2024 LIBERTARIAN PARTY BLAWS AND RULES COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING JUNE 29, 2023

Meeting called to order at 8:49 PM ET

MEMBERS	ALTERNATES	GUESTS
SYLVIA ARROWWOOD		TRAVIS BOST
PAUL BRACCO		DUSTIN COFFELL
CHUCK MOULTON (A1)		WINRICH CRUZ
CARYN ANN HARLOS		CARRIE EILER
ROB LATHAM		J. J. JACOBS
FRAK MARTIN		NATHAN MADDEN
DAVID ROBERSON (A3)		KEN MATTES
TOM ROWLETTE		GORDON SALLEE
DATA LOGAN (A6))		MARRION SKINNER
		JESSICA TEWKSBURY
		ERIC THRAEN

ABSENT AT INITIAL ROLL CALL: NICHOLAS CIESIELSKI, KEN MOELLMAN, MIKE RUFO, MICHAEL SEEBECK

PUBLIC COMMENT: MADDEN: Happy to see increase in Guests and welcomed all.

RATIONALES SUBCOMMITTEE: LATHAM: Other members BRACCO and MOULTON. Delay reporting at present.

TOWN HALL: HARLOS: Not concrete. Trying for August date.

MINUTES: No corrections at this time. Draft Minutes from 6-15 meeting Approved Without Objection with the understanding that if anything is found later, we can revisit. Committee Minutes are a bit informal.

ALTERNATE DEAN ROGERS (A7) IN ATTENDANCE AT 9:05 PM.

HARLOS: Plan to have most proposals ready to send to membership for a survey by January 24. This is good time for Rationales Subcommittee to start looking at Proposals passed. Leave that to them. Convention a year away but plan to hold mock convention to run some bylaw proposals to members for comment. Most of 2024 will be finalizations and refinements with hopefully not many new proposals.

Amend major rewrite in our rules. Google did not mix up our rules but they were in different parts of the document. Will combine LATHAM'S and my suggestions and whatever any other member has as to electronic balloting. Have gone over lots of this but it's been couple of weeks. Completely getting rid of RULE 3 and combining everything about balloting into a new RULE 3 which is in blue throughout and put in one rule.   Need to do the same with nominations but not done yet. Listened to our recording and believe these are all the changes. This was shared on email list. Nothing was added. Was all taken out of various weird areas.

BRACCO: Think RULE 8.1 Cap "N" in 'Nnominations" that should be stuck?

HARLOS: Yes. Done. Think "cosign" should be hyphenated co-sign.

MARTIN: Yes.

HARLOS: At point now where further amendment would be in order. If there are no further amendments, the next vote is to adopt this conditional upon the fact we might have to amend this and tweak a tiny bit for electronic balloting once we have our proposal for that.

BRACCO: Question on intention here. If we pass this and pass electronic voting, would that be two separate proposals or one?

HARLOS: Two separate ones in our records. How we pass these has no or little bearing on how we present them. Will be doing separate votes on combing proposals. That's part of the ordering process. At end will need to make some tactical decisions. In committee records will be shown as two separate proposals. Might not be how it is presented to the delegates. 2024 will be mostly interfacing with members and strategy.

MOULTON: In RULE 3.2 would like to amend ~~displayed on a projection screen for each delegation~~ and want to replace it with **shall be shared with each delegation**. Do not want to bind to a particular technology. Could be delegation chairs or all delegates.

HARLOS: Will make markup cleaner. Would you speak for that motion, MOULTON.

MOULTON: Bylaws should not bind us to a particular technology. Should use most efficient technology at time.

BRACCO: Would like to make an amendment. Strike ~~delegation~~ and insert **delegate**.

MOELLMAN IN ATTENDNACE AT 9:20 PM. ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES FOLLOWING:

MEMBERS	ALTERNATES
SYLVIA ARROWWOOD	DEAN ROGERS (A7)
PAUL BRACCO	
CHUCK MOULTON (A1)	
CARYN ANN HARLOS	
ROB LATHAM	
FRANK MARTIN	
KEN MOELLMAN	
TOM ROWLETTE	
DAVE ROBERSON (A3)	
DATA LOGAN (A6)	

ABSENT: CIESIELSKI, RUFO, SEEBECK

HARLOS: BRACCO is amending the amendment to strike the word ~~delegation~~ and insert the word **delegate**.

BRACCO: Will speak to it. No problem with not binding to a technology but do think should explicitly say that it need not only be related to delegations but to the delegates. Needs to be available to every person who votes. Word "delegate" rather than "delegation" takes care of that.

HARLOS: Not in favor of amendment in general. If amendment in general were to pass, prefer BRACCO'S change. Think BRACCO'S change makes it better but even if it's amended, not in favor of amendment.

SEEBECK IN ATTENDANCE AT 9:30-LOGAN RETURNED TO ALTERNATE (A6) STATUS.

HARLOS: Any debate on amendment to the amendment to strike ~~delegation~~ and insert **delegate**?

SEEBECK: Will not vote on this because don't know what we are talking about. Will jump in after that.

HARLOS: Any objection to the amendment to the amendment? (No Response).
ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION. Now back onto the primary amendment. I'm next to speak on primary amendment. Default is what is in a rule. This is a rule and not a bylaw. Someone could ask for this rule to be suspended. RONR requires things to be projected on a projection screen. Will always have "projection screen" because of that. Already tied to that technology. Often exciting to see state by state by state projected on a screen. Do not see total results until everyone has seen the count and makes for good CSPAN. Sending to a computer does not have same excitement factor.   Best to have one source. Prefer excitement to be default factor and can be shared with each

delegate. There is nothing to prevent a suspension of the rules and do it differently. Am completely against this. It's worked perfectly well for many years.

MOULTON: If this passes, would not prevent secretary or anyone from putting on a projection screen. It has not worked perfectly well for years. It slows things down for quite a lot of races. Time is precious at conventions. It would be faster to do all at once than go state by state. Agree scrolling makes for good TV, especially for presidential votes, but for other votes would rather save some time. This would enable the secretary to save some time. "Projection screen" existed long before computers. In ten years there will be technology we have not even thought of which are better than both of those things.

LATHAM: Parliamentary question. Looked thru RONR 11th; did not see word "projection". Need a reference.

HARLOS: Somewhere it says that every motion has to be read in full including strike-outs and whatever or alternatively be displayed.   But, it needs to be displayed. It may say "displayed" versus "projected". Will check for verbiage.

MARTIN: Find your argument persuasive. In something as important as this, relying on people's cell phones which could be full of malware and things could get dicey. Also is attractive to have one screen that everybody pooled in on is good.

HARLOS: "Designate an on line area" that could be it. Not "projection screen" exclusively but "the display of immediately pending question". . . "the text of the pending question is properly displayed." The ones I mentioned talked about the "display". That could be interpreted as on a screen or Google Doc as well. Did that answer your point of information?

LATHAM: Yes.

HARLOS: This would not save time. The secretary already has to have a Google Doc. Everyone trying to access my Google Doc kept crashing my system. There were those who just did not understand how to do it. No Libertarian wants to be forced to use a certain technology. If you remove this from rules, the default becomes sharing. We already have the default technology of projection. Do not fix things that are not broken. We could waste a lot of time on this and perhaps even torpedo this entire thing.

MOELLMAN: Is it necessary to have a rule where common sense should dictate otherwise? Are we already being too verbose in saying how things have to happen?

Certainly we want the tally or the results to occur but are we being overly restrictive by outlining the particular mechanism by saying this will be the way we do this rather than here is a better way? Having been on Convention Committee worry about the way it is worded. It pretty much requires you to use Scantron. It can get involved, filling in bubbles and signing paper ballots. Do we want a system that very rigidly outlines and handcuffs the abilities? Or do we want language which simply insures that the tally is accurate and correct and that every delegate has the opportunity to challenge the results if they feel their vote was not properly counted? Do we want a decision or move on to the next vote? Would like to see less handcuffs and certainly don't believe that anyone would intentionally choose – even if they were free to choose – any system from scratch today. Don't think presidential tally would change very much unless there was some way to draw it out even more because that is time the media actually pays attention to what we are doing. If during presidential tally you shorten that window, you would shorten our media coverage and it would be foolish to reduce that time in any way. Also tell you that pretty much nobody outside our convention hall or party really cares. The tally for my race took a while because there was an issue over whatever and that was fine but the reality is it's not good TV. Nobody out in CSAPN says, I'm sure glad Ken Moellman won for Vice Chair! Man, that was close! No one cared. Less handcuffs would result in the same results in what matters and easier results in easier processes where it does not.

SEEBECK: Look at this and see a major problem. By changing the words to "shared with each delegate" that does not take the handcuffs off, that makes it far worse because can very easily see troublemakers on the convention floor saying one at a time: show me the results; show me the results. That would slow everything down to a dead stop. The projection screen does a mass display for everybody at the same time and prevents that. This is not broken. Let's not fix it until it is.

HARLOS: One particular delegation purposely slowed down a vote because did not want to get to an item of business later. This would be perfect opportunity to do again. It's not broken. Could cause more work. Whatever the language is, it is going to be the default. There may be someone who will not project on the projection screen. Libertarians are suspicious people. How do they know everyone is seeing the same thing? When everyone is looking at same thing right in front of them, it undercuts all of that. Would implore us not to look for problems where we don't have any. There are many problems in our bylaws but this is not one of them. Is there any further debate?

(No Response). Or amendments? (No Response). There are differences of opinion. Will call the roll. What we are voting on is striking ~~displayed on a projection screen for~~

~~each delegation~~ and inserting **shared with each delegate for accuracy**. If passed, the entire sentence will read: "After the Secretary or the vote tellers have recorded all delegation submissions, the state-by-state delegation totals for reach candidate or choice shall be shared with each delegate for accuracy." A yes vote will change it to "share with each delegate" and a no vote will retain "displayed on a projection screen for each delegation".

ARROWWOOD	YES	
BRACCO	NO	
MOULTON	YES	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	YES	
MARTIN	NO	
MOELLMAN	ABSTAIN	
ROWLETTE	YES	
ROBERSON	NO	
SEEBECK	NO	**FAILED VOTE 4-4-2**

HARLOS: Back to primary amendment here. Is there any further amendment? (No Response). Because this is such a big change, will ask for a roll call vote on these changes we have workshopped for a couple meetings now. What we are voting on is passing this entire group of changes with understanding that we might have to tweak some of the language a bit depending upon an electronic voting proposal that LATHAM has. Any changes other than having to do with electronic voting would require reconsideration. We had agreed upon that already.   Take the roll.

ARROWWOOD	YES	
BRACCO	YES	
MOULTON	YES	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	YES	
MARTIN	YES	
MOELLMAN	YES	
ROWLETTE	YES	
ROBERSON	YES	
SEEBECK	YES	**ADOPTED VOTE 9-0-1**

HARLOS: Next is electronic voting. Is 6 Substitute the latest?

LATHAM: Yes. Most recent.

HARLOS: Because dealing with ranked choice voting later as a separate proposal, do you want to reserve not using Ranked Choice Voting or do want to put it now? Just so we can deal only with electronic voting – but it's up to you.

LATHAM: Happy to reserve those.

HARLOS: Will highlight those and just ignore that. Narrows it down. Will explain where we are and let you move it. Did not do anything with language now in red ~~6. In cases where computer readable ballots are used, each delegate must sign the ballot and submit it to the delegation chair. 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.~~ What MOELLMAN mentioned before, that would require a Scantron. LATHAM has a different proposal that would change that.

LATHAM: It's fairly straight forward. The bottom line is to give our party the capacity to use electronic voting for internal elections. We can use in ranked and non-ranked situations. Ranked choice is quicker. "Physical balance", that's in there to build trust in this type of system. Neutral on that; that's not a deal breaker for me. If we use electronic voting, it ought to be accompanied by a physical record as well.

HARLOS: Strike the red in 6. above and make that section read the blue **6. Electronic voting may be used instead of manual tabulation by affiliate delegation provided that written notice of the electronic voting system to be used is published on the Party website at least 90 days prior to the regular convention. A delegate or alternate must be physically present to cast an electronic ballot. The electronic voting system must provide for the following: a. Accommodate each voting delegate's or alternate's ability to cast; 1. A vote using a computer readable ballot; or 2. An electronic vote, which generates a physical ballot; and which ballot the voting delegate or alternate gives to their respective Delegation Chair for placement into a designated envelope provided for this purpose. b. The system generates a report of votes by affiliate delegation for display to the convention. c. The system allows delegates to cast write-in votes. 4. If a recount is successfully ordered, the recount must be done using the physical ballots collected by the Delegation Chairs.**

Do not think it's relevant to say "delegate or alternate". When an alternate is seated, they are a delegate. Have a problem where it says that "an electronic vote generates a physical ballot." That will severely slow things down as it gets into printers. It might violate the secret ballot. See all kinds of problems and it's a big, big slowdown. Get the trust factor but what I favor is at same time as they are casting the electronic votes, they physically fill out their own ballot and give envelope to their chair. That will be

faster. See this narrowing the range of what we can do and probably won't be used because it's too complicated. Concerns were raised that someone could cast an electronic ballot and then do their physical ballot a little bit different but what really would be motive for someone to do that? Don't see big problem with that. Benefits brought up far outweigh the issues. Did you have this all rolled into RCV at one time or did you not?

LATHAM: Don't know. It's been a while

HARLOS: Covered my concerns on this.

BRACCO: One small question and then a bigger one. In the new 6.a in center column it has two subsections but in right column it does not. Is proposal the marked-up column?

HARLOS: LATHAM probably forgot 'cause this is the sixth rewrite of this. Am I correct in telling BRACCO it is middle column we are looking at?

LATHAM: Yes.

BRACCO: Other question is based on my reading of this. It seems to allow either paper ballots or electronic ballots at the delegation level. Is that correct? It is not all one or the other?

LATHAM: Not my intent. My intent is standardize across all delegations, all delegates.

HARLOS: There is a choice here. But choice is not by delegation. a.1. is computer readable ballot. That's similar to a Scantron which would be a paper ballot but it gets counted by a computer. a.2. which is strictly on a computer or they handwrite one or something is printed. Everyone will be using a.1. or a.2. Won't be some using a.1. and some using a.2.

BRACCO: Within the body of 6. itself not a subsection it says "Electronic voting may be used". It's sort of like you can if you wish provided at least 90 days prior to the regular convention – and all that. How is that decision made in this framework? You are not disallowing written ballots?

HARLOS: Instead of –

BRACCO: Should the word "may" be "shall be used" instead of to meet these

 requirements? Is that it?

HARLOS: What if it fails?

BRACCO: What if it's 89 days? Too bad, written ballot?

HARLOS: If we put "shall be used", what if proper notice is given and 30 days before convention the company which notice is given, goes out of business? Would we then have to amend the rule?

BRACCO: Wouldn't we have to suspend the rule?

HARLOS: Yes. But the "shall" there complicates things. What you are getting at is somewhere in the notice thing. Do not believe the answer is making it "shall". Do understand your concern to make it clear that this decision would be made by COC. It is not made at convention. It's made 90 days before by somebody. Don't think we need to say who makes the decision. Whatever is decided, everyone is using it.

BRACCO: How the decision is made as well. Do not want to make an amendment at this time but did want to break it up.

HARLOS: As prior member of COC, may be used at the COC's discretion. The COC is not a committee that is specified in the bylaws. It might not always be called that. We might not always have a Convention Oversight Committee. FEC rules allow you to farm out the planning of a convention where there are different fund-raising limits and we have done that in the past. So to specify a certain committee is not a good idea. Plus convention rules are not binding outside of the convention. 90 days would be because it would have had to happen before. Maybe it could be but you start getting weird there if you start specifying who makes what decision. Probably might be in policy manual but don't need to say that here in a convention rule. Who makes a decision is not relevant in my opinion. That is an LNC or COC decision. But saying everyone should use same system, that's valid and think that is an LNC policy manual item and let the LNC and COC worry about that.

MARTIN: We can anticipate the question coming up of who makes the decision? People will attach significant importance to the answer. Same thing applies to the items 3. and 4. here, for elections and using what type of voting et cetera. How is that decision made? Certainly is something I would like to know and would want to know before voting.

MOELLMAN: My gut tells me this is another case where we are being overly verbose and I get it. Still think the ultimate check and balance on all of this is the mechanism by which the delegates have to accept the mechanism of electronic voting and that if the delegates have to vote first the old way, the provisional way, to adopt electronic voting as a means of voting at this particular convention, inherently that will insure that any system is meeting the needs of the delegates if the delegates agree that this is a good system and this is the system we want to do. In that scenario leaving that scenario

open and not specifying that it must have printed ballots or must have generated ballots or how it is read out, any of that stuff, right? That can all be left up to the LNC. The COC is really acting on behalf of the LNC or the policy manual or is the subcommittee that acts on behalf of the LNC regarding convention things and then it's left up to the delegates to decide.

If we agree, this is what we want to do or no, don't trust this and would rather do it the way we have done it in the past, I think that could be just made a lot shorter by something where at the very beginning s, you know right after the beginning of No. 6. saying something like upon the majority vote of the delegates to do so, electronic voting may be used dot, dot, dot and you could get rid of a whole lot of other stuff without a. and b. and all that because that would be part of that system that had to be published 90 days out, that the COC or whatever they are called, let's just put the LNC managing it, it would have had to be prepared ahead of time and published. I think that makes it a lot simpler and provides that flexibility but with a check and balance back. They are not cramming some system into it and the delegates would walk away saying it was rigged because they got to decide what system they are using. That's just my thoughts. I am not making a motion at this time. That's just my thoughts.

LATHAM: Appreciate comments. Would like to think all concerns raised are fixable and addressable. Agree with striking of "alternate". Did not know if we needed both, so was over inclusive rather than under. Subsection a.2., could get rid of that **an electronic vote, which generates a physical ballot.** A person could take a ballot-selfie but you would lose auditability. A Scantron ballot in a.1. there, you maintain the option of auditability and 2. gives you that. Just do a ballot-selfie. You lose that and you could lose the rest of the language there as well if you wanted to. Am amenable to dropping that level of detail too. Reason why there is more detail rather than less is to address concerns of those who are skeptical of electronic voting. Did want to mention why would someone question the motivation of voting electronically and then fill out a physical ballot? Of course there is human error and monkey-wrenching and mischief making that happens as well. Would rather have an electronic system that spits out something. Yes, it would require printing something but we don't have to do that but if we want to have an auditable election, it seems that would be necessary. The write-ins, some people had questions but our parliamentary authority says if we want to use electronic voting (RONR 45:42) write-ins are allowable. As to 2. open to changes on that . Want to give people options so am worried by replacing "may" with "shall". People are going to feel this is being forced down their throats. My intention here is to put it out there as an option. Know MOELLMAN suggested something about upon a

majority of the delegates -- then and if we look at timeline – we want to make it work. How are delegates going to vote prior to the convention and then give 90 days notice prior to the convention? It seems that would need a major rewrite. MARTIN'S question on who makes the decision? Would think – like rest of our rules and bylaws – that's up to the delegates. On 3. and 4. we decided to put those off. Think that would also come back to the Convention Committee and go to delegates to ultimately decide whether to use various electronic systems to elect, to populate various bodies. Hoped that covers first round of comments and questions. Open for more if there are more.

HARLOS: Will ask of committee members, please do not text with the person speaking in chat. You cannot call the question in committee. Every member will have the opportunity to ask questions on the mic.

ROWLETTE: There is "4"; that should be "7". Before that is "6" and should be "7".

HARLOS: "d".

ROWLETTE: Looked and it's not part of the a, b, c, d. Think it's part of larger section.

LATHAM: Agree, Should be "d".

HARLOS: To answer some of the questions of MOELLMAN the first time around. Think BRACCO and MOELLMAN made good points. This somehow has to be accepted by the delegates and needs to be made clear – not so sure needs to be accepted at each convention – you also are dealing with a secretary who has to prepare. Can tell you something as simple as at in-person part of the 2020 they decided they were going to save time. Hate that because it never works, having multiple rounds for secretary's race by using approval voting and had to switch all the spreadsheets around. During the audit, it was determined it would only have been one round anyway. It was completely unnecessary and took the already trained tellers – It just was a nightmare. The secretary needs to know what will be used and not have it be amended and changed and debated at beginning of convention. That is not workable and will make people hate electronic voting. Until we have done it at multiple conventions, delegates are not going to trust a system proposed by an LNC that does not meet certain minimum requirements right off the bat. It's a check on what can even be proposed. Won't vote down something that did not have that but it's a fool's errand not to. People remember Porcupine being attempted to be shoved through. There's lots of distrust of every LNC and I'm usually leader of the distrust even when it's an LNC that I'm on. There has to be some type of minimum requirement. It's kind of silly because other organizations have used electronic voting for years but we have not. Every time it's been proposed to delegates, it's been shot down. We need to learn from those

lessons and put up guardrails and make it a little less verbose. That will lead to success after we have done it a couple times and trust has been built.

Will answer question in chat. Q   How is auditability and electronic voting mutually exclusive? A   Because the whole auditability is because people don't trust "electronic". They think that ones and zeros got switched somewhere. Auditing already is on screen computed by computer. You would be auditing something that got changed in the computer. You need something independent of the computer for there to be true auditability.

My notes were at the bottom of the major rewrite. Do want to pull up in case any issues arise. Not moving a substitute. Just want to put it out there. Last Page 24, **8. Electronic voting may be used instead of manual tabulation by state delegation provided that written notice of the voting system to be used is published on the Party website at least 90 days prior to the regular convention and must include provisions for the following: a. Contemporaneous manual ballots are completed and turned into each delegation chair and placed into a sealed envelope and delivered o the vote tellers. b. A report is generated of votes by state delegation for display to the convention. c. Delegates may cast write-in votes and must be present in the convention hall at the time of the voting.** And 9. should be d. as stated before. **d. If a recount is successfully ordered, the recount must be done using the physical ballots collected by the Delegation Chairs.**   This does the same thing except it might disallow Scantron which LATHAM'S does allow. Scantron was to be considered but it was going to cost like 40K. Scantron is really old technology. If we go electronic, let's go to actual electronic balloting and not taking an SAT test. After all debate, am considering moving this as a substitute because do think it's simpler and says the same thing.   Will copy all upper blue above into another page. It is not being moved but it's just for the notes.

MOELLMAN: Cheapest for Scantron would be about 20K. Again there is no guaranty the delegates would use Scantron. This is a rule and delegates could still defend or amend the rules or to do all the things that they don't like what the LNC or its designated body comes up with. No matter, the delegates will have the authority to overturn. If you want something to fail in the LP, tell a Libertarian they have to do a certain thing. That will pretty much guaranty they will say "No I do not". If we have the language that upon a majority vote the delegates can do so, and then go to electronic voting shall upon majority vote – and upon doing so electronic voting shall be used. Would keep language about provided that written notice of the electronic voting systems shall be used dot, dot, dot at least 90 days prior. That's important because that indicates the delegates have thought through the process, have thought through

and come up with a system, has a plan – and even if it's not a 20K Scantron, they are still going to have to evaluate what tabulation software or what tabulation provider service is going to be used. They will need to test it. They will need to make sure that we don't have a critical failure like we had with previous tests. Must consider scale. Worked great when there were a hundred people but fell down on its face when there were a thousand. All that has to be taken into account. It does have to be published 90 days out so the delegates can also think about, is this what we want to do? If you want to insure or help insure failure, you would spring it on the delegates at the last minute and tell them they must do it. That will not end well. My concern with extra wording is exactly the situation we have now which is I'm sure in 2012 or 2014 or whenever it was that they took the Scantron language in, that that was, Oh, yeah. That makes sense and that's what we'll do. We'll make sure that we have this locked down. We are going to use Scantron and we will start using it and then once people get used to using it, -- they used it in the 2000 convention I guess. Saw a video where someone was hearing impaired or sight impaired was asking how do they vote? That's my takeaway from that. I do think this is worthwhile. It is important that we use whatever will help the party vote faster. We should do everything possible to help delegates decide faster. We want them to be at "I can go for that".

As our chair stated it has to be done ahead of time so that the secretary, tellers, everyone running the logistics all have time to prepare. Do think 90 day deadline is absolutely critical not just for delegate acceptance but because the people who are going to be doing the work, the awesome volunteers that make the convention go, are not trying to figure out on the floor: What are the rules? What am I doing? What are the rules of this election? That's not good. Do think there has to be something about the delegates have to choose it to use it. It will definitely help this measure pass. It will definitely help it be used in the future and it will inherently be used in the future and eliminate questions about: The LNC is trying to screw us over and they are trying to ram this thing down and bla, bla, bla which we hear every convention.

HARLOS: If this is put into bylaws versus rules, it can still be suspended because it deals with procedure and is a rule of order. Rules of order can be suspended whether in rules or bylaws. Does not matter if in bylaws or rules, it's still a rule of order. (RONR 2:21) We have a half hour left. How this will go is we will continue debating this for a half hour. LATHAM already posted a 7th substitute. He might come with an 8th after 30 minutes of discussion. Don't think we will get to a vote this meeting. That's okay 'cause this is super important. That's how see things going. Maybe someone will extend time. Who knows? Maybe we will pass something tonight?

LATHAM: Will echo Chair's point on auditability and a more specific concern of mine is voter verifiability. Each voter who is in system can access the cast-vote record to see if it matches if they do the math themselves. Would hope if we do a version that generates all computer ballots or electronic votes which generate a physical ballot, those can be scanned somewhere available to anybody who wants to analyze them and hopefully then they would match what was recorded at convention. I'm fine with approval of delegates. If one has questions, propose some language. Tell us where to put that. Language of Chair does have language that I think is problematic because it has a delegate doing an electronic vote and then generate a physical ballot and then we open up to the potential of human error, mischief, monkey-wrenching.

SEEBECK: From a software engineering perspective and from Transparency Caucus perspective really don't like it. Idea of having an electronic system that does not have proper development, vetting and aide and security checks is a non-starter. We have enough technology and inclined people in this party that it should be very easy for us to crowd source a new process for this type of technology or maybe even grass-roots develop something that could be brought into play, field tested at various conventions across the country , training delegates and also make sure we have the proper "secure" design to make it happen. They tried to pull this in 2010 with the early voting booth idea. That went down in flames. Porcupine was a great idea but in 2018 it was not quite ready for prime time. System we have right now is a little slower because of index cards, tallies and so on. But it is auditable. It is verifiable and it is pretty transparent. If we make any change to that system, would suggest we go to a system where ballots are in triplicate, carbonless system, where you have three colored copies. Delegate keeps third copy for an audit trail. Again you still have to count everything; you still have paper balloting versus electronic but it would add an extra of receipts and security. We have the availability to do this if we put our heads together with the brain trust that we have within the party to come up with a workable solution but we are not there yet and the system we have in meantime does work. It could be faster but it works. Rather than try to put this in now, let's come up with something to make this worthwhile, to make it a good endeavor to say now is the time for this has come.

MOELLMAN: Point of inquiry. SEEBECK used three words in a row to describe it and one of them was "auditable" and missed the other two. Wanted to note them down.

SEEBECK: Verifiable and think "secure". Can check the recording. (pretty transparent).

HARLOS: Liked MOELLMAN'S introductory language about the delegates approving. Way worded was very good. Believe he meant to get rid of the source specifications

which I would not be in favor of. Also in favor of his having the delegates having to pass it so the secretary would know and come prepared for either but don't trust the LNC without parameters. The way Porcupine was rammed through has soured me completely on not giving parameters for what must be included before anything can be considered. Rules are made for bad people, not good people. Assume we have a completely horrible LNC and they have a large following at convention and just want to rig a bunch of things. They could really plan that by not having any parameters. The delegates voting for it is not a guaranty. It is some guaranty but just ask people how they feel about the abortion plank. We have to have some guardrails. There has to be some parameters in these rules or the delegates won't go for it. Do like having the delegates vote for it. Yes, the system could be faster. One way, you need more vote tellers. We need twice as many tellers. That will speed things up. Aiming for a teller team of about 20 this coming time. LATHAM said this.

There was controversy over my race with Evan. Some people said I counted my own votes which absolutely did not. Saw results when everyone else did but did scan all of the delegation sheets and did an audit of those votes on video and broadcast it out on Youtube. Everyone saw post-convention audit and I was actually shorted on votes. Will stick that in new secretary's manual. An audit should be recorded. Scans of all the sheets should be available to every party member to do their own audit. Agree on that.

ROWLETTE: Three things. First point of parliamentary inquiry. If I ike this or don't if I want to reconsider, in a committee which side do I have to be on? Do I have to be on the losing side of the vote?

HARLOS: Only have to be not-on-the-losing side. On committees there is no time limit – not like on boards – and also you have to not be on the losing side. It requires a 2/3 vote. An abstain would preserve your right to reconsider. (RONR 37:35.)

ROWLETTE: Second thing, how it begins "6. Electronic voting may be used instead of manual tabulation" that's how it begins. Assume that means only in manual tabulation and not in an event where you would not be manually tabulating, you could not use electronic voting. So it's only for times when you are manually tabulating. It cannot save time from anything that's not a race for office because that's only time when we write down our vote?

HARLOS: Yes because this is under a section of the rule called "Balloting".

 ROWLETTE: Third, riffing off of MOELLMAN maybe we could have electronic voting be the default but we could put a section in here that would say, at the beginning of the convention, after the credentials committee, we can take a vote about whether or not

we want to do it the old way – after saying that, kind of sounds like bad idea. But like having electronic voting as the default for 2026 but a majority could opt out of it and say we want to go back to the old system.

SEEBECK: Suggestion for secretary's manual. In Reno when tabulations came up for the JC , I recused myself from teller team because was a candidate in that race. Would suggest adding to the secretary's manual that this would be the case for any other teller or similar volunteer where that comes up. Better optics at a minimum.

HARLOS: Shoot me an email after meeting. Send you copy. Look it over; you may see things neglected.

LATHAM: Riffing off prior comments. That's why we have the 90 day thing there so if people see there is going to be a problem, then they can organize to address it at the convention. Not a software question but am aware there are some requirements out there to require open source software. OPAvote is an example of a solution that is open source. That could be an option. My concern about doing it internally is we had the Porcupine incident and also had the optics of people were self-dealing. If someone in the party offers to do it for a certain amount of money, that could be suspect. There are many solutions out there now. The wheel has been invented and don't worry about trying to reinvent it. We may need a custom-built for our convention depending on how this ends up being worded. Do not object to requiring open source if that is a concern of some folks. That might solve some concerns.

HARLOS: All bylaw 2/3 votes should be counted if close. Chair's duty. (RONR 44:5) All tellers will be trained and they will know how to do a counted vote.

MOELLMAN: Would we need language to override what would be the most tedious project in the whole world?

HARLOS: Could if you wish to. That would be required. Actually like counted votes for bylaws. Bylaws are super important. If it's counted, it is supposed to be in the minutes.

MOELLMAN: You are saying by RONR we have to have counted votes for every single bylaw vote?

HARLOS: Not amendments, the final votes. The ones that require 2/3. Unless it's obviously not close. We are now at 8:34 and don't think we are ready for a vote. LATHAM has put up No. 7. Have not looked at it yet. Might be happy with No. 7 but maybe after additional comment, you may want to put up No. 8. Would suggest we put this as first order of business at next meeting incorporating all feedback. We can get to a vote on this next meeting. .

LATHAM: We would be working off 7th Substitute.

HARLOS: Not available on July 13th.   Does committee want to take that week off or perhaps MOELLMAN can chair that meeting? Leave that up to committee. My proposal is that we skip July 13th. It is Freedom Fest if you wonder why I'm not available. Do not feel obligated. Vote how you wish. Move to cancel our July 13th meeting and have our next meeting be July 27th. Is MOELLMAN available on the 13th? Are you available? Committee needs to know. If can make it, I will

MOELLMAN: That will be fine.

HARLOS: Motion is to cancel meeting of July 13th and resume July 27?

ARROWWOOD	YES	
BRACCO	NO	
MOULTON	NO	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	ABSTAIN	
MARTIN	YES	
MOELLMAN	NO	
ROWLETTE	NO	
ROBERSON	YES	
SEEBECK	ABSTAIN	**FAILED VOTE 3-4-3**

HARLOS: Meeting will not be cancelled. Will try to listen in if can. Will rearrange schedule to reflect what we all agreed upon. If have thoughts on RCV issue, will put them in an email and trust that committee members will take my thoughts into consideration. Since no motion to extend, we will adjourn on time at 10:45 PM ET.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 PM ET.