



# Green Party of California General Assembly

Ventura, California -  
June 24 & 25, 2006

## Agenda Packet

This “Agenda packet” volume contains the proposals that will be decided at the General Assembly. A second “Logistics packet” volume will contain the schedule, important announcements, and registration and logistics for the meeting.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRE-MEETING ACTIVITIES .....	3
Platform – Preliminary Test for Consensus .....	3
MEETING AGENDA.....	5
Saturday Morning Plenary Session.....	5
Saturday Afternoon Plenary Session .....	6
Sunday Morning Plenary Session.....	7
Sunday Afternoon Plenary Session.....	7
General Assembly Process .....	8
IT Announcement of Password Change.....	9
CONSENT CALENDAR.....	10
Standing Groups Allowed to Submit (Bylaws).....	10
Clarifying Language (Bylaws).....	11
Modify Quorum (Bylaws).....	13
Filling At-Large Rep Vacancies (Bylaws).....	15
CC Meeting Procedures (Bylaws) .....	17
Regional Rep Alternates (Bylaws).....	20
CC At-Large Increase by 2 (Bylaws).....	22
Purpose statement (Bylaws).....	23
Campaign Funding Support (CCWG) .....	24
TREASURER’S REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.....	25
Treasurer’s Report .....	26
Account Balances.....	28
Cash Flow Report .....	28
Budget Report.....	30
PROPOSALS .....	33
Budget Proposal.....	33
Unions Plank (Platform) .....	36
Conservation of Health Plank (Platform).....	39
Agricultural Economics Plank (Platform).....	42
Defining GPCA Membership.....	44
Impeachment Resolution .....	45
Regional Rep Elections (Bylaws) .....	47
Length of CC Term (Bylaws) .....	49
Endorsement Policies (CCWG) .....	53
Write-In Threshold (CCWG).....	58
California Elections Code sections for the GPCA .....	61
STATEMENTS/BIOS FOR CC-AT LARGE REPS .....	64
Jared Laiti .....	64
Ellen Maisen .....	65
Pat Driscoll .....	67
DELEGATE ENDORSEMENTS .....	68
STATEMENTS/BIOS FOR GPUS DELEGATES .....	69
Chuck Giese.....	69
Steve Loeb.....	72
Marilyn Ditmanson .....	74
Jared Laiti .....	75
Susan King.....	76
Budd Dickinson .....	78
Greg Jan .....	79
Colin Donoghue.....	80
DEFERRED PROPOSAL.....	81
Approving the GPUS Affiliation Agreement (CC).....	81
APPENDICES.....	85
CCWG Meeting Agenda.....	85
Delegates.....	86
Detail of State Assembly District Data.....	87

# PRE-MEETING ACTIVITIES

## **Platform – Preliminary Test for Consensus**

*Active counties are responsible for approving all proposed updates to our platform. To expedite the approval process, we are asking each county to record your vote on this form before the General Assembly in Sacramento.*

These ballots will be collected when you register at the General Assembly on Saturday morning. Using this form will help the plenary session move through the approval process more efficiently. Past experience has proven that trying to edit or rewrite planks on the plenary floor is an unproductive exercise. Counties were notified that the proposed updates were available for review and comment on GPCA web site. We received numerous responses and greatly appreciate this feedback. At the General Assembly, we will present the updates and address any serious concerns as time allows, but we do not intend to engage in lengthy discussions. Such discussions are more appropriate for a Platform Working Group meeting.

~~~~~

There are three individual planks being presented here.

*The objective of the Platform Working Group is to get approval of these updates, not to revisit all of the existing content. Please encourage those in your county that wish to work on content to become active members in the Platform Working Group.*

~~~~~

Each county may cast as many votes as is your allocation of delegates. Cast your full number of votes as YES, NO and STAND ASIDE for each of the three planks.

If you have concerns or other comments, please write them in the “comments” area. We would like to distinguish between concerns that directly relate to approval of the updates, and other comments that relate to larger or more general aspects of the planks that can be addressed in future updates.

Also, we would appreciate hearing concerns before the General Assembly. You can send them to the co-coordinators:

Shane Que Hee  
(310)208-1624.  
[squehee@ucla.edu](mailto:squehee@ucla.edu)

Suzanne Mayes  
(909) 421-1285  
[CrystaLily64@aol.com](mailto:CrystaLily64@aol.com)

**VOTE HERE**

County \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Delegates \_\_\_\_\_

	YES	NO	STAND ASIDE
Union Plank			
Conservation of Health			
Agricultural Economics and Social Justice			

**Comments**

Use additional sheets if necessary and mark them with your county's name. Please provide contact information if you want the Platform group to reply.

County \_\_\_\_\_

**Submitted by:**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_

email \_\_\_\_\_

---

**CONCERNS**

This space is for concerns or friendly amendments that relate directly to the approval of the proposed updates. Please provide any preferred wording too.

---

**OTHER COMMENTS**

This space is for general comments about any plank that the Working Group can address in the future. Also include here any minor edits or grammatical corrections.

# MEETING AGENDA

## ***Saturday Morning Plenary Session***

8:45 – Delegate Orientation, 15 min

9:00 - Opening Ceremony, 5min

9:05 - Setup, 5 min

9:10 - Introduce CC members and committee coordinators, 5min

9:15 Confirm Quorum & Approve agenda, 10 min

9:35 Approve meeting minutes of last plenary, 5min

<http://www.cagreens.org/plenary/archives/agendas/051210am.txt>

<http://www.cagreens.org/plenary/archives/agendas/051210pm.txt>

<http://www.cagreens.org/plenary/archives/agendas/051211.htm>

9:40 Announcement and Consent calendar, total time: 10 min

- Announcement: Notice regarding website password (IT)
- Bylaws 5-8.2 Standing Groups allowed to submit (Bylaws Committee)
- Bylaws 7-1 Clarifying/Improving language to describe existing procedures (Bylaws Committee)
- Bylaws 5-4.3 Modify the General Assembly decision quorum requirement to avoid loss of quorum on Sunday afternoons (Bylaws Committee)
- Bylaws 7-1 Process for filling unscheduled CC at-large vacancies (Bylaws Committee)
- Bylaws 7-1 CC meeting rules and procedures (Bylaws Committee)
- Bylaws 7-1 Flexibility for term of region's alternate, establish maximum number of alternates (Bylaws Committee)
- Bylaws 7-1 Change in CC At-Large Seats from Four to Six (Bylaws Committee)
- Bylaws 2: GPCA Purpose statement (Bylaws Committee)
- Re-establish Campaign Funding Support Committee/Resource Allocation (Campaigns & Candidates Working Group)

9:50 PRESENTATION of 3 DECISION ITEMS: Conservation of Human Health amendment to plank, Unions plank, Agriculture Justice plank (Platform Committee), 15 min

10:05 ELECTIONS, 15 min

CC at-large representative speeches, 3 min

Jared Laiti

Pat Driscoll

Ellen Maisen

GPUS delegate speeches, 6 min

Chuck Giese

Steve Loeb

Marilyn Ditmanson

Jared Laiti

Susan King

Budd Dickinson

Greg Jan

Colin Donoghue

10:20 DECISION ITEM: Defining membership, Bylaws, 40 min

11:00 Treasurer's report, 15 min

11:15 Budget, 50 min

12:05 LUNCH

(time for questioning candidates, platform planks)

Hand in ballots for At-Large Reps and GPUS delegates

### ***Saturday Afternoon Plenary Session***

1:04 Confirm Quorum, 1 min

1:05 Ross Mirkarimi presentation, 20 min

1:25 fundraising pitch, 10 min

1:35 DISCUSSION of 3 DECISION ITEMS: Conservation of Human Health amendment to plank, Unions plank, Agriculture Justice plank in break-out sessions (Platform Committee), 30 min

2:05 DECISION ITEM: Conservation of Human Health amendment to plank (Platform Committee), 10 min

2:15 DECISION ITEM: Unions (Platform Committee), 10 min

2:25 DECISION ITEM: Agriculture Justice(Platform Committee), 10 min

2:35 Meeting evaluation, 5 min

2:40 DECISION ITEM: Impeachment resolution (GROW), 10 min

2:50 DECISION ITEM: Noticing, Conducting, Reporting and Filing of CC Election Results and Procedures (Bylaws Committee), 30 min

3:20 DECISION ITEM: Establish beginning and ending times for CC terms (Bylaws Committee), 30 min

3:50 DECISION ITEM: Bylaws change to lower the number of write-in votes a Green Party candidate for partisan office must receive in a Primary Election to qualify as the Green Party nominee in the General Election (Campaigns and Candidates Working Group), 30 min

4:20 BREAKOUT SESSION: 85 min

Electoral Reform – Working Group MEETING

Finance – COMMITTEE MEETING

GROW – Working Group MEETING

5:45 Regional and Special Interest Caucus meetings

evening: GPUS delegate dinner & meeting (location TBA)

## ***Sunday Morning Plenary Session***

9:00 Setup, 5 min

9:05 Confirm Quorum, 1 min

9:06 Consent bring back, 4 min

9:10 DECISION ITEM: Election code with proposed code, ERWG, 60 min

10:10 Candidate Forum (Campaigns and Candidates Working Group), 60 min

11:10 Breakout sessions: 85 min

International Protocol – COMMITTEE MEETING

Bylaws – COMMITTEE MEETING

CCWG #1 – COMMITTEE MEETING

12:35 LUNCH

## ***Sunday Afternoon Plenary Session***

1:34 Confirm Quorum, 1 min

1:35 report & discussion: GPUS re-apportionment (CA GDI ad hoc committee), 20 min

1:55 DECISION ITEM: Endorsements policy #1: General(Campaigns and Candidates Working Group), 30 min

2:25 DECISION ITEM: Endorsements Policy #2: Primaries (Campaigns and Candidates Working Group), 5 min

2:30 Meeting evaluation, 5 min

2:35 affirmation of new officers, 5 min

2:40 Break out sessions: 85 min

Info. Tech. & Clearinghouse – COMMITTEE MEETING

Platform – COMMITTEE MEETING

Green Issues – COMMITTEE MEETING

CCWG #2– COMMITTEE MEETING

Media – COMMITTEE MEETING

4:05 Closing Ceremony

## General Assembly Process

The General Assembly meeting of 100 delegates from across the state represents the primary decision-making body of the organization. The main purpose of these meetings is to consider the issues and make the decisions necessary to maintain the organization's fiscal integrity, bylaws, policies as platform planks, membership numbers, processes as business procedures, public relations through media management and to facilitate GPCA-endorsed Green candidate's quests for campaign platform exposure and election to public office. The meetings are often referred to as "plenaries," although each General Assembly is actually composed of four plenary sessions.

The primary agenda packet for each of these meetings contains proposals which require advance study, occasional independent research, and for those people with questions or concerns, an effort at making personal contact with one or more of the presenters. Delegates and attenders planning to participate in these meetings are strongly encouraged to read, study and communicate as needed well in advance of the beginning of the first plenary session. For questions and concerns about the overall process, you are encouraged to contact your regional representative to request that your concerns be forwarded to the coordinating committee, which is responsible for planning and arranging these meetings.

Each proposal will consist of a brief presentation to augment the written material, highlighting any last minute changes that may have been applied to the proposal. According to our consensus-seeking model of decision making, a call for clarifying questions will be made. This is followed by a call for affirmations and concerns. Because the schedule is usually very full, time allocations are lean. Brief and succinct statements are strongly encouraged. Lengthy statements expressing mild concerns are discouraged. If you would not block the proposal if the concern was not addressed, please consider refraining from using plenary floor time to voice the concern. The natural consequence of doing so is elevated blood pressure and anxiety levels for the facilitators and the meeting organizers who must balance freedom of speech with constricted time limits.

If there are delegates with unresolved concerns, the presenters will be offered the opportunity to take the issue to a vote. Depending on the type of proposal, the threshold for passage will be either 2/3 or 4/5, for business items or a policy/bylaw changes. If there are no unresolved concerns or all of those with unresolved concerns are willing to stand aside, the proposal passes by consensus of the body.

If time is particularly tight, the facilitators may ask each delegate to confirm before speaking that their concern has not already been articulated. They may also be asked to identify whether they made a reasonable effort to study the proposal and background text before the meeting, as a way to set priorities in those cases where there are more people lined up to express concerns than there is time to listen to those concerns. This process is designed to motivate delegates to come to the meetings fully prepared to understand the proposal and to discern their motives for choosing to speak their concerns to the entire General Assembly. This process will be unnecessary in a context of all delegates reading and understanding the material well in advance, and making a good faith effort to contact the presenters and/or the sponsoring committee to convey their concerns. For those who wish to know more about the consensus process, please refer to Bylaws section 5-8.9.

# IT Announcement of Password Change

## THE COMMON PASSWORD FOR WWW.CAGREENS.ORG IS CHANGING.

As most of you know, the GPCA web site has several “internal” pages that require a common user ID and password... the same ID and password works on all pages. The IT Group has implemented a policy to change the password once a year to maintain the security effectiveness of the password.

### Why We Need a Password

We implemented password protected pages for several reasons:

1. To keep search engines from finding our internal business.
2. We want the public to find those pages that we’ve designed with the information that the public is looking for.
3. There is internal business that should not be publicly accessible. We don’t want our political opponents seeing our electoral strategies. We don’t want reporters with malicious intent copying candid statements out of some committee meeting minutes. We don’t want draft documents (those not yet approved) circulating in the public domain.

### Password Change Policy

The current user ID is gpca and the password is 13greatyears. This relates to achieving ballot status in 1992, 13 years from 2005.

The common password will change within a week after the first General Assembly of each year. For 2006, this will be the Ventura meeting in June.

The new password will be: 14greatyears

The user ID will remain the same: gpca

For this annual password change, we will use the scheme of increasing by one the number in password. So, the number will always equal the current year minus 1992.

The new password will be distributed in the agenda packet and announced at the plenary sessions of the General Assembly. The Coordinating Committee, Standing Committee and Working Group coordinators, and county contacts will be informed when the new password is implemented.

### Access and Security

This is low-level security. As mentioned, the main reasons are to keep search engines at bay and to provide a minimal barrier to those who shouldn’t have ready access to our internal business.

Feel free to share the password with any active Green who has a need or interest in the information on the internal pages. But do act responsibly and honor the intent of this process.

PLEASE follow these basic security guidelines:

1. The best way to give the password is verbally or on paper.
2. DO NOT send the password to an email list. Most lists are archived, and those archives can be searched by various internet thieving devices.
3. Sending the password by email to individuals is not recommended. If you find it necessary to do so, DO NOT include the word “password” anywhere in the message or on the subject line. There are sniffers that monitor internet traffic searching for that word.

If you have any questions or comments, send them to the IT email list: [gpca-it@cagreens.org](mailto:gpca-it@cagreens.org).

For the IT Group  
Jim Stauffer

# CONSENT CALENDAR

## ***Standing Groups Allowed to Submit (Bylaws)***

### **Consent Item: Bylaws 5-8.2 Standing Groups allowed to submit**

**SPONSOR:** Bylaws Standing Committee

**PRESENTER/CONTACT:** Tim Morgan, 707-695-9293, [blkcloud@sonic.net](mailto:blkcloud@sonic.net)

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** Due to the 2000 GPCA reorganization, the definition of committee has change somewhat in meaning for the GPCA. This proposed change clarifies which bodies have proposal presenting authority. In practice following the 2000 reorganization, both standing committees and working groups (non-ad hoc or special) have been able to bring forth proposals to plenaries. This change eliminates confusion over the explicit use of committees and replaces it with standing groups which intended to mean both standing committees and working groups of the GPCA. For reference purposes see 6-1.1 for definitions of committee and working groups.

**PROPOSAL:** Update 5-8.2 to comply with other bylaws.

The proposed change is shown below with the change indicated by text to be deleted shown in ~~strikeout~~ and the text to be inserted shown as underlined below.

5-8.2 Items presented in proposal form

Items being presented before the General Assembly for a decision shall be in the form of proposals advocated by one of the General Assembly ~~committees~~ standing groups.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** Passed by consensus at 3/1/06 teleconference with no outstanding concerns.

**TIME LINE:** To be implemented immediately following approval.

**RESOURCES:** None

## **Clarifying Language (Bylaws)**

### **Consent Item: Bylaws 7-1 Clarifying/Improving language to describe existing procedures**

**SPONSOR:** Bylaws Standing Committee

Presenters: Tim Morgan 415-706-8927 [blkcloud@sonic.net](mailto:blkcloud@sonic.net)  
Mike Feinstein (310-392-8450, [mfeinstein@feinstein.org](mailto:mfeinstein@feinstein.org))

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** This proposal provides greater clarity in Section 7-1, by doing three things that do not change the meaning of the bylaw, but do improve its clarify

- Use of '60 days' instead of 'two months', when talking about the deadline by which CC candidates need to have their biographies submitted to be included in the agenda pack
- Consistent use of the expression 'diversity and gender balance' for choosing CC reps
- Improve language that describes information to be presented to the General Assembly

Proposed New Language (deletions in ~~strikeout text~~, additions underlined):

#### **7-1.2 Membership**

The Coordinating Committee shall be composed of ~~up to twenty voting members, including sixteen regional representatives and up to four at-large representatives.~~ The General Assembly shall define the regions, and determine the allocation of regional representatives. Diversity and gender balance are encouraged, especially through the election of at-large representatives and in multi-seat regions. CC representatives are not eligible for the positions of Treasurer and Liaison to the Secretary of State.

#### **7.1.4.3 Alternate Regional Members**

Alternate members may be selected for regional members. Diversity and gender balance are encouraged in the selection of alternates. Alternates shall be designated for specific members and shall serve for terms concurrent with the members for whom they are serving.

#### **7-1.7-5 Selection of At-Large Members**

Candidates for at-large seats shall submit applications to the CC at least sixty days ~~two months~~ prior to the election of at-large CC representatives. The application shall consist of a detailed biography of the person seeking election and what they wish to accomplish as an at-large CC member.

#### **7-1.5.1 Selection of At-Large Members**

The CC shall forward, without prejudice, the applications to the active county organizations along with a full and detailed explanation of the voting procedure, including a description of the "No Other Candidate" (NOC) option and an encouragement to delegates to make their

choices seriously and a reminder that delegates do not have to fill all seats unless they feel there are enough qualified candidates.

The Coordinating Committee shall appoint three election officials to oversee the election process. ~~and after the current and newly elected regional CC representatives have been announced and before~~ Before the at-large CC representative election proceeds, all current and newly elected regional representatives to the CC shall be announced to the General Assembly. ~~the election~~ Election officials shall present a full and detailed explanation of the voting procedure (as outlined above) to the General Assembly. The election officials shall then conduct the election as described in Paragraph 7-1.7, Choice Voting.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** Approved on Bylaws Committee Conference call, March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006, as part of a larger, several-part proposal, by a three to one vote.

**RESOURCES:** If approved, Bylaws Committee would update GPCA Bylaws on web site [www.cagreens.org/bylaws](http://www.cagreens.org/bylaws)

## ***Modify Quorum (Bylaws)***

### **Consent Item: Bylaws 5-4.3 Modify the General Assembly decision quorum requirement to avoid loss of quorum on Sunday afternoons**

SPONSOR: Bylaws Standing Committee

**PRESENTER/CONTACT:** Jim Stauffer; [jims@greens.org](mailto:jims@greens.org); (408) 432-9148  
Michael Borenstein; [thebor@greens.org](mailto:thebor@greens.org); (530) 620-6659

#### **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:**

Decision quorum at a General Assembly is based on the number of delegates registered at the beginning of each session (day). Some delegates need to leave early on Sunday afternoon thereby breaking quorum which means no decisions can be made.

There are two quorum tests for the General Assembly:

Opening quorum - A one-time event on Saturday morning that ensures broad geographic representation; and/or prevents an official GA from being convened by a group in one geographical location.

Decision quorum - A per-decision event that requires 80% of the delegates registered at the front desk to be present when a decision is made. The delegate count is incremented as delegates arrive during the day, but is not decremented if delegates leave early.

The current bylaw language is:

5-4.3 Quorum for decision-making

A quorum for decision making exists when 80% of registered delegates are present.

- a) Delegates shall sign in register at the beginning of each session, identifying region and county.
- b) Facilitators shall conduct a roll call to establish a quorum at the beginning of each plenary session.

Section 5-8.9 further requires the facilitators to verify quorum at each decision item.

#### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposed changes keep the requirement that 80% of registered delegates must be in the plenary session to make a decision, but allows delegates who leave early to unregister thereby lowering the quorum. Also, an absolute minimum number of delegates present is established to ensure an adequate voting pool, thereby putting a floor on how low the quorum can drop.

Proposed changes to section 5-4.3:

1. Add two sentences to the intro paragraph: “However, a minimum number of delegates are required to be present in order to make a decision. That minimum shall be 60% of the average number of delegates counted on Saturday for item b) of this section at the previous four General Assemblies.”
2. Add to item a): “Delegates shall notify the facilitators (or other appropriate officials), and be removed from the delegate count, if they leave the General Assembly before it is adjourned.”

Additional changes to clarify the terminology used in Section 5-4 (additions in underlined text and deletions in ~~strikeout text~~):

#### 5-4.1 Quorum

A quorum exists for the purpose of opening a ~~meeting~~ General Assembly when 2/3 (rounding to the nearest whole number) of the regions containing active counties are represented.

#### 5-4.3 Quorum for decision-making

A quorum for decision making exists when 80% of registered delegates are present. However, a minimum number of delegates are required to be present in order to make a decision. That minimum shall be 60% of the average number of delegates counted on Saturday for item b) of this section at the previous four General Assemblies.

- a) Delegates shall ~~sign in~~ register at the beginning of each session, identifying region and county. Delegates shall notify the facilitators (or other appropriate officials), and be removed from the delegate count, if they leave the General Assembly before it is adjourned.
- b) Facilitators shall conduct a roll call to establish a quorum at the beginning of each plenary session. A session is each day of a General Assembly.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** Unadopted concern – The process should clarify that delegates are allowed to register and unregister only once. The four bylaws committee members have affirmed this proposal.

**RESOURCES:** Nominal extra work for the Accreditation Group. Agenda scheduling could mitigate the Sunday quorum problem by avoiding decision items that afternoon, to the extent practical.

## ***Filling At-Large Rep Vacancies (Bylaws)***

### **Consent Item: Bylaws 7-1 Process for filling unscheduled CC at-large vacancies**

**SPONSOR:** Bylaws Standing Committee

**PRESENTERS:** Tim Morgan (415-706-8927 [blkcloud@sonic.net](mailto:blkcloud@sonic.net)), Jonathan Lundell (650-346-3773, [jlundell@greens.org](mailto:jlundell@greens.org)) and Mike Feinstein (310-392-8450, [mfeinstein@feinstein.org](mailto:mfeinstein@feinstein.org))

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** Current GPCA Bylaws are silent on how to fill vacant At-large CC seats. This proposal fills that void, by

- placing a vacant seat(s) up for election at the next General Assembly
- using processes described in the Bylaws
  - IRV (Instant Run-Off Voting) for a single vacancy
  - STV (Single Transferable Vote) for multiple vacancies
- elects a person(s) for the remainder of the two-year term
- Clarifies the version of STV referenced in the Bylaws is the 2005 edition, of the Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance
- eliminates redundant use of ‘No Other Candidate’ language

Proposed New Language (deletions in ~~strikeout text~~, additions underlined):

#### **7-1.6 Filling At-Large Vacancies**

In the event that an at-large seat is not filled via the Choice Voting procedure described in 7-1.7, or in the event that a seat becomes vacated by resignation, an election shall be held at the next General Assembly to attempt to fill it. If a single seat is vacant, Instant Run-Off Voting as described in 7-1.8 shall be used. If more than a single seat is vacant, Choice Voting as described in 7-1.7 shall be used. Those elected to fill at-large vacancies serve for the remainder of the original term.

#### **7-1.87 Single Transferable Vote (STV) Choice Voting**

Each delegate shall be provided a written secret ballot containing the names of the candidates in random order. The ballot shall also include a “No Other Candidate” (NOC) option. The delegates shall vote by ranking the candidates ~~along with the NOC option~~ in order of preference. The ballots shall be tabulated utilizing a STV Choice Voting system with fractional transfers and a Droop threshold,  $1/(n+1)$  (1/3 threshold with two seats to be filled, 1/4 threshold with three seats to be filled). No candidate shall be seated who does not cross the mandatory threshold before NOC. STV Choice Voting is the Single Transferable Vote (STV) form of proportional representation described in the International IDEA Handbook of Electoral System Design. (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA). 2005 Edition. Stockholm, Sweden). Ties shall be broken at random.

**7-1.98 ~~Single Seat Election:~~ Instant Runoff Voting (IRV)**

When only one seat is to be filled ~~open~~ and two or more candidates seek office, an Instant Runoff election shall be held. Each delegate shall be provided a written secret ballot containing the names of the candidates in random order. ~~The ballot shall also include a “No Other Candidate” (NOC) option.~~ The delegates shall vote by ranking the candidates ~~along with the NOC option~~ in order of preference. The ballots shall be tabulated using Instant Runoff Voting. The IRV winner must receive, by default, an absolute majority of ballots cast in order to be deemed elected.

**FURTHER BACKGROUND:** Regarding eliminating redundant use of ‘No Other Candidate’ language, the GPCA’s current STV/IRV counting methods use a mandatory minimum threshold. The effect of this threshold is to implicitly put ‘NOC’ (no other choice) at the end of each ballot. The redundant NOC language has been removed from the bylaws to avoid confusion. There is no actual change in the counting method.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** Approved on Bylaws Committee Conference call, March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006, as part of a larger, six-part proposal, by a three to one vote.

## **CC Meeting Procedures (Bylaws)**

### **Consent Item: Bylaws 7-1 CC meeting rules and procedures.**

**SPONSOR:** Bylaws Committee

**PRESENTERS:** Tim Morgan 415-706-8927 [blkcloud@sonic.net](mailto:blkcloud@sonic.net)  
Mike Feinstein (310-392-8450, [mfeinstein@feinstein.org](mailto:mfeinstein@feinstein.org))

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** Current GPCA Bylaws provide little guidance on how to schedule and conduct CC meetings, even though the CC is a Committee of the GA and stands in its place in between state meetings. This proposal establishes that

1) the GPCA Bylaws shall refer to the GPCA's Rules & Procedure, for a description of CC meeting rules and procedures, and

2) those rules and procedures shall

- establish specific agenda distribution requirements for CC meetings,
- clarify that the CC shall use a consensus-seeking process, and
- establish how future meetings are set and quorum is reached.
- 

Committee Decision: Approved on Bylaws Committee Conference call, March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006, as part of a larger, several-part proposal, by a three to one vote.

**TIMELINE:** Approval at Ventura General Assembly.

**RESOURCES:** If approved, Bylaws Committee would update Rules & Procedures on web site [www.cagreens.org/bylaws](http://www.cagreens.org/bylaws)

Proposed New Language (deletions in ~~strikeout text~~, additions underlined):

### **7-1.3. Meetings**

#### **7-1.3.1 Regular Meetings**

Regular meetings of the CC shall be held once a month, in person or by teleconference, as well as at GPCA General Assemblies. Agendas for all regular meetings shall be circulated no later than 56 hours in advance of the meeting. Decisions shall be made using a consensus-seeking process as follows:

- a) Consensus is sought through discussion and addressing of concerns.
- b) Any stand-asides shall be recorded in the minutes.
- c) Unresolved concerns return the proposal to the presenter to decide whether to proceed with a vote; vote details shall be recorded in the minutes.
- d) Voting shall be upon the basis of a two-thirds majority, combined with a minimum number of affirmative votes required, equal to the voting threshold times

the decision-making quorum. Abstentions not counted in the percentage vote,

The ~~D~~ date and location of the next regular meeting shall be determined at no later than the close of each meeting or, failing this, shall be determined by the CC co-coordinators. Regardless, the date shall be publicly and announced with at least 20 days notice.

### **7-1.3.2 Continued Meetings**

Regular meetings may be continued to another date, at least seven days ahead, by a vote of the CC, so long as no new agenda items are added. For such meetings, the voting threshold and procedure shall remain the same, as for the regular meeting that has been continued.

### **7-1.3.3 Special Meetings**

A special (~~or emergency~~) meeting may be called with at least six days ~~one week~~ notice by the CC coordinators, or via a decision of the CC, or in response to a petition from a majority of the CC. Agendas shall be circulated no later than 56 hours in advance of the meeting. The decision-making process shall be the same as for Regular Meetings, except that if voting is necessary, it shall be upon the basis of a three-fourths majority. All decisions made at a special meeting shall be treated as policy decisions for voting purposes.

### **7-1.3.4 Quorum**

A quorum of GPCA CC shall consist of 2/3 of the currently filled seated members seats and may be satisfied by members or alternates. Only alternates may participate in place of members - Pproxy votes are not allowed.

**FURTHER BACKGROUND:** The agenda distribution deadline recommended in this proposal is 56 hours. This is designed to provide an actual deadline, where none exists at present. It is also designed to consider the timing of the existing CC agenda preparation process, which has Co-Coordinator agenda-setting calls on Thursday and Friday nights before a Monday CC meeting. The 56-hour threshold would enable agenda distribution no latter than by Saturday morning after this process.

- The clarification that the CC shall use a consensus-seeking process is included to both mention it specifically for the CC, but also to address the voting threshold question for the CC, which at times has been disputed. Since the CC is not to make policy, its decisions have been considered as 'business decisions' and hence require reaching 2/3 to pass, unless otherwise indicated.

At the December 2005 Yolo General Assembly, the delegates also added an minimum affirmative vote requirement to the GPCA's overall decision-making process, that this proposal also incorporates. For the purposes of CC votes, this is particularly significant because the bylaw that was changed allowed 20% of the CC to stand aside (which could be little as three or four people, depending upon how many CC members are present) and kill an issue, regardless of how many others voted for it.

- Finally, the clarification on scheduling of CC meetings provides that

- a) meeting dates shall be announced with at least 20 days notice, with the exception that
- b) an existing meeting may be carried to another date, at least six days ahead, if there is no change in the agenda items, or
- c) a special meeting may be called with at least six days one-week notice by the CC coordinators, or via a decision of the CC, or in response to a petition from a majority of the CC. Agenda distribution requirements would be the same (56 hours) for a special meeting as with a regular CC meeting, but the voting threshold would be raised to 3/4 in order to reflect the shorter meeting notice, and
- d) quorum shall consist of 2/3 of the currently filled seats and may be satisfied by members or alternates. Only alternates may participate in place of members and proxy votes are not allowed.

## ***Regional Rep Alternates (Bylaws)***

### **Consent Item: Bylaws 7-1 Flexibility for term of region's alternate, establish maximum number of alternates**

**SPONSOR:** Bylaws Committee

**PRESENTERS:** Tim Morgan 415-706-8927 [blkcloud@sonic.net](mailto:blkcloud@sonic.net)  
Mike Feinstein (310-392-8450, [mfeinstein@feinstein.org](mailto:mfeinstein@feinstein.org))

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** This proposal addresses two related issues, the ability for region's to set the length of term for their alternates, and a limit on the number of alternates at one time for any single representative.

Under the current bylaw, given that alternates may participate on CC email discussions and conference calls, a region could have a disproportionate number of participants, by simply electing many representatives, while at the same time, a region can not choose an alternate to serve for a limited period of time, even if there are geographic/travel/expertise/other good reasons for it.

Proposed New Language (deletions in ~~strikeout text~~, additions underlined):

#### ~~7-1.6 Alternate Members~~

#### **7.1.4.3 Alternate Regional Members**

Alternate members may be selected for regional members. Diversity and gender balance are encouraged in the selection of alternates. Alternates shall be designated for specific members and shall serve for terms concurrent with the members for whom they are serving, except if a region chooses to select an alternate for a period of lesser duration.

An alternate may participate in CC meetings, but may only vote when the regular member he/she is an alternate for is not present. If the regular member vacates his/her Coordinating Committee seat before the completion of his/her term, the alternate shall fill the vacated position for the remainder of the term for which they were elected. A region may elect up to two multiple alternate representatives for ~~their each~~ regional representative(s). ~~The That~~ region shall then submit a statement to the Coordinating Committee describing the order or method by which the multiple alternates will substitute for a regional representative.

#### **FURTHER DISCUSSION:**

The first change in this proposal establishes that “A region may elect up to two multiple alternate representatives for their each regional representative(s).”

The primary intent of the bylaw to have alternates in the first place – is to have representation if the rep can't make it. This proposal easily satisfies that intent, by allowing up to two alternates per rep. It also satisfies the corollary benefit of 'apprentice/workers' that has accrued in practice over time, that can occur depending upon the alternate's involvement.

The second change granting regions flexibility recognizes that there are many reasons' that a region may want to have an alternate serve for period less than the entire term - geographic concerns drive who can attend a face-to-face meeting, or there may be individuals whose expertise may make them a good alternate for a certain meeting or period of time.

The existing bylaw can be read to seek a full concurrence of terms in order to have the experience to step in if needed. This is important, but not guaranteed even under the current system, because there are not attendance/participation requirements for alternates. By contrast, an experienced person active on the state level, possibly even a previous CC member/alternate, could step in if needed and know the issues and procedures. This proposal assumes that the region knows best about how to balance these concerns.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** Approved on Bylaws Committee Conference call, March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006, as part of a larger, several-part proposal, by a three to one vote.

**RESOURCES:** If approved, Bylaws Committee would update bylaws on web site [www.cagreens.org/bylaws](http://www.cagreens.org/bylaws)

## **CC At-Large Increase by 2 (Bylaws)**

### **Consent Item: Bylaws 7-1 Change in Coordinating Committee At-Large Seats from Four to Six**

**SPONSOR:** Bylaws Standing Committee

**PRESENTERS:** Tim Morgan (415-706-8927 [blkcloud@sonic.net](mailto:blkcloud@sonic.net))  
Mike Feinstein (310-392-8450, [mfeinstein@feinstein.org](mailto:mfeinstein@feinstein.org))

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** The original CC formula (August 1990), was 14 regional and 6 at-large seats. Later (January 2002) it was changed to 16 regional/4 at-large, to promote better regional representation

At-large seats are elected via Single Transferable Vote, but with only two at-large CC seats elected each year, the proportionality is minimized. With three, it would be increased. Since larger groups are more favorable for using STV, the General Assembly is also the best place for STV.

At-large seats were also created to balance gender and other diversity goals resulting from the regional seats. Six at-large seats would aid that pursuit.

If approved at the next General Assembly, it would go into effect at the ensuing General Assembly, at which at-large CC members would be elected. Since two regional representative seats were added in 2002, changing back to six at-large representatives would increase the total size of the CC to 22.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED NEW LANGUAGE** –additions in underlined text and deletions in ~~strikeout text~~

#### 7-1.2 MEMBERSHIP

The Coordinating Committee shall be composed of sixteen regional and ~~four~~ six at-large representatives. The General Assembly shall define the regions, and determine the allocation of regional representatives. Diversity and gender balance are encouraged, especially through the election of at-large representatives and in multi-seat regions. CC representatives are not eligible for the positions of Treasurer and Liaison to the Secretary of State.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** Approved on Bylaws Committee Conference call, March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006, as part of a larger, several-part proposal, by a three to one vote.

## **Purpose statement (Bylaws)**

### **Consent Item: Fill in Purpose statement in Article 2 of GPCA bylaws**

**SPONSOR:** Bylaws Standing Committee

**PRESENTER/CONTACT:** Tim Morgan, 707-695-9293, [blkcloud@sonic.net](mailto:blkcloud@sonic.net)

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** For quite a few years (as least back to 1997) our bylaws have indicated that our purpose as an organization is “unadopted.” While some wry folk would most likely twinkle once or twice at this problem or , it is an embarrassment for this party not to have some stated purpose in our bylaws. The Bylaws Standing Committee has had this work item on our list for quite some time to address and has in the past few months actively been editing a proposed version of our purpose statement. Such broad statements can always be improved and adapted as time goes on and we would fully expect that this statement would evolve sometime in the future.

This composite purpose statement, shown below, first characterizes our 10 key values and then states that as a political party that we believe our general purpose is to advance these values. It goes with out saying that others could add a word or sentence here and there and / or write pages and pages as to what our purpose really is. All members of the committees and others on our list serve have contributed to the shaping of this text. Our concern as the Bylaws Standing Committee was to have a statement that is short and as succinct as possible and not to attempt to have a perfect or universal statement as that is most likely unachievable.

We believe that this proposed text shown below is a viable candidate for a broad purpose statement of our party.

**PROPOSAL:** Provide our bylaws with a purpose (deletions in ~~strikeout~~, additions underlined):

Article 2. Purpose  
(~~unadopted~~)

The Green Party of California, its county organizations and its individual members hold in common the Ten Key Values of ecological wisdom, grassroots democracy, personal and social responsibility, nonviolence, decentralization, community-based economics, feminism, respect for diversity, global responsibility and sustainability.

As the political party of California’s Green movement, the Green Party is an electoral alternative, participating actively in the electoral system to incorporate these values into the policies, laws and activities of local, state and national government, and society at large, and to compete directly with the traditionally entrenched parties and others for elected office to advance these goals.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** Passed by consensus at 3/1/06 teleconference with all outstanding concerns resolved by an online process following the 3/1/06 teleconference.

## ***Campaign Funding Support (CCWG)***

### **Consent Item: Re-establish Campaign Funding Support Committee/Resource Allocation**

**SPONSOR:** Campaigns and Candidates Working Group

**PRESENTER:** Michael Feinstein (310-392-8450, [mfeinstein@feinstein.org](mailto:mfeinstein@feinstein.org))

#### **PROPOSAL:**

1. Non-partisan municipal, county and special district races, California state legislature and U.S. House of Representative

To be considered for GPCA financial (or other resource) support, a Green Party candidate for these races must first receive the endorsement of the County Council (or other County decision-making body) in which the district is located.

It is recommended, but not required, that endorsements by Green locals in the district are received as well.

2. Partisan statewide constitutional offices (Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State; Non-Partisan statewide constitutional offices (Superintendent of Education); State Board of Equalization ; U.S. Senate

To be considered for GPCA financial (or other resource) support, a Green Party candidate for these races must first receive the endorsement. of the GPCA, via either a decision of the General Assembly or a polling of the counties.

3. In the case of special circumstances (e.g., large voting districts with multiple county organizations; special elections), support may be considered on a case-by-case basis.

4. To receive requests for support, the GPCA Coordinating Committee will re-establish the Campaign Support Fund Committee (CSFC), which will make recommendations to the GPCA CC to disburse campaign support funds.

The CSFC will consist of two members from each of the Campaigns and Candidates Working Group, Finance Committee and the GPCA Coordinating Committee.

5. Candidates will be required to fill out a questionnaire and submit it to the CSFC.

6. The CFSC will establish a procedure with deadlines, to ensure that it can receive requests and make recommendations in a timely manner so that the GPCA CC can consider candidate requests together, in order to promote strategic prioritization of funds.

**RESOURCES:** Appointments by the CC, Finance Committee and CCWG to constitute a CSFC. GPCA CC will need to include a candidate financial support fund in its annual work plan and budget.

# TREASURER'S REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

See also:

March 13, 2006

Kenny Mostern

As of this writing, there is plenty of money in the GPCA's coffers. Two things were depleting it in the middle of last year: maintenance of a staff person with no source of funding for that person, and legal expenses related to two internal conflicts. Together these two expenses were lowering the amount in our coffers around \$1500 per month. In the last three months, since the December plenary, our accounts show an increase of \$3321.00, or over \$1100 per month. How has this happened? Is it a good thing?

If you look at the Budget Report attached to this document, you will see that our actual income for FY 2005-06 is nearly \$40,000 lower than budgeted. Our expenditures are over \$42,000 less than budgeted. This certainly means that we are living within our means. However, it also means that we are not spending money that we planned to spend, because we don't have it.

The FY 2006-07 Budget, which is still in the process of being written at the time of this report, will reflect a more reasonable expectation of funding. I am recommending the following:

Resolicitation mailings (4)	30,000
Prospect mailings	2,500
Sustainers	20,000
Misc. donations/unsolicited donations	2,000
GPUS Revenue Sharing	6,000
Clearinghouse sales	2,000
Green Focus Sales	1,500
Receipts from returned loans	4,500
Spending of surplus from our current balance	<u>10,000</u>
Total available to spend	<b>\$78,500</b>

Note that this, while it represents a one-third cut in our budget, actually accurately reflects the real spending of the organization this past year. The "cuts" are largely fictional, because the level of spending anticipated by last year's budget was fictional.

Once again, the dozens of zeroes in the Budget Report, which represent budgeted items that no one has spent a penny on, suggest the following:

1. That without staff, the GPCA does not have the resources (volunteer hours) necessary to do the things it hopes to do;
2. That the GPCA has not, in the past, been successful in anticipating what it will and won't do;
3. That there is little relationship between what the GPCA budgets for, and what the actual costs of running the organization are. This is especially noteworthy not only in the fact that we have spent some unbudgeted money on the plenary, but also in the fact that most of the costs and income of the plenaries are entirely outside the budget altogether, borne by the locals that put the plenaries on.

From my point of view, the creation of this new budget comes at a good moment. If we make decisions in a manner that is tailored to the actual needs, practices and capacities of the organization rather than our dreams of all the things we'd like to do, we will be better positioned to see how, incrementally, we might expand our capacity. We will be able to advertise to locals and campaigns the money we have for their support, and see how many apply for it. We will be able to measure better

our real staff needs, and our capacity to pay for staff. We will be able to make plans, instead of spending based on whoever walked through the door last.

## ***Treasurer's Report***

Dear GPCA leadership:

In the last couple of days, I have had an exchange with a member of the GPCA leadership that indicates to me some of the problems and misunderstandings that have characterized GPCA Budgeting practices as well as the response to my reports on the GPCA budget. I have decided to adapt my responses in this exchange into a FAQ for all to see.

I would like to say that the theme of this entire message is the one in my subject line: the GPCA has had the money for full-time staff since 2002. Only for a few months, earlier this fiscal year, did we dip below an advisable level in the bank for hiring staff, and we are back above that line. **If the GPCA had properly budgeted for the last four years, we could have hired full-time staff at almost any time.**

*Q: Why did you change from a message of "budget tightening" to a message of "spend away" between last summer and the present? of "budget tightening" to a message of "spend away" between last summer and the present?*

A: Last summer I did not say "don't spend," and I am not now saying "spend away." Last summer I said "spend 30% less than you have been budgeted." I am now saying, in the face of working groups that spent 60-100% less than they were budgeted, the money is there for you to spend.

*Q: Saying "spend away" gives the impression of an end of the year sweepstakes in which you get more next year by spending more now. How is this future-focused?*

A: Planning is future-focused, and a budget is a planning document. The way the GPCA has been budgeting for many years has been to say "we will authorize anything that we might spend in the budget." This is not a plan, it is a hope. The way the GPCA should be budgeting is to say "we will authorize what we actually expect to spend, at our real level of capacity, in the budget."

I have not told everyone in the GPCA to spend thousands of dollars now. However, I received a query from a particular committee saying, "we expect a high level of expenditure in anticipation of the 2006 election, higher than we had last year." My advice to them was to take advantage of unspent money in the current year's budget and start buying or contracting the things they were going to need now (that is: **plan now for the summer and fall!**) rather than wait to find out how the budget process was going to go. Doing so not only means taking advantage of already authorized funds; it also means that when the final numbers are distributed for FY 2005-06, they will better demonstrate the spending needs and capacities of this particular working group.

Clearly, given that these considerations are based on the election calendar, a two-year budget is better than saying "spend this fiscal year." I support a two-year budget. But until an effective two-year planning process is implemented, planning in this instance means preparing for the months ahead.

*Q: Aren't the donations we receive fairly random?*

A: No. We receive funds from several specific and regular sources, and we get relatively similar amounts from them every time out. The precise amount of money may increase or decrease based on the level of media attention the Green Party is receiving and the level of internal fragmentation, but even here, the increases and decreases are incremental and not huge, and they can be planned for.

The amount of money we are actually going to bring in during this fiscal year – it will be slightly under \$75,000 – will be within 5% of my prediction when I started in this job last July. If we

do nothing to change the current state of things, we will bring in the same or slightly less next year. The following could increase our income:

- An end to the internal battles, which discourage key individuals who know what is going on from continuing to contribute
- A highly successful election season that attracts thousands of new people to the party
- The hiring of staff who are successfully able to expand our current fundraising base

What is vital to understand is that even if all three of these things happened, the organization's receipts would only increase incrementally. They would not suddenly jump from \$75,000 to \$500,000 – rather, over one year they would, if all went right, perhaps increase to \$100,000 or \$110,000. And that's only if EVERYTHING went right. In a more likely scenario, only one of the three elements would be in play, and the immediate increase would only be to \$85,000 or \$90,000.

*Q: In your writings, you have discussed only this year's expenditures. Why have you not presented two or five year average spending for working groups?*

A: Either no documentation of this exists, or it has not been given to me. So far as I can tell from the databases that I received, the categories by which transactions were recorded by the previous Treasurer had no relationship to the categories in our budget, or to the division of the organization by working group. As a result, I do not know how much CCWG spent in 2002 or the CC in 2004. And it would take a huge amount of work to reconstruct that, work that I am not prepared to do.

If, indeed, anyone has this data, I ask for the 49th time: please send it to me.

*Q: We are a volunteer organization. Maybe we need a volunteer coordinator. Why do you keep acting as though staff is our salvation?*

A: I believe that repeating the mantra “we are a volunteer organization” is a wonderful to ensure that nothing ever gets done. What people need -- me, you, all of us -- more than anything else is TIME. Political work requires extended amounts of assiduous TIME. You want proper financial reporting? That takes TIME. You want to go door to door having real conversations with real people about our positions? That takes TIME. You want effective media? That takes TIME.

The reason people don't have time is because they work for money. They do labor. Hiring staff is paying people so that they have the TIME to do Green Party work. It's labor. It's not creating an elite class – we can and should pay modestly; no one should get rich working for the Green Party. We need to pay a fair wage to committed workers who do honest work. That is all. Without doing that, no one has the TIME to coordinate the efforts necessary to get the Green message out.

I have several times submitted publicly a plan for what I believe we need – a six-person staffed office, and a mechanism for getting there. Many people have said nice things to me about it, while many others have ignored it. No one has entered into any discussions about how to change it according to their difference with me, nor how to enact it. So it sits there, like so many other ideas from the Green Party, as a “good idea” that will never be implemented.

With nearly \$60,000 in the bank, we have the money to begin to implement it now. We have the money to sign a contract with a qualified staff person tomorrow. We can put that person's income in a well-planned budget that includes the expectation of incremental increases in receipts built into that person's job. What we don't have is an organization capable of agreeing enough on priorities to actually go through a hiring process, finding a qualified professional, treating them well, and reaping the benefits. Which is to say, we have plenty of good ideas, but we do not have an organization that knows how to grow.

(16 March 2006 - PF)

## **Account Balances**

As of 3/13/2006

	3/13/2006 Account Balance
<b>Bank Accounts</b>	
Federal Checking	15,600.56
State Checking Account	32,585.15
Trust Savings	10,783.83
<b>TOTAL Bank Accounts</b>	<b>58,969.54</b>
<b>Cash Accounts</b>	
USPS	836.91
<b>OTAL Cash Accounts</b>	<b>836.91</b>
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>59,806.45</b>

## **Cash Flow Report**

12/8/2005 Through 3/13/2006

<b>Category Description</b>	<b>12/8/2005-3/13/2006</b>
<b>INFLOWS</b>	
Clearinghouse Sales	276.00
Donation	12,875.87
GPUS Revenue Sharing	1,216.50
Green Focus Sales	734.00
Interest Inc	7.23
<b>TOTAL INFLOWS</b>	<b>15,109.60</b>
<b>OUTFLOWS</b>	
<b>CC</b>	
Campaign Support Fund	1,200.00
Legal	1,249.50
Meetings	
Plenary Dinners	173.79
<b>TOTAL Meetings</b>	<b>173.79</b>
Plenary Administration	77.58
<b>TOTAL CC</b>	<b>2,700.87</b>
<b>Clearinghouse</b>	
Office	1,200.00
Phone	125.49
Postage	66.00
<b>TOTAL Clearinghouse</b>	<b>1,391.49</b>
<b>Finance</b>	
Events	240.86
Resolicitation Mailings	1,397.45
<b>TOTAL Finance</b>	<b>1,638.31</b>
<b>Green Issues</b>	

Coalition for Fair Wages	1,000.00
Organizing Support	130.00
TOTAL Green Issues	1,130.00
GROW	
Convergence	0.00
County Council Support	800.00
General Administration & Discretionary	-1,000.00
Publication	1,585.89
Subscription Maintenance	750.00
TOTAL Grow	2,135.89
IT	
Domain Name	95.00
Server and Server Support	297.00
TOTAL IT	392.00
Media	
Phone	75.00
Phone -- Cell	75.00
Press Secretary	1,500.00
TOTAL Media	1,650.00
Treasurer	
Merchant Fees	418.61
Postage	59.21
Printing	112.43
software	159.79
TOTAL Treasurer	750.04
Utilities	
Internet	0.00
TOTAL Utilities	0.00
<b>TOTAL OUTFLOWS</b>	<b>11,788.60</b>

# Budget Report

(5/1/2005 – 3/13/2006 - 10.5 months through FY 05-06)

Category Description	5/1/2005 Actual	- Budget	3/13/2006 Difference
<b>INCOME</b>			
Clearinghouse Sales	1,355.64	2,170.69	-815.05
Convergence	0.00	868.27	-868.27
Donation	55,511.52	92,471.77	-36,960.25
Dues From Locals	525.55	1,302.42	-776.87
Event Income			
CCWG	293.49	0.00	293.49
TOTAL Event Income	293.49	0.00	293.49
GPUS Revenue Sharing	6,035.50	3,907.26	2,128.24
Green Focus Sales	1,231.00	3,038.97	-1,807.97
Interest Inc	58.25	0.00	58.25
FROM Federal Checking	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>66,010.95</b>	<b>103,759.38</b>	<b>-37,748.43</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>			
Bylaws			
Copying Postage and Supplies	0.00	173.65	173.65
Phone	0.00	156.29	156.29
Travel	0.00	173.65	173.65
Web and software	0.00	217.06	217.06
TOTAL Bylaws	0.00	720.65	720.65
CC			
Campaign Support Fund	4,315.00	10,419.35	6,104.35
Insurance	1,199.80	868.27	-331.53
Legal	4,284.50	1,302.42	-2,982.08
Mediation and Ethics	500.00	868.27	368.27
Meetings			
Annual	0.00	868.27	868.27
Plenary Dinners	289.74	260.48	-29.26
TOTAL Meetings			
Personnel Ad Hoc Committee	289.74	1,128.75	839.01
Phone			
Adhoc	0.00	138.91	138.91
Co-Co Calls	0.00	138.91	138.91
Regional Representative	0.00	138.91	138.91
TOTAL Phone	0.00	416.73	416.73
Plenary Administration	227.58	173.65	-53.93
Plenary Travel	1,578.00	0.00	-1,578.00
Standing GA Ad Hoc Committee	0.00	217.06	217.06
Supplies And Copies	0.00	86.82	86.82
Travel	0.00	434.13	434.13
TOTAL CC	12,394.62	16,132.51	3,737.89
CCWG			
Printing	19.49	130.24	110.75
Staff	6,500.00	6,946.23	446.23
Staff Expenses	260.30	1,041.94	781.64
Travel	0.00	434.13	434.13
Web & IT Support	0.00	868.27	868.27
Workshops	274.00	1,302.42	1,028.42
TOTAL CCWG	7,053.79	10,723.23	3,669.44

<b>Category Description</b>	<b>5/1/2005 Actual</b>	<b>- Budget</b>	<b>3/13/2006 Difference</b>
Clearinghouse			
ISP	0.00	121.55	121.55
Mail Forwarding	0.00	225.75	225.75
Office	4,000.00	4,167.74	167.74
Office Supplies	0.00	173.65	173.65
Paraphernalia	1,001.31	2,170.69	1,169.38
Phone	459.23	434.13	-25.10
Postage	66.00	156.29	90.29
TOTAL Clearinghouse			
ERWG	5,526.54	7,449.80	1,923.26
Materials	0.00	434.13	434.1
Phone	0.00	86.82	386.82
Travel	0.00	347.30	347.30
TOTAL ERWG	0.00	868.25	868.25
Finance			
Events	240.86	2,604.84	2,363.98
GA Materials	709.86	868.27	158.41
Legacy Mailer	0.00	434.13	434.13
Legal	0.00	434.13	434.13
Mail Permits	0.00	217.06	217.06
Printing and Postage	90.00	217.06	127.06
Prospect Mailings	2,170.64	7,814.52	5,643.88
Resolicitation Mailings	5,851.41	8,682.79	2,831.38
Staff -- Fundraiser	2,500.00	4,341.39	1,841.39
Staff -- Phone Bankers	611.00	3,473.11	2,862.11
Teleconferences	0.00	43.41	43.41
Travel	0.00	434.13	434.13
Web	0.00	868.27	868.27
TOTAL Finance	12,173.77	30,433.11	18,259.34
GPUS			
Caucus Room	0.00	434.13	434.13
Phone	0.00	217.06	217.06
Teleconference	0.00	217.06	217.06
Travel	1,735.00	2,170.69	435.69
Web Services	0.00	434.13	434.13
TOTAL GPUS	1,735.00	3,473.07	1,738.07
Green Issues			
Citizen Lobbying Project	0.00	130.24	130.24
Coalition for Fair Wages	1,000.00	868.27	-131.73
Convergence on Corporate Responsibility	510.03	520.97	10.94
Convergence on Peace Holiday	0.00	499.26	499.26
Empire Boycott	0.00	651.21	651.21
IT	0.00	434.13	434.13
Organizing Support	130.00	260.48	130.48
Phone	0.00	86.82	86.82
TOTAL Green Issues	1,640.03	3,451.38	1,811.35
GROW			
Campus Outreach	0.00	217.06	217.06
Convergence	390.21	868.27	478.06
County Council Support	800.00	651.21	-148.79
Diversity Outreach	90.00	434.13	344.13
General Administration & Discretionary	0.00	868.27	868.27
IT Support	0.00	260.48	260.48
Literature and Promotions	0.00	434.13	434.13
Publication	4,871.31	4,341.39	-529.92
Speakers Bureau	0.00	434.13	434.13
Subscription Maintenance	2,500.00	2,604.84	104.84
Tabling	500.00	694.62	194.62
Video Production	0.00	86.82	86.82
Website	0.00	260.48	260.48
TOTAL GROW	9,151.52	12,155.83	3,004.31

<b>Category Description</b>	<b>5/1/2005 Actual</b>	<b>- Budget</b>	<b>3/13/2006 Difference</b>
International Protocol	0.00	434.13	434.13
IT			
Content Development	0.00	868.27	868.27
Domain Name	95.00	45.14	-49.86
Server and Server Support	1,554.35	1,823.39	269.04
Tech Assistance	0.00	434.13	434.13
TOTAL IT	1,649.35	3,170.93	1,521.58
Media			
Contact List	0.00	217.06	217.06
Fax-Email Distribution	159.12	260.48	101.36
Phone	275.00	260.48	-14.52
Phone – Cell	275.00	260.48	-14.52
Press Conference	0.00	173.65	173.65
Press Secretary	5,500.00	5,209.68	-290.32
Travel	0.00	260.48	260.48
Videotaping	0.00	86.82	86.82
Workshops	0.00	173.65	173.65
TOTAL Media	6,209.12	6,902.78	693.66
Platform			
Printing and Supplies	0.00	86.82	86.82
Travel	0.00	147.60	147.60
TOTAL Platform	0.00	234.42	234.42
Treasurer			
Bank Charge	304.27	217.06	-87.21
CPA	0.00	2,604.84	2,604.84
Data Entry	50.00	651.21	601.21
Legal	0.00	868.27	868.27
Merchant Fees	1,525.32	1,302.42	-222.90
Office Supplies	34.98	217.06	182.08
Postage	616.65	651.21	34.56
Printing	171.94	434.13	262.19
software	159.79	651.21	491.42
TOTAL Treasurer	2,862.95	7,597.41	4,734.46
TO USPS	1,000.00	0.00	-1,000.00
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>61,396.69</b>	<b>103,747.50</b>	<b>42,350.81</b>
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>4,614.26</b>	<b>11.88</b>	<b>4,602.38</b>

# PROPOSALS

## *Budget Proposal*

### FY 2006-07 Budget

**SPONSORING COMMITTEE:** 2006 GPCA Budget Committee

**PRESENTERS:** Kenny Mostern, Treasurer; Laura Wells, CC Liaison to the Finance Committee; Sharon Peterson, CC representative; Ken Smith, Finance Committee Representative

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** The Bylaws of the GPCA require that the General Assembly approve the budget for every fiscal year. It is the responsibility of the Budget Committee to propose the budget, on the basis of budget requests submitted by the Working Groups and Standing Committees.

This proposed budget was the result of the efforts not only of the four members of the Budget Committee, but of the hard work of a team of Co-coordinators who participated in the discussion of this budget. We would like to thank Warner Bloomberg (CCWG), Erika McDonald (Media), Michael Borenstein (CC, GROW), Shane Que Hee (Platform), Matt Leslie (Finance, CCWG), Tim Morgan (IT) and Jim Stauffer (IT) for their participation in the budget process. Because we succeeded in gaining the consensus of these individuals on nearly all items, we believe we have formed a budget that will be suitable for the General Assembly.

Working Groups and Standing Committees proposed, in their initial submissions, over \$195,000 in appropriations. The Budget Committee determined, on the basis of fundraising expectations as well as cash on hand, that the organization had only \$88,500 to allocate. As a result, over \$106,000 needed to be trimmed from the original budget in order to arrive at the budget reflected in this proposal. It is only because of the tremendous commitment and hard work of the co-cos named above that we were able to do this.

A separate proposal, called "Tier Two Budget Items," is being submitted by the Budget Committee separately from this document. That proposal lists the various expenditures that we were unable to fund in the budget. Should more money be raised than is currently expected, some items listed in that document may be funded.

### **PROPOSAL:**

<b>GPCA PROPOSED BUDGET FY 2006-07</b>		
<b>[Approximate Surplus from previous year]</b>	<b>[60,000]</b>	
<b>INCOME</b>		
Resolicitation Mailings	30,000	
Sustainers	20,000	
Misc/unsolicited donations	2,000	
GPUS Revenue Sharing	6,000	
Clearinghouse Sales	2,000	
Green Focus Sales	1,500	
Receipts from Return of Loans	4,500	
Minimum New Income Expected from hire of Fundraiser	2,500	In fact, if a successful hire is made, income should be considerably higher.
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>68,500</b>	

<b>Proposed spending from surplus</b>	<b>20,000</b>	
<b>Proposed maximum expenditure</b>	<b>88,500</b>	
<b>EXPENSES</b>		
<b>CC</b>		
Insurance	1,250	
Legal	5,000	
Plenary Dinners	600	
Travel support	3,000	
Plenary Admin	800	
Loans to Host Committee	4,500	
Retreat	1,200	
Phone	360	
Supplies/Copying	200	
	<b>16,910</b>	
<b>Clearinghouse</b>		
Office Rent	5,500	Represents expected rent increase
Phone	500	
Office Supplies	200	
Paraphernalia (T-Shirts, Buttons, Platforms, etc.)	3,000	
Reprinting of Platform Summaries	2,000	
	<b>11,200</b>	
<b>Finance</b>		
Resolicitation Mailings	8,000	
Thank you notes	300	
Printing of GA Materials	1,000	
	<b>9,300</b>	
<b>GPUS Travel</b>	<b>2,000</b>	
<b>GROW</b>		
Green Focus	6,500	
Subscription Maintenance	3,000	
Additional Printing	500	
County Council Development	1,500	
	<b>11,500</b>	
<b>IT</b>		
Hosting	1,800	
Backup	240	
Reserve	500	
Server Move	200	
	<b>2,740</b>	
<b>Bylaws</b>	<b>300</b>	
<b>Media</b>		
CIPI	6,000	
Phone/Fax Allowance	600	
Business Cards	75	
Travel	150	
	<b>6,825</b>	

<b>Treasurer</b>		
Bank Charges	150	
Merchant Fees	1,800	
Office	300	
Postage	750	
GA Materials	300	
Software	750	
	<b>4,050</b>	
<b>CCWG</b>		
Strategy Meetings	1,000	
Candidate Training Sessions	1,500	
Materials	200	
	<b>2,700</b>	
<b>ERWG</b>	<b>400</b>	
<b>Green Issues</b>		
Convergence #1: Travel and Stipends	400	
Convergence #1: Venue Rental	700	
Convergence #1: Publicity	175	
Convergence #2: Travel and Stipends	400	
Convergence #2: Venue Rental	700	
Convergence #2: Publicity	175	
Teleconferences	288	
Healthy Communities Alliance	250	
Lobbying	400	
Rural Organizing	200	
Printing	200	
	<b>3,888</b>	
<b>International Protocol</b>	<b>200</b>	
<b>Staff</b>	<b>16,487</b>	The Budget Committee recommends that the GPCA spend from its existing surplus on a staff member yet to be defined. We recommend that the position emphasize fundraising, with additional programming and administrative duties to be defined, possibly including liaison work among volunteers or helping to improve GA and CC administration
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>88,500</b>	
<b>[Approximate surplus expected at end of year]</b>	<b>40,000</b>	

## ***Unions Plank (Platform)***

**Decision Item: Unions in the Social Justice & Liveable Communities Section. The involved Ten Key Values of the Greens are Social Justice and Decentralization.**

**SPONSOR:** PLATFORM STANDING COMMITTEE

**PRESENTER:** John Earl – Member, County Council and Labor Caucus of the Green Party of Orange County, (714)960-5179, [johnforcouncil@hotmail.com](mailto:johnforcouncil@hotmail.com)

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** The Unions plank requires revision and it has been completely rewritten to reflect the current labor situation. Discussion of this plank was deferred at the Sylmar Plenary of May 2005. *Discussion occurred at the Yolo Plenary of December 2005 but was not voted upon because of lack of quorum.*

The Green Party of California (GPCA) believes that the right to belong to ~~a an~~ independent, democratic (member-run) labor union run only by labor unionists is a fundamental human right, and that the widespread existence of such unions is vital to ensure a more democratic and just society. Furthermore, the right to belong to a labor union is upheld in the United States Constitution by the First Amendment guarantee of free speech and association and the 13th Amendment ban on involuntary servitude, as well as by international conventions which the United States is obligated to follow due to its membership in the International Labor Organization, a branch of the United Nations.

The GPCA believes that the Union Bill of Rights as set forth in the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act should act as the starting point to assure the direct and democratic control of unions by their rank and file members.

**PROPOSAL** (additions in underlined text and deletions in strikeout text):

### A. Democratic Unionism

In order to promote democratic unionism, the Green Party of California supports:

1. Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and “right to work” laws that restrict the right to organize unions.
2. Equal Union rights for public sector, railway, and agriculture employees.
3. Legislation to allow all American based workers to join the independent union of their choice through a “card-check” sign-up procedure.
4. Legislation to require all American controlled companies to accept the presence of independent unions through a “card-check” sign up procedure in any other country where the company operates.
5. Legislation to prohibit foreign controlled companies from doing business in the United States if they do not respect the right of their workers ~~within or outside of the United States~~ to belong to a union.
6. Elimination of all legal provisions in treaties or laws and of all financial incentives that encourage American-based employers to relocate in other countries.
7. Legislation to prohibit American owned companies from subcontracting with any company in the United States or abroad that refuses to respect the right of its workers to belong to an independent union in a fashion consistent with this labor platform.
8. The continued and secure existence of a fully government funded social security system.
9. An end to privatization of government provided social services: only unionized labor workers should be hired.

10. True universal/single-payer health care that is government paid and based on need, not profit, regardless of work status, in order to provide quality and affordable health care for all and to remove health care as a corporate union busting tool.
11. Union access to company financial records for bargaining purposes.
12. Union representation on corporate boards.
13. Legislation to guarantee to employees and communities advance warning of no less than 6 months of plant closures, mergers, or buy-outs.
14. Legislation to guarantee that every ~~no~~ employee who loses ~~will lose~~ his/her job due to a company merger or change of ownership will receive company help to get a job elsewhere.
15. Legislation to assure union recognition and union contracts following a company merger or change of ownership.
16. Legislation to facilitate workers and/or communities taking over ~~closed~~ plants and forming employee-owned businesses and cooperatives before and after plant closure.
17. Strong legal consequences for American companies that interfere directly or indirectly with the right of workers to belong to a union either in the United States or abroad.

#### B. Labor Organizing Strategies:

The GPCA believes that union membership in the United States has plummeted due to an ongoing corporate backlash against democratic unionism since union membership peaked in the late 1940s. The backlash has also produced declining labor organization influence over both major political parties, and has also resulted in the loss of, and serious threat to, vital “social wages” acquired through past labor struggles. To bring attention to the social injustice caused by the backlash and to reverse its effect, the GPCA wishes to work in tandem with labor unions.

Some issues of common interest may be:

1. The direct and democratic control of unions by their rank and file members.
2. “Business unionism” versus democratic unionism.
3. Grass-roots organizing (long abandoned by mainstream organized labor)
4. Alternative forms of labor organizing that unite workers across traditional workplace boundaries and class structure
5. Establishing international labor networks to coordinate responses to multi-national corporations.
6. Joint worker control of plant occupational and environmental health and safety with the operating company.

#### C. Labor Unions and the Environment:

The GPCA recognizes the need to strive for a holistic approach to improving the quality of worker life by respecting the inextricable link between workplace or living environments and the natural environment. Society should not have to choose between job protection and environmental protection, but there must be a “just transition” for workers adjusting to a new environmentally friendly economy. In order to accomplish that goal, environmentalists and labor activists must join together in common cause through (but not limited to) the following actions:

1. By treating poverty as both a social and environmental issue
2. By combining environmental protection with job protection.
3. Supporting a “just transition” (with no loss of income or benefits and with training) to other jobs for

workers who lose their employment ~~.due to environmental protection measures.~~ This transition should be funded through the tax base and from fines on corporate polluters.

4. Use of public ~~pension~~ funds to invest in businesses that produce non-polluting, renewable and efficient energy systems and labor friendly jobs.

5. Create political alliances between labor and ~~environmental~~ advocacy groups to offset the political influence of the fossil fuel industry.

#### D. Labor Education:

The GPCA recognizes the need to provide public programs to educate the general public about labor issues to counter-balance anti-union propoganda of the news media and other bastions of corporate power. Therefore, the GPCA supports:

1. Fully funded labor studies programs at universities that are designed to research all aspects of unionism including democratic unionism.

2. Labor studies classes provided at all grade levels in our public schools.

3. Outreach to schools at all grade levels and to community organizations for the purpose of educating the public about labor unions.

---

NOTE: Bullets will replace numbers in the final version. Numbers are used for ease of reference.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** The original plank was consensed to on the Committee listserv for the Sylmar plenary of May 2005.

**TIMELINE:** General Assembly discussion of this plank was deferred at the Sylmar Plenary of May 2005. Discussion occurred at the Yolo Plenary of December 2005 but was not voted upon because of lack of quorum.

**RESOURCES:** Replaces outdated Unions plank. No other resources required.

## ***Conservation of Health Plank (Platform)***

**Decision Item: Conservation of Human Health Plank in the Social Justice & Liveable Communities Section. Grassroots democracy, social justice and equal opportunity, feminism and gender equity, respect for diversity, and personal and global responsibility are the involved 10 Key Values of the GP.**

**SPONSOR:** PLATFORM STANDING COMMITTEE

**PRESENTER/CONTACT:** Kate Curry, [kcmcurry43@yahoo.com](mailto:kcmcurry43@yahoo.com)  
Elizabeth Green, [info@green247.org](mailto:info@green247.org)

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** Exploiting human health through violence and symptom management is a form of violence profiteering. It channels funds from communities to corporations through a vicious cycle of damage and repair. It re-victimizes the disenfranchised. Violence can destroy the health of the victim and community. Sustainable communities conserve human health. Healthy aging provides communities with wisdom.

This new plank supplements but does not overlap with the Human Rights/Civil Liberties and Criminal Justice planks. The basic ideas of this plank were first presented to the Green Issues WG at the 2003 San Francisco plenary. An initial written form was posted on the Women's Caucus discussion board in April 2004. It was first posted on the Platform WG list-serve in May 2004, enabled for further consideration at the May 2004 Ventura Plenary, revised extensively thereafter, and was voted at the Sylmar Plenary of May 2005 to receive General Assembly assessment. It was included for discussion at the Yolo Plenary of December 2005 but was not published in the Plenary program but had comments at and after the Platform Working Group Meeting at that Plenary.

**PROPOSAL:** The Green Party of California supports conservation of human health through the following solutions:

1. Educating Children About Violence, Addiction, and Self-Help:
  - a. Educate children as early as possible how to recognize, prevent, stop, and report violence and addiction, and how to keep the peace, using role play.
  - b. Promote assertiveness training and self-defense classes in elementary school curricula.
  - c. Provide education in maintaining chastity, and peaceful interactions in junior high school curricula.
  - d. Offer negotiation, mediation, human rights litigation, and violence de-escalation training courses in senior high school curricula.
  - e. Include civil-litigation instruction in all civics courses.
  - f. Promote the role of men in the conservation of peace and public health.
  
2. Prevention of Violence Profiteering:
  - a. Require consent and certification to ensure that every human bodily extraction, bodily insertion, bodily injection, body imaging, abortion, and adoption are nonprofit, not coerced (informed consent has been elicited), and are not anonymous. This requires label information that includes the source and how to contact the source for verification. This must cover every toxin, organ, child, baby, fetus, cell, clone, and test tube baby.
  - b. Require provider agencies to cover all costs for materials and services without charge to any involved or potential parents, donor, or recipient. Take the profit motive out of child adoption,

abortion, rape, divorce, body battery, kidnapping, fraud, trafficking, racketeering, solicitation through decriminalizing prostitution, drug prescription, harvesting cells, cloning cells, and organ theft.  
c. Empower health professionals to provide victims of molestation or violence with counseling, social work, and drug prescriptions for immediate (within one week of the traumatizing incident) holistic recovery services.

3. Extension of Public Health Care Coverage to the Effects of Violence: Any government-funded health plan must cover the following:

- a. Injury prevention including violence prevention measures such as security systems/services.
- b. Immediate (commenced within one week of informing the victim) prosecution related to violent offenses, including attorney fees for victim compensation.
- c. Assistance with mediation and restitution processes;
- d. Assistance with annual check-ups to assess the risk and extent of injuries.
- e. Any other measures that will prevent posttraumatic stress disorders and other social conditions caused by social negligence.

4. Funding the Extension of Public Health Care Coverage to the Effects of Violence: Taxes on the sale and promotion of violence and violence products will generate funds and act as deterrent.

- a. All government Treasuries will tax violence products and services at a rate that reflects the true cost, and will tax violence profits at a rate of 100% whenever possible.
- b. All businesses that use killing, violence, coercion, or force should be nonprofit or outlawed.
- c. Spoils of war, even after being used as capital, must be confiscated by the courts or the Department of Justice(DOJ) who will return them to the original owners. Likewise, the DOJ will return all prison revenue to victims of violence.
- d. Hospitals and other establishments convicted of using violence or coercion must not be funded by the government, and have no right to compensation for services.

5. Humanizing Prisons and Jails: Each prison and jail must provide the most effective and comprehensive cure for violence addiction.

- a. These curative measures must be nonviolent, and could include such tools as counseling, aptitude testing, halfway houses, hospices, retraining, and formal education.
- b. Each prison and jail must have separate facilities for violence addicts.
- c. Executive or judicial government or other nonprofit organizations must operate all prisons.
- d. We support testing of violent criminals both randomly for psychotropic substances such as psychomimetics and alcohol, and pre-sentence for low-dose cumulative effects of toxic chemicals

## **DEFINITIONS:**

A violence product or service:

1. Contains any trace of violence, without redeeming value. Example: cops and robbers portrayed as a game; officers detaining civilians as a game. Or,
2. Depicts violence without punishment. Example: virtual child pornography; killing innocent civilians (also known as ethnic cleansing).

An anti-violence product contains redeeming value. Example: self-defense video; self-defense tactic.

Redeeming value requires:

1. depiction or acknowledgment of the pain, punishment, penance, or other adverse effect of the use of violence.
2. a constant message that the violence is in error, unethical, inappropriate, criminal, or harmful. And,
3. emphasis on the immorality, unsuitability, crime, harm, and error of the violence.

Violence addiction is the frequent desire to view, listen to, feel, or commit violence.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** The basic ideas of this plank were first presented to the Green Issues WG at the 2003 San Francisco plenary. An initial written form was posted on the Women's Caucus discussion board in April 2004. It was first posted on the Platform WG list-serve in May 2004, enabled for further consideration at the May 2004 Ventura Plenary, revised extensively thereafter, and was voted at the Sylmar Plenary of May 2005 to receive General Assembly assessment.

**TIMELINE:** It was included for General Assembly discussion at the Yolo Plenary of December 2005 but was not published in the Plenary program but had comments at and after the Platform Working Group Meeting at that Plenary.

**RESOURCES:** Complements the Healthcare plank. No other resources required.

## ***Agricultural Economics Plank (Platform)***

### **Agricultural Economics and Social Justice in the Social Justice & Liveable Communities Section.**

**SPONSOR:** PLATFORM STANDING COMMITTEE

**PRESENTER:** Don Eichelberger, (415) 861-0592 or (415)567-4577, [done@greens.org](mailto:done@greens.org).

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** According to the California Department of Food and Agriculture, California is the leading agricultural producer in the nation with nearly \$28 billion in farm receipts generated from 350 different commodities. Yet the major parties in the state give the subject very little space in their respective platforms, but praise the agriculture industry.

The Green Party of California (GPCA) has focused its agriculture plank on sustainable agriculture and support for small farms. Agribusiness, however, does rule in this state, unavoidably creating economic upheaval and waste. It is imperative that governments look at economic as well as ecological sustainability. We must be aware of how costs are factored and funds allocated, for if significant changes are to be made in agriculture policies, they must also be economically sustainable or they will not happen.

Grassroots democracy, social justice and equal opportunity, feminism and gender equity, respect for diversity, and personal and global responsibility are the involved 10 Key Values of the GP.

#### **PROPOSAL:**

The GPCA plank on Sustainable Agriculture is supplemented by proposing to end agricultural commodity dumping. Since U.S. Agribusiness, with the help of governmental policies, is responsible for the dumping of significant quantities of US agricultural products into world markets, the result is to cause irreparable harm to the agricultural economies of importing countries and to lower domestic farm prices. Dumping has long been a part of US Trade Policies, and encourages over-production of some products while destroying the agricultural economies of importing countries. Dumping is often made possible by direct and visible governmental subsidy of exported products.

#### ***Therefore governments should:***

1. End visible export subsidies. We must commit to keep U.S. products that are priced below the cost of production out of world markets.
2. Institute Fair Trade. We advocate that the terms should be defined to include:
  - (a) Controls which ensure that agricultural workers are paid a living wage that is also enough to sustain the local agricultural economy;
  - (b) Measures which prevent the exploitation of child labor;
  - (c) Common definitions of commodity dumping;
  - (d) Enforcement of anti-dumping regulations and orders.
3. Develop Local Markets for Agricultural Goods such as Farmers' Markets and Cooperatives. Environmental sustainable alternatives must be developed that (a) aid small-scale agricultural

producers at the local/regional level; (b) maintains convenience for consumers; (c) involve local processing and collaborative marketing/distribution.

Definition:

Dumping: the sale of agricultural commodities on world markets at below the cost of production

COMMITTEE DECISION: The draft plank was submitted to Platform by Wes Rolley from the Green Issues Committee. Discussion on the Platform listserv, at the Sylmar Plenary Platform Committee Meeting, and thereafter, led to consensus at the Yolo Plenary of December 2005.

TIMELINE: This is the first General Assembly consideration of the plank.

RESOURCES: Complements the Sustainable Agriculture plank. No other resources required.

## ***Defining GPCA Membership***

### **Decision Item: Clarify definition of GPCA membership in bylaws**

**SPONSORING COMMITTEE:** Bylaws Standing Committee

**PRESENTERS:** Jonathan Lundell (650) 726-1949, [jlundell at greens.org](mailto:jlundell@greens.org)  
Cat Woods (415) 897-6989, [cat801 at mindspring.com](mailto:cat801@mindspring.com)

**BACKGROUND:** The Secretary of State of California considers membership in a political party to be registration to vote in that party. The U.S Supreme Court found California's Proposition 198, which would have allowed people to participate in the decision-making of parties of which they were not members, unconstitutional on the grounds that it violated political parties' First Amendment right of association. Under the resultant Modified Closed Primary system, which took effect in 2001, political parties may decide whether to also allow Decline to State voters to participate in their decision-making process. The GPCA has not made the decision to do so.

It has come to the attention of the Bylaws committee that the GPCA bylaws have a hole in the area of defining membership. Green Party registration is the general standard, but this is not yet explicit in the bylaws. Many counties also make exceptions for people who are unable to register to vote (e.g., resident aliens) to be voting members of their party, but this also has not yet been spelled out in the bylaws. This amendment codifies existing practice of the GPCA regarding membership, by which re-registering Decline to State or in another political party is considered resignation from the party -- as assumed, for example, in Paragraph 6-3.1 b regarding Coordinating Committee representatives: "Resignation is implied whenever... the member registers with any other political party, including decline to state."

**PROPOSAL:** Amend the GPCA bylaws to add:

#### 3.1.3 Membership

Members of the GPCA are those who are legally registered to vote in California as members of the Green Party.

County organizations may extend membership to persons not eligible to register to vote in California who meet specific criteria, including affirmation of the 10 Key Values.

Only members may vote for or serve as party office-holders or General Assembly delegates, or hold outstanding concerns or vote in party decision-making.

The party office-holders of Coordinating Committee representative, Treasurer, and Liaison to the Secretary of State must be registered to vote in the Green Party.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** CONSENSUS 3/1/06

**TIMELINE:** immediate.

# ***Impeachment Resolution***

## **Decision Item: Adopt Impeachment Resolution**

**SPONSORING COMMITTEE:** GROW Working Group

**PRESENTERS:** Kent Smith ([kentwsmith@yahoo.com](mailto:kentwsmith@yahoo.com))  
Michael Borenstein (530.620.6659, [thebor@cagreens.org](mailto:thebor@cagreens.org))

### **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:**

The governance of our country has entered an era where it has become debilitating to:

- The worldwide reputation of its citizenry,
- Hopeful prospects of building world peace,
- Prospects of material and social resources worldwide being used equally for the betterment of all lives of all living things on earth.

Whereas goals and values of Green Parties worldwide yearn to reverse these debilitating factors within governments and social structures. We purpose to energize this reversal through the legal means of impeaching those facilitating these debilitating factors. The GPCA may join this worldwide effort by endorsing this proposal, attached language and actions.

**PROPOSAL:** It is hereby proposed that the State Plenary of the Green Party of California adopt the following Resolution:

A RESOLUTION OF THE GREEN PARTY OF CALIFORNIA in defense of the Constitution of the United States demanding the impeachment of George W. Bush, Richard B. Cheney and two complicit associates.

Whereas the Declaration of Independence declares securing “unalienable Rights” including “Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness” to be the purpose of government and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States establishes the firm foundation for our rule of law and its Bill of Rights provides for the precious individual rights and freedoms guaranteed to all American citizens,

Whereas, in the conduct of their offices, President George W. Bush, Vice President Richard B. Cheney, Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld, and Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, in violation of their constitutional oaths to “preserve, protect and defend the Constitution” and to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,” have committed any or all of the following “high Crimes and Misdemeanors:”

1. **WARRANTLESS SEARCHES:** ordering the National Security Agency to conduct secret warrantless searches and seizures of the private personal communications of American citizens, without oversight by the legislative or judicial branches of the government, in violation of the 4th Amendment of the Constitution and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of the Congress (FISA 1978);

2. **TORTURE:** authorizing and permitting torture against human beings, in violation of the Geneva Conventions (1864-1949) and the United Nations’ Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1985);

3. **INDEFINITE DETENTION:** depriving American citizens of their constitutionally guaranteed rights regarding unjust imprisonment and speedy and public trial, in violation of their rights to guaranteed liberty and due process of law in the 5th and 6th Amendments;

4. **WAR OF AGGRESSION:** launching an illegal, unjust and undeclared war against the sovereign state of Iraq, in violation of Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution and Chapters 1, 6, and 7 of the Charter of the United Nations (1945);

5. USE OF ILLEGAL WEAPONS: authorizing the use of illegal chemical and radioactive weapons in military campaigns, notably white phosphorous and depleted uranium in Iraq, in violation of the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR 1948);

6. DELIBERATE DECEPTIONS: repeatedly, consciously, and with forethought, lying to the American people and the U.S. Congress by providing false and deceptive rationales for an unjustified and illegal war in Iraq;

7. ATTACKING CIVILIANS: authorizing, ordering, and condoning direct military attacks on civilians and civilian homes and communities, thereby causing massive death, maiming and destruction in Iraq, in violation of Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and

8. VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL TREATIES: violating and unilaterally abrogating lawful signatory treaties, such as the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (1972) between the United States and Russia, the Treaty of Rome (1950) establishing the International Criminal Court and the Geneva Conventions providing for humane treatment of combatants and civilians, in violation of Article VI of the Constitution acknowledging these treaties to be "the Supreme Law of the Land."

Therefore, the Green Party of California demands the impeachment and consequent removal from office of the four aforementioned officials. Be it further resolved that the Green Party of California petitions the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress to initiate Impeachment proceedings against all four identified officials. Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be sent to our California Congressional representatives and to all members of the House Judiciary Committee.

## **Regional Rep Elections (Bylaws)**

### **Bylaws 7-1 – Noticing, Conducting, Reporting and Filing of CC Election Results and Procedures**

**SPONSOR:** Bylaws Committee

**PRESENTERS:** Tim Morgan 415-706-8927 [blkcloud@sonic.net](mailto:blkcloud@sonic.net)  
Mike Feinstein (310-392-8450, [mfeinstein@feinstein.org](mailto:mfeinstein@feinstein.org))

Background and Purpose: Current Bylaws provide allow regions to choose their own process for picking regional CC representatives, yet are vague about what should be addressed in the process. This isn't desirable, especially when internal divisions may be present, and a lack of clarify can make things worse.

This proposal provides clarity about what is expected, and makes the processes more transparent. The primary changes establish:

- 21-day minimum notice for CC elections.
- 13-day minimum for filling regional CC procedures before an election.
- 7-day minimum to reporting CC election results and CC member resignations
- clear questions a region's procedure needs to address in its process

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** Approved on Bylaws Committee Conference call, March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006, as part of a larger, several-part proposal, by a three to one vote.

**RESOURCES:** If approved, Bylaws Committee would update bylaws on web site [www.cagreens.org/bylaws](http://www.cagreens.org/bylaws)

Proposed New Language (deletions in ~~strikeout text~~, additions underlined):

#### **7-1.4 Regional Members ~~CC Elections and Term of Office~~**

~~At the first General Assembly meeting of each year, elections shall be conducted for CC seats whose terms are scheduled to expire within the calendar year including two at large seats and any expiring regional seats not filled by an alternative regional process (see selection of regional members, paragraph 7-1.5). CC representatives shall serve for a nominal term of two years or until their successors are elected. In any event, at large representatives shall vacate their seats at the end of the term unless reelected, and regional representatives shall retain their seats beyond the end of the term unless replaced or recalled.~~

#### **7-1.5 4.1 Selection of Regional Members**

Regional members and alternates shall be selected by each region, according to their own process. ~~Each region's process regional caucus of delegates at General Assembly meetings, unless the active counties of a region select another process. Any such alternative process must be consistent with the~~ ten Ten key Key values Values, GPCA bylaws, and California law. and The process must be approved by all the County Councils of the active counties of a region and shall include a minimum 21-day advance notice of the election to all County Council members of the active counties of a region. The process shall also include

- what body and/or group of individuals is responsible for convening and conducting the selection process
  - what body and/or group of individuals is empowered to make the Regional Member selection

- what voting process is used  
- what decision-making threshold is used
- how votes are allocated among counties in multi-seat regions  
- what the quorum is for decision-making, and
- whether there are mandated noticing requirements over and above the 21-day notice required by the GPCA

~~and~~ The process shall be filed with the Coordinating Committee and the Bylaws Committee at least 13 days prior to any alternative process election. Regions with two or more seats are encouraged to strive for diversity and gender balance.

Election results, as well as resignations for a region’s primary or alternate member(s), shall be reported to the Coordinating Committee and the County Councils from the region’s active counties within seven days (and the manner of reporting shall be established into the rules and procedures).

**ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND:**

Taking the points in order as presented above,

- the 21-day minimum establishes a uniform standard of noticing for CC seats, which still giving regions flexibility by not having the same requirement as for the at-large seats, which require 60 days, but still retaining the firm beginning and ending times of CC terms.
- the 13-day filing standard gives the Coordinating Committee and Bylaws Committee the ability to comment on a region’s process
- the 7-day period to report CC election results helps establish transparency and standardization of information
- establishing ‘basic questions and criteria a region’s procedure needs to address’, this approach fills a void in the current Bylaws (7-5.1) which only speaks about being “consistent with the ten key values, GPCA bylaws, and California law, but does not list any criteria a region must address.

Rather than being proscriptive, and taking sides among the philosophical and practically different situations and approaches in different parts of the state, this proposal begins by taking the ‘soft path’.

It asks ‘what the questions are that needed to be answered’, just like the original Ten key Values did, by the way. Then it follows that with more transparency about how a region conducted its process.

In addition to applying to alternative procedures that provide for electing CC regional representatives outside of General Assemblies, this proposal also applies to regions that wish to elect their representatives at General Assemblies. This is the current default practice, but the requirements for it are just as vaguely defined as are the requirements for alternative regional procedures. By eliminating it as a default, at this proposal does, and requiring a region that chooses to do it in that manner, to answer these same questions, that process will be improved as well.

## ***Length of CC Term (Bylaws)***

### **Bylaws 7-1 Coordinating Committee – Establish beginning and ending times for CC terms**

**SPONSOR:** Bylaws Committee

**PRESENTERS:** Tim Morgan 415-706-8927 [blkcloud@sonic.net](mailto:blkcloud@sonic.net)  
Mike Feinstein (310-392-8450, [mfeinstein@feinstein.org](mailto:mfeinstein@feinstein.org))

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** Existing Bylaws allow CC representatives to stay in their seat beyond the end of their two-year term, until a new representative is elected. This creates a lack of clarity and standardization about terms, including situations where CC representatives stay on far longer than they were elected, providing a disincentive for regional representatives to help schedule new elections because it would end their term.

This proposal would establish beginning and ending times for terms, and has the corollary effect of incentivizing regular elections, which fits in with the Two Year Work Plan approach approved by the December 2005 Yolo General Assembly.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** Approved on Bylaws Committee Conference call, March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006, as part of a larger, several-part proposal, by a three to one vote.

**TIMELINE:** Approval at Ventura General Assembly.

**RESOURCES:** If approved, Bylaws Committee would update bylaws on web site [www.cagreens.org/bylaws](http://www.cagreens.org/bylaws)

Proposed New Language (deletions in ~~strikeout text~~, additions underlined):

#### **7-1.4.2 Length of Term for Regional Members**

The term of office for regional members shall be twenty-four months. Regions must make their selection prior to the end of the twenty-four month term, with the person then assuming the position at the beginning of the next term. If not, the seat is considered vacant until filled.

#### **7-1.5.2 Length of Term for At-Large Members**

The term of office for at-large members shall be twenty-four months. The term shall run from upon election, from the first Saturday of April of the year elected, to the Friday immediately preceding the first Saturday of April two years later.

If a General Assembly is held during the weekend of the first Saturday of April, and an at-large seat is elected at it, then the term shall begin upon election for that seat at that meeting and end upon election for that seat two years hence. If no election is held for that seat at that

time, then the term of the term of the existing member shall run through the Friday immediately preceding the first Saturday.

**FURTHER DISCUSSION:** This approach – to establish firm beginning and ending dates, rather than providing some kind of grace period - was arrived at to eliminate the incentive to ‘game’ the make up of the CC, by playing with the date of CC elections.

By ‘gaming’ it is meant that, if a representative can stay on beyond the end of his/her term, then whomever is involved in setting the date of the election can choose to do it sooner or later, depending upon who they want on the CC for which meeting. Extending an existing term through a ‘grace period’ would also take time away from the person who eventually filled the seat, for the remainder of their term, or start a new two-year period at that point, throwing the election schedule out of whack and giving some people longer terms than others. None of this is something that should have an incentive in the bylaws. Yet the current bylaws incentive this approach, as would an approach that embodied a grace period. This is why a firm beginning and ending date approach was chosen.

Fortunately, this principle is easily applied for regional seats. Regions are in control of their own destiny, because they can control when they hold their elections. Under this approach, a region has an incentive to schedule their own regional representative election before the ending date of their representative(s)’s term, in order to ensure they will have continued representation. (This also follows the public model elections, where someone elected in November, doesn’t take office until a few weeks to months later).

For at-large seats by contrast, the application of this principle requires consideration that there are only two to three General Assemblies a year, compared to the flexibility a region has in time and manner of its process.

Current GPCA Bylaw says that an election for at-large seats should happen at the first General Assembly of the year. This refers to calendar years. However, this fails to account for that often meetings are held on the December/January cusp, following November general elections. Simply changing the approach from calendar years to election calendars could work wonders, based upon the empirical history of GPCA General Assemblies.

Since the GPCA’s February 1990 founding, there has been at least one General Assembly in the period from after a November general election, through the end of the April of the ensuing year. In six of those years there has been two General Assemblies held during this period. (see attachments below) If the GPCA sets a date for CC terms in April, it should easily be able to hold a General Assembly beforehand, in order to choose at-large reps in time.

Is it a reasonable to plan for this? Yes. Already in the Bylaws (Section 7-1.1 Duties and Authority) is that one of the basic tasks of the CC is to plan for state meetings: “The Coordinating Committee shall be generally responsible for coordinating meetings, internal communications and other administrative tasks, including the following :a) Establish agenda and select facilitators for general meetings.”

Perhaps even more emphatically, the December 2006 GPCA General Assembly approved Bylaws language mandating the CC to implement a Two Year Work Plan process, meaning that the General Assembly specifically wants to see longer term planning implemented in the GPCA.

In addition to setting any date in April, there are several reasons for setting a specific date in April - that being the first Saturday of the month. First, rather than picking a numerical date like April 5<sup>th</sup>, which could fall on any day of the week, this kind of description was taken because it is at the same time, every year.

Second, since the GPCA CC has its monthly conference calls on Mondays, this ensures that a new person would be serving by that Monday, should the two dates coincide.

Third, in the event that a special CC meeting were called during the remainder of the weekend in which new at-large members were elected, they would be to serve at that point.

Fourth, holding General Assemblies during the end of April/early May causes a conflict with the signature gathering period for County Council (and for some partisan candidates) for people on Committees and Working Groups, who are doing work to prepare agenda items for the General Assemblies, and for people on the Agenda Committee, CC and Site Committee, who are doing work to get ready for the plenary.

Fifth, incentivizing that meetings are not held in late April or in May, unless there is a very good reason to do so, means no conflict with Earth Day (which often includes events the weekend before and after the Earth Day weekend itself), nor with people campaigning in May for June primaries, like is currently the case for Aimee Allison in Oakland.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** Approved on Bylaws Committee Conference call, March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006, as part of a larger, six-part proposal, by a three to one vote,

**RESOURCES:** If approved, Bylaws Committee would update bylaws on web site [www.cagreens.org/bylaws](http://www.cagreens.org/bylaws)

**ATTACHMENTS:**

**GPCA General Assembly History**

(meetings between a November General Election and the following April)

2005-12 Yolo (Davis)	1997-03 Santa Clara (San Jose State)
2004-12 Ventura	1996-01 Santa Cruz
2004-03 San Francisco	1995-02 San Diego (UCSD)
2003-12 Orange (Fullerton)	1994-01 San Francisco (New College)
2003-01 Santa Clara (Stanford)	1993-04 Sacramento (American Legion Hall)
2002-01 Los Angeles	1992-04 Alameda (Oakland)
2001-04 Sacramento	1992-01 Sacramento (state bldg) first GA after ballot status
2000-12 San Diego	1991-04 San Diego
2000-04 Alameda (Berkeley)	1990-03 Los Angeles (LA City College)
1999-02 San Francisco	1991-01 San Francisco (New College)
1998-11 Santa Cruz (UCSC)	
1998-01 San Francisco (state bldg)	

## GPCA General Assembly History (all dates)

1990-02 Sacramento (Cal State Sacramento) founding meeting	1997-03 Santa Clara (San Jose State)
1990-03 Los Angeles (LA City College)	1997-06 Humboldt (Arcata) Gathering
1990-05 Fresno (Cal State Fresno)	1997-09 Los Angeles (Elysian Park)
1990-06 Nevada County Gathering	
1990-08 Humboldt (Arcata)	1998-01 San Francisco (state bldg)
1990-10 Santa Barbara	1998-04 San Anselmo Gathering
	1998-07 Mendocino
1991-01 San Francisco (New College)	1998-11 Santa Cruz (UCSC)
1991-04 San Diego	
1991-08 Santa Cruz	1999-02 San Francisco
	1999-08 Santa Barbara
1992-01 Sacramento (state bldg) first GA after ballot status	
1992-04 Alameda (Oakland)	2000-04 Alameda (Berkeley)
1992-07 Los Angeles (Cal State Fullerton)	2000-12 San Diego
1992-11 Monterey	
	2001-04 Sacramento
1993-04 Sacramento (American Legion Hall)	2001-09 San Mateo (Burlingame)
1993-06 Santa Barbara	
1993-09 Sacramento	2002-01 Los Angeles
	2002-05 Fresno
1994-01 San Francisco (New College)	2002-08 Ventura Gathering
1994-07 Nevada City	
	2003-01 Santa Clara (Stanford)
1995-02 San Diego (UCSD)	2003-05 Sacramento
1995-09 Los Angeles (Cal State Northridge)	2003-09 San Diego
	2003-12 Orange (Fullerton)
1996-01 Santa Cruz	
1996-06 Alameda (Berkeley) Nader nominated	2004-03 San Francisco
1996-08 Los Angeles (UCLA) also GP national convention	2004-06 Sacramento
	2004-12 Ventura
	2005-05 Los Angeles (Sylmar)
	2005-09 Alameda Gathering
	2005-12 Yolo (Davis)

## ***Endorsement Policies (CCWG)***

### **GPCA Candidate Endorsements Policies (2 proposals)**

**SPONSOR:** Campaign & Candidates Working Group

**PRESENTER:** Michael Feinstein (310-392-8450, [mfeinstein@feinstein.org](mailto:mfeinstein@feinstein.org))

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** These three separate but related proposals seek to establish a GPCA candidate endorsement process and re-establish a process for receiving and evaluating requests from candidates for GPCA financial support.

According to GPCA Bylaw 8.2.1, the tasks of the Campaigns & Candidates Working Group are to:

- a) Educate Green Party members about GPCA electoral strategy;
- b) Identify key political campaigns in which Green Party activists can play a pivotal role;
- c) Identify registered Greens who would make credible candidates;
- d) Promote and facilitate effective regional strategies for winning campaigns;
- e) Train Green Party activists in methods of waging political campaigns;
- f) Facilitate fundraising operations for GPCA-endorsed electoral campaigns.

Furthermore, GPCA Bylaw 9-1.2 states that the General Assembly “...shall approve the manner and method by which candidates for state or federal offices are endorsed or opposed.”

Currently, the GPCA does not have a candidate endorsement process. A previous ad hoc process adopted at the Fullerton December 2003 General Assembly expired on March 2, 2004.

The first two proposals deal with general election and primary election endorsements by the GPCA. They focus on races and procedures for statewide candidates for state and federal office, providing for General Assembly approval when possible and when timing does not permit, via a polling of the Counties.

For non-statewide races, there was disagreement upon on which races should and should not be the province of the state party. Concerns raised were that Greens on the state level would be asked to endorse candidates they did not know, who may be running in far away districts; that this took up limited state party time when there was already local/county endorsements available to these candidates; and that in lieu of direct knowledge the state should also not be put in the position of rubber-stamping a local/county position that it may not even agree with. A counter concern was that these categories of candidates should have a method for obtaining a GPCA endorsement if they wanted to have it. However, people holding concerns agreed to stand aside so that the proposals in its current form could be placed on the agenda for consideration by this General Assembly.

There has been a general consensus within the CCWG that, except in extraordinary circumstances, the GPCA should not endorse candidates in contested GPCA primary elections. The second of these proposals describes how such a circumstance might be identified.

The third proposal would re-establish the Campaign Support Fund Committee (CSFC) to make recommendations to the GPCA CC on disbursing support funds to GPCA candidates. A county endorsement would be required for individual candidates to be considered (except on the state level, where state level endorsement would be needed). The overall process would be designed to consider candidates requests together, in order to promote a strategic prioritization of funds.

### **PROPOSAL 1: GPCA CANDIDATE ENDORSEMENT POLICY FOR GENERAL ELECTIONS**

1. The GPCA may endorse Green Party members who are General Election candidates for the following offices:
  - A. Partisan statewide constitutional offices (Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Attorney General, Treasurer, Controller, Insurance Commissioner)
  - B. Non-Partisan statewide constitutional offices (Superintendent of Education)
  - C. State Board of Equalization
  - D. U.S. Senate
2. The GPCA shall not make any endorsements of General Election candidates who are not Green Party members.
3. Whenever possible, the GPCA shall make its endorsements by bringing the matter before the General Assembly, taking into account agenda distribution deadlines and other relevant procedural issues.
4. Where it is not possible to bring the decision before the General Assembly, the decision may be brought before the GPCA through a polling of the Counties.
5. The GPCA CC is not empowered to make these decisions on behalf of the GPCA.
6. Other than for the offices mentioned above, the GPCA will not consider endorsements for Green Party members who are General Election candidates for other offices, leaving the question of endorsement to the local/regional level.
7. These are policies of the GPCA. County organizations and locals are encouraged to develop their own procedures and standards for endorsing or otherwise evaluating local candidates. The endorsement(s) of a county organization or local shall clearly indicate that it is an endorsement of that local or county organization.

## **PROPOSAL 2: GPCA CANDIDATE ENDORSEMENT POLICY FOR PRIMARY ELECTIONS**

1. Except in extraordinary circumstances, the GPCA will not endorse candidates in contested Green Party primaries.

To establish if such extraordinary circumstances exist, the following process shall apply:

A. The GPCA CC must approve a statement of findings, that would clarify what are the extraordinary circumstances and their significance for the GPCA.

B. If such a statement of findings is approved by the GPCA CC, an endorsement proposal would be brought before the GPCA.

2. Whenever possible, these endorsements shall be made by bringing the matter before the General Assembly, taking into account agenda distribution deadlines and other relevant procedural issues.

3. Where it is not possible to bring these endorsements before the General Assembly, the decision may be brought before the GPCA through a polling of the Counties.

4. The GPCA CC is not empowered to make these decisions on behalf of the GPCA.

5. This procedure applies to Primary Elections for the following offices:

- A. Partisan statewide constitutional offices (Governor, Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, Attorney General, Treasurer, Controller, Insurance Commissioner)
- B. Non-Partisan statewide constitutional offices (Superintendent of Education)
- C. State Board of Equalization
- D. U.S. Senate

5. These are policies of the GPCA. County organizations and locals are encouraged to develop their own procedures and standards for endorsing or otherwise evaluating local candidates. The endorsement(s) of a county organization or local shall clearly indicate that it is an endorsement of that local or county organization.

**TIMELINE:** Adoption at the next plenary in Ventura County, April 29th-30th, 2006.

**RESOURCES:** Time and energies in presenting endorsement requests to a General Assembly or to County GP's by polling.

### **REFERENCES:**

Endorsement Procedures Temporarily Adopted December 2003

The process by which the GPCA endorses Green Candidates running for partisan office shall be as follows:

### 1. Organizational Structure

1-1. The Campaigns and Candidates Working Group (CCWG) is responsible for facilitating the endorsement of partisan candidates.

1-2. Endorsements for candidates running for the statewide constitutional offices shall be ratified by the General Assembly.

1-3. Endorsements for candidates running for the State Assembly, State Senate, and the S. House of Representatives shall be ratified by the statewide consensus polling process.

### 2. Candidate Endorsement Process

2-1. Candidates must demonstrate support from Green Party County Organizations in their electoral district by submitting endorsements in writing from locals to the CCWG and CC. If for any reason there are counties that don't endorse a candidate, the CC and CCWG will in good faith continue the endorsement process without local endorsement.

2-2. Each candidate must complete a brief questionnaire describing their candidacy and submit it to the CCWG for approval.

2-3. The CCWG shall recommend campaign endorsements and submit them to the appropriate body for ratification.

### 3. Procedures for Ratification

#### 3-1. The General Assembly

Upon recommendation of the Campaigns and Candidates Working Group, the General Assembly of the GPCA may endorse candidates for the office of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Insurance Commissioner, Attorney General, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Board of Equalization and the U.S. Senate.

Uncontested pre-primary endorsements shall be by consensus or 80 percent of the voting delegates at the first plenary past the filing deadline. Voting may not take place before the filing deadline.

Post-primary endorsements shall be determined by consensus or 80 percent of the voting delegates at the first plenary.

#### 3-2. Statewide Consensus Polling

Until March 2, 2004, Green Party candidates for the State Assembly, State Senate, and the U.S. House of Representatives shall be endorsed by the following process:

- a. The CC and CCWG will conduct the polling of GPCO's in a uniform and impartial manner.
- b. The question presented will be "are there any concerns"? If there are none, the endorsement will be made official.
- c. If there are unresolved concerns, the endorsement decision will be made by the General Assembly.

4. Sunset

- a. This proposal sunsets March 1, 2004

5. Reconsideration

- a. This proposal shall be brought back to the General Assembly at the March Plenary for reconsideration.

\*\*\*\*\*

2002 Candidates Questionnaire (CCWG)

- 1. Have you been endorsed by your local?
- 2. What other endorsements do you have?
- 3. Are you running on the GPCA platform?
- 4. What is and has been your activity with the Green Party?
- 5. Who is your competition?
- 6. What resources do you have?
- 7. Why do you think that you are electable?

**WORKING GROUP DECISION:** Development of this proposal included telephone conference discussions and posting of drafts by email to [gpcacccwg@cagreens.org](mailto:gpcacccwg@cagreens.org). The working group operates by consensus. Persons raising concerns stood aside from those concerns to allow these proposals to be brought before the General Assembly. The discussions in developing this proposal are matters internal to the working group and its participants.

## ***Write-In Threshold (CCWG)***

**Bylaws change (new) to lower the number of write-in votes a Green Party candidate for partisan office must receive in a Primary Election to qualify as the Green Party nominee in the General Election.**

**SPONSOR:** Campaign & Candidates Working Group

**PRESENTERS:** Greg Jan (510-444-7336, [gregjan4@yahoo.com](mailto:gregjan4@yahoo.com))  
Michael Feinstein (310-392-8450, [mfeinstein@feinstein.org](mailto:mfeinstein@feinstein.org))

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:** The California Elections Code, Section 8605(a), requires that a write-in candidate for partisan office on the ballot line of a political party receive votes in the Primary Election equal to at least one percent (1%) of all votes cast for that office in the last General Election.

This minimum is the same for all parties. Since smaller qualified parties in California have far fewer members than the Democrats and Republicans, those parties can nominate write-in candidates easily, but no minor party has done so since 1968.

However, in November 2004, Proposition 60, added the following language to the California Constitution: “A political party that participated in a primary election for a partisan office has the right to participate in the general election for that office and shall not be denied the ability to place on the general election ballot the candidate who received, at the primary election, the highest vote among that party’s candidates.”

This proposal would create a GPCA Bylaw that would assert lower minimum vote thresholds for GPCA write-in candidates. Differences of opinion exist within the CCWG about the legal effectiveness of this rule change or whether it is necessary given the above-quoted language from Proposition 60.

Likely, a lawsuit would have to be brought by a GPCA write-in candidate denied access to the November 2006 ballot against a Registrar of Voters or the California Secretary of State to test whether California courts will accept the argument that such a bylaw change is sufficient to overcome the effect of a general elections procedures statute. It is also possible that legal proceedings brought by other smaller parties or their candidates may establish the enforceability of a similar GPCA rule. After discussions by teleconference and on the CCWG email list, there is consensus that this proposal should be presented to the General Assembly with a recommendation for its approval.

**PROPOSAL:** The following is adopted as an amendment to the GPCA Bylaws --

(1) A Green Party member who otherwise qualifies as a write-in candidate for partisan office in the Green Party Primary Election shall qualify as the nominee of the Green Party of California for that office in the General Election

if she or he receives the highest number of votes and receives either at least sixty (60) votes  
or at least a number of votes equal to two percent (2%) of the total number of Green Party registered voters in the district for that office, whichever is the larger number.

(2) The GPCA Liaison shall promptly report adoption of this Bylaw to the Secretary of State with a request that this information be communicated by the Secretary of State to the Registrar of Voters for all California counties.

(3) The Bylaws Committee shall designate numbering of this Bylaw Amendment and include it in future text as part of the GPCA Bylaws.

(4) This amendment to the GPCA Bylaws shall become effective immediately upon approval by the GPCA General Assembly.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** The CCWG is a working group -- not a committee. Development of this proposal included telephone conference discussions and posting of drafts by email to [gpcacccwg@cagreens.org](mailto:gpcacccwg@cagreens.org). The working group operates by consensus. The discussions in develop of this proposal are matters internal to the working group and its participants.

**TIMELINE:** Adoption at the next plenary in Ventura County, April 29th-30th, 2006.

**RESOURCES** (Personnel, number and frequency of meetings, projected work hours, finances, etc. Permits/permission needed? Application needed? Insurance required? Any bylaw/platform conflicts?) :

Activities as above-described by the Bylaws Committee and Liaison to the Secretary of State.

**FURTHER BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:**

The current state mandated threshold has no relationship to the number of registered Greens in the legislative district in which a candidate is running. Having a GPCA-generated standard would give the GPCA an ability to link the threshold to the number of Greens in the district.

A GPCA-generated standard would also give the GPCA a greater ability to see who has filed and qualified in other parties' primaries, before deciding to enter a race. This is because the period to qualify as an official write-in candidate in the Primary comes after the qualification deadline to appear as a ballot-qualified candidate.

Note: This proposal does not apply to members of other parties, does not make it easier for a "cross-file" or "fusion" candidacy to occur and should not be confused with any prior GPCA discussions on those other issues.

Attachment: Green registration totals by State Assembly District, 10/18/04

State Assembly 1	9,776	State Assembly 29	1,067	State Assembly 57	554
State Assembly 2	1,318	State Assembly 30	227	State Assembly 58	624
State Assembly 3	4,576	State Assembly 31	647	State Assembly 59	1,390
State Assembly 4	2,331	State Assembly 32	684	State Assembly 60	784
State Assembly 5	2,002	State Assembly 33	2,457	State Assembly 61	590
State Assembly 6	5,955	State Assembly 34	733	State Assembly 62	401
State Assembly 7	3,258	State Assembly 35	3,252	State Assembly 63	1,075
State Assembly 8	2,180	State Assembly 36	656	State Assembly 64	1,039
State Assembly 9	2,591	State Assembly 37	1,719	State Assembly 65	921
State Assembly 10	1,416	State Assembly 38	1,239	State Assembly 66	845
State Assembly 11	1,487	State Assembly 39	521	State Assembly 67	1,629
State Assembly 12	4,194	State Assembly 40	1,055	State Assembly 68	1,222
State Assembly 13	9,439	State Assembly 41	2,321	State Assembly 69	495
State Assembly 14	7,879	State Assembly 42	2,343	State Assembly 70	1,627
State Assembly 15	1,467	State Assembly 43	1,618	State Assembly 71	959
State Assembly 16	5,527	State Assembly 44	1,713	State Assembly 72	1,156
State Assembly 17	602	State Assembly 45	1,559	State Assembly 73	1,308
State Assembly 18	1,573	State Assembly 46	478	State Assembly 74	1,652
State Assembly 19	2,418	State Assembly 47	1,692	State Assembly 75	1,301
State Assembly 20	1,153	State Assembly 48	577	State Assembly 76	3,039
State Assembly 21	2,491	State Assembly 49	588	State Assembly 77	1,188
State Assembly 22	1,769	State Assembly 50	417	State Assembly 78	1,121
State Assembly 23	1,114	State Assembly 51	669	State Assembly 79	759
State Assembly 24	1,814	State Assembly 52	381	State Assembly 80	460
State Assembly 25	1,618	State Assembly 53	2,286		
State Assembly 26	713	State Assembly 54	1,980		
State Assembly 27	5,866	State Assembly 55	651		
State Assembly 28	804	State Assembly 56	565		

See Appendices for Detail of State Assembly District Data

## **California Elections Code sections for the GPCA**

### **Decision Item: Adopt Green Party Election Code**

(complete code is online at <http://cagreens.org/erwg/ec/>)

**SPONSOR:** Electoral Reform Working Group

**PRESENTERS/CONTACTS:** Jim Stauffer, [jims@greens.org](mailto:jims@greens.org), 408-432-9148  
Warner Bloomberg, [WSB3ATTYCA@aol.com](mailto:WSB3ATTYCA@aol.com), 408- 295-9353

### **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE**

**Voting System Terminology** (as used in this proposal and the GPCA Elections Code):

RV	Ranked Voting – Generic term for the various voting systems where voters rank their ballot choices in order of preference.
STV	Single Transferable Vote – A form of RV that includes IRV and AV as well multi-seat elections (e.g. City Council). In its multi-seat form, it is the most common form of nonpartisan Proportional Representation voting.
AV	Alternative Vote – A technical name for the RV system we call IRV (Instant Runoff Voting). Used for single-seat elections (e.g. Mayor). AV is a special form of STV used for these single-winner elections.
IRV	See AV.
LV	Limited Voting – A semi-proportional system (non RV) used for multi-seat elections that prevents a majority bloc from winning all seats. This system can be implemented without hardware or software changes to any voting equipment.
SNTV	Single Non-Transferable Vote - A semi-proportional system used for multi-seat elections. A specialized form of LV that limits the voter to one choice, thereby accomplishing maximum proportionality.
NOTA	None Of The Above – A voting option on the Primary ballot for the current election system. A vote for NOTA signifies no candidate should move to the General Election.
NOC	No Other Choice - A voting option on the Primary ballot for ranked voting elections. A voter ranks NOC last to indicate the end of their ranking, thereby signifying that no other candidates are acceptable.

Each political party is required to have their own sections of the elections code that address two subjects: 1) primary elections, and 2) party structure. This proposal is to establish our sections of the elections code. Here are the main points of what we're trying to accomplish with these election code sections.

1. Ranked Voting (RV) – RV is a generic term to indicate voting methods such as Condorcet, STV and IRV (single-winner STV, also called Alternative Vote, or AV). We specify RV for three kinds of elections.
  - A. For presidential primaries, we specify single-winner RV, and that the raw results be provided by the state to the party. This will allow us to use successive IRV or Condorcet counting to rank the overall preferences of our primary voters, so that our presidential convention delegates will have guidance from the voters beyond

their first choice. Presidential primaries are different from other primaries in that they do not directly select the candidate who will appear on the general election ballot, so the procedure for presidential primaries is different from direct primaries.

- B. For direct primaries, we specify single-winner RV (IRV) with the state tabulating the results. IRV improves the chances that we have a true majority (rather than plurality) choice, and allows voters to sincerely rank their true preferences without worrying about spoiler effects.
- C. For county council elections, we specify STV, so that our county councils are elected with proportional representation, rather than the current majority-take-all system. For counties where voting equipment does not support STV, we provide the option of Limited Voting (or SNTV: single non-transferable vote), a semi-PR system not requiring ballot ranking. We have chosen not to provide an NOC option in our county council elections, to avoid problems with interpretation that might conflict with the court decision mentioned below.

For the use of STV and LV systems, the elections code will contain only a statement that these systems will be used (STV) or may be optionally used (LV or SNTV). The details of how we will conduct such elections will be in our bylaws. This allows us more flexibility in fine-tuning these systems.

- 2. NOTA/NOC (none of the above / no other choice) – NOTA is applicable to single-choice elections (the current system); NOC is applicable to ranked elections (eg IRV).

We once had the use of NOTA in our primaries but were sued by the Secretary of State and had to cease. In our 1995 appeal (GPCA v. Jones), the court upheld the SoS, citing issues of ambiguity and minority rule that could result from using NOTA. This time we define NOTA and NOC in a manner that addresses the court's concerns. This may not be the optimal usage of NOTA/NOC, but we feel this is what we can accomplish without having to fund another lawsuit. Here are the characteristics:

- A. NOTA/NOC must receive a majority to win a primary. The court did not allow NOTA/NOC to win by plurality on the grounds that a majority of voters wanted to see a candidate in the general election, even if it was a candidate they did not vote for. This is especially disputable in the cast of ranked voting, but we are choosing not to dispute it.
  - B. For ranked voting, NOC is used to indicate the end of ranking. Allowing voters to continue ranking beyond NOC creates an ambiguity: 1) contradiction of terms ("no other choice" but the voter does indicate other choices); 2) if the voter does not continue ranking, was it accident or intention? Our intent is to ignore any choices listed lower than NOC.
  - C. Single-winner ranked voting is identified as Alternative Voting rather than IRV since that is the terminology used by the IDEA handbook.
- 3. National Affiliation – Earlier drafts specifically identified GPUS as the national party with which we are affiliated. We've changed this to say, "...the national political party with which the Green Party has affiliated." Prior to each presidential primary the SoS already requests us to state our national party affiliation, so this phrasing works well with the existing system.

4. Voting Equipment – Not all counties have equipment that is certified to handle ranked ballot elections, so in all cases we have defined alternative methods for use in these cases. We expect that as counties comply with HAVA (the Help America Vote Act), they will adopt equipment that will support ranked ballots. However, county-by-county certification will still be required.

For statewide ranked ballot elections, all counties in the state must support ranked ballots, and election tabulation must be performed centrally.

## **PROPOSAL**

The ERWG requests that this proposal be approved as draft text to present to the California legislature for introduction as legislation, and that the ERWG, through its Co-Coordiators and other members, are authorized to represent the GPCA in dealings with legislators and their staff.

We will have opportunity to amend this draft after it has been introduced into the legislature. Accordingly, here are the open issues we know will require further work:

1. Should NOC on ranked ballots be implied, persistent or non-persistent?
2. For the presidential primary, when we get to using ranked voting, we require the elections department to provide us with the raw data that shows all rankings and transfers so that we know how to instruct our delegates to the national convention. If the national nominating convention is held in June of a presidential election year, it is possible that the GPCA would not receive official canvass information before the date of the convention.

Once our code is in the legislature, the ERWG Code sub-committee will provide status reports to the counties on any significant changes they are attempting to make. If a change is so substantial that the GPCA should make a decision, the sub-committee will work with the CC on county polling, or bring it to a General Assembly if the time frame fits.

## **COMMITTEE DECISION**

There have been no unresolved concerns expressed in the ERWG code sub-committee or on the main ERWG list beyond the open issues cited above. **CONFIRM**

## **TIME LINE**

Approve this proposal in June 2006

Recruit friendly legislators to introduce this into the Assembly in 2007.

Once introduced into the legislature, work with legislators and staff to resolve issues. Amend draft as open issues are resolved.

## **RESOURCES**

Many hours of work for ERWG sub-committee members. Assistance from our State Liaison. Possibly costs for travel to Sacramento, and other communications expenses.

[Direct link to complete election code:

[http://www.cagreens.org/erwg/ec/2-06-R2\\_CompleteCode.rtf](http://www.cagreens.org/erwg/ec/2-06-R2_CompleteCode.rtf)]

## STATEMENTS/BIOS FOR CC-AT LARGE REPS

### ***Jared Laiti***

Sonoma County -- [JaredL@sbcglobal.net](mailto:JaredL@sbcglobal.net)

I was elected as an At-Large Representative to the GPCA CC in March 2004. I was elected as a Co-Coordinator of the GPCA CC in November 2005 for the remainder of the term of a resigning Co-Coordinator, and I intend to seek re-election to that position. Please return me to the CC for another term as an At-Large Representative so that I may continue to work on behalf of the GPCA and its grassroots.

A Green voter since I was eligible to vote, in 2004 I ran for the CC on a platform of anti-'safe-states' and anti-capitalism. I remain committed to the full political independence of the Green Party and strongly believe that we should run the strongest possible campaigns for every office. Likewise, if we hope to change the system we find ourselves in, we must not shy away from questioning it at its root. We must move beyond capitalism if we are to ever live in a world based on our values.

I am a co-founder of the Sonoma State University Campus Greens, and a member of the County Council of the Green Party of Sonoma County. Recently I have worked in collaboration with the Sonoma County and statewide Campaigns and Candidates Working Groups to host a candidate training session in Petaluma. I have also been involved with the Californians for Fair Wages campaign, actively gathering signatures for both initiatives, as well as for Laura Wells' State Controller campaign and Cat Woods' 6th Assembly District campaign.

Soon after my election to the CC, I joined the GPCA Presidential Convention ad-hoc committee to offer my input in that process, and I served as a delegate at the convention in Milwaukee. In Milwaukee, I was elected to the Coordinating Committee of the Green Alliance, the left-wing tendency of the GPUS. I also belong to the GPUS Presidential Campaign Support Committee and the Greens for Democracy and Independence. I have served as a delegate or alternate delegate to the GPCA General Assembly from Sonoma on several occasions. In August 2005 I received a Bachelor of Arts Magna Cum Laude in Political Science With Distinction from Sonoma State University. My senior thesis focused on the role of third parties in recent US history and their potential for future successes.

I look forward to continuing to work to make the GPCA one of those successes.

-Jared Laiti

## ***Ellen Maisen***

A member of the Green Movement before the idea of a political party, I began my Green activism working with other Greens on local community issues. We worked as partners to build a strong local community. There is an urgent need to connect Greens and Green issue campaigns in communities and cities into networks across the state. Local issues are shared issues and can become common ground for all citizens.

I understand the need to increase connections, activism, membership, and involvement across the state and country. As a member of one of the oldest Green clubs in Los Angeles County, I have already begun the task of contacting all of those registered Green in our community, and helping to bring them into community and partnership.

The possibility of government that reflects our values and re-creates our political landscape is a reason to connect all of the more than 26,000 registered Greens in Los Angeles County. Imagine the political power of a group of Greens that large and connected. An educated, united electorate can change the dynamic in a community and bring our platform into being. The person who serves in the “At Large” position could help build party membership and empower Greens to become more involved in their communities and support both issues campaigns and candidates.

I hope to help in the work of uniting Greens in our state behind a shared commitment to our Ten Key Values, and developing goals through partnership and respect. We will need to have relationships based on tolerance and appreciation in order to create a future that we would like to live in.

California , like Los Angeles County, is a large and diverse region. I would like to help build relationships between communities within our state to build the larger vision of the Green Party Platform as a framework for our future efforts. As a teacher, I see the value of accountability in our structures, and clarity in our communications. Our party must be accountable to its membership, and transparent in process. These are important components for trust building with both our registered Greens and other citizens who could share our vision.

## **BACKGROUND**

I was born and raised in San Diego, and learned about racism and poverty first hand as a low-income child of mixed heritage. Growing up speaking two languages would have been more of a resource if there was not such a stigma placed on one of the languages. The lesson that I learned as a young child was that one part of my family did not respect the other and that disconnected me from most of my relatives and a very important part of my family’s culture. This is part of the legacy that our children in Southern California grow up with, and one of the reasons that I became a teacher was to work to bridge that unfortunate gap for our children.

I have been a public school teacher since 1994 and have worked with children pre-k to High school. I teach new teachers, evaluate and conduct exit interviews for credential candidates, and work as a CLAD instructor for the state. The CLAD part of the educator’s training, is an important part of diversity awareness for teachers and administrators working with children learning English as a second language. There are very few state trained CLAD instructors in California, and they provide a very valuable service to our state. CLAD is about respect for diversity. It is an example of the good

that the state of California is capable of doing. It is a Green program without the state being aware of it.

#### Green Activism

- Member San Fernando Valley Greens-consensus based green local, Northern Los Angeles County
- 2004-2006 Facilitated for “Witness For Peace” Southwest
- 2005 Facilitator for the SFV Greens
- 2005 Sylmar Plenary Host committee
- Green Democracy Meeting in Los Angeles County
- 2002-2005 Informal liaison to CSUN Greens and tabling volunteer
- 2002-2004 Facilitator for County Council LAGPCA
- 2002-2004 Delegate to state plenaries
- 1992 Elected County Council Member LAGPCA

Family and child development issues are very important to a healthy community. I would like to see the Green Party become more involved in these issues and directly work with more communities that are struggling with a lack of resources. All families today are struggling with the cost of childcare, healthcare, education, housing, finding employment and meeting the needs of their members from cradle to the grave. If we can communicate the Green Party values and Platform effectively to families, we can insure the future of our party, because our children are the future of our efforts. We must include them in our party activism so that they can carry on, especially in the areas of peace making and protecting our environment.

As an at large rep I want to help bring movement ideals into the party

Ellen Maisen

## ***Pat Driscoll***

Pat Driscoll was born in San Francisco in 1952 and after graduating high school volunteered to serve in the U.S. Navy during the Vietnam War 1971-1974. He moved to the Silicon Valley in 1975, started a career in the telecommunications field, got married and had two children, both of whom have recently graduated college. During his business career he helped design, develop, install, and operate global data networks for companies such as British Telecomm and MCI. Currently Pat is self-employed as a software consultant and a professional musician. In 2001 Pat joined the Green Party because it represented his values and concerns, particularly regarding the environment. After 9/11, Pat founded the Sacramento Chapter of Veterans For Peace which has been very active in the local anti-war movement. Recently he co-founded the Sacramento Mexican American Political Association (MAPA) chapter, Californians for A Fair Wage, and the Sacramento Post-Carbon Action Network (SPAN). He's run twice as a Green for California Congressional District 5 and attracted significant local and national media attention. Currently he is working on several Green Party campaigns and on relocalization and sustainability for the Sacramento area. He is a member of the Sacramento Green Party County Council and a spokesperson for the GPCA.

Pat Driscoll

## DELEGATE ENDORSEMENTS

At the plenary there is an election of candidates for the California Delegation to GPUS by the General Assembly using rank choice voting. As terms have ended or will soon, there are four open seats for delegates and seven seats open for alternates. Whoever does not get elected as a delegate can join those running for alternate delegate.

There are six candidates running for the four delegate seats. The current delegation has endorsed five of the candidates:

- Marilyn Ditmanson (Butte county)
- Chuck Giese (Alameda county)
- Susan King\* (San Francisco county)
- Jared Laiti (Sonoma county)
- Steve Loeb (Placer county)

The current delegation also endorses the following candidates for Alternate Delegate:

- Colin Donoghue (San Mateo county)
- Greg Jan (Alameda county)

\*Note: If Susan King is not selected as a delegate, she has expressed that she is not interested in running as an alternate.

The delegation seeks diversity. Of the nine remaining delegates, four are men and five women, two are “people of color”, and two are LGBT. We also seek to represent all parts of the state. On the current delegation, five members are from the SF Bay area, two from S. California, and one from northern California, and one from the Sacramento region.

### GPUS Committees

There are still numerous GPUS committees needing representation from California. Committee members are appointed by the delegation. Appointment can occur at any of their monthly meetings including their meeting the Saturday evening of the Plenary. Representation is needed for the following committees:

Fundraising	Annual Nat’l Meeting (ANMC)
Diversity	Accreditation
Communications	Dispute Resolution
Merchandising	Peace Action (PAX)
Platform	Green Pages Editorial Board
Presidential Coordination Strategy (PCSC)	Bylaws, Rules, Policies and Procedures

## STATEMENTS/BIOS FOR GPUS DELEGATES

### **Chuck Giese**

[cfporcupine@yahoo.com](mailto:cfporcupine@yahoo.com), (510) 585-6189, Alameda county

#### REASON FOR RUNNING FOR GPUS DELEGATE:

In 2008 we face a likely repeat of the destructive GPUS 2004 convention because of resistance to apportionment reform within the GPUS.

State parties get one GPUS-NC delegate for every 4 eligible congressional districts. (Any district with a recognized GP local is eligible.) And every state gets a minimum of 2 delegates regardless. (See Note 1 below.)

So a densely populated progressive district with several sizeable, active GP locals gets as much representation on the NC as a sparsely populated, conservative district with only a handful of Greens. Ohio, with 1300 Greens and 5 NC seats, has 1 rep/260 Greens. Indiana, with 48 Greens and 2 NC seats, has 1 rep/24 Greens. Calif., with 44,511 Greens who voted for Green presidential candidates in our March 2004 Green primary and 13 NC seats, has 1 rep/3423 Greens -- by this conservative yardstick. (See Note 2.)

At our May 2005 plenary at Sylmar, a GDI proposal for One Green, One Vote (OGOV) was favored in a straw poll by 78%. When the GPUS-NC rejected that and the other 2 GDI proposals at its July 2005 Tulsa national meeting by a margin of almost 2 to 1, several NC members mocked the GDI supporters by singing "one, two, three strikes -- you're out" from the old baseball song.

More recently, the GPUS Steering Committee (SC) has flouted 2 resolutions passed by the GPUS-NC in order to block GDI member Kristen Olson from gaining an SC seat after an election tie. It even illegitimately blocked an alternate resolution from being voted on -- a resolution presented by CA and 4 other states. So far, the NC has let the SC get away with these maneuvers. (See Note 3.)

Meanwhile, shortly after rejecting OGOV at Tulsa, the NC voted to set up a committee to re-examine GPUS-NC and convention apportionment. Implementation details are still being voted on, but apportionment committee (AC) members may be elected soon. The AC is supposed to draft new apportionment plans and present them to the NC after working for 6 months. If they do not pass the NC, the AC is supposed to take another 6 months to revise the plans and resubmit them to the NC.

There are many on the NC who want to preserve much of the disproportionate share their state delegations have. If we Calif. Greens just wait to see what the NC approves at the end of this process, it can easily be AFTER our spring 2007 state plenary. Then we could not respond as a state party until our plenary in late 2007. If the NC adopts unfair apportionment plans, that is too close to the 2008 GPUS national convention to turn things around.

How can we minimize the risk of a 2008 GPUS train wreck, and maximize the chances for maintaining GPUS unity?

We are the largest state party in the GPUS. We have a responsibility to use our strength, and be PRO-ACTIVE AS A STATE PARTY to help ensure that fair apportionment plans are adopted.

We can't leave it up to our delegation to the GPUS-NC. Voices on the SC and NC

like to dismiss our delegation, claiming they do not represent our members. So if we want a viable national party in 2008, we as a state party must devote some effort to it. We must consider some apportionment plans, then have our next plenary approve one or more of those plans as acceptable. (We would NOT make disaffiliation automatic if the NC rejected those plans.)

Because many on the NC are resisting reform, we can't just rely on the goodwill of the NC to adopt fair apportionment, either. We must apply some external pressure on the NC, as an incentive to accept a fair plan. We can do this by working directly with other reform-minded state parties. If several state parties jointly approve a few acceptable apportionment plans, we can then submit them to the NC's apportionment committee (AC). That's the best way to pressure the AC to propose fair plans, and the best incentive for the NC to adopt fair plans.

This is the strategy I will work on if elected as a GPUS delegate.

What do I mean by "fair" apportionment? We should at least consider different formulas for the convention vs. the NC. NC apportionment can be freed of any constraints posed by existing state election laws.

My firmest preference at this point is a plan for convention apportionment. Each Green voting in their state party's presidential preference process would have equal voice. If a state uses a primary, count the primary voters. For a state convention, count the Greens electing delegates to the convention. For caucuses, count the Greens attending the caucuses, and also those who can't attend but designate a proxy. This applies whether the primary, convention, or caucus is run by the government or directly by the state party. This was proposed within GDI last April. I'm a GDI member, and came to support this plan several weeks later. GDI never adopted it, but the important thing is for several state parties to agree on one or a few plans.

Lastly, in seeking to agree on a few apportionment plans, we must really make an effort to talk TO each other, not AT each other.

## **BIO:**

I've been a progressive since turning against the Vietnam war in 1970. I was pretty active through the 1970s and 1980s. In 1986 I moved to Calif. from Wisconsin, and was active in the Rainbow Coalition in Oakland in 1988.

I became inactive in the 1990s after starting to raise a family, working the grind in Silicon Valley, and moving from Oakland to politically sleepy Fremont. However, I did start voting Green (Nader in 1996, 2000 & 2004).

The presidential election steal in 2000 really woke me up again. I began attending public events of a local peace group that re-activated after Sept. 11, 2001. I became more active after our daughter got old enough to babysit for our toddler son. I registered Green in March 2004 (after wasting my primary vote on Kucinich).

There was no local in my area, so I sometimes attended monthly county council meetings 30 miles away. A few months later, the county party put me in touch with another Green in my town who was interested in starting a local. We called a few hundred of our 900 local registered Greens, and tried to get something going. It kind of fizzled out last September after I started a 70 hour/week contract job. That contract is finished, and a few of us are trying to reactivate the earlier efforts.

I've been convening local Greens, but I hold no positions. However, I have been

very active in discussing (and proposing) apportionment plans within the national GDI.

Solidarity,  
Chuck Giese

*endorsed for delegate by the CA GPUS delegation*

-----  
NOTES:

1. GPUS Bylaws, ARTICLE II. MEMBERSHIP AND COORDINATING COMMITTEE, Section 2, National Committee. <http://www.gpus.org/documents/bylaws.shtml>
2. Ohio and Indiana Green membership:  
<http://www.ohiogreens.org/membership/index.html> (Note that currently posted figures are slightly larger. However, the website showed about 1300 in January 2005.)  
<http://www.indianagreenparty.org/minutes/igpminutesjune05.pdf>
3. You can read relevant GPUS-NC proposals and vote results from the GPUS votes page at: <http://green.gpus.org/cgi-bin/vote/voterresults> These are proposals related to the election impasse:
  - 170: Call for Special Election to Fill 4th Seat on SC-- Amended
  - 173: Steering Committee election proposal 1 from PA
  - 174: Steering Committee election proposal 2 from PA
  - 184: Procedural Motion on Florida Proposal
  - 187: National Committee Support of Steering Committee
  - 188: Co-chair Election Cancellation
  - 194: Implementation Proposal for Sevigny-Olson joint proposal
  - 206: SC Co-chair Election

The votes that the SC flouted were 174 and 187. Prop. #174 called for a vacancy election. It was defeated by over 2/3. But the SC then called a vacancy election anyway, justifying it by using a rationale different from that used in the failed proposal. The vacancy election was later cancelled. Proposal #187 endorsed the SC in the face of impeachment charges for flouting the vote on Proposal #174, and endorsed using a vacancy election to resolve the impasse; it passed by 2/3. It thus let the SC off the hook for calling a vacancy election after a proposal for a vacancy election had been voted down. But Proposal #187 also provided for the NC to resolve the election impasse using other than a vacancy election, if it so chose. This was flouted by the SC when it blocked the alternate 5-state proposal from going onto the voting queue, allowing its renewed call for a vacancy election to proceed and complete. The SC had no legitimate basis for blocking the 5-state proposal, so the vacancy election was illegitimate.

This is a very messy situation. --If anyone wants more details, please contact me.

## **Steve Loeb**

[loeb@sbglobal.net](mailto:loeb@sbglobal.net), 916-435-3818, Placer county

The purpose of this letter is to express my intent to run for the position of California delegate to the Green Party of the United States (GPUS) at the April 2006 GPCA plenary.

I registered to vote with the Green Party in 1994. I was attracted to the ten key values and had recently finished reading *Green Politics* by Charlene Spretnak & Fritjof Capra and *The Tao of Physics* also by Capra.

In 1997, I started to attend plenaries and workshops. The great distraction of that time was the battle between GPUSA and ASGP. It was hard then not to get emotional about the situation. The national party is still distracted with internal squabbles and is, therefore, not living up to its potential. I would like to work to get the national party on track with ample time to prepare for the 2008 election cycle. I believe that I have the temperament, skills and commitment to be a key part of the solution.

I am currently involved with a local land use battle in my city. We are battling a Forbes 400 developer, Buzz Oates. Those of you from the Central Valley know of his reputation. He and other of his family members' development companies are trying to destroy a beautiful and ancient area of our Sierra foothills known as Clover Valley. (For more info see Elaine's site at <http://saveclovervalley.org> and Marilyn's site at <http://clovervalleyfoundation.org>)

We have a wonderful group of local activists, including the chair of the Placer Group of the Sierra Club, the chair of the Placer County Democratic Party, and many dedicated citizens from the elderly-retired to high school kids. The mayors of two adjacent cities, a county supervisor and the Auburn Indian tribe have pledged support, but our own city council is tight with Congressman John Doolittle and the developer industry here. It is a classic battle of what the Green activist working at the local level is all about. You can see a local news clip of my speaking at a public hearing earlier this month at <http://votegreen.org/clip>

What's more, I believe that my having been active with the Greens on and off for over a decade and having been outspoken about my ideas most of that time, that it is time for me to walk the talk at all levels of the party.

Some personal background: I met my soulmate, Lisa, in 1981 and we were married in 1984. I say soulmate since the sensation I got when I first saw her from a distance in 1980 (a year before we met) was like a young child who gets lost in a crowd and then feels the joy of seeing a familiar face again. After 22 years of marriage, every passing day with her is better than the one prior. Although I am a math and logic kind of guy, Lisa is the opposite. She is gifted with unbelievable intuition. Okay...now I am going to brag about my wife and kids because it really is my family that defines me.

One example of Lisa's gift is that in June of 1996 my wife urged me repeatedly to contact one of my oldest and best friends, Glenn. She said she felt he was going to die. A few weeks later I got word from a friend living in New Mexico that Glenn and two other doctors had died in a rock climbing fall in the Sandias. It was a major TV news story in Albuquerque and due to the rugged terrain the bodies were not found until the next day. The night of their tragic fall, my wife awoke startled in bed and told me that she saw Glenn standing in the doorway of our bedroom smiling. That greatly reduced the shock of the sad news the next day.

Lisa and I have four awesome kids. My oldest high-achiever, Jessica -- the only Rocklin High graduate to earn a perfect SAT score -- is graduating from Scripps College at Claremont in May with a dual major in Sociology and Women's Studies. Danielle is a sophomore at Cal and is double majoring in English and Theater. She is organizing a new Shakespeare in the Park festival for Rocklin this summer. (This conservative "pleasantville" needs the arts in a big way!) My two youngest, Ryan and Brad, are following their sisters' lead and doing very well in high school. I love them all so much.

For income, I am a small business owner with formal education in Marketing and Psychology. If you decide to vote for me as a GPCA delegate to the national party, I pledge to you to represent the Greens of California transparently and with honesty, diligence and to be committed to make our party reach its fullest potential.

Thanks for taking the time to read my bio and for giving me consideration as your delegate to the Green Party of the US.

Best regards,

Steve Loeb

*endorsed for delegate by the CA GPUS delegation*

## **Marilyn Ditmanson**

[mditmanson@sbcglobal.net](mailto:mditmanson@sbcglobal.net), (530) 894-2885, Butte County

I am applying to be a California delegate to the GPUS. I would interpret my responsibility as a delegate to represent the will of Green voters of California. I am committed to transparency and democratic procedure and will work to ensure that the workings of the GPUS are known and accessible to as many Greens as possible.

I would consider it a goal to ensure that as many Greens as possible are aware of the opportunity to have input to the decisions made by the GPUS, and that proposed changes are considered as widely and deeply in the party as possible.

My Bio:

I have grown organic gardens since 1971.

I have used almost entirely organic food since 1973.

I have been a working member of food coops since 1972.

I have been on the Board of Directors of the Sacramento Natural Food Coop and Chico Natural Foods.

I have voted Green since 1992.

I have been a registered Green since 2000.

I have served as treasurer and county council member for the GP of Butte County since 2000.

I have been the primary speech and letter writer for the Green Party of Butte County since we have been active in local issues.

I have served as North Central Regional Rep. Alternate since May 2005.

I currently serve on the GPUS Platform Committee.

I am very concerned with promoting the Green Party and Green Party issues.

I am hardworking and responsible.

-Marilyn Ditmanson

*endorsed for delegate by the CA GPUS delegation*

## **Jared Laiti**

Sonoma County -- [JaredL@sbcglobal.net](mailto:JaredL@sbcglobal.net)

A Green voter since I was eligible to vote, I am committed to the full political independence of the Green Party and strongly believe that we should run the strongest possible campaigns for every office. I believe that the GPUS must move closer to 'one Green one vote' if it is to become an increasingly powerful political force for grassroots democracy. Likewise, if we hope to change the system we find ourselves in, we must not shy away from questioning it at its root. We must move beyond capitalism if we are to ever live in a world based on our values.

I was a member of the GPCA Presidential Convention ad-hoc committee and I served as a delegate at the convention in Milwaukee. In Milwaukee, I was elected to the Coordinating Committee of the Green Alliance, the left-wing tendency of the GPUS. I also belong to the GPUS's Presidential Campaign Support Committee and the Greens for Democracy and Independence. In August 2005 I received a Bachelor of Arts Magna Cum Laude in Political Science With Distinction from Sonoma State University. My senior thesis focused on the role of third parties in recent US history and their potential for future successes.

Please elect me to the GPCA's delegation to the GPUS so that I can help work to make the GPUS a stronger alternative to the current political system and a living example of our key value of grassroots democracy.

See my statement of candidacy for GPCA CC At-Large Representative in this plenary packet for more information about me.

-Jared Laiti

*endorsed for delegate by the CA GPUS delegation*

## **Susan King**

[funking@mindspring.com](mailto:funking@mindspring.com)

Activist, fundraiser, organizer.

I started my organizing career while a student at Sonoma State University, where I was one of the co-presidents of DIA, Democrats in Action in the mid 1980's. My work on SSU's Project Censored opened my eyes to the corruption of our government and the complicity of main stream media. Following college I went to work for political candidates, starting with Mike Dukakis for President in 1988. I began my fundraising and political activist career working for the California League of Conservation Voters and went on to work for Dan Hamburg for Congress in 1992 and 1994.

In early 1990, I became familiar with the Green Party, a new party that was formed around environmental issues. I helped with the successful ballot drive to get the Green Party ballot status in 1991. In 1994, I permanently changed my voter registration to Green. I worked for the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, and then worked for the California Futures Project (an anti sprawl organization) in the 1990's.

Since becoming active with the Green Party, I have consistently worked to make our party a credible political force. My experience organizing with the Democrats and Democratic front groups like CLCV have convinced me that the two major parties in the US will never address the environmental and social justice issues in any meaningful way.

In 2000, I worked for Rebecca Kaplan for Oakland City Council, Medea Benjamin for US Senate and was the Northern CA Field Director for the Nader 2000 efforts. I have worked regularly for progressive candidates (including Matt Gonzalez for Supervisor, Mayor) and local ballot initiatives in SF. I have also done fundraising for progressive non-profits, including the Women's Building and the Community Leadership Academy and Emergency Response Project (a violence reduction organization in the southeast side of SF).

Most notably, I have been very actively involved in the Green Party since 1999, following the 1998 Gubernatorial election and Gray Davis' approval of the execution of Jaturin Sirapongs, a man who went to his death claiming his innocence. Since then I have worked hard to build a third party that opposes the death penalty, as it is one of my 'line in the sand' issues. My roles within the party have included local, state and national committee work, including: CA Green Party co-chair of the Campaigns and Candidates Working group, alternate delegate to the US Green Party, Coordinated Campaign Committee member for the US GP, member of various committees and working groups, delegate to the CA GP representing SF. I have attended nearly every state plenary meeting and most of the national meetings from 2000-2006. I have been on to the SF County Council since 2000, and am seeking a third term (I was appointed for the first term in 2000), and am very active on the local level.

My other activist work includes serving on the board of the local SF League of Conservation Voters (as one of just a few Greens, to represent our party on the local

political level despite the state org- CLCV being totally corrupt and devoid of any real environmental credibility) , being active with the SF Bicycle Coalition, serving on the SF Bicycle Advisory Committee, being an active member of the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council, and working on many ad-hoc activist committees on social justice, environmental and transportation related issues in SF.

It is because of my concern for our party and the growing internal strife that I seek a position on the national delegation. I have worked with many folks on the state and national level, and have tried to stay out of the factionalism that divides our party. I believe that we have a lot of important ground to cover to regain the trust and unity that the party enjoyed before 2004. Furthermore, I sincerely believe that this work must be done in order to begin re- building our party to be a strong and credible political force in American politics. I am committed to doing this work because I truly believe our future depends upon it.

*endorsed for delegate by the CA GPUS delegation*

## **Budd Dickinson**

[budd.dickinson@sbcglobal.net](mailto:budd.dickinson@sbcglobal.net)

I am running for re-election for GPUS Delegate. I have been on the delegation since the 13 members and several alternates were chosen in 2001. I was one of the delegation co-coordinators until recently. I was the founder of the San Francisco Greens in 1985 and was one of the founders of the California Green Party in 1991 and on the Alameda County GP County Council, 1992-94, 1996-2003 and a member of the CA GP Coordinating Committee, 2001-3. I was a founder of the US Green Party, 1987-92. Most of you know that I have been very active working on our state and national platform. I have extensive campaign experience and was a candidate for Berkeley City Council in 1998.

I ran for the national Steering Committee (SC) in Tulsa last summer to be one of the seven Co-chairs. The election to the 4<sup>th</sup> vacancy was very close and a conflict arose because different candidates were elected depending on the counting method used. This increased the destructive factionalism in the party that started at the 2004 presidential nominating convention in Milwaukee. I am concerned about those who would disrupt the party because they did not like the results of that convention.

I support the goals of Greens for Democracy and Independence (GDI) and voted for 2 of the 3 GDI proposals in Tulsa. I support increased democracy in the GPUS, e.g., CA should have a larger NC delegation and a larger 2008 nominating convention delegation. I signed a statement that appeared on the GDI website. It said in part, "And together, we continue to stand for more democratic representation within our party and the right and duty of our party to act as an independent political force in ways that may threaten the two corporate parties... What we have in common.. is far more important than what we disagreed about in 2004." I believe decisions on 2004 strategy by the GPUS and its presidential ticket were made based on a reading of the national political situation in 2004. They were made with the Green Party's best interests in mind and were made independent of the interests of the corporate parties. However, expressions of anger and other strident tactics, such as initiating impeachment proceedings against 5 SC members, have hurt the GDI cause.

I said repeatedly while running for the SC that I am looking for common ground. That puts me in the middle of this conflict and I am getting criticized by both sides. I supported the compromise to seat both Kristen Olson of Minnesota and Tom Seigny of Connecticut until Tom resigned and it fell apart.

The most recent attempt to resolve this conflict became known as "the 4 state proposal" and CA was one of the sponsors. At the plenary in Davis, I suggested some language. I felt that it deserved a vote, but it was still a draft with 2 notes at the end about the need to set the length of the term and to address bylaws implications. When it was sent to the national list, those notes were deleted. I protested to the national list that the notes were still relevant and needed to be addressed. The delegation never approved the version without the notes. The SC asked for some changes, but the presenters refused and claimed that the threshold should be 50%, not the 2/3rds required for issues concerning bylaws. The SC then scheduled another vacancy election, which an earlier CA sponsored proposal, which passed with over 2/3rds, had said could be called after the 60 days allowed to find a compromise. I won that election in February.

I am still willing to work with everyone. I am hoping that in my role on the Steering Committee I can find constructive resolutions to these conflicts.

Budd Dickinson,  
CA Delegate and SC Co-chair

## **Greg Jan**

Dear Greens,

Some things have come up recently such that I now anticipate being extremely busy for the rest of this year, and perhaps a good portion of 2007 as well. Given t! his new situation, I know that I cannot devote enough time to national Green Party business to fairly run for a delegate position, given that there are several other qualified candidates running who do have sufficient time to spend on national party work. I thought that I might limit my national party involvement to perhaps serving on a national committee, and as such, I notified our California delegation regarding my situation. However, several members of our delegation felt that I could still be helpful by serving as an alternate, and upon consideration, I do believe that that would be a workable scenario. Below is a short summary of my work with the Green Party. I wish I had more time right now to work on national Green Party business, but unfortunately circumstances are now dictating otherwise.

### **BIO**

I have been involved with the Greens since 1985 and helped organize the East Bay Green Alliance in May of that year. Later during the 1980's I served on the national body of the Green Committees of Correspondence, which later became the Greens/Green Party USA. I also helped organize northern California regional meetings of the Greens and I was one of 4 co-ordinators for the 1988 "Greening the West" gathering, held in San Mateo county.

I was also involved in the organizing that led to the founding of our state party, from 1989 until 1992, and I served on the "Q (Qualification) Group" (to gain ballot status). Once we became an official party, I started working on election campaigns including Dona Spring for Berkeley City Council, Ralph Nader for President, Dan Hamburg for Governor, Gloria Purcell for Assembly, Peter Camejo for Governor, John Selawsky for Berkeley School Board, and Aimee Allison for Oakland City Council. I have also served many terms on my local County Council, several years on the state Coordinating Committee, and I have been active on several state committees and working groups during the past 14 years that we have been a party.

I have been a delegate to the Green National Committee for several years now, and I have participated in our last 4 annual national meetings/conventions in Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., Milwaukee, and Tulsa. I have helped coordinate several of California's proposals to the Green National Committee, including a proposal (#188) related to last year's complex Tulsa co-chair election situation that passed by 77%. I've learned a number of things about how our National Committee works (and doesn't work), and I believe that serving as an alternate would be a reasonable way for me to continue as an "experienced resource" for our more active California delegates.

Sincerely,

Greg Jan

*endorsed for alternate delegate by the CA GPUS delegation*

## **Colin Donoghue**

[8foldpath@care2.com](mailto:8foldpath@care2.com)

Hi, my name is Colin Donoghue and I would like to apply for the GPUS Committee member position. I graduated from the University of New Mexico last May with a Political Science Degree, minoring in Peace Studies. I have been an active member of the Green Party for many years and have worked with college and state level Green Party organizations in the past. I was Officer of Public Relations and Co-chair of the College Green at the University of New Mexico. I had a great experience working for the university newspaper The Daily Lobo as well, doing production work and writing columns, "Progressive Solutions" which I continue to do, that promote Green Party positions: (<http://colindonoghue.portfolio.www.dailylobo.com/>) Through working for the University newspaper I have become much more familiar with American media and media relations and crucial need for truthful public education. At UNM I also co-founded and was co-chair of a chartered student organization, Students for Clean Energy, whose main focus was attempting to bring solar power to campus. As co-chair of the College Greens, I gained excellent experience with media and public relations. I also created the websites for both student organizations. I've also worked with several other public policy organizations in the past, and I feel very passionately about bettering environmental and social justice policy in America. I have given very successful public presentations on current political issues and their corresponding solutions, (the latest was on 2/7/06 at the Albuquerque Center for Peace and Justice: <http://home.comcast.net/~peacecenter/calSE2006B.html>, in which I promoted the Green Party as an excellent tool for progressive change) and plan on doing more soon. I would be proud to work for and further promote the Green Party on a national scale; I can guarantee dedicated and passionate work in the interest of the 10 Key Values. I look forward to discussing the position with you, my resume is attached.

Sincerely,  
Colin Donoghue

*endorsed for alternate delegate by the CA GPUS delegation*

## DEFERRED PROPOSAL

These following decision item was approved and scheduled for this plenary, but was deferred for lack of time. The counties are asked to please begin discussion on this item. A blog for discussion of proposals is available at <http://spr06ga.cagreens.org/>.

### ***Approving the GPUS Affiliation Agreement (CC)***

SPONSORING COMMITTEE: GPCA Coordinating Committee

PRESENTERS/CONTACTS: Cat Woods, [cat801@mindspring.com](mailto:cat801@mindspring.com), 415-897-6989  
Marybeth Wuerthner, [mb-@sbcglobal.net](mailto:mb-@sbcglobal.net), 530-891-1815

#### BACKGROUND\* AND PURPOSE

In November 1998, the GPCA General Assembly (GA) passed a proposal to affiliate with the Association of State GPs (ASGP) for two years. In the proposal, the ASGP was presented as “a forum for discussion,” particularly regarding a possible presidential campaign in 2000. No affiliation agreement was part of this proposal, nor was there any promise or discussion of a binding agreement to put an ASGP nominee on state ballots.

In December 2000, the GA decided to continue its affiliation with the ASGP, in anticipation of the upcoming ASGP meeting about possibly forming a national party meeting FEC standards. Again, no affiliation agreement was presented for approval or even mentioned. The proposal to continue the affiliation included assurances that the ASGP continued “as a federation of sovereign state Green Parties” and that “The GPCA will maintain its autonomy.” Later that month, at the ASGP national meeting, the ASGP discussed filing with the FEC, with no mention of an affiliation agreement.

An affiliation agreement was drafted for the ASGP at some point between December of 2000 and June of 2001. During this time, the name of the party was changed to the Green Party of the United States (GPUS). (The final text of this agreement is appended to this proposal.)

The GPCA Coordinating Committee (CC) decided to sign this affiliation agreement at their meeting on June 4, 2001. Several inaccurate claims were made at this meeting. Ric Newbery contested them at the time and in his corrections to the draft minutes. Despite his efforts, these claims have been widely believed in the GPCA until very recently:

- One inaccuracy was that “The General Assembly has voted to go forward with ASGP’s process for federal filing status.” Actually, the GA never voted on the issue of ASGP federal filing status, only on affiliating with the ASGP.
- A second misconception was, “We have been asked to sign the same affiliation document that we signed previously except that the name of the organization has changed.” Actually, the GPCA never signed a document prior to this. The name of

the organization had changed since the agreement was drafted, but the agreement had never been presented to or approved by the GA.

- A third point of contention, in response to a concern “that we may lose autonomy by this association,” was the claim that this was “not the case, that the purpose of the document is strictly to get national attention, legitimacy and status.” As Ric pointed out, some statements in the agreement appeared to give up some autonomy and empower the national organization “beyond the mandate previously given by the General Assembly.”

Ric asked to “re-visit this topic at the next plenary” in order to bring the terms of affiliation to the policy-making body of the GPCA, the GA. Others agreed that “the affiliation wording warrants reconsideration” by the GA. The CC decision to sign the document included a promise to address the wording of the document with the GA. However, no report of signing the agreement was made to the GA, nor was the text of the agreement presented, revisited, reconsidered or addressed, as stated in the decision, at any time during the next four years.

In November 2001, the FEC recognized the GPUS as a national political party. In December 2003, the GA adopted article 11 of the GPCA bylaws regarding our GPUS delegation, including paragraph 11-1.1:

“The Green Party of California (GPCA) has affiliated with the Green Party of the United States (GPUS). No decision of the GPUS is binding on the GPCA without its consent.”

In the discussion of this item, it was again emphasized that “We are not yielding any authority by participating in the Green Party in the United States.”

Due to contention within the party regarding how the terms of the affiliation agreement were interpreted and enforced in 2004, the breach of process regarding approval of the terms of affiliation was finally revisited. In December 2005, a proposal was brought before the GA to approve the affiliation agreement, while recognizing the stipulation in the GPCA bylaws that “No decision of the GPUS is binding on the GPCA without its consent.” The presenters had asked Greens to send them all suggested amendments to the proposal, in the effort to build the 80% support necessary for approval. The GA considered seven versions, including one to reject the terms and disaffiliate and one to alter the affiliation agreement itself. The presenters asked for a straw poll to help decide which version should go forward through the consensus process. The result of the straw poll was that the options of disaffiliating (6 votes) and altering the text of the agreement (2 votes) had very little support.

At the request of the GA, the presenters agreed to bring this decision back to the next plenary -- including both the version which had the most support (version A below, 29 votes) and a version with about half that support which some felt needed to be discussed further during the consensus process (version B below, 16 votes).

\*The presenters wish to thank these people for their help in this research: Jo Chamberlain, Mike Feinstein, Mike Wyman, Chuck Giese, Hank Chapot, Magali Offerman, Ric Newbery, Tim Morgan, and Dean Myerson.

## **PROPOSAL**

### **VERSION A:**

The GPCA approves its affiliation agreement with the GPUS, with the recognition that the GPCA bylaws stipulate that “No decision of the GPUS is binding on the GPCA without its consent” (Paragraph 11-1.1).

A state nominating convention will be held after the national nominating convention to review presidential and vice-presidential nominations made at the national level and to take an IRV vote to approve nominees for our California ballot line.

### **VERSION B:**

first paragraph above only (delete second paragraph)

**COMMITTEE DECISION: CONSENSUS** on the CC’s Jan 9, 2006 teleconference:

“The CC asks those planning the next plenary to try to reserve one hour for this item, in order to give delegates sufficient time to discuss the issues and make a good decision.”

OFFICIAL AFFILIATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN  
THE GREEN PARTY OF CALIFORNIA  
AND  
THE GREEN PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED this 20th day of June, 2001 that the Green Party of California (GPCA) agrees to formally affiliate with the Green Party of the United States, and formally agrees to abide by the Bylaws of the Green Party of the United States.

It is understood that the GPCA shall appoint delegates from California to represent the GPCA on the Coordinating Committee of the Green Party of the United States. It is also understood that these representatives should be gender balanced.

It is also agreed that the undersigned GPCA reserves all rights and powers to the GPCA that are not given, through the Bylaws of the Green Party of the United States, to the Green Party of the United States.

It is also agreed that the GPCA will continue to conduct voter registration drives in the State of California.

It is also agreed that the GPCA will use its best efforts to support ballot access for national candidates nominated by the Green Party of the United States and candidates nominated by the GPCA.

It is also agreed that the GPCA will conduct a State convention, at a minimum, once each election year.

It is also agreed that the GPCA will solicit contributions for state, local and national Green Party candidates.

It is also agreed that the GPCA will make its best efforts to nominate candidates for State, local and federal offices.

It is also agreed that the GPCA shall operate according to the bylaws of the GPCA as filed with the Secretary of State, Elections Division.

The following representatives of the GPCA, acting pursuant to the Bylaws of the Green Party of California, swear that they are empowered to enter into this affiliation agreement with the Green Party of the United States.

Signed this 20th Day of June, 2001, on behalf of the Coordinating Committee of the Green Party of California, by

Margaret Lewis, Co-Coordinator of the Coordinating Committee of the Green Party of California  
Michael Borenstein, Co-Coordinator of the Coordinating Committee of the Green Party of California  
Green Party of California PO Box 2828 Sacramento, CA 95812

# APPENDICES

## ***CCWG Meeting Agenda***

### **DRAFT CCWG MEETINGS AGENDAS FOR APRIL 29-30, 2006**

NOTE: The following are draft agendas for two CCWG meetings sessions to be held at the General Assembly scheduled for April 29-30, 2006 in Ventura County. The following may be changed due to proposals made at the beginning of each meeting and or as a result of the limited time for each meeting. Persons interested in any particular item are invited to post their questions and comments to the CCWG email list [gpcaccwg@cagreens.org](mailto:gpcaccwg@cagreens.org).

#### Session One -- CCWG Administration and Development

Choose Facilitator(s), Notes Taker(s), Time Keeper and Vibes Watcher(s)

Coordinator's Report -- CCWG activities since last plenary; FY 2006-2007 Budget Status;

Continuing issue of no second Co-Coordinator (also see other topics)

Old Business: County Contacts roles and recruitment

Old Business: Form CCWG Webpage(s) review subcommittee

Old Business: Discuss issue of CCWG fund raising

Old Business: Scheduling and (lack of) participation on monthly teleconference

New Business: Subcommittee to recruit administrative assistance (depending on budget approval)

New Business: Form group to manage review and reports about November 2006 ballot measures

for County polling

Other topics

#### Session Two -- Election 2006 Topics

Choose Facilitator(s), Notes Taker(s), Time Keeper and Vibes Watcher(s)

Review Announced Candidates Information and Acknowledge Candidates Attending Meeting

Brief Report on Sonoma County candidate training program; RFP for additional programs and volunteers

(depending on budget approval); Form subcommittee for long-term candidate training development

Brief review of GPCA Endorsement Procedures (depending on General Assembly action)

General discussion on interaction between CCWG and GPCA candidates in 2006

Old Business: Reconsider CCWG involvement in recommending candidate funding;

Recruit CFSC participants (depending on GA decision re CCWG proposal)

Other topics

County	Registered		Delegates	Cnty		Previous Registered (2)	Registration Change Since Previous
	Greens (1)	% of Ttl		Cncl			
Alameda	14,243	10.0%	9	10		14,294	0%
Butte	2,220	1.6%	2	7		2,456	-10%
Calaveras	315	0.2%	1	7		317	-1%
Contra Costa	4,365	3.1%	3	7		4,447	-2%
El Dorado	1,172	0.8%	1	7		1,190	-2%
Fresno	1,581	1.1%	1	7		1,673	-5%
Humboldt	4,141	2.9%	3	7		4,336	-4%
Imperial	119	0.1%	1	3		122	-2%
Inyo	110	0.1%	1	3		112	-2%
Kern	782	0.5%	1	3			
Lake	458	0.3%	1	7		460	0%
Los Angeles	25,258	17.7%	16	44		25,276	0%
Marin	3,477	2.4%	2	7		3,603	-3%
Mendocino	2,356	1.6%	2	7		2,414	-2%
Monterey	1,380	1.0%	1	7		1,418	-3%
Napa	936	0.7%	1	7		948	-1%
Nevada	1,646	1.2%	1	7		1,630	1%
Orange	8,271	5.8%	5	7		8,174	1%
Placer	1,220	0.9%	1	7		1,255	-3%
Riverside	2,863	2.0%	2	7		2,889	-1%
Sacramento	5,922	4.1%	4	7		5,923	0%
San Bernardino	2,925	2.0%	2	7		3,020	-3%
San Diego	9,749	6.8%	6	7		9,706	0%
San Francisco	13,264	9.3%	9	9		13,416	-1%
San Joaquin	884	0.6%	1	7		931	-5%
San Luis Obispo	2,115	1.5%	1	7		2,166	-2%
San Mateo	3,816	2.7%	2	7		3,769	1%
Santa Barbara	2,495	1.7%	2	7		2,572	-3%
Santa Clara	6,125	4.3%	4	7		6,483	-6%
Santa Cruz	4,632	3.2%	3	7		4,768	-3%
Shasta	531	0.4%	1	7		543	-2%
Solano	893	0.6%	1	7		911	-2%
Sonoma	6,677	4.7%	4	7		6,623	1%
Stanislaus	877	0.6%	1	7		866	1%
Tulare	502	0.4%	1	7		537	-7%
Ventura	3,030	2.1%	2	7		3,022	0%
Yolo	1,621	1.1%	1	7		1,672	-3%
<b>TOTAL ACTIVE</b>	<b>142,971</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100</b>			<b>143,942</b>	<b>-1%</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>	<b>145,786</b>					<b>147,565</b>	<b>-1%</b>

(1) As of Jan 2006

(2) As of Sep 2005

For more statistics, see

[www.cagreens.org/liaison/delegates.html](http://www.cagreens.org/liaison/delegates.html)

## Detail of State Assembly District Data

	Total Registered Voters	Total Votes Cast for Seat in Last General Election	Minimum Number of Write-in Votes Necessary to Win Green Nomination	Total Green members in District	Percentage of Green Voters Needed to Write-in Candidate for Candidate to be Successful	Green Percentage of Overall Voters in District
State Assembly 1	243,248	195,561	1,955	9,575	20.40%	3.94%
State Assembly 2	227,160	178,294	1,782	1,306	136.45%	0.57%
State Assembly 3	244,250	188,294	1,882	4,363	43.14%	1.79%
State Assembly 4	267,476	210,113	2,101	2,289	91.79%	0.86%
State Assembly 5	241,349	174,129	1,741	1,996	87.22%	0.83%
State Assembly 6	236,394	204,867	2,048	5,837	35.09%	2.47%
State Assembly 7	205,322	168,216	1,682	3,225	52.16%	1.57%
State Assembly 8	195,309	161,013	1,610	2,128	75.66%	1.09%
State Assembly 9	176,050	116,712	1,167	2,571	45.39%	1.46%
State Assembly 10	237,225	160,949	1,609	1,410	114.11%	0.59%
State Assembly 11	196,730	143,512	1,435	1,464	98.02%	0.74%
State Assembly 12	209,819	144,363	1,443	4,168	34.62%	1.99%
State Assembly 13	248,168	181,743	1,817	9,326	19.48%	3.76%
State Assembly 14	243,277	182,347	1,823	7,835	23.27%	3.22%
State Assembly 15	273,504	204,788	2,047	1,447	141.05%	0.53%
State Assembly 16	204,487	143,195	1,431	5,530	25.88%	2.70%
State Assembly 17	177,176	110,592	1,105	590	186.78%	0.33%
State Assembly 18	191,608	127,270	1,272	1,553	81.84%	0.81%
State Assembly 19	218,831	160,255	1,602	2,450	65.39%	1.12%
State Assembly 20	182,550	127,838	1,278	1,125	113.60%	0.62%
State Assembly 21	235,569	190,120	1,901	2,418	78.62%	1.03%
State Assembly 22	180,628	130,307	1,303	1,626	80.13%	0.90%
State Assembly 23	145,408	93,217	932	1,050	88.77%	0.72%
State Assembly 24	213,863	158,483	1,584	1,749	90.57%	0.82%
State Assembly 25	231,593	163,342	1,633	1,595	102.38%	0.69%
State Assembly 26	194,451	125,305	1,253	710	176.48%	0.37%
State Assembly 27	231,645	188,486	1,884	5,671	33.22%	2.45%
State Assembly 28	147,932	106,843	1,068	817	130.72%	0.55%
State Assembly 29	206,288	152,693	1,526	1,011	150.94%	0.49%
State Assembly 30	122,153	78,037	780	216	361.11%	0.18%
State Assembly 31	132,406	86,234	862	610	141.31%	0.46%
State Assembly 32	224,902	164,640	1,646	679	242.44%	0.30%
State Assembly 33	222,022	177,461	1,774	2,394	74.10%	1.08%
State Assembly 34	160,827	116,968	1,169	698	167.48%	0.43%
State Assembly 35	208,794	173,528	1,735	3,200	54.22%	1.53%
State Assembly 36	196,520	134,960	1,349	664	203.16%	0.34%
State Assembly 37	233,850	182,096	1,820	170,800	106.56%	0.73%
State Assembly 38	236,719	174,581	1,745	1,272	137.19%	0.54%
State Assembly 39	109,015	72,953	729	522	139.66%	0.48%
State Assembly 40	165,820	119,744	1,197	1,072	111.66%	0.65%
State Assembly 41	235,053	178,823	1,788	2,326	76.88%	0.99%
State Assembly 42	239,186	190,091	1,900	2,160	87.96%	0.90%

	<b>Total Registered Voters</b>	<b>Total Votes Cast for Seat in Last General Election</b>	<b>Minimum Number of Write-in Votes Necessary to Win Green Nomination</b>	<b>Total Green members in District</b>	<b>Percentage of Green Voters Needed to Write-in Candidate for Candidate to be Successful</b>	<b>Green Percentage of Overall Voters in District</b>
<b>State Assembly 43</b>	179,674	122,954	<b>1,229</b>	<b>1,607</b>	<b>76.48%</b>	0.89%
<b>State Assembly 44</b>	210,341	161,834	<b>1,618</b>	<b>1,707</b>	<b>94.79%</b>	0.81%
<b>State Assembly 45</b>	118,424	81,751	<b>817</b>	<b>1,545</b>	<b>52.88%</b>	1.30%
<b>State Assembly 46</b>	83,941	52,407	<b>524</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>105.65%</b>	0.59%
<b>State Assembly 47</b>	202,285	146,710	<b>1,467</b>	<b>1,655</b>	<b>88.64%</b>	0.82%
<b>State Assembly 48</b>	120,841	76,622	<b>766</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>131.62%</b>	0.48%
<b>State Assembly 49</b>	138,899	94,365	<b>943</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>153.33%</b>	0.44%
<b>State Assembly 50</b>	114,572	75,918	<b>759</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>172.50%</b>	0.38%
<b>State Assembly 51</b>	157,171	106,450	<b>1,064</b>	<b>682</b>	<b>152.49%</b>	0.43%
<b>State Assembly 52</b>	117,786	59,923	<b>599</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>151.65%</b>	0.34%
<b>State Assembly 53</b>	239,138	188,631	<b>1,886</b>	<b>2,261</b>	<b>84.41%</b>	0.95%
<b>State Assembly 54</b>	219,807	168,232	<b>1,682</b>	<b>1,994</b>	<b>84.35%</b>	0.91%
<b>State Assembly 55</b>	161,611	110,394	<b>1,103</b>	<b>664</b>	<b>166.11%</b>	0.41%
<b>State Assembly 56</b>	167,165	111,853	<b>1,118</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>192.10%</b>	0.35%
<b>State Assembly 57</b>	152,449	106,354	<b>1,063</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>184.87%</b>	0.38%
<b>State Assembly 58</b>	164,754	115,072	<b>1,150</b>	<b>649</b>	<b>177.20%</b>	0.39%
<b>State Assembly 59</b>	233,291	170,693	<b>1,706</b>	<b>1,401</b>	<b>121.77%</b>	0.60%
<b>State Assembly 60</b>	223,985	158,303	<b>1,583</b>	<b>794</b>	<b>199.37%</b>	0.35%
<b>State Assembly 61</b>	141,144	91,401	<b>914</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>157.04%</b>	0.41%
<b>State Assembly 62</b>	139,704	79,617	<b>796</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>204.10%</b>	0.28%
<b>State Assembly 63</b>	215,339	143,699	<b>1,436</b>	<b>1,017</b>	<b>141.20%</b>	0.47%
<b>State Assembly 64</b>	222,109	157,726	<b>1,577</b>	<b>1,036</b>	<b>152.22%</b>	0.47%
<b>State Assembly 65</b>	221,597	152,130	<b>1,521</b>	<b>881</b>	<b>172.64%</b>	0.40%
<b>State Assembly 66</b>	210,910	147,758	<b>1,477</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>173.15%</b>	0.40%
<b>State Assembly 67</b>	252,260	168,773	<b>1,687</b>	<b>1,628</b>	<b>103.62%</b>	0.65%
<b>State Assembly 68</b>	205,862	129,059	<b>1,290</b>	<b>1,229</b>	<b>104.97%</b>	0.60%
<b>State Assembly 69</b>	115,037	62,797	<b>627</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>123.42%</b>	0.44%
<b>State Assembly 70</b>	272,124	184,701	<b>1,847</b>	<b>1,651</b>	<b>118.87%</b>	0.61%
<b>State Assembly 71</b>	246,820	175,698	<b>1,756</b>	<b>972</b>	<b>180.66%</b>	0.39%
<b>State Assembly 72</b>	207,563	136,814	<b>1,368</b>	<b>1,168</b>	<b>117.12%</b>	0.56%
<b>State Assembly 73</b>	222,926	159,101	<b>1,591</b>	<b>1,318</b>	<b>120.71%</b>	0.59%
<b>State Assembly 74</b>	222,641	172,900	<b>1,729</b>	<b>1,654</b>	<b>104.53%</b>	0.74%
<b>State Assembly 75</b>	237,187	181,750	<b>1,817</b>	<b>1,298</b>	<b>140.00%</b>	0.55%
<b>State Assembly 76</b>	230,701	172,839	<b>1,728</b>	<b>3,090</b>	<b>55.92%</b>	1.34%
<b>State Assembly 77</b>	217,662	164,748	<b>1,647</b>	<b>1,178</b>	<b>139.81%</b>	0.54%
<b>State Assembly 78</b>	211,629	156,743	<b>1,567</b>	<b>1,125</b>	<b>139.29%</b>	0.53%
<b>State Assembly 79</b>	141,430	92,176	<b>921</b>	<b>756</b>	<b>121.82%</b>	0.53%
<b>State Assembly 80</b>	175,056	114,074	<b>1,140</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>252.21%</b>	0.26%