

3 Proposed Bylaw Changes

1)

CURRENT:

Article III – Locals. Section 1 – Locals Defined:

A) A local may be created by three or more GP-MI members who live in a single county or up to five contiguous counties, except that Upper Peninsula members may combine counties as they determine works best for them. There may be more than one Local in a county.

PROPOSED:

Section 1 – Locals Defined:

A) A local may be created by three or more GP-MI members who live in a single county or up to five contiguous counties, except that Upper Peninsula members may combine counties as they determine works best for them. There may be more than one Local within a county, to support a community of interest, such as a university or a city or region with differing commonalities.

BACKGROUND

“There may be more than one Local in a county” needs clarification. In addition to being contiguous, it could be important to align communities of interest, such as counties that are primarily rural. Lapeer County, for example, is far more connected with the other counties in the Thumb. A long-active Green member states that its residents avoid Flint and Genesee County as much as possible.

The Detroit Local, within Wayne County, is an example of a Local within a County Local. Wayne County is vast and includes urban and suburban, and rural communities. The City of Detroit is an example of a community of interest and its residents have many issues that are different than other areas in Wayne County. A university student group could be another Local within a Local.

To have a county be part of two Locals is counterproductive to a cohesive party presence. At one time, apparently, three members of Oakland County decided to form a second Oakland County Local. Although two of them had been invited to choose how they wanted to participate in the one that was formed in 2001, both declined. For lack of a

better term, they formed a competing Local. I am unaware of any activity of that second Oakland County Local—perhaps I simply was not on its notification list. I do not know who else signed on to form it. Fortunately, it appears that the two I knew of have since moved outside of Oakland County, one to another state. That Local effectively became defunct.

Ingham County has been part of the Capitol Area Local for several years. A Local was later formed to include it with Eaton, Barry, Ionia, and Montcalm counties, which are still contiguous without Ingham County and more similar than a county containing the State Capitol and a university.

2)

CURRENT: Article V – Officers.

Section 9 – Locals Liaison: The Locals Liaison shall serve as the primary advocate for locals: welcoming new members; assigning mentors for the new members; and receiving the registration forms from new locals and the quarterly reports from locals to enter them into the state party records.

PROPOSED:

Section 9 – Locals Liaison: The Locals Liaison shall serve as the primary advocate for locals: welcoming new members; assigning mentors for the new members; and receiving the registration forms from new locals and reports from locals to present for the State Membership Meetings.

3)

New: Article VI: Committees-Section 3:

Once a GPML member is appointed to a standing committee they are expected to attend every meeting whether it be virtual, in person, via email, or hybrid unless they have a valid reason for not participating.

Rationale: Every standing committee is an important part of the decision-making of the party. Each member, when appointed and approved, has the responsibility to attend meetings and let their voices be heard. They have made the commitment even though on a volunteer basis to be a vocal part of the committee. Further explanation of a "valid reason and consequences of nonparticipation shall be outlined in the Handbook.

Best, Jim Becklund