

SD51 Constitution Committee Report

Members: David Meyer (Chair), Michael Tierney, Joseph Witthuhn

Three amendments were proposed and the committee recommends that all three be adopted. The changes below show added language underlined below and removed language struck through. Each amendment will be voted on separately and requires a 2/3 majority of the voting strength as established by the final credentials report.

Proposal 1: Clarify Language on Executive Committee Replacements after Resignations Due to Absences

Article IV, Section V provides that if you an executive committee member is absent from three consecutive executive committee meetings, they may be considered resigned. We always interpreted that to mean that an executive committee member may make a motion and the committee would vote. It then says that a replacement will be nominated by the executive committee and elected by the full committee in accordance with Section II, Subsection D. I believe this meant to be Subsection "E", but the language in this paragraph is inconsistent with Section V, and only mentions the Executive Committee voting on a replacement. The language in Section V seems to clearly require a Full Committee vote, but the section it references contains conflicting information.

For all other executive committee vacancies, whether by resignation, a member moving out of the district, removal by the full committee, or by failure of a convention to elect, the vacancy is filled by the remaining members of the executive committee. This amendment makes this case the same as all of those others.

Proposed Change to Article IV:

Section V – **ATTENDANCE** - Attendance at meetings is crucial to the work of the basic political organizational unit (BPOU), therefore:

Should any officer of the Executive Committee be absent from three (3) consecutive meetings, unless they have been excused by the Executive Committee, they may be considered resigned (if a motion to consider them resigned is passed by the executive committee). ~~and a replacement nominated by the Executive Committee and elected by the District Full Committee in accordance with section II, subsection D.~~

Proposal 2: Count Seated Alternates Towards Quorums at Conventions

There is ambiguity and uncertainty around whether seated alternates could count towards a quorum at our conventions. One reading was that Article VII Section I specifically stated "delegates elected at the precinct caucuses" which would exclude them. Another reading was that Article VII Section II expressly allowed them (by stating that "seated alternates" are included in the "composition" of a convention). If we went with the more restrictive version, we would have been one delegate away from missing a quorum at the HD51B convention where we endorsed Pat Hammond, despite the presence of many duly elected seated alternates. This amendment will remove any doubt for future cases.

Proposed Change to Article VII:

Section I – **CONVENTIONS** -The Senate District 51 Convention shall be held annually at the Call of the State Executive Committee, the State Central Committee, or the Senate District 51 Committee preceding Congressional and State Conventions. Special Senate District 51 Conventions may be held at the Call of the State Executive Committee, the State Central Committee, or the Senate District 51 Committee at such time and for such purpose as the calling Committee may determine. Senate District 51 Conventions shall be held at a place determined by the Senate District 51 Executive Committee. The call shall be sent out in writing via US Postal Service or handed out at the Precinct Caucuses at least ten (10) days prior to the Convention. A quorum shall consist of 35% of the total delegates elected at the Precinct Caucuses. However, a quorum shall consist of 20% of the total delegates elected at the Precinct Caucuses for odd-year conventions only. Seated alternates shall be counted towards fulfilling a quorum.

Proposal 3: Database Access for Recommended Candidates

This changes Article VII, Section VIII, Paragraph E, Point 1 to include recommended candidates. This is sort of a moot point, as the State Party controls this access, not us, and their policy is to allow access for recommended candidates. This change would allow us to share our own lists with those candidates. Withholding those lists is silly given the much more sensitive data that they can access through the state party's database. If we trust them with our recommendation, and with that data, we should help them to win.

Proposed Change to Article VII, Section VIII, Paragraph E:

1. Only Republican candidates endorsed or recommended in the current election year, or winners of Republican primary elections, shall have the authorization to use the Republican Database. That use must and only be for their ~~the candidates'~~ or winners own election activities.