

Summary Analysis of the Proposed 2026 North Carolina Republican Party Plan of Organization

Non-Resident Administrators & Erosion of Precinct Self-Governance

One of the most significant structural changes contained in the proposed Plan of Organization is the creation of the Non-Resident Administrator position and the expansion of appointment authority over precinct organizations. While supporters have described these provisions as a practical solution for organizing inactive precincts, the issue is not whether vacant precincts should be organized. The issue is who should control that process and what safeguards should exist to ensure that local leadership remains accountable to the precinct it serves.

The proposed Plan repeatedly states that the Republican Party is built from the bottom up. If that principle is to have meaning, authority should originate at the precinct level whenever possible and move upward through the Party structure. The Non-Resident Administrator provisions move in the opposite direction by allowing leadership outside the precinct to exercise authority over precinct organization. In doing so, the Plan creates internal inconsistencies, weakens local self-governance, and leaves important questions unanswered regarding the scope, duration, and authority of these appointments.

The concerns outlined below are not objections to organizing inactive precincts. Rather, they are concerned that the proposed language unnecessarily transfers authority away from precinct Republicans and into appointed positions without sufficient limitations or safeguards. These issues can be addressed through targeted amendments that preserve the ability to organize inactive precincts while maintaining the Party's commitment to local control and grassroots leadership.

My first major concern relates to the newly proposed Non-Resident Administrator provisions. While I understand the goal of ensuring every precinct remains organized and operational, I believe the current language creates several unintended conflicts and ambiguities that should be addressed before adoption.

I have attached screenshots showing my proposed revisions. Strikeouts indicate language I recommend removing, and red text reflects my suggested replacement language.

A. Conflict Between Sections 1-204 and 3-202

Section 1-204. Right to Run for, Be Appointed to, and Hold a Party Office.

(a) **General Rule.** Any person running for, appointed to, or holding a Party office described in this Plan must be a Member of the Party and a resident of the jurisdiction for which that office has been

established. For purposes of this Section, the term “office” includes both elected and appointed membership on committees created or authorized by this Plan.

(b) Exception. Subsection (a) shall not apply:

1. to the member of the State Executive and Operating Committees representing the North Carolina Federation of Teenage Republicans if by reason of his or her age, that member is not eligible to register to vote; or
2. to a Non-Resident Administrator appointed pursuant to Section 3-202. However, such exception shall apply only for so long as there is no willing and eligible Member residing within the precinct willing to serve as Precinct Chair. Upon the identification of a willing and eligible resident Member prepared to serve, the Non-Resident Administrator shall immediately become ineligible to continue serving and the position shall be deemed vacant.

Section 1-204 establishes the general rule that any person running for, appointed to, or holding a Party office must be a resident of the jurisdiction for which that office has been established.

However, Section 3-202 creates the position of Non-Resident Administrator without creating a corresponding exception within Section 1-204.

As drafted, the Plan appears internally inconsistent. The Plan simultaneously requires residency while authorizing an individual to administer a precinct in which he or she does not reside.

My proposed amendment creates a narrow exception for Non-Resident Administrators while clearly limiting the duration of that exception. The exception would apply only while no willing and eligible resident member is available to serve. Once such a resident is identified, the Non-Resident Administrator would immediately become ineligible to continue serving.

B. Section 3-105 Removes Authority From the Precinct

Section 3-105. Vacancy in a Precinct Office.

Precinct Officers shall be entitled to hold their offices until the expiration of their terms or, if earlier, upon the Officer's death, resignation, removal, or ineligibility to serve. ~~When an office becomes vacant, the County Chair shall nominate a replacement to serve in that office until the next County Executive Committee meeting, at which time the Committee shall appoint that replacement or another Member to complete the term of the vacated office.~~

(a) Vacancies. Vacancies arising in Precinct Offices shall first be filled by the remaining members of the Precinct Committee.

(b) Absence of Remaining Officers. If no remaining member of the Precinct Committee is available to serve or act, the County Chair may appoint a Non-Resident Administrator as outlined in section 3-202.

The proposed language authorizes the County Chair to nominate replacements when a precinct office becomes vacant.

I believe vacancies should first be filled by the remaining members of the precinct committee whenever possible. If the Party is to remain a bottom-up organization, precinct leadership should retain the primary responsibility for selecting its own successors.

Only when no remaining precinct officers or committee members are available should the County Chair be permitted to appoint a Non-Resident Administrator.

My proposed amendment preserves local control while still providing a mechanism to address inactive precincts.

C. Section 3-202 Does Not Adequately Define the Purpose of the Position

Section 3-202. Non-Resident Administrator.

The Party shall work to have an effective political campaign organization in every precinct of the state. Accordingly, the County Chair is authorized to appoint a Member of the County Party to serve as Administrator of an unorganized precinct in which he or she is not a resident. The Administrator shall (i) ~~act in the role of the Precinct Chair in the conduct of political campaigns and (ii) work to identify residents of the Precinct willing to be elected as members of the Precinct Committee at the Annual Precinct Meeting to be held in the next odd-numbered year~~ willing and eligible resident Members of the precinct to assume leadership of the precinct organization, and (iii) preside at Precinct Meetings. The duties of the Administrator shall cease upon the election of a Precinct Chair as provided in Sections 1-

The current language directs the Administrator to identify residents willing to be elected at the next precinct meeting.

I believe the language should more clearly establish that the Administrator's purpose is to identify willing and eligible resident members capable of assuming leadership of the precinct organization immediately.

The position should function as a temporary bridge to restore resident leadership rather than a substitute for resident leadership.

D. Section 4-201 Does Not Clarify Voting Eligibility

2. Committee Members.

Section 4-201. Voting Members.

The Members listed in this Section shall constitute the voting members of the County Executive Committee.

(a) Required Members. The County Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, Treasurer, the Election Integrity Chair, and five other members.

(b) Additional Members. Such additional Officers and other members, including Members who hold office by virtue of an ex officio status, as provided in the County Plan of Organization.

(c) Optional Members. The General Counsel, Audit Committee Chair, and Finance Committee Chair, are not automatically members of the Executive Committee, but may be elected to the County Executive Committee as provided in Section 4-301(i).

(d) Ineligible Members. Members serving in temporary appointed capacities shall not be eligible to serve as voting members of the County Executive Committee by virtue of those appointments. Such temporary positions include, but are not limited to, Members serving on non-standing committees, convention committees, and Non-Resident Administrators appointed pursuant to this Plan. These temporary positions shall not constitute County Offices or Executive Committee positions.

Section 4-201 identifies required, additional, and optional voting members of the County Executive Committee but does not address temporary appointees.

As written, there is no explicit statement that a Non-Resident Administrator is not a voting member of the County Executive Committee by virtue of appointment.

Because these appointments are made by the County Chair and do not currently require Executive Committee confirmation, future county chairs could potentially interpret the Plan as authorizing the creation of additional voting members through appointment.

My proposed amendment would add an "Ineligible Members" subsection clarifying that temporary appointments—including Non-Resident Administrators and members of temporary committees—do not create voting membership on the County Executive Committee.

Conclusion

My concern is not with the concept of organizing inactive precincts. Rather, it is with ensuring that the Plan preserves local self-governance, maintains consistency among its provisions, and prevents unintended expansions of appointment authority.

Transparency, Representation, & Access to Party Information

My second major concern involves transparency, access to Party records, and the ability of Republicans to identify and communicate with the individuals who represent them within the Party structure.

I have attached screenshots showing my proposed revisions. Strikeouts indicate language I recommend removing, and red text reflects my suggested replacement language.

A. Access to Party Records

Section 4-404. Secretary.

The Secretary shall keep all minutes and records of Executive Committee meetings, shall maintain a roster of all Precinct and Executive Committee members, ~~and shall furnish lists of those members to the County Executive Committee members, the State Party, and to each Congressional District Party within the county, upon request and whenever a change in those members occurs.~~ At a minimum, these records shall contain the name and address for each Precinct officer and Executive Committee member. Such records shall be available, including all credentials lists and financial reports upon request, to any registered Republican within the county. The Secretary shall furnish to the Congressional District Chairman and to State Headquarters up-to-date lists of all Precinct Chairmen.

Section 6-303. Secretary.

The Secretary shall keep all minutes and records of District Executive Committee meetings and shall maintain a roster of all District Executive Committee members and of all Precinct and County Executive Committee members within the district. ~~When requested, the Secretary shall distribute to County Officers a current list of all County Officers, including their contact information, within the district.~~ At a minimum, these records shall contain the name and address for each Precinct officer and Executive Committee member. Such records shall be available, including all credentials lists and financial reports upon request, to any registered Republican within the district. The Secretary shall furnish to the Congressional District Chairman and to State Headquarters up-to-date lists of all Precinct Chairmen.

Sections 4-404 and 6-303 currently require Secretaries to maintain records and rosters. However, the proposed language removes the longstanding expectation that Republicans within the applicable jurisdiction may obtain access to those records upon request.

I believe the Plan should clearly state that Party records maintained by the Secretary shall be available upon request to registered Republicans within the applicable jurisdiction.

At a minimum, these records should include:

- Executive Committee rosters
- Precinct officer rosters
- Meeting minutes
- Credentials reports
- Financial reports
- Other official records maintained by the Party

Transparency is one of the most effective tools available to Party members for ensuring accountability and compliance with the Plan of Organization.

B. Consistency With Sections 9-104 and 9-303

Section 9-104. Transfer of Party Property upon End of Term.

An Officer or other Committee member possessing tangible or intangible Party property shall upon the end of his or her term of office promptly transfer that property, including access and control over any contact lists, internet sites, Party related data, electronic marketing media, and social media accounts, to his or her successor. Failure to do so within 30 days will be treated as grounds for discipline under clause (iv) of Section 9-303 and result in the ineligibility to hold Party Office under Section 9-308.

Section 9-303. Other Reasons for Reprimand or Removal.

Following a proceeding conducted under Section 9-307, an Officer or other Committee member may be reprimanded or removed for (i) gross inefficiency, (ii) failure without rectification to comply with a significant provision of this Plan or the relevant County or District Plan, (iii) party disloyalty, or (iv) non-compliance with Section 9-104.

Sections 9-104 and 9-303 require Party officers to transfer Party records, data, access credentials, and other Party property to their successors and provide penalties for failing to do so.

However, if Party records are no longer clearly available to Republicans within the jurisdiction, an inconsistency is created.

A Party officer who retains copies of records after leaving office could potentially face accusations of improperly retaining Party property, while simultaneously losing the ability to access records that were previously available to Republicans as members of the Party.

I believe this issue can be avoided by explicitly recognizing that Party records remain accessible to registered Republicans within the applicable jurisdiction.

C. Standing Committee Transparency

Section 7-304. The Secretary and the Assistant Secretary.

The Secretary shall keep the minutes of all Operating Committee meetings and State Executive Committee meetings, maintain the records of the Party and the Rosters of all State Committees. The Assistant Secretary shall assist the Secretary in these duties and shall act as Secretary in the absence of the Secretary.

My proposed amendment to Section 7-304 would require the State Secretary to maintain rosters of all State committees.

Currently, many Republicans have no practical way of identifying who serves on committees such as:

- Plan of Organization Committee
- Credentials Committee
- Resolutions Committee
- Audit Committee
- Other standing and authorized committees

These committees exercise significant influence over Party governance and policy. Republicans should be able to identify who represents their district on these committees and know who chairs them.

D. Representation and Communication

At a minimum, Party members should be able to determine:

- Who serves on each committee
- Which district those members represent
- How to contact the committee chair

I am not necessarily advocating for the public release of every committee member's personal contact information. However, Republicans should be able to identify their representatives and have a reliable means of communicating with committee leadership.

Without that transparency, Party members have little ability to engage with the committees that are making recommendations and decisions affecting Party governance.

Conclusion

My concern is not simply recordkeeping. My concern is ensuring that Republicans have meaningful access to information about their Party, their representatives, and the committees that shape Party policy and governance.

Accountability, Discipline, & the Review of Misconduct

Transparency promotes accountability, strengthens trust in Party leadership, and helps ensure that the Party remains responsive to its membership.

My third major concern involves accountability, disciplinary procedures, and the ability of Party members to seek meaningful review of misconduct.

While I understand the desire to prevent abuse of the disciplinary process and minimize disruption within the Party, I believe several provisions of the proposed Plan unintentionally weaken accountability and may discourage members from reporting misconduct.

I have attached screenshots showing my proposed concerns and references.

A. Section 9-305(c) – Two-Year Limitation on Complaints

(c) Limitation. A complaint that relies solely on facts occurring more than two years prior to the commencement of the proceeding shall be barred.

Section 9-305(c) provides:

"A complaint that relies solely on facts occurring more than two years prior to the commencement of the proceeding shall be barred."

I believe this provision creates a significant accountability problem.

In many cases, misconduct is not discovered immediately. Financial irregularities, procedural violations, misuse of Party resources, or other misconduct may remain hidden for years before being uncovered by a successor officer or through a review of Party records.

For example, a newly elected County Chair may review records from a prior administration and discover conduct that violated the Plan. Under the proposed language, if the underlying conduct occurred more than two years earlier, the complaint could be barred regardless of its seriousness.

In effect, this provision creates a statute of limitations that may shield misconduct simply because it remained undiscovered long enough.

I believe accountability should be tied to when misconduct is discovered or reasonably could have been discovered, rather than when it occurred.

B. Section 9-309 – Frivolous Complaints

Section 9-309. Frivolous Complaint.

If the District Chairs, the Operating Committee, or the State Executive Committee, as the case may be, find at any time that a complaint is groundless, harassing, or frivolous in nature, they may dismiss the complaint and may reprimand the complainant or complainants.

Section 9-309 authorizes Party leadership to dismiss complaints that are deemed "groundless, harassing, or frivolous" and further authorizes reprimands against the complainant.

My concern is not that frivolous complaints should be tolerated. Rather, my concern is that these terms are not clearly defined.

Terms such as "groundless," "harassing," and "frivolous" are inherently subjective and could be interpreted differently depending upon who is reviewing the complaint.

As written, this provision grants broad discretion to Party leadership to dismiss complaints and potentially punish members who bring them.

This creates a chilling effect whereby members may become reluctant to report legitimate concerns for fear that their complaint could be characterized as frivolous and result in disciplinary action against them.

A disciplinary system should encourage good-faith reporting of potential misconduct, not discourage it.

C. Section 7-601(f) – Arbitration Committee Procedures

(f) Procedure. Within 60 days of a matter being assigned to a subcommittee and after providing any affected Member with an opportunity to be heard, the subcommittee shall issue a written ruling resolving the matter in as equitable and least disruptive manner possible. Copies of the ruling shall be distributed to the members of the Operating Committee and to the parties involved in the matter. The subcommittee may also commence a proceeding under Section 9-305 if it determines that disciplinary action is necessary to prevent a violation of federal or state law or this Plan. The State Chair shall not appoint any member of the subcommittee to hear the matter conducted under Section 9-307.

Section 7-601(f) directs the Arbitration Committee to resolve matters "in as equitable and least disruptive manner possible."

While I appreciate the desire to preserve Party unity and avoid unnecessary conflict, I believe the phrase "least disruptive manner possible" creates an unintended incentive to prioritize organizational convenience over accountability.

A serious violation of the Plan may require a disruptive outcome.

For example, if an officer has engaged in misconduct, the appropriate remedy may be removal, sanctions, or other corrective action. Such outcomes are inherently disruptive, but disruption alone should not be a reason to avoid accountability.

The primary objective of the Arbitration Committee should be to reach a fair, lawful, and factually supported outcome. Minimizing disruption should be a secondary consideration, not a controlling principle.

Overall Concern

Taken together, these provisions appear to place greater emphasis on protecting Party stability than on ensuring accountability.

A healthy organization requires both stability and accountability. In my view, the Plan should encourage the reporting of misconduct, provide meaningful avenues for review, and ensure that serious violations can be addressed even when they are discovered after the fact.

Calista Cuevas

Operations and Planning Director, CCNC
North Carolina Federation of Republican Assemblies, President

