

First, a little factual review. A committee was formed to produce a smaller board. It eventually did so. It did not issue a report as to why 13 was the chosen number. It also did not address flaws in the election process.

At the “Columbus” meetings, the proposal was approved 20-4, with 1 abstention. None of the 20 inquired as to why 13 might be a good number. Of course, nobody could know, as only 1 committee had been developed (Master Points) which would no longer be a board committee. Also, none of the 20 questioned the election process, which is absurd on its face.

At a minimum, this lack of curiosity is highly disturbing and does not speak well for the future reduced board.

Let us consider the prospects of someone succeeding to the board when there is a large difference in the sizes of the districts. A couple of the pairings have approximately 40 % from the smaller district. A majority of the pairings are in the vicinity of 30% from the smaller district. This is not just an “advantage” for the larger district. It is extremely unlikely for the winner in any of these elections to come from the smaller district. It would take substantial time and money to go to the larger district unit boards (which might well be somewhat hostile territory) and still have very little chance of winning an election.

This looks very much like a rigged election process. If the motion passes, the next president should visit every district (at one of its regionals) which loses and explain how this is beneficial to that district. And these visits should be on ACBL’s dime and not be paid by the district (adding insult to injury).

Let us also consider the election process. I agree that there are difficulties in at large voting. However, candidates can write as to how they should be on the board. We can also create a voting record on past poor decisions for those who were involved in those issues.

Other matters have not been considered either. Frequency and location of board meetings should be issues. I would advocate Horn Lake or wherever the corporate headquarters would be. I would also expect fewer face to face meetings if the board’s primary responsibilities would be “big ticket” items.

Our primary goal should be to have a board of appropriate size and also to have a board with a better skill set. These are not easy problems to solve. The current motion does little to help achieve these goals.

Second, find a logical path to a smaller board.

1. Vote down both proposals which are currently up for discussion.
2. Complete the design of committees both of the board and of the corporation. We would then have some basis for discussing the size of the new board.
3. Determine a fair method for electing this new board.
4. We should also discuss frequency and location of board meetings.