

Number	Position	Comments
B101_2019	Favor	I like transparency. For many years, the central committee refused to record their votes on devisive issues. Finally, we got the 25% clause into the bylaws. This proposal is another (helpful) step in the direction of transparency and accountability. I would have written the proposal like this, "Any final vote on a proposal that amends the URP Constitution or Bylaws shall be recorded in the same manner," but it's okay.
B106_2019	Favor	Enumerating the responsibilities of members of the central committee is helpful, especially to someone who has not served on the committee before, and who wonders what is expected of committee members. Item #7 (reporting to the county party) may be problematic because this can be interpreted many ways. For example, is the report written or verbal? If written, is it posted (passively) or sent (actively)? If verbal, then at what meeting(s)? How detailed is the report? How soon after the meeting? Would minutes of the meeting suffice?
B107_2019	Undecided	Electronic meetings work well with fewer than a dozen participants, but can become problematic with larger groups. I will be interested to hear the debate on this proposal. The Executive Committee has about two dozen members, so I am inclined right now to vote for this proposal.
B108_2019	OPPOSE	(Same reason I am opposed to C119_2019).
B113_2019	OPPOSE	Actually, this provision of the bylaw ought to be struck because it is already covered by the constitution. And Article II of the constitution says "The State Central Committee may adopt Bylaws to govern subjects not covered by the Constitution." This is covered by the constitution <i>verbatim</i> .
B114_2019	FAVOR	I agree that the chair of the CBC ought to order and present rule change proposals in convention, because s/he is (or should be) most familiar with them. I especially like the opportunity to refine the proposals in the ten days following the submission deadline, when the CBC reviews them and makes recommendations to the submitters.
C103_2018	Undecided	I don't understand why we need this addition. We use our Parliamentary Authority now to choose a chair pro tem. Why do we need to write it down here?
C103_2019	Favor	This exact language is already in Article XII Section 2F (relating to nominating conventions). This proposal adds it for organizing conventions.
C104_2018	Favor	This proposal would preclude any conflicts of interest, and would allow a public office holder to focus on his public office (instead of dividing his attention between his public office and his party office).
C105_2018	Favor	This will help to prevent abuse of special meetings.

C105_2019	Undecided	I would be perfectly fine if we defined a quorum as 45 members (a fourth of the body), and I might be okay with 60 (a third of the voting members), but 40% (about 72 people) is too high (although it is better than C119_2019). And I really do like the addition of the last sentence because it eliminates the ambiguity introduced by the last current sentence about adding an item to the agenda (before adoption, or after adoption). But unless we divide this proposal (so we can approve the addition to Section E), I will be voting against the increase in quorum.
C106_2018	Favor	I like the specificity of this proposal. It also removes the ambiguity of how precise a two-year term should be. I think "parliamentarian" should be added to the list of people in item "C" (as is done in C135_2018).
C107_2018	Favor	I like the specificity of this proposal. It also removes the ambiguity of how precise a two-year term should be.
C108_2019	Favor	This would provide a helpful title for the section (housekeeping).
C109_2019	OPPOSE	This proposal would weaken the more populous counties by reducing their representation to only two at-large members. Representation elsewhere in the party is calculated using "Relative Republican Strength" and is a fitting way to reward districts that support Republican nominees. This proposal would increase the number of people required to call a special meeting from 45 (a fourth of the body) to 60 (a third of the body), which is two thirds of the average attendance. Adopting this change would make special meetings very difficult (if not impossible) to call. Calling a special meeting is already a big challenge; let's not make it impossible. This proposal would define a quorum as 90 members instead of 40. I am strongly opposed to such an increase (see my comments on C119_2019).
C110_2019	OPPOSE	The stability of our party is ensured by committee members with institutional memory. Limiting how long they serve does the organization a disservice, and limits the counties who want a long-timer to represent them. Plus, finding people in far-flung counties can be difficult, because of the time commitments and distances involved.
C112_2019	OPPOSE	This proposal strips delegates of their authority to amend the bylaws. Delegates to the state convention must retain the authority to adopt or modify party bylaws. I don't mind the requirement for ten sponsors because committee members know others on the committee, and have their contact information, and additional eyes would likely result in better proposals.

C113_2019	Oppose	I dislike the reference to the idea that the CBC can forward a proposal to the SCC instead of the convention (this undermines delegates' right to amend). The sentiment of this proposal is helpful, although I wish it would say the CBC should publish its opinion (not just give a recommendation because I want to read WHY the CBC dis/likes a proposal). And I like "e" that provides a deadline by which amended bylaws must be published. But C121_2019 and B114_2019 accomplishes most of what this proposal does, while ensuring delegates' right to amend the constitution and bylaws.
C114_2019	Oppose	Most of this proposal seems to restate what is already there, which is fine. The poison pill, however, is the 240 co-sponsors. Why? Because there is no guarantee that a sponsor could contact that many people, given the fact that historically the delegate list is so closely held, and email addresses hidden, that contacting that many delegates is nearly impossible (especially in the short length of time between caucuses and the convention in even-numbered years).
C115_2019	Favor	The current language says "membership may be further set forth" in the bylaws--which may be approved by 2/3 of the URP Central Committee. Historically, the sentiment of the central committee rarely mirrors the sentiment of grassroots delegates. So giving the central committee power to define membership without the approval of the delegates is an inappropriate arrogation of power. I am okay with the phrase, "and complies with the Utah Republican Party Constitution" because any change to the constitution must be ratified by the delegates. And delegates must have (and be) the final authority.
C116_2019	Oppose	A majority threshold would mean that bylaws would be changed more often than with a 2/3 (the current) threshold. The central committee already can adopt motions and resolutions by a majority vote. Bylaws should have a higher threshold.
C117_2019	Favor	This proposal gives delegates (the proper seat of authority) the power to veto a bylaw that was approved by a rogue central committee (one that strips authority from the delegates).
C118_2019	Favor	This proposal takes out of the PREAMBLE language that has been ignored over the years by party leadership and parliamentarians who say that nothing in the PREAMBLE is binding on the party. The additional sentence is simply a restatement of the first sentence declaring exclusivity, and is seems unnecessary to me. The bigger problem is determining what resolutions and rules lie within and without the constitution, bylaws, and Roberts.

C119_2019	OPPOSE	<p>It is my understanding that the average attendance at central committee meetings is 90, which is about half of the number of members on the central committee (of approximately 180 members). That being the average (meaning some meetings have more than 90 attendees, and some have fewer than 90), one can deduce that the committee would be able to do business at only half of its meetings. This would be unfair to committee members who drive several hours to attend a meeting where no business could be done. Less important than the number of members is the cross section of members, or the diversity of the assemblage. I believe the current number of 40 is high enough to achieve this diversity, but low enough that business can be done at nearly all of the meetings. I would be fine with 45 (a fourth of the voting members), and I might be okay with the number 60 (a third of the voting members), but 90 (half) is too high.</p>
C120_2019	Undecided	<p>Initially, this proposal didn't make sense to me, so I asked the sponsor about it. He said the first "not" should be inserted, and the second "not" should be struck, so that it reads as follows, "The State Central Committee may NOT adopt bylaws to govern subjects covered by the Constitution." I do not know what happened to the second sentence in the current constitution, "Such enactments shall not be inconsistent with this Constitution." And I don't think the proposed additional sentence is necessary, but I like the fact that the sponsor seems to be pointing out areas covered by the constitution which are also treated in the bylaws. Such bylaws are (or should be) null and void. I don't think we need to change the title of Article II.</p>
C121_2019	FAVOR	<p>This is the Delegates Rights Amendment, which will restore a right that has been lost (ignored) since 2005. Basically, it makes explicit the right of delegates to amend the party constitution and bylaws.</p>
C131_2018	Favor	<p>Technology continues to advance rapidly, that the party has difficulty keeping up, so dedicating a committee to this issue would be wise.</p>
C132_2018	Okay	<p>I like the addition of four more CD representatives. These additions will add diversity and strength. The Data and Software Management Committee is not mentioned in Article VI however, so we ought to approve C131_2018 before adding its chair to the Executive Committee.</p>

C133_2018	Oppose	<p>This proposal seems to give county parties more flexibility in balloting methods. I am fine with additional methods, but I would prefer that they be specified in the state party constitution, so we maintain some uniformity across the state. (Look at how detailed the constitution is in describing the caucus experience--what is done, how it is done, etc.) Plus, making this change now would require county parties to scramble to update their documents in time for Caucus 2020. In fact, they would not have a convention between now and then, so would not be able to update their constitutions before Caucus 2020 (although they could put it in their bylaws, I suppose). Just seems like "make work" to me; it would be much easier to augment the list in the state party constitution. That way, the whole state is "on the same page," so to speak, when it comes to election methods at caucus.</p>
C135_2018	Favor	<p>This will help to ensure that the SCC knows who is working at party HQ, and that the Chair has the support of the SCC on his appointments.</p>