

2024 LIBERTARIAN PARTY BYLAWS AND RULES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING JULY 13, 2023

Meeting Called to order at 8:49 PM ET by Ken Moellman, Acting Chair

MEMBERS	ALTERNATES	GUESTS
SYLVIA ARROWWOOD	DEAN ROGERS (A7)	RICHARD BROWN
PAUL BRACCO		DUSTIN COFFELL
NICHOLAS CIESIELSKI		CARRIE EILER
CHUCK MOULTON (A1)		J. J. JACOBS
ROB LATHAM		NATHAN MADDEN
FRANK MARTIN		JEFFREY SHULL
KEN MOELLMAN		MARRION SKINNER
ROGER ROOTS (A5)		JESSICA TEWKSBURY
TOM ROWLETTE		
MIKE SEEBECK		

ABSENT: HARLOS, RUFO

PUBLIC COMMENT: MADDEN: Happy to see guests and welcomed all. MOELLMAN: Acknowledged and thanked HARLOS for arranging and setting up logistics for Zoom Meeting. Sent to Cloud. **???What does "Sent to Cloud" mean???(SOME TYPE OF DIGITAL STORAGE DEVICE. Ch said will send to Cloud.)**

MINUTES OF 6-29-23. ARROWWOOD: Motion to accept as published. **WITHOUT OBJECTION. ADOPTED.**

MOELLMAN: LATHAM Motion to Substitute Revision P-8 for Revision P-7 as to RULE 3: Polling Procedure and RULE 7: Nomination of Presidential and Vice-Presidential Candidates. **WITHOUT OBJECTION. ADOPTED.**

MOMENT TAKEN FOR ALL TO REVIEW PENDING LATHAM REVISION P8 AND COMPARISON VERSION.

MARTIN: Request that P8 third column be read aloud.

MOELLMAN: Might be better for members to read at own pace. Things can move too fast.

MOULTON: Looked at P7, P8 and comparison. Looks fine to me. Do not need to read to me but no objection if someone else wants them read. In favor of the substitute.

BRACCO: Will share screen.

MOELLMAN: Martin has right to have it read if he desires.

MARTIN: Will waive my request.

BRACCO SCREEN SHARE DOCS, SCROLLING THROUGH TO ALLOW ALL TO READ/DIGEST.

BRACCO: Talked about custom vote for president and electronic for vice to show how quick it could be.

SEEBECK: Scroll up to RULE 1.

LATHAM: Version used makes changes more visible than others.

MOELLMAN: RULE 1 adds No. 3. to the agenda "[3. Vote to authorize electronic voting.](#)" Nothing else is changed, only adding in 3.

SEEBECK: Have question. This is proposed amendment of Convention Rules. Correct?

MOELLMAN: Yes.

SEEBECK: Does this come up automatic or do we have to amend the agenda? Or suspend the rules to go back and do that? Is there a proviso to handle this behind the Bylaws Committee? How are we going to handle this?

MOELLMAN: There is proviso at the bottom: [Proviso: This amendment shall take effect upon the final adjournment of the convention at which it is adopted.](#)

SEEBECK: So for next convention then? Okay. Answers my question.

LATHAM: Yes. Would kick in in 2026. In 7 we didn't even touch RULE 1 Order of Business. This is new to RULE 1. Also we changed "voting procedure" to "electronic voting procedure". **ELECTION BALLOTING PROCEDURE** (actually shows in doc, words and caps)

MOELLMAN: We are inserting an item into RULE 1, the Convention Agenda, third item.

LATHAM: Not using single transferable vote method now.

MOELLMAN: That will be separate item to consider? Right?

LATHAM: Yes. That's my understanding, yes. Request by our chair was to swap out ~~balloting~~ for voting [??? Why in this format? Suggests "voting" replaces "balloting". It is the opposite.???](#) (will switch out) when possible. Went through that but some places didn't seem right, so left as is. If anyone wants to weigh in on that, I'm open to it. Guess it's a judgement call when to use "balloting" and when to use "voting".

MOELLMAN: Everyone ready to move on? Okay to move on? Will keep scrolling. If anyone needs moment, just say so.

LATHAM: In a. 2. in prior we used “electronic ballot” which generate a physical ballot. Took that out as an alternative to draw a greater distinction between method I proposed and the method that the Chair was proposing. Could be electronic that is not going to generate a physical ballot but open to generating a physical ballot. Maybe they should generate some kind of electronic something. Used term “cast vote record” which is term of art. Don’t think that is used in way I am using it here. We could come up with something. Did suggest before meeting started – and know our committee chair did not like the phrase “cast vote record”. Suggest the delegates’ completion of an “electronic vote or “voting affidavit”, “ballot journal” just to stimulate wording might be optimal there.

MOELLMAN: Must be physically present to cast ballot.

MARTIN: What was CAH’S suggestion as alternative to “cast vote record”?

LATHAM: Did not see one. Saw comment did not like “cast vote record” in group chat. It is term of art in election administration. It is wordy.

MARTIN: Her message of hour ago that her substitute at bottom of the one linked and I would like it considered. She submitted a substitute somewhere.

LATHAM: Looked at that; that’s why suggested that language before meeting started. Believe her language was “contemporaneous manual ballot”. I’ve used “physical ballot” a few times. Most recent suggestion was “strike ~~cast vote record~~ and maybe replace with [delegate’s completion of electronic vote](#). Trying to distinguish between a vote and a ballot. This proposal defaults to physical ballot. This makes confrontation between the two less likely. That was intent.

MARTIN: Would request HARLOS’S suggested substitute be placed on screen.

MOELLMAN: Fine.

LATHAM: It’s global. Click link at bottom. Scroll to end. Lot is same. Big difference; now is 7 a. “contemporaneous manual ballots are completed and turned in to each delegation chair and should be placed into a special envelope”. That was her preferred iteration.

MARTIN: Does not look like a consideration for what we were considering.

LATHAM: Think she was hoping we consider this proposed language in light of considering the larger one.

MARTIN: All right. Thought she was considering the “cast vote record” language but don’t see that.

LATHAM: Last language I saw was “contemporaneous manual ballot”. We have BRACCO and ROWLETTE with hands raised.

BRACCO: Would like to run through scenarios. Process seems to be more important than nit-picking the language. Would like to see that. Looking at just language, it is not all that clear. Let’s assume this is approved. Now what?

LATHAM: Talking about which version? Look at a. 1. and a. 2. There is slight variance. a. 1. Might be the delegate will download an app; maybe it has a voting module in it and if it’s okay they announce we are going to vote and then the person votes on their device and that’s it. That data gets transferred to the tellers and it generates a report. Can look at b. and that allows write-in votes and go from there. Notice a disparity when removed from a. 1. “electronic ballot would generate a physical ballot”. What can we do about d. because now there is no physical ballot in that scenario. Maybe we need to go back in and import that electronic ballot will – or could do it two ways. Could say that electronic ballot is going to generate a physical ballot or if a recount is successfully ordered, the recount must be done using physical ballots collected by delegation chairs if we use the second process. Let’s go to second process, a. 2. Vote by physical ballot accompanied by a contemporaneous completion of an electronic vote rather than say “cast vote record”. Now we have it as “cast vote record”. We have electronic voting system but the delegate is going to complete a physical ballot but will do electronic vote as well – hopefully will be the same – but concern is because of human error or whatever, they might not be the same. Physical ballot will be the one that’s going to control ultimate result. Delegates complete the vote; they submit the ballot; the respective delegate gives to delegate chair for placement into designated envelope – maybe got over ambitious in taking physical ballot out of one – we could go back to prior version and put back in if we want – or we could bring that language up into the sub-2 – that scenario would only apply when we use a physical ballot. Then the ballot goes to delegation chair, put it in envelope. That envelope goes to Secretary’s Tellers and they count the election. My concern there is the “official election” because it will rely on physical ballots will be hand counted. But because we ask delegates to contemporaneously complete an electronic vote, then we may be able to still realize they could announce we have this electronic result; however, we need to maybe verify that through a hand-counted process. That’s the alternative we have there. Think that’s how I understand how the process plays out. Logistically with that second one you have a problem especially since we all know how long it takes to hand count results. What are we going to do in a series of officer elections? Would we get a preview vote? How could that affect subsequent officer elections? That’s a logistic issue I see happening. Maybe that means we work around that? I am open to more questions.

BRACCO: This section after 2. as it's currently written, are you saying it would also apply to 1?

LATHAM: Yes. It's not going to work. We need to put the old language back in – or just bring up the language just highlighted and just put it at end of 2.

BRACCO: Point of parliamentary inquiry. Have we already moved to substitute or remove Version 7 and insert Version 8? Is Version 8 the main motion at this time or is it still a substitute?

MOELLMAN: Main motion at this time. At beginning asked if there was objection to substitution. There was not. That made 8 the motion on the floor.

LATHAM: Let me jump in. ROWLETTE has a motion in chat saying he was going to defer and shift his vote to the next alternate. (ROWLETTE having hook-up/audio problems).

ROWLETTE DEFER TO DEAN ROGERS (A7) AT APPROXIMATELY 9:55 PM.

MOELLMAN: Stay on. We are not going to cut you out due to technical issues. BRACCO, were you finished or did you have more?

BRACCO: Would like to move that this section **and which ballot the delegates give to their respective delegation chair for placement into a designated envelope provided for this purpose** will be gone. Strike that semicolon. Do not need it.

LATHAM: Maybe a comma instead of the semicolon?

MOELLMAN: Okay. That is a motion.

BRACCO: As it's written applies to an electronic ballot. That is not possible. This provision can only apply to option 2. We should put it within option 2. Because otherwise we might be making this entire thing impossible to do through option 1.

LATHAM: Nothing else.

MOELLMAN: Not seeing any other hands up for discussion on this amendment. (No Response). Is there any objection to this amendment? Not seeing any hand up or hearing any objection, **Adopted. Without Objection.** (Motion to strike ~~and which ballot the delegates give to their respective delegation chair for placement into a designated envelope provided for this purpose.~~ (Contained at end of RULE 3, 6. A. 2.) We are now back to the main motion. When we argue electronic voting, is the intent that a delegate will be casting an electronic ballot and a paper ballot at the same time? They are doing both of those things and handing in the paper ballot but they have also cast an electronic ballot? Is that the intent?

LATHAM: Again this is HARLOS'S proposal but that is way I read the language. Wish she were here to explain it more. Believe that is intention, yes.

MOELLMAN: But in your language, that is not the intent. The intent is electronic or a physical ballot, one or the other?

LATHAM: Right and open to both. We could go with just "electronic ballot" rather than a dual system. Open to aversion but that was in prior substitute, where the electronic ballot would spit out something physical that could be counted by the tellers.

MOELLMAN: Not trying to engage in debate here. Just trying to think why logically there is path to logical result. My personal thought is if an electronic ballot happens, you would want to have the ability to print out the ballots but not kill a small rain forest every time. The option could be there but it is not required. That's my gut and how I feel. It would kind of move things along. Do believe that everything we have done here is better but that's not the hill will want to die on.

BRACCO: Do not believe there is any pending substitute. Is that correct?

MOELLMAN: Correct. We are back on main motion.

BRACCO: Would like to propose – if I'm reading it correct HARLOS proposed that this appears to refer to this (7) and not necessarily the entire proposal. Not sure it would qualify as a substitute or whether it would qualify as an amendment? We have been amending a lot of the main motion. I am not sure if this is enough to qualify as a substitute.

MOELLMAN: You would be striking the proposed and putting in what is proposed as 7 but it would be fixed –

LATHAM: It's 8.

MOELLMAN: Yes, it would be 8. there. Do believe that is the intent. Does LATHAM have additional information?

LATHAM: Would ask members to compare that to HARLOS'S version and what is in 8th substitute we are looking at now. A lot of same items are there. "Electronic ballot may be used", you will see that in 6., 7, 7. a. contemporaneous manual ballots. That is in our now 6. a.2. Report is generated by delegation 7.b. which is now 6.b. Worded a little different. Members may want to see if it is meaningfully different. 7.c. is alternative is captured in 6.c. on write-ins. We will go to work on that. That will only apply now to a vote that is conducted under 6.a.2. We will have to put language in there "if a recount is successfully ordered, the recount must be done using the physical ballots collected by

the Delegation Chairs.”, 6.a.2. Think that’s how to fix that. In our last meeting HARLOS talked about—and this is in response to your question BRACCO – why do we have a problem with doing a recount with an electronic vote? That would concern if something funky is going on, if its rigged in some way or compromised. You are just rerunning the compromised data. We talked about open source and ways to protect against that. To recount an electronic ballot, you kind of rerun the data and that’s your recount. You don’t need physical ballots in 8. If we roll with language we have right now, the recount of physical ballots only applies to 6.a.2. version.

BRACCO: Think we should put these two versions of this rule or rules, we should put them head to head and would move that we amend the proposal to replace this electronic ballot with this (7. 7, a, b, c, and 8).

MOELLMAN: And number appropriately. BRACCO has made a motion to amend striking the current 6. and replacing with a renumbered appropriate for what is in purple.

BRACCO: Like LATHAM’S procedure better. However, the language is very wordy in my eyes. Think that having language that wordy, regardless of what the procedure is, is going to be a turn-off to the delegates. We are asking them to do something that very paranoid people would object to sort of on its surface. Making them read complicated wording to try to untangle it – because we in this committee having just looked at this for at least the last meeting and perhaps some of the previous meeting as well – we are still trying to untangle that process a bit. It’s not coming through clearly in the language. Don’t know if there is good way to do this but would prefer – my ideal would be to include a provision that allows this within this language and want to give us opportunity to do that. (7, 7. a., b. ,c., 8.)

MOELLMAN: Parliamentary inquiry, can you quickly select the two amendments and do a quick inquiry. Believe WORD can do that, count the words.

BRACCO: Amendment 126 words. Original 163 words.

MOELLMAN: About 40 more words or 33 percent more.

LATHAM: Motion would be to amend this amendment. 7.a. let’s change ~~delegation hair~~ to delegation chair.

MOELLMAN: Yes, a typo. Do not need motion for that correction.

LATHAM: “Electronic voting” that should be “Electronic balloting”. On 7.a. on “contemporaneous” there do you want to change ~~manual~~ to physical? Then at the end strike ~~vote~~ before “tellers”. We have just been using only “tellers” in other proposals (7.a. and 7.b.). 7.c., would want to change “~~voting~~” to “balloting”? Lets tackle that first.

But where we want “electronic balloting” is 7.a.1. and 7.a.2. Then we change 8. So recount would just be for 7.a. Let’s move those amendments.

MOELLMAN: So you are making motion to amend the amendment striking the word ~~voting~~ to become balloting; striking the word ~~manual~~ to become physical and striking the word ~~vote~~ before “tellers” and striking the word ~~voting~~ to become balloting again; and that’s it for the moment?

LATHAM: Yes.

MOELLMAN: Do you need to speak to that further?

LATHAM: No. Don’t believe so.

MOELLMAN: Is there any objection to this amendment to the amendment? (No Response). **ADOPTED. WITHOUT OBJECTION.** Back to the amendment. **THE TEXT OF THE HARLOS/BRACCO AMENDMENT DOES NOT APPEAR IN THESE MINUTES** (when more than two changes, wise to show entire amendment but did not have as too many before and after these changes. Will delete. No problem. If not there, it’s not there)

LATHAM: BRACCO, put this language into chat so we can all play with it a little bit, 7.a. now. Where is part we don’t do contemporaneous physical ballots? Guess we could create an a.1. and an a.2. That’s the puzzle right now.

MOELLMAN: It does not currently exist as I read it. BRACCO, scroll up a bit. Want to see if there is something about a convention requiring to approve.

LATHAM: Believe it is in – we might need to look at comparison version. It’s not within the amendment but it’s after “publication at least 90 days prior”. So right there is added “, and following the convention’s approval”. Don’t know if we want to put in “as specified in the order of business”. That might be too limiting or maybe it would come outside of the order of business. Would it be too confusing?

BRACCO: Would like to make following amendment. Let me read through this.

MOELLMAN: Real quick to avoid one coming up, the words “the convention”, we used the word “the” rather than perhaps using the word “that” convention. Reason I ask is somebody somewhere can say, “Oh, we authorized this last convention. We don’t need to do this again.” Whereas if you use the word “that” convention it means that specific convention. Don’t care but that’s how I read it personally. I’m okay with it as long as we don’t think “the” convention is going to be abused. It’s your motion but it’s just to consider while we are here. Please consider motions to help perfect this.

BRACCO: Doesn't flow languagewise. Could say "each convention" or maybe "at outset of each convention". Although might have scenario where we want to do in the middle.

MOELLMAN: Thought on that was we have an agenda item and at that point it is a majority vote; right?

BRACCO: Yes, up or down.

MOELLMAN: In order to go back to it and say maybe we should not have done that electronic voting after all. This is horrible. It would be a motion to suspend the rules; right or reconsider? We could go back and it might take 2/3 but the door is not completely closed on it if the convention body suddenly has mass buyers' remorse after the fact.

LATHAM: But must be approved? Why do we need "must be? Can't it be "and if approved by that convention"? Maybe the "pending convention" or "current convention"? What about our parliamentary folks? J.J. is here; Sylvia is here.

J.J. JACOBS: Please state the question.

MOELLMAN: Looking for opinion on best way to make sure that a vote to allow electronic balloting only applies to the current convention. That one convention cannot approve it for another, for a future convention going forward?

LATHAM: Believe rules just roll over from one convention to the next. Don't believe they are voted on.

J.J. JACOBS: Believe LATHAM is correct. There are basically a permanent set of rules.

MOELLMAN: In the past there has been a whole lot of what is classified as tradition by some ruling of some chair, three or five conventions ago. It becomes part of our process and never gets codified anywhere.

J.J. JACOBS: How about changing to "each convention"?

MOELLMAN: This is your amendment, BRACCO, so you are entitled to put whatever you want to in there.

MARTIN: It is in the order of business above for each convention to approve electronic balloting or not. It's in the order of business for each convention whether they want to do it or not. Do they want to do electronic balloting or do they not want to do it?

BRACCO: Would we have to amend it for each or just do it –

MOELLMAN: Have not actually heard you make a motion yet. Believe we are working on words to make a motion. It's your motion. You can do whatever you want. (No Response) Do you have anything else, BRACCO?

BRACCO: No.

LATHAM: What about replacing "must be" with "if"? That's my motion. It achieves the same thing and its shorter.

MOELLMAN: There is no motion on the floor. We are trying to word a motion.

SEEBECK: Hasn't this proposal been made and we are looking to amend it? So there would be a motion on the floor.

MOELLMAN: The green **and must be approved by each convention and it must also include provisions for the following:** has not been moved. You are correct, SEEBECK. The purple is the main amendment and we are working on a secondary amendment to the purple. **7. Electronic balloting may be used instead of manual tabulation by state delegations 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 it must be approved by each convention and it must also include provisions for the following:**

SEEBECK: Blue is main motion; right?

MOELLMAN: Blue is main motion, right. 7. is the motion to amend. Green is attempt at a motion to amend the amendment.

SEEBECK: Got it.

J.J. JACOBS: Want to point out that an order of business can be suspended. So putting something in there would not be the same as making it a rule of this type.

MOELLMAN: What is written here currently would not be considered in the nature of a rule or order?

J.J. JACOBS: It would be technically in the nature of a rule or order but you could not suspend it in advance for the next convention. Only thing you could do technically if adopted would be to suspend it and prevent electronic balloting taking place.

BRACCO: Would officially like to make this motion. To add the green **if approved** and strike ~~E~~ and make it lower case e.

MOELLMAN: Do you need to speak to it?

BRACCO: We have to have something in here to say the default is you cannot use the default on electronic balloting but you can approve it but you would have to suspend

the rules and it takes 2/3 – Would be more comfortable with you have to approve it first no matter what . There is no let's jump to it, to an electronic ballot.

LATHAM: Like this proposed amendment because it's short and clean. However, I took J.J.'S comment a different way, that we need to actually bulk it up a little bit if approved. Approved by whom? Guess default assumption is the convention delegates but are we sure? And, when approved. Yes, we have order of business but it seems we ought to defer to that in some way. Seems like we need to add more detail but will throw it out there again to the parliamentarians if we need to be a little more specific. We talked about just limiting it to one convention. Don't know if order of business will be enough.

MOELLMAN: This language don't think precludes what you said. Would suggest the amendment is an improvement towards what you are going toward. Maybe we can have additional language. Don't think it will preclude addressing your concerns.

J.J. JACOBS: Want to assure LAHAM that this could only be adopted by the delegates. These rules can only be changed, adopted, modified, however you want to phrase it, by the delegates. That would not be an issue. Also would not suggest this be suspend. Putting it into the order of business sets a time for it to be considered. That time could be modified by suspending the rules and taking it out of order. You can also lay something on the table and tend to it at a later time. That's another way to do it. You may want to say specifically you don't want to move this stuff around and you have to do this first before you do it. It would be sufficient at least in my opinion to accomplish what I think everyone from what I'm hearing wishes to accomplish. Hope that's helpful.

BRACCO: Point of parliamentary inquiry. The way existing order of business is phrased, this would be a majority vote; correct? Then to suspend the rules to move this around would be 2/3 vote? Is that also correct?

ARROWWOOD: Yes.

MOELLMAN: Unless one of the parliamentarians wants to overrule me, that's how I would rule. You could suspend the rules or reconsider, but it would need a motion to suspend the rules.

J. J. JACOBS: Yes and no. Would take a 2/3 vote to suspend the rules and take the item out of order. However, you could also do something such as table the various reports when pending and change the order around that way. That only takes a majority vote and that is perfectly in order.

MOELLMAN: Point well taken. You can always pick it back up.

BRACCO: If you have the majority vote to lay something on the table to basically avoid approving electronic voting, if some voting block had that support, would not they just be able to vote electronic voting down when it comes up in standard agenda? Guess that's kind of my thought here. If you can approve by a majority, you can disallow it by a majority as well?

MOELLMAN: If someone in a group that was large enough that was intentionally playing games for instance to not authorize electronic balloting in particular races or for particular items, where they could shift the schedule around and whatnot; that would only require a majority. In theory they could make the chair paper ballots and the vice chair and is on electronic because it hasn't been authorized yet. Somebody could make a motion after the chair's race and decide to bring it back. Someone might do that for political reasons. Having been to a lot of conventions, suspect the scenario would be more likely that after the first vote and get to the chair's race someone could say, wow, that took two and a half hours, really too long, and maybe we should try the electronic thing? Would suspect that would be a more likely scenario. You know it is politics and anything can be gamed or happen no matter how much we write. Reason RONR is so lengthy is because of people trying to game the system for the better part of the century and it still is not perfect because in the end people who wish to game the system can do nefarious things. Sometimes a majority or 2/3 can stop them. Personally, I'm not so worried about the gaming of the system because have watched people try to do that and it fails every time but it is there. It never works, not while I've been involved.

Anyone else want to speak to this amendment? (No Response). Is there any objection? You can object vocally or with a hand-up or hand-raise. (No Response). **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION. Amendment to the Amendment has been amended.**

LATHAM: Move an amendment at the beginning of 7.a. to insert the words if contemporaneous physical ballots are used, those and then we just continue on with the existing language. We had the language to accommodate each delegate's ability to cast an electronic ballot. That is kind of a default now. So we could use an electronic ballot now without using a contemporaneous physical ballot. The additional language presents the option that we could also use contemporaneous physical ballots and if we do that, this is the process that we use. The words "are used" how do the delegates express their preference for that? That is question that comes up for me. Do we need to do a separate vote on that? Is "use" the proper word? That's where I'm at. We can decide when we take the vote.

MOELLMAN: Want to speak on this quickly. Like this language a lot. However, don't know what HARLOS'S intent was on this phraseology. Trying, if she was trying to force it, always have a physical ballot along with an electronic ballot, delegates are going to have to do both. Kind of feels that way and would really like to hear her reasoning behind that. She has been in charge of the tellers who do the counting and I'd really like to know what that was about. We have about 23 or so minutes left in this meeting. Don't think we will get this completely done. If this were to pass would like to ask body to allow HARLOS to bring back the original language, although not regularly done, as she may have a reason. Don't want to put us in a situation that we have to go through this again – probably could fix it with Robert's – but want to make sure it is understood that while I personally support this language also want to hear from HARLOS as to why she chose this route.

LATHAM: Agree. Would make same point. Maybe could do motion to reconsider if we needed to but want to echo that.

ARROWWOOD: Could we strike ~~if~~ and insert when?

LATHAM: It's to give ourselves an option. If we say "when" then we lock ourselves in. Where in our convention process do we make that determination of using a contemporaneous physical ballot or not.

MOELLMAN: This language as it sits right now if it were to pass and everything else were to pass that the proposal that comes forward as to how the voting system would work would have to include or exclude using physical ballots in conjunction with electronic or only electronic. That would be determined early in the convention whether we use only electronic or physical. That's my gut and how I understand this would work right now. Open to other interpretations.

BRACCO: This whole structure requires a proposal **PROPOSED** (will remove) system and that system has to be 90 days in advance. We are required to do that and then is it correct that that proposed system would either be fully an electronic system or it could be all contemporaneous physical ballots; it could be either or? It is either yes or no from the delegates and that's how the delegates would decide; would that be correct?

MOELLMAN: From my interpretation that's right. If the system that is proposed does not support contemporaneous physical ballots, then it cannot pass. **If system is supported, it could not happen. ???NOT CLEAR WHAT THIS MEANS???** (sounds like on audio) Would have to be a situation that could be in order for it to be able to be voted on. Whatever is proposed has to support whatever the delegates pass. There would be chance to amend the system but insofar as the system would support that amendment. You can't vote on the impossible.

LATHAM: As MOELLMAN said you could finagle this at the beginning. It's not just up or down. Say a convention says we are doing contemporaneous physical ballots and take it or leave it. If convention wanted to go straight electronic balloting, they could do that. Don't think impossibility is going to be the case here because it would not be terribly difficult for the delegates to say, hey we are just going to use OPAvote for example or hey we are going to use OPAvote and also have people write on a piece of paper their voting choice for this election. So it could be done. You would probably get inertia with the system published 90 days in advance.

BRACCO: Point of parliamentary inquiry. The fact that it will be published 90 days in advance, the fact that that is necessary, would that restrict the delegates from amending that published proposal?

MOELLMAN: Great question. It says "published" but its notice, "written notice" – so it is "notice".

J. J. JACOBS: My understanding is you have to give the actual method for voting 90 days in advance on the website; is that correct?

MOELLMAN: We use the term "written notice" and when it is used, "written notice of the system used is published on the party's website at least 90 days prior to the regular convention".

J. J. JACOBS: That would limit you. That could not be suspended. You would be locked into that method. Could say we are going to use method A or method B or you could list multiples and say come up with one. That could be in order but if you are going to specify a particular system, that would be only particular system you could use. If you were to use Porcupine, you could only use Porcupine or a manual ballot. Not suggesting Porcupine as there are problems with it. That would be only method you could use. If you were to authorize Porcupine and Scantron, then you could use both those options.

MOELLMAN: Let's say it says electronic and physical will be used for each vote. Delegates say we don't want to do physical. We just want to do electronic. Would they be able to sever those two? Would they be able to say we are only doing electronic?

J. J. JACOBS: Way it is worded now, this would allow delegates to just have electronic ballots.

LATHAM: Let's scroll down to the recount language.

J. J. JACOBS: No. you would be required to have physical ballots as well. You probably should say electronic and physical ballots at some point because you are almost creating an ambiguity here. Don't want to do that.

LATHAM: Artifact. Looking at 8. now.

MOELLMAN: Looking at it as well. Kind of falls into – goes into intent of HARLOS as said earlier. Will not speak to that as not quite sure. We have about ten minutes left. Do not think we have actually made this motion yet; right? We did, okay. There is motion on the floor. LATHAM, would you have any objection if we postpone this to our next meeting? That way HARLOS can be here to tell us what she is trying to accomplish with the physical and electronic combined versus one or the other.

LATHAM: Do not have objection to that. ~~2 (take out?)~~ Although we could kind of proceed through and I believe it is consensus of this committee that we can go back and if we are told that, no that's not what she meant, we can accommodate those changes. The value in doing these changes once you see it in writing maybe your thoughts on how this would work -- maybe that changes or not your mind. That happens to all of us as to what the intention is there and the language used to explain or further an intent. I do have another amendment.

BRACCO: Are you asking for a motion to postpone to the next meeting, the July 27th meeting?

MOELLMAN: Yes. Asking LATHAM if he would be okay with that, if we postpone this particular amendment until July 27th when HARLOS can join us and speak?

LATHAM: Is it just the green or the entire proposal?

MOELLMAN: At this time just the green in 6. a. **if contemporaneous physical ballots are used, those**. It is my intent not to pass this amendment. Given the time we have left – and we have another motion coming on 8. which will be of the same nature and probably related. We would pick back up with HARLOS'S amendment as the next order of business and then we have one or two items that have been postponed. That's my intent; put it that way. My intent is to suggest that HARLOS has the opportunity to speak specifically to this given her credentials and her experiences.

LATHAM: Motion to postpone.

MOELLMAN: We are moving to postpone the amendment in green to our next meeting. Is there objection? Raise your hand or speak. Do not care. (No Response).

LATHAM: There are some motions in the chat so would move to adjourn and maintain our parliamentary posture. We can pick up where we left off at our next meeting.

MOELLMAN: Hoping to see your proposal on No. 8. We can get a sneak peek at that after we adjourn. What we have done so far can be published to the list. Really feel that we are super close.

LATHAM: Agree.

BRACCO: Motion to adjourn.

MOELLMAN: Hearing no objection we are adjourned at 8:45 PM.

DRAFT ONLY 7-20 12:44 PM 7-21-1:25AM 7-29 at 11:31