

Republican Party of Virginia
State Central Committee Meeting
August 16, 2014

The meeting of the State Central Committee of the Republican Party of Virginia (RPV) was called to order by Chairman Pat Mullins at 10:00 am. The meeting was held at the Hilton Hotel Spa and Resort in Short Pump, VA.

The invocation was offered by Sixth District Chairman Wendell Walker. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Western Vice Chairman Suzanne Curran.

A motion was made by Mrs. Curran to approve the Minutes of June 6th meeting as read. The motion, seconded by Mr. Walker, passed unanimously.

The Chairman appointed a Proxy Committee consisting of Third District Chairman Chris Stearns, Anne Fitzgerald, and National Committeewoman Kathy Hayden.

Remarks by the Chairman on the status of Virginia's political climate included encouraging members of State Central to express their unity as Republicans especially to members of the press. He asked members of the Committee to resolve issues regarding the appeals.

A Point of Order was raised by First District Chairman Eric Herr about arrangements for lunch. Executive Director Shaun Kenney called the roll. A quorum was present with the following members in attendance:

Pat Mullins	Linda Bartlett	Travis Witt
Michael Thomas	Jackson Miller	Georgia Alvis-Long
Morton Blackwell	Kevin Gentry	Mickey Mixon
Kathy Hayden	Suzanne Curran	Scott Sayre
Diana Banister	Steve Albertson	Anne Fitzgerald
Pat McSweeney	Jeanine Lawson	Jane Ladd
Eric Herr	Larry Kile	Marie Quinn
Chris Stearns	Carl Anderson	David Fuller
Jack Wilson	Curtis Colgate	Rich Nilsen
Jon Berkley	Barbara Tabb	Anne LeHuray
Wendell Walker	Stephen Thomas	Matthew Burrow
Fred Gruber	Chip Muir	Kevin Corbett
Mark Kelly	Steve Trent	Michelle Jenkins
John Whitbeck	Rick Michael	Marcy Hernick
Terry Wear	Renee Maxey	Jerry Lester
John Scott	Peyton Knight	Susan Edwards

Heidi	Stirrup	David	Ray	Pam	Brown
Kay	Gunter	Joseph	Degreenia	Elizabeth	Mundy
Eve	Gleason	Kasha	Nielsen	John	Hager
Keith	Damon	Jeff	Wernsing		
Patsy	Drain				

Proxy Committee finds 21 proxies to be in order as follows:

Roger E. Miles proxy held by David Bartholomew
 Roger E. Miles proxy held by Gary C. Byler
 Frank M. Ruff, Jr. proxy held by Sen. John Cosgrove
 K. Michelle Jenkins proxy held by Aidan Williams
 Donald W. Huffman proxy held by Rick Boyer
 Wayne Ozmore proxy held by Carole DeTriquet
 Kristi Way proxy held by Matt Wells
 Joseph Sonsmith proxy held by Al Tucker
 Senator Emmett Hanger proxy held by Senator Frank Wagner
 William J. Flanagan proxy held by John Wood
 R. Allen Webb proxy held by David Davis
 Juanita Balenger proxy held by Anne Keast
 Bob FitzSimmonds proxy held by Russ Moulton
 Jo Thoburn proxy held by Mark Sell
 Christopher Shores proxy held by Diana Shores
 Adam Tolbert proxy held by Jack Thompson
 Liz Minneman proxy held by Peter Finochchio
 Heather Ann Homan proxy held by Michael Wood
 Carol Dawson proxy held by David E. Willis
 Mark J. Berg proxy held by Jeanine Martin
 James P. Massie proxy held by John M. O'Bannon
 Douglas W. Rogers proxy held by Donald C. Williams
 Sharon L. Jones proxy held by William Kirk

The Executive Director reported the financial condition of the Party as being strong and on budget. He announced three upcoming fundraisers in September, October, and December at the Advance. RNC Victory is committed to as many as 17 Victory centers around the Commonwealth with Josh Daniels the point of contact this year. His emails address is jdaniels@RNC.org.

Mr. Stearns delivered a report from the Republican National Committee meeting that he recently attended in Chicago. He discussed with other members there the novelty of Virginia being able to hold its own nomination methods outside of the state government process.

A presentation was made by Clara Bell Wheeler of Albemarle County Electoral Board about the real existence of voter fraud. Ms. Wheeler encouraged members to be extremely vigilant with regards to voter fraud issues. Reagan George with the Virginia Voters Alliance is a volunteer organization to help secure the ballot against voter fraud and clean up the voter registration list. He strongly encouraged members to include poll watchers inside the polls. He reported that requiring a Photo ID for voters is constitutional and valid.

Delegate John O'Bannon spoke briefly about the condition of Virginia's budget. Delegate Jackson Miller also made brief remarks about the legislature. Senator John Cosgrove offered some thoughts about the 38th District.

A motion was made to accept the amended Call by Mr. Herr. He moved to limit debate for each of the appeals before the Committee to ten minutes for the appellant and ten minutes for the response, leaving forty minutes for debate on each case and limited to two minutes per speaker. First Vice Chairman Mike Thomas seconded the motion.

Young Republican Federation of Virginia Chairman John Scott asked for a point of clarification as to whether the entire forty minutes needed to be used in its entirety for each debate. Chairman Mullins explained this was not necessary. He asked for a vote by acclamation. The motion passed unanimously.

The Chairman asked for reports from district chairmen.

1st District: No report

2nd District: No report

3rd District: No report

4th District: Chairman Jack Wilson announced grassroots training taking place in September.

5th District: No report

6th District: Mr. Walker reported that on Sept. 6th the Leadership Institute is doing training in the District and that there will be a breakfast in Buena Vista in September.

7th District: Chairman Fred Gruber reported the District Assembly was a success with 22 attendees.

8th District: Chairman Mark Kelly reported that in the 48th House of Delegates race for Republican candidate Dave Foster was looking good.

9th District: Working hard to re-elect Ben Chafin, working hard in the 38th Senate.

10th District: House of Delegate Member and candidate for U.S Congress Barbara Comstock is doing a great job. She's been to every county fair. Chairman John Whitbeck and the volunteers in the District are working very hard for Del. Comstock in a unified way.

11th District: Chairman Terry Wear reported Congressional Candidate Suzanne Scholte is doing extremely well and incumbent Jerry Connelly is not well liked by members of his own party. All out effort is in gaining that seat, Mr. Wear said.

Hooff Cooksey with the Ed Gillespie for Senate Campaign reported that the grassroots organization is doing well, and that Mr. Gillespie will be in the 38th Senate District to help elect Chafin and rally the troops. On the Victory campaign "things are going very well" said Mr. Cooksey. He reported that the campaign is very encouraged about the absentee balloting program. Democrat Mark Warner's 97% voting record with President Obama is resonating with Virginians as well as his "shameful record in the Senate" is coming to light and is offending Democrats who supported Warner in 2008. Many have said they cannot support him in 2014. Mr. Cooksey announced he has a packet with all Gillespie staff contacts for members of State Central.

Mr. Thomas echoed the comments from the Gillespie campaign. "This will be a tough race, but one we can win," he said.

Virginia Federation of Republican Women Chairwoman Linda Bartlett said they are working hard for the Gillespie campaign.

The College Republican Federation of Virginia is also working hard for deployment for the Gillespie campaign and the House candidates. John Scott reported that YR's are working hard in the 38th State Senate District and will be on deployment for congressional candidates and the Gillespie campaign.

In the appeals that are to be heard today, Chairman Mullins reminded members of the parameters of the debate per Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised (RRONR). He cautioned members on questioning the integrity of others or personal invective and insisted he will intervene and ask the member to sit down if the debate devolves in this regard.

The motion to accept the proxy of Senator Frank Ruff for Senator John Cosgrove was made by Mr. Herr was seconded by Seventh District Chairman Fred Gruber. The motion passed without objection.

Chairman Mullins reminded the members that he wants to make sure all members feel as if they have been heard.

Eleventh District Member Patsy Drain raised a question regarding ensuring that State Central Committee members are the only ones allowed to speak during the debates. Chairman Mullins reminds the body that only State Central members may participate in the debate.

APPEAL: FAUQUIER COUNTY

Mr. Scott Russell: Mr. Russell explained that he has been a Republican all his life, a transplant from Ohio who suffered under Jim Traficant as a Congressman. He moved to Fauquier County and chose to run for chairman at the March 22nd meeting and won with 706-500. His opponent in the race appealed to 1st District. The Party Plan states that contests should originate within the unit, yet the opponent appealed directly to 1st District. He reported that the Unit committee did hear the appeal, but ruled that Jones did not have standing and the appeal did not stand on the merits. The 1st District then took up the appeal where Mr. Albertson made a motion to overturn the canvass and redo the chairman's vote. The motion passed 16-8.

The issue today is that Fauquier erred in their decision to overturn. Herr mentioned that they were right on all issues except for the statement of qualifications ("loyalty oath") -- the question is whether or not the statement of qualification is "required" by the Party Plan. In 2012, the Fauquier County Unit did not require a statement of qualification in the presidential primary. Mr. Russell explained his objections to a requirement of the statement of a qualification rather than the option of including it.

District Member Allen Webb demonstrated that 55 Democrats participated in the Fauquier Unit election. If those 55 Democrats were all removed, Mr. Russell would still have won by 150+ votes. The people who conducted this appeal have integrity. One of the best run canvasses in memory.

Fauquier County has been a Republican juggernaut over the last few years. It is a solid Republican county and should not be fighting over this and instead should be working to elect Republicans to office. This is a strong party that wants to elect conservatives. Attorney Chris Ashby, the former deputy counsel for the Republican Party, has said that in his opinion that this appeal was decided wrongly by 1st District, and that the State Central Committee is duty bound to overturn. By upholding this appeal, Fauquier will be holding a canvass in September rather than working for Ed Gillespie, Hurt and Rob Wittman. He commended the Committee to read the documents, obey the Party Plan and abide by those rules.

MR. HERR: Speaking on behalf of the actions of the 1st District, he said it is a matter of timeline and rationale. He spoke with Mr. Jones with concerns about who participated in the meeting. He encouraged them to work with opposition, but there was no movement from the other side. He tried working with the unit committee who raised the appeal, was met with a motion to expel him from Fauquier. Mr. Webb, Carol Dawson, as Secretary, and Davis formed ad hoc committee with 125 years of experience. He gave no instructions other than to come to a

consensus and make a motion. He was not advised of their decision or findings until 48 hours before the meeting in order to establish procedures for hearing the appeal before knowing the result.

Each party had 10 minutes to present a case with unlimited debate. Mr. Herr said in his view, an appeal has to be based on how things were done, how the canvass was conducted, and was the ruling proper. What we found was that by a 16-8 vote with high attendance, that the canvass was not conducted in accordance with the Party Plan. Therefore the chairman's seat in Fauquier is invalid and a new canvass would have to be conducted with only those members who properly pre-filed. All other parts were fine; only the canvass was improper. This is not and was not about a "loyalty oath." The Party Plan says everyone has to be in accordance with the principles of the Republican Party. That is the independent clause. If requested, an attendee can be asked to sign a statement of qualification. "This has nothing to do with the statement of qualification. A loyalty oath is severable." He would prefer to see Republicans only participating in processes, and would have personally fought it. Giving a bit more background, Mr. Herr said he asked for a voter file, but they did not deliver this information but were told the next chairman would not deliver it. He received a spreadsheet with those who voted, but nothing was done to determine party affiliation. E-mails specifically encouraged others – Democrats and Libertarians -- to participate in our nomination methods. The question is do Republicans decide our offices, or not?

Pam Brown: No loyalty oath in the canvass for Wayne Coleman in 6th Senate District and observers were happy with the process. She expressed her opposition to this appeal.

Chris Stearns: Asked who were the senders of e-mails? Jessica Swan. Mr. Russell responded that he never sent any e-mails asking for others to participate outside of process and that he is not responsible or to blame if other e-mails were sent outside of their influence or name.

Steve Albertson: This is not about Russell, he said, it's about the process. We should protect ourselves against Democrats participating in our nomination methods. We have the means to protect ourselves. Requirement to protect the integrity of our processes remains with the unit, district, and State Central committees. Freedom of association is a core requirement.

First Vice Chairman Mike Thomas: Does not disagree with Mr. Albertson, but pleaded with members to have the Statement of Intent. Chesterfield and Henrico County units have had these for as long as he can remember. In January 2012, when State Central reconsidered a motion requiring the voters in the 2012 presidential primary to sign a Statement of Intent, he personally voted to keep it in.

Keith Damon: Confused here, heard two different things. Russell said that a list of people was sent to Allen Webb. Herr says that the requests were not made, but that some list was sent.

Would like both to respond as to what lists were made available -- the 1,200 list or just the list of who they think were Democrats?

Mr. Herr: An actual voter file was not issued, but he received an Excel spreadsheet, never the primary source document, he was refused access to it and still does not have it.

Mr. Russell: Responded that the reason they do not have it is because secretary (Leinhart?) talked to Mr. Webb directly and asked how to get the list to him. Mr. Webb did not respond for a week and a half. On their own initiative, they listed everyone down who participated according to the RPV database. According to Party Plan, these would be able to vote because they had not participated in a Democratic primary. When he says two months passed, that is because Jones first appealed to 1st District.

Mr. Herr: To be clear, because of equivocating e-mails, we asked for them to "send us the list" and we had to settle because it was the only data we were provided. Webb did not drop the ball.

Mr. Russell: Webb never asked for them to be mailed or Fed Ex'd.

Gary Byler: Asked if they had an e-mail trail?

Mr. Russell: Yes.

Russ Moulton: Explained that he has always understood that the responsibility lies with the unit and district committee for the Statement of Intent. The question has to be asked as to how the organizers protect the integrity of the process. When you find 107 Democrats on the list, how many people couldn't sign a simple Statement of Intent? You wonder whether or not the right people voted, and it challenges the integrity -- and that's bad for our party.

Don Williams: Question regarding what the remedy is, to recast the canvass? Is it true that no one who would be deemed a Democrat would be allowed to participate?

Mr. Herr: What we allow is that the Party Plan be enforced. One of the reasons why we established this, everyone must sign.

Mr. Russell: The decision of the 1st District affects the entire county. The decision made can overturn an election in the 5th District. So the three individuals that won that race in the 5th would have to run their canvass again.

John Scott: My question is (1) what would be the standard going forward, and (2) what is the protection to ensure it does not happen again?

Mr. Russell: I have no clue, but would need to be decided on a case by case situation. If any election turned out the way the loser did not like it, ultimately it can be challenged.

Delegate Jackson Miller: Point of order that the discussion is veering off the topic of the appeal. The remedy for the Party going forward is a different debate than what happened in Fauquier.

Mr. Scott: So what remedy?

Mr. Herr: We recommend the remedy that is consistent with the Party Plan.

A motion to close debate was made by Steven Thomas and seconded. However it was ruled out of order as there is 23 minutes still remaining in the debate period.

Matt Wells: Question whether anyone was requested to sign a Statement of Intent?

Mr. Russell: Both candidates had poll watchers, decision on the rules and procedures for the canvass. No one in the room or observers challenged a voter on the day of the canvass.

Mr. Herr: No check was made.

Mr. Russell: Could have asked, but chose not to do so.

Del. Miller: Complimented Chairman Herr on the process, question is whether we have any legal counsel in the past on this issue that agrees with 1st District's ruling? The answer is "no," none on the Statement of Intent? (Not aware of any.) Does Russell or Herr know of any party ruling that states that a Statement of Intent is required?

Mr. Herr: This decision is not about the oath but are you registered, and are you in accordance with the principles? This did not happen.

Mr. Russell: The answer is no, there has not been a determination. It is on a case by case decision.

David Ray: Silly to talk about the Statement of Intent. Both sides agree that there is no requirement to have the statement. Traditionally he has opposed the Statement of Intent. The question is whether they should do some good faith determination as to whether participants in this canvass are or are not in accordance with the Party Plan. It wasn't feasibly practical for the two observers to track all six (6) tables. Appearance of fairness, but not substantively fair. Russell: Raises the fair question as to why he should be penalized for the actions of others encouraging Democrats?

Mr. Herr: But Russell's responsibility is to protect the vote. The 1st District remedy is reasonable.

Larry Kile: Question is when did we lose our common sense? Republicans should vote in Republican events. But how do we make this happen? A Statement of Intent was enforced under King George. To actively recruit Democrats is beyond belief.

Mr. Stearns: Point of order, the debate is devolving into personal attacks.

Chairman Mullins: Reminded both sides to refrain from personal attacks.

Mr. Kile: Members in this room have participated in Democratic primaries. The State Central Committee should provide unit committees precisely what to do. In 2012, the State Central chose not to require it. What changed?

Mr. Herr: The Party Plan does allow for people to do so. We have that provision. We give them this guidance.

Suzanne Curran: May I yield my time to Stearns?

Chairman: No, this is not allowed.

Jack Wilson: Question if the appeal is granted, would the canvass require the Statement of Intent to enforce it? Can the 1st District require this? Can the 1st District require those in the 5th District to sign the Statement of Intent?

General Counsel Patrick McSweeney: So you want an instantaneous ruling? (laughter)

Morton Blackwell: The Party Plan requires that people who participate be in accord with Republican principles. Who ultimately decides whether or not the system ensures that the participants are in accord? Not the General Counsel, or State Chairman, it's the State Central Committee that has plenary power over that process.

Chairman : Asks for any further debate. Calls for a motion. A motion was made by Chris Stearns to close debate, with Matt Wells seconding the motion. The motion passed.

Mr. Albertson made a motion to uphold the 1st District Ruling in denying the appeal. Stearns seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken and with 51 yeas and 24 nays, the motion passed. (*Vote tally on page 43)

A motion was made by Mr. Scott to recess until 2 pm. After a second by Mr. Wells, the motion carried and a recess commenced at 12:24 pm.

APPEAL: CAMPBELL COUNTY

Chairman: Campbell County, Les Williams is one of the people involved and John Ferguson.

Rick Boyer: Les Williams and John Ferguson are the parties involved. Mr Chairman, I'm Rick Boyer, Lester Williams had asked me to represent him today. Les is here today as is a number of our former chairs and candidates. I represented Mr. Williams in front of the Fifth District appeal as well and he's asked me to represent him today and see if we can make a presentation in front of this board if this committee is so willing.

Neil Vener: Mr. Chairman, my name is Neil Vener and I will be representing John Ferguson in the Campbell County appeal.

Rick Boyer: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you, to you folks, the members of State Central Committee. Les Williams who is here today and over a 100 slated Republicans from Campbell County are in your debt today for taking the time and the interest in our appeal. We've provided you all with the list of transgressions against the Republican Party in Campbell County by the folks who took over our last meeting on March 20th. It goes back about four years. We've provided you all with a pile of evidence via email that thoroughly demonstrates our case. Hopefully you've seen in. If not, I do have a couple of hard copies. I didn't have the resources to print 80 of them.

The issue before you today is not a difficult case. It's not a close call. All of you all are long time Republican activists and your unit, no doubt, has factions, has changes in leadership but we're here today simply because a group of folks dedicated to the destruction of the Campbell County GOP and it's candidate since 2011 have repeatedly broken our Party Plan demonstrating by their actions that they are not, as Mr. Albertson pointed out in a previous appeal, in accord with the principles of the Republican Party, the basic requirement for participation in our Party.

We have tried to employ the Statement of Intent to screen folks out and yet most of the folks, the leadership team behind Mr. Ferguson's campaign, all signed up to be delegates to our convention, our state convention last year in 2013, signed that loyalty oath in February. The convention was in May. By April these folks were out running candidates for supervisor against the Republican nominees.

In 2011 they formed an organization, a pact, called the Independent Conservatives of Campbell County (ICCC) who's intent, according to it's secretary, Will Wheaton was: " to support independent candidates" against Republicans. Since 2011 this group has run a candidate against every single nominee of the Campbell County Republican Party for local office. Last year the group nominated three candidates for Board of Supervisors who was also endorsed by the Campbell County Democrats.

I'm trying to think where one begins with this. Let me read to you from Mr. Wheaton's blog post and he also writes for a small local newspaper. "In order to support these independent candidates a number of us quickly formed an organization we called the Independent Conservatives of Campbell County. We performed all the functions a political party would normally perform." With that I end the quote.

He says, and I paraphrase, that we recruited candidates, we raised money, we printed sample ballots, we worked the polls and we resoundingly defeated two out of the three candidates the Republicans put up. Actually, he said we resoundingly defeated all three but the truth was they defeated two of our three but that's when these folks began this. This is not a simple matter of inviting Democrats to participate in the Republican process. This is a matter of folks who have signed the loyalty oath, who have been privileged to participate as delegates and as members of our committee, who have then decided that if we don't like the nominee not only will we not support that nominee, we will go out and we will form our own political party, we will recruit candidates to run against the Republicans.

The Independent Conservative group, they've written letters, held press conferences, conducted opposition research, they've actually asked a former Commonwealth's Attorney to be responsible for conducting opposition research last year against our candidates after he signed a loyalty pledge to be one of our delegates at the 2013 convention.

On March 20th they made him the chairman of the Campbell County Republican Mass Meeting. They also printed that the secretary of the ICCC, who is now the secretary of the Campbell County Republicans since March 20th wrote an Article slamming Matt Farris our delegate, after he won the Party nomination, was up against Democrat Tony Brennan doing all sorts of opposition research that ended up coming back to help Tony Brennan's campaign.

The mass meeting campaign leading up to March 20th run by the, I'll call them the ICCC for time's sake, the Independent Conservatives of Campbell County as they call themselves, was fraudulent in it's claims and completely defied our Party Plan. Neil Vener, who chaired the meeting sent an email to every employee of the county schools on the county side, both the school employees and all the county employees. We provided you with a copy of that. Again, I have a couple of hard copies if folks would like to see it.

He attacked the Republicans on our Board of Supervisors as: "extremists." Indeed the point of attending this meeting, March 20th, according to both Mr. Vener's email and the campaign Facebook page was to make sure that no more Republican extremists were elected to our Board of Supervisors. Both pieces, the email and the Facebook page, specifically told readers that our Statement of Intent which they knew we were going to require was unenforceable and that they need not be Republicans at all to attend our meeting.

The plan was devilishly simple and it was very effective. The largest previous GOP mass meeting in Campbell County history had less than 250 people. Over 600 attended on March 20th, many

of them scared to death that their jobs were at stake. In Mr. Vener's email he says: "come to this meeting, if we get one more extremist Republican on this Board of Supervisors, they are going to cut teacher jobs, they're going to slash the size of government and your jobs are at stake." Among the 600 people were included scores of Democratic primary voters from 2009 and on and contributors to Democrats including two co-hosts of a Tom Perriello fundraiser in 2010.

One of them had signed this loyalty oath at our 2010 mass meeting only to host the Tom Perriello fundraiser two weeks later. He was there in 2014 at this mass meeting. There were also three candidates, one of whom actually temporarily put his hat in the ring for chairman of our Party at the mass meeting, who had actually been ICCC endorsed candidates for supervisor last year against Republicans. They had also been endorsed by Campbell County Democrats against the Republicans.

The long and short of it is the Independent Conservative folks, the ICCC folks, they actively sought massive voter fraud against the Campbell County Republican Party by opposing parties, Democrats and the Independent Conservative group and they got it by the truck load. The result was that they slated out over 100 long time loyal Republican activists and some brand new folks who it was their first ever mass meeting and they were thrown out.

We have long time Robert Hurt poll workers, phone callers, door knockers thrown out. Our former chairman, Les Williams, who lost the bid against John Ferguson, was thrown out. Matt Farris was slated off as a delegate to the Fifth District convention. All three Republican supervisors were thrown off the committee, thrown out as Fifth District convention delegates. They got what they wanted. We believe that the rule of law and the interest of justice ... Let me back up a step.

At the Fifth District, this meeting was appealed to the Fifth District. The Fifth District ruled that, yes, the meeting had been improper, the slating was illegal due to the Democrats coming and procedural issues but that they were not going to provide us with a remedy. That's why we're in front of you all today. At the Fifth District hearing Mr. Vener was repeatedly asked: "did you in fact intend the slate;" his response was "absolutely we intended the slate, we were not going to give them any seats on the committee and we are not going to give them any Fifth District delegates."

They weren't as concerned about the state convention, he said. Slating is legal. Inviting Democrats, begging Democrats to come and lie, urging them to lie as so many of these folks did last year when they signed a loyalty oath to this Party. And then before they attended the convention they were out running candidates against us by inviting Democrats to come in droves to a Republican mass meeting for the purpose of preventing "extremist" Republicans from winning elections is totally beyond the pale of Article One of our Party Plan. Thank you.

Neil Vener: Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the State Central Committee. My name is Neil Vener. I served as the elected Republican Commonwealth's Attorney for Campbell County for 28 years prior to my retirement at the end of 2011. I'm here representing the Campbell County Republican Party in my capacity as having been chairman of the mass meeting. The basis of their appeal is usually narrowed down to four central points. They're appealing because they lost and they lost handily. Now, they claim they lost only because we recruited Democrats to participate in the mass meeting.

They are appealing because they allege that three of the four candidates who filed to challenge Mr. Winger for chairman were ineligible because they had previously supported non-Republican candidates for office. However, it was a losing candidate and former chairman, Les Williams who ran the pre-filing and deemed them qualified and all three withdrew before any voting occurred so that issue is moot and irrelevant.

They are appealing because some of them were not elected as delegates to the Fifth District and the state conventions. That issue is also moot at this point because the district conventions and the state conventions have been held and they are appealing because the Fifth District committee ruled that the mass meeting should not have slated them, that district committee also upheld the election of John Ferguson and the union committee.

Their appeal is without merit. They are asking you to give them what they did not win in the mass meeting. First of all you should keep in mind they were the incumbent leadership. They decided what went into the call, they issued the call, they oversaw pre-filing, they oversaw all the logistics of the meeting, they decided how registration would work. They ran registration, they designed and printed the Statement of Intent form, they checked voters' registration and unlike the hearing before us, they required every single participant to sign a Statement of Intent and collected those statements and issued credentials.

Those who are now appealing ran every single aspect of the mass meeting until the election of the temporary chairman. They and they alone had access to the information about who was registering and what their previous vote history was. Every single voter met the qualifications to participate in the mass meeting and if anyone was given credentials to participate who should not have participated they bear sole responsibility. At no point was the right of a voter challenged before or during the meeting.

It was only after the meeting, after they lost that they decided to challenge anyone. On March 20th of this year almost 600 Campbell County Republicans turned out at Yellow Branch Elementary School in Rustburg for the mass meeting. It was the largest in the history of Campbell County. The credentials committee certified there were allowed to vote 581 people including four challenged candidates for chairman.

I was elected chairman of the mass meeting by 68 votes, 308 to 240. John Ferguson was elected chairman beating Les Williams by 112 votes, 301 to 189. Both votes were cast by secret ballot

as agreed to by both sides. The votes were not close. Everyone we recruited was told they were required to sign the Statement of Intent for participation at the mass meeting as governed by the state Party Plan which is our constitution, Article One, Section A1. Some people refused to sign that form and left but I don't need to read you the whole Article One because it's been read to you twice before.

It basically says that if requested in writing or orally to sign that form of intent you may participate in the mass meeting. There are no ifs, ands or buts. The paragraph is one whole paragraph. The language is also set forth in the call to the mass meeting issued by the former chairman and, in fact, at the beginning of the mass meeting Williams told the assembly if anyone can't follow this pledge you need to leave. Once they signed the Republican loyalty oath all the participants were in compliance with Article One, Section One of the state Party Plan and allowed to participate unless they were successfully challenged.

Again, I repeat, they challenged no-one. The appellants did not challenge a single one of the 581 voters through the voter registration process. They did not challenge them through the mass meeting credentials committee and they did not challenge anybody on the floor of the whole mass meeting. The time to challenge voters is before they voted not days, weeks or months after because you don't like the outcome. It's also to be noted that at the Fifth District appeal meeting on May 10th, they accused 88 people of being Democrats, falsely accused. Our research provided that only a handful; at most 10 to 12 participants could even be honestly accused of being Democrats.

Some of the people they falsely accused had voted in Democratic primaries. Important to note, prior to December 6th, 2013 when Article A, Section A2 became effective, in years where there was no Republican primary for strategic reasons. He's voted in a Republican primary too. Remember Rush Limbaugh's operation chaos? Other people were falsely accused in his list because they had names similar to people but with different middle names but they didn't bother to correct it.

We give you a spread sheet showing that at least 56 people were falsely accused of being Democrats but if they really believed that any of these folks should not have been allowed to participate they were in charge, they should have challenged them. In fact, some would argue they had a duty to challenge anybody they thought was ineligible to vote. The entire mass meeting was run according to the state Party Plan. The mass meeting call, they designed and the Rules adopted by the mass meeting.

In order to be fair and objective we requested that the Republican Party of Virginia's First Vice Chairman, Mike Thomas, serve as parliamentarian. Mike Thomas was present throughout the whole mass meeting and he has provided a sworn written statement attesting that the meeting was run in accordance with the state Party Plan and that was emailed to you Thursday by our chairman, John Ferguson. You should have that. The mass meeting adopted Rules governing the

conduct of the mass meeting including the nominations process which, as you know, supersedes Robert's Rules of Order just as in a convention.

You have also been sent a copy of the Rules and the minutes. The appellant has claimed that the Fifth District committee found the new unit illegally slated and offered them no remedies. That is a distortion. The Fifth District committee at their May 10th meeting voted to sustain their appeal but never identified or voted on any specific violations of the state Party Plan. The Fifth District also chose to take no action and offered no remedy except to resolve that our unit should manage its own affairs.

The issue has been addressed by the credentials and nominating committee at the Fifth District and state conventions by their own respective decisions. The Fifth District appeal hearing on May 10th voted to uphold the election of John Ferguson as chairman. They requested remedy to make a losing candidate, Les Williams a chairman, was rejected by the district committee as was the request for a new mass meeting.

Campbell County is a heavily Republican jurisdiction with a population of 60,000. This is why the fight started. Campbell County is a heavily Republican jurisdiction with about 60,000 yet membership in the Republican unit under Mr. Williams' leadership was down to about 10 or 12. That's right, a dozen members in a county of 60,000 people. The election of 2013 was the last straw. If Campbell County had had a vital active committee last year our county alone would have provided the votes necessary for Mark Obenshain to be attorney general. In this one instance we can see how history may have changed because of the deterioration of the Republican Party in Campbell County.

Believe it or not the campaign road signage used by the previous unit leadership omitted the name of Mark Obenshain. In essence, what the appellants are protesting are their own failures. They failed to develop a prosperous unit. They failed to turn out the necessary votes to win a mass meeting. They failed to challenge any of the 581 voters before or during the mass meeting that they now claim to be ineligible voters. However, one thing they did succeed at; they had all 581 voters sign the Republican loyalty oath bringing them in compliance with Article One, Section A1 and thus nullifying the whole basis of their argument.

Since winning control of the unit less than five months ago we have grown the membership of the unit to over 98 people and we aren't done growing. This includes the return of local elected officials who were forced out and many active, lifelong Republicans that have also been forced out of the unit by the previous leadership and Matt Farris, delegate Matt Farris has joined our unit. He was not elected as a delegate because he had the same last name as his father. That was a mistake. On July 19th we held our first annual great American cook out event for Congressman Robert Hurt and Ed Gillespie.

We had over 200 Republicans in attendance. This was the first and only campaign event hosted by the unit in many years and we plan to hold it again for our state and local candidates in

2015. We have also just joined with the Lynchburg Republican unit to jointly staff and fund a Republican victory center and campaign in Lynchburg with the upcoming senate and house races. The remedy they are seeking is extraordinary. They want you to dissolve the action of a mass meeting of 581 Republicans and to dissolve an active flourishing unit of almost 100 people.

John Ferguson's election was upheld by the Fifth District committee and they declined to dissolve the unit and order the mass meeting. They understand how profoundly destructive that would be. I ask that you uphold their decision. If we wish to grow our Party we have to respect the decisions of the grassroots voters. Primaries are neat and clean.

Chairman: Time.

Mr. Vener: Again, I ask you to ... In closing, we won fair and square. We'd ask you to uphold the Fifth District and let Campbell County finally flourish as a unit and help elect Republicans.

Chairman: Questions, comments. Just come on up to the microphone and identify yourself if you're a member of State Central.

Mike Thomas: What I have heard happen that the credentials at the 2013 convention, 29 individuals, 29 Republicans from Campbell County who are certified by the unit chair or had to be removed. Thankfully the credentials committee didn't do that. There was history there. They do want to get involved. Our intent in getting involved is to make sure the process was right.

The only thing I agree with Mr. Boyer on is that this is a very simple issue. The issue is that in all respects we're not perfect but in all major respects the meeting was run properly. The Statement of Intent is that you conform to the principles of the Republican Party as discussed in the last appeal, every individual was made to sign it and if there were people, there were people that left, who didn't want to sign it and that was fair. That was their free choice. The absurdity of this thing is that all of the bases on which we're being asked to overturn the mass meeting are things that those making the appeal themselves were in charge of. They ran everything up until the election of the chair. They're the only ones that had the data to challenge that somebody had voted in a Democratic primary. We know they did because they brought it up with certain individuals.

It was their responsibility and they didn't do it. To now turn around and say: "well, we didn't run it right so we want you to overturn this," sets a dangerous precedent for the future because in the future...

Chairman: Time.

Mr. Thomas: If they lose they can overturn and it's just wrong.

Chairman: There was no question there. You need to make statements or they can ask questions, either way as far as the debate and the delegates pointed that out to us in the first one. It wasn't a question. Go ahead.

Diane Shores: I'm here by proxy for Kurt Shores and I was present at the Campbell County mass meeting. A couple of things I just want to point out that I heard that I think everyone here should know. When we arrived to the meeting there were people in the hallway who were urging individuals there who were concerned about signing the pledge, they told the people: "don't worry about the pledge, it's not binding". That was very blatant and that was in the hallway leading into the meeting.

I believe it was Mr. Vener who said there was no opposition during the meeting two Democrats present. There were lots of people standing up trying to make objections about Democrat participation and non-Republicans being targeted for the meeting. They were ignored. There were people shouting to be recognized and just to mention, it was hot, it was overcrowded and it was a difficult meeting to begin with. People were trying to make objections and they were not heard.

I was also on the chairman Campbell County so I was part of the Fifth District meeting that heard the appeal. We were told by Bill Stanley that we could not overturn the meeting. He told us after a motion was made that we could not, in fact, make that motion. He called it out of order. We did make attempts to remedy the situation by overturning the meeting because everyone, I feel, in that room knew wrongdoing occurred. We all had an agreement that wrongdoing occurred.

Even in the district hearing it is my opinion that both Mr. Ferguson and Mr. Vener candidly admitted that they targeted non-Republicans to come to the meeting which I feel just counters the spirit of the pledge.

Chairman: Time.

Mrs. Shores: Thank you.

Russ Moulton: Proxy for Bob FitzSimmonds. I heard two different claims, one that there were no objections or challenges. I heard this one that there were objections and challenges to the credentials and qualifications of people there. I'm very disturbed by this email that Mr. Vener, I believe, sent out, I understand to all the school system employees, specifically asking them to participate and not worry about the enforce-ability of the statement. I had a discussion with somebody earlier about this when it occurred to me that the Party Plan was amended since I served on this body.

It (the Party Plan) says if you have come out publicly after you signed one of those statements and are caught publicly opposing one of our nominees you are ineligible for the next four years.

I didn't see any attempt by anybody there to assure the people who had clearly violated that Statement of Intent in the past were barred from participation. The one question I would have is who is Mr. Vener and that e-mail he sent out encouraging school systems to participate and not worry about the enforcement of the Statement of Intent, how many people did that go to and what is his role?

Mr. Vener: I sent that to the school board employees, the sheriff's department and Les Williams also sent an email to them encouraging them to come to vote as a Republican. Your decision didn't become effective until December 2013 and the call, their call and their pre-file form both had the language that if you'd ever participated in a Democratic process you have a one-time opportunity to participate in this mass meeting and if you do it again, we're going to kick you off for five years.

Their form had that in there about the one-time exception. Their call had that in there; their pre-file form had that in there. It said: "if you've ever participated in a Democrat committee, sign this form you can renounce your Democratic prior activities and you can participate in this mass meeting."

Ask Mr. Williams. It was in his pre-file form. It was in his registration form and it was in the call. Campbell County is 70% Republican. I would dare a guess, 70% of the teachers are Republican. A lot of you folks haven't been to Campbell County and again, at the meeting there was one objection to the nominating committee. Rule 12 of the Rules adopted said that the nominations committee could not be amended unless defeated. There was a voice vote. I believe one of the people here made a motion to have a secret ballot on the nominations committee.

They voted no. They made another motion, they voted no. We expected they were going to ask for a division of the house. They did not ask for a division of the house. The people at the meeting clearly upheld the nominations, the Rules and voted on whether or not to have a second vote on the nomination and they voted no.

Mr. Boyer: With regard to Mr. Moulton's question as to why the folks were not challenged previously, they were challenged through us and Mike Thomas already pointed that out. We challenged the credentials of Mr. Vener and about 20 other folks who had signed a loyalty oath in 2013 and we required the loyalty oath if they were going to be delegates at the 2013 convention last year in Richmond. They signed it. The convention was in May.

By April these folks were out recruiting and running candidates on their independent conservative banner with Democrat endorsements against the Republican nominees after we already certified them as delegates. At that point we went to the credentials committee of the Republican Party in Virginia, the state convention and we asked them, we said: "look, at this point these people are not qualified to participate, they have violated, they've signed that they're going to support our candidates and now they're out there publicly supporting the opponents to a Republican candidate."

They are not, as Mr. Albertson pointed out in the previous appeal, they are not eligible. They have demonstrated they have not in line with the principles of this Party and they are not going to support our candidates in the ensuing general election. On that basis we asked the credentials committee to address this. We asked the credentials committee to strike those specific names that were publicly supporting the independent candidates with Democratic endorsements against the Republicans. Unfortunately, the credentials committee opted not to uphold the Party Plan.

That's why we're asking you all for remedy today. Unfortunately, that determination emboldened these folks who then went back out this year and openly begged Democrats to come, openly told folks what their entire campaign plank was, "if we have one more extremist Republican on the Board of Supervisors people are going to start losing their jobs." Our supervisor this year passed a 1% tax cut and a teacher pay increase. That's out of three Republicans with only one in ten supporting them but the entire campaign was based on falsehood.

The entire campaign was based on scare tactics against the Republican Party. The entire campaign was show up at the Republican mass meeting to make sure no more Republicans ever get elected. No other committee in this state would be asked to bear up under that and no other committee in this state could. The blue ring was laid out; if you don't like the direction of your Republican Party whether it's too conservative, too liberal or whatever, if you don't like the direction of your Republican party, we all know, those battles go on all the time.

We ought to have those battles within the context of the convention and at the primary mass meeting, push the Party, try to push the Party in the direction we believe. Once the nomination process is over we have to support the candidates. Campbell County had Ken Cuccinelli. We were the only county outside of South West Virginia to get 70% of the vote to Ken Cuccinelli last year.

Mr. Stearns: What I see here is very disturbing. The gentlemen behind you, Mr. Vener, openly acknowledged, no denial whatsoever about the intentional corruption of our Party process and there are people here that are okay with that. Think about that folks. Yes, people signed the Statement of Intent and if that means enough to you that it's okay to allow the corruption of our process just simply because they signed their names on a sheet of paper, I think that speaks a lot about this body if we vote in favor of that type of notion as opposed to having these folks redo the process.

Del. Miller: This gentleman never acknowledged corruption of the process. I think there's a difference of opinion. He has never acknowledged corruption of the process.

Mr. Stearns: When I say corruption of the process, just for clarification, I'm talking about the solicitation of Democrats and other non-Republicans, individuals who run against Republicans, things that go against the Creed of the Party and Article One of the Party Plan, people that

openly defy that. That is not something that is okay to do and just for signing a sheet of paper, stating something and being told that it's okay to lie about this. I do think that is a problem and I think if we vote in favor of that motion today I think we're doing our Party a disservice.

I think in the maize of wrongdoings and bringing Democrats in under threats of their jobs and things of that nature, I think we really need to take that into consideration and I strongly encourage everybody to vote in favor of an appeal today.

Peyton Knight: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I was in the Fifth District Committee meeting. My name is Peyton Knight, I'm sorry. I was in the Fifth District and I was at the committee meeting where we heard this appeal originally. I don't want it to be lost in the debate here but this is very similar to the previous appeal we just heard in Fauquier County in the sense that this is not about personalities. This is about the integrity of our electoral process, of our Party.

I don't know either of the chairmen personally. I spent a long day in Roanoke hearing this appeal a while back and I don't want it to be lost that the Fifth District as a body found that the Campbell County mass meeting had been illegally conducted. We found that. What happened was when we went to move to a resolution we were told by then chairman, Bill Stanley, that we were not allowed to vote to conduct a new meeting which clearly is not true. We were actually denied the ability to put that forward as a motion and hold a vote on how to rectify the situation.

Essentially, what we were told we could do was we could find wrongdoing, illegal activity which we did, but do nothing about it and I just don't want that to be lost in all the discussion here.

John Scott: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I go back to thinking what we just did about 90 minutes or two hours ago, what we voted on and I can't help but keep remembering what Chairman Herr said about it would it be good enough for him if he just simply, he would have voted against that appeal if he simply had gone to someone and said: "are you Republican" and they answered yes.

In this case we have every single person who attended that meeting not just asked "are you Republican" but takes a signature in oath which is not a piece of paper which someone simply signed. It's them putting their name promising that they are Republican and they signed that. I was fine with the last appeal but suddenly now we're questioning the integrity of statements of intent. Think about that for a second.

If we're now going to question the integrity of statements of intent where does that leave us and where are we going to be applying that in any other appeal, any other time somebody could go: "well, I know he signed it but does it really mean anything." Think about that. That's the precedent that we'll be setting here today by voting that appeal when we just said in the last one, we just said: "it's okay, it's okay if they signed that Statement of Intent, it's perfectly fine with the accords and principles of our Party." Think about that, ladies and gentlemen. Do

not put yourself in a position where you're going to contradict yourself from one vote to another when you have said this is the line that we're going to draw in the sand and on the very next appeal I'm going to hop over that line and do it. I would vote down this appeal.

Unidentified Male: Alright, I'm not a lawyer. What he just said, we didn't say that it would be okay to just accept the loyalty oath. Chairman Herr did. I would not just accept that especially when we openly invited people to ... It doesn't matter if they signed it or not and then openly invited Democrats. Again, it's a common sense thing. It's a Republican mass meeting. Where have we lost that? We need to have this mass meeting redone and done properly and make sure that these people, if they signed their oaths before supporting a candidate other than a Republican that they don't participate.

We have teeth in that now. Kick them out. Chairman Herr said he would accept it. I wouldn't accept it.

William Kirk: Thank you Mr Chairman. I'm Will Kirk. I'm speaking in proxy. Mr. Vener, I am a school teacher. I'd appreciate it if you folks wouldn't tell me there is not a problem with unions and Democrats. I promise you that I have to keep quiet and undercover at every moment.

I have a serious concern that if this mass meeting is not redone that more than just a blueprint is laid. Every one of your counties is at significant risk. Every single one of them may have a Democrat who can do exactly the same thing if they don't like where you're headed. I'm just asking questions for Mr. Boyer. First of all, I want to know exactly what you're appealing. I want to know exactly why you're appealing it and I want to hear some more about that process and why those were not contested.

I was actually at the mass meeting as well and I was behind the registration table. When I ran for chairman in 2010 there were 228 people in attendance. That was the largest at the time. We did due diligence. We planned for 500 people and we were overwhelmed by Democrats folks. We were overwhelmed by people who had broken the state Party Plan multiple times who I had politely dismissed from the Party for violations of the Plan. I want to hear these questions answered on this floor.

Mr. Boyer: The only illegality, Mr. Kirk, and in contrast to Mr. Scott's claim, Mr. Kirk's only complaint was that nobody required him to sign a loyalty oath. Mr. Kirk's complaint, quite frankly, was the exact opposite. The point was not the loyalty oath. The point was that the folks at the meeting had not met the basic threshold requirement to be in accord with the principles of our Party as demonstrated by being willing to support our candidates in the ensuing general election.

That is the illegality that we're challenging. We have folks, again, we asked the credentials committee to address this last year and it was not addressed and have that embolden folks to go out and do this again but the specific illegality we're challenging, even if you do sign a loyalty

oath, we can have 20 something of these folks including Mr. Vener who signed that loyalty oath last year in February.

Before they had even attended the convention for which they had signed that loyalty oath they were out endorsing independent candidates, Democrat endorsed candidates against Republicans. What they had done and then there's supposed to be some sort of moral equivalence is that they actively have gone out, folks who were in virtually their entire leadership team signed the pledge to support our candidates last year, came as delegates and violated that pledge, supported Democrat endorsed independents before they even attended that convention to vote.

That is the illegality. You cannot, if you have a problem with the direction the Party is going in you challenge it within the party, you come to the mass meeting, you bring all your Republican friends and you try to win. If you win? Wonderful. If you lose, you lose. Had they lost only with Republican votes we would have complained to each other and we would have let it go. The illegality that's being challenged is the threshold requirement.

Mr. Vener's other point, we somehow failed because we got overwhelmed by their intentional campaign by folks with years of history of running campaigns against our party, writing letters to the editor against our candidates, raising money against our candidates through fundraisers, press conferences, handing out sample ballots against our candidates, a coordinated campaign urging people not only to bring Democrats to the meeting but to lie, to falsely state that they're Republicans on a pledge they promised people could not be enforced and our mistake, by contrast, was that we missed the point of technically calling for a division of the house.

Mr. Kirk, your point is well taken.

Mr. Vener: I'd like to respond to what he said. Mr. Boyer put up a list of 88 people who claimed were Democrats. He went through everybody. He combed through the whole thing. Fifty-six of the people he accused of being Democrats are falsely accused. There were at most a dozen Democrats that participated in this meeting. We came out, we organized, we brought Republicans and we beat him and he said we ran people against his candidates last year for supervisor. The people we supported were the incumbent Republican Board of Supervisors members that they would not even let have a primary.

They selected candidates and put two long time conservative Republican incumbents out of office. They're the ones who came after Republicans. They purged the Republican Party. The ICC as members of the Republican Party were purged after we refused to support an unqualified candidate for clerk and a candidate for sheriff in a 70% Republican county that got 471 votes, less than 5% of the votes. We're the ones that are concerned about the Campbell County Republican party. We're the ones that now have 98 members instead of 10. We're the ones, the workers and we did it, we came and we did it fair and square.

They were in charge of the meeting. They knew who we were. They knew who were coming and anybody's activity according to the State Party Plan which is the Bible of this party, December 6th 2013 is as far as you can look back because the five year rule starts at any activity after December 6th, 2013. Mr. Boyer voted in a Democratic primary. Some of the people he accused of being Democrats have voted in one Democratic primary and five Republican primaries but if you're going to follow your Party Plan you can't judge people on conduct prior to December 6th, 2013.

Chairman: We don't need applause after everybody speaking.

Unidentified Male: A couple of things occurred to me as I followed some of the conversation this afternoon or this morning. I'm going to tag on to what John talked about in following trying to connect those dots on what they're really looking for and earlier today I've had the pleasure of serving on the credentials committee for some years and I know I'm not putting words in his mouth and anyone else's mouth but I know that whether we agree on a matter or not one thing we always agree on is following things through to a conclusion and try our best to not let external discussion cloud the facts as we get to that decision point.

Usually you do that by making sure that all of the data is correct. We talked earlier about the exchange of information, in another case earlier today, and it occurred to me that that was important then and I think there was probably a gap that folks talked about and I believe it affected the way some people voted. Today, having some experience with that Campbell County appeal at the credentials last year, I'd like to find out from Mr. Vener, if you all had all the information, if you were not in charge of the convention, did you all get all of the information that you needed to prepare? Did you have a list of voters and that sort of thing? It's really a short question. I don't think we need to debate it.

Mr. Vener: We that night, asked Mr. Williams if he had a list of everybody who had pre-filed. He said he did not. When he came to the Fifth District hearing he said that he didn't know you're supposed to have it. He had a list but he left it at home. Basically, they gave our nominating committee just a big bag of unopened envelopes and they had no list of who had pre-filed and who they had vetted and said were qualified voters. Our nominations committee came up with nominations but they didn't give us a list.

We asked them in advance if we could have a list of the pre-files and he said: "no, I don't have to give it to you." We tried, we asked for the list. They didn't give us a list. He said he left it at home.

Mr. Witt: Thank you.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Williams did not bring an Excel spreadsheet. Again, I've looked in vain for the section of the Party Plan that said you have to bring an Excel spreadsheet. The job of the nominations committee at a mass meeting is to determine who is properly pre-filed to be on

the committee for chairman, for delegates at the state and the Fifth District convention. He is correct, all Mr. Williams had was the envelopes with the copies of the original pre-files in them which, incidentally, I think Chairman Bill Stanley ordered those to be delivered to the credentials committee but the Fifth District in order to determine if it was properly pre-filed Mr. Ferguson refused to release.

To this day no one but Mr. Ferguson has access to those pre-files to even know who was supposed to have been pre-filed. The fact of the matter is if Mr. Williams' candidate had won the temporary chairmanship then Mr. Williams' candidate would have been pointing the credentials to the nominations committee instead of Mr. Vener and Mr. Williams' candidate for temporary chair, Mr. Williams' nomination committee would have had to read through those same envelopes as well.

If that's somehow put out there as a way of sand-bagging, you have to assume Mr. Williams planned on losing that vote. Mr. Williams, I'm certain, planned on winning it. The list he provided to the other side was the only list he himself had access to. If Mr. Williams had won the temporary chair vote his nomination committee would have had to go through those pre-files, read off the names. That was his intention, was to simply call the names out and read them off. Here are the folks who have pre-filed for the credentials committee and just read through them.

Mr. Boyer: These are the folks who have pre-filed for the state convention. Read the names. Mr. Vener, as he stated, at this district appeal he had no intention of reading them off. They intended to slate them.

Travis Witt: I'm on the Fifth District Committee. Let me just give you my take on this. Every single one of us in this room have principles and when those principles are caught up with personalities many of us become pragmatic and when we become pragmatic we lose our purpose. Understand that a request going out to everybody within the Campbell County public domain requesting that they come to a Republican meeting and vote, to me, stands, despite the fact that we might look at the slating and the other issues as legal, there's something about principles that we must agree upon.

I believe, as a party, we are losing our principles if we don't stay purposeful on the issues and the issues of being purposeful is not about pragmatism not is it about personalities. If we watch these debates, that's exactly what we're getting into. We're walking away from principles and I think you can walk away from principles if we allow individuals that are not a part of the Republican Party to vote in any kind of mass meeting if we know they aren't. Thank you.

Anne Fitzgerald: Good afternoon. I'm in the Sixth District. I've been listening to the conversation. I've been reading through the mountains of paperwork that was sent to all of us. The only thing I'd like to point out is that thing I heard from Mr. Vener was that there's a one-

time allowance for Democrats. Whether that was his intent or not we were discussing the spirit of intent earlier and the loyalty of the pledge.

If you're telling folks that they're given a one-time allowance and you're sending out an email encouraging folks regardless of their political party to come out and vote I take that as a spirit of intent not being for the Republican Party. I just want to point that out. Thank you.

Matt Wells: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Matt Wells of the Seventh District. Many of you will remember that I used to work for the state party and when I did I don't think there was anybody that held more events and fought for more unites than I did. Many of you will remember that time, it might have slipped off the tracks but we did it within the Rules as they were not the Rules as we wished they were, not the Rules as we thought they would be.

If this body feels that the Rules currently are not sufficient to protect itself then we should change those Rules going forward. If we feel the law does not allow us to make those changes we should work to change the law but this body and this Party cannot become a dumping ground for appeals, for brief parties whose only complaint is that they didn't follow the Rules the way we wish they were.

That's not what we do. We're a party of rules and we should uphold those rules. I would urge the body to reject this appeal. Thank you.

Mr. Herr: My name is Eric Herr, I'm the First District chairman and a number of people have put a couple of words in my mouth. In this case no one lied, no one was encouraged to lie. They said "it's okay if you're an independent, come on out." They didn't encourage people to lie. That's not what happened here. The appellants charged that they sent out that email and said there's no way to enforce this so it's okay to lie. The respondent never addressed that. That's the essence of this.

There were about 150 pre-files for delegates and members and 581 people showed up. They had a chance to do due diligence on 140 or 150 and I think they lost the vote by 50 votes for temporary chair when over 400 people who were said show up and lie. My position is consistent. It's not okay. You don't blame the bank because they have bars and a guy comes in with a gun and steals money. He's wrong. We expect people to be honest when they fill out the forms.

If they're encouraged to lie we have to enforce it. It's unenforceable? Newsflash folks, we can enforce it today and I will support this appeal.

Peter Fiochio: I'm Peter Fiochio one of our CR's and I thought it was interesting earlier when Mr. Boyer said that folks were coming to this meeting to stop Republicans from getting elected and that seems strange to me because it seems that the committee has grown quite

substantially and they've had their first major event in years. If their purpose was to stop Republicans from getting elected it seems like they've done quite the opposite of that.

The Campbell County Committee has grown and I was present as a proxy at the Fifth District meeting back in June and we voted unanimously to reject this appeal and I'd like to encourage you all to do that and vote against the appeal today. Thank you.

Don Williams made a motion to close debate and call the question. The motion was seconded by Frank Nutter.

Peyton Knight: Thank you, Mr. Chairman for recognizing and making a call on this motion. For hearing what we've heard here today I'd like to move that we resolve that the State Central Committee finds it improper that certain individuals associated with the Independent Campbell County Conservatives, which has been operating in effect as a third Party in Campbell County, encouraged participation by Democrats and non-Republicans to lie about their intent to support Republican nominees in order to subvert a mass meeting.

Further that the election of the Campbell County unit chairman and unit committee is hereby voided, that RPV staff with the guidance of the chairman and the executive committee are hereby instructed to issue a Call to a new Campbell County mass meeting at the earliest practical date before the end of this year and the RPV staff, with guidance from the executive committee adopt a new proper mass meeting for Campbell County for the singular purpose of electing a new chairman and committee members that only those that properly pre-filed before and considered properly pre-filed now with the executive committee making a determination of those properly pre-filed.

The role of the RPV staff and executive committee oversight shall reissue the same Campbell County Call as before but with a new date, time and venue. That they shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that only those qualified with Article One, Section A of the Party Plan be allowed to participate in the mass meeting. Specifically, that all participants must sign a Statement of Intent confirming that they are in accord with the principles of the Republican Party and intend to support nominees of the Party and those participating shall be screened for publicly violating past statements of intents and participating in nomination methods of another Party including the Democratic Party.

Those refusing to sign statements of intent or those who have violated past statements of intent in the past four years shall be barred from participating. Those that have participated in the nomination process of another Party shall sign a renunciation statement and shall be barred from participating in this year's mass meeting.

Mr. Thomas: Point of order. The motion by Mr. Knight is out of order because the motion contradicts the General Counsel's ruling issued in the spring that the amendment we made to the Party Plan in December 2013 cannot be applied retroactively with regards to the four year

time period allowed since voting for a candidate in the Democratic Party. This motion would apply retroactively and is therefore out of order.

Discussion and debate on the Point of Order commenced.

The motion to close debate was moved and seconded.

After an attempt to offer a substitute motion was ruled out of order, the Chairman asked Mr. Knight to offer the motion in a concise, clean manner so the Committee could vote more accurately.

Del. Jackson: Before Mr. Knight reads this Mr. Chairman, we know where these folks are going everyone in the room does I'm not sure it is a point to where is in that even for Mr. Knight to re-read a 15 or 16 paragraph motion And us take a vote on it is absolutely unfair to every member no matter what side you're on. This motion is just way too long to detail and I don't know if Mr. Knight can take time or perhaps go into recess and start in on other business just bring to this motion down to simple idea, otherwise we need to print this motion and let everyone read it, see what's on it is just too long of a motion for anyone to understand.

Chairman: Just in precise one or two sentences what do you move?

David Ray: That the appeal be upheld, that's the motion that the appeal be upheld?

Mr. Knight: That the Campbell County Mass Meeting be ruled null and void and that we issue a Call at the discretion of the Chairman of the Executive Committee of RPV for a new Campbell County Mass Meeting to be held before the end of this year.

Male: It sounded like two questions.

Mr. Knight: The motion on the floor is that the Campbell County Mass Meeting, which elected its Committee Chairman and officials for Campbell County, be deemed null and void by the State Central Committee and that a new Call be issued for a new meeting to elect a new Chairman and officials for the Campbell County Republican Party."

Morton Blackwell: The body voted overwhelmingly to cut off debate. There's nothing else that we could undertake except having to retake the motions we've done. We must proceed to a vote on the motion. No more debate.

Chairman: We'll take a roll call vote.

The vote was 49 in favor of the motion, 28 opposed. The motion carried to uphold the Appeal of the Campbell County unit. (*Vote tally found on page 43)

Chairman: The vote to approve the motion, so there will be a re-do in Campbell County. The Party doesn't come in to do it by the way. Okay, we'll do one more of these and come back and take a break and come back for the last two and that we are on track for the 11:00 service tomorrow morning (laughter) but if its at 9:30 then you might not make it okay.

APPEAL: FIFTH DISTRICT/GENERAL COUNSEL RULING

This is the Fifth District appeal of the General Counsel's ruling.

Mr. Thomas: I will try to make this brief background, at the Fifth District convention in May, the district convention, exercised its right under Article IV, Section E about passing a motion to rescind the voting rights of its members to the State Central Committee on its district committee. Article IV, Section E says as follows "each biennial district convention may determine whether it's members on the State Central Committee will have a vote on the district committee. Such voting privileges, once extended shall continue until rescinded by subsequent biennial district convention. Shortly after the conclusion of that district convention the general counsel was asked to make a ruling primarily whether previous notice was needed in order to take such an action. The reason this is being appealed is somewhat odd because although I would agree with a lot of what's contained in it that the ruling is actually misapplied as it pertains to the Fifth District convention.

The ruling which says that the action of the district convention wasn't legitimate as predicated on a necessity of the Fifth District amending its bylaws to say that the members would not have a vote. It's very important to keep in mind that some of the materials and out in the mail is inaccurate.

Currently the bylaws of the Fifth District lists the members, like I assume most of your bylaws do, and under voting members of the voting members at the district committee says members of the state down in parentheses it says "see Article IV, Section E of the state Party Plan" that's referring to that section that I just read, is important to note that throughout the district bylaws probably like many of your bylaws, there are a lot of references to the Party Plan so there is context for the district bylaws but you don't have to make them so long by spelling everything out.

These are the points that the Fifth District Committee bylaws are in compliance with the state Party Plan because it lists the State Central Committee members as members and whether they have a vote or not it would first refer to Article IV, Section E as to whether they will have a vote, perfectly in compliance with the Party Plan.

The General Counsel's ruling, and the reason this being appealed is to cover more fundamental reasons, that the premise of the general counsel ruling being that it is necessary to first amend the district bylaws in order to rescind the votes of the district committee members. This could be looked at very broadly if a district committee's bylaws say other things that perhaps are in

conflict with the Party Plan it would be necessary to amend those district committee bylaws in order to actually be in compliance with the Party Plan and I'll give you a couple of examples.

Let's assume for a moment that the Fifth District bylaws said that no member, no district member of the SCC shall still have a vote on a district committee. So we all agree hypothetically this in the bylaws does that mean that because that's in the bylaws that the members of the state central district do not have a vote? No because that being the bylaws but because the Party Plan clearly rests with the delegates in the district convention has the power to decide whether or not they will. Likewise and again the district doesn't say it this way but let's the district bylaws said that the district members will always have a vote regardless of what the district convention does. Is that then binding on the district? No, its not because it conflicts with the Party Plan which rests that power at the grassroots convention, it can extend those rights or take them back.

Let's look at the issue of notice at what's really the genesis for their request. You have to give notice, there wasn't notice in the Call, that sort of thing had the district level. A motion made by one of the delegates.

The General Counsel's ruling, I believe is correct and how it describes the notice requirements for amending the district committees bylaws. But the Fifth District convention was not attempting to amend the bylaws because they didn't have to. This is accurate and the kind of notice that has to be get out in order to amend the bylaws that doesn't apply to what happened at the Fifth District convention because they weren't attempting to amend the bylaws.

The Party Plan is very precise after notice has been given, for with proper notice or notice in the agenda or some variation thereof in accordance with the Party Plan. Again and again it goes through all of the things where notice is required. The Party Plan doesn't require notice for this instance and we have a couple of recent examples where this has applied in the 6th district.

In the Sixth Congressional District in the year 2010 when Wendell Walker served as chairman of the convention and I served as Parliamentarian, there was a motion passed to extend voting rights to all of the members of the State Central Committee that passed with the simple majority, wasn't included in the call. There wasn't notice given ahead of time and keep in mind that we said the notice has to be given to rescind them, they would have to give notice to extend them, correct?

Then at this year's convention there was a motion passed that wasn't included in the Call, there wasn't notice given to rescind the voting rights of some other members of the State Central Committee. Again that passed so we see how it has operated and as far back as I can research with the mid '80's, I came across a motion to extend rights never had prior notices made at the convention because really that's all that's required by the Party Plan. So this being appealed not because it has a necessary bearing on the next appeal because that was under a separate

appeals process, the general counsel ruling was granted after the convention had acted and as we know the only process by which you can address an action of a convention is the appeal process.

It does not have direct bearing on that but I believe it does have an intensive impact for the Party overall and I give the benefit of the doubt to our general counsel I do not know what set of facts he was presented. I think he's correct about what it takes to amend the bylaws both what the bylaws say and what Robert's says, but the district committee was not trying to amend their bylaws because they didn't have to.

Patrick McSweeney: Does everyone have a copy of my May 31, 2014 ruling? I think it is unseemly for me to defend the ruling, it's either stated properly in that letter or its not. I just want to point out that the when an action is to be taken to rescind a vote of the district members of that committee, Robert Rules requires notice and the super majority so regardless of what the Party Plan says, we follow Robert's Rules. So there are multiple reasons which you will see in that letter. The letter speaks for its self.

Keith Damon: Mr. Thomas made a point in the fact the Party Plan. Is it logical, and I ask both parties just because it is not noted in the Party Plan therefore there's something about it? In my opinion Robert's Rules say that it has to be previous notice. If it's not in the Party Plan we revert to Robert's Rules.

Mr. Thomas: Pat I'll like to address that, it's never been interrupted that way, if this kind of thing is true we couldn't pass resolutions at conventions. It was just because notices not called for in our Party Plan, is it illogical because Robert's says this then there must be notice. Is that a fair description of your question? I don't believe it is and again that goes to the heart of this being appealed because yes this section requires notice but there are a lot of districts out there who's members don't have votes because when they were granted those votes in the first place there was no notice given. There are potentially a lot of things can happen as a result of that that are unintentional.

Mr. McSweeney: I'll just restate what I said earlier, is not every matter every resolution is required to have notice. If it's not specified in the Party Plan but when you're going to rescind votes from a voting member that requires notice by Robert's Rules.

Don Williams: Would like to know about precedence. How do we get to Robert's where are we deciding that when we get to Robert's about something not being in the Party Plan.

Mr. McSweeney: That's really a simple answer where the Party Plan deals with an issue, you don't go to Robert's Rules. Where it's a necessary implication the Party Plan negates something or require something you don't go to Robert's Rules. When it's silent, you go to Robert's Rules.

Mr. Thomas: There's not a single in the Party Plan where the Party Plans says no notice is required, it doesn't say it either says notice or it doesn't have anything. And historically its always been interpreted that notice has been required and if its not required there its required in the body and the point I'm making and the reason I'm bringing this up is that yes it is required to rescind. It therefore has to be required in order to have extended them in the first place.

Mr. Ray: As I understand this particular question, in my opinion an incredibly eloquent case, for both parts and you sited multiple incidences where credentials were extended the right to vote. This is different because this is an instance where voting rights were taken away, not granted. Mike makes an almost persuasive case that if you don't require notice to extend the voting rights then you don't require notice to take them away. It is set for one thing which I think I can see his point, since the Party Plan does not require both parties to agree today. Robert's Rules does require a simple majority votes to restrict rights of a body or members thereof and that's where Robert's Rules would apply because in this instance for example that's right, those don't restrict the rights of members of the State Central Committee but this particular action restrict the rights of those three represented and that's why Robert's Rules of Order apply.

Mr. Scott: This is directed to Counsel as well. Mr. Thomas talked about the Sixth District decision being similar. Now I was there and it was a simple majority the revoked those voting rights and was passed by a simple majority and there was no notice at all. Now to my understanding the decision they made at the Fifth District meeting is out of order I feel as though there's a conflict between those two things. I don't understand how the Sixth District stands in the Fifth District doesn't stand.

Mr. McSweeney: That has been brought to me.

Mr. Scott: So if the decision today is that there has to be notice required and that they have to be notice required and you have to have super majority which is 3/4ths majority, then that means that no other body can do that right?

Mr. McSweeney: You're asking a hypothetical question in the context of an appeal. We're dealing only with the Fifth District by logic obviously the appeal would apply to the others but that is not before us.

Diane Shores: Here by proxy. At the end of the meeting at the conclusion of all the agenda items people started to leave and a gentlemen started to walk forward and he didn't call it a motion, he called it a resolution he said to the then Chairman, John Larson, "Mr. Chairman I have a resolution" I would like to bring before this committee. So I raised my hand and I objected because the resolutions committee had already brought forward everything. John Larson the parliamentarian decided that no, it wasn't a resolution it was a motion, and I said to the gentlemen "is this a motion or a resolution?" He said no it wasn't a resolution it was a

motion, he said so again and he made a motion when everyone was leaving so all the agenda items in their minds had been conducted and I then called and asked the chairman is there's a quorum present because if we don't have a quorum of members here we can't take a vote. Several people stepped forward and objected and they found it to be in order and that's how it went down. People were leaving, people were unsure of a motion, and there was no super majority.

Rick Boyer: I was there at the 5th District convention and the biggest problems with motion made to take away certain voting rights from State Central Committee members have been put forward. The motion was taken, it was a voice vote and was ruled the chairman to be a majority vote. Am I correct Mr. Chairman according to Mr. Thomas once a convention is obviously your vote for temporary chairman is going to be a simple majority vote. But once the credentials committee has reported you cannot take actions, other resolutions, you can't do a motion like this, a simple vote without considering a weighted vote. There was never a vote by unit, it was at the very end and a number of folks had already walked away. A voice vote was taken and the chairman stated that the 'I's' have it and the motion carries. I don't believe that vote could be under valid under Robert's Rules or the State Party Plan, primarily Robert's. Once the credentials committee has been enpaneled, has determined who is there and generally voting, I don't think you can do the simple voice vote majority. It has to be a weighted vote, there's no indication that was the case, there's no vote taken, it's a voice vote, 'ayes' have it, I don't believe that both could be permissible under Robert's regardless of 3/4ths of the majority says.

Chairman: Did you have a question?

Mr. Boyer: Is there any way that you can take a voice vote on anything other than a resolution without a simple majority vote to take voting rights away, without doing it by weighted vote once the credentials committee has been seated and determined by units.

Chairman: This is not pertinent to the discussion.

Mr. Herr: Chairman I suggest that we close the debate.

The motion was seconded and passed to close debate.

Mr. Thomas: I move that the State Central Committee overturn the General Counsel's ruling.

The motion was seconded.

Chairman: It's been moved and seconded that we will overturn the General Counsel's ruling in the Fifth District.

Shaun Kenney: Then the motion is to vacate the General Counsel's ruling, you're voting to overturn the general counsel with a 'yes' vote. If you vote 'no' you're voting to keep the General Counsel ruling.

A roll call vote was called by the Secretary. The “yay” votes are 15, the “no” votes are 62. The General Counsel’s ruling is upheld. (*Vote tally found on page 43)

Steve Albertson: I would like to make a motion to reconsider the previous motion, and before you start hurling things at me saying I'm wasting your time, I'm doing this for the purpose of amending the previous motion to invalidate the previous motion in the Fifth District made that excluded the people. It shouldn't have been brought to a vote according to the General Counsel’s ruling, and in doing so we can save time by making the next appeal moot. So the motion is to reconsider for the purposes of amending the previous motion.

Chairman: There's a motion to reconsider, is there a second?

Del. Miller: Mr. Chairman, Point of Order. This is not correct. This motion cannot be made because the gentlemen voted in the affirmative. He was on the failing side, therefore he cannot make this motion to reconsider.

Chairman: Okay. We'll take a 10 minute break and come back in. Okay. We got three things left to do, one is the district appeal in the Fifth District, second one is Virginia Beach and then we go into executive session to hear the financial report.

The meeting adjourned for a brief recess.

APPEAL: FIFTH DISTRICT

The meeting was called back to order by the Chairman who recognized Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, I have a Point of Order in that this next appeal on the agenda is not validly before this committee because the action requires 25 signatures as it required in Article X, Section E, Paragraph 4 of the Party Plan.

Mr. Thomas: This is regarding the Fifth District, it is Article X, Section E, paragraph 4.

Chairman: What's it say?

Parliamentarian: Must be accompanied by 25 signatures.

Mr. Thomas: All appeals under subsection 1, 2, and 3 appeals from a district committee must be accompanied by at least 25 signatures of Party member from, in this case, members of the Congressional District.

Chairman: Is that correct it only has ten?

Parliamentarian: That's correct.

Mr. Thomas: This is appeal from the Fifth District.

Parliamentarian: The Gentlemen is correct, I rule that it is out of order.

Chairman: It's ruled out of order for that one so. This is number 5. The Fifth District appeal of the executive committee.

Mr. Damon: Who are the constituents of the Fifth District executive committee, who has to provide these 25 votes?

Parliamentarian: Has to be 25 signatures of any qualified Republican.

Chairman: Whoever submits the appeal has to have the 25 signatures.

Mr. Damon: Well are there 25 people on the committee?

Parliamentarian: No, that would make no sense because many don't have 25 members. Any 25 Republicans, those who are qualified under Section A, have to sign but you have to have at least 25 signatures and those could be people that are just grassroots type folks, whatever, it has to be 25. I didn't realize that we didn't have 25 on that.

Chairman: So that one is not something that we could consider today given the fact that there were not meet the requirements of the 25 signatures.

Mr. Moulton: Mr. Chairman, I know you've already ruled. I agree with Mr. Thomas on technicality which is right and intended by the Party Plan. But, the wording of the Party Plan is not precise and I agree with Mr. Thomas that the appeal was not perfected before us. However, given the fact the that appeal has now been ruled out of order, that had an impact on prior decision which was the decision we made on the General Counsel ruling that sustained Mr. McSweeney's ruling that State Central members of the Fifth in fact had a vote. The appeal that just happened and ruled out of order was to seek appeal remedy of votes that had been conducted on that Fifth District committee since that general counsel ruling was issued and that legal vote on that Fifth District committee. So Mr. Chairman I would move that we reconsider the prior vote Mr. Chairman to modify the prior resolutions sustaining Mr. McSweeney's ruling and further stipulating that all those votes conducted by the Fifth District committee since the General Counsel's ruling that State Central members had votes should be invalidated, specifically the election of officers. That's my motion before the body Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Blackwell: I second the motion.

Chairman: Moved and seconded. Do you all understand the motion?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman I would ask for appeal ruling on the previous issue on the reconsideration that expands the previous motion that was voted on. This new reconsideration far reaches past the intent or the appeal as we have heard before and now there's a whole other set of issues that add to it that seems to be, seems to be contrary to the requirements of reconsideration which is a simple reconsideration of the matter before the committee previously. So this seems to be out of order and I would ask the chair to rule it so.

Parliamentarian: It's a clarification, it's not a new independent or separate issue, it's a clarification of the previous motion.

Chairman: So is the motion in order?

Parliamentarian: Yes

Mr. Thomas: Point of Inquiry Mr. Chairman. Obviously reconsidering the motion would put it back in the state which it was before us before so that point the party that made the appeal in the first place could withdraw the appeal correct? And it will no longer be before this body.

Parliamentarian: No I don't think you can withdraw the appeal, the action has been taken. I think you can reconsider the vote but I don't think you can withdraw the appeal after the body has voted on it.

Mr. Thomas: Clarification to answer my first question does this put it back in the state it was before us before. The answer was yes therefore the vote hadn't been taken would exist to nothing.

Senator Cosgrove: Mr. Chairman I would say we were treading over the same ground we just covered. I believe Mr. Moulton voted to sustain the Counsel's vote. He cannot ask for reconsideration under Robert's Rules.

Mr. McSweeney: No, he voted on the prevailing side.

Mr. Damon: If it requires 25 people because if you don't have 25 members of the Fifth District committee that's different from the Fifth District convention and if 20% rules and not 25 votes rules.

Mr. Boyer: It was 10 members of the Fifth District that made the appeal.

Mr. Albertson: The appeal about signatures was already ruled out of order. The motion to reconsider is on the table and a Point of Order as to whether that motion is proper. Mr. Thomas had a point of inquiry that says that if reconsideration comes up, can the person who initiated that prior appeal that we just voted on, can that person withdraw their appeal? My opinion is

yes, they can withdraw their appeal but that still leaves the motion on the floor because the motion was not to withdraw. So the motion being reconsidered is still on the floor and essentially we're taking that prior motion and inviting an amendment as Mr. Moulton said, to invalidate the prior votes to the Fifth District committee members who were improperly excluded in accordance with the General Counsel's ruling that was just upheld. Does that make sense?

Chairman: Not really. (laughter)

Mr. Damon: It was made by committee members it was not made by a convention. The committee doesn't have 125 members it has I don't know 15 members. Then, I'll make a motion to overrule the chairman in his ruling that it was out of order.

Chairman: You have a motion to reconsider on the floor?

Mr. Thomas: My point of inquiry is that the Party Plan is very specific about the General Counsel ruling. The general counsel ruling is considered binding unless or until the appeal's committee or the State Central Committee takes other actions. This could not have been properly appealed because it lacked the proper signatures. No where does the Party Plan allow us to take other actions. We're trying to do something that is out of our scope for a General Counsel ruling.

Mr. Moulton: Mr. Chairman I'm assuming your ruling my motion in order to reconsider?

Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Moulton: Thank you, I'd like to address Mr. Thomas' concerns. We're not bringing up appeals issues, its come to my attention that the general counsel ruling that he just stated was issued before the Fifth District's meeting so you should know the general counsel ruling was ignored by the Fifth District committee. They knowingly disregarded the general counsel's ruling and now we know that so that's why I'm proposing we reconsider. The Fifth District proceeded with votes it and not only disregarded Mr. McSweeney's ruling, but the General Counsel's rulings are binding that in the manner it was requested from that time forward, it was requested specifically for this and you chose to ignore it, that is a violation of Party Plan. So it is very appropriate that we take up this motion to reconsider.

Chairman: Been moved and seconded that we reconsider. Everybody know what we're reconsidering? Pat, can you speak to that? What are we reconsidering?

Mr. Moulton: I have a motion we vote again to further sustain the general counsel ruling, and that the Fifth District committee should have abided by it the first time, and if any votes conducted in the district committee since the general counsel ruling are null and void and all

future votes on the district committee must allow these State Central Committee members to vote. That's my motion.

(Discussion with the Parliamentarian, Mr. Albertson, Mr. Thomas and the Executive Director proceeded.)

Mr. Herr: My question, sir, is to uphold the general counsel ruling and Mr. Thomas stipulated that those rulings are in effect until overturned. Isn't it just an administrative point that those votes are vacated and really no reason to bring it up? That's to me an administrative issue because they ignored the general counsel ruling. Mr. Thomas said that that ruling is in effect until this body overturns it. They were obliged to abide by it, they did not so to me it's an administrative point that doesn't require a vote.

Chairman: They have to abide by it.

Mr. Herr: That's what Mr. Thomas said until this body overturns it, we did not turn it over and voted the way they wanted and so to me those votes are out there on their face invalid and I don't think can be valid. It's an administrative issue. That's my question, is it?

(Discussion regarding taking a roll call vote. Further discussion commenced on parliamentary procedure.)

Chairman: Since the motion is out of order, Eric you're stating that this is an administrative matter that they need to take care of.

Chairman: Okay. So we can move on Virginia Beach now right?

Mr. Moulton: So now that my motion is ruled out of order that a vote was taken illegally in fifth after the general counsel's decision, is the general counsel going to issue an opinion? That the vote in the Fifth District on the vice chair elections that ignore these opinions should be invalidated? Or issue a letter Mr. Chairman, can you clarify how we're going to resolve this problem?

Chairman: Russ (Moulton), your motion is ruled out of order. Eric (Herr) is correct it is an administrative matter.

Mr. Moulton: Now that my motion has been ruled out of order, how do we remedy the fact that there were illegal votes?

Parliamentarian: I can't rule on anything unless it comes to my desk.

Chairman: You can make the request.

Mr. Moulton: I cannot make the request according to the Party Plan. What we could do Mr. Chairman, I don't want to do that but I can move to contest your ruling, vote a majority overrule your ruling, we might have to resort to that right now.

Chairman: Okay.

Mr. Moulton: Mr. Chairman I contest that we overrule your ruling, although I love you.
(laughter)

Chairman: I know that.

Mr. Moulton: We've got to deal with this matter now so I move to overturn your ruling.

Chairman: It takes 2/3rd's vote to overrule the chair. Can we do this one by standing vote?

(Further clarification was given on the motion.)

Chairman: All right, ask to over rule the chair requires a majority vote, can we do this by standing rather than role call? All in favor of Mr. Moulton's request to overrule the chair please stand.

The votes were 51 in favor of overruling the Chairman, 18 opposed.

Mr. Stearns: Mr. Chairman, is that the first time you have been overruled?

Chairman: I was married for 47 years. (laughter)

Chairman: Great, Russ you want to reiterate again what your motion is then we'll vote on it.

Mr. Moulton: We are simply confirming the general counsel's ruling and saying that any votes that were conducted since that general counsel ruling that did not allow the votes of those State Central Committee members are null and void.

The motion was seconded. Do we need to have any discussion on this at all?

Chairman: The 'ayes' clearly have it so Mr. Moulton you were successful in overruling me. Russ, thank you.

APPEAL: 2ND DISTRICT/VIRGINIA BEACH

Chairman Mullins: Mike will you come up and take the gavel before we do Virginia Beach? I'm going to do a rare thing and make a motion and then we will hear from the Ad Hoc Committee and then we will hear from Senator Wagner and Curtis Colgate are the people involved in this. I mentioned early on that we need to get through all this stuff and concentrate

on beating the Democrats instead of beating up on each other. I know in Virginia Beach is a major problem, I mentioned earlier, we talked to the Congressman Rigell's office, we talked to Ed Gillespie, we talked to other folks over there. And there's a real concern that we don't have the Party in Virginia Beach things are frozen over there, and that's affecting our volunteer efforts, I think they cancelled the last two meetings, and the breakfast where they usually have 100 people and we're down to 20 or 30 or something like that? And that's a situation that's not healthy going into the November elections; we're less than 90 days away so we don't have a whole lot of time to address Virginia Beach. I'm going to make a motion and Mike will have the gavel to see if there's a second to it but on the basis of Party unity and we will still have the Ad Hoc Committee report, I'm going to move that we certify in Ken Longo Virginia Beach chairman, and Curtis Colgate be certified as second district committee chairman.

Mr. Moulton: Second.

Chairman Thomas: A motion has been made and seconded.

(Discussion commenced.)

Del. Miller: Mr. Chairman, can I have the floor for one moment for a point of order?

Regarding the Ad Hoc Committee and if I may its time to request that the chairman as a courtesy to the committee based on the optics and also upcoming November elections and to request the chairman or someone might make my statement a motion.

I just have a concern about the Ad Hoc Committee. I know what is going to happen here today. I know the request I have is this committee perhaps the chairman of the committee that the Ad Hoc Committee generally will say. Mr. Chairman you said it earlier today, you're going to prove to Virginia, you're going to prove to the press, that we are a fair organization.

Vice Chairman Thomas: You have a point of order?

Delegate Miller: The Ad Hoc Committee was created and appointed three people who are on the side of one of the appellate. I guess that I'm not being successful in my parliamentary procedure here, but am concerned about the make-up of Ad Hoc Committee.

Vice Chairman Thomas: I have not heard a valid point of order Delegate Miller.

Delegate Miller: The Ad Hoc Committee, appointed by Chairman Mullins included Tenth District Chairman John Whitbeck, who served as chairman, National Committeewoman Kathy Hayden, and Sixth District Chairman Wendell Walker. Mr. Whitbeck reported on the work of the Ad Hoc Committee who he said worked very hard to come up with solutions in this case. He said they "stand with their position and came to a resolution."

John Whitbeck: So thank you guys. First I want to say thank you Kathy Hayden and Wendell Walker spent a lot of hours on this. We listened to anybody that contacted us, anybody we know involved in this case. We came up with a report. Has anybody not seen the report? It was distributed to the entire State Central Committee, everybody knows what's in it, I won't re-read it.

Pam Brown: I've seen it and I have a lot of disagreements with it.

Mr. Whitbeck: I'm sure you do. The bottom line is this, a couple days ago we reached out on behalf of the committee to the two candidates we started discussions trying to come up with some way to avoid what would be a very contentious situation. I will tell you that the two candidates treated each other with respect, they traded ideas, they're both working for the best interests of their Party and they have come up with their own agreement between the two of them. The Ad Hoc Committee stands by its report. We've spent a lot of time on it, that's our position and we're going to meet with our board. Mr. Chairman with that I will turn it back over to the floor.

Vice Chairman Thomas: Thank you. The Chair recognizes Senator Frank Wagner.

Sen. Wagner: Thank you Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank everyone in this room for sticking it out as long as you have today and taking up this issue. I think we all know what went on in the City of Virginia Beach. It's with a great deal of reluctance that I come before you. I used to be second district chairman and even though a lot of people spent a lot of time and a lot of effort in it I can tell you something, there's not going to be very many easy feelings. But I also know one thing that if we don't resolve this issue and come together as you said very, very well at the beginning of the meeting, you do not carry Virginia Beach and you don't get Ed Gillespie elected, it's just that easy.

Over and over and over again we've seen the results of these elections. So I'm willing to burying the hatchet, I'm willing to say you know what, I know what went down, I know exactly what's going on but we do not need another mass meeting and another district convention in middle of election. I think we're all here for one reason and one reason only and that's to get our Congressman Rigell elected and get Ed Gillespie elected.

That's why I'm here, I believe that's why so many of you are here. It's not about internal party politics and that type of event that the media loves to write about. It's a united message and I'm willing to back off and try to do my part and I believe Curtis and I can help unify the Party and I hope that you will accept the agreement that we came up with. It's within your ability. You have that power but ask yourself why we sat here for 6 and a half hours today if we are not about getting Ed Gillespie elected. There is so much more at stake with what goes on in Washington this is the most critical, this is an extremely, extremely important election. What's at stake in the US Senate and once we take control of the US Senate as Republicans. We will put

on Obama's desk bill after bill after bill after bill and he would have to veto bill after bill after bill after bill that sets the stage for 2016.

You know what worries me at the bottom of my heart, if Hillary Clinton were to win in 2016. Ladies and gentlemen that in my mind is what we're here for. That's what concerns me the most. I backed down because we do not need this going on in the City of Virginia Beach, with everyone arguing. We haven't had Party unity. I believe Curtis and I can probably work within our power to bring the Party back together and I hope for your support. So thank you Mr. Chairman.

(applause)

Sen. Wagner: I had a question about Mr. Longo and I will tell you chairman Longo probably does not want me to do what I just did in acquiescing. But I think what we are doing and why we are all here is to ensure that we get Republicans elected because I don't want to go further. We've said what we all needed to say here and I respect your wishes. Chairman Longo won't be happy but it's what we need to do.

Mrs. Drain: So will he publicly endorse candidate Ed Gillespie?

Sen. Wagner: I believe he already has again if you ask me. But I'm quite certain, I don't know what email or Facebook page or whatever you can grab but I'm quite certain that he has 100% supportive of Mr. Gillespie.

Mrs. Brown: I want to follow the direction everyone is going and agree, but I will invite anybody who's sitting here to read through this...

Vice Chairman Thomas: Come to order please. You are out of order here.

Sen. Wagner: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one final comment based on what I just heard. We ought to be walking out here hand-in-hand like Curtis and I just did. *(applause)*

Curtis Colgate: I know it's hot-blood and strong feelings and I'm sure my emails are already blowing up, but its for the health of the Party that his decision was made. We've got to start getting along, we can't keep on fighting each other, and this is a great way to go.

We don't have to go through the debates and worry about the infighting that is how we get re-elected to senate, that's how we take control of the U.S. senate and control the house. Thank you all. *(applause)*

Mr. Moulton: Thank you Mr. Thomas, I don't oppose this proposal but I will tell you this I served as parliamentarian in the 2nd District and saw the acrimony. I completely agree with those that argue that the credentials committee acted properly on the appeal but there's no question about it. I generally don't feel that we should be pick winners and losers. We should

be insisting on a fair process of only Republican vote and I think that we should be doing that consistently down the line.

So my personal preference is that I would like to see them redo the mass meeting and redo it and canvass the delegates that would be elected and if all of them are elected, Curtis is the chairman and if not Senator Wagner has the chairman. I've got no preference just to have a fair process but I don't oppose the deal generally. I don't like deals because I think the grassroots doesn't like when back room deals get done. Perhaps we can convince the grassroots that it would be in their best interest, but I would have preferred that we do a mass meeting along the lines I've said. I hope that makes sense. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Senator Cosgrove: Ladies and gentlemen I think today you have achieved an extraordinary display of statesmanship and compromise. I know Curtis, it's been tough for you. Frank, thank you for showing leadership. This is a win for everybody. This is the one issue after six long hours where we walk out without acrimony. I do hope that you will support Curtis in his position. Vote for a mere compromise and let's walk out together. We can do it and this is a very first step, thank you guys. *(applause)*

Vice Chairman Thomas: So you withdraw the motion? If there's no further discussion we move to a vote and do a voice vote. The motion is to confirm second Congressional District chairman and Virginia Beach chairman Ken Longo.

The motion passes by acclamation.

Chairman Mullins: Thank you Mike (Thomas). Any new business or old business anybody want to be brought up? Then we will move into executive session.

Mrs. Drain: I just like to say is that I'm still in the dark as to the appeal.

Chairman: Patsy, it was ruled out of order so no vote is going to be taken-

Chairman: We'll give you clarification once the meeting is over. All right if there's no new business we will go into executive session to look at the finances and then to adjourn so if you're not carrying proxies please vacate the room now.

The meeting moved to executive session at 5:17 pm.

*Votes on Appeals:

5th District GC				First	Last Name
Ruling	CAMPBELL	FAUQUIER	Title	Name	
GC Ruling					
Overturn?	CAMPBELL	FAUQUIER	Executive Committee		
ABSTAIN	ABSTAIN	ABSTAIN	RPV Chairman	Pat	Mullins
Y	N	N	First Vice Chairman	Michael	Thomas
N	Y	Y	National Committeeman	Morton	Blackwell
N	Y	Y	National Committeewoman	Kathy	Hayden
N	Y	Y	Secretary	Diana	Banister
<i>N</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Treasurer</i>	Bob	FitzSimmonds
--	--	--	Legal Counsel	Pat	McSweeney
--	--	--	Associate Legal Counsel	Chris	Marston
--	--	--	Finance Chairman	Robert	Bell
N	Y	Y	1st District Chairman	Eric	Herr
--	--	--	2nd District Chairman	Curtis	Colgate
N	Y	Y	3rd District Chairman	Chris	Stearns
N	N	N	4th District Chairman	Jack	Wilson
Y	N	n	5th District Chairman	Jon	Berkley
N	Y	Y	6th District Chairman	Wendell	Walker
N	Y	Y	7th District Chairman	Fred	Gruber
N	Y	N	8th District Chairman	Mark	Kelly
Y	N	N	9th District Chairman	Adam	Tolbert
N	Y	Y	10th District Chairman	John	Whitbeck
N	Y	Y	11th District Chairman	Terry	Wear
Y	N	N	CRFV Chairman	Elizabeth	Minneman
N	N	Y	YRFV President	John	Scott
Y	N	N	VFRW President	Linda	Bartlett
N	N	N	StCen Caucus Rep.	Jackson	Miller
	--		StCen Caucus Rep.	Emmett	Hanger
N	Y	Y	Eastern Vice Chairman	Kevin	Gentry
N	Y	Y	Eastern Vice Chairwoman	Juanita	Balenger
N	Y	Y	Western Vice Chairman	Donald	Huffman
N	Y	Y	Western Vice Chairwoman	Suzanne	Curran
			State Central		
Y	Y	Y	1st C.D. StCen Rep	Steve	Albertson
N	Y	Y	1st C.D. StCen Rep	Jeanine	Lawson
N	Y	Y	1st C.D. StCen Rep	Larry	Kile
N	Y	Y	1st C.D. StCen Rep - Congressional	Allen	Webb

N	Y	Y	1st C.D. StCen Rep - Presidential	Carol	Dawson
N	Y	Y	2nd C.D. State Central Rep.	Roger	Miles
N	Y	Y	2nd C.D. StCen Rep	Carl	Anderson
N	Y	Y	2nd C.D. StCen Rep	Curtis	Colgate
--	--	--	2nd C.D. StCen Rep - Congressional	John	Salm, III
N	N	N	3rd C.D. StCen Rep	Barbara	Tabb
N	Y	Y	3rd C.D. StCen Rep	Stephen	Thomas
N	N	Y	3rd C.D. StCen Rep	Chip	Muir
N	N	N	4th C.D. StCen Rep.	Steve	Trent
N	N	N	4th C.D. StCen Rep	Bill	Flanagan
N	N	Y	4th C.D. StCen Rep	Rick	Michael
--	--	--	4th C.D. StCen Rep - Congressional	Bob	Wheeler
N	N	N	4th C.D. StCen Rep - Presidential	Wayne	Ozmore
N	Y	Y	5th C.D. StCen Rep	Renee	Maxey
N	Y	Y	5th C.D. StCen Rep	Chris	Shores
N	Y	Y	5th C.D. StCen Rep	Peyton	Knight
N	Y	Y	5th C.D. StCen Rep - Congressional	Sharon	Jones
N	Y	Y	5th C.D. StCen Rep - Presidential	Travis	Witt
N	Y	Y	6th C.D. StCen Rep	Georgia	Alvis-Long
N	Y	Y	6th C.D. StCen Rep	Mickey	Mixon
N	Y	Y	6th C.D. StCen Rep	Joseph	Sonsmith
N	Y	Y	6th C.D. StCen Rep - Congressional	Scott	Sayre
N	Y	Y	6th C.D. StCenRep- Presidential	Anne	Fitzgerald
Y	N	N	7th C.D. St. Rep.- Presidential	Jane	Ladd
Y	N	N	7th C.D. StCen Rep	Doug	Rogers
Y	N	N	7th C.D. StCen Rep	Marie	Quinn
Y	N	N	7th C.D. StCen Rep	Kristi	Way
Y	N	N	7th C.D. StCen Rep - Congressional	David	Fuller
N	Y	Y	8th C.D. StCen Rep	Rich	Nilsen
N	Y	N	8th C.D. StCen Rep	Anne	LeHuray
N	Y	Y	8th C.D. StCen Rep	Matthew	Burrow
N	N	N	9th C.D. StCen Rep - Congressional	Kevin	Corbett
Y	N	N	9th C.D. StCen Rep	Michelle	Jenkins
N	Y	Y	9th C.D. StCen Rep - Presidential	Marcy	Hernick
N	N	Y	9th C.D. StCen Rep	Jerry	Lester
N	Y	Y	9th C.D. StCen Rep	Susan	Edwards
N	Y	Y	10 C.D. St. Cen. Rep. – Congressional	Heidi	Stirrup
N	Y	Y	10 C.D. St. Cen. Rep. - Presidential	Jo	Thoburn
N	Y	Y	10th C.D. StCen Rep	Mark	Berg
N	Y	Y	10th C.D. StCen Rep	Kay	Gunter
N	Y	Y	10th C.D. StCen Rep	Eve	Gleason

N	Y	Y	11th C.D. StCen Rep	Keith	Damon
N	Y	Y	11th C.D. StCen Rep	Patsy	Drain
N	Y	Y	11th C.D. StCen Rep	David	Ray
N	N	Y	CRFV First Vice-Chairman	Joseph	Degreenia
N	N	Y	CRFV Second Vice-Chairman	Kasha	Nielsen
N	Y	Y	YRFV StCen Rep	Heather	Homan
N	Y	Y	YRFV StCen Rep	Jeff	Wernsing
Y	N	N	VFRW StCen Rep	Pam	Brown
Y	N	N	VFRW StCen Rep	Elizabeth	Mundy
N	N	N	House Caucus St. Cen. Rep.	Jimmie	Massie
<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	Senate Caucus StCen Rep	Frank	Ruff
-	-	-			
63	28	24			
14	49	53			

	Yes 49-28	Yes 53-24
Yes 14-63 No	No	No