

Accreditation Committee Members raised three fundamental questions during the conference call on Thursday, July 27, 2017.

1) Was the Committee's statement issued on July 14, 2017, its final decision, and if so, why is the Committee continuing to consider this matter?

The Committee's statement recommended follow-up monitoring of the GPCO annual meeting in August 2017, suggested that dispute resolution facilitated by the GPUS might be a way forward, called for two members to be appointed as GPCO Forum administrators, and called on the GPCO leadership to postpone the threatened and in-progress bannings until after the August meeting. The GPCO leadership was told that the Accreditation Committee would revisit the topic of disaffiliation if the objections raised by the complainants were not addressed. The Accreditation Committee's finding does not close the book on the matter. It specifically keeps the book open. The Accreditation Committee is monitoring whether its recommendations are being followed and whether further action is appropriate.

2) Did the complainants exhaust their state process before turning to the national organization?

The Accreditation Committee has already determined that the circumstances made this unfeasible. The attached file, already provided to the Committee, gives an example of the obstacles that hindered effective use of a state process. [*Further documentation demonstrates lack of an internal process, Folder 4, Item 4.7 – AC*]

3) Why is the complaint so long? Why did the complainants not couch their objections in two or three sentences?

We refer to the following paragraph on the first page of our complaint:

6. Summary of the Complaint-provide date, situation, etc.: Throughout 2016 and 2017, the individuals have violated key values and have largely succeeded in consolidating control of the Green Party of Colorado in their hands rather than in the grassroots chapters of the state. Their control of the state party forum suppresses meaningful dissent and prevents efforts to conduct party business according to the bylaws and guidelines. We have objected repeatedly, but [Co-chair] Andrea Merida uses unorthodox interpretations of state bylaws and procedures to derail our complaints. Redress through the state process is therefore impossible.

That is a three-sentence summary of our objections. Obviously the reader cannot make a decision about the validity of the objections without evidence, so we provided a dozen pages of explanation and a few hundred pages of documentation. We recognize that the complete file is long. We wanted to do a thorough job.

Judy Harrington  
member of the Caucus to Restore Green Values