

BYLAWS AND RULES COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES JANUARY 4, 2024

Meeting called to order at 9:05 PM ET

MEMBERS	ALTERNATES (NONE)	ETHAN MATHIS
SYLVIA ARROWWOOD		ANGELA MC ARDLE
PAUL BRACCO	GUESTS	KAT MC ELROY
NICKOLAS CIESIELSKI	TRAVIS BOST	PATRICK MERRITT
CARYN ANN HARLOS	JASON BRAND	CLAYTON SOULTZ
ROB LATHAM	ANDREW CHADDERDON	ZACH TATUM
FRANK MARTIN	WILL HOBSON	JESSICA TEWSKBURY
CHUCK MOULTON	JJ JACOBS	ANDREW WATSON
TOM ROWLETTE	MARRION KAUFMAN	KATHY YENISCAVICH
MIKE RUFO	NATHAN MADDEN	
MIKE SEEBECK	ADRIAN MALAGON	

TOWN HALL: HARLOS: Next Thursday, January 11th.

PUBLIC COMMENT: JACOBS: Expressed concerns about cumulative voting. Noted an accredited delegate can only be removed in a disciplinary matter or by a point of order related to credentials. **WATKINS, BOST, Mc ARDLE, MALAGON, Mc ELROY, CHADDERDON, TATUM, HOBSON, SOULTZ:** Stated were in favor of Proposal RR, revamp of LNC structure to include elimination of regions/regional representatives. **MADDEN** expressed concern that a restructure might be a hard sell to the convention. **HARLOS:** Advised any inquiries as to credentialing should be addressed to the credentials committee and at present there is no intent as to uncredentialing of any delegate.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Dated December 28, 2023 as corrected **APPROVED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

PROPOSAL SS – ARTICLE 15 ALTERNATIVE VOTING PROCEDURES

BRACCO: There are some in the party that do not believe the direction of the party is correct. That on top of regional system, creates a chaotic mess. We could get rid of whole thing and make it far more efficient and provide more accurate representation by getting rid of regionals and instituting cumulative voting and would also apply to the JC.

HARLOS: Whether RR passes or not, we need to get rid of alternates. The whole regional system does not work. Never has. Been played with since beginning of the Party.

LATHAM: Would like to move a substitute now.

HARLOS: Let's discuss it before it is moved.

DEBATE AS TO PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY LATHAM

HARLOS: Not a substitute. It is an amendment. You wish to strike d. and put in Candidates receiving more votes than NOTA provided that each candidate's vote total is greater than the majority or equal to the majority of ballots cast. . . Probably should not spend a half hour rewording this when we have an email list. Maybe put in there somewhere the votes received by NOTA shall be elected. Lot of this is in RONR and doesn't need to be in bylaws.

DEBATE

HARLOS: There are some things that are divisible upon the demand of one person. Believe because of the nature of this, they are related. Anyone can motion to divide if they wish.

MARTIN: Move to end debate on this amendment.

HARLOS: Is there an objection to ending debate? (No Response) Will explain what the vote is. Yes Vote would strike the blue language Candidates receiving the largest vote total, provided that vote total is greater than or equal to the majority of ballots cast shall be elected. No Vote would keep the blue language proposed by BRACCO.

ARROWWOOD	NO	
BRACCO	NO	
CIESIELSKI	NO	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	YES	
MARTIN	NO	
MOULTON	NO	
ROWLETTE	YES	
RUFO	NO	
SEEBECK	NO	FAILED VOTE 2-7-1

HARLOS: There has been some discussion by individuals as to a proviso.

DEBATE AS TO PROVISIO

BRACCO: Move to strike the proviso in its entirety.

FURTHER DEBATE AS TO PROVISIO

ARROWWOOD: Call the question.

HARLOS: Will vote on ending debate and if it passes, we will then move directly to the vote on whether or not to delete the proviso. Is there any objection to going to a vote? There was dissent. Yes Vote will delete the proviso. No Vote will keep it.

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

ADOPTED VOTE 8-1-1

HARLOS: Do not see any debate. We can go to a vote on the proposal. We will do a roll call because it is an important proposal. Yes Vote will adopt the proposal. No Vote would defeat it.

ARROWWOOD	YES
BRACCO	YES
CIESIELSKI	YES
HARLOS	YES
LATHAM	YES
MARTIN	YES
MOULTON	YES
ROWLETTE	YES
RUFO	YES
SEEBECK	YES

ADOPTED VOTE 10-0-0

HARLOS: This will not be part of our Town Hall packet but we can still talk about it. Next Proposal expands on cumulative voting. We are not going to get through this in the five minutes that we have. This will be considered at next regular meeting but am seeking the committee’s guidance whether we will stop for the evening or whether we press on and try to pass this, Proposal TT. We might be able to pass this maybe with a ten-minute extension. Is there any objection to us doing that? Say it out loud because not sure why hands are raised.

RUFO: I OBJECT.

HARLOS: There is objection. We will bypass 3 and go directly to 4. SEEBECK is going to extend if necessary. We will vote to amend the agenda. It will take a 2/3 Vote. Yes Vote will move directly to 4. No vote will lead to adjourn.

ARROWWOOD	NO	
BRACCO	YES	
CIESKIELSKI	YES	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	YES	
MARTIN	YES	
MOULTON	YES	
ROWLETTE	YES	
RUFO	NO	
SEEBECK	YES	ADOPTED VOTE 7-2-1

HARLOS: This is TT.

LATHAM: Don’t know that we need SS. Let’s talk about that on the list but let’s talk about TT.

PROPOSAL TT – ARTICLE 10: CONVENTIONS BY LATHAM

LATHAM: Problem: The count of each member and computation of convention delegate allocations for each affiliate is not subject to challenge by any member or affiliate outside of convention or action by the National Committee. A count of members that is too low or a computation that is in error could unfairly disadvantage or advantage an affiliate’s representational capacity at convention. In addition in practice the Secretary has not performed the count or computation. **Solution:** Require the National Committee to ratify, by a reviewable, roll call vote, the count of each

member and computation of convention delegate allocations for each affiliate.

Benefits: Adds accountability and reviewability to the count of each member and computation of convention delegate allocations for each affiliate.

DEBATE AS TO PROPOSAL TT

BRACCO: Move to strike after shall – strike ~~make a count~~ and insert cause the count to be made.

SEEBECK: Move to extend time to 10:15 or a resolution of this proposal whichever comes first.

HARLOS: Any objection to SEEBECK’S motion? (No Response) **ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION** Will move forward with BRACCO’S amendment. Add between the word “and” and “shall” the Secretary.

DEBATE

HARLOS: Divisible on demand. It’s two different concepts. That’s my ruling. Any appeal? (No Response) On to the first sentence.

SEEBECK: Orders of the day.

HARLOS: Is there a motion to extend further?

SEEBECK: Move to extend to 10:30.

HARLOS: Is there any objection to extend for 15 minutes? (No Response) **Extend for 15 additional minutes.** We will be working on the first sentence. Some of this is in the policy manual.

DEBATE

HARLOS: We have a custom of allowing appeals on constructive decisions such as constructive disaffiliation. It would be up to the JC whether someone can appeal that. However, that’s going to be up to a JC. We are coming up on time. Let’s try to workshop this. We passed the first part. The other one we need to work on a little more. Let’s workshop it on the list with the JC as well. Right now still doing approval voting for the JC. May want to make that cumulative voting as well. Can this wait until after adjournment or is it debate?

BRACCO: Can wait until after adjournment.

HAROS: We are at orders of the day. We will workshop this second sentence here and see what we can come up with which will go on the agenda. Town Hall is the 11th. Meeting after that, we are anticipating being done with our proposals. Might not be done but that's what we are proposing. Adjourned at 11:31 PM ET.

DRAFT ONLY 1-11-23 AT 1:54 AM 1-11-23 at 12:04 PM