

Overview and Minutes of HPPOA Nominating Committee Meeting of March 10, 2014:

Members Present: Joan Galante, Elizabeth Weatherford, June Conant, Bruce Derrick, and Leilani Bronson-Crelly.

Meeting convened at 2:00 p.m. in the Activity Center Library, with all members in attendance.

The meeting was called by June Conant and Elizabeth Weatherford to discuss ballot preparation, hand out of vetted candidates, and preferential voting.

Leilani handed out a copy of all the candidate forms for their review. All but one of these candidates is in good standing. Ms. Sherry Overbay is currently not in good standing. It was suggested that this candidate be called to ask if she wanted to pay her road fees that are in arrears, but there was no phone number provided or any listing for her in the office data system, or in the white pages of the phone book.

Candidate for District 9 – B.J. Mullinex will be asked to rewrite her overview and cut down her description from 400 to 200 words.

Following the March 14 deadline for submittals a welcome letter will be drafted and mailed to each candidate along with a timeline of the election, “rules” on where not to post campaign signage, and a copy of the Bylaws.

The proposed Candidates’ Forum – slated for April 30 or May 2 needs to be coordinated by the general manager and staff – as has been the past practice. It is not necessarily the duty of this committee to handle its production.

Discussion ensued as to who is to receive the results of the election. The consensus was that past practice showed that the party responsible for tallying the votes sent a certified copy of the results to the office and the president of the Board.

June Conant raised the point that the Nominating Committee always provided the Board with a sample ballot to approve. At some point, the write-in line on the ballot was deleted from the form.

Further discussion ensued as to whether or not ballots would need to be mailed out to district races with only ONE candidate. Bruce Derrick considered it a waste of postage; while June Conant and Leilani Bronson-Crelly felt it was valid because it allowed the district the opportunity to see who their potential representative would be.

June Conant handed out a preferential ballot sample. It was over four pages long on letter size paper, but she plans to revise it onto legal size paper – and use less pages.

Strong discussion ensued as to whether preferential voting – even with the proposed ballot description was valid. Leilani Bronson-Crelly opined it did not.

MOTION was made by Elizabeth Weatherford to include and reference the visual diagram in the ballot making; SECOND by June Conant. Ayes: June Conant, Elizabeth Weatherford, and Joan Galante. Nays: Leilani Bronson-Crelly and Bruce Derrick. MOTION PASSED.

In discussion, Leilani pointed out that the visual diagrams were not a part of Robert’s Rules of Order, Newly Revised (RONR), Edition XI, and hence should not be included in the ballot at all. June Conant countered that it better explained the process for lot owners.

MOTION was made by June Conant to amend the verbiage on item #5 of the preferential description that will accompany the ballot to read: *“The second choice/preference of Candidate A’s ballots are distributed accordingly to Candidates B, C or D.”* AND to amend verbiage on item #7 to read: *“The second choice/preference of Candidate B’s ballots are distributed accordingly to Candidates C or D.”*; SECOND by Joan Galante. Ayes: June Conant, Elizabeth Weatherford, and Joan Galante. Nays: Leilani Bronson-Crelly and Bruce Derrick. MOTION PASSED.

MOITON was made by Elizabeth Weatherford to amend the verbiage on the first page of the preferential description that will accompany the ballot to strike the second and third words *“the preferred”* of the first paragraph, last sentence and replace it with *“a preferential,”* AND to make gender-neutral the fifteenth (15th) word of that same sentence from *“he”* to *“s/he.”* SECOND was made by June Conant. Ayes: June Conant, Elizabeth Weatherford, and Joan Galante. Nays: Leilani Bronson-Crelly and Bruce Derrick. MOTION PASSED.

Elizabeth Weatherford asked Leilani Bronson-Crelly what she most objected to with preferential voting. Leilani read from RONR – page 428 lines 5 through 11, and pointed out that the descriptive diagram that Elizabeth hoped to include in the ballots with more than two candidates in a race, did not accomplish that requirement. In other words, neither the Bylaws nor the handout *“thoroughly instructed the members.”* It also did not *“precisely establish in advance and prescribe in detail the voting and counting procedure.”*

In addition, Leilani pointed out that the proponents (seated in the committee) of preferential voting had at the most, four years (Bylaws were amended and restated July 22, 2010), and at the least one year (since the much-contested election of 2013) to clean up the scantily worded Bylaws to reflect the procedures of preferential voting, but did not do so.

Finally, Leilani held up a sample of the ballot for District 1’s race in 2013 and compared it to the proposed ballot for District 8’s race in 2014. The differences were vast. In the 2013 ballot, the instructions read: *“NEW – THIS YEAR’S INSTRUCTIONS” “RANK CANDIDATES IN ORDER OF 1ST, 2ND, AND 3RD PREFERENCE IN THE BOXES BY THEIR NAME.”* The instructions of the 2014 ballot for District 8 are currently four pages, and in the opinion of the chair, do not precisely reflect RONR – pages 425-428, which the proponents claim is what they say the Bylaws (Article V, Section 17) entitle them to use.

In fact, Leilani explained, that specific section of the HPPOA Bylaws merely says, *“The definition of this term shall be as defined in parliamentary authority.”* In no way, does it refer to its use, procedure, instruction or tallying of the votes. It merely refers to: *“the definition.”*

In response, June Conant felt the visual instructions were very logical and appropriate for their need.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leilani Bronson-Crelly, Chair