

2024 LIBERTARIAN PARTY BYLAWS AND RULES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING JUNE 1, 2023

Meeting called to order at 8:47 PM ET

MEMBERS	ALTERNATES	GUESTS
SYLVIA ARROWWOOD	CHUCK MOULTON (A1)	RICHARD BROWN
PAUL BRACCO	DATA LOGAN (A6)	DUSTIN COFFELL
NICKOLAS CIESIELSKI	DEAN ROGERS	J.J. JACOBS
CARYN ANN HARLOS		NATHAN MADDEN
ROB LATHAM		KEN MATTES
FRANK MARTIN		MARRION SKINNER
KEN MOELLMAN		
TOM ROWLETTE		
MIKE RUFO		
MIKE SEEBECK		

PUBLIC COMMENT: Nathan Madden thanked Committee for information and hard work. Appreciated and enjoyed Town Hall.

MINUTES APPROVAL: Minutes of 5-18-23 **Approved Without Objection.**

HARLOS: LP's Rules not the best. Two proposal P's, CAH P and Latham P. Best to go through CAH P first and then Latham P, electronic voting. Is there any objection to taking the proposals in that order? (No Response). **Adopted Without Objection.**

PROPOSAL CAH P – EXPLANATION, DEBATE, VOTES

HARLOS: Done major rewrite of Voting Rules and then plan to merge in Latham's electronic balloting proposal. The two are connected and in agenda together. At this time on agenda as related items.

LATHAM: Agree. This is major rewrite.

HARLOS: Yes. Do the rewrite and then go back to electronic balloting.

MARTIN: Easier to present if not bundled together. Easier for delegates to digest.

HARLOS: Yes. If the rewrite should fail, electronic balloting could still be decided. But, they are interconnected. Do not want the two dependent on each other. After discussion, is there any objection with going forward with the rewrite first? We are going to take a vote on this and treating it as a motion to table. (No Response).

Adopted Without Objection.

HARLOS: Pulling up rewrite. This is complex. Problem is balloting rules are all over the place. No procedure in writing. Mostly custom, tradition. We will go through my thought process before actual debate. Highlighted in yellow every place where election/balloting rules appear. All of RULE 3, portions of RULE 7 and 8. All of RULE 9 and all of RULE 10. Those are all over the place. There is confusion and duplication.

Then struck through everywhere and were scattered. Moved them all to RULE 3 without changing anything. Also deleted the title of RULE 3 ~~POLLING PROCEDURE~~ as it violates the secret ballot and a rule cannot violate a secret ballot. It would require a bylaw. Changed the title of RULE 3 to ELECTION BALLOTING PROCEDURE and struck out that portion believed to be out of order to begin with.

Struck out In cases where a roll call vote is required because there are no roll call votes in conventions. And polling shall be by state. The Secretary will ask for the vote from each state in alphabetical order that's not a problem. We can do that always. Don't need a rule or that. This is where things get weird If someone challenges the vote reported by any state's chair, the Secretary shall poll the delegates from that state individually. We cannot do that absent a bylaw.

MOULTON: Historical note. Believe the Ohio delegation had a roll call in Columbus.

HARLOS: That's against RONR.

MOELLMAN: Believe it happened in Red Rock in 2012. Remember debate over secret ballots. Just throwing out there what the argument was.

HARLOS: Absent a bylaw no one can be forced to reveal the contents of a ballot. Everything highlighted was moved up to 3. In RULE 8 also struck out where it says ~~ELECTION~~ and inserted NOMINATION and added AND JUDICIAL COMMITTEE. RULE 9 and RULE 10 are gone. No reason for them. A lot got combined. Going to suggest later we do same with NOMINATION because those are in various rules now. Then took new RULE 3 and arranged in logical order. Don't know why No. 1 is struck out; it is not supposed to be. Don't know why 15 is purple. Just the way it is.

Now we have everything in one place; did a markup of combining it. Would like to read aloud what the clean, new RULE 3 would be if we did this (Reading Underlined Green)
RULE 3: ELECTION BALLOTING PROCEDURE. 1. The State Chair shall serve as chair of his or her delegation, unless that delegation selects another of its members to serve as its chair and so notifies the Secretary. The convention seating will be by state delegation. There shall be a team of tellers approved by the Secretary. 2. Each delegation shall conduct its vote by written ballot delivered to the delegation chair who shall tabulate

the votes on a delegation tally sheet provided for this purpose. The delegation chair then submits their tally sheet with a sealed envelope containing each of the delegate ballots to the vote tellers. When all delegations have submitted their votes, the convention chair shall declare the voting closed. After each delegation has tabulated its own vote totals, before submitting the totals to the Secretary, the vote tellers shall review the ballot tabulation for accuracy and cosign the delegation totals. After the Secretary or the tellers have recorded all delegation submissions, the state-by-state delegation totals for each candidate or choice shall be displayed on a projection screen for each delegation to review for accuracy. During the period of time allotted for such votes, the business of the convention shall continue without interruption. 3. For each election for office or nomination, a majority vote shall be required. 4. In single-winner races each delegate may cast a ballot with one vote for a candidate or for none-of-the-above. If no candidate has attained a majority, the candidate with the fewest votes and any candidates polling less than 5% shall be struck from subsequent ballots. This procedure shall be repeated after every ballot in which no candidate has received a majority vote, until one candidate attains a majority. 5. In multi-winner race, each delegate may cast a ballot with a vote or either none-of-the-above or one vote per candidate or any number of candidates. Every ballot with a vote for none -of -the-above or one or more candidates is counted as one ballot cast. A vote for none-of-the-above shall be ignored if the ballot also includes a vote for any other candidate. Tie votes affecting the outcome shall be decided y lot. If the total number of candidates to fill the open seats have not attained a majority, any candidates who have attained a majority shall be elected, and he candidate with the fewest votes and any candidates polling less than 5% shall be struck from subsequent ballots. This procedure shall be repeated until the total number of candidates to fill the open sets have received a majority vote or been elected in previous rounds. 6. In the event a region has not otherwise provided for he election of its National Committee representation then the delegates from the region shall elect its regional representative and alternate, provided there are at least five delegates present. Each Region’s delegates may elect their representative and alternate in whatever manner they choose, provided all delegates present from that region are given equal voice in the selection. Now am leaving this language here. Know we will strike when we get to electronic balloting. 7. In cases where computer readable ballots are used, each delegate must sign the ballot and submit it to the delegation chair. – Now I know there is a problem with “signing” because we will work on changing it later – After verifying that the number of votes cast does not exceed the number the state is entitled to, the chair of each delegation shall submit the ballots to the Secretary. – Actually that sentence is supposed to be

struck because it was moved up – During the period of time allotted for such votes, the business of the convention shall continue without interruption.

Here is where we are at voting because things get a little sloppy. The first thing is to vote on this here and forget about the purple. Strike the title ~~POLLING PROCEDURE~~ and inserting ELECTRONIC BALLOTING PROCEDURE IN TITLE AND IN 2. Striking everything except for the convention seating will be by state delegation. We will move that up to No. 1. In a separate vote. We need to vote on this separately as there might be controversy about polling.

MOULTON: Does this get removed from a vote for president?

HARLOS: Believe that is someplace else.

MOULTON: Think it important in vote for President and VP but in other cases, it's a waste of time.

HARLOS: It is a custom and there is nothing to stop that custom but let me check. There is no rule that requires us to do that. There is nothing requiring polling by state. RULE 7.3 Following the first presidential ballot, an announcement of each delegation's vote total shall be made by delegation chairs in alphabetical order beginning with randomly selected delegation. Not moving to remove that from RULE 7. This strikes ~~here a roll call vote is required.~~ There is nothing that requires a roll call at convention.

Now dealing with title and changes to 3.2. Is there any objection to this change? (No Response). **Adopted Without Objection.** Next thing suggested is an interim motion. We can always reconsider anything. Way to do this is step by step. Next motion I make is with intention we can clean it up.

Motion is to take all of the stricken purple language out of RULE 7, RULE 8, all language of RULE 9 and RULE 10 and move it unchanged into RULE 3. Do not want to remove what Moulton talked about. That will stay in. Out of RULE 8, strike from RULE 8.1 portion highlighted in yellow. Strike from RULE 8.2 highlighted also. 3 is good. 8.4 strike highlighted. Strike all of RULE 9 and all of RULE 10. Motion is to strike all the above highlighted language from those scattered rules and move them all unchanged up to RULE 3. From there we will start to amend and perfect them. No content is being changed from those sections. Just being moved up to 3. Want to move all language about balloting without changing any language and strike all language where it appeared in RULE 7, 8, 9 and 10 and move it all to RULE 3 so we can perfect. This is an interim motion. Getting to a proposal but have not put together yet. Will not present a jumbled proposal to the delegates. That does require a change to RULE 8. Is there any

objection to this mass move with understanding this is not going to be presented to the delegates. This is to get everything into one place to work with. (No Response).

ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.

MOELLMAN: So far not made any substantial changes but it sounds like we are about to. I am in my vehicle and unable to read any documents. Would like to cede my seat.

MOELLMAN CEDED HIS SEAT TO MOULTON (A1) AT APPROXIMATELY 9:30 PM.

HARLOS: We moved all election language out of RULE 8 and completely gotten rid of JC election committee items because there will be a change to RULE 2 covering multi-races and there will be a rule for that. RULE 8 is only about nominations. Next motion is to strike in the title of RULE 8 the word ~~ELECTION~~ and substitute NOMINATION and strike the word AND before NATIONAL COMMITTEE and add the words AND JUDICIAL COMMITTEE there and where appropriate, make it blue and shall be 'from the floor stays.' That puts it all into one section. That's the motion before us now. That is next motion to clean up RULE 8. Is there any objection to this motion?

BRACCO: Why not have one that says all three? Is there a benefit to having officers separate?

HARLOS: No. Believe everything to do with nominations needs to be combined into one and we are dealing with elections right now. Will be a future proposal that will deal with nominating procedures. It will contain everything including President and Vice President, Officers, National Committee and JC in one rule just like doing for elections. It's to simplify our rules. Like to keep subject matters separate. Any objection to this motion? (No Response) **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

Now we are at, this is language we just moved. All under RULE 3 now with no language changed. When this is on the floor we will handle via a substitution. Might even combine nominations like Bracco brought up. Will not go through all these steps on the floor. Will end up with a motion to strike a lot and insert a lot. Needs to be a lot of education ahead of time.

ROWLETTE: Missed a lot of what just happened. Computer problems. Now at Taco Bell wifi. In few different places it says that voting is closed when all state delegations have their votes in. Last conventions, didn't get votes in for a very long time. In 2022 Arkansas took forever and didn't tell us they had left the building. Do we want to put that into the bylaws? Nothing can move forward if a single state decides to filibuster? Might we take this up now instead of all in one piece? Apologize for missing so much.

HARLOS: Did not discuss that. At any time a delegate can move to close voting and stop a filibuster which people were getting ready to do in 2022. Moellman warned them when he was chair that he was entertaining a motion at that time but if Virginia kept it up, he would entertain that motion. Don't think we need a rule for that. However, we can make a rule for that but that should probably be a separate proposal. The idea is to change as little substance as possible and not really change anything.

Here is our combined RULE 3. Did rearrange things slightly to a more logical order. Suggest we ignore No. 15 about computer readable ballots as will deal with that when Latham's electronic balloting procedure is handled. Go to RULE 3 where we have struck through things and added things. Will go through these one by one which will be fully open for amendment.

BRACCO: In middle of 2 you have in red **tellers approved by the Secretary**. Should that be struck out?

HARLOS: Yes. Will go through all of the changes. Then suggest we handle it seriatim although someone can suggest a different method. 3.1. a stray sentence in 2. was moved up There shall be a team of vote tellers approved by the Secretary. That makes it a positive obligation that this is something to be done.

3.2 Next paragraph you can see what is stricken out and what is written in. ~~For each vote in which subtotals are submitted by delegation, e~~Each delegation shall conduct its vote by written ballot delivered to the delegation chair who shall tabulate the votes on a delegation tally sheet provided for this purpose. That's how things are done. Struck out ~~Each delegation shall tabulate its total vote, and the delegation chair shall deliver a written total to the Secretary.~~ This follows actual practice. The delegation chair then submits their tally sheet with a sealed envelope containing each of the delegate ballots to the vote tellers. Those envelopes are what we use if there is a challenge. They are not signed. That is what the Secretary uses to do an after-convention audit. Continues on When all delegations have submitted their votes the Secretary-Convention Chair shall declare the voting closed. After each delegation has tabulated its own vote totals, before submitting the totals to the Secretary, ~~the vote tellers approved by the Secretary~~ the vote tellers shall review the ballot tabulation for accuracy and cosign the delegation totals. After the Secretary or the vote tellers ~~has~~ have recorded all delegation submissions, the state-by-state delegation totals for each candidate or choice shall be displayed on a projection screen for each delegation to review for accuracy. And then also repeated several times During the period of time allotted for such votes, the business of the convention shall continue without interruption.

3.3 Same.

3.4 You can see there changed ~~aces~~ to elections. Rest is same.

3.5 Talks about President and Vice President and Party Officers, single-winner races. A lot of language there did not change.

3.6 Struck out.

3.7 Completely rewrote this so all multi-winner races will fall under one rule. It used to say "5 seats". Now says "5%". We don't need to say a certain number as we don't know that. Best to say "open seats". That way don't have to change the bylaws if numbers change. That was a substantive change. Also struck from last sentence ~~after every~~—This covers the at large and the JC.

That makes the rest of this redundant because it's all covered. Left alone the paragraph about regions. Just moved up to RULE 2. Also left alone the paragraph about computer readable ballots since we will be dealing with that later with Latham's proposal. Also moved up sentence about continuing to do business. Suggest we deal seriatim but someone may have different idea.

BRACCO: No. 7, we need this now. This is not just for future. It's for now.

HARLOS: Correct.

ROWLETTE: Have two issues. First is last sentence in 7. What happens if you have 5; are 3 people elected by a majority vote and then a majority for none-of-the-above? In that case seems like delegates only want 3 at larges but it seems like this last sentence would not allow that; would not allow none-of-the-above to function that way.

HARLOS: Our bylaws say "Should none-of-the-above be elected for any Party office" so that would mean however many the at large seats, that position shall be declared vacant and none of the losing candidates for that position may be selected to fill the vacancy for that term of office. Elsewhere in bylaws it says that vacancies are filled by the LNC. So what would happen at convention if only three at larges would be elected. The remaining two would be selected by the LNC with any candidate who lost to none-of-the-above being ineligible.

ROWLETTE: Other thing was to solve the problem with 3.4 or 3.3, you were speaking about Party office or the President or Vice President?

HARLOS: Right.

ROWLETTE: Don't think you need to say that.

HARLOS: The word “nomination” is so equivocal; is electing our top ticket – is that an “election”?

SEEBECK: It’s a selection for election.

ROWLETTE: If it causes a problem, don’t worry about it.

HARLOS: Wording here too is weird. Think this whole sentence is kind of weird and not sure how to word it better.

ROWLETTE: Leave that up to everybody else.

LATHAM: Now starting to deal with new language in this proposal, very top 3.1 [There shall be a team of vote tellers approved by the Secretary.](#) We have that language in the existing rules, and in 10. Is “appoint” a better term of art there? That’s one and the other is “tellers” contemplates you are counting votes. “Vote tellers” is more than we need. RONR uses “tellers” throughout and there is only one occurrence of the term “election tellers”. I think “tellers” kind of assumes that. Don’t think we need to say “vote tellers” repeatedly.

HARLOS: Agree. Don’t want to make another version until we discuss –

LATHAM: Should I make a global motion now?

HARLOS: That would certainly clean things up. Appears in several places. You are moving to strike the word “vote” before the word “tellers” each place it appears and as appears on our screen as 1 and 2?

LATHAM: Yes.

HARLOS: Is there any objection? Don’t object as the maker. (No Response). Going to strike those. **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** Treating your objection as to “approved” versus “appointed” as somewhat a point of information and a question for the Secretary and then you can decide if you want to make a motion. Convention delegates do have recourse to challenge votes. That’s probably why language is the way it is but as maker of the motion have no problem with saying “appointed”. It’s up to Latham if he wants to make that motion?

LATHAM: Don’t know where I sit on that. This is kind of including existing language. So this is kind of the status quo language and do not want to further complicate an already complicated proposal and open up a hornet’s nest.

HARLOS: It is the Chair that appoints tellers.

LATHAM: Don’t want to address that at this point. But we ought to think about it.

Do have two more items. It's in 5, in single-winner races. We don't have those words, single-winner races in existing bylaws or rules. Just as a matter of tone it seems unnecessary. You know races, winners and losers. My suggestion is replacing that with "for single office or nominee elections" . . .

HARLOS: Can we come back to you because my intention was to do this seriatim which means go through them one at a time. You had some really simple changes with the vote teller item. Will put you first in line to when we come to No. 5. Is that okay?

LATHAM: Totally sounds fair, yes. Take them in order. Have one more thing for the multi-winner part.

HARLOS: Put you in line for both of those.

SEEBECK: If we wind up on the JC where we don't get a full elected crew because NOTA happened to win, that would create an inconsistency. Who fills those vacancies?

HARLOS: The JC does.

SEEBECK: Okay. It's not the LNC?

HARLOS: No. Question before had to do with at larges. Vacancies are filled as the bylaws state.

BRACCO: Put me in line for No. 7 please.

LATHAM: 3.1 would that be an instance to clarify which Secretary, Party or Convention?

HARLOS: It could be. That is problematic. What if the Secretary is removed in the midst of convention and a new Convention Secretary is appointed; do all the tellers get thrown out or does there need to be a new approval? I think it's best to keep things simple. Don't really care one way or another. Just throwing that out. A motion to replace the Convention Secretary or the Convention Chair before -- Both of which happened in Reno. Well, it happened in 2020 and sort of happened in 2022.

****1:23:21 ***?

LATHAM: Other than these last several times, not that I know of, no. Would lean toward "Convention Secretary". But clarity over brevity most of the time.

MOELLMAN: As far as my time in the party, not that I know of other than times you have mentioned. Bylaws say that the LNC Chair shall preside at all conventions.

HARLOS: That is a rule of order which is very typically in the bylaws. Same as where it says the Secretary will take minutes of all meetings. You can appoint a pro tem. My

opinion, we have more important matters pending. Other members may feel otherwise. Nothing is getting approved yet. We are amending each paragraph separately. Any further amendment to Paragraph 1? (No Response) Going on to No. 2, any amendments to be had to No. 2? (No Response). It says 4 on the screen but it actually is 3. Does anyone have any suggestions for cleaning up that language?

LATHAM: And for nomination for President and Vice-President, a majority vote.

SEEBECK: Point of information. Are we still nominating them separately or together?

HARLOS: Separately now. That is in our bylaws.

SEEBECK: Then it would be in order.

LATHAM: "And" means they are separate. Could fix that by saying nominations for President and Vice President.

HARLOS: That's better. No. This is still "they". Is this for the nomination? Still a problem? How about: for all votes, a majority vote shall be required?

LATHAM: What about multi-member bodies? We may move to single-transferable-vote proportional representation; then it would not necessarily be a majority. Want to keep majority for single-winner races even though don't like that term.

HARLOS: That already is an issue here. Can make an exception to this rule in a rule.

LATHAM: Could clean it up later.

MOULTON: Circle back to me because have a question about Paragraph 2. Once we are done with 4, can we go back to 2?

HARLOS: Yes.

BRACCO: Put it in chat and will read it out. It says that for each election for Party office for election of candidates for Federal office, a majority vote shall be required.

HARLOS: Why would you say "Federal office" because we only do President and Vice-President?

BRACCO: We could use that instead. It's shorter. National Committee does not select Federal officers.

MOULTON: Would that bind the State Parties?

HARLOS: So for election to Party office or election of candidates for President and Vice-President, a majority vote shall be required. I'm good with that. Do not want

people arguing that the National Rules, even though it does not bind them, don't want to be causing problems at state conventions because we worded things badly.

ROWLETTE: We don't need 4 then.

HARLOS: Are you suggesting getting rid of 4 entirely?

ROWLETTE: You could or just say that a majority vote is required for Federal office. That is a simple, short sentence. And Maybe you don't even need that. You don't even need to talk about presidential elections.

HARLOS: You just made a good argument for getting rid of 4 entirely because we say it's for single-winner races and we say it for multi-winner races.

MOULTON: So moved.

ROWLETTE: It already says that. So what's the point?

HARLOS: Yes. Moulton moved to strike this and that's probably the best solution. Not adopting anything yet but is there any objection to this so far? It's not final yet. (No Response).

MOULTON: Could we go back to Paragraph 2? Where we say "state-by-state delegation totals for each candidate or choice shall be displayed on a projection screen for each delegation to review for accuracy" know that has been our custom and guess it is in current rules but my concern is we are tying ourselves to a particular technology and technology has progressed. Why does it have to be a particular projection screen? It seems nowadays it would be fairly trivial for a secretary to post it on a Google doc or something else that delegation chairs could review.***1:40-12*** Do we really want to tie ourselves to the technology of a projection screen?

HARLOS: You can make any amendment that you would like. The goal in this is to change as little as possible. Even if a secretary did it on a Google doc, it does play to cameras. Having things up on a screen is exciting.

MOULTON: Definitely true for the presidential race but it may be a waste of time for Party officers and other things that the people care about. That's my argument.

HARLOS: But what waste is it because you already have to have it anyway if you are putting it on a Google doc?

MOULTON: Latham suggests that maybe it should be a separate proposal which he could withdraw later.

HARLOS: That is what I would suggest if you want to change that.

LATHAM: Single-winner races paragraph, my motion would be to replace it. We replace that with “for single office or nominee elections”, each delegate may have --

HARLOS: Tell you that you just added in the nominee problem.

LATHAM: know and hate myself for doing it. We still need to come up with –

HARLOS: No. We deleted that paragraph. Have a question for Latham. What is the problem with it, single-winner races?

LATHAM: Want some people to feel like we are all winners. You are a winner for running. Know that’s sappy.

HARLOS: Maybe it’s not your experience but the term “single-winner race” is almost a term of art.

LATHAM: Completely agree and use it myself. Trying to improve with what we have there. There is also the lock-in concern I have. What if we delete 4? What if we get into a proportional situation? Want to get away from the “winner” word and the “races” word. Should we use “elections”, single-winner elections?

HARLOS: Is that your motion?

LATHAM: That will be my motion.

HARLOS: So you would like to strike “races” and make it “single-winner elections”?

LATHAM: Yes.

HARLOS: Would you like to speak to that any further?

LATHAM: Scrolling through RONR and the word “races” does not show up in the 11th Edition. Words do matter in terms of setting tone and “race” suggests horse race and that is a competition. It’s an election.

SEEBECK: Point of procedure. “Single-winner” should be hyphenated.

LATHAM: Okay with that.

BRACCO: Is President election and Vice-President election, couldn’t someone say it only refers to the President and the Vice-President?

HARLOS: Good point.

SEEBECK: Is it in order to amend the amendment?

HARLOS: It is.

SEEBECK: move to change the word “elections” to “contests” or ‘balloting’.

HARLOS: Which one?

SEEBECK: “Balloting”. Would it also be correct to move to change the word “in” to “for”?

HARLOS: Can we deal with that separately? It could be non-controversial but it could turn out to be the most controversial thing we do tonight. Would like to deal with them separately. Would you like to speak to that?

SEEBECK: Sure. We are talking about casting ballots. To me “casting a ballot” means you are balloting. It’s pretty straight forward.

HARLOS: I am next. When you speak to an amendment to an amendment it kind of relates to both. Like the amendment to the amendment better than the amendment. Like “balloting” better than “election”. However, personally don’t know why we are stressing over this. What if the question were asked: Are you running again for secretary? Who is running for Chair? We have races. We can call it a peanut-butter sandwich but it is a race. Don’t know why when we are in the Libertarian Party and with a meritocracy we are freaking out over the word “race”. ***1:48:35*** This is much ado about nothing. Will be voting for the amendment to the amendment but will ultimately be voting only if my vote counts.

MOELLMAN: It is an election. You are electing someone to be the nominee. “balloting” is fine. We only have ten minutes left in this meeting. Would be good to finish with this.

MOULTON: The Brevity Caucus is going to mutiny over the first idea. Like “election”. like “election” better than “race” or “races”. Like “balloting’ worst of all.

LATHAM: Is Moulton saying he disfavors “balloting” the most?

HARLOS: Yes.

MOULTON: Yes.

LATHAM: That is my point also. “Balloting” and looking through the 11th Edition of RONR and in reading the context, it seems like a process and the election is the result or outcome. To me “balloting’ just comes up short as a term of art. Think “election” is the preferred, standardized term that we ought to go with.

ROWLETTE: Had something to say but my question was answered.

HARLOS: Any further debate on the amendment to the amendment? (No Response). Know there are objections so will call the roll. What we are voting on is striking the word “election” and replacing it with “balloting”. A Yes Vote would adopt “balloting”. A No Vote would kill “balloting”. Then we would choose between “balloting” and “races”.

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

DEEATED VOTE 1-8-1

HARLOS: Any further debate between “elections” and “races”? (No Response). Will move to a roll call vote. A Yes Vote would strike “races” and insert “elections”. A No Vote get rid of “elections” and keep original wording of “races”.

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

ADOPTED VOTE 6-3-1

BRACCO: Motion to extend time for 10 minutes.

HARLOS: Any objection to extend time for 10 minutes?

SEEBECK: No. But to amend “in” to “for”. It’s not “in” but “for elections”.

HARLOS: Motion to extend for 10 minutes It’s now 47 after. So will go to 57 after.

SEEBECK: Move to amend “in” to “for”.

HARLOS: So it would read “for elections”. Would you like to speak to that?

SEEBECK: It’s better wording. We are talking about balloting. So it would be for that type of election. It would be similar for the multi.

HARLOS: Whatever changes get made in single will be included in multi as well. Is there any further debate on this? On striking “in” and making it “for”? So it would read “for single-winner elections”? (No Response). Is there any objection to that change? (No Response). That passes. **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** Are there any other amendments to the single-winner elections paragraph? (No Response). Moving to the multi-winner paragraph. ***1:58:50*** Going to make a suggestion and see if there is any objection. Before we amend further would suggest that introductory phrase in multi-winner races get changed to [for multi-winner elections](#) to make it consistent with single-winner elections. Is there any objection to that?

LATHAM: Have a point of clarification. My suggestion is for at-large members and Judicial Committee elections; would there be other multi-winner elections that we would be leaving out?

HARLOS: No. Not at this time.

LATHAM: My proposal is to replace that language, to substitute for at large members and Judicial Committee members or for winners in multi-winner races. Just to be more specific.

HARLOS: Would suggest that we first make the language conforming because there was already a motion on the floor which will get to next. Motion on the floor was to change for conformity. You can strike but if your strike does not pass, we have conforming language that instead of in multi-winner races it says for multi-winner elections.

LATHAM: No objection to that.

HARLOS: From there you wanted to change that to –

LATHAM: Do we want to do the procedural without objection?

HARLOS: There was no objection to that as far as I knew. You are up for amendment.

LATHAM: Motion is to replace “multi-winner” with “at-large member and Judicial Committee”. Just to recap since multi-winner is only to those two specific type elections would rather be more specific because we are only talking about those two and not leave it open to people wondering what multi-winner elections are. What are we talking about? It is just those two?

MOULTON: Brevity Caucus has met and we passed a resolution strongly condemning this proposal. It adds a bunch of words. In addition to adding words it also makes it more obfuscated and more complicated to deal with later amendment. Moellman stated in future he would like to see the Bylaws Committee and the Platform Committee elected by convention rather than the LNC and if we adopt something like that in the future, this would be another place that would need changed if we started adding specific names of things that qualify for this. Think “multi-winner elections” broadly covers everything and is future proof. Would urge you to vote against Latham’s amendment.

HARLOS: Point of information for Moulton. Who else are members of the Brevity Caucus? He needs to make an LPedia article.

MOULTON: Very short list.

BRACCO: Moulton beat me to it, especially on future proofing. It’s never going to happen. Existing language “multi-winner” is going to cover if this committee, the Platform Committee or if created an entirely new committee, it would cover all of those. I too would urge you to vote against it.

LATHAM: Can I withdraw because I’m persuaded and would like to expand multi-winner elections. Just had no idea. Don’t want to preclude that.

HARLOS: Any objection to Latham withdrawing his amendment? Moellman has declared he is also a member.

LATHAM: Better be a member of that. Don’t know who decides.

HARLOS: Not too sure on that. Are there any further amendments to this paragraph on multi-winner elections?

BRACCO: Want to go on this one as well. In the middle there is a section that says any candidates who receive a majority shall be elected and then the last sentence This procedure shall be repeated until the total number of candidates to fill the open seats having received a majority vote or been elected in the previous rounds. Given the last sentence says “open seats” and that in previous rounds if some candidates but not all had received a majority vote, then those seats are not open. Do we need the or been elected in previous rounds.? Would move to strike ~~or been elected in the previous rounds.~~ from the end of the sentence. In that sentence it already says “open seats”. If seats had been filled in previous rounds, they are not open. By saying “open seats” you are covering it. That is duplicative.

HARLOS: Anyone else like to speak to this?

LATHAM: It is existing language and if we decide to use a ranked-choice-voting process, sometimes you would say you stop counting the candidates that are either elected or defeated. Wondering how this change would influence that? That's my question.

HARLOS: As time goes on we can adopt a proposal that moot proposals previously adopted. Later adopted proposals take precedence. Now we don't use RCV. Unless we are moving to amend to add a RCV procedure at this time to this existing language adding in "but what if pig entrails" how would that factor in? It is not relevant now because that's how we are doing things. There is nothing in our bylaws yet to provide for it. Remember, these are rules which can be suspended.

LATHAM: Not personally invested in any of that. Was your point then that this is beyond the scope of the rewrite?

HARLOS: Yes.

LATHAM: May support this in theory but because it overcomplicates the rewrite, do not know that am supportive right now.

BRACCO: Motion to extend time by five minutes.

HARLOS: Is there objection to an extension of five minutes?

SEEBECK: Objection.

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

ADOPTED VOTE 4-2-4

HARLOS: Motion adopted. Extended for five minutes. Any further debate on Bracco's amendment which is to strike ~~or been elected in previous rounds.~~? (No Response). Is there any objection to Bracco's amendment?

LATHAM: Objection. Think it is outside the scope.

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

ADOPTED VOTE 5-3-2

****2:15:10****

ROWLETTE: Move to adjourn.

HARLOS: We were extended for two more minutes. Would you mind letting that time expire and then adjourn automatically?

ROWLETTE: Fine.

HARLOS: Not 16 and 17 but two paragraphs at bottom. Suggest we leave these alone for now. Goes beyond our simplification. Is there any question about the paragraphs as to regions? (No Response). Last one was about the business of the convention continuing, **“During the period of time allotted for such votes, the business of the convention shall continue without interruption.”** that was moved up, preserved, put in a different paragraph. Intent of proposal was not to touch anything about computer readable ballots because will be dealing with this language in Latham’s amendment. This is beyond the scope my amendment because we are going to be dealing with this later.

We have been through the seriatim. Are there any further changes to this rewrite? If not, we can go to a vote and then immediately start next meeting with Latham’s proposal about electronic voting. If there are, we will start next meeting with further changes.

ROWLETTE: Prefer to leave us where we are right now so that we may change this up at the beginning of the next meeting.

HARLOS: What we will do then is present a clean copy of how this looks and post on the list so that everyone can read it without the distraction of this red and blue to see if something jumps out. That is how will start next meeting. Without

any further motion to extend time, we are adjourned at 11:05 PM ET with our next meeting being June 15.

DRAFT COPY 6-6-23 3:51 6-7-23 at 3:01 APPROVED 6-15-23 TYPOS CORRECTED