

**2024 LIBERTARIAN PARTY BYLAWS AND RULES COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING MAY 18, 2023**

Meeting called to order at 8:53 PM ET

<b>MEMBERS</b>	<b>ALTERNATES</b>	<b>GUESTS</b>
SYLVIA ARROWWOOD	DATA LOGAN (A6)	J.J. JACOBS
PAUL BRACCO	DEAN ROGERS (A7)	KEN MATTES
NICKOLAS CIESIELSKI		LARRY SILVER
CARYN ANN HARLOS		GENE TROSPER
ROB LATHAM		JESSICA TEWKSBURY
FRANK MARTIN		
KEN MOELLMAN		
TOM ROWLETTE		
CHUCK MOULTON (A1)		
MIKE SEEBECK		

ABSENT: MIKE RUFO

**MINUTES: 4-20-23 AND 5-4-23:** Approved Without Objection.

**PUBLIC COMMENT/ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:** Convention 2024 theme being solicited by contest. Funds generated to be donated to LP. Seebeck to post link in chat for a GoFundMe to help out fellow Libertarian in Alabama.

**PROPOSAL O CONTINUING FROM MAY 4, 2023 MEETING.**

**BRACCO:** Appeal to decision of Chair made 5-4-23 and pending as to substitution of entire Proposal O Withdrawn Without Objection.

**HARLOS:** Dealing with now O 2 and 3.

**2. The Party platform and** These bylaws may be amended by ~~a 2/3 vote of the delegates at any regular convention,~~ by a 2/3 vote with prior notice or by a ¾ vote from the floor without prior notice.

**3. Article 3, Section 1, of this Section, shall not be amended by a vote of less than 7/8 of all registered delegates at a regular convention.**

**BRACCO:** There is no amendment on the floor now?

**HARLOS:** Right. We are ignoring highlighted portion now because it was dependent and mirroring the language of the original amendment which was changed. Suggest we pass or not pass a proposal of some primary language and if we don't pass any

alternative language, it becomes moot as we have no proposal. If we do pass a proposal, then suggest we work on an alternative. Deletions take a majority.

**BRACCO:** This is if E fails?

**HARLOS:** My substitute is assuming E passes.

**BRACCO:** Keep both open. The difference here is the token system. Within the if-E-fails, ARTICLE 17, 2, c., the largest purple block, starting with **The Convention Rules** and going all the way through **threshold** that needs to go into other one as well. In both of these the token rules are maintained. Could make it 2., c. as a stand-alone; that's okay. Would move this version as a substitute. Wording differs more than function.

**HARLOS:** Not a substitute.

**BRACCO:** There is another one in RULE 5.

**HARLOS:** Is your motion to strike all of my 2 and insert your 2 with three subsections a, b, c.?

**BRACCO:** Yes and unstrike –

**HARLOS:** To strike my strikes of RULE 5 except for last section of 5?

**BRACCO:** Yes. Keep it together.

**HARLOS:** Yes. If yours passes, we will want to keep 5. If someone wants to move to divide, we can. (No Response). You are moving to strike all this which is now (yellow).

**2. The Party platform and t**These bylaws may be amended by **a 2/3 vote of** the delegates at any regular convention **by a 2/3 vote with prior notice of by a** **¾ vote from the floor without prior notice**

And put the now green back in (Indicating) which is RULE 5. There is no change in the current platform deletion program. Remember we have to consider these proposals as they are written in the bylaws. We will eventually have to put these proposals in some type of order which will depend on if one or another passes. By the time we get to that point, we might even have withdrawn some of our proposals. That will be part of our last work of the committee. My proposal is this. If we end up passing the higher threshold first, it will be to strike the new language. If we don't do it first, my proposal here passes and we strike that, it will render the later one moot. This report will be very difficult to write.

**BRACCO:** In terms of striking token voting, think it distracts from the main thrust of this proposal. This is a complex proposal and adding notice, it makes it a harder sell. It is a hard-to-explain proposal. If we are going to do a striking of the rules, then it should be its own proposal to not bog this one down.

**HARLOS:** No objection to the change. With notice it kind of makes the token process moot. Someday another Bylaws Committee might get rid of the token process or it could be moved from the floor. Bracco is moving to strike ~~The Party platform in these bylaws may be amended by the delegates at any regular convention by a 2/3 vote with prior notice or by a 3/4 vote from the floor without prior notice.~~ and to insert The Party platform in these bylaws may be amended by the delegates at any regular convention: a. by a majority vote with prior notice. b. by 2/23 vote without prior notice. So far nothing is changed except for the formatting. Here is the change: the convention rules may provide for a token process in order to delete platform planks which may eliminate notice requirements and provide for a different voting threshold. Considering a conforming amendment leaving in the current wording on tokens. A problem is that our current language does not provide for a different threshold. Unless we do that, this will be defective.

**BRACCO:** With that in mind can I amend the amendment? At the end of c. would like to strike ~~and provide for a different vote threshold.~~ It won't be perfect.

**HARLOS:** Another problem. When it says the token process may eliminate notice requirement, it's ambiguous. It is not just eliminating notice requirement but all requirements. That's not the most reasonable interpretation but is an interpretation. But we can deal with that later. Is there any objection to the amendment to the amendment which is "and provide for a different threshold? (No Response. Amendment to Amendment adopted Without Objection.

**MARTIN:** Who sets the convention rules?

**HARLOS:** Convention rules are standing; they carry over from convention to convention. The "delegates" do as they pass the standing rules. Requires a 2/3 vote to amend the standing rules.

**LATHAM:** The words "in order" some consider that throat clearing. It appears in two other spots in our bylaws and rules, so we might look at those. Does the sponsor want to keep that or just remove "in order"?

**HARLOS:** No such thing as "friendly amendments". If you wish to amend, it doesn't matter what Bracco thinks about it.

**LATHAM:** Will make that amendment. Move to delete “in order” so that it would read “The convention rules may provide for a token process to delete platform planks which may eliminate notice requirement.”

**HARLOS:** Any objection to that amendment? (No Response). Adopted Without Objection. My suggestion is to delete ~~which may eliminate notice requirements~~ and insert the two without prior notice.

**BRACCO:** Better language. Make that motion.

**HARLOS:** That would do it. Any objection to the amendment to the amendment which will strike ~~which may eliminate notice requirements~~ and insert without prior notice? (No Response) Adopted Without Objection. Any other debate on Bracco’s amendment which is to strike the pink highlighted area which was the original proposal No. 2 – it will be No. 2 if it passes -- and will reinsert the language that already exists, however it exists at the time this proposal is heard on tokens. Is everyone clear? (No Response). Is there any objection to this? (No Response). Adopted Without Objection. Let’s clean this up. We are deleting No. 5.

**BRACCO:** Nothing further.

**HARLOS:** Suggest we vote on this proposal with the understanding that if it passes, we are going to need to then work on alternative amendment language in the event that deletions remain at 50 percent. If everyone is agreeable to that process, because no point even thinking about alternative language if this proposal does not pass. First, is there any objection to this proposal?

**LATHAM:** Please state it again.

**HARLOS:** Will read again as it’s been a while. Going to read as if it passed. ARTICLE 17, AMENDMENT AND NOTICE. 1. Notice of Proposed Amendments. a. The Platform Committee and the Bylaws and rules Committee must provide reports of their recommendations along with minority reports to the Party Secretary at least thirty-five days prior to the regular convention which shall then be published on the Party website within five days of receipt. There was discussion about adding the Party Chair to the list which can be added before we vote so we don’t forget about this sort of thing. b. Any Party sustaining member may submit to the Party Secretary proposals to amend either the Platform or these bylaws, provided they are signed by fifty sustaining members at the time of proposal submission and provided to the Party Secretary no later than sixty days prior to the regular convention. These proposals shall be forwarded to the respective committee

chairs and published on the Party website within five days of receipt. The committees may include recommendations on these proposals in their reports. 2. The Party platform and tThese bylaws may be amended by ~~a 2/3 vote of~~ the delegates at any regular convention a. by a 2/3 vote with prior notice or b. by a ¾ vote without prior notice or c. the convention rules may provide for a token process to delete platform planks without prior notice. Next section just got renumbered; didn't get touched. Can't be touched with less than 7/8. Not going to read it. Then we would be amending RULE 1: ORDER OF BUSINESS and inserting 7. Other bylaws and rules amendments with notice and then after 10. Platform Committee report and adding Other platform amendments with notice. It will delete RULE 5 entirely. Then it provides rules for members submitted. Adding RULE 6: DEBATING AND VOTING – MEMBER-SUBMITTED AMENDMENT PROPOSALS WITH NOTICE – BYLAWS AND RULES, PLATFORM. Believe these numbers are correct. 1. Member-submitted proposals shall be heard beginning with the proposal with the greatest number of sustaining member signatures and continuing in descending order. a. Sustaining members may sign on to member proposals after they have been submitted, provided that no signatures shall be accepted after the convention has been called to order. 5. The member who submitted the proposal, or their designee, may take up to two minutes to state and explain the proposal. 6. The Convention Chair shall then open the proposal to debate without amendment for a period of up to ten minutes before bringing the matter to a vote. a. If the recommendation fails, the Convention Chair shall inquire if any amendments are proposed from the floor. b. If there are such proposals, the Convention Chair shall request a vote on whether to consider amendments, and with majority approval may consider amendments for a period of up to ten minutes.

**LATHAM:** Thanks for reading that. Would like to make an amendment to strike the word "Party" from before "Secretary" in a. and think it occurs twice in a. and a couple times in b. It is excessive. Once at beginning, fine; but after that we know we are talking about the Party's Secretary. Move to strike "Party" from wherever it occurs. "Party website" think we can leave alone. But as to Secretary and members, it's excessive.

**HARLOS:** Want to speak against this. Phrase "Party Secretary" is used consistently. Style manuals emphasize consistency over correctness. Don't think "Party sustaining member" appears. Move to divide this question and to deal first with striking "Party" before "sustaining member" and second to deal with striking "Party" before

“Secretary”. They are unrelated changes. They are divisible upon the demand of one member. Is there any objection to that ruling of the Chair? (No Response). Division of the Question Adopted Without Objection. We will deal with striking of “Party” before the words “sustaining member”. Does anyone wish to speak for or against that amendment? (No Response). Is there any objection to that amendment? (No Response). Adopted Without Objection. The word “Party” will be struck before “sustaining member”. Now dealing with striking “Party” before “Secretary”, there is a slight ambiguity. The Party Secretary is supposed to be the Convention Secretary but is not always. Want to make it clear we are talking about the Party’s Secretary. Think it adds meaning.

**BRACCO:** ARTICLE 8, SECTION 3 it just says “secretary” but it does mention party headquarters. ARTICLE 10 SECTION 4 through b. it just says “secretary” twice. ARTICLE XIII it just says “secretary”. There is precedent for both but in favor of clarity. Just want to point that out.

**LATHAM:** Doing a word search and only find the one in ARTICLE 2. Do we have a copy of the most current Bylaws and Rules on the Party website? Notice it’s from 2020. Did we not touch Bylaws at the 2020 Convention?

**HARLOS:** No. Your LNC is positive we do have most current bylaws. That is part of my responsibility.

**LATHAM:** Find it excessive.

**HARLOS:** Party Secretary has authority to make necessary clerical changes to the bylaws provided no meaning is changed. Also the LNC has to approve it. Suggest a recommendation in our report citing all these various rules and ask the Party Secretary and the LNC to take a look and smooth this out. We use the Chicago Style Manual which uses the Oxford comma.

**BRACCO:** Speak in favor of it. ARTICLE 10, Section 4 b. “secretary” is used twice. There is no specification that it is the “Party Secretary” in that subsection. Also references 10, 4 b. Affiliates have their own secretaries. If you have ambiguity, that’s where it’s going to happen. Specificity is preferable to brevity.

**MOELLMAN:** ARTICLE 6, 3 and 5 make it pretty clear. The Chair shall preside at all conventions.

**HARLOS:** In the nature of a procedure and it can be suspended by a 2/3 vote.

**MOELLMAN:** The Secretary shall likewise attend all meetings and Party conventions. Don't remember until very recent times hearing of the ability to suspend a bylaw when it's in the nature of a rule of order. Previously if it was a bylaw, it was a bylaw, that was a bylaw. When did that happen; was there a reinterpretation? Don't understand bylaws being able to be suspended unless it's something new.

**HARLOS:** Not new. In last two editions. RONR 2:20.

**MOELLMAN:** What if the body wanted to codify those specific things; would it have to say this is not suspendible after each item? Or, the following is not suspendible?

**HARLOS:** Yes. The Amendment before us now is to strike the word "Party" before "Secretary". Is there any further debate? (No Response). I have made an objection. We are voting on striking the word "Party" before the word "Secretary" in our new Proposal O, Section 1 a. and 1 b.

ARROWWOOD	NO
BRACCCO	NO
CIESIELSKI	NO
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
LATHAM	YES
MARTIN	NO
MOELLMAN	YES
ROWELTTE	NO
MOULTON	YES
SEEBECK	NO

**DEFEATED 3-6-1**

**HARLOS:** Back to the main motion. Any further debate?

**MOELLMAN:** Would ask if Logan (A6) would not mind taking over for the rest of the debate and vote on this particular item? Not leaving but distracted and not able to fully pay attention to this.

**HARLOS:** He will take your vote as well?

**MOELLMAN:** Yes.

**HARLOS:** Appropriate. He is already able to debate, but you are transferring your vote?

**LOGAN:** Here and ready.

**MOELLMAN:** Yes.

**LOGAN (A6) TO REPLACE MOELLMAN AS TO VOTE ONLT ON PENDING MATTER AT APPROXIMATELY 10:10 PM ET.**

**HARLOS:** Moellman, just pipe in when you are ready.

**MOELLMAN:** Yes.

**HAROS:** Any further debate on this proposal? (No Response). Asking for a roll call.

**SEEBECK:** Point of order. Can we restate question just to make sure we are clear?

**HARLOS:** It is to adopt the language just read and then Latham had made an amendment to strike the word "Party, one which passed and one did not. It is to adopt this lengthy part on notice requirements but it does retain the tokens because we passed Bracco's amendment on tokens.

**SEEBECK:** Okay.

ARROWWOOD	NO
BRACCO	YES
CIESIELSKI	YES
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
LATHAM	NO
MARTIN	YES
LOGAN	YES
ROWLETTE	YES
MOULTON	NO
SEEBECK	ABSTAIN

**ADOPTED VOTE 5-3-2**

**HARLOS:** After this passed, we agreed we would deal with alternative language which depends upon E passing or being heard later. The only part that is affected by this is ARTICLE 17, 2. Looking at my language which Bracco has changed so we'll need to work on this a little bit.

**BRACCO:** So this is an what-if-E-fails problem?

**HARLOS:** Yes. We are going to have to break up the party platform and bylaws which is in my alternative language and if my alternative language is good but No. 2 needs to conform to the amendments we made to 3.

2. Would take out reference to the bylaws and would talk about the amendment. Then there would be 3. Any platform plank may be deleted by the delegate at any regular convention. It would need to mirror this language –



**LATHAM:** You have a double “may” where your cursor is hanging out.

**HARLOS:** -- would need to mirror and would need to say “by a majority ...” and would suggest instead of  $\frac{3}{4}$  this be  $\frac{2}{3}$ , but someone can make it  $\frac{3}{4}$  -- and this is supposed to be a., b., c. Alternative language would be 3. These bylaws may be amended by the delegates at any regular convention by a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote with notice or by a  $\frac{3}{4}$  vote from the floor without prior notice. The Party Platform may be amended a. by a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote with prior notice. b. a  $\frac{3}{4}$  vote without prior notice. 3. Any platform plank may be deleted by the delegates at any regular convention by a majority vote with prior notice and by a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote without prior notice. Then it goes on to talk about tokens.

**BRACCO:** Put some items in chat. This is convention authorization language. 17, 2 c. and then the d. in chat would be 17. 2 d.

**HARLOS:** Let me try to fix this because it is super confusing.

**BRACCO:** If we look at the structure of ARTICLE 17, 2 that we just passed, immediately above this, the language that I put into the chat would be pasted over the top of 17 2, c. Might be better to show this on the screen rather than having ask everybody to visualize it?

**HARLOS:** Can tell you this makes no sense to me because we are getting rid of notice and we just passed notice requirements. This is alternative language that should only deal with threshold requirements. Your c. by majority vote without prior notice when deleting platform planks just undoes our notice. Do you understand?

**BRACCO:** Not really.

**HARLOS:** Let me put this on screen because want to show you what I mean. We already passed notice requirement for all platform issues. You now want to get rid of notice and that would require reconsideration. This is not an alternative proposal. That is just dealing with a different threshold. It’s changing notice requirements. Right now our platform requires a majority vote to delete and  $\frac{2}{3}$  to amend. We have agreed we need notice requirement. However, we don’t know yet what the thresholds are going to be for platform.

**BRACCO:** Had thought that the intention of this language was to only be heard if Proposal E was to fail because if E passes, we don’t need this at all.

**HARLOS:** If E passes, platforms and amendments will require a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote.

**BRACCO:** And we can proceed with language we just passed?

**HARLOS:** Yes.

**BRACCO:** This alternative language is in the event that E fails?

**HARLOS:** If E fails, it has nothing to do with notice. It only deals with threshold.

**BRACCO:** But we can't use our language as written; it failed. Right?

**HARLOS:** Right but we may still want to make a proposal with notice and you are deleting notice.

**BRACCO:** Want to leave token process unchanged.

**HARLOS:** Think what you are intending to do here for c. is by a majority vote with prior notice when deleting platform planks only; the convention rules may provide for a token process to delete platform planks without notice requirement.

**BRACCO:** That's not contradictory?

**HARLOS:** No.

**BRACCO:** If it goes through the token process, it would be a majority. But if they submitted a proposal to the secretary and the secretary –

**HARLOS:** Like your idea. Want to put this up here – and get rid of 3. Because we are not dealing with that – So what you are suggesting, like it better than mine. But we should change the wording because you are getting hung up.

**BRACCO:** That is fine. Needs to be workshopped. My intention is to have the rules be the same, change the language as little as possible. The language of that second c. is the exact same. That is intended. We would only be looking at this if E fails meaning the deletion in general – current process.

**HARLOS:** Right. I think the alternative language will be if we maintain a majority vote to delete is the party platform in these bylaws may be amended by the delegates at any regular convention by a 2/3 vote with prior notice, by a ¾ vote without prior notice, by a majority vote with prior notice when deleting platform planks only. We should add a however in convention rules provide for a token process to delete platform planks without notice requirement by a 2/3 vote without notice when deleting platform planks only. That's pretty clear.

**BRACCO:** Could they vote to suspend the rules?

**HARLOS:** Yes. It would be a 2/3 vote. Like your language better than mine. Cleaner. Nothing has been moved. Would you like to move that alternative language?

**BRACCO:** That would strike the existing 17, 2. c.

**HARLOS:** Will make that upon the failure of Proposal E. Proposal E may be heard later and we may end up having alternative language.

**BRACCO:** Sure.

**HARLOS:** This is not official. It's just an explanatory note, so don't worry. Think we all understand.

**BRACCO:** Depends on E failing or not being yet heard, whichever.

**HARLOS:** Right. Depends upon the disposition of E. Whether it is not heard or fails. This part in purple is my explanatory language. **ALTERNATIVE AMENDMENT LANGUAGE DEPENDING ON PROPOSAL E.** Are you moving this alternative language?

**BRACCO:** Yes. Would like to.

**HARLOS:** Let me explain to everyone in case it is unclear. We passed a lot of things. If in fact Proposal E has not yet been heard meaning that our vote threshold at the time of hearing this proposal is majority, we will instead move this alternative language for 2 c. and then add d. If Proposal E passes and is heard before, we will go with our original language. When we order these proposals, am going to highly suggest that we hear Proposal E first no matter what other considerations there may be because it will really complicate matters but we needed to -- while this was all fresh in our heads -- to come up with alternative language in case we need it. Highly suggest we hear E first. When we present our proposals, the ease of understanding the ways these are presented to not confuse people is important. Hearing Proposal E before this one will greatly add to it even if Proposal E is wildly unpopular in the survey. But, that's going to be up to the committee to decide. This is alternative language, all depending upon E failing or not being heard. That is all we are voting on. Already passed the rest of it. Are there any questions? (No Response).

ARROWWOOD	YES
BRACCO	YES
CIESIELSKI	YES
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
LATHAM	YES
MARTIN	YES
LOGAN	YES
ROWLETTE	ABSTAIN

MOULTON YES  
SEEBECK YES

**ADOPTED VOTE 8-0-2**

**HARLOS:** Need a proviso. Move to add the proviso: These amendments shall take effect upon the final adjournment of the convention at which they are adopted. Is there any objection to that proviso? (No Response). Adopted Without Objection. When we write our report keep in mind if there are provisos we need to pass them so won't be neglected. Make sure we do that because bylaws take effect immediately.

PROPOSAL P ARTICLE 10 CONVENTIONS, 7.

**HARLOS:** Moving on to what Latham has long been waiting for. Amend Bylaws 10, 7 allow electronic voting. Amendment to RULE 3.

**LATHAM:** There is some outdated language in our rules about using computer-readable ballots. This language authorizes the use of electronic voting systems to supersede manual tabulation. There are concerns about electronic voting systems and transparency about them. Look at the bottom, if 20 or more convention delegates object and they want a count, then we can do a count. They would be printed ballots that folks would use as a receipt and we could have a verified count if we decide to count. It baby-steps up to use an electronic voting system more but it does not fully adopt an on-line Opavote. Borrowed some language from 2010 when submitted although added more of that language at the end of this call for a recount and would even join in that recount. Happy to entertain any questions.

**MOULTON:** Like it in general. Do not like the fourth that was added there. If we have a manual tabulation, the threshold should be much higher; 20 not high enough.

**HARLOS:** Alternative language is in the event that we do not change deletion of a platform plank to a 2/3. So 2. and 3. are alternative language and we will deal with that last because it could conflict with some items that we have already passed. We have not dealt with alternative language yet. Forget the highlighted. What we are dealing with now is the blue and red language.

**MOELLMAN:** For the record, I am back.

**MOELLMAN RETURN. LOGAN BACK TO ALTERNATIVE AT APPROXIMATELY 10:30 PM.**

**MOELLMAN:** Remember why this failed, because the LNC got to choose the form of the voting and the delegates have never trusted the LNC but it all boils down to establishing trust. Would suggest the threshold be a percentage.

**Commented [RL1]:** Is this paragraph in the right place in the minutes?

**HARLOS:** Can see we won't be making any amendments yet. Don't know why the Secretary and the Credentials Committee are the ones to authorize this. Think it might need to be the Convention Oversight Committee and there should be a requirement about notice and let the delegates know what the system will be and perhaps training ahead of time. The Credentials Committee is completely irrelevant. Maybe the secretary might be in there. RONR says anyone can challenge and order a recount with a majority vote and maybe we should leave it at that and get rid of 4. If a majority wants a recount, we can do that now but this makes it less. Let's abide by RONR and leave it alone. So let's strike 4. Also 4 would get rid of a secret ballot. Don't like Secret ballots and all for getting rid of secret ballots but I'm in the minority. Most Libertarians like the secret ballot. I don't.

**BRACCO:** Parliamentary Question: 45:42 in Robert's has specific requirements about electronic voting and would ask does this as written comply with those requirements? How would anyone know if there were a secret ballot?

**HARLOS:** We have a secret ballot right now and people can challenge. There is a presumption that the machine has it correct. Tallies are still by state delegation which is what we do now.

**LATHAM:** Appreciate discussion. On raising the threshold, I'm totally supportive of that. Starting off conservative and being mindful of those who might be skeptical, but how are we to establish that trust? We might have a chunk of those who are skeptical. I'm willing to up that number or make it a percentage. As to Credentials Committee, somehow they would be administering ballots. Could it be the secretary and the tellers instead of the Credentials Committee? COC don't know enough about their work; never been on that committee. Wonder if they are the right fit for that? Trying to keep an open mind here. Want to know what notice requirement would look like; is that a must-have or a nice-to-have? Don't know about training. Would we want to put that in a rule? RONR 45:42, that's the reason that language is in there. Recount numbers being low, hopefully that will bring along the skeptics. I'm fine to abide by RONR. Could be totally on board with getting rid of 4. The secret ballot, think it implicitly does repeal the secret ballot and think RONR lets us do that but that is no different than what we do now.

**HARLOS:** We are out of time. Is there motion for extension of time?

**MOELLMAN:** Move to extend for nine minutes.

**HARLOS:** Any objection? (Objection Voiced) Is the objection because of the time allotted or to the extension?

**MOULTON:** We cannot get through this whole proposal.

**HARLOS:** Does anyone want to amend the motion for extension of time? (No Response).

ARROWWOOD	YES
BRACCO	ABSTAIN
CIESIELSKI	YES
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
LATHAM	ABSTAIN
MARTIN	NO
MOELLMAN	YES
ROWLETTE	YES
MOULTON	NO
SEEBECK	NO

**VOTE DEFEATED 4-3-3**

**HARLOS:** Takes a 2/3 vote to extend time. Motion is not adopted. Next meeting will be June 1. We can workshop this on the list or we can also stay on the call. We are Adjourned at 10:54 PM ET.

[DRAFT May 25 at 6:30 pm](#) [MAY 26 AT 2:04](#) [may 30 at 4:52](#)

---