

Jim,

I've attached the draft Voluntary Vetting Process. I added it as number (13) into the bylaws under Committees. I then inserted the makeup of the vetting committee followed by the details of the vetting process in the section that describes each committee. The bylaws committee may have its own sense of where these items should appear in the bylaws.

I also attached a draft letter to "My Fellow Republicans" explaining the reason(s) and benefits to the Party for my proposal. It has not been sent.

Thank you.

Tom

909.913.9500

The proposed by-law would add a Voluntary Vetting Committee within Article III, Section 2.06.01 as (A), (13), including the purpose of the Committee, Members, and Voluntary Vetting Standards.

ARTICLE III

Section 2.06 STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Section 2.06.01 Composition

(A) The Committee shall include the following standing committees, other than the Executive Committee:

- (1) Proxies and Credentials Committee;
- (2) Rules Committee;
- (3) Resolutions Committee;
- (4) Finance Committee;
- (5) Veterans Committee;
- (6) Platform Committee;
- (7) Volunteer Organization Committee;
- (8) County Chairmen's Association;

- (9) Budget Committee;
- (10) Cal Plan Committee;
- (11) Initiatives Committee;
- (12) County Treasurer's Association; and
- (13) *Voluntary Vetting Committee.*

Section 2.06.01

(L) Voluntary Vetting Committee

- (1) The Voluntary Vetting Committee will meet to vet candidates for Congressional and Statewide Elective Offices. The purpose of which is to reduce the number of candidates for these offices to those most qualified according to those standards established in Article III, Section*
- (2) All candidates attending shall be present at the Committee meeting and to respond to the Committees voluntary vetting standards in the presence of all candidates attending. Each candidate can assess the responses of the other candidates, including standards addressing public, private, and voluntary experience.*
- (3) The Voluntary Vetting Committee shall consist of the following members:*
 - (a) The Chairman of the Committee.*
 - (b) The Chairman of the California Republican Party.*
 - (c) The current Republican United States Senators from California.*
 - (d) The current California Republican Congressional*
Delegation
Chairman or his or her designee.
 - (e) The Chairman or President of the County Central*
Committee

Chairmen's Association, or his designee.

(4) Voluntary Vetting Standards:

(a) Present a statement of where the candidate resides in the state, including legislative and congressional districts and the names of the current Republican legislators in both;

(b) Present a statement that the candidate has been continuously registered as a Republican for at least one year prior to the date of filing for office;

(c) Present a brief history of private and private sector and volunteer experience;

1. jobs the candidate has held and duration of each;

2. years of experience in a decision-making position(s);

3. volunteer service to the community;

(d) A statement of relevant experience for the specific office being sought;

(e) A statement that the candidate shares the political principles of our Party;

(f) A statement of the candidate's top three (3) priorities once elected;

(g) The candidate's plan to finance his/her candidacy.

CRP Spring 2019 Convention - Bylaw Proposal #3
Bylaw proposal submitted by Tom Palzer

My fellow Republicans,

As you know, I ran for the U.S. Senate in 2016 and 2018. I have moved on from politics as an active candidate. However, as a member of the Party and a Delegate, I feel it is my duty to offer an important change in our by-laws that will positively impact on our Party's congressional and state elective races, particularly under the Top Two primary system. It would make it possible for a Republican to reach the Top Two. I propose a voluntary vetting process.

Among the several reasons we have not had a candidate for the U.S. Senate in the general elections in 2016 and 2018, the most prominent is that too many candidates from our Party flood the field. There is no statistical way to get a Republican into the Top Two in this State with a plethora of Republican candidates, each siphoning off votes from one another.

The second reason we have not had a candidate for the U.S. Senate in the Top Two is the fact that our Party does not provide our voters (and NPP voters that our Party needs) with information about our candidates early enough in the Primary process. While our Party prohibits providing financial resources to all but the endorsed U.S. Senate candidate(s), it would behoove our Party to pay closer attention to the candidates and post well in advance of our nominating convention the results of a voluntary vetting process to help voters determine who they want to support (vote for).

Of the 32 candidates running for the U.S. Senate in 2016, 14 were Republicans. The total number of votes cast for Republican candidates was 2,150,514. The Republican with the highest vote total received 584,251 votes.

In 2018, 10 Republicans received a combined total of 2,041,736 votes in a field of 30 candidates. The highest vote getter in our Party received 556,252 votes. The Democrat who finished in the Top Two, besides Feinstein, was Kevin DeLeon, who received only 805,466 votes.

In the 2018 election, two candidates with absolutely no experience in the public sector, both of whom running for the first time in a political race, garnered nearly 600,000 votes (591,027). This begs the obvious questions, "What were both thinking? Why would any candidate run for a high-level office with no experience? Isn't such action disingenuous to candidates with experience?"

Had those votes gone to the Republican candidate with the most votes, the total number of votes (1,147,279) would have exceeded the total number of votes received by DeLeon.

But, there's a red flag. The Republican who received the highest number of votes had little or no public sector experience. The candidate with the most public sector experience received 205,183 votes.

CRP Spring 2019 Convention - Bylaw Proposal #3
Bylaw proposal submitted by Tom Palzer

This illustrates a third reason our Party's system fails us. We don't identify the experience of our candidates to our Party members.

I firmly believe that our Party needs a voluntary vetting procedure for congressional and statewide elective offices. While anyone who meets state and federal requirements to run for office may do so, a large number of candidates in the field from a single Party takes votes away from those candidates with the most experience to rise to the top. Too many candidates for an office splinters the Party. By not having a voluntary vetting procedure early in the process, we wind up with candidates with no viable experience syphoning off votes from those who have the level of experience to, not only compete with candidates in other parties, but to move the Party's principles forward. In my experience, having run for the U.S. Senate in 2016 and 2018, no less than 30 candidates ran in each election, including 12 Republicans in 2016 and 8 Republicans in 2018. The math simply does not work, especially in the Top Two primary system, to wind up with a Republican on the general election ballot.

Currently, we rely on our convention process and our bylaws to endorse candidates, the timing of which, in my opinion, is too close to the primary election. In order to gain the Party's endorsement, a candidate must compile at least 10 signatures of delegates from each of the 8 regions in the state and signatures from not less than 5 of our board members. We can retain the signature requirements, but add the vetting procedure well in advance of the convention.

The voluntary vetting meeting should be paid for by the Party. It should be held within two weeks of the final filing date for office by candidates. Anyone in the Party may attend and listen to each of the candidate answer questions, for example:

1. A statement of where the candidate resides in the state, including legislative and congressional districts and the names of the current Republican legislators in both;
2. A statement confirming that the candidate is a registered Republican;
3. Presentation of a brief history of private and public sector experience;
 - a) jobs the candidate has held and duration of each;
 - b) years of experience in a decision-making position(s);
 - c) volunteer service to the community;
4. A statement or brief history of relevant experience for the specific office being sought;
5. Demonstration that the candidate shares the political principles of our Party;
6. A statement of the candidate's top 3 priorities once elected;
7. The candidate's plan to finance his/her candidacy.

Each candidate must be present to listen to their fellow Republicans responses. I believe that, once each candidate has responded, some, hopefully most, will withdraw their candidacy and unite behind no more than 3 of the candidates who demonstrate the most experience and those qualities best-suited for the office he/she is seeking. In addition to reducing the number of Republicans running, the obvious benefit would preclude the siphoning off votes from qualified candidates by less-experienced candidates. In my

CRP Spring 2019 Convention - Bylaw Proposal #3
Bylaw proposal submitted by Tom Palzer

opinion, this will yield quality candidates, and in the number best needed to compete for office.

Now, some may say that President Trump had no public experience and he won the Presidency, but that would be flat out wrong! Every project that he proposed over his professional career had a definitive political element. He had to know and work with every politician at the local,

state, and federal level, depending on the project, in order to get his building sites approved and his buildings built. Having had 32 years of experience working with and advising politicians and department heads, I can assure you that Donald Trump knew the names of every single politician involved in the development process. He knew, as I did, that if a politician is ignored in the process, he or she is more likely to delay a project, at least until his or her input is received or ego is satisfied.

I propose that the vetting process include:

1. A statement of where the candidate resides, including city, county, legislative and congressional districts and the name of the legislators within their respective districts;
2. Experience with the Party;
 - a) proof of membership in the Republican Party;
 - b) as a volunteer for the Party or a candidate;
 - c) as a former candidate and office sought and/or held;
 - d) as a delegate;
 - e) as a campaign manager;
 - f) as a donor to the Party or a candidate;
2. Presentation of a brief history of private and public sector experience;
 - a) jobs the candidate has held;
 - b) years of experience in a decision-making position;
3. A statement of relevant experience for the office being sought;
3. A statement of the top three priorities of the candidate once elected;
4. Demonstration that the candidate shares the political views of our Party;
5. The candidate's plan to finance his/her candidacy.

I would like to hear from each of you so that this idea garners the support of needed to present to Party officials.

Thank you. Tom

Thomas E. Palzer tep509@yahoo.com 909.913.9500

Former Candidate for U.S. Senate Republican - California

P.O. Box 2413

Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91729-2413