
[Home](#)

Coordinating Committee on-line vote minutes, February 22nd-24th, 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. This letter incorporates feedback to amend a draft considered on that call. The CC's 48 hour on-line voting procedure is used here because it is a response to the timeline and political urgency that merited the CC co-coordinators calling the CC's special executive session meeting of February 20th.

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 noon, Wednesday, February 22, 2012 and noon, Friday, February 24th, 2012. Further review will be up to the Steering Committee upon receipt of response

References: Executive session materials, not for public distribution.

Friday, February 24th, 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 was not 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 must request clear and unambiguous answers to the following questions in the form of a signed affidavit from Tom Yager, sent to GPCA Coordinating Committee co-coordinators by midnight West Coast time on Friday, March 2nd, after which we will decide upon what further courses of action we will take to ensure the integrity of our presidential primary ballot line and our relationship with the GPUS:

- Why did Tom Yager in his role as PCSC co-chair declare on January 25th, 2012 that Barr's candidacy had met the GPUS requirements for presidential candidate recognition when he did not provide documentation to the PCSC to support that assertion?

- In making that declaration of January 25th, why and under what authority did Yager declare that an 11:50pm East Coast deadline on February 1st would apply to the period during which Barr's recognition could be challenged, when (1) it is standard GPUS practice for all voting periods to begin at midnight East Coast time and end at 11:59pm West Coast time a week later; when (2) an 11:59pm deadline was applied to Kent Mesplay but not to Barr; and (3) 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?

- In making that declaration on January 25th, why and under what authority did Yager declare that an 11:50pm East Coast deadline on February 1st would apply to the period during which Barr's recognition could be challenged, so that it created an unprecedented, highly irregular ten minute window of recognition for her 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?

- Why and under what authority did Yager declare a PCSC conference call for January 31st, 2012 with less than a week's notice as required under PCSC Rules and Procedures 3-1.2 as approved by the GPUS National Committee, when as the co-chair he should've known these rules, and when the need for the January 31st meeting date could've been foreseen far in advance given the need for the committee to address compliance issues as of February 1st?

- Despite posting notice of the January 31st, 2012 conference call to the PCSC list on January 26th, 2012, why and under what authority did Yager invite a representative of the Barr campaign onto that conference call without notifying the rest of the PCSC; and why was the opportunity to attend that call not also extended to the Mesplay campaign, as it was only the Barr and Mesplay campaigns whose status would be discussed on that call?

- Why did Yager not mention on the PCSC call of January 31st the very ten minute window of recognition he created in which Barr could arguably avoid the \$5,000 requirement, when a majority part of the PCSC's discussion on that call was centered upon methods of verifying whether as of whether Barr's campaign had raised and met the \$5,000 requirement as of February 1st?

- After Yager agreed on the call on January 31st with PCSC members to 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, as a way of validating the veracity of whether the \$5,000 without self-financing, why did Yager not ever produce such a document to the PCSC and why did he nevertheless declare on February 2nd to the PCSC and Barr's campaign, that Barr achieved GPUS recognition that required this very withheld validation?

- Does Yager know the identify of Barr's major donors? If so, has he told any other members of the PCSC or GPUS Steering Committee?

A scanned copy of the affidavit sent by email by the March 2nd deadline to the GPCA Coordinating Committee's Co-coordinators, 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 7th will be acceptable.

We look forward to the Steering Committee ensuring that the GPCA is provided with clear and unambiguous answers to these questions.

Sincerely

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

Vote:

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

No (4): Daniel, Hermanson, Rubin, Tanaka

Abstain (0):

Not Voting: Mancias

The proposal did not pass, because it received 75% and 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.