
[Home](#)

Coordinating Committee on-line vote minutes, February 27th-29th, 2012

Subject/Title: Letter to GPUS and Tom Yager

Co-sponsors: Mike Feinstein and Tim Laidman

Background and Purpose: On the CC's executive session conference call of February 20th, the CC reviewed background material regarding GPUS process and the GPCA presidential ballot line. Between February 22nd and 24th, the CC considered a letter to the GPUS Steering Committee seeking answers to questions raised during that call. By the close of the vote on Friday, February 24th, the letter received 12 votes in favor and 4 against (75%), enough to pass it during a regular CC call, but not enough to pass it in a 48 hour vote, which requires 80%.

Since then, unbeknownst to the CC and without any prodding by the GPCA, the GPUS Steering Committee conducted their own executive session on February 26th to consider this issue, but without benefit of the GPCA's letter, which it would've had, had the CC approved of it as of the 24th.

Rather than bringing that letter back to the CC's regular March 5th call, during which it would need only a 2/3 approval and arguably would pass then, but would take time away from other needed business, it is the hope that the interest and actions of the GPUS Steering Committee on this matter demonstrate to the CC that there is need for such a letter as soon as possible. With that in mind, this new revision also seeks to address the outstanding concerns of those voting no on February 24th, by softening the tone of the earlier version in several places.

The CC's 48 hour on-line voting procedure is used here because this letter is both a response to the urgency that merited the CC co-coordinators calling the CC's February 20th special executive session meeting in the first place, and to the need for such a letter as evidenced by the GPUS Steering Committee's executive session of February 26th.

Proposal: That the following letter attached below be emailed by the GPCA CC Co-coordinators to the GPUS Steering Committee in care of Steering Committee Susan Chunco (CA) and separately emailed to Tom Yager.

Implementation/Timeline/Resources: GPCA CC voting shall take place between 1pm, Monday, February 27th, 2012 and 1pm, Wednesday February 29th, 2012. Further review will be up to the Steering Committee upon receipt of response.

References: Executive session materials, not for public distribution.

Wednesday, February 29th, 2012

Steering Committee
Green Party of the United States
7059 Blair Road NW, Suite 104
Washington, DC 20012

Tom Yager
(Home address withheld out of privacy reasons for this internet version of the minutes)

Dear GPUS Steering Committee and Tom Yager,

Access to the GPCA's presidential primary ballot is determined by a process that involves the California Election's code, GPCA Rules and Procedures and GPUS Rules and Procedures.

To the degree that the GPCA willingly accedes part of the discretion over who appears on its presidential primary election ballot to the GPUS, it does so based upon the belief that the GPUS will follow its own rules in exercising that discretion. It appears in this year's election cycle, that discretion may not have been exercised in concert with GPUS rules.

As it is the Steering Committee's responsibility under GPUS Bylaws to "4-2.7 Facilitate, coordinate and assist the activities of Standing and Ad Hoc Committees of the GPUS, including but not necessarily limited to...4-2.7(g) Assuring compliance with committee Mission Statements and Rules, Policies and Procedures"; and in light of the PCSC's actions during January and February of this year, we are writing to request clear and unambiguous answers to the following questions in the form of a signed affidavit from PCSC Co-chair Tom Yager, including any supporting documentation, sent to GPCA Coordinating Committee co-coordinators by midnight West Coast time on Sunday, March 4th:

- On January 25, 2012 in his role as PCSC co-chair, Yager declared that the Barr candidacy had met the GPUS requirements for presidential candidate recognition. For what reason and under what authority did he do so, when he did not provide full documentation to the PCSC to support that assertion?

- It is standard GPUS practice that all voting periods begin at midnight East Coast time and end at 11:59pm West Coast time. Yet in making his declaration of January 25th, Yager declared that an 11:50pm East Coast deadline on February 1st would apply to the period during which Barr's recognition could be challenged. For what reason and under what authority did he do so? Furthermore, for what reason and under what authority was an 11:50pm East Coast deadline applied to Barr when an 11:59pm West Coast deadline was applied to Kent Mesplay, especially when this 11:50pm East Coast deadline meant that the period during which Barr's recognition could have been challenged ended before one could have fully determined whether her campaign had met the requirements for recognition itself?

- It appears that the deadline Yager declared for the Barr campaign created an unprecedented, highly irregular ten minute window of recognition for Barr campaign from 11:50 pm East Coast time through 11:59pm East Coast time so that as a result, Barr's campaign arguably did not have to provide evidence of raising \$5,000 as of February 1st, as required by Article X of GPUS Rules and Procedures? Did the Barr campaign provide documentation that it had met that requirement before the deadline?

- The PCSC conference call for January 31st, 2012 was called on January 26th by Yager with less than a week's notice as required under PCSC Rules and Procedures 3-1.2. When the need for the January 31st meeting date could've been foreseen far in advance, given the need for the PCSC to address compliance issues as of February 1st, why was the PCSC not given the required notice? And for what reason and under what authority did Yager invite a representative of the Barr campaign onto that conference call without notifying the rest of the PCSC? Given that it was only the Barr and Mesplay campaigns whose status would be discussed on that call, was the same invitation extended to the Mesplay campaign, and if not, why not?

- During the PCSC's call, a great deal of time was dedicated to establishing methods of verifying whether as of whether Barr's campaign had raised and met the \$5,000 requirement as of February 1st. Given this, why did Yager not mention on that call the very ten minute window of recognition he created in which Barr could arguably avoid the \$5,000 requirement?

- In order to validate whether the Barr campaign had raised \$5,000 without self-financing, it was agreed on that call by all participants including Yager, that the PCSC would require an affidavit by February 2nd from the Barr campaign stating (1) the name of the campaign account, and the bank in which it exists, (2) that the campaign had raised at least \$5,000 that did not include self-financing by the candidate, and (3) a list of all major donors during this period that would otherwise ultimately end up in a future FEC report. Why didn't Yager ever produce such a document to the PCSC? Under what authority did he nevertheless declare on February 2nd to the PCSC and Barr's campaign, that Barr achieved GPUS recognition that required this very withheld documentation? Does Yager know the identity of Barr's major donors? Do any other members of the PCSC or Steering Committee? Are any GPUS officials in possession of said documentation and if so, can it be provided to the GPCA?

The GPCA greatly values the integrity of our presidential primary ballot line and our relationship with the GPUS. As such, we look forward to the Steering Committee ensuring that the GPCA is provided with clear and unambiguous answers to these questions.

A scanned copy of the affidavit sent by email to the GPCA Coordinating Committee's Co-coordinators by the March 4th deadline, followed by a signed, hard copy sent to the GPCA, c/o Alex Shantz, (Home address withheld out of privacy reasons for this internet version of the minutes) by March 9th will be acceptable. We thank you in advance for your aid in this matter.

Sincerely

Sanda Everette (sanda.greensolutions@gmail.com),
Alex Shantz (alexshantz@gmail.com)
Co-Coordiators, Coordinating Committee
Green Party of California

Vote:

Yes (12): Bernstein, Bloomberg, Everette, Feinstein, Heller, Laidman, Leslie, Luther, Mancias, Quackenbush, Shantz, Sinnott

No (3): Hermanson, Rubin, Tanaka

Abstain (2): Ashley, Daniel

Proposal passes 12-3-2 (80%). The approval threshold under Coordinating Committee Internal Procedures for 48 Hour Expedited Proposals is 80%

Attachment: Coordinating Committee Internal Procedures

(http://www.cagreens.org/committees/coordinating/procedures#Article_IV_On...)

4-4 Expedited Proposals

When a decision can only be made within a compressed time period to respond to pressing legal, financial or political deadlines, the Coordinating Committee may make a decision within 48 hours if it achieves a 2/3 quorum and an approval threshold of 80%. In such cases, the proposal shall be posted as "48 HOUR ONLINE VOTE: [TITLE]" in the subject header of the email and shall be in the format described in 3-4.