

**Regular Meeting**  
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee  
January 21, 2012  
4 p.m.  
Local 2, 209 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco

**Minutes**

1. Roll Call

Roll was called at 4:10 p.m.

Present: John Avalos, David Chiu, Matt Dorsey, Mary Jung, Leslie Katz, Hene Kelly, Rafael Mandelman, Eric Mar, Jane Morrison, Aaron Peskin, Alix Rosenthal, Arlo Hale Smith, Debra Walker, Dianne Feinstein (proxy George Broder), Jackie Speier (proxy Margo Rosen), Kamala Harris (proxy Matthew Rothschild), Leland Yee (proxy John Rizzo), Mark Leno (proxy Keith Baraka), Fiona Ma (proxy Bob Twomey), Tom Ammiano (proxy Kim Shree Maufas)

Excused, with Proxy: David Campos (proxy Debra Walker), Bill Fazio (proxy Leslie Katz), Sandra Fewer (proxy Hene Kelly), Tom Hsieh (proxy Brian Doherty), Carole Migden (proxy Rafael Mandelman), Melanie Nutter (proxy Wendy Soone-Broder), Connie O'Connor (proxy Mary Jung), Scott Wiener (proxy Juan Cerea)

Absent: Gabriel Haaland (en route), Milton Marks, Wendy Phillips, Nancy Pelosi

The Recording Secretary announced a quorum was present at 4:13 p.m.

After roll was called, Gabriel Haaland arrived at 4:15 p.m. and tendered his proxy to Aaron Peskin.

Wendy Phillips arrived at 4:19 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved.

3. Approval of October 26, 2011, minutes

Item continued

4. Approval of January 11, 2012, minutes

Peskin stated Mary Jung passed out first drafts of the minutes from the last two meetings. He asked that members look them over and email corrections directly to her. She will incorporate changes regarding content and forward them to the Chair for final editing. She asked that members not concern themselves with misspellings and punctuation as these are normally taken care of in the second and third drafts. These minutes will be available for approval at the next regular meeting.

Gabriel Haaland arrived at 4:15 p.m. and tendered his proxy to Peskin. He was not feeling well.

1. Discussion and possible action on recommendation to California Democratic Party (CDP) proposal to reflect Democratic population disparity between San Francisco portions of the proposed 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Assembly Districts in election of San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee (DCCC) membership.

Peskin provided background information on the reason why this item is on the agenda and recounted what transpired at the DCCC Special Meeting of January 11, 2012. He said he had three proposals on the table (one each from Smith, Mandelman, and Jung). He proposed, as a procedure, that all three proposals be on the table, discussed, and then voted on. The proposal that receives the most votes will be the one forwarded to the CDP and our local State Legislative representatives.

Jung asked if the winning proposal is considered advisory. Peskin replied that it was up to the State Legislature to adopt whatever legislation it so chooses.

Wendy Phillips arrived at 4:19 p.m.

Peskin indicated that CDP Chair John Burton told him “that he doesn’t give a shit” or have any particular preference as to how the SF DCCC chooses to organized itself. Peskin clarified that if no proposal gets a majority, then no recommendation will be forwarded to the CDP and the state legislature.

Bob Twomey asked that resolutions be taken one by one, amended, and then voted upon.

David Chiu asked the Chair to clarify what goes forward to the CDP. Peskin clarified that the proposal receiving the highest number of votes – providing it meets at least a simple majority – go forward.

Peskin recommended that Smith provide information on his proposal. Smith provided information on how the Top 2 Subcommittee calculated and arrived at the 12/17 split, describing how they looked at the U.S. Census information and Democratic registration. He explained how this increase in DCCC members from 24 to 29 members could help certain underrepresented groups get elected and provide representation on the DCCC. Under Smith’s proposal the total number of members will be 29, with 12 members representing the west side, and 17 members representing the east side.

Next, Jung was asked to explain her proposal for membership by Supervisorial District. Jung explained that this is not a new idea and that many DCCCs throughout the State of California are organized by Supervisorial District. She said she thought this idea would allow the DCCC to be more grassroots and make it possible for members to concentrate on their home districts to increase democratic representation and provide information in their neighborhoods. This would ensure representation would be spread throughout all of San Francisco. Currently, Districts 2 and 10 have no representation on the DCCC, so this proposal could help promote the election of minority candidates.

Brian Leubitz, CDP Region 4 Director, stated that many DCCCs in California are organized by supervisorial districts, except San Francisco and Los Angeles. Jung added that Marin County and San Mateo County DCCC members are elected by supervisorial districts and Sacramento is changing to this system.

After this, Mandelman explained his proposal would keep the number of members at 24, but with a 10/14 split. He called his proposal a compromise that supports proportionality without raising the number of members on the SF DCCC. In other words, the west side assembly district would have two less members, and those would be added to the east side assembly district based on the new assembly district configuration.

Peskin summarized that there are four (4) proposals: (1) Enlarge DCCC to 29 members with a 12/17 split; (2) Enlarge DCCC to 29 members, and allocate the number of members proportionately (no numbers would be set here); (3) Supervisorial District representation; and (4) Remain at 24 members, but with a 10/14 split by assembly districts (District 19 to have 10

members and District 17 to have 14 members). Peskin noted that if no consensus is reached, then the membership and allocation would remain the same.

Peskin stated that the DCCC decision must be forwarded to the State Legislative body by 5 p.m. on Monday, January 23<sup>rd</sup>. He repeated that the resolution that receives the most votes – provided it receives a supermajority – will be forwarded. All proposals will be considered.

Chiu asked if the list could be narrowed down starting, from the bottom. Peskin replied all the proposals would be voted upon, and eliminations would happen similar to ranked choice voting, where eventually, as the lower vote getting proposals are eliminated, there will be a run-off on the top two proposals.

Moved by Chiu to conduct an election on the four proposals; seconded by Debra Walker. This passed without objection.

Peskin stated Chiu was going to conduct the election. Mandelman said this is unlike other elections. Peskin agreed and amended the motion to vote until we narrow it down to two proposals – and then we vote again on the top two. Everyone agreed to this.

Peskin said that the DCCC will discuss the four proposals and after that, he will take public comment. He asked for discussion on Proposal 3 – Supervisorial District allocation.

Hene Kelly started off by saying she thought the idea for allocation by Supervisorial Districts was an interesting idea, but that it still wouldn't be proportional by Assembly Districts, so she was against it for that reason. Jung responded that this proposal should be looked at proportionally according to Supervisorial District.

Twomey suggested that since this proposal only allows for 22 members, perhaps there could be more positions in play and amend the proposal to include more members.

Jane Morrison thought this was too complicated.

Matthew Rothschild commented on Democratic proportionality – noting that Districts 2 and 7 have fewer registered Democrats than the other supervisorial districts. Jung responded that a possible solution would be to add one member to districts that have (pick a number) 75% or more registered democrats. This would incent members (or potential members) who live in districts with lower Democratic registration to work harder to increase their number of Democratic registrations.

Walker said that she agreed with Rothschild's assessment on Democratic representation and didn't want the committee to have fewer members. She said the public is upset that the DCCC is not used as a farm team to develop leadership. While supervisorial representation is an interesting concept, she supports increasing the number of members.

Twomey proposed an amendment to increase the number of representation in this proposal by 5 (from 22 to 27) and provide the Assembly District with the highest number of Democrats the five additional seats.

Peskin reminded everyone that the point of the omnibus bill was to make life easier for the 58 county registrars, not more complicated.

Twomey responded that this is for San Francisco and it is a hybrid that allows for local representation. He made a motion to add five members. There was no second, so the motion died.

Leubitz provided information on the current Democratic voter distribution – 58% in Assembly District 17 and 42% in Assembly District 19. The expense of running for DCCC is currently too high for most people. Jung’s proposal would help candidates become more familiar with their respective districts and would be less expensive because the candidates would be running more localized campaigns. Example: Instead of 20,000 mailers going out in an Assembly District, it would only require candidates to reach out to the smaller Supervisorial District.

Peskin remarked that he was concerned that electing the DCCC solely by Supervisorial District would make it so that the DCCC would no longer be a farm team, and that the DCCC will become pre-supervisorial race contests and that the DCCC will only be about the Supervisors.

Walker expressed concern about printing 11 different ballots.

Morrison called the question; Walker seconded it.

Peskin suggested the DCCC vote on three proposals: (1) Increase the number of DCCC members from 24 to 29, with 12 members representing AD 19 and 17 members representing AD 17. Henceforth, the proportion would be looked at and possibly be adjusted every 10 years if there is enough of a democratic registration shift to warrant this. (2) Elect members by Supervisorial District – for a total of 22 members. (3) Remain at 24 members, but AD 19 would have 10 members and AD 17 would have 14 members. This number would only change with a change to state law.

Morrison called the question; Katz seconded it.

Katz made a change to the Mandelman resolution, so that the fourth paragraph would read: NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO DEMOCRATIC COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE that the Committee urges the State Legislature to amend Elections Code Section 7204 to provide that the elected membership of the County Central Committee shall consist of 24 members, elected from the 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Assembly Districts, consisting of 14 members from the 17<sup>th</sup> Assembly District and 10 members from the 19<sup>th</sup> Assembly District. *(added) These numbers shall be reviewed by the Committee after the next census, or whenever the Assembly District boundaries are redrawn.*

Jung stated that while she didn’t think anything could be done about this, she wanted to note that the voters statewide voted to have an independent body review district lines so there wouldn’t be any favoritism by the legislators who usually make these types of changes. She thought it wasn’t right that the DCCC was making the rules for themselves and to serve their own self-interests. She further added that the DCCC could still be like a farm team without increasing the number of seats if representation was really about allowing for the grassroots to run and win. Instead, the current membership is stacked with elected representatives who already hold elective offices, and then also ran for a seat on the DCCC.

Peskin asked for public comment.

Suzanne Ruecker, Alex Walker, Annie Chou, Wendy Aragon, and Kevin Bard spoke in support of having proportional representation. Robert Chou also spoke in favor of same.

At 5:09 p.m., Morrison tendered her proxy to John Avalos and left the meeting.

On Proposal 1, the vote was 15 no and 14 yes. The proposal to increase the DCCC to 29 members failed. Below are the votes:

Yes: Avalos, Campos, Dorsey, Fewer, Haaland, Kelly, Mar, Morrison, Peskin, Phillips, Rosenthal, Smith, Walker, Ammiano.

No: Chiu, Fazio, Hsieh, Jung, Katz, Mandelman, Migden, Nutter, O'Connor, Wiener, Feinstein, Speier, Harris, Leno, Ma

Abstain: Yee

John Rizzo announced that it was just announced that Newt Gingrich won South Carolina.

On Proposal 2, the vote was 20 no and 7 yes. The proposal to elect members by Supervisorial Districts failed. Below are the votes:

No: Avalos, Campos, Chiu, Dorsey, Fewer, Haaland, Katz, Kelly, Mandelman, Mar, Migden, Morrison, Peskin, Phillips, Rosenthal, Walker, Wiener, Harris, Leno, Ammiano

Yes: Fazio, Hsieh, Jung, Nutter, O'Connor, Smith, Ma

Abstain: Feinstein, Speier, Yee

On Proposal 3, the vote was 23 yes and 5 no. The proposal to reapportion the members of the DCCC to 10 from the 19<sup>th</sup> AD to 14 from the 17<sup>th</sup> AD won. Below are the votes:

Yes: Avalos, Campos, Chiu, Dorsey, Fewer, Haaland, Katz, Kelly, Mandelman, Mar, Migden, O'Connor, Peskin, Phillips, Nutter\*, Rosenthal, Smith, Walker, Wiener, Speier, Harris, Leno, Ma, Ammiano (Note that Smith, Feinstein, and Speier passed on the first round.)

No: Fazio, Hsieh, Jung, Morrison

Abstain: Feinstein, Yee

\*Nutter (who was tendered her proxy to Wendy Soone-Broder, subsequently informed the Secretary that her vote was incorrectly cast and asked that her vote be changed from "No" to "Yes" which is reflected above).

Peskin announced that Proposal 3 would be sent to the State Legislature and California Democratic Party.

## 2. Election of Officers to vacant seats (vice chairs formerly held by Quezada and Goldstein)

Peskin stated that with the recent deaths of Eric Quezada and Michael Goldstein, there are two open officer positions. He nominated Rafael Mandelman for 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair and Debra Walker for 4<sup>th</sup> Vice Chair.

Moved by Katz; seconded by Margo Rosen. This passed by acclamation without objection.

## 3. Resolutions – Citizen's United Resolution

Chiu thanked Alix Rosenthal for putting forward the resolution. He said he had just done the same thing at the Board of Supervisors.

Kelly, Chiu, Walker, Mandelman, Matt Dorsey, Katz, and Avalos asked that their names to added to the resolution.

Katz asked if there was time to forward this resolution to the CDP to be added to the resolutions at the convention in San Diego. Brian Leubitz answered that no resolutions would be considered at this convention since this is considered a “platform” convention.

George Broder stated that the Senator will support the “spirit of the resolution” and asked the minutes to reflect this.

This passed by acclamation.

Smith stated he agrees with the U.S. Supreme Court decision and is casting a ‘no’ vote.

#### 4. Public Comment

There was no additional public comment.

#### 5. Reports

##### 9a. Chair’s Report

Peskin asked all members to sponsor a table for the March 7, 2012, Gala at the Fairmont Hotel.

##### 9b. Executive Director’s Report

There was no report.

##### 9c. Treasurer’s Report

There was no report.

##### 9d. Fundraising Report

There was no report

#### 6. New Business

Kelly made a motion that the DCCC adjourn in honor of Walter Johnson; seconded by Dorsey.

Walker mentioned that the memorial for Michael Goldstein was postponed from January 22<sup>nd</sup> to January 29<sup>th</sup> – same time and place.

Kim Shree-Maufas stated she is offended whenever she hears of the DCCC referred to as the Farm Team. She thinks of the DCCC as the Major Leagues. Peskin associated himself with her remarks.

#### 7. Adjournment

Moved by Kelly to adjourn in memory of Walter Johnson; seconded by Katz.

The motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 5:24 p.m.