

BYLAWS AND RULES COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES MARCH 28, 2024

Meeting called to order at 9:06 PM EDT

| MEMBERS | ALTERNATES | GUESTS |
|---------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| SYLVIA ARROWWOOD | DATA LOGAN | JACK BLUE |
| PAUL BRACCO | DEAN RODGERS | MARRION KAUFMAN |
| NICHOLAS CIESIELSKI | | |
| CARYN ANN HARLOS | | |
| ROB LATHAM | | |
| FRANK MARTIN | | |
| CHUCK MOULTON | | |
| TOM ROWLETTE | | |
| DAVE ROBERSON (A2) | | |
| MIKE SEEBECK | | |

ABSENT: MIKE RUFO

PUBLIC COMMENT: MOULTON: Agreed to present Regional Rep elimination proposal. Have concern we may have too many proposals. Need to check hotel reservation dates. **KAUFMAN:** Would like to be considered to serve on following Bylaws Committee. **ROWLETTE:** Will present a proposal if need be.

PROPOSAL LL AFFILATE PARTIES

HARLOS: [No affiliate or other constituent unit of any other political party or](#) . . . Let’s hear both sides on this proposed insert. Tend to like clarity in bylaws so everybody knows where they stand. This could cause reason to disaffiliate. Think it best to put warning shot in bylaws. This would not grant LNC any more or less authority. Some may do it anyway but it provides clarity particularly in case of a JC appeal.

Think we yellow-lined this. Would like to move to primary report. – Forgot. It was withdrawn. I am moving this proposal. Any debate?

MOULTON: Move this be added as a yellow.

DEBATE

BRACCO ENTERS AT 9:25 APPROXIMATELY

HARLOS: Will do a bit of heresy here. If you Vote Yes, it approves it as yellow. If you Vote No, we are back to maybe amending it. We all understand what we are doing and this makes it easy.

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| ARROWWOOD | YES |
| ROBERSON (A2) | YES (BRACCO PASSED TO ROBERSON (A2)) |
| CIESIELSKI | YES |
| HARLOS | ABSTAIN |
| LATHAM | YES |
| MARTIN | YES |

MOULTON YES
ROWLETTE YES
LOGAN (A5) YES
SEEBECK YES

ADOPTED VOTE 9-0-1

HARLOS: This motion by MOULTON approved but as a yellow-lined.

Have an emergency. MOULTON, will take the gavel while I take this emergency? Something has come up at National. And would BRACCO take care of any amendments?

MOULTON: Sure. We can discuss it a bit and maybe postpone it.

BRACCO: Yes.

HARLOS: Let me point out problem is last sentence. Will be on mute.

MOULTON ACTING AS PRO TEM CHAIR and BRACCO TO TAKE CARE OF ANY AMENDMENTS AT APPROXIMATELY 9:40 PM

MOULTON: This proposal open for debate. I will start off.

DEBATE

MOULTON: Seeing no further debate, I move that we table this and take care of the minutes and hopefully our Chair returns at that point. Is there any debate? (No Response) Is there any objection? (No Response) **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** (Proposal tabled until return of Chair).

MINUTES APPROVED: Minutes of March 14 **APPROVED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

BRACCO: Don't have an amendment. Was just asked to handle amendments if there were any.

MOULTON: Does anyone else have any proposed amendments?

SEEBECK: No. MS. HARLOS is back.

HARLOS: Open to postpone to workshop that last sentence as there is a problem with it. It only deals with actions when the whole idea was to make it deal with actions and inactions. It could be appealable. Will workshop this some more.

MOULTON: Any further debate? (No Response) Any objection? (No Response) It will be postponed to the next meeting. Will hand gavel back over to chair.

PROPOSAL LL POSTPONED TO NEXT MEETING WITHOUT OBJECTION

GAVEL TAKEN UP BY CHAIR HARLOS AT APPROXIMATELY 10:00 PM.

PROPOSALS 7 (PRIOR B) AND 8 (PRIOR S) PROVISOS

HARLOS: Proviso reconsideration for Proposal 7 (PRIOR B) and Proposal 8 (PRIOR S)

DEBATE AS TO PROVISOS FOR PROPOSALS 7 (PRIOR B) AND 8 (PRIOR S) DEBATE

BRACCO: Taking 8 proviso and adding it to 7.

MOULTON: Agreed. Don't see a problem.

DEBATE CONTINUED

HARLOS: Anything further? (No Response).

MOULTON: Move we take language for Proposal 8 Proviso and make it for Proposal 7 Proviso as well.

“PROVISO: For current sustaining members only, this shall go into effect when current memberships lapse or renew, with the lapse date fixed as the last lapse date which exists at adjournment sine die of this convention.”

HARLOS: Does anyone want to speak to this amendment? (No Response) Is there any objection to this amendment? (No Response) Hearing none -- The two languages are now identical. Is there any further debate on this proposal as amended? (No Response) Is there any objection to changing the current Provisos 7 and 8 to the above? (No Response) They are changed. **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION PROVISOS TO 7 AND 8 CHANGED.**

PROPOSAL 10 (PRIOR F) ALTERNATIVE VOTING PROCEDURES

HARLOS: Not dealing with rationales now. Will deal with after proposals report. Have to make sure rationales fit.

BRACCO: Do not want to move because like your language better.

HARLOS: Let's look at both so can come to a consensus. Start with mine and we can amend. Have different rules for presidential which does not have to do with not receiving a majority. It has to do with a certain percentage. First we have to decide whether we want to reconsider.

SEEBECK: Move to reconsider.

HARLOS: Any objection to reconsidering? (No Response). **ADOPTED MOTION TO RECONSIDER WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

DEBATE PROPOSAL 10

HARLOS: Have a feeling this will not be resolved today. Would like to simplify. Not making any changes. Like way it is written. If LATHAM has a substitute, need it with markups.

LATHAM: Did paste it into chat. If we want to continue to another meeting, I'll do a fifth substitute.

HARLOS: Yes. Hard to do on the fly. It's up to you. Putting items in the chat does not work even on a good night. Do not understand what you are trying to say. Verbally say what it is you want me to do.

LATHAM: Insert after "fewest votes" -- "receiving fewest votes" is still kept in there.

DEBATE CONTINUED

HARLOS: Definitely going to next meeting. See problem. Even if they are ineligible to be a write-in,

they still get counted towards the denominator and can still keep people from getting a majority and slowing things down. We need to address the issue of ineligible candidates. Don't have a proposal for that. This may discourage people from writing in but does not solve the problem of them still doing it and being able to slow things down. If we want to change that, we either need a special rule of order or a convention special rule and quite possibly even put in the bylaws. Would have to research that. Other issue, it still conflicts with 7.2 or potentially does because it says that when no candidate receives a majority, and for nominating for president and vice president and receives less than 5% -- and 7.2 actually has both of those in there. Candidates that get removed -- "the candidate with the fewest votes" . . . That does not even make sense.

DEBATE CONTINUED

HARLOS: What if candidate with fewest votes has less than 5%? Are we locking out all candidates who have less than 10% and then also lopping off the guy with 10%? That's not clear.

SEEBECK: That's way we have done it in past. We are not amending 7.2 now but we might want to think about it because it's very ambiguous.

HARLOS: It is time to conclude. These are out (indicating). Look at where we are at now. There are two various versions. Think we can rewrite this whole bylaw. This will be on next agenda as well as the reconsideration of moving the affiliate dispute to yellow. We will be adjourned at 11:02 PM EDT. Would suggest we workshop this on the list if there is any further comment or suggestions. See you all next week (Thursday, April 4, 2024).

DRAFT COPY ONLY 4-1-24 AT 12:20 PM4-2- AT 10:28**