MEMORANDUM

TO: All Interested Parties  
FROM: Compliance Review Commission (CRC)  
DATE: March 11, 2019  
RE: DECISION OF THE COMPLIANCE REVIEW COMMISSION (CRC) RELATING TO A CHALLENGE FILED IN THE ASSEMBLY DISTRICT ELECTION MEETING (ADEM) IN AD06

INTRODUCTION:

On January 27, 2019 Lori Anzini, a candidate for Executive Board, filed a challenge to the Assembly District Election Meeting (ADEM) process in Assembly District 06. Ms. Anzini was the top vote getting candidate for Executive Board, however, because she was not eligible to hold the seat, the convener announced that Emily Ward, the top vote getting ADEM candidate, would serve as the Executive Board representative.

DOCUMENTS INITIALLY RECEIVED AND REVIEWED:

Documents received and reviewed by the CRC associated with the challenge included the following:

2. Testimony submitted by Tomas Vera and Kate Scott.  
3. 2019 ADEM Procedures  
4. CDP Bylaws

TIMELINESS:

According to CDP Bylaws, Article XII, Section 4:

“All challenges must be commenced by the filing of a written challenge with the Secretary of This Committee, with copies served on the Chair of This Committee, as well as the appointing person, and the chair of the relevant organization, where applicable no later than seven (7) calendar days after the alleged violation occurred. Upon a showing of good cause, sustained by unanimous vote, the Compliance Review Commission may waive this requirement.”

(All By-Law references are to the California Democratic Party Bylaws, as amended through November 2018, unless otherwise indicated.)

The challenge filed by Ms. Anzini was submitted on January 27, 2019. The ADEM in AD06 occurred on January 26, 2019. The submission was within 7-days of the alleged incident, thus the CRC finds the challenge timely.
**STANDING:**

According to Article XII, Section 3:

“All party to a challenge must be adversely affected to bring the challenge.”

Ms. Anzini was both a candidate and a voter at the ADEM in AD06. The CRC finds Ms. Anzini has standing as she would be adversely affected.

**JURISDICTION**

Article XII, Section 2a states:

“The Compliance Review Commission shall have initial jurisdiction over all challenges and/or appeals arising under these Bylaws.”

The CRC has jurisdiction under Article II (Membership) and Article VI (Assembly District and Assembly District Election Meetings).

**FINDINGS:**

CDP Bylaws, Article XIII, Section 5 provides that the Party is responsible for publication of selection procedures:

“Section 5. FULL PUBLICATION OF SELECTION PROCEDURES
The Democratic Party shall publicize fully and in such a manner as to assure notice to all interested parties a full description of the legal and practical procedures for selection of Democratic Party Officers and representatives on all levels.”

CDP Bylaws Article VI, 1, h provides the Rules Committee is to promulgate procedures governing the Assembly District Election Meeting:

“h. The Rules Committee of This Committee shall promulgate procedures governing the conduct of the Election Meeting, including the election of 14 delegates to This Committee as set forth in Article II, Section 5, and one representative to the Executive Board, as set forth in Article VII, Section 2(c), which Rules shall include, for candidates for delegate and for candidates for Representative to the Executive Board, a filing fee of $30 (which may be waived due to hardship and such waiver shall be available as an option online and on all written forms), a filing period 30 days prior to the biennial Assembly District Election Meetings and call for the posting of eligible candidate names (to be updated no less than once per week starting with the opening of the filing period) on the Party's website, along with statements by the candidates, with the proviso that such statements be no longer 2400 characters and shall not mention the name of any other candidate. Statements
shall be published as submitted; no additions, corrections, or other edits shall be made once submitted.”

To determine eligibility of ADEM EBoard candidates, the 2019 ADEM procedures state:

Requirements to Run for Assembly District Representative to the CDP Executive Board
Like ADD candidates, E-Board representative candidates must also file in advance. A candidate for E-Board representative must be qualified to run by either:

A. Having been elected as an ADD at the ADEM, or

B. By being elected/appointed in one of the following categories of membership on the upcoming State Central Committee (in this case, 2017-19):

1) Any elected Democrat to a state or congressional office;

2) The Democratic nominee to any state or congressional office, until such time as a Democrat is elected to that office;

3) The highest vote-getting Democrat in a state or congressional special election in which that Democrat did not win election; or

4) An appointed member pursuant to Article II, section 3 of the CDP By-laws.

Due to a typo in the procedures, which were adopted by both the Rules Committee and the CDP’s Executive Board, a candidate could assume eligibility based on being elected/appointed in “2017/19.” In this specific case, Ms. Anzini was not a 2017-19 Democratic State Central Committee Member.

According to the CDP Bylaws Article VI, Section 1:

j. Assembly District Representatives to the State Executive Board:

(1) An Assembly District Representative to the State Executive Board shall be chosen at each Assembly District Election Meeting from among those persons who will be delegates (resident in the respective Assembly District) to the forthcoming biennial convention of This Committee by virtue of being a member of This Committee pursuant to Article II, Section 2b, 2d, 2e; Article II, Section 3; or Article II, Section 5. In the event that no qualified candidate is elected at an Assembly District Election Meeting, then the highest vote-getting candidate for Assembly District Representative shall be provided the opportunity to serve as Executive Board Representative if that person so chooses. If that person declines to serve as Executive Board Representative, then a caucus of those members of This Committee from the Assembly District as described above, shall meet at the next meeting of This Committee to elect an Assembly District Representative to the State Executive Board, who must be qualified under the same criteria as used for direct election at the Assembly District Election Meeting.
According to the CDP Bylaws, Executive Board members are chosen “by virtue of being a member of This Committee pursuant to Article II, Section 2b, 2d, 2e; Article II, Section 3; or Article II, Section 5.” [emphasis added] Ms. Anzini, is a delegate through the El Dorado County Central Committee. As noted in the CDP Bylaws, individuals who are members of This Committee by virtue of election by a County Central Committees are not eligible to run for ADEM Executive Board representative as the section of the Bylaws providing for County Committee-elected delegates is Article II, Section 4 and Article II, Section 4 is not one of the sections listed as providing for eligibility to be elected to the Executive Board at the ADEMs.

According to the 2019 ADEM Procedures:

*In the event that no qualified candidate is elected, then the highest vote-getting candidate who participated in the ADEM will be provided the opportunity to serve as Executive Board representative if that person so chooses.*

Emily Ward was the highest vote getting candidate in the ADEM. In accordance with the procedures cited above, if the highest vote getting Executive Board candidate does not qualify (Ms. Anzini), then the highest vote getting ADEM candidate (Ms. Ward) is elected as the Executive Board Member.

**ORDER:**

Based upon the above facts and Bylaws of the CDP, the CRC makes the following Orders:

1) The CRC denies the challenge for the reasons stated above and finds that Emily Ward was properly offered and is qualified to serve as Executive Board representative from ADEM AD06.

Appeal of this order, if any, must be filed with the CDP Secretary, with copies to the Chair of the CDP State Central Committee, within twelve days of the date of this decision. (Article XII, section 6(a).) Thus, any appeal must be filed on or before March 23, 2019 with the Sacramento office of the California Democratic Party, and shall be an appeal to the next meeting of CDP Credentials Committee upon conclusion of the response period.

Please note that per CDP Bylaws, Article XII, Section 6b, the filing of an appeal shall not stay any decision of the CRC. Parties may additionally respond in person, if so desired, provided there has been a timely filing of an appeal and notice of intent to testify is provided in writing to the Lead Chair of the Credentials Committee by 5 PM on April 5, 2019, at the Sacramento office of the California Democratic Party. The Credentials Committee may accept such additional testimony, written or oral, considering the nature and import thereof, as well as the time available for its proper consideration, as it deems appropriate, in its discretion.

Accordingly, this decision is so ordered, and is in effect, unless, and until, a successful appeal is made, decided, and contrary orders made whether by the CRC, or by the
Credentials Committee. CRC shall retain jurisdiction up until the time of an appeal, if any, is heard by the Credentials Committee.

Respectfully submitted by a 6-0 vote of the members of the CRC,

Coby King, Co-Chair, Rules Committee
Lara Larramendi, Co-Lead Chair, Credentials Committee
Garry S. Shay, Lead Chair, Rules Committee
Keith Umemoto, Co-Chair, Credentials Committee
Michael Wagaman, Lead Chair, Credentials Committee
Laurence Zakson, Co-Chair, Rules Committee