

2024 BYLAWS AND RULES COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES SEPTEMBER 7, 2023

Meeting called to order at 8:48 PM ET.

MEMBERS	ALTERNATES	GUESTS
SYLVIA ARROWWOOD	CHUCK MOULTON (A1)	J. J. JACOBS
PAUL BRACCO	DEAN RODGERS (A7)	NATHAN MADDEN
NICHOLAS CIESIELSKI		LARRY SILVER
CARYN ANN HARLOS		JESSICA TEWKSBURY
ROB LATHAM		
FRANK MARTIN		
KEN MOELLMAN		
TOM ROWLETTE		
MIKE RUFO		
MICHAEL SEEBECK		

Full Complement

PUBLIC COMMENT: Link to Town Hall will be posted forthwith. Rationale Committee to submit input for Town Hall which is presently in setup stage. LP New Operations Director soon to be hired. Chair McArdle presently acting on volunteer basis.

PROVISO I PROPOSAL

HARLOS: Proposal I requires proviso. Chair submitted but requires members to approve. Proposal I is to delete token threshold. Going to change five signature tokens to three and change percentage for deletion. Need proviso which will not be included in the upcoming convention. Proviso to Proposal I [This amendment shall not go into effect until adjournment sine die of the convention at which it is adopted.](#)

Thoughts from committee as to proviso? (No Response) Any objection? (No Response).

ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.

MINUTES APPROVAL: Corrections implemented prior. No objection to approval of minutes of 8-24-23. **MINUTES APPROVED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

MOELLMAN: As to Agenda, it indicates 5 is withdrawn. Believe 6 was withdrawn. 5 was to be kept.

HARLOS: Final version stated is in link.

PROPOSAL T CONTINUATION

HARLOS: Last meeting agreed to workshop I on the list. Last item posted to list by CAH.

Move to amend by substitution to alternate language. Any objection to amend by substitution with understanding it can be amended further, this workshopped language, or we can perfect separately? Usually amended after substitution but if no one objects we can handle that way. Otherwise would have two competing proposals.

ROWLETTE: Move to vote on which proposal to choose and then move to suspend the rules and keep open so we can amend whichever one we might want to amend.

HARLOS: Is there any objection to the motion -- to make it clear Rowlette's motion to substitute alternate language which was substituted to the list. That would get rid of original language and then suspend rules to allow further amendment to the substitute?

DEBATE.

HARLOS: Any objection to Rowlette's Motions to substitute the amendment and have opportunity to amend later if desired? (No Response). **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

LATHAM: Move to remove ~~consider~~ and insert approve keeping with original language.

DEBATE.

HARLOS: Is there any objection to the motion by Latham as to "suspension" to strike ~~consider~~ and insert approve?

MOELLMAN: Would like to remove about doing it separately. Move to strike first sentence of a. ~~The platform committee must approve each platform plank separately.~~ The changes have to be done plank by plank already. That is required elsewhere in the bylaws. If Platform Committee wants to internally debate three planks, to move things around between three planks, five or ten planks, whatever they want to do, at the end of the day the Convention Committee still has to go one by one. That could be suspended I believe but that's up to the convention body to decide.

DEBATE.

HARLOS: Any further debate? (No Response). Has been objection so will take the vote.

Motion to strike ~~The platform committee must approve each platform plank separately.~~

ARROWWOOD	NO
BRACCO	NO
CIESIELSKI	NO
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
LATHAM	NO

MARTIN	NO
MOELLMAN	YES
ROWLETTE	YES
RUFO	NO
SEEBECK	ABSTAIN

VOTE 2-6-2 FAILED

LATHAM: Move to amend in the second sentence – and open to thoughts here – where it says “regarding any plank reported to the floor. Was thinking we could replace **plank** with proposal or could say proposed plank? Maybe proposal to keep it consistent?

DEBATE.

HARLOS: Any further debate? (No Response). Is there any objection? (No Response).

ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.

LATHAM: Move to strike last sentence of c. ~~There are no minority reports submitted for the Credentials Committee.~~ Lean toward liking idea of having people concentrated on the issue of credentials as may be alerting the broader convention delegates to an issue. Don’t like idea. If we didn’t have this mechanism, then we could wind up getting it by rumor and innuendo and that’s not optimal way to solve that. Best to look to Credentials Committee and whether there is a minority report. Open to further discussion.

DEBATE.

HARLOS: Any further debate? (No Response). Obvious there is disagreement. Please call the roll.

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

VOTE 2-6-2 FAILED

HARLOS: Back to amendment and debate. See a minor point but will wait for Moellman.

MOELLMAN: a. and b. talk about reports being submitted to the convention whereas c. does not say that.

DEBATE.

HARLOS: Anything further? (No Response). Now at the top of hour with a vote of whether or not to pass this proposal. Want a roll call. Not sure there is unanimity.

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

VOTE 8-1-1 ADOPTED

RUFO DEPARTS AT APPROXIMATELY 10:20 PM. MOULTON (A1) TO REPLACE.

PROPOSAL U-HAROS

HARLOS: Want to get this moved. Problem is there are perceived ambiguities. One, that the LNC must take any taker (or even the first taker) on a petition for affiliation even if there is a good reason not to. Two, whether or not the duty to provide the governing documents is ongoing. Solution could reorganize the sentence to make it clear that there is no such duty to accept any petition and that the duty to provide governing documents is ongoing. Also it states that petition has to be signed by not less than ten members. We can strike that if we don't like it. This language was put in when we were trying to affiliate all 50 states plus one. We are not doing that now unless for a very unfortunate affiliate. Then at end where it says "~~file a~~ provide copy-copies of their constitution and/or bylaws as adopted and later amended with the Party Secretary. That would create an on-going duty for these documents. Multiple reasons for that. It's self-explanatory.

DEBATE.

MOELLMAN: Call for orders of the day – unless Latham is going to extend time.

LATHAM: No. Am not.

HARLOS: Give a moment to see if there is a motion to extend time. If not, the meeting will be adjourned. We will pick up from here with encouragement as everyone thinks

this section needs to be amended. We just differ in how. Perhaps we can take this up on the email list?

Reminding everyone at the end of October no matter where we are at on proposals and work on reconciling proposals we have already passed, realizing we are up to Proposal MM and some have been withdrawn-- At end of October, we will go through everything we have already gone over. We can combine where there are two in conflict and decide which will be our proposals. Remember there may be minority reports and we have the Town Hall yet to be. We are getting into a sticky wicket here with overlapping proposals and it is rapidly turning into an untenable situation. Want to stop at end of October and resolve that and get into a good place where we are not bundling revision upon revision. Need to get a handle on that.

MOULTON: Would ask that committee vote on that rather than the chair decide.

HARLOS: When the Chair makes decisions as to the timeline and matters like that, it's always subject to the committee to take it from my hands. If Chair makes such a decision and there is no objection, will treat it as adopted without an objection; but it is ultimately in the hands of the committee. Thought that was made clear in email thread but if not, making it clear now. Think we are getting into some overlapping especially in the rules. Once we resolve those difficulties, then we could take up more proposals. Not saying all proposals stop in October. Am saying we should pause. If we take time to straighten out what we already have, that would be functionally no more proposals but once we are already motivated to clear up what we already have, there will be time for more proposals. All decisions are ultimately in the hands of the committee. The committee at any time can overrule my timeline. Committee can always take that out of my hands. When I ran for chair, laid out that was my intention. Would not take personally if committee says, no we want another timeframe. Am here to guide and advise and not to rule.

We are at time and nobody has moved to extend time.

LATHAM: Can I move to adjourn and make a comment?

HARLOS: Hearing no motion to extend the time, we are adjourned at 10:56 PM ET.

DRAFT 9-14-23 @ 2:24 am 9-16-23 AT 11:15 AM 9-17-23 at 10:20 AM

