

Jeannie Davis

From: Ally Miller
Subject: FW: Agenda item regarding bundling of votes

From: Chris Straub
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2015 2:34 PM
To: Ally Miller (Ally.Miller@pima.gov)
Cc: Amelia Cramer; Sharon Bronson (Sharon.Bronson@pima.gov)
Subject: FW: Agenda item regarding bundling of votes

Hello Supervisor Miller: Amelia asked that I respond to your email on her behalf, as I am more familiar with this issue. As you know, Rule N of the Pima County Board of Supervisors Rules and Regulations provides that "the Board will follow Robert's rules of Order where applicable and not in conflict with these and other superior rules." The rule then provides, in descending order of precedence in determining parliamentary procedure, that the Arizona Constitution, Arizona Revised Statutes, Pima County Ordinances and the Rules of the Board, are superior to Robert's Rules. As I pointed out at the December 16 meeting, and as the Chair at that same meeting agreed, Board Rule G(2) specifically allows a member "upon request," and before the matter is put to a vote, to have "a question [] divided if it includes propositions so distinct in substance that, one being taken away, a substantial proposition shall remain."

This rule appears to have its origins in the provisions of Roberts Rules which you have cited as background information for item 11, but it is broader in scope than Robert's Rules. The latter requires a motion and second to require by division of the question (motion) a separate vote on distinct but *related* propositions (such as parts of a resolution dealing with a single subject), while mandating a separate vote on *unrelated* items combined in a single motion. Rule G(2) makes no such distinctions and mandates division of questions(motions) whether or not their distinct provisions are related. Regardless of the nature of the main motion, Robert's Rules also requires that those parts of the main motion that remain are to be voted on first, and then the divided part next.

To summarize, Rule G(2) requires, *on request* of a member to the Chair (who under Rule B(5) decides all points of order and procedure), the division of motions that contain distinct stand-alone provisions, whether or not they are related. Thus, if one member, for the sake of expediency, moves the approval a group of agenda items (e.g. Items 1, 2, 3, and 4 on the Addendum Agenda), and you have a concern regarding one of those items (e.g., Item 2), you can simply ask the Chair, before the vote, that the motion be divided to allow for separate consideration of that agenda item. (As the Chair also already knows), she will then proceed, to ask for discussion and take the vote on the part of the motion where there is no apparent disagreement (in our example, Items 1, 3, and 4) before turning to the remaining item (Item 2). The motion at issue will then be the *approval* of item 2 (the divided part of the main motion to approve all four items.)

I hope this answers your questions in this regard, but please let me know if you have further questions.

Christopher Straub
Chief Civil Deputy
Pima County Attorney's Office