

Draft Notes – GPCA Plenary May 22, 2005

Day 1

Opening - 9:36am - Ellen Maisen
Delegate Orientation - Ellen Maisen
Setup / Intro

Facilitators - Mike Bernstein, Pat Grey, Ginny Marie-Case
Timekeeper - Paul Franklin
Note takers: Tim Morgan, Don Eichelberger
Vibes - Kent Mesplay, Diane from Butte
Quorum - 70 Delegates - 9:51am

David Keulen - Orange - objection to quorum LA delegates -vibes- some delegates disenfranchised.
Bylaws WG conferred and asked that this issue be deferred to afternoon discussion, as this concern does not affect quorum. DK - will step down but is concerned that this issue should be add

Proposal to Affirm Plenary Agenda

Concerns:

- David Sobel - Tulare - two LA items are too close should be moved.
- John Earl - Orange? How can we move forward with agenda if not true to values of party?
- Demonstration interrupts meeting -
- Sara Amir - LA - opposes issues but issue has change
- Patrice Anderson - LA - has no representation currently
- Ron Redarty - Orange -
- Mike Borenstein - concern will be used to discuss the LA delegation this afternoon.

POP - Warner Bloomberg - Santa Clara does not understand how plenary can move forward until credentials are resolved.

Cat Woods - Marin - if not settled until afternoon who votes for LA - response - at this time LA delegates are confirmed.

Pat Grey - confirms LA delegates

Concerns / Affirmations -

- John Morton - Alameda - affirms agenda - have had 3 CC delegates whose status is questionable, but
- Have moved on. Let's move on.
- Dave Rasmussen - LA - concern that LA county delegates might not be able to vote
- Mike Feinstein - LA - voting against agenda - county has followed bylaws,
- Ron Redarty - Orange - lot of issues should move item to from of agenda
- Gabriel Weeks - LA - wants actual democracy - wants proportional representation

POP - 5 minutes over 25 behind

- Joe Compton - LA - accreditations of delegations is in the best interest of time should be address now.
- Marc Salomon - SF - GDI proposals should be discussed at grass root not by CC. Should be removed.
- John Earl - Orange - should discuss now.
- Patricia Anderson - LA - put off all items until LA is resolved.
- Jo Chamberlain - San Mateo - have decided to seat LA
- Sara Amir - LA - LA delegates seated. Response no will discuss this afternoon
- Jo Chamberlain - San Mateo - will LA delegates remain seated for plenary - facilitators – yes, Ginny
- Jim Stauffer - POP - we had agreed to take question about seating of LA delegate up during discussion this afternoon. If the GA decides, LA delegates can be unseated at that time.
- Jo- Not acceptable- Changing nature of LA delegation is the discussion, and changing its constitution will not be acceptable. Did not understand there would be chance for changing it.
- Sara Amir – LA - Opposes agenda approval as amended.
- Dave Rasmussen, LA- Believes in grassroots democracy and LA shows the worst sort of top-down decision-making,
- Michael Ruben - LA - Concern that last night a discussion item was put on for 2006. Is this still part of the agenda?
- Mike Bernstein- we were going to adjust the Sunday Agenda to accommodate that, but at present, if there are more changes to the agenda, we will not be able to accommodate that. It is not currently organized.

Ginny Case - Closed stack with 2 speakers who want to speak. Understands all people's concerns were not addressed. If people are willing to stand aside, they may put their concerns in writing to the note takers to include in the notes.

- Mike Feinstein - LA- It should be non-stand asides get their reasons listed in the minutes.
- Ginny Case- Stands corrected, all people, whether they stand aside or not, should get their concerns in writing to the note takers via Ginny.
- Tian Harter - Santa Clara - Should move this item up on the agenda.
- Jo Chamberlain, San Mateo- Caucused with by-laws members and clarified the question if the intent was to change the delegation form LA. Jim Stauffer said it was not the intent of discussion to change the make-up of the delegation, but if the GA wishes to, there s nothing we can do to prevent that.

Pat Grey - explains the deliberations - Orange unhappy with the friendly amendment on the LA afternoon discussion.

Jim Stauffer - bylaws decision - 10:45 - concern by Sara Amir about amendment accepted by bylaws after further discussion bylaws will not accept the amendment. Want to defer discussion to the afternoon.

Mike Borenstein – El Dorado - Orange County delegate is dropping his friendly amendment changing the seating of the LA delegation.

- Sara Amir- To affirm, the agenda up for approval has not been amended.
- Jim Stauffer - that is it for the decision item - will still be a discussion item.
- Mike Borenstein - Concerns?
Chuck O'Neil – Sacramento - Has a clarifying question. How can we decide anything with a delegation in question?
- Mike Borenstein - That has already been decided. The delegation is seated.
- Chuck still had concerns he will not stand aside on.

- Mike Wyman - We should be addressing concerns, not questions.
- Chuck O'Neil – Sacramento - Still has concern that there is a question about the validity of the LA delegation. We cannot conduct business until we establish a proper quorum.
- Outstanding Concerns? If no consensus, can send it back to a committee or go to a vote.

POP- John Morton- Asked for 2 minutes for delegations to caucus.

Vote to approve the plenary agenda. PROPOSAL: Shall we approve the agenda as presented, recognizing that the friendly amendment to revisit LA credentialing later has been removed?

POP- 61 total delegates needed. If LA were not seated, would need 59. 78 Delegates- present

Vote Tally: Yes 51 No 26 Stand aside 1 **Does not pass** (52 needed)

11:35 am Magali - Announcement - coordination team caucus.

11:52 A.M. Pat Grey - Announcements: Caucus report: Delegate concern of CC has been dealt with. Vote stands as is after deliberation. Whole LA issue needs to be discussed, and that is still on the agenda for this afternoon. It was decided to continue working on a revised agenda and to break for lunch, now.

P.M. Session

Facilitators: Nanette Pratini, LA, Stuart Bechman, Ventura,

Vibes: Kent Mesplay, San Diego, Diane Suzuki, Butte

Time Keeper: Paul Franklin, Santa Cruz

Agenda Ratification: CC comes up with the agenda needs to be consensed by GA. Presenter will take questions, do a straw poll to feel the room, and then take concerns about the agenda.

Proposed new agenda:

LA Regional Rep proposal - no concerns

GDI proposal- 4 concerns

Finance Proposals- no concerns

Budget Proposal- no concerns

Consent Calendar- no concerns

At-large election- no concerns

GPUS Delegate election- no concerns

LA Account- 10 concerns

Process: Line by line review. If delegates have a problem with any of the items, people were asked to raise their delegate card, and their concerns would be addressed later.

GDI and LA Account only ones with concerns. Rest consensed.

GDI- Forrest Hill – Background- 3 separate issues were requested for this plenary, as state decisions will be needed before the next plenary, and that is why it is on today.

GDI Concerns:

- Mark Salomon, SF- No objection to being on the agenda, but should not be decided today. Still lot of divisions in the party and if we are to decide about democracy, we need to have a more grassroots process. We also have time before the next presidential candidate is chosen.
- David Silva, Tulare - All give up the hope that we can solve problems with consensus.
- Warner Bloomberg - Santa Clara - Time concern - If agenda items with no objections are to be given a fair hearing, we do not have enough time to deal with them fairly.
- Bruce Wolfe, SF- Just taking concerns and giving it back to committee that had the problems in the first place, is a problem.

LA Accounting Item concerns:

- Paul Franklin, Santa Cruz- Seems to be outside the jurisdiction of the GPCA
- Jan Ardo – Alameda - Why not vote now?
- Sara Amir – LA - Is the LA account issue a decision item or discussion item? Reply, Discussion, only.
- Coby Skye – LA - Resigned from LACC when they voted to drop the lawsuit vs. MF. This is the core issue that blocked this item this morning. We need to address this issue and move forward.
- Donna Warren - LA - Was LACC Treasurer, before being fired. One of only a few blacks in the room. Former candidate for Lt. Gov. Does not feel LA local is appropriately represented. Only a small number of locals being represented is a matter that will keep coming back.
- Mike Feinstein - LA - Was happy to see it go as a discussion item. He offered to let CC and his attorney to come to arbitration with LACC. We need to get together outside and address it correctly.
- Genevieve Marcus - LA- What is presented in pack is incomplete, and does not lay out the real foundations of this and lack of info. Unfair to ask for a vote without given complex background info.
- David Silva, Tulare- Also felt this was not well put together. Should be a “white elephant” proposal to discuss these together, in context. Otherwise, should not be dealt with on same day.
- Mike Borenstein - El Dorado - This issue has pulled us apart for a long time, and this proposal tries to address that.
- Paul Encimer – Mendocino - CC already has dealt with this earlier. Plenary does not have jurisdiction.
- John Morton - Alameda- Same issue keeps coming up and the CC has failed to deal with it in a balanced way. Feinstein and supporters have been prevented by the CC from putting out all the issues.
- Christina Olague - SF - Validates what others have said. Grassroots democracy is being held hostage. Having been on the CC for a year, she has seen how people have failed to work together.

- Caucus of presenters - 2:46 pm

Announcement - will have two presenters address concerns

GDI

Forrest - SF - want to bring these proposals to the national, not a vote, advisory decision only, would return to states. Marybeth - list serve issue open to any CA green, called on people at last plenary to join. Contact her mb-@sbcglobal.net about joining the CA GDI list. Peter Camejo - Sacramento – This is about the heart and soul of the green party. Lot of excellent ideas, this is a process, not voting for the final form.

Test for consensus - 7 concerns - not willing to stand aside - move to vote - Mark Soloman - friendly amendment to change this to a discussion item. Not accepted - Forrest Hill.

Vote to include on agenda.

Tally: 67- yes, 15 - no, 0 - stand aside, 1- non-voting

PASSES

LA Account- Presenter- Jo Chamberlain

- If this is passed, MF has said he will need to be absent from the room.
- This problem has kept coming back. CC cannot reach resolution. She feels it is beyond the role of the CC, so it has been brought by the Finance Committee to bring this before the GA. Some suggestions not approved: meet with attorneys, mediate, and forget it. Seems best process is for the GA as the most appropriate place to hold discussion of this to give direction.

Greg, Co-Co Finance- Differs. Was with the idea that he would keep books and do the unglamorous job of helping the organization. He will follow instruction if this is not the kind of thing we should consider. What do people want of the finance committee, is it to follow all the rules, or allow some leeway?

Straw Poll - Still many unresolved concerns. Going to vote on including LA Accounting on today's agenda: Yes: 40 No: 39 Abstentions: 2

FAILS

Joe Compton- Concern that MF voted, with conflict of interest. Since it has no effect on the vote, he was instructed to take it up with the agenda committee.

Approved Agenda:

- I. GDI proposals
- II. Finance Proposals
- III. LA Representation
- IV. Budget Approval
- V. Consent Calendar
- VI. At Large Election
- VII. GPUS Del. Election

I. GDI Proposals – Presenters: Forrest Hill, Peter Camejo, Cat Woods - Motivation, where they come from. Last year, [people were upset with decisions made. Nader/Cobb divide is not directly to blame, but we have put together a unity proposal to send to National to try to improve our democracy.

Forrest- What is one person, one vote? There has been a lot of talk at the national to discuss this, absent discussion of how people voted in the last election. Need a fair way to come up with decisions. This would set up a review committee to review how many votes the states will be allocated. Three proposals:

- Fair representation, not weighting smaller states and disemboweling bigger states.
- We need a way to certify how delegates will support nominees.
- We are a “Third Party.” Therefore, in matters of state and national levels, we should not support the corporate parties. Locals can do whatever they feel they need to do. We want to be a big third party and make a big difference.

Presentation on Selection of Delegates to respect the vote of the membership- Donna Warren, Kent Misplay

Best way to make sure that people who support a candidate or proposal will be able to. Third proposal provides a vehicle for doing that. Open for ideas to modify the proposals.

Proposal 2- Selection of delegates - First round of voting, delegates should vote the will of the party. In subsequent rounds, delegates can vote their conscience.

GPCA Declaration of Independence- Pat Gray- This does not prevent us from talking with anyone who agrees with our position. We are not the Liberal wing of the Democratic Party. Many of us came from the Democratic Party, and it has been in our hope that we can move the party back toward its roots as a worker, environmental, social justice party. We have seen efforts in this die in the Democratic Committee. Military budget is bigger than ever, and neither party represents our values. Both corporate parties have caused problems we are seeing today, so we need to state clearly that we are not a liberal wing of the DC.

Peter - Democratic Committee opposes all the ten key values. We have made a position to not join the war parties. Greens should feel free to support candidates of any party, but having it built in to the state party to endorse main parties, we work against our own best interests. Base should be free; this would only affect the state's ability to endorse. He has gotten feedback from all Greens on all sides of the debate. We need to build more equality in, i.e., TX has 10% of NY membership, but has equal say. This needs to change.

Clarifying Questions:

- David Silva - Tulare- Will 1 be separated from 2 and 3? Answer- there will be three separate votes.
- Shannon, San Mateo- Clarifying this just affects CA
- Warner Bloomberg, Santa Clara- Wording implies we are passing a specific proposal. Response: Trying to say the spirit and a committee is working to express our will. (Not responsive). Cat- All concerns will be forwarded to National to deal with the debate in full.
- David Keulen - Orange- Proposal 2 Item 3, question about representing a candidate or proposal that they did not vote for in their state primary or caucus. How can we assure participation if people who voted differently agree to participate?
- Response- Cat: Has gotten amendments addressing that. This is getting to a level of detail that has already been considered.
- Peter: All other political parties have their delegates support within their party.
- Dana St. George, Santa Clara- Would one person, one vote endanger the GPUS base? In addition, as recalled, we were instructed to vote the plenary vote, then to vote our conscience after.
- Response: Forrest- There are ways to work this out. Delegates should be there as delegates of a candidate, for the first round of voting. (New Zealand formed a strong Green Party)
- Wilson Shelly – Yolo - Seems to ask the National party to tell the state party what to do.
- Reply: That is being discussed at national
- Laura Wells – Alameda -
- Response – Peter - Only question is if we support this.
- How do you choose a neutral delegation to determine how many votes?
- Response: There will be
- Question: In addition, what do we mean by support?
- Response: Specific concern needs to be expressed, and we can discuss this level of specificity.
- Matt Leslie- Only against the two corporate parties? What if another third party, or no Greens in? This is just for discussion at the national, and will come back for decision.
- Marc Solomon, SF- This is a restrictive proposal, mostly to help Peter. We need to help people take

part, not limit it. Even Nader defined his campaign largely in how we could affect our opponents. This needs to be simplified and clarified for more clarity and vote on it tomorrow.

- Linda Fierra – LA - This needs to be more feminist and exclusionary- We need to have the ability to cross endorse people who will help promote the Green agenda.
- Mike Feinstein, LA- Independent-minded people are able to make independent decisions. We should not be prevented from cross endorsement. We need to make that choice on a case-by-case basis. Locals should have autonomy.
- Response: That is part of it- locals can endorse as they see fit.
- Michael Rochmes – LA - Delegate selection- Concern about only allowing people who voted in primary to be delegates.
- David Keulen -No on #1 and 2
- Ross Mirkarimi, SF- If a compelling case is being made to set us aside, NOTA should be included. Democrats sued us over use of NOTA. This proposal is high on sloganeering. Need to develop a more mature language, and be less fringe like, but see how mainstream our agenda really is.

Time ended. This will need to be brought back.

Presenters - Buy time? From where? Test for consensus on GDI proposals 1, 2, & 3. POP - did we not take a vote on the agenda and times? No, times are flexible. Try to vote. No cannot do it, no time. Presenters have ballot. Decision - vote tomorrow.

II. Finance Issues - Craig Petersen

Simple bylaw changes #1 - should spend everything but need a reserve.

#2 - budget approval process - if problems with budget need to go line by line. Change get consensus on what is agreed on versus line by line.

Questions - Mike Feinstein - what is a prudent reserve, could that be defined? Response - reserve is a question for accounting folks. Example corporations typically have a 6 month operating reserve. Had intended

- Jonathan Lundell - not hard and fast but really up to GA similar process for any budget item. Reserve could be excess year-to-year monies.
- Mike Feinstein - LA approved but not comfortable for GA approval process. 6 months is a good starting point. Amendment - say that we should maintain a minimum operating budget. (accepted / then withdrawn)
- Jared Laiti - Sonoma - does this require us to have a reserve?
- Jonathan Lundell - San Mateo - concern about amendment, does not like specific value.
- Ron Redarty - Orange – [did not get comment]
- Matt Leslie - Orange - affirmation for proposal
- Mike Feinstein - LA new amendment - at some point before the next years budget FC present to the GA ideas to consensus on (accepted).

Test for consensus #1 - YES! #2 - YES

III. LA Regional Delegate Structure- Proposal to address a conflict in LA around elections of the delegates from LA. Local Greens have come to the CC for help resolving this. CC tried to make a decision to not recognize the elections of 2004.

Presentation- Jim Stauffer- What is our authority regarding what goes on in counties and regions? Center is relation between state and locals. Is a local, independent to make their own rules? No, they are part of a statewide organization with guidelines how to make decision. 3-2.1 identifies the local as the official decision-making body, 3-2.2 List of how locals should make decisions. Information flows from the state to the local, and decisions flow from local to the state. Article 7 defines Committees of GA. Locals choose who serves, and are required to see they were fairly elected.

LA is large region unto itself, with 28,000 registered Greens, and they therefore get more delegates than other regions. Largest region in the state is governed by a single council, dominated by one district in LA. Is that consistent with key values and process as defined?

Discussion

- Sara Amir - This is a proposal that gives the state party too much control over local party. Key value of decentralization needs to be followed.
- Mike Feinstein - LACC conducted an election using bylaws used since 1992. CC did not bring it to a previous plenary. This is a process used for 13 ears, and never before a problem. There are over 20 counties not represented here, do we stop the process because of that?? LA efforts have been attacked. LA is talking and willing to look at this, but CC didn't even mention that counties are allowed to have their own process.
- Joe Compton - LA- Much made of locals following their local rules. Local has made effort to affect the fact that too much power has been concentrated in too few hands. We need to reject undemocratic processes.
- Donna Warren - LA- Proof is in the pudding- for 28,000 people, there is no representation. Only 10 seats are filled because people are disgusted with the CC. Why are there only 2 out of 18 locals affiliated with the CC? They know they cannot get representation. Why, with so few African Americans represented in a GP that wants to make inroads is South Central LA so underrepresented?
- Ellen Maisen - LA- Region is structured to disallow discussion among regions of LA.
- Dave Rasmussen – LA - CC has a process and does outreach in all communities. People have jumped in and hijacked the proceedings (again).
- Genevieve Marcus - LA - General misconception. CC has a democratic process: anyone registered Green in LA has the right to run. Info could have gone out by Registrar. It is not correct to say a small number of Greens made this decision
- Jeff - LA- Polarized room today, each side saying they are the angels working for our best interests. We need not to meddle in LA internal process.
- Linda Fierra - Santa Monica, Long Beach, San Fernando Valley, Mid-city, represented in CC. If people want on the council, run a candidate and do the work it takes to elect someone.
- Bob LA- Open process, anyone can look at the vote.
- Byron Delear, LA- This is his first plenary - We need to keep our focus on the other key values that have been largely disregarded. Are we personality disordered, or are we a party of purpose?
- People have left the local because of power plays, etc. People are writing Schwartzenegger and SOS to help us.
- Michael Rochmes, LA - Default should be to not allow
- Coby Skye, LA- Packet contained info that clearly showed misappropriation of funds. 39 of us (at GA) voted not to discuss this. (out of order)
- Kjersten Jeppesen, Riverside (added written comment)- in the interest of GPCA, I propose that facilitators chosen and accepted by GPCA and GPLA work with the LA delegation AND THE MEMBERS OF THE GREEN PARTY to resolve the issue within the LA delegation and party. Once resolved, if the state CC needs involvement regarding bylaws or other adjustments for future resolution

of dissention, that that be a consideration for action.

Mike Borenstein - Presenters have to end discussion now, and we hope that later, the CC will deal with it more appropriately than in the past. Apologies for not letting all who have input to speak. Bylaws say the presenters have the right to extend or not extend discussion. They chose not to. It maybe brought back tomorrow.

IV. Budget Proposal- Jo Chamberlain - The Finance Committee took budget requests and put them in to the plenary packet, and explained to those who needed to be reminded of our limits and capabilities. Work plans are required for disbursal.

CC- not submitted, used last years plan

GROW- Has not

Other work plans will need to be filed.

Test for Consensus - To approve the budget as presented and all the funds will be made available, although funds will not be disbursed to workin groups who have not submitted a work plan.

- Question about line item for software. Current software not useful?
Needed software costs \$1500 for 2 years.
- Like budget, but it does not account for increased costs through inflation, we should try as best we can to keep track of people's volunteer efforts.
- Response: Try to take in account of inflation, to the best of its forecasting abilities. Worth of Volunteer time is calculated at \$200 per hour. Would help to give estimates of how much volunteer time is being used,

Unresolved Concerns? None, CONSENSUS reached!!

V. Consent Calendar

1. GPUS Delegation - To allow for elections to fill vacated seats of GPUS delegates and alternates prior to the time specified in the bylaws.
2. Multiple alternative delegates - Tim Morgan, Sonoma - State bylaws say we can have reps and an alternate. Some regions have more than one alternate, so need to change the wording to allow multiple alternates.
3. Endorse SB 840- Kevin McKeown, Santa Monica - Sheila Kuhl's Single Payer bill has been improved above the bill we have already endorsed two years ago, and we should endorse it again.

Consent Calendar items all approved by consensus.

VI-VII. GPUS and At-Large Election - Presentations by candidates and instructions for the vote.

Adjourn

Draft Notes – GPCA Plenary May 22, 2005

Day 2

Facilitators: Consuelo Delgado, Jim Shannon

Note takers: Don Eichelberger, Tim Morgan

Time Keeper: Tian Harter

Vibes: Tim Fitzgerald, Diana Suzuki

Ratify Agenda for the day.

Concerns were raised and dealt with on the agenda as modified:

- I. Announcements
- II. Ratify minutes
- III. Internal Democracy/Ethics
- IV. LA Filing
- V. Fair Wage
- VI. Strategy Session
- VII. GDI (Return)
- VIII. LA Delegate bring back
- IX. Consensus/Threshold
- X. Treasurer election

Lunch

- I. Next Plenary
- II. Announcements
- III. Confirm Secretary of State Liaison
- IV. SG/WG Meetings:
- V. GROW/Finance/ERWG
- VI. CCWG, Bylaws, Int'l Protocol
- VII. CCWG, GIWG, Platform, Media
- VIII. New officer affirmations
- IX. SG/WG Reports

I. Announcement: Results of elections:

At-Large reps, Cat Woods and Laura Wells

National Delegates - Bud Dickinson, Leslie Bonett, Sandra Everett, Donna Jo Warren

Alternates - Chuck O'Neil, Mary Beth Wuerthner

II. Ratify Minutes from Fullerton, Sacramento, Ventura

Notes Ratified by consensus

III. Ethics Ad Hoc Committee- Presenters: Cat Wood, Paul Encimer- We need to address structural issues based on principle and not desire for a specific outcome. Decentralization issues raised, i.e. local control, locals accepting violence or racism, etc. Committee would not have a judicial function, i.e. deciding disputes. Committee would study issues, put key points out to membership and draft specific proposals. Main issue will be study of group processes and what is appropriate.

Cat Wood - chose Paul Encimer to help because he has the most outspoken opposition to some of her ideas, and she wants to show inclusiveness. Issues listed in plenary packet.

Paul Encimer - Has some differences, but supports the idea to help separate the personal and political. We always need to watch for accountability of people taking responsibility that they are following through with the rank and file to give feedback. Need open communication, active listening and other skills to make this happen.

Discussion:

- ❑ Paul Franklin, Santa Cruz- Concern about “possible consequences” for non-compliance with standards.
- ❑ Response: Awkwardly worded to avoid words like punishment. Need to brainstorm other ways to do this.
- ❑ Seems this is a lot about etiquette, and not so much about consequences. Anything that is decided would need to go through the CC
- ❑ Russell Sidney, West Side Greens- Concern divisive disrepair party-wide. This idea tries to deal with this. Suggests that the process itself is part to blame, since it is system-wide. Issues are so important and not handled by his body.
- ❑ Kjersten Jemmsen, Riverside- Good step, but is there a process for resolution between sources of conflict?
- ❑ Any grassroots party needs processes, and he would like to be part of it.
- ❑ Tian Harter, Santa Clara- Looking at faction fights we are experiencing, and feels the base is over the \$10,000 check- this falls outside what we are prepared to deal with, \$5-10 checks. We need to be involved in an ethical system to be ethical.
- ❑ Reply- This committee will not try to solve the LA problem. Want to talk about policies, but not specific issues like LA.

Discussion time ran out, and people are invited to give feedback to Cat: cat801@mindspring.com and Paul: Emerald@mail2Green.com

IV. LA Filing- Packets given out, feedback should be given to Jo Chamberlain: joc@resilience.com or Craig Peterson: compmail@pacbell.net

V. Fair Wage Initiative- Presenters: Tim Smith, Cres Valucci, Dannika Kavulich, Diane Suzuki

Many people have been involved in this and the focus is on unity. Yesterday, \$1000 was approved or a stakeholders conference. We will discuss the issues and take questions.

Proposal: GPCA Project coordinating an effort to gather 600,000 signatures and do fundraising coordination consistent with that.

Stakeholders' conference - CFW is a political PAC separate from GPCA, but wants the party involved with this for many reasons. Our main goal is to pass initiatives and elect candidates. This is an excellent opportunity to do concrete outreach to people and talk to groups we don't usually talk to, to show how we put green values in to action to make a difference for people.

We also have 2006 election, and this will give candidates a common thread to organize around and show how GP is different. Will also help with coalition building, labor, faith based, elders, youth. We need help contacting the great organizations Greens are involved with. Please let us know who we can contact for this to make a broader meeting. This will also help us diversify and outreach with people of color. We also need more women and people of color involved with this WG.

Anyone who wants on the list serve should contact Mary Beth Wuerthner: mb-@sbglobal.net

Cres V. on media - GPCA Press Secretary - Media WG helps get our message out and this effort will really help with that on both the state and local level.

Discussion and concerns on the proposal: GPCA Sponsored project to coordinate collecting 600,000 signatures and do fundraising efforts consistent with that goal.

Clarifying Questions:

- Marc Solomon, SF- [did not get comment]
- Jane Grems, Orange Co. - Will vols be paid out of fundraising? Will there be a separate account, or will it come out of the general fund?
Reply- Will be its own fund. We have great people helping keep track of funds. With signature collecting, this will offer a chance to gather small donations from each of the 600,000 people who sign.
- Gloria Purcell, El Dorado - Has the wording of the initiative been produced?
Reply- No, this will result from the stakeholders' conference. It is important to get input from stakeholders, and get them to buy in to it.
- Note: We should not name a dollar amount since the value of the dollar is varying
- Ross Mirkarimi, SF- Often working in statewide coalitions, we rarely get the GP view out to the public. We need to have our message strategy to give our effort the credit it deserves.
- Michael Ruben, Alameda- If we can do this, there needs to be a failsafe that if we do not reach a point, we need to be able to call an end.
- Response- This issue has come up in our meetings. At this point, we have a lot of positive interest. Also, to Ross, Greens are facilitators in this effort and we will get word out. We will come back with reports on the stakeholders' conference.
- Peter Camejo, Sacramento - Occasionally, we need to be willing to try and even fail. This is an important issue, and we do not need to be ashamed if we do not prevail. Suggestion: Advocates not to go lower than 1968 level, and not be willing to give in to the Democrats, who my advocate a lower amount.
- Response- We are going in to win, but even an electoral loss may not be a loss, as long as we can get out on the street and show people the GP is fighting the good fight and not be intimidated.

No Concerns remaining - CONSENSUS!!

VI. Strategy Discussion for 2006- Discussion item-

Magali Offerman, Ross Mirkarimi, Mike Feinstein - Before we can focus on 2006, we need a general

assembly dialogue to plant seeds and plan a common strategy. Now is the time to do it.

Mike Feinstein - Discussion of recent election results. In last few cycles we have run a lot of congressional candidates not assembly. Want to look at state wide candidates. If we try to follow a tax reform strategy, strong candidates could have chance for success. Can't put all efforts into a lot of candidates, but in select areas, could have good results down-ticket. C&C is going forward to develop a common set of issues north/south.

Ross Mirkarimi - running candidates is our trend. While we talk about running candidates, there is no discussion of registering voters. We are not good organizers. Need to get better at that. Not talking smartly- we are plateauing. Ignoring populations we are supposed to be all about. MAPA and Islamic groups are good, but we need to do more. Cannot forget our roots and need to be organizers again. Need identifiable goals.

Floor discussion:

- Forest Hill, Alameda - agree with comments, need to be more activists and people of color. Campaign of Aimee Allison was a very good example, did things different in Oakland.
- Leticia Anderson, San Diego - vibes - we scare people off, people of color.
- Tian Harder, SC - in Santa Clara a women tables Carol Brule. Went to her and said yes. Need to put the comedy in green back. 14th congressional district.
- Susan King, SF - Need to focus on local races. Can win there. School board and water board good places. Harder to win in regional races. Think carefully about whom we run- too many WM's- need diversity think careful for 2006. Consider for the Secretary of State.
- Glen Hopkins, LA - answers questions for the LA Teachers groups. Website is a good tool. Green cabinet is good tool. Business card.
- Tim Fitzgerald, SC - suggests that the group look at his handout. Need a new paradigm. Need strategy committee.
- Gloria Purcell, El Dorado - affirms Susan King's comments. There is a democrat in ED county has changed viewpoint.
- Bruce Wolfe, SF - join with others as to how to get others to get elected. Where is the youth? WE NEED them. Need an absentee voter program.
- Jim Stauffer, SC - small counties worth going after can win.
- Dannika Kavulich, Sacramento - when looking at candidate need to prioritize women and people of color when deciding where we should put efforts. Need concrete support from State party. Need more of this.

Presenters - who would attend north / south strategy secessions?

VII. GDI Bring-back - Jonathan Lundell - Proposal as stated with the change noted that all written and stated concerns will be included with the proposal to the national party.

Discussion:

- Concern (not noted who) that we are doing this over again.
- Response- this was brought to presenters, and it was decided that this would be brought back.
- Concern still stated that there could be gaming because fewer people would be expected today. Response- It was made clear it would be brought back.
- Marc Solomon, SF- we are going to a vote, again, before striving for consensus - taking the lead of the

democrats and republicans.

- Responses: Yesterday, a straw poll decided to bring it back. We want to bring it to a vote today. Straw poll showed a strong majority wanting to take it to a vote.

Proportional Representation	Yes	63	No	18	Abs	1	78%- pass
Delegate Selection	Yes	55	No	24	Abs	3	70%- pass
Independence	Yes	50	No	31	Abs	1	62%- fail

VIII. GPLA Delegation bring-back

Jim Stauffer - After yesterday's discussion, it seemed evident that people had more to say, so we decided to bring this back to see if people want to continue discussion - Straw Poll to put LA Regional Rep discussion on to the agenda.

Poll results - 25 votes to bring it back, no consensus to bring it back.

X. Consensus / Threshold Discussion - Forrest Hill, Cat Woods:

This will be minimal discussion time, so people with input should contact Forrest or Cat. Forrest - We have seen many of the same people come back year after year, and getting cantankerous. He feels our decision making is not effective. Consensus is good, but with fall back votes, the threshold is too high. While discussion and debate is good, our move for high threshold fallback voting works against us and makes us stagnate. Feels high thresholds make us fight among ourselves too much.

Cat Woods - Not about doing away with consensus. Many condemn parliamentary procedures without knowing much about it. Parliamentary procedures were used to overthrow a monarchy in England. Consensus would not have done that. While IRV adds to democracy, high thresholds do not, because a no vote counts more than a yes vote, 4-6 times, depending on 80 or 60% threshold. What situations are analogous to candidate voting and which available for threshold votes? Many times, no action is much worse than imperfect action, i.e. nomination processes have been used to manipulate decisions. Consensus-building is a process for building agreement and incorporating good ideas from the group. This is part of all decision-making models. Democratic processes- many worry that 51% is bad, but 35-65% is good. Democratic process is less manipulative and lessens the gate keeper role.

Discussion-

- Mike Feinstein, LA - OK with changing threshold as long as all the issues are available to all before coming to a vote.
- Susan King, SF- Good idea, eliminates discussion re if it is policy decision or not.
- Mike Borenstein, El Dorado- OK with change, but need to make sure people are educated to the process so people will not game it.
- Charlotte Smyth, SF- Re: People new to process. She is new, and the process is a complicated, and many who do not understand the process would be helped by simplifying it
- Mitch Smith, San Mateo - Many of us like the use of consensus. Was originally used to protect the minority, but it has been used incorrectly to prevent change.
- Paul Encimer, Emerald Region Opposed, promotes a managerial mentality rather than an org. This is

a red herring, where a small minority can have a say against just getting small agreements to affect proposals.

- Christina Olague, SF- Feels that consensus is a basic strength of the party. We need to learn to give up the power and move away from the mike, to over come Euro centrality. Part of Consensus is learning to let go of power.

We ran out of time and were not able to allow all comments, so invited written comments.

IT Group announcement re: GPCA password being changed for access to the site, See pg. 95 in plenary packet.

X. Treasurer Election - Presentations by Kenny Mostern and Mike Wyman

Concerns-

- Paul Franklin, Santa Cruz- Bylaws make no provision for voting for a treasurer.
- Sharon Peterson, Contra Costa- CC could not come to consensus on this, and she fees the CC did not do its job.
- A report was given out that outlined the problems the CC had with the process.
- Jonathan Lundell, Bylaws, on why there is being an election. Since CC could not decide on a treasurer, Bylaws consensed to allowing the fall-back position of IRV in an effort to allow the GA to make the decision.
- Jarred Laiti, Sonoma - The whole report from the CC were not included. Noted: missing pages will be provided.

Afternoon Session

I. Liaison to Secretary of State. Larry Cafiero nominate by CC to replace Jim Stauffer. He has some personal contact with current Secretary of State as part of his work with Santa Cruz Sentinel newspaper.

AFFIRMED

Treasurer Election Results - Kenny Mostern was elected Treasurer - Won by 1 vote in round 2 of IRV voting.

II. Working Group sessions

III. Closing business

A. Next Plenary- Earliest date for next plenary will be September. Since two have been n S Cal, need to have the next 1-2 in No Cal. Alameda, Santa Clara and Santa Cruz are possible sites being discussed.

Werner Bloomberg - CCWG is in transition and he agreed to serve as interim co-co for the WG.

B. Election results- Bud Dickensen and Peggy Lewis are new GPUS Co-Co's.

Shane Que Hee Platform - two new members Mitch Smith and Elizabeth Green

Paul Franklin - new Coco of the CC.

C. Working Group Reports

- 1) Don Eichelberger - Green Issues WG - now has Co-co Liz Green and Ellen Maisen and Conseulo Delgado. Promote restorative justice.
- 2) Craig Peterson - Finance - training for how to get \$1 million, budget good meeting
- 3) Paul Franklin - Bylaws - dispute resolution process for issues elevated by counties.
- 4) Mitch Smith - GROW - short meeting lot done we be good. Mark Barney new activator for campus greens
- 5) Shane Que Hee - Platform - short but productive meeting, buy platforms. Plan to produce an addendum to summary books. Two draft planks were discussed. Hope to bring things forward. Two new members Mitch Smith and Liz Green
- 6) Larry C - Media - discussed bureau chiefs - if any local has media we want to work with them.
- 7) Jim Stauffer - IT - remember the password...read about how to keep the passwords secure. Domain move soon. Should be happening soon. Need members and skills.
- 8) Werner Bloomberg - two strategy secession in august north / south. Watch out for special election requests for endorsements from the state.
- 9) Fred - International - new banners coming - quick intense meeting. Redefining nature of group, bylaws change for next time. Better affiliation with nation and international GP. Want home for video conference.

Adjourn