

**2023 HOUSE GOVERNMENT AND VETERANS AFFAIRS**

**HB 1523**

# 2023 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

## Government and Veterans Affairs Committee Pioneer Room, State Capitol

HB 1523  
2/3/2023

Relating to political committee organizations, and to committeemen and political party reorganization after redistricting.
--

Chairman Schauer called the meeting to order at 10:58 AM.

Chairman Austen Schauer, Vice Chairman Bernie Satrom, Reps. Landon Bahl, Claire Cory, Jorin Johnson, Scott Louser, Carrie McLeod, Karen M. Rohr, Vicky Steiner, Steve Vetter, and Mary Schneider. Reps Jeff A. Hoverson and Karen Karls not present.

### **Discussion Topics:**

- Notification of committee reorganization
- Process of district reorganization
- Redistricting after census

Rep. Henderson introduced HB 1523 with supportive testimony and proposed an amendment (#19060) (#19064).

Sen. Weston, spoke in support.

Wendy Bagley, citizen from Minot, North Dakota, spoke in support.

Britany Baine, North Dakota citizen, spoke in support.

### **Additional written testimony:**

Erik Nygren, Chairman of District 25 North Dakota Republican Party, supportive testimony (#18937).

Gordon Greenstein, North Dakota citizen and veteran, supportive testimony (#18940).

John Trandem, North Dakota citizen, supportive testimony (#18952).

Jared Hendrix, Chairman of District 38 North Dakota Republican Party, supportive testimony (#18989).

Chairman Schauer adjourned the meeting at 11:32 AM.

*Phillip Jacobs, Committee Clerk*

# 2023 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

## Government and Veterans Affairs Committee Pioneer Room, State Capitol

HB 1523  
2/16/2023

Relating to political committee organizations, and to committeemen and political party reorganization after redistricting.
--

Chairman Schauer called the meeting to order at 8:35 AM.

Chairman Austen Schauer, Vice Chairman Bernie Satrom, Reps. Landon Bahl, Claire Cory, Jeff A. Hoverson, Jorin Johnson, Karen Karls, Scott Louser, Carrie McLeod, Karen M. Rohr, Vicky Steiner, Steve Vetter, and Mary Schneider. All present.

### Discussion Topics:

- Committee work
- Private organizations
- Proposed amendment.(23.1035.02005)
- Appointed district chairs.
- Representation of party districts

Representative Lefor answered questions from the committee. (#21807)

Perrie Schafer, Chairman of the North Dakota Republican Party, opposition testimony. (#21809)

Vice Chairman Satrom moved a DO NOT PASS on HB 1523.

Seconded by Representative Bahl.

### Roll Call Vote:

Representatives	Vote
Representative Austen Schauer	Y
Representative Bernie Satrom	Y
Representative Landon Bahl	Y
Representative Claire Cory	Y
Representative Jeff A. Hoverson	N
Representative Jorin Johnson	Y
Representative Karen Karls	Y
Representative Scott Louser	N
Representative Carrie McLeod	N
Representative Karen M. Rohr	Y
Representative Mary Schneider	Y
Representative Vicky Steiner	N
Representative Steve Vetter	N

Motion carries: 8-5-0.

House Government and Veterans Affairs Committee  
HB 1523  
2/16/2023  
Page 2

Bill Carrier: Representative Johnson

Chairman Schauer adjourned the meeting at 9:15 AM.

*Phillip Jacobs, Committee Clerk By: Leah Kuball*

**REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE**

**HB 1523: Government and Veterans Affairs Committee (Rep. Schauer, Chairman)**  
recommends **DO NOT PASS** (8 YEAS, 5 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB  
1523 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

**TESTIMONY**

**HB 1523**

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee,

My name is Erik Nygren and I serve as Chairman of District 25 and formerly served as Regional Chair for the Southeast Region of the North Dakota Republican Party. I have been involved in politics for almost 20 years and I strongly believe that a hallmark of Republican governance has always been to rely on the people to guide our party and our state. In the organization of the NDGOP State Committee we have veered away from that model and toward one which allows leadership to perpetuate itself and shore up power rather than allowing the citizens to decide through those they have elected to represent their districts.

Our State Committee consists of 47 District Chairs, elected by the members of each district, in what should be fair and open elections. When the NDGOP leadership is elected, however, this representative body is augmented by a slate of officers who were not elected at the district level and who, when included, represent nearly 18% of the voting body, which can easily swing an election and reflects a disparate and non-representative voting body.

In many cases, those who are voting on leadership are outgoing members of the leadership who no longer have a stake in the direction of the organization. Imagine if all outgoing legislators were given a vote on the next session's leadership along with the newly elected legislators from their respective districts. Several districts would have unequal representation which would ultimately be a disservice to the voters.

Article 3 Section 3 of the NDGOP bylaws states: " The District Chairmen, which make up the State Committee, shall meet on or before July first of each odd- numbered year and organize in accordance with state law."

It is clear that the intent of that rule is to allow the District Chairs to elect the leadership, but despite objections from members, that has not been the practice in recent years. This bill will codify that system to ensure that the grassroots voters who give their time and energy attending District Conventions and Caucuses will be equally represented in the election of the Party leaders.

This bill will provide a mechanism for all parties to elect their leadership by giving the largest voice to those members who have the largest stake in their local representation. When you enter the legislature, you are on equal footing with every other member who has been elected by their constituents. The parties should be represented in a similar way.

I thank you for your consideration on this issue and strongly urge a 'do-pass' on HB1523.



HB 1523 Do Pass

Gordon Greenstein

Bismarck, ND District 35

Chairman Schauer and the Government and Veteran Affairs Committee, I urge a Do Pass on HB 1523. After reading the contents of the bill, I believe this bill will change the party organization process for the better. I urge the support of HB 1523.

Thank You Gordon Greenstein

US Navy (Veteran)

US Army (NDNG Retired)

### 2023 HB1523 Testimony

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify on this important bill. My name is John Trandem and I have served in various capacities within the Republican Party at the District and State level for the past 27 years and have conducted and attended numerous organizational and endorsing conventions.

While I believe that as a rule, Districts should be able to maintain autonomy in their governance and organization, in recent years we have seen some Districts take liberties and compromise the right of the electors to participate in their organizational conventions or caucuses. These events are the gateway to serving your community and working to advance the values of the political party with which you align and need to be open for newcomers to participate and work alongside the longer-term advocates that they may learn, and one-day assume a leadership role if such is desired.

There has been great frustration of late in districts which abuse their unchecked status by imposing standards for participation which are impossible to meet unless the desired participants are tipped off in advance and told how to meet the criteria. This is done is by setting participatory requirements-often the payment of dues, and setting a date by which those dues must be paid in order to participate in the meeting. The deadlines are rarely publicized and are often set well in advance of the notice requirement for the meeting. For example- a district may require that dues be paid forty-five days in advance of the reorganizational meeting, but only notice the meeting fifteen days in advance. Those whose participation is desired by district leadership are notified well in advance of the deadline and encouraged to pay their dues and attend while many who are not informed are met at the door immediately prior to the meeting and told they are too late to participate as the dues they didn't know were required were not timely paid.

Another tactic is to set dues or requirements but not inform anyone as to how they can satisfy them- who to pay, or how to register.

As a long-time member of the State Committee, I know that when reorganizational conventions come around there are invariably people clamoring for copies of the bylaws for their district to find out how to participate. NDGOP Headquarters is often deluged with calls from citizens wishing to find out how to participate after having been refused the pertinent information by the leadership in their District. This intentional disenfranchisement is among the reasons that people suggest that District Conventions are like 'the wild west' with no laws but outlaws, and while it is the exception, not the rule, there are cases where those assessments are accurate.

Among other things, this bill will require, as a matter of proper notice, that the participation requirements be publicized so citizens who wish to participate cannot be denied access if they satisfy the requirements. In addition to that information, notice requirement will need to exceed the deadline for any participatory requirements by thirty days to give citizens ample opportunity to satisfy the requirements.

Current provisions in Century Code prohibit any regulation of these district processes and make it impossible for the respective parties to impose any standards regarding the conduct, notice, or transparency of the reorganizational meetings. Without the passage of this bill the standard of no accountability will remain intact and the disenfranchisement of our citizens who wish to become active in politics will persist. It is for that very reason I stand to encourage a do-pass on House Bill 1523 and welcome your comments or questions.

Chairman Schauer  
& Members of the House Government & Veterans Affairs Committee

My name is Jared Hendrix, of Minot. Thank you so much for your time.

I write in support of HB 1523, a bill to establish a more transparent and fair process for political party organization, that better protects the rights of those who participate. My testimony and support refers to the proposed amended Christmas tree version of the bill presented to the committee by Rep. Henderson.

I am currently an elected Republican district chairman in District 38, serve on the NDGOP State Committee, and have served on the NDGOP Rules Committee. I was also elected to the State Central Committee of the Republican Party of Virginia. I've worked within laws and rules in multiple states in political parties and on political campaigns, giving me 16 years of experience in the realm of party rules and processes.

The rights of political parties (and voluntary association) are protected through the right to peaceable assembly by the First Amendment. Constitutionally, states are given the authority to manage their own elections, and so this covers, for instance, ballot access, candidate selection, campaign finance, as well as the selection of presidential electors. Courts have generally ruled there must be a compelling state interest when it comes to the regulation of political parties. While it is unclear to what degree courts will side with the state's compelling interest to regulate how political parties organize and operate internally, it is clear that the government should have as little say as possible.

With all of that being said, the premise behind this bill is that *IF* we accept that the state has a compelling interest in the organizational process of a political party, then it must be applied consistently, with fairness, clarity and transparency. Currently, it is not.

#### **WHAT HB 1523 ACCOMPLISHES:**

##### **> Establishes a more transparent process for meeting notices.**

This bill will require greater advance public notice of party reorganization meetings, increasing from 10 to 30 days as required public notice. Additionally, notices must include all participation requirements (dues, membership deadlines). Notices must be submitted at least 30 days in advance of any such deadlines. Note – this bill does *not* dictate to a private organization *what* these participation requirements should be, it simply requires that they be disclosed. If political parties can establish criteria for who can participate, and the state otherwise defines eligible participants and requires notice

for party organization, then it must require that all participatory criteria be disclosed.

In 2021, there was a legislative district party that changed their rules less than two weeks before their reorganization meeting, to require prospective participants to have paid their dues more than two weeks prior. Effectively, this unethical and undemocratic move deterred participation of new members. I have personally witnessed countless anecdotes over the years of similar situations. As grassroots engagement has increased dramatically in the last few years, with literally thousands of North Dakotans attending party organizational meetings, it would be wise to set some basic standards to give these participants greater trust and confidence in our process.

**> Addresses the problem of organizing districts after redistricting.**

This issue arose in the 2021 special session, in which a bill was passed that allowed state party chairs to appoint unelected, “acting chairs” in districts that were either newly formed after redistricting, or dramatically changed from previous boundaries. However, this legislation is believed by many to be a violation of equal protection, as we allow the electors in some districts the right to organize a political party, which includes the election of a district chair, while not allowing others.

In truth, all districts should reorganize after redistricting. It does not matter if a district boundary changes by one street, or one person. Districts are geographical areas defined by population distribution. Since that changes every 10 years, it is best to reorganize. We cannot treat the electors in some districts differently than others.

**> Addresses the organization of districts without functional party committees.**

Instead, HB 1523 states that with the absence of a functional district committee due to redistricting, the state committee must simply designate an individual elector of a district for call of the time and place of a party caucus. This gives the local participants full autonomy to organize their districts as they see fit. It must be clear that the caucus participants have a right to organize, adopt bylaws or rules, and run their meeting as they see fit as a private organization.

It's acceptable to stipulate that some authority is needed to actually call the meeting, since the notice is required by law. However, the government should not stipulate who chairs a meeting or who is “appointed” as a chair. The only way someone becomes a chair, is if they are elected by a self-governing body, which has fundamental rights protected under the First Amendment. The people who show up at the caucus can elect their own temporary chair to chair the meeting, as well as organize by a formal election

of district officers.

Line 7 on Page 2 asks for the name of the state committee, which would be the name of the political party (Republican, Democrat, etc.). The section G now includes a requirement for contact information to be included in the notice, in order to allow prospective participants an easier ability to communicate with the organizers of the caucus. Line 6 states this information can be from the district chair or “a representative of the state committee” which can be the aforementioned designee.

**> Removes precinct caucus requirements.**

The state should not be requiring precinct organizations within political parties. Most districts, as a matter of practice, do not organize their precincts. Therefore many will argue that some districts organize in violation of the law. For these reasons, we should eliminate the government mandate to caucus and organize by precinct. HB 1523 does not *prohibit* districts from choosing to organize by precincts, it simply removes the government dictate to do them, giving local participants greater autonomy.

**> Removes mentions of the state executive committee.**

HB 1523 removes the many instances in this section that mention a “state *executive* committee” and replaces it with “state committee”. It is not good practice in law to reference something that is otherwise not defined in statute. It seems likely that this language is used alternatingly with the goal of centralizing power into the state party leadership, and away from local districts.

**> Clearly defines what a state committee is.**

Current code section 16.1-03-11 does not make sense. Essentially, it states that the state committee meets to organize the state committee. An entity that is not yet organized cannot meet to organize itself. Similar in principle to 16.1-03-01, which outlines the eligible participants of the district caucus, so too must we define the eligible participants of the organization of the state committee – i.e., the district chairs.

**> Requires districts to adopt rules but allows them to do so how they wish.**

Participants in political party meetings and conventions have a right to assemble and self-govern. A political party organization therefore creates itself, and must establish a structure through autonomous deliberation. Lines 4 & 5 on Page 3 covers this.

This code section previously referenced bylaws throughout. All mentions of bylaws have been replaced with “bylaws or rules”. If the participants of a district caucus wish to operate under temporary rules which are adopted at the outset of the organization meeting, then they should be able to do so.

Lines 5, 6, 7, on Page 3 should also be amended further as such: ~~“That party's nominees for and members of the legislative assembly shall serve as members of the executive committee.”~~ The reason this should be struck is twofold. First, the government should not be dictating that elected officials, or any specific persons, serve in political party positions. Second, it references an “executive committee”, which is otherwise not defined in this section of code. *Please note that striking this language from century code does not prohibit local district parties from putting their legislators on their committees per their own rules.*

### **> Prohibits districts from conflicting with “parent” state party organizations.**

Lines 10-16 on Page 3 are cumbersome and unnecessarily wordy. The intent of this as originally written was to prohibit state parties from unjustly interfering with the organizational process of local districts. While I am sympathetic to this intent, it is problematic on two fronts. One, to the extent it is justified to protect the autonomy of districts from their own state parties, it should be only to prohibit actions from a state party that is not consistent with their own rules, or law.

Two, state parties acquire ballot access, not district parties. There is clearly a compelling state interest in the regulation of ballot access for political parties. If a district wants the benefit of affiliating with a “parent” party that maintains ballot access, then they should be aligned with the rules of that parent organization. Likewise, state parties that wish to be aligned with the Republican or Democrat National Committees, must have rules that are consistent as well. For example, in the case of the North Dakota Republican Party, many districts allow participants to bring proxy forms and vote on behalf of people who do not even show up at meetings. This is done despite the fact that NDGOP rules specifically prohibit this.

### **~ In Conclusion ~**

HB 1523 streamlines century code, provides greater consistency, and strengthens the autonomy of the individuals who choose to participate in the organization of political parties. It is a pragmatic solution to many concerns which have been raised by citizens participating in this process in North Dakota. No matter someone’s personal beliefs, they must be able to exercise their rights to participate in a process that is fair and

transparent.

This is a nuanced and somewhat complex issue which heavily inter-locks with rules and procedure for political parties. I am happy to answer any questions you may have about this bill before you decide to take action as a committee. I can be reached via email, phone or text at 701-712-1487 and [libertyhendrix@gmail.com](mailto:libertyhendrix@gmail.com).

Thank you for your time. Respectfully,

Jared Hendrix



Good morning Chairman Schauer, and committee members—

For the record, I am Representative Donna Henderson from D 9B in North Eastern North Dakota including parts of Cavalier, Towner and Rolette counties.

House bill 1523 would make changes to how political parties reorganize, including after redistricting. After we submitted our bill draft, we did notice other areas that needed clarification and I've have been working with a former NDGOP rules committee chairman to bring you an amendment to make it even better. So I have handed out our proposed amendment and a Christmas tree version to make it more clear.

First I'll give you a little background information on myself and my involvement in the North Dakota Republican Party. My first District meeting was back in 1994 when our district stretched from the Canadian border down to Minnewaukan and I attended my first endorsing convention and I voted for Representative Dennis Johnson. After the meeting, I was asked if I would like to attend the Republican state convention as an delegate or alternate for the district and I eagerly accepted. I liked it so much that I attended almost every State convention since- with the exception of the year we had twin boys born shortly before the convention. We always made it a family affair and all 6 of our children have served as pages for the State Conventions over the years.

For the past 15 years I've served on our District's executive committee. My husband was a District chairman for over 20 years and served 4 terms as a regional chairman. During that time I attended almost all of the state committee meetings as his guest. I guess I was just a political party nerd as I found the meeting far more interesting than shopping. During those years I proxied for him at State committee meetings, served on the State convention credentials committee, I was on the rules committee, and I was elected at the State Convention to be a delegate or alternate to 3 National conventions. I ran for 2<sup>nd</sup> vice chair of the party in 2020 and lost by only 3 votes. It is with that experience in party politics that I am here to propose changes to how political parties reorganize.

We propose to repeal sections 16.1-03-03 and 16.1-03-05. They both refer to organizing by precinct. Currently in 16.1-03-01 subsection 2, it clearly states that a district party may organize by precinct or on at large basis. So this section is not needed, and micromanages the process. We thought it best to leave it to the districts to choose what works best for them.

Next we propose repealing section 16.1-03-17 which deals with party reorganization after redistricting takes place. Here's why.

Now it used to be that every district reorganized after redistricting took place. That's how we've done it for all long as I've been in the party. This was recently changed in November of 2021 during the special session. Instead, new language added which stated that districts "SHALL" reorganize when the new geographical area had a 2020 population change more than 25% of the district's population. It doesn't say Only then, just that that group "shall" During the Senate floor debate, the bill carrier said that if a district had less than 25% population increase, they could still reorganize if they chose to. It did not prohibit a district to reorganize if they wanted to. If I was tech savvy I would have downloaded that video clip into the testimony, but it is archived on the legislative website and you can watch it if you desire. The point is, it shows that the intent of that legislation was to force a reorganization if population increase was 25% and over, and optional if under the 25% population increase.

So here's the problem. Our district, District 9, had a population increase of 24.58% We were not forced to reorganize last year, so our District took a vote at our District meeting and we voted 33-2 in favor of choosing to hold a reorganization meeting according to the new century code. Our District Chairman called the meeting and the proper notices went into the official county newspapers. But our meeting was cancelled because the State party chairman misinterpreted the new language in century code and said we were not able to reorganize according to the law. I included a copy of that document in my testimony. It is Interesting to note that the Democrats of District 9 did hold a reorganization meeting that was perfectly legal and I included a copy of the notice for the District 9 Democrats reorganization meeting in my testimony as well. Now that misunderstanding

although unfortunate, is long past I'm not here to get into all that. We simply want to move on and solve the problem- and clearly we do have a problem with the current language and we need to make a change, to protect any other Districts in the future from the same misinterpretation. We decided to do it now while it's fresh in our minds and not wait till the next census in 2030, as many of us may not be here serving in the legislature by then.

So after removing that section dealing with reorganizing after redistricting, we needed to add the redistricting language back into the code in other places to make it complete, including what happens in a newly formed district without a sitting district chairman. In that case the state committee would choose an elector from the boundaries of the newly formed district, and that could be done at their annual December meeting.

There is also language to increase publication of the reorganization meeting from ten days to thirty days. This is in response to many districts putting additional restrictions in their bylaws or rules in regarding deadlines or timelines for notification of running for party positions and other requirements that also need to be noticed to ensure all participants are informed prior to the meetings.

We recognize that districts can make their own rules of procedure, but also want to make sure that they do not conflict with the state party bylaws or rules, hence some of the added language on page 3.

We've worked hard to cover all the changes we feel necessary, and added an emergency clause to make this effective immediately, as there are many districts that will be reorganizing up until the middle of May.

Please adopt the amendments we are offering along with the bill. Keep in mind if we need to do any more work on some of the language, we are happy to do so to get this in it's best possible form for the good of our political parties in North Dakota.

There is some written testimony submitted online and I especially want to acknowledge testimony submitted by Mr John Trandem. John served as the chairman of the NDGOP rules committee for many years and he kindly worked closely with me on this project. I was hoping he could testify online today- do you know if he's there?

Thank you and I welcome any questions you may have.

Some political districts were required to reorganize by state law, but NOT District 9. The North Dakota Century Code reads:

***16.1-03-17. Political party reorganization after redistricting.***

*If redistricting of the legislative assembly becomes effective after the organization of political parties as provided in this chapter and before the primary or the general election, the political parties in each of the following districts shall organize or reorganize as closely as possible in conformance with this chapter to assure compliance with primary election filing deadlines:*

- *A district that does not share any geographical area with the pre-redistricting district having the same number.*
- *A district with new geographic area that was not in that district for the 2020 election and which new geographic area has a 2020 population that is more than twenty-five percent of the district's population as determined in the 2020 federal decennial census.*

District 9 does NOT meet the trigger for a reorganization. While your district has new population, the percentage of new people is 24.58%.

Thus, neither the District 9 Rules & Modes of Procedures nor state law requires a reorganization of the district at this time, and in fact your District 9 Rules & Modes of Procedures do not permit it.

That makes the motion to reorganize made at the February 23, 2022, meeting an improper motion, and it is therefore null and void, and not subject to appeal per Robert's Rules of Order.

District 9 will reorganize, in accord with its Rules, in the next odd year and before May 15, 2023.

Sincerely,



---

Perrie Schafer, Chairman




## Henderson, Donna

---

**From:** Henderson, Donna  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 2, 2023 3:58 PM  
**To:** Henderson, Donna  
**Subject:** FW: Ad

**District 9 Dem-NPL  
MEETING**

Reorganization and Endorsement of Candidates  
and Delegates to the state convention

 **Tuesday, March 1, 2022**  
**Rolla City Hall**  
**Community Room**  
(Turn south at Dacotah Bank)

**Starts with reorganization at 6 p.m.**  
**Contact: Marvin Nelson at 701-550-9731**

23.1035.02003  
Title.

Prepared by the Legislative Council staff for  
Representative Henderson  
February 1, 2023

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1523

Page 1, line 2, remove "and"

Page 1, line 4, after "redistricting" insert "; and to declare an emergency"

Page 1, line 18, remove "appoint a temporary"

Page 1, line 19, replace "chairman to chair" with "designate an elector of the district to call"

Page 2, after line 7, insert:

"h. Any participation requirements other than qualifications for electors under section 16.1-01-04."

Page 2, line 11, after the period insert "The published notice must precede any deadlines set by participation requirements by thirty days."

Page 3, line 5, overstrike "bylaws of the state committee or state party may not include any requirement"

Page 3, overstrike line 6

Page 3, line 7, overstrike "committees nor may the"

Page 3, line 7, after "party" insert "may not"

Page 3, line 8, after "requirement" insert "inconsistent with state party bylaws or rules"

Page 3, line 8, overstrike "unless a district lacks a district"

Page 3, overstrike line 9

Page 3, line 10, overstrike "may not" and insert immediately thereafter "or"

Page 4, after line 4, insert:

"**SECTION 6. EMERGENCY.** This Act is declared to be an emergency measure."

Re-number accordingly

## Representative Mike Lefor Testimony

### HB 1523

Good morning, chair Schauer, vice chair Satrom and members of the GVA committee, for the record my name is Mike Lefor and I represent District 37-Dickinson in the House.

I appreciate the opportunity to address my concerns with HB 1523. I have many concerns regarding this bill. First and foremost, there are provisions in this bill regarding redistricting and what happens after that. In the special session, the legislature passed a bill which afforded the party chair the opportunity to appoint temporary chairs in districts where the majority of the executive committee has been redistricted to another district.

This worked out very well in the republican party as the chair vetted candidates throughout the eight districts which were affected. These temporary chairs did an excellent job in setting up the time and location of each district reorganization. This legislation was brought forward as a part of the discussion within the redistricting committee in which I served.

This legislation purports to set up a system for reorganizations happening after the next redistricting process which will not happen until 2031. This is a bill offering a solution in which there is no problem. The affected parties are private organizations who have not asked for this legislation, in fact, had no previous knowledge of the bill. I was notified of the bill by the sponsor, but I did not know all of the provisions contained within it.

Typically, if legislation affecting an organization in such a substantial way, the organizations should have been notified. The bill completely changes the manner in which district party caucuses can be held, it eliminates the ability for these districts to hold elections via precinct selections.

On page two, beginning on line 29 it takes away the ability for a district committee to appoint an executive committee. Why? What problem is this trying to solve? On page three, beginning on line 11, it takes away the ability for a party chair to appoint a temporary chair and the rest of the language which was just approved by the legislature just over a year ago. Again, why?



## Testimony on HB 1523

My name is Perrie Schafer, I am the Chair of the ND Republican Party.

As I read the document, 1523, I am more that happy to talk about changes to the operation of how the party is governed, however in the case of 1523 I have never been asked to discuss anything relating to this bill. I have asked all our Executive members of the State committee and no one has been asked to weigh in on this bill or in any way asked for input to this bill.

Secondly, there is mention in the bill to change from the "Precinct" model of organization.

To be clear, each district already has the option to form under the "Precinct" model or the "At large" model, so I am not sure why legislative action needs to be taken on something that doesn't exist as an issue in our party presently.

Redistricting is also mentioned in bill 1523, in that the districts need to be allowed to provide a 30 day notice rather the 10 days official notice when noticing their meetings in the paper for reorgs or their individual conventions, if this is an issue, the NDGOP State committee of which all 47 chairs are members, as well as the executive, can offer this as a rules change and the committee can take it up with it's members and make the decision from there, there is no Legislative ruling that needs to be done.

Why would the legislature want to tell a private organization how to notice meetings? Isn't that the role of the organization?

Also with respect to redistricting, which happens every 10 years, the chair was given the ability to chose temporary chairs if a given district isn't able to reorganize...this time around there were about 17 districts that had to reorg and of that 17 or 18; 8 were not able to form a legal entity to even call a meeting. The process that we used to ask people to temporarily chair the district was to call the sitting legislators in said district, and ask who they'd suggest, as leadership, of the 8 appointed, 6 were elected to chair the district and 2 were elected at large from their district that we did not appoint. This process can only take place every 10 years...the bill asks you as legislators to fix something that isn't broken and won't even be up for consideration for another 10 years.

If the party wants to take up a change to this process, they are welcome to notice it properly for the next state meeting and we will take it up.

The biggest issue I have with 1523 is starting on page 3 line 26 and going through line 8 on page 4.

This section simply asks the legislature to remove 10 members of the State Committee...remove them! How is removing duly elected members of the State Committee a function of the Legislature?