

Your Precinct Caucus is Under Attack!

Preserve and protect local control

These amendments by Aaron Bullen must be defeated!

3. Amendment to Constitution Article VII.E: “Precinct Definition”

4. Amendment to Constitution Article XII, Sec. 2: “State and County Nominating Conventions”

Some destructive consequences of Bullen’s amendments

No maximum precinct size – precincts can consist of thousands or even more than ten thousand voters (current limit is 1,250), making caucuses untenable

Irreversible – private citizen influence is diminished, and lobbyist power thus acquired will never be relinquished

Bad consequence already known – In 2024, Salt Lake County Party eliminated about 280 precinct chairs (about 29%) even without this proposed constitutional authority

Citizen control is subverted – elimination of precinct chairs stacks the deck on county central committees *in favor of Party officers, lobbyists, politicians, cronies, and gravy train operatives*

Arbitrary and capricious – precinct boundaries may be changed at any time and for any reason, including for selfish political advantage and political retribution

No disclosure requirement – boundaries need **NOT** be disclosed to caucus attendees

Unrestricted authority to eliminate precincts – authority is given to the “county party”, which could amount to a Party chair, or a lobbyist or crony appointed by a Party chair

Disrupted delegate position allocation – arbitrary precinct boundaries make allocation formula *de facto* unusable and cause delegates to no longer be allocated in a uniform and fair manner

Flyer provided by Grassroots GOP Delegates (protecting your caucus since 2006)

Visit www.grassrootsgopdelegates.org

(801) 669-3213

Recommendations for Party Constitutional Amendments

Item	Title	Summary	Recommendation	Rationale
1	Party Platform Amendments (McEntee)	Authorize platform amendments at State Organizing Convention and establish approval threshold in Bylaws.	NEUTRAL	Allow platform to be modified in advance of even year elections and provide consistent approach to approval threshold. We honor the platform, but politicians have neutered it by imposing SB 54.
2	Budgeting Process (Sandberg)	Change fiscal year to October 1 – September 30	SUPPORT	Current fiscal year is inconsistent with other Party constitutional provisions.
3	“Precinct Definition” (Bullen)	Change current precinct definition based on state code to authorize precincts to be defined in an arbitrary and corrupt manner, without disclosure	STRONGEST POSSIBLE OPPOSITION	The heart of the caucus/convention system is the small, neighborhood precinct, established by fair, disclosed rules and outcome. This amendment will authorize the elimination of hundreds or thousands of precincts in the state. Local authority is replaced with regional control.
4	“State Delegate Allocation” (Bullen)	Repeal minimum state delegate allocation for certain counties and replace with power to de facto eliminate precincts completely	STRONGEST POSSIBLE OPPOSITION	Precincts may be combined in any manner, including for purposes of special political advantage and retribution. Precincts may consist of thousands of voters. Neighborhood precincts and local control are ended.
5	“Relative Republican Strength” (Sims)	Calculate strength based on Republicans who cast ballots vs. actual votes cast for Republican candidates	OPPOSE	Likely increases delegate allocations to areas where RINOs dominate. A RINO casting a ballot doesn’t mean a Republican was supported. A careful analysis must be performed before making this fundamental change.
6	Eligibility to Run for Office (Bullen)	Requires continuous Republican voter registration for the previous year to run for office	OPPOSE	In practical effect the change accomplishes nothing. The Constitution is made more complicated without any practical benefit. It is a diversion from the real issue of long-registered “Republicans” burdened with extreme conflicts of interest and always riding the lucrative gravy train.
7	Conditions for Revocation of Party Membership and Convention Winner Threshold (Gaunt)	Eliminate the Party’s use of the government primary system and revoke Party membership for candidates that try to access the ballot in contempt of the Party Constitution	SUPPORT	The Republican Party has the right to establish criteria for membership. The criteria established by this amendment merely states that Party rules must be followed. By eliminating the use of the government primary system, the government has less authority to dictate the conduct of Party business.
8	State Central Committee Quorum (McEntee)	Lowers quorum from approximately 90 to at least 50.	STRONGLY OPPOSE	Under current circumstances of members with conflicts of interest and Zoom participation chaos, the timing of this amendment is not right.

Refutation of Arguments in Favor of Aaron Bullen's Precinct Caucus Destruction Amendments

Item	False Assertion	Bullen's Arguments in Favor of Caucus Destruction	Grassroots Republican Response
1	Small precincts are a problem	"If a precinct is primarily non-republican or in a liberal area, our constitution requires that they still have a delegate allocated to that area even if they do not qualify for any single delegate based on RRS. So if you are in an area that is nearly 100% Democrat, there is still a caucus there and a democrat voting unaffiliated resident can just show up, affiliate the day of, and become a Republican delegate. In order to protect the integrity of our caucus convention process, we need to have precincts that contain enough Republican voters to qualify to at least one state delegate, ensuring that caucuses are well attended and that actual Republicans are elected"	The Party Constitution does not authorize allocation of delegates to precincts where there are no or few Republicans. This practice has been carried out, nonetheless, by some counties as a means to strip delegate positions from precincts that are actually entitled to have them under the relative Republican strength (RRS) formula. A viable and fair solution to the "small precinct problem" was rejected for presentation to the delegates by the sponsor of these amendments.
2	Small precincts in conservative areas punish counties with larger precincts	"Those precincts would also receive a delegate, even if they only have 10% of the RRS required to qualify for a delegate. While this is not the same pitfall as we discussed above in the more democrat leaning areas, it is an issue nonetheless. If a county government draws smaller precincts, we could be required to give twice as many delegates per Republican voter to certain counties while other counties would lose delegates because they drew larger precincts. We should have equal distribution of delegates based on RRS without punishing certain counties just because their average precinct size is larger."	There are a few, small counties that have a few additional state delegate seats allocated due to small precinct sizes. An analysis conducted shows about 20 delegates in this category, or about 0.5% of total. While it is reasonable to consider constitutional amendments to address this concern, it is not reasonable to undermine the entire caucus system while doing so. If there was a genuine concern about delegate seat allocation, action would be taken to stop the unconstitutional allocations to politicians and Party insiders.
3	It is fine to eliminate precinct chairs	"The concept is that if a precinct does not have enough RRS to qualify for one delegate, that area is not Republican enough to require a precinct chair either. Attendance at quarterly meetings for precinct chairs and vice chairs (referred to as county central committee meetings) is between 18% and 65% in some counties (like Salt Lake). We would be well served to have stronger precincts with more dedicated precinct chairs."	Salt Lake County, without constitutional authority, has eliminated 280 precinct chairs according to a calculation performed, or approximately 29% of the total. The purpose of this is to empower politicians and Party insiders (whose numbers have not been decreased) at the expense of the grassroots members in central committee meetings.
4	Party chair or steering committee should be trusted and abuse of authority can be reset	"First of all, who is more accountable to the delegates when it comes to precinct boundaries? The County Chair or the County Clerk? Second, a motion can be made to change or undo party precinct allocations at a county central committee as a check on the Chair's decisions. So its [sic] really all of our decision on if we want party precincts formed or not. This proposal just gives us the right to make that decision."	It's not "all our decision on if we want party precincts formed or not." The amendment doesn't specify who will make the change. It could be the Party chair, solely on his or her initiative. Central committees are often stacked with politicians, lobbyists, representatives of special interests, and family members and associates of these individuals. This group will consolidate power for its own selfish benefit and will never reverse precinct combinations and cancellations made for that purpose.

Support “State Central Committee Eligibility” Bylaw

Reasons to support

- Party exists to represent its members and advance its platform; it does NOT exist to represent politicians and lobbyists
- Politicians and lobbyists have conflicts of interest
 - Will politicians enthusiastically support prohibitions against conversion of campaign accounts for personal use?
 - Will lobbyists want to disclose influence they wield over politicians?
- Politicians and lobbyists should have no authority over Party budgets that can provide to them direct, personal benefit
- Checks and balances and separation of power should exist in our Party rules as they do in the U.S. Constitution
- Central Committee members should be accountable to delegates and not personal or special interests
- Level the playing field

Response to counter-arguments (in italics)

- “Delegates should decide if politicians and lobbyists should be on the State Central Committee”
Exactly! If approved, the delegates will have decided that certain conflicts of interest are always unacceptable and that the interests of delegates and the advancement of the platform shall be prioritized.
- “The Central Committee benefits from the experience and knowledge of politicians and lobbyists”
There is nothing preventing politicians and lobbyists communicating their knowledge and experience with Central Committee members, while keeping power closest to the people
- “This change creates division within the Party”
This is an overreaction, while the actual division is created by those with conflicts of interest that advance themselves instead of transparency, fairness, and accountability