

**California Democratic Party Rules Subcommittee on Endorsements Tentative Agenda  
Wednesday, September 14, 2022 at 6:30pm**

**I. Roll Call**

**II. Meeting Called to Order**

**III. Adoption of Meeting Agenda**

**IV. Ramos Proposal on Timing of Special Election Endorsing Caucus**

This amendment would require a Special Election Endorsing Caucus to be scheduled prior to the deadline announced by the Secretary of State for the submission of political party endorsements for inclusion in the sample ballot pamphlet.

See Exhibit A

**V. Ramos Proposal on Judicial Retention Elections**

This amendment would provide that an endorsement in a judicial retention election is treated as a ballot measure endorsement, but may only be initiated with the support of a majority of the statewide officers or thirty Executive Board members.

See Exhibit A

**VI. Doll Proposal to amend and restate Article XIII, Section 3(c)4**

See Exhibit B

**VII. PERC – Amend Article VIII. Section d.3(b)**

See Exhibit C

**VIII. Endorsements: Voting participants at each pre-endorsing conference – Amend Article VIII, Section 3(g)5(c)**

See Exhibit D

**IX. New Business**

**X. Adjournment**

# EXHIBIT A

MEMORANDUM

To: CDP Rules Committee  
From: Coby King, Vice Chair, CDP Rules Committee Subcommittee on Endorsements  
Date: August 25, 2021  
Re: Report of CDP Rules Committee Subcommittee on Endorsements

---

On August 4, 2021, the CDP Rules Committee Subcommittee on Endorsements held a meeting where they considered two proposals submitted by Ramos.

**M/S/P unanimously to adopt all four of these changes by the Subcommittee and recommend them to the full Rules Committee.**

Section 2: Two proposals submitted by

**Proposal 1– Timing of Special Election Endorsing Caucus.**

Explanation: This amendment would require a Special Election Endorsing Caucus to be scheduled prior to the deadline announced by the Secretary of State for the submission of political party endorsements for inclusion in the sample ballot pamphlet.

Rationale: In early 2019, the CDP endorsed Silke Pflueger for the Senate District 1 special election, however the endorsing caucus was held after the Secretary of State’s deadline to submit political party endorsements in the sample ballot. As a result, the CDP’s endorsement of Ms. Pflueger was not communicated to voters in the sample ballot. Ms. Pflueger narrowly lost the top-two primary after another Democrat (who had recently been a registered Republican) on the ballot pulled enough votes to split the Democratic vote.

**Amend Article VIII, Section 3, Subdivision e, Paragraph (1) by inserting “The date selected by the Chair of This Committee for the convening of the Special Election Endorsing Caucus shall be before the deadline for the submission of political party endorsements for inclusion in the sample ballot as announced by the Secretary of State.” After “shall appoint a Special Elections Appeals Committee.”, as follows:**

- (1) In the case of a special election where an endorsement cannot be made at the biennial endorsing convention of the California Democratic Party, for the primary special election, the Chair of This Committee shall cause to be convened a Special Election Endorsing Caucus of the members of This Committee resident in the relevant district, shall designate a convener and shall appoint a Special Elections Appeals Committee. *The date selected by the Chair of This Committee for the convening of the Special Election Endorsing Caucus shall be before the deadline announced by the Secretary of State for the submission of political party endorsements to be included in the sample ballot.* The endorsing caucus shall be comprised of all members of This Committee resident in the district at 5 PM of the day of the Governor’s Proclamation of the election, except that:

**After extensive discussion, the Subcommittee came to a consensus that the concept contained in the proposal was worthy of inclusion in the Bylaws but that there were issues with the exact wording that needed additional consideration.**

## **Proposal 2– Judicial Retention Elections.**

Explanation: This amendment would provide that an endorsement in a judicial retention election is treated as a ballot measure endorsement, but may only be initiated with the support of a majority of the statewide officers or thirty Executive Board members.

Rationale: This situation is very unlikely to occur, but the bylaws should be clear about what the process would be for a retention election endorsement just in case the need arises in the future. If right-wing interests attempted to oust a justice as happened in 1986 with Chief Justice Rose Bird and Associate Justices Cruz Reynoso and Joseph Grodin, it would make sense for the CDP to oppose such an effort. This proposal requires that consideration of the position be initiated by a majority of the statewide officers or thirty Executive Board members. That would ensure that a position would only be considered in extraordinary circumstances (such as happened in 1986).

Amend Article VIII, Section 5 by adding Subdivision e, as follows:

- b. *This Committee may support or oppose the retention of a justice of the California Supreme Court or of the California Court of Appeal in the same manner as the adoption of a resolution to endorse or oppose a state ballot proposition, initiative, or referendum, but only if a majority of the statewide officers or thirty (30) members of the Executive Board present a resolution to support or oppose the retention.*

**After extensive discussion, the Subcommittee came to a consensus that the concept contained in the proposal was worthy of inclusion in the Bylaws but that there were issues with the exact wording that needed additional consideration.**

# **EXHIBIT B**

Amend and Restate Article XIII, Section 3(c)4 as follows:

Each candidate seeking the endorsement of the California Democratic Party shall be mailed or provided via email, a copy of the Code of Conduct and the CADEM Campaign Financial Disclosure. All candidates seeking the endorsement of This Committee under Article VIII, Section 3, shall (i) shall affirm in writing that they have read and agreed to abide by, the Code of Conduct; and (ii) complete and submit the Campaign Financial Disclosure to this Committee.

**CADEM Campaign Financial Disclosure**

Candidate: Last name \_\_\_\_\_ First name \_\_\_\_\_

Cell phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Candidate for: Title \_\_\_\_\_ District \_\_\_\_\_

Campaign address: \_\_\_\_\_

Campaign Treasurer: Last name \_\_\_\_\_ First name \_\_\_\_\_

Cell phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Financial Disclosure:

What contributions will the campaign solicit and accept? Check the options that apply to the campaign. If 2, provide additional information.

- \_\_\_ 1. The campaign will be self-funded and will not solicit or accept contributions.
- \_\_\_ 2. The campaign will solicit and accept individual contributions, [but] will not solicit or accept PAC [define] or corporate contributions [define].
- \_\_\_ 3. The campaign will solicit and accept individual, PAC and corporate contributions.

[If option 3 is selected, please provide the name and address of the PAC and corporate entities below:]

PACs: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Corporations: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

# EXHIBIT C

### **Article VIII, Section d 3(b)**

In either case, this written motion must be filed with the Secretary of This Committee by 8 PM on the day that the endorsing caucuses are held at the endorsing convention. The Pre-Primary Endorsement Review Committee shall be comprised of all members of the Executive Board registered in the relevant district, the Statewide Officers; the Regional Director(s) of the relevant district, and two (2) Executive Board members, appointed by the Chair of This Committee prior to the start of the Convention, from each of the following committees: Rules, Credentials and Voter Services. If such a motion for formal objection to the ratification of an endorsing caucus decision is so filed with the Secretary by 8 PM the evening before the period set aside for ratification vote, then the relevant Pre-Primary Endorsement Review Committee shall meet at 8 AM the morning prior to the ratification vote. Presentations for the motion by the filer and against the motion by the endorsed candidate shall be no more than five (5) minutes each. Such a motion for formal objection to the ratification of an endorsing caucus decision may be adopted by the relevant committee by a majority of the committee present and voting.

# **EXHIBIT D**

### **CADEM Secretary as Final Collector of Information**

The current bylaws say that clubs must submit club roster information to the Regional Directors. This can be difficult for Staff to collect with 21 Regional Directors having to submit information to us. The challenge that arises is that information that is submitted timely to RD's is not always shared timely with CADEM Staff. From August 2021 until the Thursday and Friday before the Pre-Endorsing Conference vote, RD's were continuing to share voters and club information with us after the deadlines. In some cases it was a couple days late and in other cases it was Months Late. The issue for us, is that the bylaws say that the RD's have to receive it, not CADEM staff or a party office where staff may act as a proxy recipient.

What we would like to propose is that in all places in the endorsement bylaws related to submitting rosters that the bylaws say that the Regional Directors collect the information and that it must be submitted to the Party Secretary or Party Chair by the deadline. This way if CADEM did not receive something on time, it is definitely late. This would greatly improve the ability for CADEM staff to prepare voting lists and give campaigns enough notice of who is eligible.

### **Process for Addressing Duplicates in Club Roster Submissions**

The current bylaws require RD's, or this cycle CADEM Staff, to de-dupe the club members for the club's representative allocations. We continually ran into individuals that were members of 4,5,6, even 10 clubs. It was a lot of work to de-dupe and we believe there are better ways to address this process moving forward.

#### *A. First Come First Serve*

Start the process that the first club to submit a name gets Credit for the voter. This is cleanest and gives clubs an advantage if they submit their list early. Makes life easier for CADEM staff and RD's. Obviously this hurts clubs that come later, but this incentivizes clubs to not wait until the very end to submit their lists.

#### *B. Fractional Credit for Duplicates*

For this idea, we would give fractional Credit for club members that are submitted by multiple clubs. This would mean that every club gets Credit for each member they submitted, however they would have to share the Credit with other clubs. For example if Member A was submitted by the North Club and the South Club, then they would count as 0.5 club Credits instead of 1 club Credit. If Person B was submitted by 4 clubs, then they would be worth 0.25 Credits for each club. If Person C was submitted by 10 clubs, then they would be worth 0.1 Credits for each club. The idea is that when we are counting how many Credits each club has, each club gets Credit for each member, but not the full value. Only the fractional value. A club could submit 100 members, with 40 duplicates. If the total value of the duplicates, all of whom would have fractional values, is over 20, they would get 4 reps instead of 3 reps. From a computing standpoint, it would not be difficult at all to calculate fractional values. A simple count report of members submitted would allow us to calculate the value for each member submitted.

To be clear each Member is worth 1 Credit. It is just whether one club gets full credit for that member or multiple clubs share credit for that member.