



FALL 2023 BYLAW PROPOSALS

This page intentionally left blank.

**CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #1
Bylaw proposal submitted by Thomas Weissmiller
Tabled to Fall 2023 Convention at Spring 2023 Convention**

PROPOSED BYLAWS AMENDMENT

From: [T W](#)
To: [Jessica Patterson](#)
Cc: [Danielle Cullum](#); [Membership](#)
Subject: Proposed Bylaw Amendments
Date: Sunday, January 29, 2023 2:43:48 PM
Attachments: [BylawAmendmentProposal_Spring 2023 County Certification Program 220129.docx](#) [BylawAmendmentProposal_Spring 2023 ZeroRegVoters 220129.docx](#) [BylawAmendmentProposal_Spring 2023 Performance&Standards 220129.docx](#) [BylawAmendmentProposal_Spring 2023 Endorsements 220129.docx](#) [BylawAmendmentProposal_Spring 2023 CodeEthicsDecorum 220129.docx](#) [BylawAmendmentProposal_Spring 2023 Board of Directors 220129.docx](#) [BylawAmendmentProposal_Spring 2023 DelegateAppointments 220129.docx](#)

Date: January 29, 2023

From: Thomas Weissmiller
tarzantom@pobox.com
Mobile: 650-218-6386

To: Chairwoman Jessica Patterson
chairwomanpatterson@cagop.org

RE: Delegate Appointments by County Central Committees and Chartered Volunteer Organizations

CAGOP Bylaws are silent concerning the timing when Chairs of County Central Committees and Chartered Volunteer Organizations can make delegate appointments.

We had this situation this year in at least two counties, Alameda and Shasta. The county chairs of 2021-2022 were not reelected to be county chairs for 2023-2024. Both chairs appointed delegates of the CAGOP State Committee prior to their organizational meeting. This is a bad practice that causes division in county central committees and chartered volunteer organizations.

This bylaw amendment limits county chairs and chartered volunteer organizations presidents from appointing delegates to future committees beyond their elected term.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CAGOP BYLAWS

Section 2.01.02 Delegate Appointments

Section 2.01.02 Delegate Appointments

- (A) An appointment of a delegate, once made, shall not be revoked except by the removal process of subsection 2.01.06. Any appointment made by a regular delegate in excess of the number of appointments to which he or she is entitled, is void.
- (B) An appointment of a delegate, to be effective for any convention or meeting of the Committee, shall be made in writing by the person or committee authorized to make such appointment, and shall be made either by personal delivery, email, facsimile, guaranteed overnight delivery, or by delivery by first-class mail, postage pre-paid, to the office of the

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #1
Bylaw proposal submitted by Thomas Weissmiller
Tabled to Fall 2023 Convention at Spring 2023 Convention

Committee set forth in Article III, section 3.08 of these bylaws, and shall be postmarked no later than 17 calendar days before the date on which the convention or meeting convenes.

(C) County Central Committee Chairs and Chartered Volunteer Organization Presidents shall not appoint delegates to the CAGOP State Committee beyond their term as Chair or President.

Tom

Thomas Weissmiller
3rd Vice Chair, SMGOP
Delegate, CRP

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #2
Bylaw proposal submitted by Ron Nehring

From: Ron Nehring <ron@ronnehring.com>
Date: July 20, 2023 at 2:32:40 AM PDT
To: jessica@millanpatterson.com, Bryan Watkins <bwatkins@cagop.org>
Cc: "Matt Shupe (matthewshupe@gmail.com)" <matthewshupe@gmail.com>
Subject: Proposed bylaw amendment concerning endorsed candidates

Please find attached for your consideration a proposed bylaw amendment concerning endorsed candidates.

Sincerely,
Ron Nehring

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #2
Bylaw proposal submitted by Ron Nehring

PROPOSED AMENDMENT CONCERNING “DEEMED ENDORSED CANDIDATES”

Submitted by former CRP Chairman Ron Nehring and Contra Costa Republican Chairman Matt Shupe

Section 3.02.02 Deemed Endorsements for Partisan Elective Office in a Top Two, Special, or Recall Election

CURRENT LANGUAGE

After the Secretary of State’s certification of the primary election results, all Republican Nominees as defined in Section 1.04 (B) shall be deemed to be endorsed by the Committee, absent a Committee decision not to endorse in accordance with Section 3.02.03(A)(3)-(5), and any endorsement for any other candidate for the same office shall be void.

PROPOSED LANGUAGE

Strike existing 3.02.02 and replace with:

- A. All Republican Nominees as defined in Section 1.04 (B) who are currently incumbents seeking re-election to the same office shall be deemed to be endorsed by the Committee, absent a Committee decision to unendorse in accordance with Section 3.02(C), and any endorsement for any other candidate for the same office shall be void. In the event of two incumbents seeking re-election to the same office in the same district as a result of redistricting, this subsection shall not apply, and no endorsement shall be granted unless as prescribed in Section 3.02(B).
- B. Nominees as defined in section 1.04(B) not currently holding the office sought may be endorsed by the committee upon a majority vote of the board of directors, the executive committee, or the committee.
- C. The board of directors, executive committee, or full committee may by 2/3rds vote of those present and voting following a hearing revoke the nominee status of any candidate who brings discredit to the Republican Party.

SUMMARY

The California Republican Party bylaws currently confer the committee’s endorsement automatically any time only one Republican candidate for partisan office moves on to the second round from the top-two primary. This “deemed endorsed” rule is flawed in that it allows any individual, no matter their views or how they reflect on the Republican Party, to claim to have the endorsement of the California Republican Party.

The rule currently constructed has resulted in significant reputational damage to the California Republican Party multiple times.

In 2018, a three-time Democratic candidate, Holocaust denier and blatant anti-Semite running in a heavily Democratic Congressional district, switched to the Republican Party, was the only “Republican” filing for the office, moved on to the second round, and thus earned the party’s “automatic”

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #2
Bylaw proposal submitted by Ron Nehring

endorsement. In effect, by virtue of being the only “Republican” candidate to file in a lopsided Democratic district, this three-time Democrat, anti-Semitic fringe candidate had been endorsed by the California Republican Party. See [Holocaust Denier in California Congressional Race Leaves State G.O.P. Scrambling - The New York Times \(nytimes.com\)](#)

To prevent a repeat of this and similar damaging incidents, the proposed change would limit “deemed endorsements” to incumbents seeking re-election to the same office. Presumably Republican incumbents who have previously been elected to state or federal office will have met a higher standard of scrutiny and conduct, and can still have the endorsement revoked per the current language.

Candidates seeking open seats, or challengers, would be deemed endorsed only following an affirmative vote by either the Board of Directors, the Executive Committee, or the full committee. This requirement of a vote to receive the party’s official endorsement is critically needed to protect the future reputation of the California Republican Party, and to protect Republican candidates from being unwittingly affiliated with endorsed candidates who do not reflect the values and ethics of the Republican Party.

The proposed language also empowers the full Committee, the Board of Directors, or the Executive Committee to revoke a candidate’s nominee status if they bring discredit to the Republican Party. Rather than defining strictly the term “discredit,” the proposed language requires a hearing and has a high threshold (2/3rds vote) to take effect.

Respectfully submitted by former CRP Chairman Ron Nehring and Contra Costa County Republican Chairman Matt Shupe.

This page intentionally left blank.

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #3
Bylaw proposal submitted by Lee DeMeo

Danielle Cullum

From: Lee J DeMeo <lee@leejdemeo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2023 6:17 AM
To: Danielle Cullum; Membership
Subject: Proposed bylaw proposal for Submission
Attachments: Bylaw proposal on Resolutions to be given to Delegates.pdf

Hi Danielle, Chairwomen Patterson and/or Membership,

As I noticed that the deadlines for the upcoming fall Convention are posted on the CAGOP Website, I assume you are taking now bylaw Amendment proposals.

I am hereby submitting the attached bylaw amendment proposal concerning Resolutions.

Please confirm that you have received it and that it is submitted for consideration at this next fall

Convention. Sincerely Yours,

Lee J. De Meo Delegate -
75th AD

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #3
Bylaw proposal submitted by Lee DeMeo

To: Chairwoman Jessica Millan Patterson and Membership
Cc: Danielle Cullum, Bryan Watkins, and Matt Jacob

At our last Convention, much concern was expressed by The Delegates over the proposed general resolutions that were presented, in that many or most delegates never saw the resolution proposals before having to vote on them at the Sunday General Session meeting. Many delegates felt there was a lack of transparency.

This following Bylaw proposal would make the change that notice would be required to be given the delegates of all proposed Resolutions submitted 20 days prior to any meeting where a vote on these would be taken for adoption.

This exactly follows our current procedures and language in our Bylaws concerning notice having to be given to the delegates concerning any Bylaw proposed amendments.

Notice is now given concerning proposed Bylaw amendments as they are posted on the CAGOP website before the required 20 days for Delegates to review. With the adoption of this Bylaw amendment, the same can now be done for general Resolutions. This would give all delegates the ability and adequate time to review the Resolution proposals so they can make an informed decision with their vote. This would also eliminate any perceived issues of lack of transparency.

Thanks you for your consideration. Here is the proposed Amendment. The new added language is in blue.

Section 2.06.06 (C) Resolutions Committee

The Resolutions Committee at all meetings of the Committee or of the Executive Committee shall receive, consider and report on all general resolutions proposed for adoption for the meetings. **Notice of any proposed general resolutions submitted shall be given to the delegates no fewer than twenty days prior to a meeting or convention of the Committee or Executive Committee .** No proposed resolution shall be considered by the Committee or the Executive Committee at any meeting unless and until the Committee has received at least 30 days' notice of a proposed resolution and a favorable report is submitted on the resolution by the Resolutions Committee; provided, however, the Committee or the Executive Committee, by a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote of the voting delegates present, may take up any resolution without such a favorable report of the Resolutions Committee. The Resolutions Committee may, in its discretion, initiate and prepare proposed resolutions and report the same to the Committee or to the Executive Committee for consideration. **Any such proposed resolutions shall also be given to the delegates no fewer than 20 days prior to a meeting or convention of the Committee or Executive Committee.**

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #4
Bylaw proposal submitted by Thomas Weissmiller

Danielle Cullum

From: Thomas Weissmiller <tarzantom@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2023 7:53 PM
To: Jessica Patterson; Danielle Cullum
Subject: Proposed Bylaw Amendment, Fall 2023 Convention, Section 6.01 (A)
(2); Delegates to RNC Convention
Attachments: BylawAmendmentProposal_Fall 2023_Section 6.01(A)(2) Delegates to RNC
Convention, 230815.docx; Apportionment Model Calc_Ver09.xlsx

Chairwoman Patterson,

Attached are two files concerning the above.

- Word document with proposal and explanation.
- Excel document, appropriation models

Tom

Thomas Weissmiller (Weißmüller)

Appointe

d

Delegate,

CAGOP

3rd Vice

Chair,

SMGOP

Reply to tarzantom@pobox.com

PROPOSED BYLAWS AMENDMENT

Date: August 15, 2023

From: Thomas Weissmiller, Appointed Delegate
tarzantom@pobox.com
Mobile: 650-218-6386

To: Chairwoman Jessica Patterson
chairwomanpatterson@cagop.org

RE: Delegates to RNC, Section 6.01 (A)(2)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CAGOP BYLAWS

Section 6.01 (A) (2) as amended does not allocate delegates correctly on a proportional basis leading due to lack of a defined allocation model. This omission can lead to confusion, conflicting answers depending on who is allocating and possibly lead to litigation because the CAGOP allocation rule is not determinate in all cases.

PROBLEM

The delegate proportional allocation described in Section 6.01 (A) (2) has two inherent problems.

1. The requirement to “. . . [round] up fractions to the next higher whole number”: Application of this rule deprives the lower finishing candidates of delegates earned and gives them to the higher finishing candidates. This is not proportional in the dictionary sense of the word.
2. The order of delegate allocation between the two classes of delegates: “Congressional district delegates” and “at-large delegates.” Congressional district delegates must be allocated before at-large delegates to ensure there are three delegates from each Congressional district. Reversing the process will deprive some candidates of their proportional allocation of delegates.

DISCUSSION

[Apportionment Model Calc Ver09.xlsx](#) provides a scenario of six candidates applied to seven allocation models. The “1.Simple Math(Round Up)” implements Section 6.01 (A) (2) as described in the bylaw.

All allocation methods described in this paper follow the following workflow:

1. The candidate receiving the most statewide votes selects his/her delegates first, the candidate with the second most selects second, and so forth until all delegates have been allocated to a candidate based on votes received. .
2. For Congressional district delegates
 - a. A candidate is limited to two per district.
 - b. Each Congressional district must have three delegates (52 x 3 = 156).

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #4
Bylaw proposal submitted by Thomas Weissmiller

- c. The candidate that finishes first selects Congressional district delegates first, followed by the candidate with the second most, and so forth until all 52 congressional districts have 3 delegates.
- 3. After apportioning Congressional district delegates, the ten (10) at-large delegates are selected by the candidate that finishes first, followed by the candidate with the second most, and so forth until all at-large delegates are allocated. There is no allocation restriction on delegate assignment once congressional district delegates are allocated.

The only method that calculates the allocation of delegates fully proportional and does not require manual manipulation is the (2.Simple Math (Round)) method.

The following tables summarize the comparisons:

Comparison of Methods								Divisor		Round
Congressional Districts	Total	A	B	C	D	E	F	Standard	Modified	Formula
1.Simple Math (RoundUp)	159	75	47	16	10	7	4	na	na	Up
2.Simple Math (Round)	156	75	47	16	9	6	3	na	na	0
3.Simple Math w/ StanDiviso	156	75	47	16	9	6	3	32,051	na	0
4.Hamilton	156	75	46	16	10	6	3	32,051	na	Down
5.Jefferson	156	76	47	15	9	6	3	32,051	31,500	Down
6.Webster	156	77	46	15	9	6	3	32,051	31,000	Down
7.Hill-Huntington	156	75	47	16	9	6	3	32,051	31,000	Up/Down

At Large	Total	A	B	C	D	E	F	Standard	Modified	Formula
1.Simple Math (RoundUp)	10	5	3	1	1	0	0	na	na	Up
2.Simple Math (Round)	10	5	3	1	1	0	0	na	na	0
3.Simple Math w/ StanDiviso	10	5	3	1	1	0	0	500,000	na	0
4.Hamilton	10	5	3	1	1	0	0	500,000	na	Down
5.Jefferson	10	6	3	1	0	0	0	500,000	400,000	Down
6.Webster	10	6	3	1	0	0	0	500,000	400,000	Down
7.Hill-Huntington	10	6	3	1	0	0	0	500,000	400,000	Up/Down

Total Total	Total	A	B	C	D	E	F
1.Simple Math (RoundUp)	169	80	50	17	11	7	4
2.Simple Math (Round)	166	80	50	17	10	6	3
3.Simple Math w/ StanDiviso	166	80	50	17	10	6	3
4.Hamilton	166	80	49	17	11	6	3
5.Jefferson	166	82	50	16	9	6	3
6.Webster	166	83	49	16	9	6	3
7.Hill-Huntington	166	81	50	17	9	6	3

Section 6.01 (A) (2) should but does not address the following two possible scenarios.

- 1. A candidate that is awarded delegates chooses not to select all or some of their delegates.
- 2. A candidate wishes to transfer his/her delegates to another candidate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Fractional delegates be rounded to the nearest whole number.
- 2. All Congressional district delegates be allocated by district before the ten (10) at-large delegates.

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #4
Bylaw proposal submitted by Thomas Weissmiller

3. Provision be made to address the scenario in which a candidate does not fill all their delegate allocation.
4. Provision be made to allow a candidate to transfer his or her delegate appointments to another candidate.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT

Section 6.01 (A) (2)

Under circumstances when Rules of the Republican National Committee do not permit the State's delegates to be allocated all to one candidate (winner-take-all), such as when the Primary elections takes place before a specified date (like the 2024 Primary election), Presidential Nominating Convention at-large and Congressional district delegates and alternate Presidential Nominating Convention delegates shall be allocated proportionally based on the statewide vote. A candidate who receives a majority (50% plus 1) of votes statewide is entitled to all of the at-large and Congressional district delegates and alternates. If no candidate receives a majority (50% plus 1) of votes statewide, the at-large and Congressional district delegates and alternates shall be apportioned among all candidates based on the statewide vote, beginning with the candidate receiving the highest number of votes and rounding fractional delegates and alternates ~~upward~~ to the ~~next~~ nearest whole number, and then awarding delegates and alternates to the second highest candidate in the same manner, and so forth until the delegates and alternates to be apportioned have been fully awarded. All congressional district delegates (156) shall be proportionally awarded to candidates in order of statewide finish before the ten (10) at-large delegates are allocated based on statewide finish. If a candidate is awarded delegates and does not select all or some of his/her delegates, they will be given to the Chair of the CAGOP for allocation after all other candidates have selected their delegates. A candidate may transfer his or her delegates to another candidate, within five (5) days after certification of the Presidential Primary by the Secretary of State.

Tom

Thomas Weissmiller

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #5
Bylaw proposal submitted by Tom Hudson

Danielle Cullum

From: Tom Hudson <hudsontn@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2023 4:45 PM
To: Danielle Cullum; Chairwoman Jessica Millan Patterson
Subject: CRP Bylaws Amendments (2) for consideration at the CRA Fall Convention
Attachments: CRP, Bylaw Amendment to Prohibit the Sale of Proxies, Tom Hudson 16AUG23.pdf; CRP, One Proxy per Delegate Amendment, Tom Hudson 16AUG23.pdf; CRP, Bylaw Amendment to Prohibit the Sale of Proxies, Tom Hudson 16AUG23.docx; CRP, One Proxy per Delegate Amendment, Tom Hudson 16AUG23.docx

Dear Chairwoman Patterson and Danielle Cullum,

I am hereby submitting two proposed Amendments to the Bylaws of the California Republican Party: the “One Delegate, One Vote Amendment” and a separate amendment to prohibit the purchase and sale of proxies. These items are for consideration at the upcoming Fall Convention, which I believe is scheduled to begin on September 29, 2023.

The amendments are attached as separate documents, each in PDF format and Microsoft Word format. Thus, there are four attachments.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. I would enjoy discussing these amendments with anyone who is interested in talking with me about them.

May I have a roster of the new members of the Bylaws Committee, with their contact information?

Best regards,

Tom

Thomas N. Hudson
Immediate Past President



E-mail: hudsontn@yahoo.com

CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN PARTY

Proposed Bylaw Amendment – “Proxy Votes are Not for Sale”
Submitted by Tom Hudson
Past President, California Republican Assembly

Section 2.02.03(B) (Proxies) of Article II shall be amended by adding a new subsection (4), without changing any other provisions of that Section:

(4) Delegates and associate delegates shall not buy or sell proxies, nor shall they solicit or conspire with others to engage in these prohibited activities. Proxies that were obtained or submitted as a result of these prohibited activities may be invalidated by the Board of Directors, the Rules Committee, the Proxies and Credentials Committee, and the Executive Committee, but any action or inaction by these committees may be appealed to the full Committee and resolved by the adoption or amendment of the Proxies and Credentials Committee report. Delegates and associate delegates who have engaged in these prohibited activities may be removed or censured in the same manner as set forth in Section 2.01.06 (Discipline of Delegates).

Explanation: Our Bylaws do not prohibit the purchase or sale of proxies. These practices are detrimental to the representative nature of our State Central Committee and they create at least the appearance of corruption. Proxies that have been purchased by interested parties dilute the votes of the honest Delegates who show up to vote at our Conventions. Even the hypothetical possibility of buying and selling proxies creates a bizarre financial incentive to appoint Delegates who will never show up, thus allowing their proxies to be bought and sold.

Enforcement of this prohibition may not be practical in some situations, especially when proxies are sold in secret, far away from Conventions and Party functions. However, most Delegates and Associates are honorable people and public figures who consistently obey our rules without the need for disciplinary actions. For that reason, the adoption of this rule alone, even if it is not vigorously enforced, will have a substantial impact on this corrupt practice.

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #6
Bylaw proposal submitted by Tom Hudson

Danielle Cullum

From: Tom Hudson <hudsontn@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2023 4:45 PM
To: Danielle Cullum; Chairwoman Jessica Millan Patterson
Subject: CRP Bylaws Amendments (2) for consideration at the CRA Fall Convention
Attachments: CRP, Bylaw Amendment to Prohibit the Sale of Proxies, Tom Hudson 16AUG23.pdf; CRP, One Proxy per Delegate Amendment, Tom Hudson 16AUG23.pdf; CRP, Bylaw Amendment to Prohibit the Sale of Proxies, Tom Hudson 16AUG23.docx; CRP, One Proxy per Delegate Amendment, Tom Hudson 16AUG23.docx

Dear Chairwoman Patterson and Danielle Cullum,

I am hereby submitting two proposed Amendments to the Bylaws of the California Republican Party: the “One Delegate, One Vote Amendment” and a separate amendment to prohibit the purchase and sale of proxies. These items are for consideration at the upcoming Fall Convention, which I believe is scheduled to begin on September 29, 2023.

The amendments are attached as separate documents, each in PDF format and Microsoft Word format. Thus, there are four attachments.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. I would enjoy discussing these amendments with anyone who is interested in talking with me about them.

May I have a roster of the new members of the Bylaws Committee, with their contact information?

Best regards,

Tom

Thomas N. Hudson
Immediate Past President
California Republican Assembly


E-mail: hudsontn@yahoo.com

CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN PARTY

Proposed Bylaw Amendment – “One Person, One Vote”
Submitted by Tom Hudson
Past President, California Republican Assembly

Section 2.02.03 (Quorum, Proxies and Voting) of Article II shall be amended as follows, with deletions shown by strikeout and additions shown by bold italic text:

(B) Proxies.

- (1) At any meeting of the Committee, any ~~regular, appointive, or~~ associate delegate may be designated as a proxy for ***any regular or appointive delegate who is not present or registered.*** ~~up to two delegates.~~ ***No individual may carry more than one proxy or cast more than one vote.*** At any meeting of the Committee, any such proxy or proxies shall be submitted to the Chairman or the Chairman of the Proxies and Credentials Committee no later than 12:00 noon on the Saturday preceding the Sunday business session.
- (2) Proxies for any convention or meeting of the Committee shall be in the form prescribed by the Board of Directors and shall be made in writing under penalty of perjury by the person giving the proxy. The use of a photocopy of an approved form shall not be a reason to invalidate the proxy.
- (3) A person who has granted a proxy in the prescribed form may revoke or change a proxy only in writing under penalty of perjury. Where more than one proxy is given by a delegate, the one dated subsequently shall be given effect over the one dated earlier. Any writing ~~which~~ ***that*** revokes or changes a proxy must be received by the Committee not later than the date and time set forth in subsection 2.02.03(B)(1), and shall indicate the name of the person whose proxy is revoked, the date said proxy was given, and the name of any person or agent to whom the proxy form was given.

Explanation: During the 1990s, the State Central Committee often had difficulty achieving quorum, so the number of proxies was increased from one to two so that quorum could be achieved with a smaller number present. Over a decade later, the formula for quorum was revised, eliminating the need to allow delegates to carry more than one proxy in order to attain quorum. (Tom Hudson authored both the proxy amendment and the quorum amendment.)

The controversial two-proxies-per-delegate rule has outlived its only purpose and it should be repealed. Our Conventions never have difficulty achieving quorum under the new quorum rule. Allowing multiple proxies and multiple votes-per-person interferes with the ideal of “one delegate, one vote,” it makes it easier for a small number of people to manipulate the outcome of Conventions, it encourages the illicit trade in proxies by making it cheaper because proxies are free but delegate registrations raise money for the Party, and it discourages Convention attendance because fewer people can form a majority. This amendment will ensure that every delegate on the Convention floor will have exactly one vote.

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #7
Bylaw proposal submitted by William Michael Wright

Danielle Cullum

From: wmwright50@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, August 18, 2023 6:16 PM
To: Danielle Cullum; Membership
Subject: Proposed Bylaw Amendment
Attachments: Proposed Bylaw Amendment.docx

Danielle,

Please see attached proposed bylaw amendment. Let me know if you need anything else from me.

Thanks,

Mike Wright

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #7
Bylaw proposal submitted by William Michael Wright

Section 2.01.03 Term of Delegates

(A)

- (2) The term of each regular delegate designated in subsection 2.01.01(A), subdivisions (3) through (6) inclusive, ~~shall commence upon his or her election to the qualifying office and shall continue until the day his or her successor is elected~~ shall commence at the close of the convention during which he or she is elected to the qualifying office and shall continue until the close of the convention during which his or her successor is elected. In the case of the National Committeewoman and National Committeeman, they shall serve successive two-year terms upon taking office and shall continue until his and her successors are elected and take office.

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #8
Bylaw proposal submitted by John Dennis, Johanna
Lassaga, Lani Kane, Matt Heath, Tom Montgomery

Danielle Cullum

From: john johndennis.com <john@johndennis.com>
Sent: Friday, August 18, 2023 8:43 PM
To: Membership
Cc: Matt Heath; Johanna Lassaga; Lani Kane; Tom Montgomery; Chairwoman
Jessica Millan Patterson
Subject: By Law Amendment proposals
Attachments: PROPOSED AMENDMENT REGARDING COUNTY COMMITTEE CHAIR
RESIDENCY.pdf; PROPOSED AMENDMENT REGARDING COUNTY
COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN.pdf

Attached please find two CAGOP By Law amendment proposals.

The submitters are happy to answer any questions. Thanks for your consideration.

Regards,
John

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #8
Bylaw proposal submitted by John Dennis, Johanna
Lassaga, Lani Kane, Matt Heath, Tom Montgomery

PROPOSED AMENDMENT REGARDING COUNTY COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN’S DELEGATE APPOINTMENTS

Submitted by: John Dennis, CCA Chairman; Johanna Lassaga, CCA 1st Vice Chairwoman; Lani Kane, CCA 2nd Vice Chairwoman; Matt Heath, CCA Secretary; Tom Montgomery, CCA Treasurer.

This proposal is an addition to the current by laws. We propose it as Section 2.01.03 (B) 3.

Proposed section:

2.01.03 (B) 3 When a County Committee has an organizational meeting or officer elections before the end of January in the year of the new Delegate terms, Delegates can only be appointed by the newly elected and certified Chairman after his election.

The CAGOP will hold the appointments for these county central committees until after the election of a chairman and certified minutes are submitted to the CAGOP.

For committees holding organizational meetings in months other than December and January, the new Chairman and Treasurers become delegates immediately. Appointed delegates from these counties, however, finish the remainder of their respective terms.

SUMMARY

Recently a county chairman made appointments just before his county’s organizational meeting. Many delegates and chairmen thought the newly elected chairman of that county should have appointed the delegates for the new term. And while the appointments by the outgoing chairman may have been technically allowed his appointments were widely considered outside the spirit of the appointment process.

The proposed amendment allows only the most recently elected chairman to make delegate appointments for new terms.

In addition, for committees conducting organizational meetings in months other than December and January, the new language clarifies that delegates complete their appointed terms while newly elected Chairmen and Treasurers become delegates upon election.

Respectfully submitted by John Dennis, CCA Chairman, Johanna Lassaga, CCA 1st Vice Chairwoman, Lani Kane, CCA 2nd Vice Chairwoman, Matt Heath, CCA Secretary and Tom Montgomery, CCA Treasurer.

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #9
Bylaw proposal submitted by John Dennis, Johanna Lassaga, Lani Kane, Matt Heath, Tom Montgomery

Danielle Cullum

From: john johndennis.com <john@johndennis.com>
Sent: Friday, August 18, 2023 8:43 PM
To: Membership
Cc: Matt Heath; Johanna Lassaga; Lani Kane; Tom Montgomery; Chairwoman Jessica Millan Patterson
Subject: By Law Amendment proposals
Attachments: PROPOSED AMENDMENT REGARDING COUNTY COMMITTEE CHAIR RESIDENCY.pdf; PROPOSED AMENDMENT REGARDING COUNTY COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN.pdf

Attached please find two CAGOP By Law amendment proposals.

The submitters are happy to answer any questions. Thanks for your consideration.

Regards,
John

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #9
Bylaw proposal submitted by John Dennis, Johanna Lassaga, Lani Kane, Matt Heath, Tom Montgomery

PROPOSED AMENDMENT REGARDING COUNTY COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN’S RESIDENCY

Submitted by: John Dennis, CCA Chairman; Johanna Lassaga, CCA 1st Vice Chairwoman; Lani Kane, CCA 2nd Vice Chairwoman; Matt Heath, CCA Secretary; Tom Montgomery, CCA Treasurer.

This proposed amendment has been endorsed by the County Chairmen’s Association.

Section California Republican Party By-Laws Section 2.01.01 (A) 4.

Current:

The current Republican National Committeeman and Republican National Committeewoman.
The current Chairman of each Republican County Central Committee.

Proposed:

The current Republican National Committeeman and Republican National Committeewoman.
The current Chairman of each Republican County Central Committee. Chairmen of Republican county central committees must reside in the county they chair.

SUMMARY

The submitters and the County Chairmen’s Association believe the proposal improves local Republican representation. The proposal also prevents individuals from holding multiple county chairmen seats and disproportionate power over delegate appointments.

Respectfully submitted by John Dennis, CCA Chairman, Johanna Lassaga, CCA 1st Vice Chairwoman, Lani Kane, CCA 2nd Vice Chairwoman, Matt Heath, CCA Secretary and Tom Montgomery, CCA Treasurer.

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #10
Bylaw proposal submitted by Thomas Weissmiller

Danielle Cullum

From: Thomas Weissmiller <tarzantom@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, August 19, 2023 9:40 AM
To: Jessica Patterson; Danielle Cullum
Subject: RE: Proposed Bylaw Amendment, Fall 2023 Convention, Section 2.06.03 Meeting and Standing Rules
Attachments: BylawAmendmentProposal_Fall 2023_Section 206.03 Meetings and Standing Rules, 230819.docx

Chairwoman Patterson,
See attached proposal.

Tom

Thomas Weissmiller (Weißmüller)
Appointed Delegate, CAGOP
3rd Vice Chair, SMGOP
[REDACTED]
Reply to tarzantom@pobox.com

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #10
Bylaw proposal submitted by Thomas Weissmiller

PROPOSED BYLAWS AMENDMENT

Date: August 19, 2023

From: Thomas Weissmiller, Appointed Delegate
tarzantom@pobox.com
[REDACTED]

To: Chairwoman Jessica Patterson
chairwomanpatterson@cagop.org

RE: Standing and Special Committees, Meetings and Standing Rules , Section 2.06.03

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CAGOP BYLAWS

This amendment facilitates communication and intent of Standing Committees to all delegates by publishing the following in the “Members Only” section of the CAGOP website.

1. Meeting schedules, agendas, and minutes
2. Procedures/rules/processes

The intent is to be open and transparent and avoid surprises.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT

Section 2.06.03 Meetings and Standing Rules

Meetings of the standing committees shall be called by the Chairman, by the State Vice Chairman, or by the Chairman of the standing committee at such time, place and on such notice as they may designate. The standing committees may adopt standing rules not inconsistent with these bylaws.

Meeting schedule, agendas and approved minutes will be posted in the “Delegates Only” section of the CAGOP website. Minutes to closed/executive sessions and confidential information will not be posted, but will be available to Board of Directors’ Members upon request.

All standing committees will adopt and post its internal operating procedures/rules in the “Delegates Only” section of the CAGOP websites at least ten (10) days prior to each convention.

Tom

Thomas Weissmiller

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #11
Bylaw proposal submitted by David Chan

Danielle Cullum

From: chairman <chairman@cacollegegop.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 19, 2023 6:38 PM
To: Jessica Patterson; Chairwoman Jessica Millan Patterson
Cc: Bryan Watkins; Danielle Cullum; David Chan
Subject: Bylaw Amendment Submission
Attachments: 2023 Permanent Charter Bylaw Amendment (3).pdf

Hi Madam Chairwoman,

I am respectfully submitting the attached bylaw amendment for consideration at Fall 2023 CAGOP convention.

We believe this will be a wonderful way to celebrate unity at convention, and we look forward to this hopefully growing the College Republicans' partnership with the Party and encouraging youth involvement.

Thank you, and I look forward to seeing you and the CAGOP team at convention.

Best,

David Chan

Chairman, Alameda County Republican Party
Chairman, California College Republicans

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #11
Bylaw proposal submitted by David Chan

CRP 2023 Fall Convention – Bylaw proposal,
respectfully submitted by the unified College Republicans,
from delegate David Chan.

PROPOSED BYLAW AMENDMENT
TO SUPPORT THE UNIFIED COLLEGE REPUBLICANS
& CHARTERED ORGANIZATIONS

Whereas, permanently chartered status alleviates pressures and requirements of volunteer organizations; and

Whereas, the California College Republicans (CCR) and California Federation of College Republicans (CFCR) have peacefully unified under the CCR name and were congratulated and supported in the endeavor by Party officials; and

Whereas, the College Republican groups have been working in peace together for over a year, indicating they have achieved a stable and reliable status; and

Whereas, California Republican Party delegates and officials have firmly stated their support for returning a permanent charter to the College Republicans if they unified under a single group again, and they have met this condition and all other conditions asked of them; and

Whereas, the College Republicans sacrificed 2 of their CAGOP delegate appointments by merging into a single organization again, and this amendment would grant them 1 of the 2 delegate positions back and encourage youth involvement in the party; and

Whereas, a permanent charter status will serve to increase the relationship and partnership between the Party and the next generation of leaders; and

Whereas, granting the permanent charter will serve as a symbol of unity among Republicans at Fall convention and provide something for the Party to celebrate heading into 2024; and

Whereas, the CAGOP Volunteer Organizations Committee unanimously passed a resolution in Spring 2023 supporting the College Republicans to receive a permanent charter as soon as they unified, and unification has occurred; and

Therefore, Be it Resolved, that this body here assembled keeps its promises to the College Republicans, upholds and follows through on the Volunteer Organizations Committee's Spring 2023 Resolution of support, and amends section 2.01.01 (B)(8) of the Standing Rules and Bylaws to read:

CRP Fall 2023 Convention – Bylaw Proposal #11
Bylaw proposal submitted by David Chan

Persons appointed by statewide Republican volunteer organizations chartered by the Committee and in good standing, according to the following formula:

(b) Two appointments by each of the following organizations: **California College Republicans**; California Federation of Republican Women; California Republican Assembly; California Young Republican Federation; California Republican League; the Log Cabin Republicans of California; and the California Congress of Republicans.

Further Resolved, that this body here assembled amend section 3.01(D)(2) of the Standing Rules and Bylaws to read:

(2) The following nationally - or Committee - chartered volunteer organizations shall be permanently chartered organizations exempt from the biennial requirements set forth in this subsection; provided, however, such organizations shall submit to the Committee Secretary and the chairman of the Volunteer Organizations Committee annually, by February 1st of each year, a list of their current officers: California Federation of Republican Women, with the proviso that said charter in no way contravenes or supersedes the charter granted the California Federation of Republican Women by the National Federation of Republican Women; **the California College Republicans**; the California Young Republican Federation; the California Republican Assembly; the California Republican League; the Log Cabin Republicans of California; and the California Congress of Republicans.

This page intentionally left blank.