

Greetings from the team of Loughrey, Brody, Ritchie and Phinney. We're the team who volunteered to decide what to bring to the Board concerning Article II and responsive resolutions.

We signed up for the responsive resolutions: "Article II," directing us to continue the discussion on Principles and Purposes; and "Article XV," directing us to clarify the process and limitations dealing with by-law amendments. The resolution on "Inclusion" deals with the specific language of Article II therefore must be addressed later.

We've exchanged many e-mails and concluded that the priority is to make Article XV, Section 15.1 more understandable. That work will serve as the basis from which to re-start work on Article II, probably at some time after GA10. With that priority in mind, we've redrafted Article XV (including very minor changes to Section 15.2). The initial thrust of this work was clarity rather than change the basic intent of Section 15.1. However, our discussion lead to consideration of several consideration of several substantial changes. Therefore, we are asking for Board discussion on several points that should be addressed in contemplating a major re-draft of Article XV.

We've attached our draft amendment which includes a few of the comments from within our group. This is a re-organization of Article XV. If you would like to review the (MS Change Marks) markup of the existing Article through seven versions, please send an e-mail to Lew Phinney (lphinney@uaa.org). He'll be glad to send you those versions.

To help shape our discussion, we pose the following questions:

- Did we get the priorities right (Article XV first, then Article II later)?
- Is there any reason to press the timeline (two-year wait) to reconsider changes to Article II? We assumed that we should make a deliberate effort to get it right rather than rushing the process. Recommend we discuss a timeline and strategy (new commission?, committee of the Board?, how to gather congregational input?, etc.) for Article II at our April meeting. We promise some thoughts in preparation for that meeting.
- Line 38 (line number refer to the following draft). Recommend we drop this requirement. This really isn't by-law stuff. It could more appropriately be stated in the rules or included in the Board's instructions to a new commission. Concur or not?
- Line 41. Such a review and study should be completed, including a report to the Board, in sufficient time for inclusion on the agenda and action at the third GA following the vote to create of the commission. Concur or not?
- Line 50 – 51. Consider reducing requirement to  $\frac{3}{4}$  vote to dispense with a review and study commission. Concur or not?

- Lines 56 – 57. Consider a substantive change: permitting amendments during GA following presentation of a commission's draft amendment. This would allow amendments during the first consideration of a draft amendment. If the amendment is approved (simple majority) for presentation at the next GA, no further amendments will be permitted. Concur or not?
- Should the BoT have the authority to amend a review & study commission's draft amendment prior to presenting it to a GA?

We've also included a draft timeline that includes the several variables involved in the overall consideration of Articles XV and II. This will give you some idea of what's involved in making the changes on the table.

See y'all in San Antonio.

Respectfully submitted,

Your Article II Team