

BYLAWS AND RULES COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES APRIL 4, 2024

Meeting called to order at 9:02 PM EDT BY Chair Harlos

MEMBERS	ALTERNATES	GUESTS
SYLVIA ARROWWOOD		RICHARD BROWN
PAUL BRACCO		JJ JACOBS
NICHOLAS CIESIELSKI		LARRY SILVER
CARYN ANN HARLOS		
ROB LATHAM		
FRANK MARTIN		
CHUCK MOULTON		
DAVE ROBERSON (A2)		
ROGER ROOTS (A4)		
MIKE SEEBECK		

ABSENT: TOM ROWLETTE, MIKE RUFO

PUBLIC COMMENT: HARLOS: If any minority reports, write, format and distribute yourself. Party does not pay for any of that. If minority reports finalized before we turn in our report, will include. Will slip it in there. Please don't produce the day before as someone is going to have to do the work, copy and distribute.

COC committee will not allow any papers to be distributed on the delegate tables. Only official convention business is allowed on tables. That would include minority reports. Our report is expected by the 20th. It could be a day or two late, but it could be inserted into a three-ring binder but best to have in on time. Platform Committee will take a little longer and we could too but it's a matter of if there is someone there early enough to be inserting into the binders.

JACOBS: Might be wise to insert a clause relating to unsuspendability of cumulative voting.

HARLOS: Cumulative voting was going to be in standing rules. Bylaws can authorize alternative voting and authorize alternative forms of voting which has to do with approval voting.

JACOBS: My opinion was it would be advisable to have greater than a 7/8^{ths} vote.

HARLOS: Bylaws would authorize it but it would be in the standing rules.

JACOBS: You could amend the rule but not suspend it.

HARLOS: If no one objects, we can stick it on there.

There was discussion about video restructuring with MOELLMAN and MOULTON. Seems to be two groups within the body and those that are really in love with regionals. But, there are some who do not understand cumulative voting. We are trying to find a way to unite the clan. Will ask MOULTON to tell us a little about his discussion with MOELLMAN.

MOULTON: Think discussion went fairly well. Agreed on some things and disagreed on others. MOELLMAN stated he did not think his proposal was going to pass and there was debate about whether this one would pass. He thinks national should be subservient to the state. He also stated he would favor eliminating the at-larges. There are people on both sides of that debate. Not too much static about cumulative voting. A concern was that if there were cumulative voting, then the LNC could remove people which we are trying to protect against with another bylaws change.

HARLOS: Our policy manual right now covers what we are trying to get into the bylaws. Will watch that video when have a chance.

MOULTON: Want to make public comment of my own. Am interested in putting a couple minority reports of my own. Will check the email to see if other committee members are willing to sign on. Main thing was restructure of the LNC proposal whether it should take effect immediately or one convention later. Another concern is proposal that we may end up withdrawing anyway, affiliates.

DISCUSSION RELATED TO MINORITY REPORTS

HARLOS: RONR 46:43 and 45:62 where it talks about preferential voting will be looked into next meeting. Would like to go back to agenda now. Some people ask for approval voting of officers. You can only use if expressly expressed in the bylaws.

MINUTES APPROVAL: Minutes of March 28, 2024 **APPROVED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

HARLOS: Back to candidate reconsideration. Reconsideration Proposal 10, candidate elimination. Thanks to all for the workshopping we did on this. On the bottom is LATHAM'S substitute. Primary is No. 2. at the top and next underneath it is a substitute. Would like informal discussion.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION AND DEBATE AS TO SUBSTITUTES TO PROPOSAL 10 (PRIOR F)

HARLOS: Is there anyone here who has objection to the first two which no longer exist and we will start with the third one that we have all had an opportunity to workshop by email? (No Response) We will start with the third one which is the new proposal. We can amend it fresh. Let's read it out loud because reading out loud can bring out an error that we don't see when it is written.

2. The convention special rules of order may provide mechanisms for eliminating candidates on subsequent rounds of voting for the same office. ~~Which~~ Should they exist these rules can only be suspended for one round at a time. Any candidate so eliminated will be ineligible for further consideration for that race. No write-in votes are permitted and any such votes will not be credited to any candidate nor counted as a ballot cast.

HARLOS: We are now in amendment and debate mode.

DEBATE AND AMENDMENT AS TO PROPOSAL 10 (PRIOR F), ARTICLE 15 ALTERNATIVE VOTING PROCEDURES

SEEBECK: Move “further” before “consideration”. I agree.

HARLOS: Any debate or objection to insert “further” before “consideration”? (No Response)

AMENDED WITHOUT OBJECTION.

FURTHER DEBATE AND AMENDMENT TO PROPOSAL 10

BRACCO: Offer an amendment. Put a period “.” After “same office.” Strike the word ~~which~~ and insert Should they exist, these rules can only be . . . Will put in chat as well.

DEBATE ON AMENDMENT

HARLOS: Any further debate on the amendment? What we are voting on is inserting a period after the words “same office”, strike the word ~~which~~ and then make a new sentence Should they exist, these rules can only be suspended for . . . A Yes Vote would adopt this and a No Vote would not.

ARROWWOOD	YES
BRACCO	YES
CIESIELSKI	YES
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
LATHAM	ABSTAIN
MARTIN	NO
MOULTON	YES
ROBERSON (A2)	YES
ROOTS (A4)	YES
SEEBECK	YES

AMENDMENT ADOPTED VOTE 7-1-2

FURTHER DEBATE

MOULTON: Move to amend this by saying No write-in votes are permitted on subsequent rounds of voting.

DEBATE ON AMENDMENT

RICHARD BROWN ENTERED ZOOM MEETING AT APPROXIMATELY 10:00 PM

HARLOS: Not moving to consider striking entire amendment and replacing it with what is below.

Write-in votes are permitted on the first round only and any such vote on subsequent rounds of voting will not be credited to any candidate nor counted as a ballot cast.

Does anyone care to debate or move it?

MOULTON: Ask permission to withdraw my amendment and insert instead language on screen.

HARLOS: Any objection to MOULTON withdrawing his amendment. Instead he would be

substituting the language at the bottom? This does not pass the amendment. It is switching it around. (No Response) MOULTON is suggestion to strike out the last sentence and insert the one on the bottom. Is there any debate or amendment on this fresh amendment? (No Response). We will come to a vote. Yes Vote would strike the last sentence and insert the highlighted section. No vote would leave the last sentence in the fresh amendment. Is there any objection to that?

SEEBECK: Objection.

ARROWWOOD	YES	
BRACCO	NO	
CIESIELSKI	YES	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	NO	
MARTIN	NO	
MOULTON	YES	
ROBERSON (A2)	NO	
ROOTS (A4)	NO RESPONSE	
SEEBECK	NO	FAILED VOTE 3-5-1-1

SEEBECK: Is there a proviso on this proposal?

HARLOS: No. Don't think there needs to be.

LATHAM: Write-ins could be declared but not official.

HARLOS: There is a motion to suspend the rules and reopen nominations for whatever reason.

DEBATE AS TO MAIN

HARLOS: Any objection to passing this as proposal in place of one we had before? (No Response)

ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.

PROPOSAL OO NATIONAL POLICIES AND DIRECTIVES INFORMAL DISCUSSION

HARLOS: Substitute. Don't think particularly different between HARLOS and LATHAM'S, so a primary and substitute.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION PRIOR TO AMENDMENT

HARLOS: On the primary strike everything after "ordered to remediate" ~~either by the remedy sought by the appellant or another conforming remedy.~~ Is there any objection to striking the last wording, items in red from primary? (No Response) **STRICKEN FROM PRIMARY WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

Propose an amendment. Think this whole phrase is not necessary and it's overly broad. Move to strike ~~or those documents to which these bylaws refer.~~ Anyone like to debate that point?

(No Response) Is there any objection to that amendment to strike? (No Response)

AMENDMENT ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.

Any further debate on the primary or amendment?

LATHAM: Move to strike ~~If an action is vetoed by the Judicial Committee, it shall be declared null and void.~~ and insert The Judicial Committee shall void contravening actions.

HARLOS: Debate?

DEBATE ON AMENDMENT

HARLOS: Yes Vote would strike out red ~~If an action is vetoed by the Judicial Committee, it shall be declared null and void.~~ and insert The Judicial Committee shall void contravening actions. A

No Vote would keep the language in red and the insert will be gone.

ARROWWOOD	ABSTAIN	
BRACCO	NO	
CIESIELSKI	NO	
HARLOS	ABSTAIN	
LATHAM	YES	
MARTIN	NO	
MOULTON	NO	
ROBERSON (A20)	NO	
ROOTS (A4)	NO	
SEEBECK	ABSTAIN	FAILED VOTE 1-6-3

HARLOS: Back on main primary. Any further amendment or debate to the main primary? (No Response) Now on the substitute.

MOULTON: Move we amend the substitute in same way we amended the primary. Put in a period after the word “remediate” and remove the words ~~through the remedy sought by any petitioner or another appropriate remedy.~~ in the last sentence.

HARLOS: Any objection to this amendment? (No Response) **AMENDEDMENT ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

LATHAM: Move the language I tried to move in the primary into the substitute. Hopefully what I said previously suffices.

HARLOS: Any objection to the amendment to the substitute? (No Response) That is adopted. **AMENDMENT ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION.**

Any further amendment to the substitute? (No Response) Any further amendment to the substitute? (No Response) We are not quite at the head-to-head portion. Question now is shall the substitute become the primary? We can debate that. Is there any debate?

DEBATE AS TO PRIMARY OVER SUBSTITUTE

HARLOS: Question is shall the substitute become the primary? Yes Vote would get rid of the primary at the top. No Vote would not. It would do opposite. Then we would vote on whether to adopt the one at the bottom.

ARROWWOOD	NO
BRACCO	NO
CIESIELSKI	NO
HARLOS	ABSTAIN
LATHAM	ABSTAIN
MARTIN	NO
MOULTON	NO
ROBERSON (A2)	NO
ROOTS (A4)	NO
SEEBECK	NO

FAILED VOTE 0-8-2

HARLOS: There can be debate on whether to adopt as a proposal. No further amendment except to add. Does not touch existing language.

MOULTON: Move this be adopted as a yellow. Number of proposals we have in main report is a good number. Later we can decide if we want to make Proposal 6 into a yellow and maybe bring one of the yellows into our main report. Would be against adding any more proposals to our main report without deleting any.

HARLOS: If we adopt this proposal, would put it at the end. Any further debate?

DEBATE

SEEBECK: Call for orders of the day.

LATHAM: Move to extend time for five minutes for debate.

HARLOS: Okay. Any objection to extending time for five minutes? (No Response) We are extended for five minutes.

DEBATE TO CONTINUE FOR FIVE MINUTES

HARLOS: Motion on floor by MOULTON is to make this proposal yellow. A Yes Vote will do that. No vote brings it back to us as to whether we will pass it at all and if we do pass it, it goes into report with understanding that it is the Chair's intention to put it at the end. If you wish to place it somewhere else, that would require another motion later. We would most likely have to put that on the next agenda. Yes Vote would move it to yellow. No Vote would put it into the final report.

ARROWWOOD	NO
BRACCO	NO
CIESIELSKI	YES
HARLOS	ABSTAIN

LATHAM	ABSTAIN
MARTIN	NO
MOULTON	YES
ROBERSON (A2)	YES
ROOTS (A4)	YES
SEEBECK	YES

ADOPTED VOTE 5-3-2

HARLOS: This is passed unto next meeting. Notice for next meeting that we move other one into yellow. Am going to move to reconsider putting this into the report. Want to give notice of my intention. Was not on losing side; I abstained.

Next meeting will be the 11th. We cannot meet on the 18th. We can work on the list. Next on agenda is to discuss the survey including yellow-lined Proposal 6. Received more responses to survey. Will be updating that and will send out next six proposals. What is in spreadsheet is those that had comments. Raw numbers better looked at in a bar graph. Cannot give you that because it has party-sensitive information with peoples' phone numbers, emails and all of that. You will see some bar graphs. There were close to 500 comments.

MOULTON: Would like to see some sort of preferences for the yellows. Would like to know what the committee as a whole thinks is important of these yellow proposals. Want to figure that out.

HARLOS: Have a yellow report but it's not in any order. Will put that together soon.

SEEBECK: Please put titles of proposals in so we know.

HARLOS: No problem. So you know, it took about four hours to do that. It's listed by proposal number in our draft report. Will stick short titles in. We will meet on the 11th and we are adjourned at 11:17 PM EDT.

DRAFT COPY ONLY 3-11-24 AT 2:06 pm ** 2:21 4:07 PM**