

Michael Golojuch, Jr., Questionnaire

Timestamp	2019/02/15 12:55:35 PM HAST
Consent: I, Michael Golojuch, Jr., consent to being interviewed via this electronic questionnaire. I understand that I have the right to decline to answer any question contained herein.	Yes, I consent.
1. Are you willing to allow this questionnaire (not including your answers) to be published publicly as part of the Fact Finding section of the committee report?	Yes, you may publish these questions.
2. What is the process for receiving and processing applications to the LGBTC? Are all applications approved for membership? How are new members notified of their membership, and how long does a decision usually take?	<p>My responses here are by no means an agreement from me, Michael Golojuch, Jr., that the O’ahu County Committee (OCC), or any of its Committees, has any jurisdiction over the LGBT Caucus, our meetings or how we operate under our By-Laws that have been approved by the State Central Committee (SCC). In fact, it is my assertion that neither the OCC or any County Committee has any jurisdiction over any Caucus and this is because Caucuses are state wide organizations and we are certified by the SCC, as are all of our By-Laws, pursuant to the Democratic Party of Hawaii’s (DPH) Constitution - Article 5, Section 7 and the DPH By-Laws - Article 5, Section 7.</p> <p>I would also like to point out that no where in DPH By-laws Article I Section 8A (2) (c) or (d) do they mention Caucuses, or even County By-laws for that matter. They do go out of their way to list the Constitution & Bylaws of the Democratic Party of Hawai’i and the platform of the Party if they intended this process to apply to Caucus' By-laws they would have listed them. Following the DPH's Parliamentarian Dr. Puette's opinion this complaint should have been dismissed. That being said...</p> <p>This question is not germane to the complaint (and same thing for #3) as it is stated above this complaint is only "regarding a lack of teleconferencing availability at the August 21, 2018 LGBT Caucus ("LGBTC") elections." I will be more than happy to explain this to you all outside of these proceedings and anyone else that wants to know.</p>
3. Approximately how many new members were admitted in 2018?	

<p>4. You mention in your response that parking was a major influence in the decision to hold the election meeting on Tuesday, August 21, 2018 at 4:30 pm at the ILWU facility. Were there any other circumstances that influenced the meeting date, time, and location for the LGBT election? If so, please elaborate.</p>	<p>This information should have been included in the complaint because according to Article 1 Section 8B (2) of the DPH's By-laws clearly states complaints should be self-contained and it is the complainant's responsibility to provide all evidence to substantiate the complaint.</p> <p>For your personal information - Availability of the facility and schedules.</p>
<p>5. The complaint, and the response both cite e-mails that informed members of the change in date and time of the LGBT election meeting, but neither party has provided evidence of the notice of location change. When, and how, was notice of the location change given?</p>	<p>There was no change in location, date or time, per the meeting notice. Having something posted on a website does not to my knowledge count as notice of a meeting per Robert's Rules or the DPH By-laws.</p> <p>The first email that went out announced the date and time for the meeting and that never changed. The location of the meeting was first announced in the Facebook event when it was created on or about 7/23/18 and the second was an email that was sent out 5 days before the meeting.</p>
<p>6. Per LGBT Caucus bylaws Article 3 Section 3 'Election and Term of Office': "The actual meeting date and time shall be determined by the Steering Committee". Was the Steering Committee involved in the decision to change the meeting date, time, and subsequently the location, regardless of the reason or subsequent circumstances thereof?</p>	<p>Yes they were.</p>
<p>7. Did the complainant Mary Hackney exercise her voting rights in the election? Do you recall any details such as abstaining from voting, or voting in favor of or against any candidate for office?</p>	<p>From my recollection - YES Ms. Hackney did vote. She did not abstain from voting from any of the elections from my recollection. If she did abstained from voting it should have been noted in the minutes, which were provided to you.</p>
<p>8. Ms. Hackney claims that she expressed concern for the lack of teleconferencing available at the election, but this is not mentioned in the minutes of the August 21, 2018 election meeting. Do you recall Ms. Hackney voicing this concern at the meeting? If so, do you know why this is not noted in the minutes?</p>	<p>Per Robert's Rules minutes are not a verbatim record of everything that is said during a meeting. They only record motions and the outcome of the motions aka the votes and Ms. Hackney made no motion, she just made a statement.</p>

<p>9. How were the LBGT neighbor island representatives nominated, and subsequently elected at the August 21, 2018 election meeting?</p>	<p>Not germane to the complaint as it is stated above this complaint is only "regarding a lack of teleconferencing availability at the August 21, 2018 LGBT Caucus ("LBGT") elections."</p> <p>For your personal edification - They are not island reps they are county reps. I contacted all current county reps to see if they wanted to run again. If they were not a current county rep they contacted the Caucus seeking to be nominated for the position.</p>
<p>10. DPH Bylaws Article 1 Section 8B(2) states that each allegation in a complaint must be numbered, and similarly Article 1 Section 8B(4) states that the response of the accused "must respond to each allegation: admitted, denied, or denied in part". We acknowledge that the complaint's allegations were not numbered. Your response seems to clearly deny all allegations of wrongdoing in whole. Is this correct?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>11. Why was tele- or videoconferencing not available at the meeting on August 21, 2018 at the ILWU facility?</p>	<p>This information should have been included in the complaint because according to Article 1 Section 8B (2) of the DPH's By-laws clearly states complaints should be self-contained and it is the complainant's responsibility to provide all evidence to substantiate the complaint.</p> <p>Neither the LGBT Caucus nor the DPH by-laws require teleconference or video-conference - so there was no by-laws violation.</p> <p>It should be noted that there was NO teleconferencing or videoconferencing available for the SCC meeting that was held right after the 2018 DPH State Convention at the Waikaloa where we elected the other officers for the DPH Party - Vice Chair, Secretary, Assistant Secretary, Treasurer, and Assistant Treasurer. It makes me think that this complaint was filed just to target me especially given the personal attacks in the addendum.</p>

<p>12. There are several posts from people on the LGBTCC Facebook Page requesting information about teleconferencing for the election meeting, but there are no responses to those queries on Facebook. Additionally, the complaint alleges that e-mails requesting this information did not receive a response. How were these concerns addressed, and if they were not, why not?</p>	<p>This information should have been included in the complaint because according to Article 1 Section 8B (2) of the DPH's By-laws clearly states complaints should be self-contained and it is the complainant's responsibility to provide all evidence to substantiate the complaint.</p> <p>Please note - Every email that was submitted in the complaint from Ms. Hackney, a member of the LGBT Caucus, did receive a response. The other email was from a person who was not a member of the caucus at the time and we have limited resources so members get priority.</p> <p>The Facebook posts were not submitted as evidence so please see Article 1 Section 8B (2) of the DPH's By-laws.</p>
<p>13. Please elaborate on your interpretation of the DPH Bylaws Article V Section 7A(2), which pertains to the certification of new caucuses, and the LGBTCC Bylaws Article V Section 3 (Member Voting Rights); specifically, how do they relate to each other?</p>	<p>They are not related to each other with regards to this complaint.</p> <p>As you stated Article V Section 7A(2) deals with the certification of a new caucus so it provides the SCC Rules Committee and the entire SCC standards to decide on whether or not to approve a new caucus.</p> <p>As for Article V Section 3 that deals with the voting in the caucus. If the SCC thought that it was deficient then they would have never approved the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual & Transgender Caucus (our name up until 2015).</p> <p>It should be noted that this language has remained basically the same since our certification back in 2001 and was recently reconfirmed when the LGBT Caucus changed our name in 2015 and our By-laws were changed to reflect this change. It was also re-affirmed in the fall of 2016 when we also amended our By-laws again to take advantage of the Caucus' being allowed to vote for their own members.</p> <p>Neither the LGBT Caucus nor the DPH by-laws require teleconference - so there was no by-laws violation.</p>
<p>14. Why was the LGBTCC election meeting not held at the regular date, time, and location of Saturday, August 18, 2018 at 10 am at DPH HQ? Please explain the selection of a weekday, late afternoon date and time.</p>	<p>This information should have been included in the complaint because according to Article 1 Section 8B (2) of the DPH's By-laws clearly states complaints should be self-contained and it is the complainant's responsibility to provide all evidence to substantiate the complaint.</p> <p>See question #4.</p>