is objection to making the substitute the primary so we will try to do two votes in a couple minutes.

Motion before us is shall the substitute motion become the primary motion? Neither can be amended further except by adding. Anticipate two votes in rapid succession potentially. Shall the substitute motion become the main motion?

ARROWWOOD	NO	
BRACCO	NO	
CIESIELSKI	ABSTAIN	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	YES	
MARTIN	NO	
MOELLMAN	ABSTAIN	
ROWLETTE	NO	
RUFO	NO	
SEEBECK	ABSTAIN	FAILED VOTE 1-5-4

HARLOS: Main motion. No amendments to it. Can be further debate. We are at time but if no further debate, we will get this vote in. Is there any objection to adopting what is now the primary motion? (No Response) **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

We are done with this proposal. We will start with Agenda No. 3 at next meeting. Next meeting is two weeks from today, Thursday, October 19th. If you are interested it is suspendability of rules and bylaws. Is a topic that came up before. Adjourned at 11:05 PM ET.

DRAFT 10-13 AT 5:28 PM 10-14 at 12:02**10-15- at 11:53 AM**