

2024 BYLAWS AND RULES COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES DECEMBER 28, 2023

Meeting called to order at 9:02 PM ET

MEMBERS	ALTERNATES	GUESTS
SYLVIA ARROWWOOD	DEAN RODGERS (A6)	TIM HAGEN
DAVE ROBERSON (A2)		JJ JACOBS
NICKOLAS CIESIELSKI		MARRION KAUFMAN
CARYN ANN HARLOS		NATHAN MADDEN
ROB LATHAM		LARRY SILVER
FRANK MARTIN		JESSICA TEWKSBURY
CHUCK MOULTON		
TOM ROWLETTE		
MIKE RUFO		
MIKE SEEECK		

BRACCO LATE ARRIVAL

PUBLIC COMMENT: HARLOS: Town Hall January 11, 2024. Will announce on LP.org website. SEEBECK new member of National Association of Parliamentarians, third committee member. Thanks to Roberson and Rodgers for their continued attendance at meetings. Rationales Committee will be presenting findings soon.

MINUTES APPROVAL: Minutes 12-21-23 **APPROVED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

PROPOSAL PP EMAIL 5-5-0 FAILED

ARROWWOOD	NO	
BRACCO	NO	
CIESIELSK	YES	
HARLOS	YES	
LATHAM	NO	
MARTIN	YES	
MOULTON	NO	
ROWLETTE	NO	
RUFO	YES	
SEEBECK	YES	FAILED VOTE 5-5-0

HARLOS: If it's just grammar that would be a reconsideration. There can be a minority report if someone wants.

MOULTON: Will send an email ballot while we talk.

HARLOS: Will continue where we left off with MM(b). We divided the question and first part failed so we are now on second part. We have stricken out ~~total~~ and inserted maximum. Then we have a substitute. "A quorum shall consist of 40% of the total number of delegates registered in attendance at the convention, not including those who have checked out with the Credentials Committee." Since both are short, will accept amendments to either of them. We can amend or debate either.

DEBATE AS TO PRIMAY AND SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENTS.

BRACCO IN ATTENDANCE AT 9:35. ROBERSON RETURNS TO ALTERNATE.

HARLOS: Motion before us is shall the substitute become the primary motion? Yes Vote would make the highlighted language go away and then the blue would become the primary. Yes Vote would make the substitute the main motion. No Vote would get rid of the substitute and the yellow would be the main motion,

ARROWWOOD	YES	
ROBERSON (A2)	YES	
CIESIELSKI	NO	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	NO	
MARTIN	NO	
MOULTON	YES	
ROWLETTE	YES	
RUFO	NO	
SEEBECK	NO	FAILED VOTE 4-5-1

HARLOS: Substitute fails. Back on main motion.

MOULTON: Move that we replace ~~40%~~ with 33%. Will have less business if people leave after all the sexy business. There is potential for that to happen in the future.

DEBATE

MOULTON: Proviso, that it take effect with this motion.

HARLOS: Anything further? (No Response) Is there any objection to adding this proviso? (No Response) **PROVISO ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.** Back to the 33% versus ~~40%~~. Anything further? (No Response) We are going to vote now. Yes Vote would adopt

both 33% and the proviso and get rid of 40%. Yes Vote would do that. No vote gets rid of both of them and leave at 40%.

ARROWWOOD	NO	
BRACCO	ABSTAIN	
CIESIELSKI	NO	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	YES	
MARTIN	NO	
MOULTON	YES	
ROWLETTE	YES	
RUFO	NO	
SEEBECK	NO	FAILED VOTE 3-5-2

LATHAM: Want to strike ~~registered in attendance~~ and add registered as attending.

DEBATE

HARLOS: Yes Vote will strike ~~registered in attendance~~ and insert registered as attending. No Vote will leave the original language of “registered in attendance”.

ARROWWOOD	NO	
BRACCO	NO	
CIESIELSKI	NO	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	NO	
MARTIN	NO	
MOULTON	NO	
ROWLETTE	NO	
RUFO	NO	
SEEBECK	YES	FAILED VOTE 1-8-1

HARLOS: Back to original language.

DEBATE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE

LATHAM: Propose replacing ~~maximum~~ with present.

MARTIN: Call the question and end debate on just the amendment.

HARLOS: Any objection to ending debate on the amendment? (No Response) **ADOPTED**

TO END DEBATE WITHOUT OBJECTION. Amendment is to strike out the word **maximum** and insert the word present.

ARROWWOOD	NO
BRACCO	NO
CIESIELSKI	NO
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
LATHAM	YES
MARTIN	NO
ROBERSON (A2)	NO (Moulton Pass to Alternate)
ROWLETTE	YES
RUFO	NO
SEEBECK	ABSTAIN

FAILED VOTE 2-6-2

HARLOS: As to the words “total” and “maximum” this is not an amendment. It’s just a suggestion. Leave the word “total” and add a sentence at the end “checkout is not permitted.” We can choose one way or the other whether checkout is allowed or is not allowed. It could be amended on the floor. Not making an amendment. That might be a more graceful way to handle this.

DEBATE

MARTIN: Motion to amend is strike **maximum** and replace it with total and to add checkout is not permitted.

HARLOS: This is a substitute.

DEBATE

HARLOS: Move to end debate between “checkout is not permitted irrespective to whether some may have departed.” Is there an objection to the motion to end debate so we vote on those two just as to the substitute? Can’t read the room. Yes Vote will strike out **checkout is not permitted** insert a comma , irrespective of whether some may have departed . No Vote will get rid of the yellow and keep “checkout is not permitted.”

ARROWWOOD	YES
BRACCO	YES
CIESIELSKI	YES
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
LATHAM	YES

MARTIN	YES
ROBERSON (A2)	YES (Moulton pass to Alternate)
ROWLETTE	NO
RUFO	YES
SEEBECK	YES

ADOPTED VOTE 8-1-1

HARLOS: Primary which is strike ~~total~~ and insert maximum. Substitute is adding a comma , irrespective of whether some may have departed. at the end and removing ~~total~~. Is there further debate or amendment? (No Response) Will vote now. Shall the substitute become the main motion? Substitute is the second one starting with “irrespective of whether some may have departed.” No Vote would get rid of that and leave us back to strike ~~total~~ and insert maximum.

ARROWWOOD	YES
BRACCO	YES
CIESIELSKI	YES
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
LATHAM	YES
MARTIN	YES
ROBERSON (a2)	YES (Moulton pass to Alternate)
ROWLETTE	YES
RUFO	YES
SEEBECK	YES

ADOPTED VOTE 9-0-1

HARLOS: Does anyone have anything else? (No Response) We will go to a vote. Will give it a moment to see if there is a handraise. (No Response) Yes Vote would adopt this language as recommendation of the committee. No Vote would fail it. We are talking about ARTICLE 10; the first part failed.

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

RUFO

YES

SEEBECK

YES

ADOPTED VOTE 7-2-1

HARLOS: That passes, only the quorum one. Everything else failed at the prior meeting where question was divided. Next is Proposal RR. MOULTON started an email ballot. It was sponsored. Will start an email ballot tomorrow. Debate is allowed in the email thread. Don't have to just say yes or no. If you debate, please separate your yes or no from the debate portion.

BRACCO: Similar to an earlier proposal. Main difference is it gets rid of the regions and it creates additional at-large seats, specifically two, so a total of seven. Distinction between the previous proposal and this one is how are the at-larges and in addition the JC elected. Also gets rid of approval voting. Get to have seven votes. You can, if you wish, cast all seven votes for one person. 2. C. "The candidates receiving the largest vote total, provided that vote total is greater than or equal to the majority of ballots cast, shall be elected." NOTA is a ballot cast but it is not a vote for any candidate. It makes it harder for candidates to exceed that threshold. Getting rid of regions, adding two additional at-large positions and changing to accumulative voting. There is a proviso in there.

DEBATE

HARLOS: We are almost at orders of the day.

BRACCO: Will type up for next meeting.

DEBATE

HARLOS: We are at orders of the day. Will start next Thursday with RR and then move right to cumulative voting LATHAM'S Proposals SS and TT to confirm Secretary's calculations. The Town Hall is on the 11th

LATHAM: Is it too late for me to change my vote on MM? It would not change outcome.

HARLOS: Yes. We are adjourned at 11:02 PM ET. Feel free to stick around for comment.

DRAFT ONLY WENESDAY 1-3-24 AT 2:43 PM * W 11:24 PM ** TH AT 1:00 PM**