

Green Party of California

General Assembly Meeting (Plenary), December 1-3, 2000

<http://www.sdgreens.org/plenary/>

(version 11.19.2000)

Table of Contents

General Information	2
Accommodations and Housing	3
Delegate Allocation	4
Proposed Agenda	5
Appendix 1: Plenary Minutes (April 2000).....	6
Appendix 2: Consent Calendar	6
Appendix 3: Restructuring Plan Update.....	8
Appendix 4: Two-Year Work Plan.....	10
Appendix 5: Bylaw change - CC at-large elections	13
Appendix 6: Green Party section of state election code	15
Appendix 7: ASGP continuing affiliation	17
Appendix 8: Working Groups / Committees.....	23
Registration Form.....	24

General Information

For More Information:

Check the web site, <http://www.sdgreens.org/plenary/>

Delegates:

General Assembly delegates are appointed by each active county in the state. The allocation of delegates is described in the bylaws (see page 4). Counties must send the list of selected delegates to the host committee before the meeting by email (plenary@sdgreens.org) or by postal mail (GPSD Plenary Host Committee, P.O. Box 122283, San Diego, CA 92112). Delegates **MUST** register -- preregistration is highly recommended.

Non-Delegates:

The GPCA Plenary is open to all interested observers. Non-delegate registration is requested but not required.

Registration:

\$30 for the weekend (no single day rate). To make sure that we are prepared for your visit, please preregister before November 26. Preregistration includes breakfast and lunch on Saturday and breakfast on Sunday. Lunch on Sunday is \$5. No guarantee of meal availability if registering after November 26 -- register early! Register online at www.sdgreens.org/plenary/ or by postal mail (see last page of this packet)

Location:

International Association of Machinists Hall, 5150 Kearney Mesa Rd., San Diego

Directions:

From San Diego's Lindberg Airport... Go South on North Harbor Drive, turn left onto West Laurel Street, turn left onto 6th Ave, take Highway 163 North, take the Clairemont Mesa Blvd West exit, turn right onto Clairemont Mesa Blvd, turn left onto Kearny Mesa Rd.

From North County, Interstate 5... Go South on 5, take Interstate 805 exit, take Clairemont Mesa Blvd East exit, turn right onto Clairemont Mesa Blvd East, turn right onto Kearny Mesa Rd.

Local Transportation:

Several bus routes serve this area including Routes 20, 20C, 25, 27, 210, 870, and 990. Bus scheduling and routing information is available by phone, 1-800-COMMUTE, and online, <http://www.sdcommute.com/>

Saturday Night Dinner Event:

To be announced soon. Check the web site for the latest info.

Accommodations and Housing

Commercial Lodging:

Several motels/hotels are near this facility

Nearest hotels (approx. 2-3 blocks)

Hampton Inn, 5434 Kearny Mesa Rd., San Diego, 92111
858-292-1482, 1-800-Hampton

Ramada Inn, 5550 Kearny Mesa Rd., San Diego, 92111
800-447-2637, 800-228-2828

Nearest budget motels (approx. 3/4 mile)

Motel 6, 5592 Clairemont Mesa Blvd., San Diego, 92117
1-800-4Motel6

Days Inn, 5550 Clairemont Mesa Blvd., San Diego, 92117
858-560-4551, 1-800-693-6888

California Suites, 5583 Clairemont Mesa Blvd., San Diego, 92117
1-800-562-2217, 858-560-0545

Nearest union hotel (approx 7 miles)

Handlery Hotel, 950 Hotel Circle North, San Diego, 92108
619-296-0511

Host Lodging:

To arrange a home-stay, call or email Michele Delehanty 619-420-3142, johnmicheled@aol.com. Call early or we might not be able to find you a host in time.

Delegate Allocation

Counties	# Greens	% Greens	Count (1)	Correction (2)	# Delegates
Alameda	11,610	9.86	9		9
Butte	1,181	1.00	2	-1	1
Contra Costa	3,583	3.04	4	-1	3
El Dorado	826	0.70	1		1
Fresno	1,115	0.95	1		1
Humboldt	4,428	3.76	4		4
Lake	320	0.27	1		1
Los Angeles	22,001	18.68	18		18
Madera	164	0.14	1		1
Marin	3,466	2.94	3		3
Mendocino	2,111	1.79	2		2
Monterey	1,272	1.08	2	-1	1
Napa	675	0.57	1		1
Nevada	1,429	1.21	2	-1	1
Orange	5,095	4.33	5	-1	4
Placer	939	0.80	1		1
Riverside	1,717	1.46	2	-1	1
Sacramento	4,435	3.77	4		4
San Bernardino	1,977	1.68	2		2
San Diego	7,813	6.64	6		6
San Francisco	11,785	10.01	10	-1	9
San Joaquin	595	0.51	1		1
San Luis Obispo	1,842	1.56	2	-1	1
San Mateo	2,911	2.47	3	-1	2
Santa Barbara	3,070	2.61	3		3
Santa Clara	5,294	4.50	5	-1	4
Santa Cruz	5,615	4.77	5		5
Shasta	321	0.27	1		1
Sonoma	5,574	4.73	5		5
Stanislaus	523	0.44	1		1
Ventura	2,671	2.27	3	-1	2
Yolo	1,398	1.19	2	-1	1
TOTAL:	117,756	100.0	112		100

The above count is based on the registration report from the CA Secretary of State's office, as of September 8, 2000. Total Green Registrants: 121,595 (active plus inactive counties)

Any county becoming active before the meeting will be entitled to one delegate.

Delegate selection formula is in the Bylaws of the CA Green Party, Section 4-2.2, a)-f).

1) From Section c)...the total number of Green registrants in the active counties shall be added together. Each active county with 4.99% or less of the total shall be assigned one delegate, plus one additional delegate for each whole percentage number of the total achieved. Active counties with more than 4.99% shall be assigned a delegate for each whole percentage number of the total achieved.

2) From Section e) If after (c) above, more than 100 delegates have been assigned, then one delegate shall be removed from each county with more than one delegate, beginning with the county with the lowest fractional percentage, then the next lowest, and so on until only 100 delegates remain.

Proposed Agenda

Friday, Dec. 1

- 7:00 PM - 9:00 PM FPPC presentation to county treasurers
- 8:00 PM - 9:15 PM Coordinating Committee meeting
- 9:30 PM - 10:30 PM Instant Runoff Voting workshop (Caleb Kleppner, Electoral Reform WG)

Saturday, Dec. 2

- 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM Delegate Registration / Breakfast
- 8:30 AM - 8:45 AM Welcome / Opening Ceremony
- 8:45 AM - 9:15 AM New Delegate Orientation
(mandatory for first-time attendees, suggested for all others)
- 9:15 AM - 9:25 AM Housekeeping: Approval of agenda, minutes (see Appendix 1), facilitators, vibes watcher, timekeeper
- 9:25 AM - 9:35 AM Consent Calendar (see Appendix 2)
- 9:35 AM - 9:50 AM Update & Summary: Restructuring Plan Implementation.
(Coordinating Committee, Lucy Colvin, Appendix 3)
- 9:50 AM - 10:05 AM Treasurer Report
- 10:05 AM - 10:15 AM -- BREAK --
- 10:15 AM - 11:15 AM Presentation: Greens in 2000 elections
(Campaigns & Candidates WG, Orval Osborne)
- 11:15 AM - 12:25 PM [Decision] GPCA two-year work plan 2001-2002
(Coordinating Committee, Mike Feinstein, Appendix 4)
- 12:25 PM - 1:45 PM -- LUNCH BREAK -- Caucuses / Networking
- 1:00 PM - 1:40 PM -- PRESS CONFERENCE --
- 1:50 PM - 3:10 PM Working Groups / Committees (Session 1, Appendix 8)
- 3:15 PM - 3:20 PM Reconvene General Assembly
- 3:20 PM - 4:00 PM [Decision] Bylaw change - CC at-large elections (Bylaws & Electoral Reform WGs,
(Ric Newbery & Caleb Kleppner, Appendix 5)
- 4:00 PM - 5:00 PM [Decision] Green Party section of state election code
(Electoral Reform WG, Caleb Kleppner, Appendix 6)
- 5:00 PM - 6:00 PM [Decision] ASGP continuing affiliation
(Coordinating Committee, John Strawn, Appendix 7)
- 6:00 PM -- SESSION ENDS --
- 7:00 PM - 10:00 PM Dinner off-site (location to be announced).
Panel Presentations: Campaign 2000

Sunday, Dec. 3

- 8:00 AM - 9:30 AM Delegate Check-In / Breakfast
- 9:30 AM - 10:50 AM Working Groups / Committees (Session 2, Appendix 8)
- 10:50 AM - 11:00 AM -- BREAK --
- 11:00 AM - 12:20 PM Working Groups / Committees (Session 3, Appendix 8)
- 12:20 PM - 12:25 PM Reconvene General Assembly
- 12:25 PM - 1:25 PM Discussion: Electoral strategy for 2002
(Campaigns & Candidates, Orval Osborne)
- 1:25 PM - 1:35 PM Affirmation of Working Group coordinators
- 1:35 PM - 1:50 PM Plenary Wrap Up / Evaluation
- 1:50 PM - 2:00 PM Closing Ceremony
- 2:00 PM -- SESSION ENDS --
- 2:00 PM - 3:30 PM -- LUNCH -- Caucuses / Networking
- 2:30 PM - 3:00 PM -- PRESS CONFERENCE --

Appendix 1: Plenary Minutes (April 2000)

The draft minutes from the state plenary in April 2000 is available online at <http://www.sdgreens.org/plenary/minutes.html>

Appendix 4: Consent Calendar

Three items on the consent calendar:

- Clearinghouse interim budget proposal
- Bylaws amendment, CC at-large election threshold
- Energy Issues Resolution

IMPORTANT! There is no time budgeted to discuss consent calendar items. Questions and resolution of concerns should be attempted **BEFORE** the day of the meeting and submitted directly to the contact listed for the item.

Clearinghouse Interim Budget

CONTACT: Clearinghouse Committee, Jo Chamberlain, 650-726-1949, joc@pobox.com>

The Clearinghouse Committee proposes the following interim budget until the next plenary. At that time, a more detailed proposal addressing the long-term GPCA infrastructure needs of office space, staff, and equipment will be presented.

The Green Party of California is steadily growing in activity and visibility, particularly through this last campaign season. We have gained over 27,000 registered Green Party voters making a statewide total of over 138,000. The Clearinghouse workload and volume has increased. Keeping an infrastructure that supports our growth is important for the vitality of the party.

The GPCA agreed to rent 1/3 of the San Francisco local office during Project 2000. When funds were no longer available to pay this rent, our space was rented to the Medea for Senate Campaign. We are obliged by our lease agreement to assume this rent on 8 Nov 2000. We also now have the financial resources to do so.

This modest budget gets us back on track with an office and clerical help for the Clearinghouse. Since February 2000, the Clearinghouse duties have been performed by an all-volunteer staff. The volunteer staff can't continue to carry the entire load of the Clearinghouse. A part-time clerical person would take responsibility for answering phone calls, letters, email communications and, time permitting, maintaining the data base.

Expenditures:

	Monthly	Annual
Office rent	\$500	\$6,000
Part-time clerk	\$500	\$6,000
Supplies	\$200	\$2,400
Phone	\$100	\$1,200
Insurance		\$2,613
Sacramento PO Box		\$120
Total	\$1,300	\$18,333

This budget does not include equipment such as computers, monitors, desk and chair, etc; that will be part of a future budget.

GPCA Plenary: Bylaws: CC at-large election threshold

CONTACT: Caleb Kleppner, chair, Electoral Reform WG, 415-824-2735, calebk@fairvote.org

SUBJECT: Coordinating Committee at-large election vote threshold

PROPOSAL: Switch from use of Hare threshold $[1/n]$ to Droop threshold $[1/(n+1)]$ in paragraph 7-1.4 c) of the Coordinating Committee election bylaw.

BACKGROUND/JUSTIFICATION: Our current by-law has two conflicting provisions. This by-law change resolves that conflict, while retaining the use of use proportional representation to choose at-large state Coordinating Committee seats.

Our current by-laws allows delegates to vote for "no other candidate" (NOC), in addition to voting for a candidate or not casting a vote at all.

The conflict arises because on one hand, our by-laws require a candidate must reach the vote threshold, and do it ahead of NOC.

But at the same time, our by-laws also use Hare threshold $[1/n]$, which allows that the final seat can be (and is usually) filled with a candidate that does not reach the threshold.

These provisions -- requiring that all candidates reach the threshold and then using a system that doesn't require all candidates to reach the threshold -- conflict with each other.

The solution is to switch to the Droop threshold $[1/(n+1)]$, because with the Droop threshold, all seats can be filled with candidates who reach the threshold. That way we fill all the seats unless lots of people vote for NOC or allow their ballots to exhaust by not ranking 2nd and 3rd choice candidates.

If we had used the Droop threshold in the last two CC elections, the same people would have been elected because the final candidate would have reached the Droop threshold and been ahead of NOC in each case.

Energy Issues Resolution

CONTACT: Green Issues Working Group; Don Eichelberger, 415-861-0592, done@energy-net.org

A MODEST PROPOSAL CALLING UPON CALIFORNIA GREEN PARTY TO TAKE ACTION IN ENERGY DEREGULATION AND OIL POLICY

WHEREAS California State Green Party's energy platform builds from a base stressing conservation, efficiency and using renewable energy resources; and

WHEREAS California State Green Party platform went on record in 1998 as opposing the Energy Deregulation Act, AB 1890, as a giveaway to the Investor Owned Utilities; and

WHEREAS the deregulated electric energy market in San Diego has provided a preview of the greed and potential for fraud evident in a deregulated energy market limited only be maximization of profits in a "supply and demand" paradigm; and

WHEREAS Consumption patterns in America of non-renewable resources for energy and raw materials to produce consumer goods promotes an unsustainable economic model, unresponsive to the survival needs of the present generation, let alone the next seven, as advocated by Green Party Vice-presidential candidate, Winona LaDuke;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the California State Green Party body of the whole affirms its commitment to work with all diligence, utilizing all legal and political resources at out disposal to oppose the continuing commodification of electric and petroleum energy, including, but not limited to:

Supporting a Renewables Portfolio Standard, such that a percentage of all energy dollars is mandated to go in to research and development of renewable energy;

Supporting increased California Auto Fuel Efficiency (CAFÉ) standards, to discourage gas guzzling autos;

Working to lower barriers to forming a municipal utility district;

Working to allow cities to become “default aggregators”, and allow them to purchase power for their cities in bulk at large user rates;

Supporting maintaining a cap on utility corporation profits from energy sales; and

Supporting the civil rights and anti-trust complaint lodged on behalf of the people of the State of California against electric energy gougers by Michael Boyd.

Appendix 3: Restructuring Plan Update

Green Party Members Needed to Participate In Working Groups and Standing Committees:

Contact: Lucy Colvin, lucycolvin@juno.com, 415-242-7919

Last April the GPCA Plenary in Berkeley passed a Restructuring Proposal to enable the GPCA structure to reflect the focus and priorities of our work and to invigorate and build our Party. The San Diego Plenary will be our first Plenary since Restructuring was passed. A goal of restructuring is to have thriving ongoing participation by Green Party membership in Working Groups and Standing Committees. The Working Groups and Standing Committees are vital to developing and implementing the GPCA priorities, goals and 2-year Workplan. They meet at plenaries, on-line and occasionally in teleconference.

The GPCA now has 4 Working Groups and 5 Standing Committees. Standing Committees focus on internal Party business while the Working Groups are more externally focused. Standing Committees are small (5-7 members) with a consistent membership appointed by the CC for 2 year staggered terms. Working Group membership is open to all Green Party members. A voting member will have attended one Working Group session.

Recruitment for the Standing Committees will take place in the following way. Appointments will be made based on county input and Green Party individual members desire to serve. The main criteria is that the person has attended State Plenaries for at least a year and has knowledge of the California State Green Party by-laws and operating procedures. Standing Committee meetings at the San Diego plenary will be open to all Green Party members who may be interested in serving on a particular committee. CC members serving as co-coordinators of each committee will make recommendations to the CC based on the above criteria from those who indicate a desire to serve.

The Working Groups are: Voter Registration and Outreach, Green Issues, Electoral Reform, and Campaigns and Candidates. Each of Working Group has a CC liaison and a 2 co-coordinators. The Standing Committees are: Platform, Bylaws, Finance, Clearinghouse, and International Protocol. Each Standing Committee has a CC member as a co-coordinator with another member of the WG as the other co-coordinator. Below is a description of each group.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Bylaws: Purpose: To be the official conduit for changes to the GPCA Bylaws for the plenary body to vote on. To formulate and prepare and to work in conjunction with other SCs and WGs to formulate and prepare any Bylaw changes to the GPCA Bylaws to be voted on by the plenary body so that any changes are in concordance with the languaging and the content of the GPCA Bylaws; to provide the official interpretation of the Bylaws for the GPCA; and to provide the official delegate count for each plenary to be sent with the plenary packet.

Finance: Purpose: To work with the GPCA treasurer to oversee the financial operations of the GPCA as the yearly GPCA Goals and Strategies plan defines them to be. This includes working with the treasurer to: collect county dues to the GPCA and any other monies allocated to the GPCA; ensure the allocating and disbursing of funds to WGs, SCs, and the CC per their yearly workplans; provide quarterly financial reports to the CC; provide an annual budget report to the plenary; to provide any official reporting required by the State of California; and to be the official conduit for fundraising done by and for the GPCA.

Platform: Purpose: Responsible to keep the official platform for the GPCA and ensure that copies are available for distribution; To identify issues not in the platform and to suggest and formulate platform planks with substantial input from appropriate experts in the field; to provide the final language for any additions and changes to the platform that will be submitted to the plenary; advise the CC and the Media Spokespersons on taking positions on any issue or initiative relative to the state platform.

International Protocol: Purpose: To network with and handle the administration and hosting of international Greens.

Clearinghouse: Purpose: Responsible for archiving all GPCA documents, maintaining database, website, returning communications received by phone, email, and postal mail. In addition to appointed members and CC Co-coordinator, membership on this committee would include the Liaison to Secretary of State. Appointed members would include a web master.

WORKING GROUPS

Voter Registration & Outreach/Organizing Locals: Purpose: To facilitate coordination of locals into statewide efforts to register Green Party voters and do public outreach through tabling; provide training for county locals in tabling; to be a resource for organization of locals; maintain and develop key literature piece for tabling efforts; maintain list of registered Green Party voters statewide; publish a statewide GPCA newsletter; engage in direct mailings statewide to Green Party membership for purposes of fundraising and membership outreach.

Campaigns and Candidates: Purpose: To educate Green Party members about our electoral strategy with an emphasis on local initiatives that open up the system and local candidates who can win; to identify key political campaigns in which Green Party activists can play a pivotal role; to educate Greens about the importance of running credible candidates in strategically chosen races and avoiding poor candidates and unconstructive races; where appropriate, to identify registered Greens who would make credible candidates; to promote regional strategies for winning campaigns so that Greens avoid spreading resources too thinly; to train Green Party activists in methods of waging political campaigns either for candidates or for issues; and to raise money for Green Party campaigns.

Electoral Reform: Purpose: to educate Green Party members, the public and the media about electoral reforms that will open up the political system, including Proportional Representation, Instant Runoff Voting, and public financing of elections; to identify strategies for enacting these reforms such as promoting the use of Proportional Representation for County Council elections; to encourage Greens to initiate or support successful local campaigns for electoral reform; and to advise GPCA of internal party voting mechanisms and electoral policy

Green Issues: Purpose: To identify current issues and events for which the GPCA or its platform has no position; to sponsor debate of issues that may impact the platform; to sponsor resolutions on current issues to be passed by the GPCA plenary body; when appropriate, to interface with the Platform Standing Committee and with candidates whom are running for office as Green Party members; and where appropriate, to build coalitions with other organizations.

Appendix 4: Two-Year Work Plan

GPCA DRAFT TIMELINE 2000-2002

Followed by a discussion of some of the tasks the party needs to accomplish during this period.

Note: This is a working document current as of the creation of this agenda packet. Check the workplan web site for the most current version (<http://www.feinstein.org/greenparty/gpcatwoyearplan.html>)

October/November, 2000

- Green Candidate Registration Status/Preparation for Partisan races in 2002
To run in a partisan race in the 11/02 election, one must run in the 3/02 primary. To run in the 3/02 primary, one must be registered Green, either Registered Green by 12/01 (this year), or Register Decline to state by 12/01, and then change to Green by 9/01/01. This means that for the Green Party to expand its possibilities for viable candidates in 2002, potential candidates who might not yet be Green need to be notified that they should change now. This information should go out as soon as possible, including by locals to people they think they might want to recruit.

October 17th, 2000

- Agenda pack for November state meeting goes out (latest day for pack to go out and meeting 45-day advance noticing requirement).

November 7th, 2000

- Municipal, state and national elections.
Locals and candidates are asked to send their results for local candidates to ereturns@greens.org, as they come in. Results will be tabulated on <http://www.greens.org> for the entire country. Locals and candidates are also asked to send campaign reports/analysis to ereturns@greens.org. These reports will form the basis for reports for state and national Green Party newsletters and web coverage.

December 1st-3rd, 2000

- State meeting, San Diego, December 1st-3rd
Machinists Hall, 5150 Kearney Mesa Rd., San Diego, CA 92111

Decision-making items

- 1) ASGP affiliation; ASGP/GPUSA agreement
- 2) By-law change on CC election
- 3) ERWG on state party rules/state legislature
- 4) GPCA two-year work plan 2001-2002

Discussion items

- 1) Report on 2000 elections report and analysis from candidates and others involved in 2000 elections
- 2) Discussion of process towards 2002 statewide elections
- 3) Implementation of Restructuring Plan (Lucy Colvin, Restructuring WG)

Working Group/Standing Committee time

Press Conference on Greens in November election and looking ahead
New Delegate Orientation

January, 2001

- State Coordinating Committee meeting, face-to-face

March/April 2001

- Municipal elections in March and April

May 2001

- State meeting, Sacramento
(potential timing conflict for April - Global Green meeting in Australia, April 14th-16th
<http://www.global.greens.org.au/>, and LA City Council election April 10th)

Decision-making items

- 1) Treasurer: State party budget
- 2) Coordinating Committee: Coordinating Committee at-large election (three seats)
- 3) By-Laws - Implementing language for the RWG changes approved in Berkeley.
- 4) Platform: Platform amendments (possible)
- 5) Electoral Reform: Strategy on state laws (possible follow up from December)
- 6) Coordinating Committee: Language to remove CC member or officers for cause

Discussion items

- 1) Campaigns & Candidates: Discussion of 2002 statewide elections
- 2) By-laws - Discussion of 80% voting threshold (possible)

Working Group/Standing Committee time

Possible Press Conference on issues of the day and looking to 2002

New Delegate Orientation

September-November, 2001

- State meeting, San Mateo

Decision-making items

- 1) Coordinating Committee: Position-taking on initiatives for March, 2002 ballot
- 2) Platform: Platform amendments (possible)
- 3) By-laws: Proposal regarding of 80% voting threshold (possible)
- 4) GPCA two-year work plan 2002-2003
- 5) Coordinating Committee: Coordinating Committee at-large election
(three seats for terms ending in November)

Discussion items

- 1) Campaigns & Candidates: Presentation of recommendations for 2002 statewide elections
(it is possible that there will be formal decisions to be made with this item, but it is also possible that there will only be discussion).
- 2) FPPC seminar

Working Group/Standing Committee time

Possible Press Conference on issues of the day and looking to 2002

New Delegate Orientation

January, 2002

- State Coordinating Committee meeting, face-to-face

Spring, 2002

- State meeting (after March primary, likely in April/May)

Decision-making items

- 1) Coordinating Committee: Position-taking on initiatives for November, 2002 ballot

Discussion items

- 1) Campaigns & Candidates: Report on 2002 elections report and analysis from candidates and others involved in 2002 elections

Working Group/Standing Committee time

Possible Press Conference on issues of the day and looking to 2002

New Delegate Orientation

Fall, 2002

- Polling of counties

Decision-making items

- 1) Coordinating Committee: Position-taking on initiatives for November, 2002 ballot (for any that were not addressed at Spring 2002 meeting).

GPCA state platform update

After the 11/00 election, the GPCA will surely be out of printed platforms. This makes it a good time to update the platform early, so it doesn't all have to happen at the last minute. In addition to the normal plank-by-plank work, a group should go through the platform looking things like 'what is no longer timely and should be changed/eliminated'. There should also be a discussion about whether we give a contact information, publicize our web site, offer a newsletter, solicit donations, etc. I would like to see a well-done presentation of our electoral history, including our successes.

Statewide Candidates for 2002

The final recommendation regarding statewide candidates should occur before the filing dates in November/December, 2001. This suggests the San Mateo plenary.

March/April 2002 municipal and county elections statewide

- what process do we have to seek out Green candidates for these races?
- what process do we have to aid Green candidates in these races?

November 2002 municipal, county, state and congressional elections?

- what process do we have to seek out Green candidates for these races?
- what process do we have to aid Green candidates in these races?

Goals of Electoral Reform WG

- Continue efforts on PR for county council.
- Continue educating Green Party members by using PR for elections at state plenaries.
- Encourage regional cooperation among locals on local campaigns for electoral reform. If the entire Bay Area, for example, selected a single local initiative on electoral reform, several counties could pool their resources and volunteers, score a victory and show the public that the Green Party can effect real change.
- Try to find a state legislator willing to introduce legislation to create a Green Party section of the elections code.

Statewide Candidates for 2002

In Berkeley, the Campaigns & Candidates WG set up an ad-hoc committee for looking at the state Green Party in the 2002 elections. The ad-hoc group must first come up with a process for going about this. The process will likely contain an analysis of:

- who are the likely candidates from the other parties
- what are the strengths and weaknesses of Green participation in any/all of the statewide constitutional races
- what sort of representation (geographic, gender, ethnic, racial, etc.) should the state ticket contain
- who are currently likely Green candidates
- who are candidates that Greens in the counties would recommend be approached
- who should be approached among this list and who shouldn't
- what is the message to communicate to potential candidates/who will do it

The GPCA went through such a process, based on a decision taken at the state meeting immediately after the 1992 election (Monterrey, 11/92). The G&SWG met together with C&CWG. They made recommendations at the Santa Barbara (7/93) and San Francisco (1/94) plenaries. We should anticipate that such a process should take some plenary time at each of the next three plenaries, leading up to the filing date in 11/00 for running in the 3/01 primaries.

Appendix 5: Bylaw change - CC at-large elections

Proposed Bylaw change, CC at-large elections

Subject: Number of At-Large Coordinating Committee members elected at a time. Other modifications to the way At-Large CC members are chosen

Proposal Summary:

- Elect three CC members at a time.
- Require CC candidates to submit applications in advance of state meetings at which they will be chosen. Only candidates that submit application in advance of state meetings will be considered.
- Require that a full explanation of the CC voting procedure be included in writing in each delegate pack, and given orally to the plenary before the delegates vote. Ensure that the "no other candidate"
- (NOC) option is explained clearly.
- Change the CC terms from 18 months to two years. (New addition: Change ALL CC terms, including regional reps, to two years)

Background/Rationale

- Elect three at-large CC members at a time.

There is currently no coordination of the phasing of the terms of at-large state Coordinating Committee members. The result is that we elect a different number of CC seats each time. This variability means the threshold needed to win a seat changes from election to election. This means there is no continuity for the level of support one needs to be elected to the CC. This is inconsistent with the GPCA's commitment to proportional representation.

By electing three CC members at a time, we ensure that all six at-large CC members are elected with a basic level of support.

In combination with the introduction of two-year terms, we can stagger the terms of the six at-large members (three and three) and also have this coordinate with the two year election cycles of the state party.

- Require CC candidates to submit applications in advance of state meetings at which they will be chosen.

This change is to ensure that the CC at-large choice is a more informed one, both for delegates at state meetings and for people back home that they represent.

Even though the CC is the executive body for the state party, there is little background offered on at-large CC candidates that declare in advance, and of course no advance information on those that come from the floor.

There is also little compulsion for any CC candidate to explain how he/she fulfill the diversity mandate for at-large seats as is stated in the by-laws.

Delegates hear only short statements from CC candidates, then a quick question and answer. For some delegates, this may be all they know about a CC candidate. Along with this, there is no overall analysis of what are the outstanding diversity needs given the current CC, so that we can complement what we have.

Because CC candidates sometimes announce literally right from the floor, Greens back home in the locals are also completely disempowered, as they can't know whom their delegates will even consider for CC election. This is in a party committed to an accountable and transparent electoral process.

Furthermore, because CC candidates are not required to submit an application in advance, there is little pre-work to develop CC candidates - unless that "development" is shepherded by the few party regulars who are often involved in everything. The process for CC candidate development should be broader than that, to ensure that our process is inclusive, and develops the best field of potential CC candidates to choose from.

Having a CC candidate statement sent to the locals two months in advance should not be a problem, because CC elections can be regularly scheduled and appear as part of our annual two-year plan process. Currently most people don't even know there is a CC election until they get their delegate pack a few weeks before a state meeting. Because people will now know when the CC elections will occur, we will have a broader base of talent to draw from.

- Require that a full explanation of the voting procedure is given in writing in each delegate pack, and orally before the delegates vote. Ensure that the NOC option is explained clearly, and that delegates should take this choice seriously and do not have to fill all seats unless they feel there are enough qualified candidates to fill them.

People do not understand the voting process and need to be reminded of it before they vote, otherwise it is pointless for us to use to use our voting procedure.

- Transition plan: This plan will go into effect with the election of three new CC members at the spring, 2001 state meeting in Sacramento.

Appendix 6: Green Party section of state election code

Proposal to create a Green Party section of the state elections code

PRESENTER: Electoral Reform Working Group

CONTACT: Caleb Kleppner, 415-824-2735, calebk@fairvote.org

SUBJECT: Creation of a Green Party section of the state elections code

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND: When the Party gained ballot status in 1992, there was no legislation that controlled Green Party elections (primaries and county council elections). The state required us to adopt bylaws from one of the existing parties, so we chose Peace and Freedom's. We made some changes to these bylaws and actually went to court to establish the principle that our bylaws, and not state law, control our elections. This litigation allowed us to use None of the Above (NOTA) in our gubernatorial primary in 1994.

Unfortunately, the state later appealed this decision, and although the courts upheld the principle that our bylaws control our elections, the courts ruled that the burden on registrars of using NOTA was too great, which allowed them to disregard our bylaws.

We later adopted a bylaw that gives county Green Parties the option of using proportional representation to elect their county councils, and several counties attempted to implement this provision. In all cases, registrars refused, claiming that there were no provisions to do this.

This is why we need to create state law that clarifies the party's right to control our elections and explicitly legislates our right to use choice voting for county council, NOTA in primaries and any other provisions the party judge to be important for our functioning.

PROPOSAL: To select provisions for inclusion in legislation to create a Green Party section of the state elections code and to seek a member of the legislature to introduce and attempt to pass the legislation. Potential provisions to consider:

1. Allow counties to use choice voting to elect county councils.
2. Give GPCA option of using instant runoff voting (IRV) and None of the Above (NOTA) in primary elections (as long as primary remains closed).
3. Put the burden of proof on county registrars who claim that complying with our election code section would be too burdensome (this is the point we lost NOTA on - too much burden). It could work like this: if a registrar certifies in writing that the cost of compliance exceeds a particular amount - such as \$1 per registered voter or the per voter cost of the Democratic or Republican primary - then the registrar shall work in good faith to achieve the goals of the party by using alternative or provisional means. Such provisional approaches could include but are not limited to: allowing Greens or election workers to count ballots by hand, delaying counting of Green party ballots until after all other election results have been certified, and so forth.
4. Give GPCA option of conducting presidential nomination by party convention OR primary election.
5. Give GPCA option to nominate other races by convention rather than primary. Races to consider are state and federal races.
6. Allow voters registered "Decline-to-State" to vote in Green primaries.

7. Require all candidates for county council to appear on the ballot. Under current practices, if a race for county council is not contested, the registrar is not obligated to place the candidates on the ballot. This would repeal the "sufficiency" clause, which says that if there are not more candidates for county council than seats, the registrar is not obligated to place the candidates on the ballot.
8. Change signature requirements for running for office. Current requirements for county council are a minimum of 20 signatures. For statewide races, there are requirements for geographic distribution of signatures.
9. Adopt provisions to protect the party against "raiding" by outside forces working against Green values, especially if we receive federal matching funds. Remember the Reform Party.
10. Any other provisions that the plenary deems important???

Considerations:

1. **PASSING THE BILL:** It's clear that the legislature may not pass the bill if we get it introduced even though there is the tradition of passing party rules. However, in practical terms, we don't have better options. Currently, registrars are violating our bylaws and the case law that upholds our right to control our elections through our bylaws. At this point, we can either appeal the most recent court decision on our use of NOTA or we can attempt to pass legislation. Litigation would be expensive and might not succeed. Legislation would be inexpensive and might succeed. If it doesn't, we can still resort to litigation if it ever seems promising or necessary.
2. **HOW MUCH DETAIL:** There is a real question about how much detail we want in the state law. It would be nice to have a very simple bill saying something like, "The bylaws of the Green Party of California control Green Party elections." This would probably be too open-ended for the legislature to pass. On the other hand, if we lay every aspect of our elections in state law, then we have to go back to the state legislature if we decide to change our state bylaws. We need a balance.
3. **AVOIDING BEING "RAIDED":** If we receive matching funds, we should quickly work on building safeguards to avoid being "raided."
4. **LOGISTICS FOR MOVING FORWARD:** Once the plenary reaches consensus on the desired provisions for a Green Party section of the elections code, the plenary could authorize the Coordinating Committee to translate the will of the plenary into a specific legislative proposal, which would be conveyed to Legislative Counsel by the member of the legislature who agrees to introduce the legislation.
5. **CONSIDERATION AT PLENARY:** The facilitators may wish to gauge via a straw poll support for the overall concept. If support exists, we can then assess support for individual provisions. For a provision that does not enjoy strong support, we will attempt to address concerns about the specific provision or drop the provision. With luck, this will leave us with some provisions with strong support, others that need additional committee work, and others to be dropped from further consideration.

TIME LINE: Upon reaching consensus on the desired contents of the Green Party section of the election code, the CC and/or ERWG could oversee efforts to find a member of the legislature to introduce this legislation. We will then submit our desired contents of the bill to the state Legislative Counsel, who will draft appropriate statutory language. If the legislation is introduced by mid-February, it could be passed in 2001. Perhaps more likely, we would strive for passage in 2002 with implementation in the 2004 primary.

RESOURCES: If the plenary adopts the proposal, the plenary will not have to spend additional time on it, and the state party will not expend money on the project. Members of the CC and the ERWG will need to work to

find a sponsor, submit a specific legislature proposal to the Legislative Counsel and shepherd the bill through the legislature. By convention, the legislature defers to members who wish to introduce legislation changing party rules, so there is a reasonable chance that the bill will pass. In addition, the Secretary of State's office will likely be supportive, since there are no guidelines under current law for certain aspects of Green Party election. Creating this section of state law will make the Secretary of State's job easier. Of course, there are no guarantees the legislature will pass the bill, but if the bill is not passed, we strengthen our legal argument that our state bylaws control our election.

Appendix 7: ASGP continuing affiliation

PRESENTER: The Coordinating Committee of the Green Party of California

CONTACT:

Lucy Colvin, Co-Chair lucycolvin@juno.com

Michael Bornstein, Co-Chair thebor@jps.net

John C. Strawn, jcs@west.net

Jo Chamberlain, joc@pobox.com

SUBJECT: Continued Affiliation of the Green Party of California (GPCA) with the Association of State Green Parties (ASGP)

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE: During its November 1998 plenary at Santa Cruz, the GPCA chose to affiliate with the ASGP. The affiliation was for a period of two years, to be re-visited at the GPCA plenary which followed the 7 Nov 2000 election. It is with this history that we propose to continue the affiliation. There have been many developments in national green politics during that period of time. Since the ASGP National Presidential Convention in Denver, ballot access has been granted to Green Parties in 45 states. This growth is a result of an ASGP that is increasingly well organized, as well as a strong national campaign by our presidential candidate. That presidential campaign will end on 7 Nov 2000 but Green Party activity will go on.

GPCA is the largest Green Party in the United States. Many state Green Parties are looking to GPCA for leadership in helping to facilitate the formation of a reconciled and unified national Green Party, and now is the time for us to accept that leadership role. Our continued affiliation with ASGP will help all the state Green Parties become strong active members of a single national party.

PROPOSAL: That the GPCA agree in San Diego at its Plenary of 2-3 Dec 2000 to continue its affiliation with ASGP. The affiliation will continue until the transformation of ASGP to a unified national Green Party, at which time this affiliation will transfer to the newly constituted organization or until GPCA sees fit to discontinue its affiliation, whichever occurs first.

The formation of a single, unified national Green Party can become a reality with GPCA's support of the principles encompassed within the Boston joint proposal, resulting from negotiations instigated at the Denver 2000 convention for the formation of a single national Green Party. That agreement is contained as a reference at the end of this proposal.

A national Green Party will give our Green values a national presence with a major impact on national politics. This year's campaign and voter registration and state ballot access drives have shown us that the people of California and the US are ready for a strong, well organized national Green Party.

Continued affiliation with ASGP as a federation of sovereign states Green Parties and our support of the principles of the Boston proposal will not directly affect our GPCA bylaws or platform. The national platform agreed to in Denver will continue to be developed and can best be done so with our focused involvement. The

GPCA will maintain its autonomy: bylaws, platform and policy statements. The GPCA will further its involvement in the ASGP at the committee level further insuring our beliefs and process have weight on the national Green Party stage. We will do what is best for the party and what helps to grow the party.

REGARDING REPRESENTATIVES:

Currently the ASGP operates with two representatives from each state. Each representative has one vote. A Transitional Committee is presently studying representative models which are more proportional and would better satisfy the belief of most state Green Parties, including GPCA, in systems of proportional representation. California Greens are participating on that committee.

Until the completion of that work and its subsequent acceptance, GPCA shall add two active alternates to its present two-person representation. The alternate ASGP representatives will be confirmed at the plenary and with the exception of regular voting, will serve in the same capacity as the primary representatives. If and when a primary representative cannot participate in full or cannot attend a given ASGP meeting or vote, their ability vote shall transfer to an alternate. It shall be incumbent upon both primary and alternate representatives to maintain close communication and cooperation with one another.

A representative may not serve more than two consecutive terms without a one-term break. Vacancies may be filled by the CC until the following plenary.

Candidates for the position of ASGP representative and alternate representative must submit their applications to the GPCA Plenary Committee for inclusion in the Agenda Packet for the next Plenary which follows the positions vacancy. Nominations for ASGP representative positions will not be accepted from the Plenary floor.

TIME LINE: The proposal is to take effect immediately upon passing and will be considered a continuance of the Santa Cruz plenary decision of November 1998 decision to join ASGP.

RESOURCES: As required, to include personnel, number of meetings, frequency of meetings, projected work hours, finances etc.

REFERENCES: The joint statement of ASGP and GPUSA, referred to as the "Boston Joint Proposal", follows as a reference:

BOSTON JOINT PROPOSAL

Per the directive of the Massachusetts proposal passed at the Association of State Green Parties Coordinating Committee meeting held in Denver, CO, June 23, 2000, negotiating teams from the Association of State Green Parties and the Greens/Green Party, USA met in Boston, MA, October 1-2, 2000, to discuss issues related to the establishment of a national Green Party. Substantive progress was made, resulting in the co-signing of a document of proposals to be considered respectively by the constituents of both of the current national Green organizations. The negotiating teams will be enthusiastically recommending adoption of their proposals.

JOINT PROPOSAL OF NEGOTIATING COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION OF STATE GREEN PARTIES AND THE GREENS/GREEN PARTY USA

The Negotiating Committees of the Association of State Green Parties and the Greens/Green Party USA, meeting on October 1 -2, 2000, have agreed unanimously to recommend to their respective organizations the following proposal for the creation of a new national Green Party, to be called "Green Party of the United States," and a National Committee of the Green Party, which will apply to the Federal Election Commission for official recognition as a national political party.

1. The Greens/Green Party USA may continue as an independent organization but will cease functioning as a political party and will adopt a new name that will omit the word, "party." It will relinquish the domain name, "www.greenparty.org" to the new party.
2. The Green Party shall leave the question of state dues entirely to the state parties and shall neither encourage state parties to collect dues nor discourage state parties from collecting dues.
3. The new Green Party shall have a paid "sustaining members" category of membership and shall encourage members of all state parties to become sustaining members of the national organization.
4. State parties in the new Green Party shall have written democratic by-laws and at least one convention a year (whether it be a general membership assembly or a delegate assembly elected by locals and members-at-large).
5. State Green Parties shall make a good faith effort, where reasonable, to have delegates to the National Committee elected by clusters of local groups. The basis of representation to the National Committee shall be one person, one vote, and in the United States, Congressional Districts are a reasonable approximation of equal population areas. Local groups within a Congressional District or Districts shall come together for the purpose of electing delegates. (Statement of intent: The exact number of delegates and the size of the areas to be used for selecting these delegates is currently under study and will be determined by the ASGP.)
6. Representation to the National Committee shall be based on the principle of one delegate per specified number of Congressional Districts, provided that there is a requisite level of Green Party activity, electoral and/or non-electoral, being conducted in those Congressional Districts.
7. The Accreditation Criteria of the Green Party National Committee shall include the following in addition to the criteria currently used by the ASGP:
 - a. Evidence of commitment to, and good faith efforts to achieve, gender balance in party leadership and representation.
 - b. Evidence of good faith efforts to empower individuals and groups from oppressed communities, through, for example, leadership responsibilities, identity caucuses and alliances with community-based organizations, and endorsements of issues and policies.
8. The Green Party National Committee shall reserve seats for representatives of nationally organized caucuses for traditionally disempowered groups, provided that each caucus shall demonstrate a total membership of at least 100 people, from at least 15 member states, use democratic procedures and choose to send representatives to the National Committee.
9. The G/GPUSA Negotiating Committee recommends to the affiliates of G/GPUSA that a mail referendum of the Green Congress be initiated. The referendum shall ask the Congress to authorize the G/GPUSA National Committee to certify whether the ASGP, at its December 2000 meeting, amends its bylaws to reflect the terms of this joint proposal. The mail referendum will also authorize the G/GPUSA National Committee to ;(a) adopt a new name that will omit the word "party"; (b) relinquish the domain name "www.greenparty.org" to the new party; and (c) support the request of the ASGP for an advisory opinion on the national committee status of the new party, provided that it does in fact certify that the ASGP has amended its bylaws in accordance with this proposal.

For the Association of State Green Parties:

Anne Goeke, Stephen Herrick, Tom Sevigny, Greg Gerritt, Robert Franklin, Tony Affigne, David Cobb

For the Greens/Green Party USA:

Richard J. Whitney, Starlene Rankin, Julia Willebrand, Jeff Sutter, John Stith, Steve Welzer

ASGP Representatives

The GPCA Coordinating Committee has forwarded four candidates for affirmation by the General Assembly.

Two candidates for the two ASGP Rep positions and two candidates to act as alternates for same. The candidates are Jo Chamberlain and John C. Strawn. Alternates: Beth Moore Haines and Mike Wyman. Candidate statements follow.

Candidate Statement : Jo Chamberlain

I am a candidate to be one of GPCA's representatives to the ASGP. I have the support of my family and friends, as well as my local, the Green Party of San Mateo County.

I intend to work for the formation of a strong national Green Party.

I will commit the time and financial resources required to do the job.

I am the tabling coordinator for the San Mateo County Green Party and an active tabler myself. I served as an appointed member of my County Council and have been elected to a second term, which I am now serving.

With the support of my local, I was elected a GPCA At-Large Representative at the Santa Barbara Plenary in August 1999, and have participated in the GPCA Clearinghouse, Project 2000 wrap-up, Fundraising Ad Hoc Working Group, Budget Committee, ASGP Proposal Working Group for the San Diego plenary, and the FEC Budget Working Group for the 2000 campaign. I have actively participated in every Plenary Meeting and Gathering since November 1998.

During the November 2000 campaign, in addition to Party activities, I was a delegate to the national nominating convention and was an active volunteer worker for the Nader campaign, routing and organizing campaign volunteers.

My commitment extends from budget committees to tabling to protest in the streets of Seattle. Please give me your support.

Jo Chamberlain
501 Lucy Lane, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
650.726.1949, fax 726.5097
joc@pobox.com

Candidate Statement : John C. Strawn

It has been my honor and privilege to serve as a representative of the Green Party of California (GPCA) to the Association of State Green Parties (ASGP) since being appointed to the position at the GPCA plenary in Santa Cruz, November 1998.

Since that time we have witnessed the growth of Green Party movements around the country and have seen the ASGP grow commensurately to 28 affiliated states with others waiting to be ratified. California Greens who attended the Green Party Presidential Nominating Convention in Denver were witness to the maturation of Green Politics in this country and the ability of ASGP to convene a serious and well-respected conference. With the largest delegation in Denver, the GPCA was looked to for its leadership. It was my pleasure to help our delegation keep events moving forward and on schedule. It was important that we dealt with those issues placed

before us and demonstrated our state party's democratic leadership potential by conceding to another day, some of our wants and desires. We were in fact, the proverbial "800-pound gorilla."

I believe I have served well in this capacity as a representative. I have tried to convey to the ASGP what I felt to be the larger interests of GPCA. I have not always agreed with every member from other states but have always tried to build consensus while holding firm to the far-flung beliefs of our state party. We are a group of diverse opinions. I feel my role as a member of the Santa Barbara Green Party County Council and as a member of the Coordinating Committee of the GPCA as well as other duties, work to keep me informed and in touch with Green Party activities at most levels.

I ask that the plenary affirm me for a final 2-year term as a member of the GPCA representation team to the ASGP. I will work diligently for a representative model in the ASGP that reflects not only our state party, but also all state parties and caucuses in a proportional manner. A model, which may be used in the formation of a reconciled national Green Party, something I support strongly but know must be approached carefully.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns you may have.

With Best Green Regards,

John C. Strawn
Jcs@west.net
(805) 682-4050

Candidate Statement : Beth Moore Haines

October 20, 2000

Dear GPCA Members,

I am thrilled with the growth this little party has made in the move toward political maturity these past ten years. The next few years will be a crucial time for our organizing work and building coalitions locally, statewide, and around the planet. Our active participation in the Association of State Green Parties (ASGP) is critical to building a strong national Green Party. It is my hope that we continue to encourage strong, consistent GPCA members as representatives to the ASGP.

I am interested in serving the GPCA as an alternate representative to the (ASGP). Following is a little about me...

June, '90- Started working with my local Greens in Nevada County.

'91-'92 Active in tabling, radio, media, events to establish GPCA ballot status.

'92-'94 Active with the local, regional and state GPCA.

July, '94 - Coordinated state plenary in Nevada City

'94-'98 - Hiatus from the GP to rediscover my children, finish my degree, and turn in my recycling (Confucius says you have to get home in order, first).

Sept, '98 -Joined the Nevada County Council. Began airing and hosting GreenTV weekly on local cable TV.

April, '00- In Berkeley, joined the Grass Roots Organizing Working Group (GROW); joined the GPCA Coordinating Committee as at-large member (and have been in every monthly cc conference call since).

June, '00 - Attended the ASGP nominating convention in Denver as a GPCA delegate. Co-coordinated floor votes of the 63 GPCA delegates with John Strawn.

June, '00-present - Co-coordinated Nader/Green campaign activities in Nevada County.

Miscellaneous:

Mother of Forrest, 14, and Laurel, 12.

Wife of Terry, a Republican for 30 years until 10/14/00, now a Green(!).

Teacher of students with Learning Disabilities and behavioral needs.

Owner/operator of a '94 Harley 883 Sportster (motorcycle)

Singer for 8 years now in "Real George", a 12-piece hot swinging R&B horn band.

Gemini, artist, reformed juvenile delinquent, cook and sew (but not a lot), oldest of four, a little hyper, but basically ok.

My house isn't usually very neat, but I get a lot done.

Beth Moore Haines

Member, Nevada County Green Party County Council;

GPCA Coordinating Committee

Candidate Statement : Mike Wyman

Dear Fellow Greens,

Among the decisions we will be making at this plenary is choosing two representatives to the Association of State Green Parties (ASGP).

We will also be choosing two alternates. I am a candidate for an alternate representative to the ASGP.

In the year 2001 the ASGP, and indirectly, the GPCA, will be involved in what we all hope will be a successful attempt to create a unified national green party.

If re-elected this spring as Treasurer of the Green Party of California, I expect to be carrying on extensive interaction with the ASGP during this process of unification, coordinating with them in matters of fundraising, budgeting, finance and recognition by the Federal Election Commission.

To a certain extent this process has already begun. I have already been involved with the ASGP treasurer's office in fundraising matters and with the Federal Election Commission (FEC) in our efforts to obtain recognition as a state party. Both of these efforts will continue in parallel fashion with the efforts of the ASGP/National Green Party.

As an alternate to the ASGP I would be in a more effective position to carry out duties that I will already be involved in as treasurer. It would also enable me to provide, in an official way, some back-up for the two people we will be electing to represent us during a period in which there will be a much greater demand on their time and energies than usual.

Normally, as Treasurer, I would hesitate to take on additional responsibilities. However, the work I would be doing with the ASGP largely consists of work I would be involved with as GPCA treasurer anyway. Accordingly, I believe I could fulfill the duties of an alternate with only a minimal impact on my present duties.

I have high hopes that we will be successful in our efforts to create a viable national green party in the next 6-12 months. I would be proud to be a part of this historic effort as an alternate from California and would appreciate your support.

Michael S. Wyman

248 Via La Cumbre, Greenbrae, CA 94904

415-461-6268, native@slip.net

Appendix 8: Working Groups / Committees

Working Groups & Standing Committees will be meeting during three different sessions.

Session 1: (Saturday, 1:50pm - 3:10pm)
Campaigns & Candidates (Orval Osborne)
Platform (Greg Jan/Bud Dickinson)
Outreach/Voter Reg (Jo Chamberlain)

Session 2: (Sunday, 9:30am - 10:50am)
Green Issues (Don Eichelberger)
Clearinghouse (Jo Chamberlain)
International Protocol (Mike Feinstein)

Session 3: (Sunday, 11:00am - 12:20pm)
Electoral Reform (Caleb Kleppner)
Bylaws (Ric Newbery)
Finance (Nancy Marmol / Mike Wyman)

Clearinghouse Committee

(Jo Chamberlain, 650-726-1949, joc@pobox.com)

Proposed Agenda:

1. Report on Activities for 2000
2. Review of Duties and Member Participation
3. Financial Requirements and Plan for 2001 and beyond
4. Communicating with Locals - Contact Lists
5. Maintaining Website GPCA and Local's Sites
6. Material Management

Outreach & Voter Reg WG

(David R. Shorey, dshorey@jps.net)

Proposed Agenda:

1. Review of this years successes. What worked and why.
2. Literature
3. Better communications for the group
4. Goals and strategies for the coming two years
5. Mission statement

Electoral Reform Working Group

(Caleb Kleppner, 415-824-2735, calebk@fairvote.org)

Proposed Agenda:

1. Proposal to create a Green Party section of the elections code.
2. Discussion of local opportunities for electoral reform (time-permitting)
3. Discussion of races to target for a "spoiler" strategy (time-permitting)

Green Issues Working Group

(Don Eichelberger, 415-861-0592, done@energy-net.org)

Proposed Agenda:

1. Focus on energy
2. Focus on media
3. Healthcare reform (universal coverage)
4. Mission statement

The other Working Groups and Committees did not submit agendas. Contact information follows.

Bylaws Committee

Ricardo Newbery

619-286-5807, newbery@sdgreens.org

<http://www.greens.org/cal/bylaws/>

Campaigns & Candidates Working Group

Orval Osborne

805-545-9838, oosborne@fix.net

Platform Working Group

Bud Dickinson

510-848-4641, bdickinson@california.com

International Protocol Committee

Mike Feinstein

310-392-8450, mfeinstein@igc.com

Finance Committee

Nancy Marmol

415-695-1726, nmarmol@aol.com

Mike Wyman

415-461-6268, native@slip.net

Registration

Please mail completed registration form no later than November 24 to *GPCA Plenary Host Committee, 5917 Vale Way, San Diego, CA 92115.*

Name _____

County _____ Delegate? yes / no

Email _____

Phone _____

Need Housing?

Friday night

Saturday night

Sunday night

How many adults _____ How many children and their ages _____

Allergies or other special considerations _____

Put me on the plenary update email list

I will be attending the FPPC presentation on Friday evening

I will be attending the IRV workshop on Friday evening

Registration is \$30. Sunday lunch is an additional \$5.

Make check or money order payable to *Green Party of San Diego County*