

California Grand Jurors' Association Board of Directors Meeting—June 23, 2015

MINUTES

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

The roll was taken, and the meeting began at 7:02 PM.

Present: Directors Karen Jahr (president), Lloyd Bell, Medsie Bolin, Marsha Caranci, Karin Hern, Dianne Hoffman, Beckie Jennings, Jerry Kunkle, Jerry Lewi, Jim Ragan, Diane Shepp, Gary Spaugh; Membership Relations Committee (MRC) Chair Mike Chernock; Awards Committee (AC) Vice Chair Joann Landi

Absent: Director Lou Meyer (excused)

B. Agenda and Comments

B-1 Agenda Approval: Jahr

The Board unanimously approved the agenda.

B-2 Member Comments

None.

C. Consent Items

C-1 Approve Regular Board Meeting Minutes, 05/26/15: Ragan

C-2 Acknowledge Committee Minutes in 06/23/15 meeting packet: Jahr/Ragan

The Board unanimously approved the consent items.

D. Officer and Committee Chair Reports

D-1 **President's Report (Jahr)**

- Update on Senate Bill 227, which would prohibit grand juries from hearing indictments brought by DAs in cases against peace officers that involved victim death. The DA would have to use the preliminary hearing for indictments. CGJA opposed this bill. It went to a hearing before the Assembly Committee on Public Safety on June 18. We joined the California District Attorneys Association in opposition because of the bill's potential erosion of the grand jury system. The bill passed the assembly committee. It should be up for assembly action in the next two to three weeks. It looks like it will pass.

Lewi asked whether any of this information should be on the website. Jahr said no. No one disagreed.

- ❑ Inquiry from a reporter of the Riverside Press-Enterprise about a conflict between the Riverside County Grand Jury and their County Counsel. Consulting with Board members, Jahr sent to the reporter responses to his inquiry. One question was whether conditions were deteriorating between grand juries and county counsels. The response was no; in fact, with training such relationships seem to be improving. We encourage forepersons to establish relations with their county counsels. The resultant article in the Press-Enterprise is on the CGJA blog and quotes Jahr favorably, or at least neutrally. Jahr said that she just received a second email from the reporter asking for comment on a grand jury report critical of the County Counsel. She said that she would decline to comment. Lewi said that the County Counsel had purchased a copy of the CGJA system book. He had a problem with the Grand Jury when he was City Attorney for Riverside.

D-2 **Officer Reports**

Vice President Shepp. She said that she is concerned that we are losing an opportunity to demonstrate our inclusive intent that came out of the Board retreat in January. We have made some major strides in improving relations with chapters. However, Shepp wants to make the Board aware of a recent incident that may have ramifications that are detrimental to CGJA. She said she wants this concern to trigger some construction Board discussion. Before describing the incident, Shepp made three introductory comments. First, it is critical for CGJA survival to support chapter involvement in all our activities. Second, CGJA is a membership-driven organization. Third, it is the responsibility of this Board to tackle the difficult issues no matter how unsavory they might appear on the surface.

Shepp said that the incident was that the Napa chapter was recently banned by the Training Committee (TC) from attending the CGJA training session of Napa grand jurors in Napa in July. She said that she believes that several other chapters have had similar experiences. For the past few years, the Napa chapter has provided coffee and pastries at a cost of several hundred dollars each year. Chapter representatives then made welcoming remarks and explained about the chapter and CGJA. Shepp said that the ban of chapter members and her, as CGJA vice president and former chapter president, from attending the training session has resulted in the chapter ceasing its provision of coffee and pastries. Shepp asked that this TC decision be revisited. Chapters are the face and interface with CGJA. The chapter ban flies against all efforts we have made at the Board level to be more inclusive. The TC could allow chapters three minutes to make introductory remarks about the chapter and to welcome the incoming jurors. Shepp asked for Board discussion leading to a policy that CGJA chapters are critically important to the sustainability of CGJA

and that chapters are the direct interface between members and CGJA; therefore that all CGJA programs reflect and include actions that embrace the Board's decision to be more inclusive of chapters and members and to reflect outreach efforts that attract members' and chapters' involvement rather than barring them from CGJA activities. If consensus is not reached this evening, then Shepp suggests the formation of an ad hoc committee to address this issue. Perhaps the MRC subcommittee dealing with chapter relations could work on such a policy. Shepp's comments stimulated substantial discussion.

TC Chair Caranci said that Shepp's statement caught her by surprise. It was, she added, very well prepared. Caranci said that local chapters are highly regarded and highly touted by the trainers at every training session we conduct. The TC does not ban chapters from training sessions. We have excellent working relationships with them. We encourage them to speak at on-sites and to help with the regionals. The Napa chapter was not banned by the TC. At the Napa on-site, the Superior Court expressed concern about the chapter's participation at last year's training session by certain individuals and wanted to know why CGJA was insisting on the chapter's participation. Caranci said she responded that CGJA was not insisting on the participation, but that CGJA's practice is to invite chapters to give some introductory remarks. In addition to the court voicing concerns, there were numerous trainee evaluations from last year that said that the chapter representative's comments were inappropriate (including some comments that criticized the previous year's grand jury). Caranci said that she therefore asked the chapter representative this year to limit comments to the trainees to supporting the grand jury. Caranci expressed to the Board her regret that the chapter has misinterpreted TC's intentions.

Shepp responded that she and Caranci can independently discuss the specific Napa concerns. The need at the moment is for a Board policy of welcoming chapters in every single program we have.

Caranci stated that the Training Committee already has that policy.

Bolin said that she has never experienced this problem as a trainee, a chapter member, or a trainer at all the venues she has been involved with. Chapter volunteers have been wonderful. But, she said, we have to remember that the trainers and CGJA serve at the pleasure of the courts. We are invited in to train. If a particular court has an issue, we as trainers have to recognize that.

Hoffman said that this discussion is inappropriate as part of the vice president's report on the agenda. This should have been on the agenda. Hoffman said that in her 15 years as a trainer a chapter has never been excluded. But we can't do anything about what a court wants to do.

Jennings agreed that we need a policy. If there is no problem, then we won't have a problem with the policy. We as a Board are ambassadors of

our chapters. If there were inappropriate comments made at a training session, they should be addressed.

Spaugh said that we need a problem-solving procedure of some form. Problems such as this have the potential to reverse our progress we have made over the past nine months. This requires dialogue between MRC and TC. We need to get on top of this immediately.

Hern said that training mission is critical to the future and thrust of CGJA. While we want to develop and expand relations with our chapters, these matters are un-central to our mission to educate grand jurors. Regretting that there is may be disconnect and perhaps miscommunication with the Napa chapter, she said that our responsibility is to the courts and the grand jury system to deliver a quality training program. She supports Spaugh's suggestion to develop a procedure to resolve issues. But, she said, chapter relations and training are separate. Training is on its own; chapter "stuff" doesn't fit in to continuing our training mission.

Kunkle asked how we can separate the two. If we don't have members, we don't have chapters and an organization. He favors establishing a group to work on the Napa issue and to come up with a plan for addressing future issues with other chapters.

Jennings added that our trainers are volunteer members. If we aren't fostering good relations with our chapters and members, there will be no trainers.

Hern responded that training is through the counties. The chapters don't bring us the clients; the counties do. She expressed her support for the chapters and the work they do. But the lifeblood and financial mission of CGJA is to train. We connect with the counties and the grand juries themselves. We must not mix chapter relations with our training function.

Bolin supported Hern, saying that she tried other activities in CGJA and says that her niche is now with training. That is who we are. This discussion is unproductive.

Chernock said that are people who are looking at this situation.

Jahr said that where Board action is contemplated, Board members should submit the proposed action as part of the noticed agenda. This item was sprung on the Board.

Spaugh said he doesn't understand why we shouldn't have a problem-solving process through MRC and TC to resolve this issue now before the problem gets away from us.

Hern, responding to Spaugh, said that we do need to discuss these issues. She said that she would hate to see rumors going out to members before we as a Board and others collaborate and define and resolve the issues.

Spaugh said we're trying to preempt the building of a mountain of misunderstanding among members, chapters, and CGJA.

Jennings argued that we can come together. There is a solution to every problem. This is a problem to be solved. But we can't control chapters talking to chapters. We can only control what we do.

Lewi agreed that if people think there is a problem, there is a problem. But, we're now in the training season. Once training ends, let's deal with the problem in a properly noticed agenda item.

Caranci agreed with Lewi. She said that this issue is blown out of perspective. It is a small issue between one chapter and someone who has had her feelings hurt, bringing this unagendized item to the Board and creating a rift. She asked Shepp to inform her privately of any other chapters have had problems with the training program. Caranci said she would work to resolve any identified problems.

Treasurer Meyer. Not present.

Secretary Ragan. Ragan directed attention to two information items that he submitted as part of the Board packet: Revised Committee and Training Roster (H-1) and Board Action Item Template (H-2). He also asks committee chairs, in submitting committee meeting minutes, to avoid including graphics such as logos. They make the size of the board meeting packet much larger and can slow down downloading.

D-3 Legal and Legislative Resources Committee (LLRC)

Jahr said that major recent LLRC project has been to completely update the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) menu item under Jury Resources on the website.

D-4 Public Relations Committee (PRC)

Nothing new to add to the PRC minutes.

D-5 Membership Relations Committee (MRC)

Chair Chernock reported:

- Several MRC members are ill, which has slightly affected MRC deliberations.
- The MRC letter to Introductory Members (IMs) regarding active memberships, which follows up on TC's letter to IMs, will soon go out.
- The Santa Cruz chapter is now back on active CGJA status. Chapter members can see a positive change in CGJA.
- Jahr will present the Monterey chapter with its certificate of membership at a party that the 2014-15 Monterey Grand Jury is hosting on June 28.
- Margaret Furman resigned as president of the San Bernardino chapter. We will follow up on the reasons why after the training season. One of the problems may have been required chapter documentation.

- ❑ MRC will host the chapter officers' meeting at the 2015 Annual Conference, paying for snacks (out of the MRC budget).
- ❑ The Bay Area Regional will celebrate its fifth year in August. A media expert (on the 2015-16 Marin County Grand Jury) is coming to speak.
- ❑ With regard to Infusionsoft, the installation team has had its first conference call with the Infusionsoft technical people. The process is a little more technical than MRC had expected, but it's more of a thought-process change than a technical knowledge change. So far, the installation is looking very good. A second phone call between a smaller group of our team and the technical people is coming up. The process is moving very fast.
- ❑ The political editor with the Marin Independent-Journal is willing to discuss with us how better to use newspapers to further our cause. This is mainly local, but it can help CGJA more broadly.

Chernock then made his comments with respect to the dialogue earlier in the meeting about the Napa incident. He spoke about his policy in MRC that everyone gets treated with respect and no one gets hollered at.

He then turned to how we recruit. Talking with a few chapter presidents, he said that he came to the conclusion that virtually all recruitment of CGJA members comes through chapters rather than directly to CGJA. Almost on one comes to CGJA directly after their year of grand jury service. He is going to propose to chapter presidents that the MRC work with them to do their recruiting at the chapter level.

Ragan requested to Chernock, with respect to the contact with the Marin Independent-Journal, that he involve PRC – since media relations is a PRC issue. Chernock responded that he would.

Hoffman asked about chapter documentation. She said that it is important that CGJA receive up-to-date information on chapter officers and who our contact points are – and maybe on additional chapter formation documentation so that we can avoid the disconnect that might have occurred with the San Bernardino chapter. She then asked: how does information about membership renewals get into the CGJA database for voting and committee memberships.

Chernock said that Infusionsoft will generate the notice that says membership dues are due. This will involve an automatic renewal (that is, the member must opt out not to renew). When it goes to the treasurer with payment, he notifies Infusionsoft. Every committee will have a Infusionsoft administrator trained to go into the database and retrieve whatever information is needed.

Hoffman responded that it is critical that we have the eligible voter information for 2015 by July 31. Chernock said that we are doing everything we can to meet that deadline, but the current database has not been in good shape. Di Masini, database manager, has been doing an incredible job to pull everything together.

Caranci asked about letters to chapters, reminding Chernock that all such communication must go to the Board as information. Chernock replied that with respect to retiring grand jurors who are not IMs, the letter would be for the possible use of chapter presidents. Caranci said that she looked forward to seeing the letter. Caranci asked if MRC would share the CGJA mail list with those people. Chernock said no.

Caranci also asked about current data with respect to membership and renewals. Chernock said that we're still grappling with it, but the information will now appear in MRC minutes.

Caranci also said that it's important not to neglect the IMs who are in counties without chapters.

Lewi, chair of the NEC, said that the 2015 voters list will come from the existing database, not from an Infusionsoft product. Chernock agreed.

Jahr asked Chernock to address the questions that she sent to Chernock on June 17. He agreed to do so.

D-6 Training Committee (TC)

Chair Caranci said that:

- Jerry Kunkle has joined the training team to conduct some sessions on jail inspections.
- Over the past few years, TC has invited grand jury legal advisors to attend our on-site training sessions. Many judges, district attorneys, county counsels, and assistant county counsels have attended all or part of our training sessions. Last year, the Shasta County Presiding Judge attended both days of the Redding regional. This year, Jahr has taken this to a new level. She has personally contacted all county counsels supporting grand juries covered by our regional sessions, inviting them to attend a regional. The response has been amazing. Karen's status in the state legal community gives our training great credibility.
- The 2015 training season begins this coming Sunday, June 28, at two venues.

D-7 Finance Committee (FC)

Chair Bell said that everyone has seen the financial statements. As for the 2015 budget reforecast, all of the numbers are in. Meyer is consolidating them for FC review and then send them to Board members for review and comment prior to Board action.

D-8 Nominations-Elections Committee (NEC)

Chair Lewi said that all actions relate to Action Item E-3. Nothing else to report.

D-9 Awards Committee (AC)

Vice Chair Landi reported that AC requests the President to create an ad hoc committee to consider renaming some of the CGJA awards. AC believes that

the awards should reflect the point of the awards rather than the name of a person. There will always be people worthy of having an award named after them, but we'll soon run out of awards. AC believes that the Jack Zepp Award should revert to its original name, the Lifetime Achievement Award, and that the Robert Geiss Excellence in Reporting Award return to its original name, the Excellence in Reporting Award. As for the Angelo Rolando Memorial Award, it was established to honor Rolando for a different purpose. AC recommends renaming it the Angelo Rolando Service Award.

Jahr said that AC Chair Sommer asked her to seek Board comments on the AC's views regarding changing the award names as stated above. She said this is sensitive, since some CGJA members support continuing to associate the Zepp and Geiss names with the referenced awards. An ad hoc committee could address this sensitivity.

Hoffman said that we're going to run out of awards. Why do we need an ad hoc committee to recommend this? The AC can bring this to the Board as an action item, with appropriate discussion.

Lewi said that he will have comments at a later time, once others have spoken. If Board members have comments on the proposed award name changes, Jahr asked them to send the comments to Sommer, Landi, and her. Some Board members may have contact with other CGJA members who may have opinions about changing the names. Jahr said that she doesn't want to set up an ad hoc committee or working group if it is not necessary.

D-10 Annual Conference Committee (ACC)

Chair Shepp updated the Board on 2015 Annual Conference registrations to date: 7 paid attendees, 1 not attending the dinner, 2 guest lunches, and 2 guest dinners; 17 hotel room nights are booked.

Host committee Chair Bell said that the committee is close to completing the program topics (two sessions away). He said that he is completing information to go into the Journal and on the website. He also highlighted a notice in the June Journal asking members to submit questions to ask the Chief Justice by the end of July. This is a reminder.

Bolin, Chair of the 2016 AC Venue Subcommittee, said that the subcommittee now has two hotels under consideration pending site inspection and contact with the Sacramento chapter. The subcommittee will then make its recommendation to the full AC, allowing it to make a recommendation to the Board, followed by an announcement at the 2015 Annual Conference.

Shepp said that she will follow up with the site inspection and contacting the Sacramento chapter.

D-11 Ad Hoc Bylaws and Policies Review Committee (BPRC)

Co-Chair Spaugh said that there have been BPRC meetings since the May Board meeting when the Board approved the three proposed changes in concept to

the bylaws. We agreed to a two-step process seeking member input. We sent an eBlast to members on May 29 and placed an article in the Journal seeking this input. Spaugh said he recently emailed to Board members a summary of the member comments received. The majority of respondents supported all three proposed changes.

One question, from an out-of-state member, was about voting regionally: in which region would an out-of-state member vote? Consensus in BPRC is that it would be most fair to have the person vote in the last region in which he or she resided in California. This will be reflected in the ballot language to be voted upon tonight.

Co-Chair Jahr said that Rich Knowles is now a member of BPRC, replacing Larry Johnson.

D-12 Ad Hoc Fund Development Committee (FDC)

Chair Shepp said that the FDC is meeting regularly and continuing research and gathering information.

D-13 Ad Hoc Succession Planning Committee (SPC)

Chair Kunkle said that SPC met on June 22. It has a comprehensive document describing succession planning with guidelines. SPC will add a timeline. The document will be out for review prior to the August Board meeting.

E. Action Agenda

E-1 Confirm appointment of Linda Glasscock to the Awards Committee.

President Jahr said that Policy 10.002A requires that an appointment of a person to the Awards Committee be confirmed by the Board of Directors. The Chair of that committee, Barbara Sommer, has appointed Linda Glasscock of Corte Madera to the committee as member-at-large.

The motion passed unanimously, 12-0-0.

E-2 Approve the proposed amendments to the CGJA Bylaws as part of the 2015 ballot to be voted on by the members (2/3 Board vote required).

Jahr asked if Board members had any comments.

Lewi commented, with respect to Ballot Measure A, Board member term limits, about the status of currently serving Board members. Using Caranci as an example, he said his reading of BPRC minutes is that if this measure passes, then she could not run for another consecutive term. She is the only one who is now serving more than three terms.

Spaugh confirmed Lewi's statement. Any Board member having served three consecutive terms could run again after a year.

Lewi then asked about how you're going to explain to the members the rationale and background for the three proposed amendments.

Jahr answered that BPRC has discussed this and is of the opinion that neutral language should be provided to the website and Journal. BPRC does not think that the Board should be suggesting any particular outcome and not presenting any information that might be slanted. In fact, “pros and cons” might be the best way. Jahr said that she had thought about drafting such a pros-and-cons statement herself based on member input from the May eBlast plus additional comments from Board members. Another approach is to not provide any such information at all. Spaugh said that members now have substantial information as part of the May eBlast on how the measures came up and why they’re so important. Anything more provided after member input would have the unintended effect of looking like we’re trying to sway the vote. He said there was a strong belief on the part of BPRC to not do anything more. Lewi said that he is hearing contradictory information from Jahr and Spaugh. Jahr agreed. She said what she heard in BPRC that all the information provided must be neutral. She questioned whether all the information proved thus far is fully neutral in that it didn’t indicate any opposing viewpoints. In fact, it seems to imply that the Board of Directors is promoting the adoption of the three ballot measures.

Lewi said that he thinks presenting pros and cons is the correct thing to do. Bolin agreed with Lewi and Jahr.

Bolin then asked, are we just agreeing to approve the ballot language? Jahr and Spaugh answered no. Jahr said that it is approval of the ballot measures themselves. This requires a two-thirds vote (nine Board members). If the measures affect members’ voting rights, then the members must vote, as well, by a majority vote. If the Board votes no tonight, then the measures will not go in the ballot.

Spaugh said that in May the Board voted on the measures in concept in order to hear from members and then to make any necessary changes before finally approving them. He said he assumes that by approving the changes Board members would also be approving the amendments, or they wouldn’t go on the ballot.

Bolin responded that she sees this as two different things. One is that I’m approving or disapproving the changes, and the other is that I’m approving that the members should vote on them.

Hern said that the whole concept of the members being able to approve measures affecting their rights comes out of the Corporations Code. The Board can say: this is what we want to do about your voting rights. We want to amend our bylaws to reflect this. The Board speaks first. Then the members speak (vote) on those measures that affect their rights. Until the Board acts, there is nothing to present to the members.

Caranci spoke to two issues in the current discussion. First, she said that it is important to offer pros and cons. Second, she addressed the action items. She

said that the majority of member responses are favorable. In reviewing these responses, however, she noted some comments suggesting that members' voting rights would be degraded by reducing the term limits to three two-year terms (Measure A). If a Board member was doing a good job in these three terms, members wouldn't be allowed to vote to reelect that director. There is a learning curve for each Board member. With respect to Measure B, regional elections, currently every member gets to vote for six directors every year. If Measure B passes, every member will be able to vote for only two directors. But all directors represent the state. Caranci said she has no problem with Measure C. While she is not in favor of A and B, she said she strongly believes in letting members decide. Therefore, she does not want her vote to keep the measures from going to the members for a vote. So, if her vote is needed for the two-thirds majority, she will vote yes on the action.

Ragan said that, listening to the discussion, he thinks we have two options. One is to vote on the action on the table, which is to approve the three proposed amendments together. The other is to vote on each separately. If we decide via motion to do the latter, it requires a second, but there is no discussion on the motion – just a vote.

Ragan moved, and Hoffman seconded, to separate Action E-2 into three separate votes, one on each ballot measure.

Bell asked a procedural question with regard to the motion. He thought the action items were placed in the form of a motion, but now he sees another motion being made without acting on the first. Ragan responded that there is a procedure in Roberts Rules of Order to vote to separate a motion into parts as long as they are independent.

A roll call vote was taken. Bell: NO; Bolin: YES; Caranci: YES; Hern: YES; Hoffman: YES; Jahr: YES; Jennings: NO; Kunkle: NO; Lewi: YES; Ragan: YES; Shepp: NO; Spaugh: NO. **The motion passed, 7-5, no abstentions.**

Hoffman asked for clarification before voting on each measure. As she understands it, each ballot measure requires nine Board member affirmative votes to go on the ballot; if any measure does not receive nine affirmative votes, it will not go on the ballot. Hern and Ragan said yes. Depending on the vote, it could change Action E-3, approval of the ballot.

Jennings said that if we turn down any of these measures in light of what the members have told us, she has very large concerns.

Spaugh, speaking on behalf of BPRC, said that these measures have been thoroughly vetted. We should have done this in one motion. It will be unfortunate if we don't vote for them.

Bell agreed, saying that if we don't listen to our members' voices, we'll do it at our own peril. We'll be back in December 2015 where we were in November 2014.

Shepp agreed with Jennings, Spaugh, and Bell.

Lewi and Kunkle said that they support all three. Kunkle expressed strong support for director representation by region.

The Board then proceeded to vote on each measure. Jahr asked for a roll call.

E2-A. Reduce director term limits from five to three (two-year) terms

Bell: YES; Bolin: NO; Caranci: NO; Hern: YES; Hoffman: NO; Jahr: YES; Jennings: YES; Kunkle: YES; Lewi: YES; Ragan: YES; Shepp: YES; Spaug: YES. **The motion passed, 9-3, no abstentions, and goes on the ballot.**

E2-B. Members to elect directors in only their region, not statewide

Bell: YES; Bolin: NO; Caranci: YES; Hern: NO; Hoffman: NO; Jahr: YES; Jennings: YES; Kunkle: YES; Lewi: YES; Ragan: YES; Shepp: YES; Spaug: YES. **The motion passed, 9-3, no abstentions, and goes on the ballot.**

E2-C. Add a required residency requirement for directors

Bell: YES; Bolin: NO; Caranci: YES; Hern: YES; Hoffman: YES; Jahr: YES; Jennings: YES; Kunkle: YES; Lewi: YES; Ragan: YES; Shepp: YES; Spaug: YES. **The motion passed, 11-1, no abstentions, and goes on the ballot.**

E-3 Approve the CGJA 2015 ballot.

NEC Chair Lewi explained the ballot. There are three candidates each in the north and central, two in the south. The language for the ballot measures was vetted with BPRC. NEC added the statement that passage of the measures is not effective for this year's election of directors. This year, the candidates' statements and the pros-and-cons statement regarding the ballot measures will be printed in the Journal and posted on the website. As pointed out by BPRC, the actual language of the proposed bylaws amendments must be on the ballot. It is on the back of the ballot.

Hoffman asked if the ballot is being mailed under bulk mail. Lewi said yes. Then, Hoffman asked, why can't we include the candidate statements and ballot measure information in the mailing? Lewi responded, because of printing costs.

Caranci said that there appears to be a general consensus to prepare and distribute the pros-and-cons statement. She asked for confirmation before voting on the ballot measure. Jahr asked Ragan, as secretary, whether he recorded a consensus. Ragan responded that he seemed to hear a general consensus, but that a few directors favored providing no additional information on the ballot measures. He added that CGJA procedures allow us to vote on it.

Spaug expressed his support for a vote on whether to prepare and distribute a pros-and-cons statement on the ballot measures so that he can inform the BPRC that this was a Board decision. He said that BPRC would then prepare the statement. Jahr responded that this is a Board matter because it has to do with the ballot. She said that she would draft it and send it to directors for their review. Spaug said that he would like to inform BPRC members of the

statement. Jahr said of course, she misunderstood that Spaugh said that BPRC would be drafting it.

Hern asked what Board members are currently voting on. Ragan responded that the motion on the floor is to approve the CGJA 2015 ballot. We would then introduce another motion to print a pros-and-cons statement about the proposed bylaws amendments in the Journal and post it on the website.

Lewi highlighted for directors item H-4 in the Board meeting packet: Journal Election Information Mockup. A significant part of the August Journal will be the election pamphlet, similar to what the state does for state elections.

Hern asked for clarification: is this next vote to approve the entire ballot? Yes. Spaugh also asked what we are now voting on. Jahr responded that we are voting on the words and form of the two-page ballot: attachment E-3b in the Board meeting packet. The front has the candidates and the bylaws amendments, with instructions on the right. The back has the actual text of the proposed bylaws changes.

With respect to the candidate list, Shepp asked where Andi Winters, on the ballot for northern director lives. Shepp said her records show Winters living in Berkeley. Lewi responded that Winters now lives in El Dorado County. The move was very recent.

The motion passed unanimously, 12-0-0, by roll call vote.

E-4 Jahr moved, and Lewi seconded, that a Pros-and-Cons statement on the proposed Amendments be printed in the Journal and posted on the Website.

Spaugh said that if this motion passes, we have to be very certain that the language we used before in informing the membership is consistent with this additional information. Jahr answered that she will draft the pros-and-cons statement and circulate it to all the Board members. Hern said that she supports Jahr's efforts, since such language can be loaded, although no one here is intending that. She offered her help. Jahr said that she wants everyone's help. She sees this as a group effort. This is the Board's ballot, and it should be the Board's language. She said that she has had experience in this area. As county counsel, she prepared many impartial analyses of ballot measures for public review.

Lewi pointed out that the deadline for this statement is the Journal deadline for final copy: July 27. A roll call was taken.

Bell: YES; Bolin: YES; Caranci: YES; Hern: YES; Hoffman: YES; Jahr: YES; Jennings: NO; Kunkle: YES; Lewi: YES; Ragan: YES; Shepp: NO; Spaugh: NO.

The motion passed, 9-3, no abstentions.

F. Director Comments

Lewi welcomed Hoffman back. She said she is happy to be back. But she had surgery again last week, so she doesn't know how long it will take her to recover.

Jahr thanked everyone for “hanging in there” this evening. She hopes that no one took differences of opinion to be a lack of collegiality. She welcomes the point of view of everyone, encouraging everyone to speak up kindly.

Hern returned to an earlier meeting topic. She said she loves this organization. She served on the Marin County Grand Jury for four years; she has been on the CGJA Board for eight years; and she has trained people throughout the state. She has been the president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer of her chapter. She said that her biggest concern is that some people don’t get the big picture: our objective is to support, promote, and extend the grand jury system. Chapters are obviously very important. But accomplishing our objective is mainly through training our successors. The best way we can do this is to train incoming grand jurors. The training mission is so important. Other functions are secondary.

Spaugh responded. He said he thought we were a membership organization. Now we’re a training organization. That’s fine, but we won’t have any members. He doesn’t agree with Hern’s position. There are many of us who love the organization who believe that for CGJA to survive, it has to be focused on member relations. That takes nothing away from training. If we want to be a training organization, we should decide that; then the members don’t matter. No one said tonight that the chapters are going to take over CGJA or that the chapters are the members. We need to address these issues as a Board.

Jahr responded that we seem to have a lack of meeting of the minds with respect to the focus of CGJA. This is precisely the kind of topic that we have to address in our retreats and business meetings. Let’s continue discussing our differences at the same time that we are moving forward all the important work we are doing. No one of us should leave tonight thinking that anyone of us is wrong.

Kunkle said that this dialogue should only occur face-to-face.

G. Adjournment (9:47 PM).

Respectfully submitted,
Jim Ragan, Secretary