

The Platform Support Card

*Briefing for Gov. Mike Dukakis
August 11, 2004*

Description

- The Platform Support Card is intended as a source of information for Massachusetts citizens as well as a recruiting device to bring independent voters into the Democratic Party.
- It presents voting records of legislators on key votes which are addressed in the Democratic Party Platform. It compares how the legislator voted and how the Platform recommends voting on that issue.
- It is provided to the public via a website, www.PlatformSupportCard.org, along with a detailed explanation of the process involved.
- The voting records of Republican incumbents are included.
- We intend to include how Democratic challengers would vote (not done on the current version).
- All legislators are provided an opportunity to comment on their vote or to provide any information they deem relevant (not done on the current version).
- Samples of the website appear in Appendix A and B. The sample list of votes for early 2003 appear in Appendix C. The criteria by which the votes were selected appears in Appendix D.

History and Timeline

June 2003: The Democratic State Convention passed an Action Agenda Amendment by a vote of 60% to 40%. It read:

“Promoting accountability to the Party Platform and reinforcing the Party’s commitment to social and economic justice, by publishing a ‘scorecard’ by March 1 of each year, indicating how Democratic legislators voted on 10 fundamental issues from the current Party Platform.”

July 2003: The group which sponsored the amendment, the Progressive Democrats of Somerville (PDS), posted a website www.MassScorecard.org as a demonstration of how the result might look. Our representatives met with Phil Johnston during July, and vetted the votes with him and several state Reps.

August 2003: An incomplete version of the Scorecard “leaked” to the Senate floor. Jim Roosevelt sent us a cease-and-desist letter (Oct. 9, 2003) because we used the term “Mass Dems Scorecard” without Party permission, per MGL 56-40. We changed the name to the “Mass Scorecard” accordingly, and removed the public website in order to continue the development process with the Party.

December 2003: Phil Johnston empowered the Public Policy Committee, chaired by Rep. Mike Festa and Martina Jackson, to implement the Mass Scorecard. Our representative, Jesse Gordon, was later appointed as a member.

January 2004: The Democratic caucuses elected delegates to the 2004 convention. PDS and our allied organizations recruited people to run as delegates in anticipation of introducing a Party Charter Amendment.

February 2004: The Public Policy Committee met and decided to establish a Platform Support Card Subcommittee. One of our representatives, Rebekah Gewirtz, was later appointed as a member. We agreed to not pursue a Party Charter Amendment as a contingency of the Democratic Party pursuing implementation in cooperation with us.

April 2004: PDS began sending representatives to Democratic Town Committee meetings seeking endorsements of the Platform Support Card. We have received six ward and town committee endorsements with more pending.

June 2004: The Party promised three items by the time of the Convention:

- To appoint the membership of the Platform Support Card Subcommittee
- To schedule meetings for a good faith attempt at results by Sept. 1
- To announce the agreement at the Convention.

None of these three were done.

August 2004: After several Subcommittee meetings, the chair, Trellis Stepter, declared that the process would not be completed by Sept. 1, and that Ms. Gewirtz would be removed from the Subcommittee. Mr. Gordon’s Public Policy Committee membership status is ambiguous.

Action Items

➤ ***1. Implement by October 15, 2004.***

The Democratic State Committee meets on Thursday, Aug. 12, for the last time prior to the September primaries. Since that body must approve the Platform Support Card, we consider it too late for the primaries this year. We would like a commitment for implementation in time for the General Election.

➤ ***2. Implement again for the 2006 primaries.***

Our agreement with the Party is for a two-year trial run. Since the Party has missed the 2004 primaries, we want a commitment from the Party to implement the Platform Support Card for the 2006 primaries, including soliciting responses from all Democratic challengers who will appear on the ballot.

➤ ***3. A representative on the Public Policy Committee***

This body will vote on the implementation for presentation to the Democratic State Committee. We want at least one voting member, so that we can make our viewpoint known to the other voting members, and can report back to our organizations about process and results. Mr. Gordon voted as a Public Policy Committee member in spring 2004 but his name was excluded from the MassDems.org membership list for this Committee in summer 2004.

➤ ***4. A representative on the working Subcommittee***

We feel that as the authors of the original Amendment, we have the right to formal representation on the implementing bodies. The major point of contention leading to Ms. Gewirtz's removal was whether she could report back to our organization as our representative. We want a voting member on this Subcommittee who is free to report back to us as she sees fit, and is free to volunteer our services as she sees fit.

➤ ***5. Clarification of Open Meeting rule***

The Party Charter says, "All meetings of all Party committees, or sub-units thereof, at all levels shall be open to the public...." We feel this rule allows our participation in all relevant meetings whether we are appointed members or not. The Party disagrees. We have asked Jim Roosevelt for a formal clarification of this rule. Our memo appears in Appendix E.

➤ ***6. Assistance with Legislative materials***

The mass.gov website often does not include House Journals and/or voting records, which are required to implement this project. We need the Party's help in getting copies of these materials when they are not posted on-line.

Appendix A. Scorecard for Rep. James Miceli

Caveats: The votes listed include only through August 2003, when the process was stopped to begin collaboration with the Mass Dems.

2003 Mass Scorecard for State Representative James Miceli

PLEASE NOTE: THIS IS A DRAFT WEBSITE NOT READY YET FOR PUBLIC USE



Democrat representing Nineteenth Middlesex

Office: 167

Phone: (617) 722-2692

E-mail: Rep.JamesMiceli@hou.state.ma.us

Website: <http://www.state.ma.us/legis/member/jrm1.htm>

Fundamental Issue in MassDems' Party Platform (Click for full text of platform section)	Summary of related issue put to vote (Click for House Journal references)	This Rep's vote on this issue	Party platform on this issue
Part I: Families & Children	Jul 10, 2003 : Veto override of \$200K reduction to blind job program	Miceli: YES	Platform: YES
	Jul 10, 2003 : Veto override of federal school breakfast supplement	Miceli: YES	Platform: YES
	Jul 10, 2003 : Veto override of \$900K for disability & mentoring aid	Miceli: YES	Platform: YES
Part II: Education	May 6, 2003 : 3-year moratorium on charter schools	Miceli: NO	Platform: YES
	Jun 4, 2003 : Allow municipal meals tax, in addition to state meals tax	Miceli: NO	Platform: YES
	Jul 14, 2003 : Exempting two-way bilingual programs from English-only rules	Miceli: NO	Platform: YES

Part III: Health Care	Jul 8, 2003 :Veto override of \$10M cut in the uncompensated care pool	Miceli: YES	Platform: YES
	Jul 10, 2003 :Veto override of "Turning 22" mental disability program	Miceli: YES	Platform: YES
Part IV: Economic Growth	May 1, 2003 :Defeating corporate tax disclosure	Miceli: YES	Platform: NO
	May 1, 2003 :Extending corporate tax credit 5 years	Miceli: YES	Platform: NO
	May 5, 2003 :Requiring workfare for mothers of 2- to 6-year-olds	Miceli: YES	Platform: NO
	Jul 16, 2003 :allowing parents on welfare to go back to school	Miceli: NO	Platform: YES
Part V: Fiscal Responsibility	Apr 30, 2003 :Borrow \$300 million to offset the budget deficit via bonds	Miceli: NO	Platform: NO
	Apr 30, 2003 :Raising the income tax to 5.95% to offset the budget deficit	Miceli: NO	Platform: YES
Part VI: Safety & Justice	Jul 10, 2003 :Veto override of Mass Correctional Legal Services	Miceli: YES	Platform: YES
Part VII: Housing	(No votes on which to base response)		
Part VIII: Environment	Jul 8, 2003 :Veto override of reduced fees for blood lead level testing	Miceli: YES	Platform: YES
Part IX: Political Reform	(No votes on which to base response)		
Part X: Worker Rights	Jul 16, 2003 :Early retirement for cases of MWRA-work-related cancer	Miceli: YES	Platform: YES
Part XI: America & the World	(No votes on which to base response)		

Appendix B. Scorecard for Rep. Jay Kaufman

Caveats: The votes listed include only through August 2003, when the process was stopped to begin collaboration with the Mass Dems.

2003 Mass Scorecard for State Representative Jay Kaufman

PLEASE NOTE: THIS IS A DRAFT WEBSITE NOT READY YET FOR PUBLIC USE



Democrat representing Fifteenth Middlesex
 Office: 489
 Phone: (617) 722-2552
 E-mail: Rep.JayKaufman@hou.state.ma.us

Website: <http://www.state.ma.us/legis/member/jrk1.htm>

Fundamental Issue in MassDems' Party Platform (Click for full text of platform section)	Summary of related issue put to vote (Click for House Journal references)	This Rep's vote on this issue	Party platform on this issue
Part I: Families & Children	Jul 10, 2003 : Veto override of \$200K reduction to blind job program	Kaufman: YES	Platform: YES
	Jul 10, 2003 : Veto override of federal school breakfast supplement	Kaufman: YES	Platform: YES
	Jul 10, 2003 : Veto override of \$900K for disability & mentoring aid	Kaufman: YES	Platform: YES
Part II: Education	May 6, 2003 : 3-year moratorium on charter schools	Kaufman: YES	Platform: YES
	Jun 4, 2003 : Allow municipal meals tax, in addition to state meals tax	Kaufman: YES	Platform: YES
	Jul 14, 2003 : Exempting two-way bilingual programs from English-only rules	Kaufman: YES	Platform: YES

Part III: Health Care	Jul 8, 2003 : Veto override of \$10M cut in the uncompensated care pool	Kaufman: NO	Platform: YES
	Jul 10, 2003 : Veto override of "Turning 22" mental disability program	Kaufman: YES	Platform: YES
Part IV: Economic Growth	May 1, 2003 : Defeating corporate tax disclosure	Kaufman: NO	Platform: NO
	May 1, 2003 : Extending corporate tax credit 5 years	Kaufman: NO	Platform: NO
	May 5, 2003 : Requiring workfare for mothers of 2- to 6-year-olds	Kaufman: NO	Platform: NO
	Jul 16, 2003 : allowing parents on welfare to go back to school	Kaufman: YES	Platform: YES
Part V: Fiscal Responsibility	Apr 30, 2003 : Borrow \$300 million to offset the budget deficit via bonds	Kaufman: NO	Platform: NO
	Apr 30, 2003 : Raising the income tax to 5.95% to offset the budget deficit	Kaufman: YES	Platform: YES
Part VI: Safety & Justice	Jul 10, 2003 : Veto override of Mass Correctional Legal Services	Kaufman: YES	Platform: YES
Part VII: Housing	(No votes on which to base response)		
Part VIII: Environment	Jul 8, 2003 : Veto override of reduced fees for blood lead level testing	Kaufman: YES	Platform: YES
Part IX: Political Reform	(No votes on which to base response)		
Part X: Worker Rights	Jul 16, 2003 : Early retirement for cases of MWRA-work-related cancer	Kaufman: YES	Platform: YES
Part XI: America & the World	(No votes on which to base response)		

Appendix C. Complete list of votes

Caveats: The votes listed include only through August 2003, when the process was stopped to begin collaboration with the Mass Dems. The agreed-upon number of votes for the entire 2003-2004 legislative session is thirty to thirty-five.

<p>Veto override of \$200K reduction to blind job program</p> <p>Platform indicates YES based on Part I: Families & Children</p> <p>Vote number 251 on Budget Veto Override on July 10, 2003</p>	<p>"Override Gov. Romney's veto of a Budget Line Item which reduced by \$200,000 the funding for the Ferguson Industries for the Blind, which employs blind individuals as well as providing them an opportunity for socialization and a chance to mingle with peers, learn daily living skills and gain a feeling of independence.</p> <p>Relevant platform section: PART I: FAMILIES & CHILDREN, DIVERSITY & COMMUNITY: Persons with Disabilities: ""We reaffirm our support for The Americans with Disabilities Act and other laws to prevent discrimination on the basis of disability, and for efforts to bring the Commonwealth into full ADA compliance. We believe state assistance should be made more readily available for community-based care, and should not be inappropriately biased toward institutional settings."" "</p>
<p>Veto override of federal school breakfast supplement</p> <p>Platform indicates YES based on Part I: Families & Children</p> <p>Vote number 252 on Budget Veto Override on July 10, 2003</p>	<p>Override Gov. Romney's veto of a Budget Line Item which eliminated a state supplement to the federally-funded school breakfast program whereby all eligible children shall be provided free, nutritious breakfasts at no cost to them.</p> <p>Relevant platform section: PART I: FAMILIES & CHILDREN, DIVERSITY & COMMUNITY: No Child Left Behind: "We believe that young people are our most precious resource, and we see inherent worth and promise in every child. Ours is truly the Party that seeks to "Leave No Child Behind." We endorse, therefore, the goals established under The Children's Defense Fund initiative of that name, to ensure every child a healthy start [which includes CDF's support of school breakfast programs]."</p>
<p>Veto override of \$900K for disability & mentoring aid</p> <p>Platform indicates YES based on Part I: Families & Children</p> <p>Vote number 254 on Budget Veto Override on July 10, 2003</p>	<p>Override Gov. Romney's reduction of a Budget Line Item which cut: \$99,000 for Special Olympics Massachusetts; \$304,000 for Work, Inc. and \$500,000 for Best Buddies Massachusetts [two programs for job training of people with disabilities].</p> <p>Relevant platform section: PART I: FAMILIES & CHILDREN, DIVERSITY & COMMUNITY: Persons with Disabilities: "We believe state assistance should be made more readily available for community-based care, and should not be inappropriately biased toward institutional settings."</p>

3-year moratorium on charter schools

Platform indicates YES based on [Part II: Education](#)

Vote number [88](#) on [H.4000](#) on May 6, 2003

"Would require 3 yr moratorium and empower commission to study feasibility of charter schools

Relevant section of platform: PART II: EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND OPPORTUNITY: Full Funding: ""We call upon the state to change funding of Commonwealth Charter schools to ensure that funds are not drained from established public schools."" "

Allow municipal meals tax, in addition to state meals tax

Platform indicates YES based on [Part II: Education](#)

Vote number [122](#) on [Section 100](#) on June 4, 2003

"Any city or town shall be authorized to impose a local excise tax upon the sale of meals, of 1% of the total price thereof. The local excise tax imposed shall be paid by the vendor in the same manner as the excise tax due the commonwealth. All sums received shall at least quarterly be distributed, credited and paid by the state treasurer to each city or town. [Provides a new revenue source for cities and towns to pay for schools and other local services].

Relevant platform section: PART II: EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND OPPORTUNITY: Full Funding: ""We believe education must be a top priority at all levels of government, and we reject policies that direct funds away from the children and the programs in our public schools to finance political promises of tax reductions or to other unrelated purposes. We support just and equitable funding mechanisms that provide for vibrant public schools in all communities.""

Exempting two-way bilingual programs from English-only rules.

Platform indicates voting YES based on [Part IV: Economic Growth, Jobs & Security](#)

Vote number [266](#) on [Budget Veto Override Section 209](#) on July 14, 2003

Gov. Romney vetoed budget section 210, which says. "Section 4 of MGL chapter 71A is hereby further amended to add:— "Foreign language classes for children who already know English, 2-way bilingual programs for students in kindergarten through grade 12 and special education programs for physically or mentally impaired students shall be unaffected." [MGL chapter 71A requires English-only classroom teaching. Section 210 would exempt "2-way classes" in which some students are native English speakers and some are non-native English speakers. A vote to override would continue to allow that type of bilingual education although foreign-language classes without native English-speaking students would still be disallowed.]

Part II: Education, Training, And Opportunity -- Excellence, Equality and Community: "We reaffirm our support for classroom programs, including Special and Bilingual Education"

Veto override of \$10M cut in uncompensated care pool

Platform indicates YES based on [Part III: Health Care](#)

Vote number [170](#) on [Budget Veto Override](#) on July 8, 2003

Override Gov. Romney's veto of a Budget Line Item which eliminated \$9,670,807 in funding for the uncompensated care pool. This care pool provides health care for people who would otherwise not be covered for hospital visits.

Relevant platform section: PART III: HEALTH CARE, ACCESS & CHOICE: Access and Costs: "We remain committed to extending proper coverage to each of the hundreds of thousands of residents still uninsured, and to aiding the even greater number who are underinsured, or at risk of being so."

<p>Veto override of "Turning 22" mental disability program</p> <p>Platform indicates YES based on Part III: Health Care</p> <p>Vote number 253 on Budget Veto Override on July 10, 2003</p>	<p>Override Gov. Romney's veto of a Budget Line Item which eliminated state funding for the "Turning 22" program, which provides residential and treatment services for severely disabled individuals (who are mandated to exit other state programs after age 21). "Turning 22" is designed to allow a person to remain where his or her family lives.</p> <p>Relevant platform section: PART III: HEALTH CARE, ACCESS & CHOICE: Mental Health: "Our Party supports the full implementation of mental health policies which will provide emergence care, family support, and appropriate housing to our citizens with chronic mental health disorders."</p>
<p>Defeating corporate tax disclosure</p> <p>Platform indicates NO based on Part IV: Economic Growth</p> <p>Vote number 69 on H.4000 on May 1, 2003</p>	<p>Would study corporate tax disclosure, defeating measure to implement it.</p> <p>Relevant section of platform:PART IV: ECONOMIC GROWTH, JOBS & SECURITY: A Healthy Business Environment: "We support monitoring the costs of doing business in the Commonwealth, so that companies can grow and compete while still meeting their obligations to workers and the community."</p>
<p>Extending corporate tax credit 5 years</p> <p>Platform indicates NO based on Part IV: Economic Growth</p> <p>Vote number 71 on H.4000 on May 1, 2003</p>	<p>Would extend corporate tax credit 5 years</p> <p>Relevant section of platform:PART IV: ECONOMIC GROWTH, JOBS & SECURITY: A Healthy Business Environment: "We support tax incentives for business when accompanied by commitments to good corporate citizenship and enforceable terms assuring continued investment in Massachusetts."</p>
<p>Requiring workfare for mothers of 2- to 6-year-olds</p> <p>Platform indicates NO based on Part IV: Economic Growth</p> <p>Vote number 80 on Section 487 on May 5, 2003</p>	<p>[Welfare] recipients not qualifying as exempt,[Welfare] recipients not qualifying as exempt, and whose child of record is under the age at which full-time school attendance is mandatory, may meet only 10 hrs of the work requirement through education and training programs.</p> <p>Relevant platform section: PART IV: ECONOMIC GROWTH, JOBS & SECURITY: Supporting the Transition from Welfare to Work: "We are committed to ensuring a safety net to members of our families in times of need. We recognize that for some, that transition may take a lifetime."</p>
<p>Allowing parents on welfare to go back to school.</p> <p>Platform indicates voting YES based on Part IV: Economic Growth, Jobs & Security</p> <p>Vote number 368 on Budget Veto Override Section 528 on July 16, 2003</p>	<p>Override Gov. Romney's veto of a program to allow parents with young children who are on welfare to go back to school in lieu of working to meet the requirements of the Personal Work and Responsibility Act.</p> <p>PART IV: ECONOMIC GROWTH, JOBS & SECURITY: Supporting the Transition from Welfare to Work: "We seek to help welfare recipients successfully find and keep jobs. We advocate increased job training and educational opportunities, and we must ensure that support systems in child care, transportation, and health insurance are in place to enable people to work and to advance into more highly paid jobs.... We support measures that reduce, not increase, the number of children living in poverty."</p>

Borrow \$300 million to offset the budget deficit via bonds

Platform indicates NO based on [Part V: Fiscal Responsibility](#)

Vote number [62](#) on [Amendment to MGL 29](#) on April 30, 2003

The state shall issue and sell bonds of the Commonwealth in an amount [up to] \$300,000,000. All such bonds shall be payable not later than June 30, 2010. All interest and payments on account of principal on such obligation bonds issued pursuant to this section shall be special obligations of the Commonwealth. [Establishes a 7-year bond program to borrow money to pay off the budget deficit]

Relevant platform section: PART V: FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY, TAX EQUITY, & PUBLIC STEWARDSHIP: Tax Fairness and Responsible Budgeting: "Budgets should be fiscally responsible and balanced without gimmicks."

Raising the income tax to 5.95% to offset the budget deficit

Platform indicates YES based on [Part V: Fiscal Responsibility](#)

Vote number [64](#) on [Section 470](#) on April 30, 2003

Taxable income shall be taxed at the rate of 5.95 per cent for tax years beginning in 2003, for Part B income. [Increase in the tax rate].

Relevant platform section: PART V: FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY, TAX EQUITY, & PUBLIC STEWARDSHIP: Tax Fairness and Responsible Budgeting: "We believe that taxes should be fair and based on ability to pay, and that budgets should be fiscally responsible and balanced without gimmicks."

Veto override of Mass Correctional Legal Services

Platform indicates YES based on [Part VI: Safety & Justice](#)

Vote number [258](#) on [Budget Veto Override](#) on July 10, 2003

Override Gov. Romney's veto of Budget Line Item 0321-2100, \$500,000 for the Massachusetts Correctional Legal Services (MCLS). MCLS provides the only legal aid to indigent incarcerated individuals.

Relevant platform section: PART VI: SAFETY, JUSTICE & CRIME PREVENTION Legal Services: "We support publicly funded legal services to provide legal representation and advice on issues such as housing, employment, domestic violence, health, elder law, public benefits, and immigration. We urge full state and federal funding of such services."

Veto override of reduced fees for blood lead level testing

Platform indicates YES based on [Part VIII: Environment](#)

Vote number [176](#) on [Budget Veto Override](#) on July 8, 2003

"Override veto of exception of fees charged for the testing of blood lead levels. The fees would be limited based on the fees in 2002. Relevant platform section: PART VIII: ENVIRONMENT, PRESERVATION & SUSTAINABILITY: Food Safety, Pesticides and Public Health: "We believe state and federal regulatory agencies should pay especially close attention to pollutants that have a direct impact on our families' health, with a particular emphasis on regulating mercury, arsenic, pesticides, and lead."

Relevant budget section: SECTION 631. Notwithstanding any general or special law to the contrary and with the exception of fees charged for the testing of blood lead levels, fees charged by the division of occupational safety... shall be set at a rate not less than twice the rate charged on July 1, 2002." "

Early retirement for cases of MWRA-work-related cancer

Platform indicates YES based on [Part X: Worker Rights](#)

Vote number [397](#) on [Budget Veto Override](#) on July 16, 2003

Gov. Romney vetoed budget section 673, which says: "A person who has been in the state retirement system for more than 35 years, with at least 10 or more of those years in the employment of the Massachusetts Water and Resources Administration; who, in the course of his state employment was exposed to asbestos or other hazardous materials; and who has been diagnosed with an extraneously cancer related illness as well as an extraneously cardio-vascular cardiac related illness, shall be eligible for early retirement with surviving spouse benefits at a compensation rate equivalent to his current salary, if the individual makes application for an early retirement on or before December 31, 2003." A YEA vote would override the veto and fund the early retirement arrangement.

PART X: WORKERS' RIGHTS AND FUTURES: Occupational Safety -- "We support environmental Right-to-Know laws about chemical and other potential dangers to worker health. We oppose efforts to weaken workplace safety standards, or the ability of OSHA or state-level agencies to enforce them."

Appendix D. Selection Criteria

Our criteria for selecting votes are:

- ? Count only roll call votes -- no voice votes, no bill sponsorships, etc.
- ? No omnibus legislation (such as vote on the entire budget bill, because the purpose of the legislator's vote is unclear).
- ? No constituent service votes, nor any votes that apply primarily to one locality (such as funding for a hospital or court in one legislator's district, since the vote depends more on geography than on one's stance on the issues).
- ? Count only one vote in a series of amendments, or only one vote on any given topic (to avoid over-weighting one issue over others).
- ? No unanimous or near-unanimous votes (because they do not distinguish legislators from one another, and likely have some other political component hidden from the apparent vote).
- ? Count only votes that clearly address a platform issue, as expressed in the platform, and as the core issue of the vote.
- ? Vet all votes by confirming with elected officials on a confidential basis that the selected votes meet the criteria above, that the descriptions and platform links are fair and accurate, and that the vote is a fair representation of the legislator's view of the corresponding section of the party platform.

Following are votes which do NOT count on the Mass Scorecard, with the reason for which they were rejected. We include this section to demonstrate our vetting process.

<p>Excluded because it addresses the same issue as rollcall #88.</p>	<p>Expanding charter schools program</p> <p>Platform indicates NO based on Part II: Education</p> <p>Vote number 87 on H.4000 on May 6, 2003</p>	<p>Would study charter school moratorium, killing measure to implement moratorium</p> <p>Relevant section of platform: PART II: EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND OPPORTUNITY: Full Funding: "We call upon the state to change funding of Commonwealth Charter schools to ensure that funds are not drained from established public schools."</p>
<p>Excluded because it authorizes GUIDELINES, without authorizing the actual sale of naming rights.</p>	<p>Selling naming rights on state forests and parks</p> <p>Platform indicates NO based on Part IV: Economic Growth</p> <p>Vote number 78 on Section 484 on May 5, 2003</p>	<p>The department of parks and recreation is hereby authorized to develop guidelines and criteria on the subject of the public sale of naming rights for state forests and parks or for facilities within state forests and parks.</p> <p>Relevant platform section: PART IV: ECONOMIC GROWTH, JOBS & SECURITY: Privatization Accountability: "We assert and recognize... that it is the public sector, not the private sector, which has the distinct capacity to deliver efficient, high quality services in many areas."</p>
<p>Excluded because the link to the platform on economic grounds, while correct in the public view, is not the primary reason that most legislators voted yea or nay.</p>	<p>Pay raises for Legislature leaders</p> <p>Platform indicates NO based on Part V: Fiscal Responsibility</p> <p>Vote number 54 on H.3743 on April 14, 2003</p>	<p>Additional compensation for the following [legislators]: presiding officers, members of the majority and minority leadership, chairmen, vice-chairmen, assistant vice-chairmen and ranking minority members of committees -- shall be established by the joint rules of the senate and the house of representatives. [This gives power over salary to the Legislative leadership].</p> <p>Relevant platform section: PART V: FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY: Investments and Tax Relief: "We believe surpluses should go to public priorities like... the provision of tax relief targeted first to working families. We reject emphatically state or federal tax policies that redirect hard-won budget surpluses or other public revenues into the hands of a few."</p>
<p>Excluded because the core issue is privacy, which is not addressed in the platform.</p>	<p>Publicizing delinquent tax payers on-line</p> <p>Platform indicates NO based on Part V: Fiscal Responsibility Rollcall 85 on H.4000 on May 6, 2003</p>	<p>Would require making delinquent tax payers public on-line</p> <p>Relevant section of platform: PART V: FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY, TAX EQUITY, & PUBLIC STEWARDSHIP: Consumer Protection: "We support the protection of consumers and their interests in all areas of the marketplace."</p>

<p>Excluded because the connection to environmental impact statements is too tenuous.</p>	<p>Requiring regulatory impact statements for new regulations</p> <p>Platform indicates NO based on Part VIII: Environment</p> <p>Vote number 75 on MGL Chapter 30A on May 5, 2003</p>	<p>Requiring a 'Regulatory impact statement' for all new regulations promulgated by state agencies. The statement shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? identify the problem addressed ? identify expert information and analysis ? identify specifically who is affected and to what extent ? identify when such regulation becomes effective, and how and when the regulation will be reviewed ? describe the financial impacts of the regulation, including compliance costs and indirect costs ? identify the fiscal effect over the first five years; and ? describe specifically the benefits of the regulation. <p>[Would have the effect of making new regulations more difficult for state agencies to implement, in a manner analogous to how environmental impact statements make environmentally degradatory practices more difficult].</p> <p>Relevant platform section: PART VIII: ENVIRONMENT, PRESERVATION & SUSTAINABILITY: Environmental Law Enforcement: "We believe it is a basic responsibility of government to ensure that all laws enacted to protect our environment are obeyed and enforced."</p>
<p>Excluded because the particular usage of the land being sold is the core issue, not the general concept of selling conservation land.</p>	<p>Selling land currently under conservation protection</p> <p>Platform indicates NO based on Part VIII: Environment</p> <p>Vote number 184 on H.3831 on July 9, 2003</p>	<p>Would convey [sell] a certain parcel of land in the city of Fall River, [which is currently subject to] easements for conservation purposes, as defined by Article XCVII of the Amendments to the Constitution.</p> <p>Relevant section of platform:PART VIII: ENVIRONMENT, PRESERVATION & SUSTAINABILITY: Safeguarding Natural Resources. "We support state assistance for communities to protect, by purchase or conservation restriction, threatened parcels, with a priority on riparian lands or wetlands, wildlife habitat, and urban and semi-urban communities with little open space left."</p>

Appendix E. Open Meeting memo

(e-mailed July 9 to Jim Roosevelt; promised a verbal reply; none received)

Aug. 10, 2004

To: Jim Roosevelt, Phil Johnston, Sue Thomson
From: Jesse Gordon, jesse@MassChange.org, 617-320-6989
1770 Mass Ave. #630, Cambridge MA 02140

Dear Jim, Phil, and Sue,

I would like your interpretation in writing of the following line from the Mass Dems Party Charter:

Article 8, Section II: Openness:

“All meetings of all Party committees, or sub-units thereof, at all levels shall be open to the public, and no vote shall be taken by secret ballot. However, secret ballot is permitted in local caucuses.”

I note that this is the section text in full, and that the Convention determined that openness was an important enough matter to warrant a full section of the Party Charter. I note also that there are no exceptions to the openness rule, either in Section 8 of the charter nor elsewhere in the charter or By-Laws.

Therefore, my questions are:

1) On what basis may a party committee, or sub-unit thereof, be entitled to decide that their meeting is not open to the public? I would interpret the Party Charter as unambiguously stating that there is no such basis. If there is one, could you please point out the section of the Party Charter or By-Laws in which those rules are determined?

2) Is a subcommittee designated by a formal party committee considered a “party committee or sub-unit thereof”? I’m asking specifically about the Platform Support Card Subcommittee of the Public Policy Committee, but I would apply your answer to other subcommittees as well. My interpretation is that the Party Charter is unambiguous in defining that body as a sub-unit of a party committee. If not, could you please point out the section of the Party Charter or By-Laws in which

the definition of such a subcommittee is established as not being a sub-unit of a party committee. The Party By-Laws establish the Public Policy Committee as a subcommittee of the State Committee (Article IX), but make no further definitions such as “task force” or “working group” or anything else.

3) Does the “Open Meeting Law” (MGL 30A-11A-1/2) apply to party committee meetings? I assume not, but if so, could you please point out the section of the Party Charter or By-Laws in which the Open Meeting Law is referenced? I have been excluded from several meetings by several members of the MDP on the grounds of exceptions which, to my knowledge, only apply to the MGL Open Meeting Law, and hence only apply to governmental meetings and not party meetings. Members of the MDP have cited rationales such as “This is an Executive Session,” “This is a private task force,” “This is a closed meeting,” and so on, to exclude myself and others from meetings of the Platform Support Card Subcommittee, the MDP Rules Committee, and other such meetings. I find no such rationales anywhere in the Party Charter or Party By-laws, and as such, I would like to establish my right to attend any and all such meetings, and my right to freely report on their proceedings, which I would interpret as the intent of the “Openness” section of the Party Charter. I would like your opinion on this matter, and if in disagreement with mine, could you please point out the section of the Party Charter or By-Laws in which the alternative opinion is established.

4) I would further interpret my right to attend any and all Party meetings as implying that I may request to know the meeting time and place of any meetings that I choose to attend. I base this implication on the fact that one cannot attend a meeting that one does not know about, and therefore the concept of “openness” as established in the Party Charter requires that meeting time and places be made available upon request. If you are in agreement with my interpretation, I hereby request that I be notified of the meeting time and places of upcoming meetings of the Public Policy Committee, the Platform Support Card Subcommittee, and the Rules Committee. If you are in disagreement with my interpretation, could you provide an interpretation about how “openness” then applies to those meetings?

Democratically yours,
Jesse Gordon