Coordinating Committee minutes, June 4, 2012

Coordinating Committee members present (12): Victoria Ashley (East Bay), **Warner Bloomberg** (Silicon Valley), **Maxine Daniel** (at-large); **Sanda Everette** (at-large), **Mike Feinstein** (Los Angeles), **Dave Heller** (at-large), **Tim Laidman** (at-large), **Sasha Karlik** (at-large) joined call at 7:51, **Stevie Luther** (at-large), **Cynthia Santiago** (at-large), **Alex Shantz** (North Bay), **Lauren Sinott** (at-large)

Coordinating Committee members not present (8): Marla Bernstein (at-large), **Daniel Braun** (San Diego/Imperial), **June Brashares** (at-large), **Barry Hermanson** (San Francisco), **Matt Leslie** (Orange/Riverside/San Bernardino), **Nancy Mancias** (at-large), **Michael Rubin** (at-large), **Kate Tanaka** (at-large)

Quorum: Quorum reached by 7:38 with 11/20 present: **Victoria Ashley** (East Bay), **Warner Bloomberg** (Silicon Valley), **Maxine Daniel** (at-large); **Sanda Everette** (at-large), **Mike Feinstein** (Los Angeles), **Dave Heller** (at-large), **Tim Laidman** (at-large), **Sasha Karlik** (at-large) joined call at 7:51, **Stevie Luther** (at-large), **Cynthia Santiago** (at-large), **Alex Shantz** (North Bay), **Lauren Sinott** (at-large)

Facilitator: Alex Shantz
Minutes taker: Mike Feinstein
Time keeper: Sanda Everette
Vibes Watcher: Tim Laidman

---

3) Approval of Agenda (simple majority vote)

Proposal (Feinstein): Move #13 to #11

Approved by consensus

---

4) Approve minutes (simple majority vote)

- Approval of minutes from 5/11 CC meeting
http://www.cagreens.org/committees/coordinating/minutes/2012-05-11

Because the correct link had not been included with the agenda, a decision upon these minutes was defered until the CC's July meeting.

---

5) Appointment: Media Committee

Pamela Spevack

Approved by consensus

---

6) Appointment: Finance Committee

Miguel Sanchez

Approved by consensus

Karlik joined call at 7:51

7) Appointment to IT Sub-Committee

Sasha Karlik

Approved by consensus

---

8) Decision: Bylaws interpretation (Ashley, Feinstein, Laidman, Shantz)

Proposal: That the CC adopt the following bylaws interpretation

Whereas there has been broad interest within the GPCA in establishing a Standing General Assembly since at least 2004-2007, when a CC-appointed sub-committee was tasked with researching how to bring one to the GPCA (http://lists.cagreens.org/mailman/listinfo/sgarc-l); and

Whereas there was strong support for a Standing General Assembly during the December 2011 General Assembly strategy session discussion in Los Angeles; and

Whereas the strategy session is designated by GPCA bylaws to provide input into a two-year party work plan for the CC to present at the subsequent General Assembly; and

Whereas the GPCA Bylaws Committee subsequently began work on an SGA right at that meeting and thereafter; and

Whereas the GPCA Bylaws Committee determined that a revision of the GPCA Bylaws to incorporate a Standing General Assembly would be best accomplished as part of an overall reordering and simplification of the existing bylaws text that reformatted, renumbered, and edited for brevity, clarity, consistency and better organization, without changing any meaning; and

Whereas the GPCA Bylaws Committee additionally determined that to ensure a smoothly functioning SGA, other amendments to the text should be made to resolve ambiguities and disputed points in related processes that would affect the SGA, including how delegates would be chosen, which counties are active, which committees and working groups can bring proposals to the SGA and upon what areas, and when and how coordinating committee elections are held; and

Whereas the Agenda Team, Coordinating Committee and General Assembly all agreed upon dedicating less than two hours to the SGA proposal on Sunday morning, May 13; and

Whereas it was clear from discussion from delegates during that agenda item that they wanted to see an SGA; and

Whereas the GPCA's consensus-seeking process was followed, where clarifying questions were taken and outstanding concerns expressed on the text, and amendments proposed to address the outstanding concerns; and

Whereas many delegates did not express concerns with specific parts of the SGA proposal, but instead requested breaking up the proposal into a series of votes on various parts of the proposal; and

Whereas for the purposes of responding to this outstanding concern, the presenters separated the part of the proposal about Coordinating Committee elections from those parts relating to an SGA;

Whereas by the end of the time allowed, there was not a decision to approve bylaws language to establish an SGA; and

Whereas the General Assembly approved of a two year work plan calendar on May 12th, which was based a Standing Green Assembly being in place and in use over next two years, starting on July 1; with the calendar's approval contingent upon an SGA being approved by the General Assembly; and

Whereas there will not be a General Assembly before the November General Election and therefore the GPCA must use its County Polling process to take its positions on the between seven and nine measures that will be on the November ballot; and

Whereas the work plan calendar is based upon the SGA scheduled County Polling to take place via the SGA this fall; and

Whereas the GPCA did not reach quorum in County Polling held this spring, with the email County Polling model used; and

Whereas the GPCA Campaigns and Candidates Working Group is of the opinion that the existing County Polling process in the Bylaws appendix can be interpreted to allow for the use of the same voting page technology such as that specified in the SGA proposal; and

Whereas for the purposes of maximizing its stances on the ballot measures, its in the strategic interest of the GPCA to establish its positions by Labor Day, when the fall campaign official begins; and therefore such County Polling should begin its discussion process by approximately the same time as advocated in the SGA proposal – July 1st – in order to provide for sufficient discussion and voting before Labor Day;

Therefore it is in the interest of the CC to authorize its IT sub-committee to prepare the web-paged voting capability to effectuate such a County Polling process in the time period recommended by July 1st if feasible; and

Whereas the CC is tasked with calling a General Assembly under GPCA Bylaws, when the General Assembly has not done so itself; and

Whereas the San Francisco General Assembly in May did not set a date or location for the next General Assembly; and

Whereas no county party has come forward with a proposal to host the next General Assembly; and

Whereas under GPCA Bylaws the CC is authorized to "make decisions (but not set policy) between General Assembly meetings; and

Whereas given the broad support for the SGA concept at the May General Assembly suggests that the topic continues to need to be heard; and

Whereas to address the SGA proposal in its multiple parts in the manner requested by some delegates would require a large part of the weekend of the next General Assembly, if the SGA is agendized for it; and

Whereas attendance at recent General Assembly has been only between the high 30s to high 40s in delegates, with many parts of the state unrepresented because of the time and cost involved with travel; and

Whereas a General Assembly that is mostly about bylaws is likely to draw an even smaller number of delegates than the low turnout of recent years, depreciating the democratic decision-making base of any decisions taken; and

Whereas at the same time it was clear that for the just concluded General Assembly, many delegates came without having either read the material closely and/or didn't know or understand the existing GPCA bylaws, suggesting that the face-to-face process may not be the best for intricate, extensive bylaw revision work; and

Whereas establishing a SGA would address many issues for the party, including allowing it to make decisions in between general assemblies, to involve more counties in the process, to provide more time for delegates to review proposed material, and to take care of various administrative decision-making via the SGA to free up face-to-face meetings for more direct political work; and

Whereas GPCA Bylaws around bylaws interpretations state that the CC "shall decide these questions subject to review at the next General Assembly";

Therefore the CC interprets the existing bylaws that allow it to set the next GA, to set the next GA as an SGA, based upon the SGA proposal of May 13, for the following purposes:

1) Conducting County Polling; and
2) Voting upon the individual sections of the SGA proposal, to address the outstanding concerns from the San Francisco General Assembly (and in the process allow the SGA to conduct its review of the CC's interpretation).

In light of an outstanding concern by Bloomberg, the presenters chose to go to a vote.

Yes: Ashley, Everette, Feinstein, Heller, Karlik, Laidman, Luther, Santiago, Shantz, Sinott
No: Bloomberg
Abstain: Daniel

Proposal passes 10-1-1

---

9) Decision: Exception to GPCA bylaws 6-1.4 Committee Membership (Everette)
Proposal withdrawn by sponsor, based upon the understanding the passage of item #8 create the conditions for the goal of this proposal to be met.

---

10) Decision: Carrying out tasks that were previously Marnie's responsibility (Brashares)

Discussion held, not decisions taken as presenter was not on call.

11) Decision: Official Address of GPCA (Laidman)

Proposal: That we use the GPCA's San Franciso PO Box if that is legally acceptable; if it is not, we'll use Doug Barnett's home address; if that is not acceptable to Doug, we'll use Warner Bloomberg's.

Approved by consensus.

---

12) Discussion: Listserves being open to anyone (Everette)

Discussion held.

---

13) Decision: Formation of CC Information Technology Sub-Committee (Bloomberg)

Proposal withdrawn by presenter

---

14) Appointment: Campaign Financial Support Committee (Laidman)

Lauren Sinott nominated by Feinstein.

Approved by consensus