7 April 2012

To: GRP Administrative Committee
From: John Andrews, Candidate Development and Legal Committee
Subject: Delegate Selection for 2012 Green Party Convention

1. Introduction

This report is submitted as part of the process specified in the Green-Rainbow Party's Delegate Selection Plan (DSP) [1]. The DSP is designed to comply with Green Party convention rules, Massachusetts state election law, the bylaws of the Green-Rainbow Party, and the GRP's Presidential Election Plan. The initial version of the DSP was approved by State Committee (StateCom) in July 2011. A revised version, incorporating certain changes made necessary by later developments, has been submitted to the Administrative Committee (AdCom) for approval. The main reason for changes is the fact that the Green Party reduced the overall size of the convention and dropped the number of delegates allotted to Massachusetts from 33 to 11. This made it impossible for the delegation to contain two persons from each of the 9 Congressional districts in Massachusetts, and so the approach to geographic diversity had to be modified.

The delegate selection process is fully described in the revised Delegate Selection Plan [1]. The required calculations were performed with the help of a spreadsheet that has been made available to AdCom and StateCom. It is intended that the slate of delegates be approved at the April 15 State Committee meeting.

2. Results of the Presidential Preference Primary

Table 2.1 shows the results of the presidential preference primary [2]. As provided for in the DSP, the"All other" votes for which names were not provided by the Secretary of the Commonwealth are reassigned to the "No Preference" option. Similarly, the blank ballots were reassigned to "No Preference". No tiebreaker points were necessary since no two candidates received an identical vote total. The "Adjusted Vote" column shows the vote totals that are used in allocating delegates to candidates.

Table 2.1 Seat Assignment Calculations

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Candidate	Raw Vote	% Raw Vote	Reassigned Votes	Tie-breaker Addition	Adjusted Vote	% Adjusted Vote	Fractional Seats Won	Final Seats Won (q formula)
Mesplay	89	5.7%	0	0	89	5.7%	0.63	1
Mikkelson	84	5.4%	0	0	84	5.4%	0.59	1
Stein	1018	65.5%	0	0	1018	65.5%	7.21	7
No Preference	232	14.9%	131	0	363	23.4%	2.57	2
All Other	95	6.1%	-95	0	0	0.0%	0.00	0
Blanks	36	2.3%	-36	0	0	0.0%	0.00	0
SUM	1554	100.0%	0		1554	100.0%	11.00	11.00

3. Award of Seats to the Candidates

Under the 2012 convention rules, the GRP is allocated 11 delegates. The "Fractional Seats Won" column (Column H) in Table 2.1 shows the number of seats that would be awarded to each candidate without integer rounding, i.e. v_i N/V. Because we do not assign fractional seats, we apply the following "q formula" to round each seat award to an integer value:

$$n_i = INT\left(\frac{v_i}{V}N + q\right)$$

It was determined that the proper number of seats (11) are awarded with q=0.428. As a result of these calculations, the seat awards were 1 for Mesplay, 1 for Mikkelson, 7 for Stein, and 2 for No Preference (Uncommitted).

4. Seating of Delegate Applicants

14 persons applied for the 11 delegate seats. According to the DSP, the 11 applicants to be designated as delegates are selected according to a point system. The remaining 3 applicants will be alternates.

Table 4.1 provides the computations used to select delegates. The first step is to use information on the delegate application form to assign basic priority points as defined in the Delegate Selection Plan. Extra points are then awarded to applicants that are listed on priority lists submitted by the candidates. At this point the "Basic Priority Points" are ordered, and the top-ranking applicant in each Congressional district is awarded an additional 7 points. This produces the "Final Priority Points" values. The 11 highest ranking applicants are then selected as delegates. The 3 remaining applicants become alternates.

Table 4.1 Determination of Seating Priority

			Max Points Awarded-->	30	7	6	5	4	4	2.5		
ID	Name	Cong District	On Candidate List?	Cong. Distr. Coverage ?	Will Attend?	Diversity?	Ran as GRP Candidate?	Hold GRP Office?	Gender	Basic Priority Points	Final Priority Points	Selected As
9	Espinal, Isabel	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	54.5	61.5	D
4	Andrews, John	5	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	47.0	54.0	D
2	Connell, Sean	3	1	1	0.5	1	0	0	0	45.0	52.0	D
16	Nickerson, Wes	7	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	43.0	50.0	D
11	England, Dave	4		1	0.5	0	0	0	0	10.0	17.0	D
6	Rohrlich, David	8		1	0.5	0	0	0	0	10.0	17.0	D
3	Stein, Jill	5			1	0	1	1	1	16.5	16.5	D
1	Fortune, Nat	2			1	0	1	1	0	14.0	14.0	D
19	Fortune, Joyce Palmer	2			1	0	1	0	1	12.5	12.5	D
18	Barrows, Anthony	7			0.5	1	0	1	0	12.0	12.0	D
12	Gerry, David	7			0.5	1	0	1	0	12.0	12.0	D
5	Larner, Tar	3			1	1	0	0	0	11.0	11.0	A
8	Yarden, Elie	7			1	0	0	1	0	10.0	10.0	A
17	Kressel, Shirley	7			0	0	0	1	1	6.5	6.5	A

5. Assignment of Delegates to Candidates

Once the applicants are identified, the next step is to assign them to candidates. Any delegate who received priority points due to their appearance on a candidate priority list is automatically assigned to that candidate. After that, an attempt is made to honor

assignment requests by the applicants to the extent possible. Delegates who specifically requested to be uncommitted are assigned to the uncommitted slots until those slots are exhausted. Delegates who made no specification of their preference are given priority for remaining uncommitted slots. The results of this process are shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Assignment of Delegates to Candidates

Delegate	Candidate (Option) Requested by Applicant	Assigned to
Andrews, John	Stein	Stein
Barrows, Anthony	Stein	Stein
Connell, Sean	Stein	Stein
England, Dave	none	Mesplay
Espinal, Isabel	Stein	Stein
Fortune, Joyce Palmer	Stein	Stein
Fortune, Nat	none	Uncommitted
Gerry, David	Uncommitted	Uncommitted
Nickerson, Wes	Stein	Stein
Rohrlich, David	Stein	Mikkelson
Stein, Jill	Stein	Stein

6. Final Result: Proposed Delegation

The proposed Massachusetts delegation is provided in Table 6.1. In the assignment computed by CDLC there were 14 applicants for 15 seats, leaving one empty alternate seat. At their April 4, 2012 meeting, AdCom decided by consensus to appoint M.K. Merelice to fill that seat. Although this appointment did not occur through the CDLC delegate selection process, it is included in the table for completeness.

Table 6.1 Massachusetts Delegation as Determined by CDLC with one additional alternate appointed by AdCom

Name	Delegate or Alternate ?	Cong District	Candidate Assignment
Andrews, John	D	5	Stein
Barrows, Anthony	D	7	Stein
Connell, Sean	D	3	Stein
England, Dave	D	4	Mesplay
Espinal, Isabel	D	2	Stein
Fortune, Joyce Palmer	D	2	Stein
Fortune, Nat	D	2	Uncommitted
Gerry, David	D	7	Uncommitted
Larner, Tar	A	3	N/A
Merelice, M.K.	A	4	N/A
Nickerson, Wes	D	7	Stein
Rohrlich, David	D	8	Mikkelson
Kressel, Shirley	A	7	N/A
Stein, Jill	D	5	Stein
Yarden, Elie	A	7	N/A

7. Subsequent Management of the Delegation

Once the delegation is approved by StateCom, CDLC will notify all the applicants within one week.

Certain changes to the delegate/alternate assignments may take place in response to developing circumstances. Any delegate that cannot attend the convention should notify AdCom as soon as that fact becomes known. AdCom may then replace that delegate with an alternate if an alternate exists who will make a commitment to attending. An alternate who becomes a delegate will inherit the candidate assignment of the delegate they are replacing. If the convention begins without a sitting delegate being present, that delegate may cast a vote by proxy.

As specified in the DSP, swaps in candidate assignment can be approved by AdCom as long as there is mutual consent between the two delegates involved.

References

1 Green-Rainbow Party Delegate Selection Plan, revised 7 April 2011

2 Green-Rainbow Party Presidential Primary Results, released by the Secretary of the Commonwealth on 30 March 2012