

The logo of the Green Party of California, featuring a stylized green 'G' inside a circle, is positioned in the background behind the main title text.

# **Green Party of California General Assembly**

**Riverside County  
September 8-9, 2007**

## **Agenda Packet**

This document contains the proposals and other items  
that will be discussed at the General Assembly

## Table of Contents

---

General Assembly Agenda Schedule .....	3
Consent Calendar – Health Care Plank .....	5
Consent Calendar – Secrecy Plank .....	7
Consent Calendar – GMO/Cloning .....	9
Consent Calendar – A Call for Amnesty .....	12
Proposal – GA Quorum .....	14
Proposal – Candidates for Primary .....	16
Election – GPUS Delegation .....	20
Proposal – GPCA-CC Business Actualization .....	21
Proposal – Tax Reform Plank .....	24
Proposal – Standing General Assembly Developmental Implementation Experiment (S.G.A.D.I.E.) .....	27
Proposal – County Polling .....	29
Proposal – Resolve the LA situation .....	33
Proposal – LA Resolution #1 .....	34
Proposal – LA Resolution #2 .....	37
Proposal – LA Resolution #3 .....	39
Proposal – LA Resolution #4 .....	41
Appendix 1 – GPUS Candidate Statements .....	43
Appendix 2 – Delagte Allocation .....	57

# General Assembly Agenda Schedule

---

## SEPTEMBER 8-9, 2007 GENERAL ASSEMBLY Riverside County

\* Denotes decision item (facilitator handles Business v Policy)

### Saturday Morning Plenary Session

- 08:00 Breakfast/Registration
- 09:00 Opening Ceremony, HostComm
- 09:05 Delegate Orientation
- 09:20\* Introduce meeting facilitators, set up notetkr(s), Vibes, Scribe, timekpr, Housekeeping announcements from HostComm.
- 09:30 Introduce CC, SC/WG Cocos Liaisons
- 09:35\* Confirm Quorum [Accreditation Committee]
- 09:40\* Ratify Agenda
- 09:55\* Ratify draft GA minutes, Ventura '06, Tahoe '06, SF '07  
Presenter/sponsor GPCA CC
- CONSENT CALENDAR
- Health Care plank, Presenter S. Que Hee, Sponsor-Platform SC
  - California Secrecy plank, Presenter S. Que Hee, Sponsor-Platform SC
  - GMO/Cloning plank, Presenter S. Que Hee, Sponsor-Platform SC
  - Amnesty Proposal, Presenter L.Downey/Napa, Sponsor-GROW
- 10:15\* GA Quorum Proposal, Presenter J.Stauffer, Sponsor Bylaw SC
- 10:25\* GPCA Presidential Ballot Line Proposal Sponsor CCWG
- 12:00

### LUNCH, People Of Color Caucus

### Saturday Afternoon Plenary Session

- 01:00\* Confirm Quorum [AC], Intro Facilitators
- 01:05\* GPUS Delegate Election (STV), Presenter ?, Sponsor GPUS Delegation
- 01:35\* CC Business Actualization Proposal, Presenters
- Breakout Session #1, SC/WG meetings  
Campaigns & Candidates Working Group (CCWG)
- 02:15 Finance Committee  
Information Technology Sub-Committee & Clearinghouse Committee  
Platform Committee
- 03:45\* Tax Policy Platform Plank, presenter David Wilbur. Sponsor Platform SC  
(Time use up to Ptfm SC for other planks not passed, if tax concludes early)
- 04:45 GPCA Strategy brainstorming session, Presenter ?, Sponsor CC and SC/WG Coco's,  
(brainstorming w/ SC/WG workplans
- 05:45 BREAKOUT SESSION: Regional Caucuses
- 06:30 END OF DAY ONE OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY
- Evening: GPUS delegates? dinner & meeting (location TBD)

## Sunday Morning Plenary Session

- 08:00 Breakfast/Registration
- 09:00\* Introduce morning facilitators, set up
- 09:10\* Confirm Quorum [AC]
- 09:15\* CONSENT CALENDAR BRING BACK, if needed. (items from Saturday's session that have received clarification can be retested for consensus)
- 09:30\* SGADIE Decision/Discussion, Presenter Borenstein et al, Sponsor GROW and SGARC
- 10:00\* PROPOSAL: County Polling Proposal Presenter Bloomberg, Sponsor CCWG
- Breakout Session #2, SC/WG meetings
- 10:30 Media Committee  
Green Organizing Working Group (GROW)  
Electoral Reform Working Group (ERWG)  
International Protocol Committee
- 12:05 **LUNCH - Womens' and men's Caucus**
- Sunday Afternoon Plenary Session
- 01:05\* Confirm Quorum [AC], Intro Facilitators
- 01:15\* Proposed date and host to hold next General Assembly
- 01:25\* Time as allotted from San Francisco General Assembly discussion for Green Party Los Angeles county council to present. Los Angeles Region to state facts and information of local resolution to contested Regional Representative election in region. Sponsor - GPLAC county council.
- Breakout Session #3: SC/WG meetings
- 02:20 Campaigns & Candidates Working Group  
Bylaws Committee  
Green Issues Working Group
- 04:10\* Confirmation of elected SC/WG Co-coordinators
- 04:20 PRESENTATION: SC/WG reports
- 04:35 CLOSING CEREMONY

## Consent Calendar – Health Care Plank

---

SPONSOR: PLATFORM STANDING COMMITTEE

PRESENTER/CONTACT: Shane Que Hee, [squehee@ucla.edu](mailto:squehee@ucla.edu). The only sections to be considered are underlined and in bold.

SUBJECT: HEALTH CARE in the Social Justice & Liveable Communities Section. The involved Ten Key Values of the Greens are Social Justice, Decentralization, and Community Based Economics.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE: The Health Care plank was passed in December 2005 at the UC Davis Plenary. The Conservation of Health plank was not accepted at the June 25/26 2006 Ventura plenary. The current version contains the new sections from the rejected plank that are proposed to fit into the current Health Care plank. Only the underlined sections will be discussed.

PROPOSAL:

Every person has the right to adequate and affordable health care. In California in 2005, 20% of the population is uninsured. Many more have insurance that is inadequate to pay for the care they need. Out-of-pocket costs, such as deductibles, co-pays and the cost of insurance increase every year. Many, especially among seniors, pay out of their pockets for large portions of their health care costs. America spends more per person for health care than any other nation in the world. Yet it ranks only 37th by WHO standards in quality of health care.

Therefore the GPCA advocates the following policies:

1. The GPCA supports a Single Payer Universal Health Care system. This means health insurance coverage for ALL through a single insurance plan offered by the government, which would control the growth of health care spending through a simplified administrative structure, consolidated financing and purchasing, and statewide health planning. That system must offer a comprehensive benefit package, including complete medical, dental, mental health, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, vision, hearing, hospice, and in-home care. No necessary service can be left out. If co-pays and deductibles are included to finance the system, they must be reasonable and affordable. This system should also cover long-term care and the medical component of Workers Compensation. We support state or federal efforts that would establish such a system.
2. Everyone must have access to all necessary medical care, including those who are economically disadvantaged. Preventive care is more effective, more humane and more cost-effective than treating people after they are already ill. Preventive care should be emphasized in the planning and financing of our health care system. **Injury prevention and social support services should be supported. Measures to minimize post-traumatic stress syndromes, mental distress, and psychological problems after injury, illness, or social neglect need support too.** We also support measures to assure adequate supply of primary care providers, nurses, and other allied health care personnel.
3. Care must be culturally competent. Our health care system must affirm rights to human dignity, personal choice, and privacy. It must practise respect for racial, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, age, disabilities, and other cultural needs/differences. We support giving patients complete freedom of choice as to their form of treatment or to refuse treatment, as part of a patient's Bill of Rights.
4. The GPCA strongly supports a holistic approach to health care. Different philosophies of care, broadly characterized as conventional and alternative/complementary care co-exist and sometimes compete. Both have roles in a modern and compassionate health care system. We support funding for research for both conventional and alternative/complementary care to cure and prevent cancer, heart disease, AIDS/HIV, and other illnesses. We support funding for modalities of care with proven benefit or widespread popular acceptance, such as Acupuncture and Herbal Medicine. We support access to a natural birthing alternative for all women. We support licensing, medical malpractice insurance, and oversight of alternative/complementary

care practitioners, identical to that those for other health care professionals. We support encouraging and educating people about healthy lifestyles, and more awareness of mechanisms of self-healing. **In addition, we support funding holistic recovery services after any injury or illness.**

5. Health care resources must be distributed fairly and used in an efficient and cost effective manner because these resources belong to all of us. Disparities between care for the wealthy and poor must end. Health care costs in 2005 account for 15% of the U.S. Gross Domestic Product.
6. We support existing measures, programs, and legislative actions that will increase access to high quality, cost-effective medical services for all Californians until we get a Single Payer system, and as necessary afterwards.
7. We need reasonable prices for all medical goods and services. The largest single unnecessary cost in 2005 is the health-insurance system. In addition, profits for pharmaceutical and medical equipment companies, health maintenance organizations (HMOs), and for-profit providers are often unjustifiably high. The pharmaceutical industry, for example, has the highest profit margin of any sector of the economy. It is also heavily subsidized by tax breaks, special patent legislation, and lucrative licensing arrangements by the federal government. We assume that Single Payer will bring costs for prescription drugs in line with what others in the world pay. This is accomplished through bulk purchasing. Until Single Payer is established, we support measures such as drug re-importation from Canada and high quality generic drugs to reduce drug costs. Drugs should be developed with public money with the objective of getting the best help for the most people. The public should receive a reasonable financial return on its investment. As long as we use the current system, we oppose any legislation to extend the patent of any specific drug.
8. We want hospitals, clinics, and other care providers to try to develop management that is democratic and representative. People representing health care workers, consumers, and other public interests should be included on the Board of Directors and other governing structures.
9. We demand that California's medical marijuana law be fully recognized and implemented by all the appropriate local, state, and federal jurisdictions. The federal government must not interfere with duly-enacted California laws on health care.
- 10. We support reimbursement of health care costs for victims of assault, including costs of therapy to treat psychological damage, mental distress, and traumatic shock as well as the physical effects. Legal costs to assure assault victims the restitution they legally and morally deserve should also be covered by public funds.**

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** The ideas of the plank amendments from the Conservation of Health plank were first presented to the Green Issues WG at the 2003 San Francisco plenary. An initial draft was posted on the Women's Caucus discussion board in April 2004. Another draft 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 Platform Committee meeting of May 2005 to receive General Assembly assessment. While it was submitted for the Yolo Plenary of December 2005, it was not published in the Plenary Program. The draft nevertheless received more comments at the Yolo Platform Committee meeting. It was included in the draft Plenary packet for the Ventura Plenary of April 29/30 2006 that was cancelled. It was presented at the Ventura Plenary of June 2006 and a straw poll agreed that the appropriate portions should be inserted into the relevant platform planks. The initial designated presenter of the amended Health Care plank was Adrienne Prince who presented a verbal draft at the Lake Tahoe Plenary Platform Committee meeting on September 9/10 2006 where it was agreed to include it for consideration at the next Plenary. Don Eichelberger of GROW also gave more comments in 2007 in a posted set of additions on the <http://www.green247.org> website. The amended plank version compiled by the Platform Co-Coordinator was posted for comment on the Platform listserv on March 13 2007, and modified again on March 15, 2007. Consideration of the revised plank was not possible at the San Francisco Plenary of May 26/27 2007, as part of the final adopted Agenda that was preceded by two dueling Agendas.

**TIMELINE:** This is the first consideration of the amended plank; **RESOURCES:** Plenary packet.

## Consent Calendar – Secrecy Plank

---

SPONSOR: PLATFORM STANDING GROUP

PRESENTERS/CONTACTS: Shane Que Hee, [squehee@ucla.edu](mailto:squehee@ucla.edu), (310)208-1624; Fax (310)794-2106

SUBJECT: CALIFORNIA SECRECY 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.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

Law Enforcement Sector: The processes and mechanisms of the California law enforcement sector (police and sheriffs departments, California highway patrol, district attorneys, attorney general) are entirely secret by law and beyond the reach of public records law. Information about specific peace officers is also off-limits according to a 1978 law, except in court-controlled discovery by a criminal defendant or by a civil plaintiff suing for an officer's alleged misconduct or excessive force. On August 31 2006, the California Supreme Court ruled that the public does not have access to police discipline records filed during administrative appeals, including the names of officers who have been terminated, unless the officers waive their rights to privacy (Copley Press Inc vs. Superior Court of San Diego). Yet all other state and local government employees are subject to the California Public Records Act that allows their disciplinary records on significant wrongdoing after a complaint investigation to become open, but retaining confidentiality for minor complaints or those that are found baseless.

Specific police departments e.g. the LAPD, currently hold secret disciplinary hearings at which the past record of the accused officer is not considered except "only it is used to demonstrate a pattern of misconduct". Only if the LAPD officer is found guilty is past record considered in the sentence. This opens the door for "rogue cops". In a civil trial, any police record of an accused is considered in the proceedings during trial and the sentencing. There must not be a double standard of justice for police and the general public. This is particularly important for minority citizens who are often targeted multiple times by specific police e.g. use of extreme force; intimidation; entrapment; general abuse. Public police disciplinary hearings and disclosures would ensure that police rules were actually obeyed, and that the proceedings are transparent.

This state of affairs must end to achieve open government, and to dispel the appearance of a police state.

All Other Publically Funded Organizations and Institutions: Meetings (face to face or electronic) dealing with wages and compensation for services rendered in all publically funded organizations and institutions need to be open to the public to allow public comment. The Ralph M Brown Act must be enforced in all sectors of government. Currently, the Bagley-Keene Act allows the UC Regents to conduct closed meetings in regard to appointment, employment, performance, compensation or dismissal of university employees: this must be repealed. Sweetheart deals and the "old boy" networks give the impression of impropriety.

Products and Legal Settlements: It is unacceptable public policy to permit secret deals that conceal evidence of dangers to the public.

PROPOSAL:

1. Amend the California Public Records Act to conform to the federal Freedom of Information Act relative to law enforcement confidentiality. That is, release of closed case files, withholding only matters of personal privacy, confidential informant identities, procedures, or guidelines, or facts whose release could endanger a person's safety.
2. Repeal the secrecy provisions of the 1978 Act and place peace officers under the same "bad apple" disclosure standard as other state government workers. Those entrusted with deadly force and the

authority to detain, question, investigate, and arrest their fellow citizens need to be at least as publically accountable for serious wrongdoing as others in state public service.

3. Support any appeal of the California Supreme Court decision of August 31 2006 in the case of Copley Press Inc vs. Superior Court of San Diego.
4. Start and support as an interim measure a Ballot Initiative to establish a three-strikes process for serious offences committed by law enforcement officers for so long as the three-strikes process for California citizens is also in force, even though there is a case for law enforcement officers to be held to a higher standard than non-police citizens.
5. Consider the past record of an accused police officer during police disciplinary hearings that must also be made public to verify any failure of self-policing.
6. Identify problem police officers in public Police Commission Reports e.g. those involved in multiple shootings, in beatings of prisoners, and in violent and non-consensual acts (including on fellow officers); all who had disciplinary action; officer witnesses to fellow officer violence or non-consensual acts who did not protest or attempt to stop the violence or acts; and those who entrap/frame Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender people for sexual “offences” or who entrap gang members by pushing drugs.
7. Identify in public Police Commission Reports police officers who accept bribes and gifts, steal drugs, and push drugs.
8. Mandate that meetings (face to face or electronic) dealing with wages and compensation for services rendered in all publically funded organizations and institutions must be open to the public with at least one month’s notice, for example, for state universities, the University of California, Prisons, State Agencies, State Committees. The Ralph M Brown Act must be enforced in all sectors of state Government. Currently, the Bagley-Keene Act allows the UC Regents to conduct closed meetings in regard to appointment, employment, performance, compensation or dismissal of university employees: this must be repealed relative to compensation packages (current Senate Bill 190).
9. Mandate that all information pertinent to the safety of the public relative to commercial products (like drugs, pesticides, foods, animals, and crops) and industrial facilities (like settlements for damage to the environment or to injured people) be public information. Judges must not grant secrecy protection relative to commercial products and industrial facilities where public safety is involved even when lawyers of both sides are agreeable.
10. Support the repeal of Title 5 United States Code Section 552 c (1) (B). The GPCA supports legislation that requires law enforcement to notify the people to be investigated.

COMMITTEE DECISION: The plank was first placed on the Platform Listserve on April 21 2006 and approved for General Assembly consideration at the Ventura Plenary of 2006. It was not put forward for that Plenary because important election platform planks needed to be considered instead, and the Ruling of August 31 2006 had not occurred. Versions were submitted on the Platform list serve on the following dates: 1, April 21; 2, July 6, 2006;3, July 9 2006; 4, Sep 6 2006; 5, Jan 18 2007; 6, Feb 9 2007; 7. Mar 6 2007.; 8. Mar 13 2007; 9. July 7 2007

TIMELINE: This is the first General Assembly consideration of the plank. Consideration of the plank was not possible at the San Francisco Plenary of May 26/27 2007, as part of the final adopted Agenda that was preceded by two dueling Agendas.

RESOURCES: The Governmental Secrecy Platform plank in the Democracy and Electoral Reform Section of the GPCA Platform relates to all U.S. Governmental bodies and is not specific to California nor does it deal specifically with police secrecy.

## Consent Calendar – GMO/Cloning

---

SPONSOR: PLATFORM STANDING GROUP

PRESENTERS/CONTACTS: Erica Martenson [eamartenson@sbcglobal.net](mailto:eamartenson@sbcglobal.net) (PRESENTER), Shane S. Que Hee, (310)208-1624, [squehee@ucla.edu](mailto:squehee@ucla.edu). Please send comments to both.

SUBJECT: Genetically Modified and Cloned Organisms in the Section Ecology and Earth Stewardship. Ecological Wisdom, Sustainability, and Personal and Global Responsibility are the involved 10 Key Values of the GP.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

GMOs: Most of the currently used genetically modified (GM) crops have been altered by inserting genes from soil bacteria so that the GM crops resist glyphosate (Roundup) herbicide and/or secrete *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) toxin.

The first GMO plant, the *Flavr savr* tomato, became available in 1994. It was removed from the market soon after due to a lack of consumer demand. While cross-breeding and grafting different strains of the same type of organism have been done for millennia, genetic engineering involving the insertion of foreign genes is a much more radical step, fraught with unpredictable consequences.

The use of bacteria and viruses (to overcome an organism's natural resistance to foreign genes), of antibiotic-resistant marker genes (to determine if the gene insertion took hold), and of promoter genes (to ensure the inserted gene expresses the desired trait) all bring inherent risks.

The major four GM crops are soybean, corn, cotton, and canola, and about 75% of processed foods contain at least one of these ingredients or a derivative. About half of Hawaiian papaya is genetically modified. Smaller proportions of zucchini, yellow crookneck squash, and Quest brand tobacco are also genetically modified. Farmers started planting GM alfalfa for forage in 2005. GMOs have been used to produce such food products as cheese and alcoholic drinks. Therefore, all U.S. consumers have already been exposed to GM food products, and are eating GM foods without being aware of it. This is a consumer rights issue, and currently 94% of the U.S. public believe GM foods should be labeled as such.

The European Union, Japan, China, Korea, Australia, and New Zealand and others label GM foods unlike the U.S. Because GM foods are not labeled, U.S. consumers cannot avoid them, and health problems cannot be linked to GM foods.

Some criticisms on the unregulated entry of GMOs into the environment and food supply include health, environment, and economic risks. Some environmental risks include: non-target organism effects (Bt plants can kill beneficial insects and soil biota); and the development of insect and plant resistance necessitating more powerful pesticides and inducing "superweeds". The health risks include: introduction of new allergens, toxins, antibiotic resistance, nutritional and reproductive problems, and cancer. The economic risks include: market loss to farmers; lower prices; lower crop yields; crop failure; contamination of the gene pool of existing crop plants; corporate monopolies over the food supply through GMO patent protection.

The federal regulation of GMOs in the U.S. is through the Food & Drug Administration (FDA), the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The EPA evaluates environmental safety; the USDA evaluates the safety of growing crops or raising animals; and the FDA evaluates food safety. The FDA does not require the safety testing and labeling of GM foods since it decided in 1992, over the objections of its own scientists, that GM foods are "substantially equivalent" to unmodified "natural" foods. The USDA since 1997 has required only notification to conduct field trials on GM crops (only 10% of the trials were actually monitored) rather than a permit application. A 2005 Report of the Inspector General criticized USDA for lax oversight, and in August 2006 a federal court found USDA negligent for allowing field tests of GM crops to produce pharmaceuticals in Hawaii. In 2007, federal courts ruled that the USDA's 2003 field testing of

GM bentgrass for turf in Oregon and its 2005 approval of commercial sale of GM alfalfa were both illegal. In the first case, the judge ruled that the USDA could not approve any more GM field trials without issuing at least prior Environmental Assessments. The EPA oversees Bt crops because they are registered pesticides. In the second case, there was no environmental impact statement required under the National Environmental Protection Act.

The California Department of Health Services, the California Department of Food and Agriculture, and local city/town/county health departments are also concerned with food safety in California but have not issued any GMO or GMO product guidelines.

Cloning: In 2006, the FDA gave preliminary approval to the sale of milk and meat from cloned animals despite knowing that animal clones often have genetic abnormalities, and that 65% of Americans are not comfortable about animal cloning. The FDA again used its “substantially equivalent” dogma to bypass safety testing and labeling. Since Dolly the sheep, the world’s first cloned mammal, was born in 1996, cloning of pigs and cattle has occurred in U.S. research. Transgenic research is aimed at optimizing a desired trait, and cloning can complement this by allowing the favored GMO to be multiplied.

Note: While the Green Party of California has been opposed to genetic engineering of all organisms in philosophy, GMO products are already on the market and the Green Party believes it is up to the supplier/producer to prove safety before commercialization. A similar criterion must be applied to products of cloned species too should their use be permitted by governments. While the Green Party has always urged minimization of use of animals in research, many preferring an outright ban, it is recognized that animal testing is currently necessary while the alternative toxicity tests are being developed.

### **PROPOSAL:**

GPCA shall support and encourage efforts to oppose policies that promote the indiscriminate use of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs), cloned animals, and their products. The responsible corporations must be financially responsible for all changes that cause adverse effects. We call for a permanent moratorium on the commercial use of cloned products until they are demonstrated to be safe in field and human tests as described below.

The Green Party of California supports the following demands to:

1. Mandate safety tests (including for toxicity and allergenicity and epidemiology studies) of at least three years duration or 2 generations of the species involved, whichever is longer, for all GM food products, and foods from cloned animals to form the basis of a human health impact statement before marketing is allowed.
2. Recall GM crops and GM products that have not been tested as safe as in item 1.
3. Ban the use of commonly eaten foods containing GMOs or GM products, or products from cloned animals until their safety is assured as in item 1.
4. Institute a permanent moratorium on the commercial use of cloned products until they are demonstrated to be safe in field and human tests as in the first item.
5. Mandate the labeling of all GM foods and foods from cloned animals even if the product is approved by Local, State, Federal or Foreign Governments.
6. Support entities that currently label GM foods voluntarily or have policies against using GM ingredients in their products or brands such as Whole Foods, Trader Joes, and Wild Oats in California. Support should also be provided for entities that will similarly not sell cloned food products.
7. Mandate an environmental impact analysis and statement before GMOs are field-tested or introduced into the environment in addition to applying to local government environmental agencies for a permit to use fields for GMO planting/testing, and to hold public meetings to discuss the issues with the potentially affected communities.

8. Require that USDA notify the Agriculture Commissioner of the county location of any intended field trials or plantings of GMOs, outline the steps being taken to prevent contamination, and offer a public comment period before any field tests or plantings are conducted.
9. Inform neighboring farmers that GMO crops are being planted within a safe distance of their fields.
10. Ban the planting of GMO plant varieties that are tolerant of increased levels of applied herbicides or produce their own pesticides.
11. Ban the planting of pharmaceutical and industrial crops containing GMOs in open fields.
12. Require that biotech corporations provide farmers clear written instructions on the use of safety of GM crops and cloned animals, and explain any potential risks and liabilities.
13. Hold the biotechnology corporation accountable for any genetic pollution of conventional and organic farms, and natural areas, and for the costs of testing, any cleanup, and any market loss.
14. Make the patenting of GMOs illegal, and allow farmers to save and reuse seed from year to year. Similarly, the patenting of cloned animals should not be allowed.
15. Ban the use of ‘Terminator Technology’ to create sterile seeds and plants, or sterile animals.
16. Oppose any legislation that would prevent local governments from regulating GMOs and cloned animals at the local level.
17. Require the FDA to define scientifically what “substantially equivalent” means by techniques such as genetic sequencing, DNA and RNA base quantitation, RNA characterization, proteomics, lipomics, saccharomics, and metabolomics.

**Definitions:**

1. Genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are seeds, plants, rootstocks, animals, or microorganisms created by inserting foreign genes to impart a desired trait.
2. Clones are the mature organisms created by replicating abiotically most or all of the DNA of the organisms.

COMMITTEE DECISION: The plank was modified from a Green Issues Committee draft platform plank provided by members of the Humboldt County Green Genes (Martha Devine, Mike Gann, Angela Flynn, and Barbara Shults), Arcata, in May 2004. Subsequent versions were posted on the Platform Listserve on the following dates: 1, Dec 6 2006; 2, Dec 18, 2006; 3, Dec 23 2006; 4, Jan 15 2007; 5. Mar 7, 2007; 6. Mar12, 2007; 7. Mar 13, 2007; 8. Mar 31, 2007; 9. April 2, 2007; 10. May 24, 2007; 11. June 29, 2007; 12. July 6, 2007; 13. July 10 2007

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

RESOURCES: There is no comparable GPCA or GPUS plank.

## Consent Calendar – A Call for Amnesty

---

Sponsor: GROW Working Group

Presenters: Lowell Downey, Chris Malan, Glynn Baker, Dr. Robert Moore, Erica Martenson, Matt Grantham, Napa County Green Party, 707-257-1166

We call on the United States government to give amnesty to all soldiers that have refused to fight in the Iraq War. We call on Congress to debate this important issue. We state that this is not a military issue. This is a human rights issue.

Amnesty is the right thing to do. This war was created from lies and deception directed by the President of the United States. The office of the President is responsible for this war. Our elected leaders supported this war for years, ignoring the facts that were pouring out in front of them like the blood of our soldiers and the innocent Iraqi citizens on the streets of Baghdad.

Our soldiers have been returning home maimed, psychologically scarred for life, and mistreated by our government. Soldiers are not returning to home with citizens protesting and condemning them. They are returning home and being disgraced by the treatment they are receiving from our government and military. One out of every three homeless are veterans. Veterans and their families are being harassed, financially crippled, and systematically exorcised from the governments promise to financially and medically care for them and their families. Veteran families are victim at home while their husbands and wives and children are dying and wounded in Iraq. Our leading military hospital has been disgraced for its treatment of our soldiers.

Amnesty is about compassion. Our soldiers are in the business of handling adversity and disappointment. Handling shame by our government is not one of them. Our soldiers, who have been fighting an unjust war, are deserving of compassion. They should not be punished for refusing to fight an unjust war, a war disguised as morally right but criminally wrong. Amnesty is about healing a great wrong suffered on us, and suffered on the world. Why should our soldiers be victim to this great tragedy?

Today, would we condemn the soldiers who were ordered to commit the horrific My Lai Massacre in Vietnam from rejecting the command of their officers? Would we not offer them compassion and amnesty if they chose to disobey the military order? Would we not offer them compassion and amnesty?

Quoting St. Augustine, Martin Luther King said, "An unjust law is no law at all." So, are our soldiers who refuse to follow an unjust law, an unjust order, guilty of a crime that will forever be on their Green Party of California General Assembly, September 8-9, 2007, Packet #1 Version 2 Page 22 records? Is it right that they bear the shame of a dishonorable discharge, prison and humiliation? Are we, the citizens of the United States, going to turn our heads and not look at these brave people, our neighbors and friends, who have been ostracized and turned into criminals for standing up against our political leaders? They stood up and said what we all accept! This war is wrong! This war is criminal!

Men and women across the United States are refusing to fight in this war. They are refusing on strong moral grounds. They are making decisions, difficult decisions, that do not simply risk their life and career but harms their families. Ultimately, this harms all of us.

Amnesty is the right thing to do. Our country needs healing. We do not want our soldiers to be victims for the rest of their lives. This will be a great shame on the United States. It is not important if the military objects. This is one of the challenges of being the military of a democracy. Our soldiers are trained to follow orders. This will have to be one more order they will have to learn to live with. They will have to find it within themselves to understand that their fellow soldiers, who objected to a war they were fighting and dying for, received an amnesty. One challenge is not greater than the other. There will be soldiers who say it is far greater challenge to stay on the front line and confront the enemy. Yes, that is a difficult and terrible challenge. We also say that it is a difficult challenge to go against your life's pursuit, that of a military officer or career in the military, and threaten the wellbeing of your

family. We believe that it is a difficult challenge to stand up against our government and refuse the order to fight and kill when you know that the reason for doing so is morally corrupt and criminal.

There should be no conditions for amnesty. Our country needs to find a way back from the horror that this war has inflicted here at home. We have another generation of children who have grown up with this violence. We have another war generation to support. In ten years, we may look back and say that giving amnesty to our soldiers who refused to fight in the Iraq War was the catalyst for healing. We are a nation in grief. Let's find a way to restore faith in our democracy and our humanity.

We believe that the military will also find that amnesty will help them at home and on the front line. Let us not look at amnesty as a stain on these soldiers or on our military. Amnesty can instill pride in a democracy for whom they serve with their lives. So let us restore honor to our brave men and women in our military who stood up and spoke the truth about the injustice inflicted on our soldiers, the citizens of the United States, and the citizens of Iraq. Our leaders need to provide moral strength and courage. Granting amnesty to our soldiers is the right thing.

In an address Martin Luther King, Jr. once spoke, "The first question which the priest and the Levite asked was 'If I stop to help this man, what will happen to me?' But the good Samaritan reversed the question, 'If I do not stop to help this man, what will happen to him?' We ask, what will happen to our children if we do not grant amnesty."

# Proposal – GA Quorum

---

SPONSOR: Bylaws Standing Committee

PRESENTER/CONTACT: Jim Stauffer; jims@greens.org; (408) 432-9148

SUBJECT: Modify the General Assembly decision quorum requirement to avoid loss of quorum on Sunday afternoons; and clarify terminology used in those bylaws sections.

## BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

Decision quorum at a General Assembly is based on the number of delegates registered at the beginning of each session (i.e. each 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 proposed changes keep the requirement that 80% of registered delegates must participate in the plenary session to make a decision, but allow delegates who leave early to unregister thereby lowering the quorum threshold. However, we want to maintain a voting pool large enough to be considered a valid decision-making body. Therefore, this proposal introduces a maximum allowable attrition of registered delegates.

Historically, this quorum problem occurs on Sunday afternoon when some delegates need to leave early. On those occasions, the delegate count dropped below quorum by only a few delegates. So allowing a small-percent attrition of delegates should rectify the problem and still maintain a sizeable voting pool.

## PROPOSAL:

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 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.

### 5-8.9 Details of Process Flow

- a) The facilitation team determines if a quorum exists.

## Proposed changes to section 5-4.3:

1. Add two sentences to the intro paragraph: “However, a minimum number of delegates are required to remain registered in order to establish a valid quorum. That minimum shall be 90% of the maximum number of delegates registered for that day.”
2. Add to item a): “Delegates shall notify the registration officials (or other appropriate General Assembly officials), and be removed from the delegate registration, if they permanently leave the General Assembly before it is adjourned.”

Additional changes to clarify the terminology used in Section 5-4:

5-4.1 Quorum

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

5-4.3 a) Delegates shall [ DELETE sign in ADD register ] at the beginning of each [ DELETE session ADD day of a General Assembly ], identifying [ DELETE region and ADD their ] county.

Proposed changes to section 5-8.9:

Section 5-8.9 requires the facilitators to verify quorum at each decision item. This contradicts 5-4.3 b), so 5-8.9 a) is amended as follows:

5-8.9 a) The facilitation team determines if a quorum exists in accordance with section 5-4.3, or may verify the current quorum if circumstances warrant such action.

COMMITTEE DECISION:

TIME LINE: Implement immediately.

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.

---

FINAL WORDING with above changes

5-4.1 Quorum

A quorum exists for the purpose of opening a 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 remain registered in order to establish a valid quorum. That minimum shall be 90% of the maximum number of delegates registered for that day.

a) Delegates shall register at the beginning of each day of a General Assembly, identifying their county. Delegates shall notify the registration officials (or other appropriate General Assembly officials), and be removed from the delegate registration, if they permanently 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.

5-8.9 Details of Process Flow

a) The facilitation team determines if a quorum exists in accordance with section 5-4.3, or may verify the current quorum if circumstances warrant such action.

## Proposal – Candidates for Primary

---

PRESENTER: Campaign & Candidates Working Group

CONTACT: Warner S. Bloomberg III CCWG Coordinator (San Jose, CA, 408-295-9353, wsb3attyca@aol.com)

SUBJECT: Affirm a list of GPUS presidential candidates to appear on the GPCA February 2008 Presidential Primary Election ballot.

### BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

Although the GPCA approved draft Elections Code sections in June 2006, those provisions are not enacted. Separately, the GPCA Bylaws do not have procedures for approving a candidates list for the GPCA presidential preference primary.

That election is scheduled to occur on February 5, 2008. In CCWG teleconference discussions, there was consensus that a procedure that favors inclusivity of announced candidates should be followed. This proposal would allow the General Assembly of Delegates to affirm the appearance of a list of candidates on the GPCA ballot that would allow the GPCA Liaison to the Secretary of State to communicate that list as having been approved by the GPCA's highest decision making group.

The Green Party of the United States (GPUS) solicited statements of interest from potential GPUS presidential candidates through its Presidential Candidates Search Committee (PCSC) and a candidates forum was held in July 2007 at the Annual National Committee meeting in Pennsylvania. However, no formal list of candidates has been issued by the GPUS.

The California Secretary of State office must receive the GPCA presidential primary candidates list by October 8th. Candidates will have until November 29, 2007 to withdraw their name from that list by communicating with that office.

### PROPOSAL:

At the September 8-9th, 2007, General Assembly of Delegates, a list of announced candidates for nomination as the GPUS candidate for U. S. President will be presented to the General Assembly of Delegates for approval. The General Assembly of Delegates shall decide upon a list of candidates to be submitted to the California Secretary of State for placement on the GPCA Presidential Primary ballot. The GPCA Liaison to the Secretary of State shall communicate the list as the decision of those delegates and request that the list of candidates be those placed on the GPCA presidential preference primary ballot. Each candidate will be contacted by the GPCA Liaison to the Secretary of State and informed of their respective listing. If a listed candidate requests to be removed from the list at least a week before the submission deadline, that request shall be honored, and that person's name shall not be included in the names submitted to the California Secretary of State.

Process: A brief report will be made of the list of candidates recommended for inclusion on the GPCA presidential primary ballot and the list of potential candidates not recommended. The recommendations list will be reviewed under ordinary process for clarifying questions and concerns as to names included or omitted on the list of recommended candidates. Candidates for whom there is consensus for listing will be identified separate from those for which there are outstanding concerns without stand asides. Listing of the latter category of names will be determined by a written ballot in which any number of the remaining candidates' names can be written on a Delegate's ballot.

Any candidate whose name appears on at least 2/3rds of ballots submitted (including NOC and NOTA votes) will be included in the final list of candidates' names for submission to the California Secretary of State will be decided by consensus or vote of the Delegates.

Ballots submitted marked "abstain" will be treated under current GPCA rules for abstention voting.

## COMMITTEE PROCESS:

This proposal was published on the CCWG email list in June 2007 and discussed at the June 2007 CCWG monthly teleconference. This proposal was discussed again at the July 11, 2007 CCWG monthly teleconference at which time clarifications about the list approval process were discussed and approved. The revised proposal was submitted on July 15, 2007, the announced final deadline for submitting items for the plenary agenda. After publication on the GPUS Delegation email list, it was revised again and republished on the CCWG and Delegation email lists. It was discussed during the August 8, 2007 CCWG monthly teleconference. The current proposal and the following report represents the consensus of those participating on that teleconference.

## TIMELINE:

Publication of the list of GPUS recognized candidates as soon as available. Requests and discussions about additional possible candidates before the plenary for the purpose of creating a supplemental list to circulate at the General Assembly. Preparation of paper ballot forms. Adoption of a list of candidates at the next plenary in Riverside County, CA, September 8-9th, 2007, for the GPCA Liaison to the Secretary of State to promptly transmit. There is an October 8th (effectively September 30th) deadline for reporting the GPCA requests for candidates on its ballot line. This proposal, as originally circulated, did not include any list of candidates to be presented at the time of the plenary because of the June 30th / July 15th deadlines for submitting proposals for the agenda packet (e.g., no formal list of candidates announced by GPUS). A supplemental report has been added to this revised proposal because the agenda packet has not been published as of August 9, 2007.

## RESOURCES:

Time and energies for pre-plenary preparations (e.g., meetings; reports and announcements). GPCA CC / Agenda Team preparing a ballots counting committee for counting and certifying the vote from written ballots at the state meeting. Time and energies by the Liaison to the Secretary of State and her assistants. Possible use of CCWG budget to provide written materials at the plenary.

Reference: Policies and Procedures for Selection and Conduct of GPCA Delegates to the GPUS Presidential Nominating Convention adopted May 27, 2007.

---

## GPUS PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES EVALUATIONS REPORT

August 9, 2007

To: GPCA General Assembly of Delegates, Riverside County Plenary, September 8-9th

From: Warner Bloomberg, CCWG Coordinator

Re: Evaluation of GPUS Presidential Candidates;

Recommendations for GPCA Presidential Primary Election Ballot

There is no current “official” list of GPUS presidential candidates following the Annual National Committee (ANC) meeting held in July 2007 in Pennsylvania. As part of this report’s preparation, California GPUS Delegates were requested to submit comments regarding impressions of individuals who participated at the candidates forum at that meeting. I received some email comments and information from outside the California delegation and I reviewed candidates’ web pages where available. The draft list also was published on the CCWG email list. Comments were requested with an August 5th deadline. One person wrote to the effect that Jerry Kann be removed because, in the writer’s words, he wasn’t “really a candidate”. A few other comments either partially or fully affirmed the “not recommended” list. The list was reviewed again during the CCWG monthly teleconference on August 8, 2007.

The recommended candidates list includes individuals who have affirmatively expressed an interest in seeking the GPUS nomination for U.S. President. In teleconference discussions, CCWG members had various positions on

how to evaluate candidates, but there was consensus that, in the absence of good reason to the contrary using GP Values and GPCA positions as a guide, the decisions to list candidates to appear on the GPCA Presidential Primary Ballot should favor inclusiveness rather than exclusivity.

The CCWG proposal for creating a list of candidates to submit to the California Secretary of State follows usual process of presentation, clarifying questions, and affirmations and concerns. The delegates first will be asked to approve the list of candidates for which there is internal CCWG consensus. Then there will be opportunity for delegates to propose additions to the list of candidates for the GPCA Primary Election through expression of concerns and requests for amendment of the proposal by the presenter. The facilitators will be requested to take a snap straw poll of delegates to advise the presenter whether there is consensus or concerns regarding each proposal to add a name to the list. Pursuant to the policies adopted at the May 2007 San Francisco Plenary, in the absence of prior General Assembly approval, the name of any candidate who is currently seeking the nomination from any other national political party will not be considered. In the absence of consensus for inclusion of any additional candidate(s), the question of additional names will be decided by a written ballot. A candidate receiving 2/3rds or more of the total votes cast will be included on the list to be submitted to the California Secretary of State.

#### CCWG CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRIMARY BALLOT LISTING

Jared Ball <<http://www.voxunion.com/jaredball/>> (Washington, D.C.) -- Member of the D.C. Statehood Green Party. Appeared at the Presidential Panel at the GP-US Annual National Meeting in Reading, PA. Video of his speech: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-TBSSaaeR0c>. Kimberly Wilder (NY) quotes him as saying “We need to revive the true, radical politics that inside all of us” at the ANC forum and describes his message and strategy as consistent with green values.

Elaine Brown <<http://elainebrown.org>> (Georgia) -- Member of the Georgia Green Party and Black Panther Party activist. Brown has communicated her intention to seek the Green nomination to the GP-US Presidential Candidates Search Committee (PCSC) and has issued a public statement by email announcing her candidacy, but did not attend the Reading meeting. Her current web page does not mention her candidacy and has an emphasis on cases asserting wrongful convictions in various murder cases.

Jesse Johnson (West Virginia) -- Member of the West Virginia Mountain Party, which became affiliated with the GPUS at the Reading meeting. Ran for Governor in 200 <<http://www.mtparty.org/nominations/2004/jesse/platform.html>>. Appeared on the Presidential Panel in Reading. Video of his speech: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mMxgYnmDHfg>. Kimberly Wilder writes that she found his speaking style simple and clear and that he articulated many of the concerns of Greens.

Kent Mesplay <<http://mesplay.org>> (California) -- Member of the GPCA. Sought GPUS nomination in 2004 and appeared on the June 2004 California presidential primary ballot. Also sought the GPCA nomination for U.S. Senate in 2006. Is a GPCA Delegate to the GPUS National Committee. His web page is clear about his candidacy. Appeared at the Presidential Panel at the GP-US Annual National Meeting in Reading, PA. Video of his speech: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5RzsfFJS\\_Q](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5RzsfFJS_Q)

Kat Swift <<http://www.prezkat.info>> (Texas) -- Member of the Green Party of Texas. Ran for San Antonio City Council in 2007. Is a GPTX Alternate delegate to the GPUS National Committee. Her website is clear about her candidacy (and her request to spell her name in all lower case letters). Appeared at the Presidential Panel at the GP-US Annual National Meeting in Reading, PA. Video of her speech: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uzHn2D789Wg>

#### NOT RECOMMENDED BECAUSE OF LACK OF CCWG CONSENSUS

Jerry Kann <<http://kannforpresident.net>> (New York) -- States on his web page that he is a candidate to access the national discussion about strategies and to advocate Ralph Nader as the best possible candidate. Kimberly Wilder’s impression is that “Jerry is not running for himself to be the nominee.”

## CCWG CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATIONS TO OMIT FROM PRIMARY BALLOT LIST

Sheila Beilyu (state?) -- Kimberly Wilder reports that Sheila stated that she was born with a B on her forehead and promised to use government technology to control the weather for good instead of evil. Cat Woods' email stated that Sheila would be a public embarrassment to the GP.

Dan Imperatu (Massachusetts) -- Jan Arnold reports that Mr. Imperatu said he was knighted by Pope John Paul and also is pro-life. Our state party platform expressly asserts that: "Women have an inalienable right to control their own bodies. The decision whether to bring a pregnancy to term is a woman's alone to make. All women must have the option of obtaining a safe and legal abortion...." The GPCA has repeatedly taken pro-choice positions on ballot initiatives.

Michael Jingoian (Oregon) -- Web page states that he is a "Libertarian candidate for President" under a platform to "Reset America". There is not a word about the Green Party (or the color green).

Billy Olsen (California) -- Billy is a GPCA activist in Kern County and a disability and health rights advocate. He sent an email to the CCWG email list requesting to be included on the GPCA presidential primary ballot list, but he apparently made no contact with the GPUS PCSC, has no web page, and has not otherwise announced or pursued a candidacy.

Gail Parker (Virginia) -- Current web page reflects that she is running for U.S. Senate and deals mostly with the need for light rail in Fairfax County. Kimberly Wilder reports that she suggested Michael Bloomberg as a candidate for president at the ANC meeting forum. Tamar Yager (GPVA) advises that Ms. Parker is a member of the "Independent 'Green' Party of Virginia" that is NOT affiliated with the GPUS but which has caused confusion and disruption to the GPVA. Gail also is reported to be registered with the Libertarian Party.

Joe Schrinier (Ohio) -- Independent. His web page, including copies of press reports, makes his anti-abortion rights position clear.

Additional Comments: Although discussed widely on email and web pages as possible candidates, as of the time of writing this report, neither Ralph Nader nor Cynthia McKinney have stated that they are a candidate to be the GPUS nominee for President. Both the proposal and California Secretary of State policies and procedures allow someone named as a Primary Election candidate to withdraw their name from the ballot.

## Election – GPUS Delegation

---

SPONSOR: Coordinating Committee

### BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

The GPCA is entitled to 42 delegates to the GPUS National Committee, and 42 alternates. Currently the GPCA has 36 delegate and three alternates. At the September General Assembly, there will be elections for six delegate seats and 39 alternate seats.

Fifteen GPCA members are running for the six delegates seats. Five GPCA members are running only for one of the 39 alternate seats. The nine GPCA members who are not elected as delegates, also plan to run for the 39 alternate seats.

Those GPCA members are as follows.

### Running for Delegate and Alternate:

Theresa Boardman, Tim Casebolt, Byron DeLear, Jim Dorenkott, Rebecca Gonzalez-Tobias, Nicole Haldeman, Glenn Hopkins, Derek Iversno, Jack Lindblad, Bernie MacDonald, John Morton, Michael McCue, Genevieve Marcus, Craig Thorsen, Peter Thottam

### Running for Alternate Only:

Josefina Aranda, Sheila Laracy, Edith Mendez, Christine Pinto, Pamela Spevack

### The list of candidates:

Bernie MacDonald, received 6/10/07  
Craig Thorsen, received 6/27/07  
John Morton, received 6/27/07  
Theresa Boardman, received 6/27/07  
Michael McCue, received 7/08/07  
Genevieve Marcus, received 7/08/07  
Glenn Hopkins, received 7/08/07  
Byron DeLear, received 7/08/07  
Tim Casebolt, received 7/09/07  
Nicole Haldeman, received 7/09/07  
Pamela Spevack, received 7/09/07 (alt only)  
Jack Lindblad, received 7/09/07  
Peter Thottam, received 7/09/07  
Derek Iverson, received 7/09/07  
Sheila Laracy, received 7/09/07 (alt only)  
Rebecca Gonzalez-Tobias, received 7/09/07  
Christine Pinto, received 7/09/07 (alt only)  
Edith Mendez, received 7/09/07 (alt only)  
Josefina Aranda, received 7/09/07 (alt only)  
Jim Dorenkott, received 7/09/07

Candidate statements are in Appendix 1 on page 43

## Proposal – GPCA-CC Business Actualization

---

SPONSORING COUNTIES: Fresno, El Dorado

### PRESENTERS:

Larry Mullen <larry\_mullen@sbcglobal.net>, 559.227.0293

Michael Borenstein, <thebor@cagreens.org>, 530.620.6659

Bob Vizzard, <thevizz@earthlink.net>, 916.663.1739

### PURPOSE:

To give the regions the onus to, and the right of filing the alternate plan for the decision making process best suited for their region, as agreed upon by the decision making process of the region and/or its member counties, for electing or selecting the region's Reps and Alts.

To immediately affect the actualization of the GPCA-CC's administrative duties.

To immediately afford the CC a working procedure to manage Regional Rep elections, contested elections, overt and continuous misbehavior during meetings and official discussion, and to affect a method for a Region to replace its rep(s) with a duly filed alternate process, if the need arises.

This proposal endeavors to mitigate all background with a method that will permit business to be done without delay, while also effecting remedies to those Rep seats that remain in contested status.

### BACKGROUND:

Paragraphs of background material are abbreviated here to say: The GPCA-CC has become self-stifled, to the extent that almost all business items and actualization of almost all of its administrative duties have come to a halt. This has been unfortunately accomplished via the inability of the CC to reconcile the status of various contested regional Rep elections, and/or to mitigate the distractive, manipulative and continuous behavior of members.

### PROPOSAL

#### 7-1.4 CC Elections and Term of Office

##### 7-1.4 a) Term of Office for Regional Coordinating Committee Members

Upon selection as per section 7-1.5 the term of office for regional CC reps shall be nominally two-years or until replaced and may fluctuate as mandated by the state's timing of primary elections in which the County Councils of regions are elected.

##### 7-1.4 b) Term of Office for At-Large Coordinating Committee Members

At the first General Assembly meeting of the year, elections shall be conducted for one half of the At-Large CC seats. (See selection of at-large members, 7-1.7).

#### 7-1.5 Selection of Regional Members

The regional caucus of delegates at General Assembly meetings shall select regional cc members, unless the active counties of a region select an alternative process. Any alternative process must be consistent with the ten key values, GPCA by laws and California law; and approved by all county councils of the active counties of a region; and filed with the Coordinating Committee and Bylaw SC.

Regions with two or more seats are encouraged to strive for gender balance.

##### 7-1.5 a) Election of Coordinating Committee Regional Representatives

Unless amended by an alternative regional process that is consistent with the 10KV, state law and GPCA bylaws, and is filed with the Bylaw SC and the GPCA-CC, the following bylaws shall be the default process that regions shall use.

Three months after or upon official notification of the outcome of the direct primary election in which county councils are elected, each region, who does not have an alternative process on file, shall conduct a properly noticed, agendized, and quorumed CC rep selection process (See Section 4-1.1 a).

Regions shall select a majority of their reps at this election. The balance of the CC reps shall be elected to a one-year start-up term with a two-year election cycle beginning one year later.

*\\The intent of this bylaw is to clarify that currently seated County Councils of a region shall be able to determine or delegate the alternate process for their own region, or be subject to procedures that enact a fallback plan to select/elect their own CC reps. It is intended that the election of new CC reps shall be held after the primary election in which County Councils are elected, and that any CC reps selected/elected by outgoing county councils of a region will serve only until replaced by the newly elected county councils. CC reps may be recalled per specific reasons stated in the bylaws or replaced without cause by the county councils of the region as described in 7-1.5 b.*

The county councils of the region will have the jurisdiction to hold and/or organize the Rep election or election process best suited for their individual county and/or region.

#### 7-1.5 b) Replacement of CC Reps Without Cause

Regions may and replace their cc reps for any reason at any time during their term of office by using the region's approved election/selection process.

*\\The intent of this bylaw is to clarify that "replacement" by currently seated County Councils of a region shall be defined separately from the forced "resignation" and subsequent "recall" described in section 6-1.3 and the related procedure and process.*

#### 7-1.5 c) Contested CC Rep Elections

In the event that a CC election is contested, the seats being contested shall be represented on the CC in the following manner:

1. No rep of a contested seat shall have a vote on the CC.
2. Contested reps will be counted as one for quorum and may participate in discussions, ask clarifying questions, raise points of process, and have concerns noted in the records of meetings. No contested rep may [hold an unresolved] concern.
3. Regions with contested rep/s shall hold a new election within six weeks, overseen by an election committee of three neutral Greens [preferably] from outside the region, who are approved by all the county councils of the region.
4. If the alternate for a contested rep position is duly elected and uncontested, that alt may have full consensus making and voting privileges providing the contested reps are not at the meeting/teleconference.
5. Any rep or alt bringing the subject of a contested election to the agenda during a meeting/teleconference, when it has not been placed on the agenda, shall be subject to removal from the meeting. The vibes watcher shall immediately call a point of process to have that rep or alt removed from the meeting. The facilitator shall immediately call for consensus or a simple majority vote. The rep raising the issue and the contested reps may not participate in the vote. Removal of reps/alts from the meeting/teleconference will not be counted as breaking quorum. Reps removed may attend the next CC meeting.

*\\The intent of this procedure/bylaw is to empower each region to take care of its own business at the appropriate level in the appropriate manner. It is also the intent of this procedure to empower the CC to*

*conduct Green Party business in an unobstructed manner consistent with Green values, bylaws and state election code. The contributions of each rep are valued. The intent is to stop the disruption and welcome the removed reps to return to the consensus process at the next meeting.*

#### 7-1.5 d) Removal of At-large and Regional CC Members From Office

This section applies to At-Large and Regional CC Reps.

CC Regional Reps shall serve at the pleasure of their regions, while At-Large Reps serve at the pleasure of the GA. In addition to Section 6-3.0 Removal For Cause, CC reps may be asked to resign or recalled for:

1. Making overt and/or constant profane, racist, violent, or sexist comments in meetings, teleconferences, or on the CC list serve to or about fellow cc reps.
2. Displaying overt and/or constant disruptive behavior in meetings, teleconferences, or on the CC list serve.
3. Misappropriation of California Green Party funds.
4. Misrepresenting the California Green Party to the SoS, FPPC/FEC, or news media.
5. Violating security or inappropriately accessing California Green Party computer or data files.

CC reps shall not be recalled for expressing minority or unpopular views. A region may replace its Rep(s) at any time with a duly noticed election/selection, in compliance with the region's pre-filed alternate process (Per section 7-1.5 b).

*\ \ The intent of this section is to expand on Section 6-3.1 Resignation a, b, c, and d. Failure to perform the enumerated duties are not the only causes that may cause the replacement of a cc rep. This section addresses behaviors that have been seen as breaches of trust by other cc members for which there is no apparent accountability other than removal from office.*

TIMELINE: Immediate.

RESOURCES: None, other than adherence to the filing of Alternate processes by the regions who are lacking the filing of such.

# Proposal – Tax Reform Plank

---

SPONSOR: Platform Standing Group

PRESENTERS/CONTACTS: David Wilbur, drwsf@yahoo.com (PRESENTER), David Geisen, telekosmos@yahoo.com, Elisabeth Green, bethg247@yahoo.com, Shane Que Hee, squehee@ucla.edu.

SUBJECT: CALIFORNIA TAX REFORM in the Social Justice & Livable 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.

## BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

### Economic and Tax Principles

The Green Party of California believes a sound community revenue system is rooted in a sustainable economic model that rewards individual and group contributions to the community and takes care of those who are incapable of caring for themselves.

Economic and tax policy must distinguish between land rent, labor wages, and capital interest, the only three factors of economic activity that can “pay” taxes in our money economy. An economic model is sustainable and equitable when the full amount of labor wages go to labor, capital interest goes to capital, and land rent goes to the community.

### GREEN PARTY TAX PRINCIPLES

The Green Party believes working people should pay the least tax possible, and landlords and land speculators the most tax.

The Green Party believes since small businesses are the heart of any local economy, small businesses should pay little, if any, tax, and the largest businesses should pay a fair share of government revenue requirements.

The Green Party believes a tax system should be fair, simple, and easy to administer, using a large tax base such as gross receipts so that tax rates can be very low. Using gross receipts as a tax base along with a low tax rate is an easy calculation for every business, and is a simple tax to audit. The need and opportunity for tax evasion are minimized with a broad based income, low tax rate system.

The Green Party believes working people should pay far fewer taxes by reducing and eliminating income taxes, payroll taxes and sales taxes, and increasing taxes on gross rents, natural resources (such as the airwaves, oil, and timber), and the gross receipts of companies who profit most from our economy and who benefit most from the significant government investments made in the economy’s infrastructure, transportation, schools, and other municipal investments.

The Green Party is not opposed to a Value Added type tax, allowing a credit against gross sales for direct labor costs paid to local labor, which would encourage local business activity and investment, and would discourage companies from moving jobs overseas.

## PROPOSAL:

The Green Party supports:

1. Reduction and eventual elimination of all taxes on salaries and wages, replaced by graduated tax rates on gross rents, gross business receipts, and resource-based taxes.

Taxes on business "net income" should be eliminated and replaced with far lower tax rates on business gross income earned in California. This change will not only significantly reduce government expenditures to

administer the current tax system, but will capture far more tax revenue from overseas companies and will benefit California companies who employ California workers and who invest in the local California economy..

The Green Party proposes a modest 3% gross receipts tax to begin to replace the current business tax system, until determining which graduated tax rates on gross receipts are needed to offset all current taxes paid by businesses.

The Green Party also proposes a 10% tax on gross rents, phased in by 2% over a 5-year period. Each year 50% of the money collected would be used to give a rebate check to each individual California taxpayer, and 50% would be used to pay off outstanding state bonds. When the bonds are finally paid, all of the tax proceeds would be rebated to individual taxpayers.

2. Elimination of sales taxes.

Sales taxes are one of the most regressive taxes on working people, especially for lower income individuals who pay a much higher percentage of their income on sales taxes. Moreover, because tangible personal property is primarily taxed and services are not generally taxed, a higher percent of sales tax is paid by poorer people who don't often use high-priced services. The Green Party supports a gross receipt tax (that would be far less than the current 7.25% to 8.75% sales tax rate – perhaps only 0.5-2%) to offset the revenue lost from repealing sales taxes.

3. Elimination of landlord and speculator loopholes from the existing tax system and redirecting these tax subsidies into building new limited-equity ownership housing within existing urban boundaries.

Currently the federal and state governments give hundreds of millions of dollars in tax subsidies to landlords and real estate speculators – interest write-offs, depreciation deductions, capital gain exclusions, and a host of other loopholes, exemptions, and exclusions. These loopholes are available to already built assets so the tax subsidies do not help produce anything new of value to society, but only serve to enrich landlords and speculators. These tax subsidies also cause real estate prices to be higher than they would be if they were eliminated, and make it more difficult for families to afford a home.

This change to the current tax system will provide more home ownership opportunities, reduce the cost of housing, prevent urban sprawl, and bolster local transportation systems and businesses.

4. Implementation of a more robust and nuanced approach to California property taxation that not only addresses Proposition 13 for all business property - including residential rental property - regardless if the property is owned by a corporation, partnership, family trust, LLC or other entity.

The Green Party fully supports California Proposition 13 that protects homeowners from displacement, and supports property tax exemptions for small businesses that do not make profit. The Green Party also supports a property tax system that makes a distinction between land (higher tax) versus improvements upon the land (low or no tax) to be consistent with Green Party values for preserving land for public use, agriculture, open space, and encouraging development in appropriate locations.

5. Redirection from using bond financing to pay for necessary government goods and services to using a pay-as-we-go system using taxes on gross rents and gross receipts.

Bond financing is regressive, non-sustainable, and saddles our children and grandchildren with the debt from our public consumption, while transferring billions of dollars of interest payments from California taxpayers to the wealthiest individuals and companies. Other taxes such as those proposed above are far more just and sustainable than bond financing.

Definitions:

**Capital interest** is the periodic value, or one-time change of ownership value, of things made by human beings such as buildings, equipment, and factories.

**Labor wages** is that portion of value that remains after land rent and capital (tools, money or other things made by labor) have been compensated.

**Land rent** is the periodic market value of land after subtracting the enhanced value that labor and capital have contributed to the land. Land rent is the economic measure of the community value of the land, which takes into account geographic location, current zoning, mineral values, nearness to transportation, natural views, convenience, and a whole host of other tangible and intangible factors.

COMMITTEE DECISION: Versions were placed on the Platform Listserve on the following dates: 1, July 1 2006; 2, Sep 6 2006; 3, Sep 12, 2006, 4, Oct 1, 2006; 5. Jan 8 2007; 6. Feb 27 2007. 7. The material was a Discussion item at the Lake Tahoe Plenary of Sep 9/10 2006; 8. The plank received informal comment at the Sonoma CCWG Retreat of Feb 24/25 2007. 9. July 14 2007.

TIMELINE: This is the first General Assembly consideration of the plank. Consideration of the plank was not possible at the San Francisco Plenary of May 26/27 2007, as part of the final adopted Agenda that was preceded by two dueling Agendas.

RESOURCES: There is no comparable GPCA or GPUS plank.

## **Proposal – Standing General Assembly Developmental Implementation Experiment (S.G.A.D.I.E.)**

---

SPONSORING WG, PRESENTERS: GROW, <gpca-grow@lists.riseup.net> Michael Borenstein, 530.620.6650, <thebor@jps.net>

PROPOSAL IN BRIEF: [In detail below]

To set to real time the building, by proportionality represented active counties, the creation of a sanctioned GPCA online decision making forum, heretofore and commonly known as the ‘Standing General Assembly’ (SGA).

PURPOSE:

To create a GPCA online decision making forum. aka SGA. -To build a decentralized decision making structure. -To give the ‘building’ of this over to those who will be using it. -To give an actual walk to the talk about GPCA’s desire for a SGA. -To ascertain if GPCA’s county councils and delegates can muster for a SGA. -To help move GPCA’s decision making procedures closer to county locals -To exercise a goal of removing 1/3 of GPCA business from GA floor time. -To not necessarily change any existing decision making structures or plan, but more to afford GPCA another tool with which to expedite decisions.

BACKGROUND:

The SGA concept was introduced prior to, then presented at the 12/04 GA as a discussion item. A very complete SGA proposal was introduced into that discussion. The proposal and concept generated much comment and were well received as a formal start up of the SGA idea.

This project has since generated much discussion, mostly positive. -This project has not generated the activity needed for implementation. -The desire for less cramped plenary agendas has been clearly stated. -The desire for other activities at GAs and/or gatherings is evident. -Some GPCA locals could use help augmenting interaction with the GPCA. -The GPCA could use help augmenting this interaction from the state’s side.

Proposal in detail:

1. Convene this SGA ‘experiment’ concept immediately upon GA consideration.
2. Not to interfere, in any way with current GA structure, planning or timing.
3. Use the present list of active counties & current delegate count.
4. Set up a listserv for these delegates, inclusive of county councilors.
5. Each county elects delegates up to or equal to the current delegate count.
6. Elected delegates need commitment to a 6 month starting, or one time, term.
7. Each elected delegate is to be a publicly available person, with contact information, and maintain valid GPCA registration status during their term.
8. Via this Delegate/county-councilor (del/cc) listserv and periodic teleconferences this group will set up the mechanisms it needs to proceed. i.e. website, voting page, video conferencing, etc.
9. As IT systems are implemented, this elected del/cc group then spends 3 months making and designing its working procedures and rules.
10. The proverbial bugs can be weeded out of the systems as we design it, citing our ability to stumble on and realize ill designed procedures.

11. At the end of 3 months, ready with rules, technology, elected delegates and individual county's decision making method in place, this experimental SGA makes one official GPCA decision.

[Note: #6,7,8 & 9 may call for IT and others' resources yet to be discussed]

12. They take 30 days to decide a platform plank or bylaw item, or...

13. So that no volunteer sees this as a frivolous exercise, this 'decision' will be real, actualized, and acted upon in the same way as any GA decision.

14. The group should now be able to isolate in real time all that worked and all that did not.

15. This del/cc group then spends one more month introspecting all bugs, procedures and rules.

16. Make adjustments, tune and present a final working model to the GA

17. Periodic reports to GPCA committees, and plenaries taking place in this 'development' window, to assure transparency and continued activity.

18. Make a final report and proposal to the GA for final consensus, and launch a mutual and trustfully perpetual, Standing General Assembly.

**TIMELINE:** Start experiment immediately, with possible permanent implementation in less than a year to as little as 6 months.

**RESOURCES:** -Volunteer time/efforts on many's part. -Undetermined IT interface. -Some resources remain undetermined until construction begins. -Limited 'specific expenditures' may be needed for software, equipment, etc.

## Proposal – County Polling

---

PRESENTER: Campaign & Candidates Working Group

CONTACT: Warner S. Bloomberg III CCWG Coordinator (San Jose, CA, 408-295-9353, wsb3attyca@aol.com)

SUBJECT: Establish policies and procedures for County Polling on California ballot measures.

### BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

GPCA Bylaws, Section 9-1.1, provide that the state party may take positions opposing or supporting statewide ballot measures, and Section 9-1.2 provides that the General Assembly of Delegates shall decide the process for endorsement or opposition. Policies and procedures for County Polling were adopted at the December 2003 (Fullerton, Orange County) plenary, but documentation of that decision has been ambiguous. Although County Polling regarding initiatives has occurred since the 2004 elections, a need for updated procedures and clarification of policies has become apparent. Updating this proposal is part of the goals of the CCWG 2007 Work Plan. The following proposals mostly follow past practices and clarify that the described procedures do not require CC involvement (which delayed County Polling by approximately two weeks in August 2006).

### PROPOSAL:

A County Polling Committee (CPC) is hereby established as a standing committee of the GPCA General Assembly of Delegates (GA) administered by the Campaigns and Candidates Working Group (CCWG).

#### 1. Co-Coordination.

The CPC will be led by two Co-Coordination appointed by the CCWG (Co)Coordinator(s) not later than the end of the first state meeting held in odd numbered years. The GPCA Coordinating Committee (CC) Liaison to the CCWG shall promptly inform the CC Co-Coordination of the names and contact information for those persons. Except as otherwise provided below, the term of office for CPC Coordination shall be two years from date of appointment. In the event of a vacancy, the CCWG (Co)Coordinator(s) shall appoint a replacement to complete the term of office. In the event the term of office of a CPC Co-Coordination expires and there has not been a re-appointment or replacement appointed, the term of office of the current Co-Coordination shall continue until new appointments are made or until the current CPC Co-Coordination resign or become disqualified (i.e., by change of residence or party affiliation).

Transition Provisions: The initial terms of office shall start upon adoption of this proposal and shall continue until 2009. Upon adoption, the CCWG (Co)Coordinator(s) shall promptly appoint the initial CPC Co-Coordination.

#### 2. Responsibilities.

The CPC shall coordinate the collection of reports describing and making recommendations concerning statewide ballot measures prior to formal polling of active GPCA county organizations (County GPs). The CPC shall publish its report(s) as part of a County Polling process to determine if sufficient County GPs support or oppose specific ballot measures to constitute a GPCA position opposing or supporting that measure. The CPC will collect responses from County GPs and report those results to the CC and the County GPs. The CPC Co-Coordination shall serve as the administrators and lead contacts for the CPC.

#### 3. Processes.

Promptly after the close of the ballot certification date and announcement by the California Secretary of State of measures certified for inclusion in the next statewide ballot, the CPC shall invite any GPCA member to participate in summarizing and evaluating ballot measures. To the extent possible, this invitation will precede the close of the certification period. The CPC Co-Coordination shall promptly form teams from volunteers to complete the applicable reports within approximately one month following the close of the certification date.

The reports shall be communicated to County GPs via the County Contacts email list and by other additional methods as the CPC Co-Coordinators may consider appropriate. County GPs will report their respective positions on each ballot measure. A County GP may choose among the following choices for each ballot measure: “Yes” or “Support” (meaning the County GP votes that the GPCA should support the measure); “No” or “Oppose” (meaning the County GP votes that the GPCA should oppose the measure); “No Position” (meaning that the County GP votes that the GPCA should not take any position on the measure); or “Abstain” (meaning that County GP takes no position on what should be the GPCA position). Abstentions will be counted to determine quorum, but will not be counted to determine if there are sufficient votes to support, or oppose, or have no GPCA position, on a ballot measure.

County GPs shall have the same number of votes on each ballot measure as the County GP could have a total number of delegates at the first General Assembly of Delegates to be held following the start of the County Polling period. A County GP may report a distribution of votes for any ballot measure as decided by its internal processes up to the maximum number of its total delegate votes. County Polling results shall be communicated by at least one County Council member of the County GP to the CPC Co-Coordinators in writing (including email). A County GP may divide its votes as to any ballot measure by half votes.

A quorum for purposes of County Polling shall be at least one half (1/2) of the total number of active GPCA county organizations at the time of the start of the County Polling period. If quorum is not achieved from the number of reports received by the CPC Co-Coordinators for any ballot measure by the completion of the County Polling period (including extensions), no GPCA position will result from the County Polling as to that measure.

A GPCA position to support, or oppose, or have no GPCA position on a ballot measure shall require a minimum of Eighty Percent (80%) of the number of votes received by the close of County Polling Period. If that threshold of votes is not received by the CPC Co-Coordinators for any ballot measure by the completion of the County Polling period (including extensions), no GPCA position will result from the County Polling as to that measure (notwithstanding achievement of quorum). If that threshold of votes is received by the CPC Co-Coordinators for any ballot measure by the completion of the County Polling period (including extensions), then that position to support, or oppose, or have no GPCA position on the ballot measure shall be the formal position of the GPCA, effective immediately.

County Polling will begin approximately one month following the close of the ballot certification date and last for a period of approximately five weeks. Promptly following the close of the Polling period, the CPC Co-Coordinators shall report the results to the CC Co-Coordinators and the CCWG (Co)Coordinator(s).

In the event a quorum has not been achieved during the initial polling period, the CPC Co-Coordinators may extend the polling period for as long as an additional three weeks, or until two days before the convening of the next General Assembly of Delegates, whichever occurs first.

For purposes of example, the schedule for County Polling in 2007-2008 is expected to be as follows:

End of September 2007	Certification date for ballot measures on February 5, 2008 ballot
October 2007	Collect ballot measure reports
November 2007	County Polling
December 2007	Announce County Polling results
End of January 2008	Certification date for ballot measures on June 2008 ballot
February 2008	Collect ballot measure reports
March 2008	County Polling
April 2008	Announce County Polling results
End of June 2008	Certification date for ballot measures on November 2008 ballot

July 2008	Collect ballot measure reports
August 2008	County Polling
September 2008	Announce County Polling results

4. Plenary Agenda.

The Agenda Team shall schedule and the CPC Co-Coordinators shall report on County Polling results at the beginning of the first day of the first GPCA Assembly of Delegates (Plenary) following the close of any County Polling period, or if the Plenary begins during the County Polling period. In the event the GPCA position as to any ballot measure has not been determined by County Polling not later than two days before the commencement of the General Assembly of Delegates immediately following the start of the County Polling period, consideration of each such ballot measure shall be presented to the Delegates for determining the GPCA position, if any, as part of the Plenary Agenda. The CPC Co-Coordinators shall promptly advise the Plenary Agenda Team concerning any such items to be presented at that Plenary. The CPC ballot measures reports and voting instructions to County GPs shall be published in the Agenda Packet for that Plenary. The CCWG and CPC Co-Coordinators shall have joint responsibility to present those issues for support, opposition or taking no position by the General Assembly of Delegates whose decision shall establish the GPCA position as to any ballot measure position not decided by County Polling. The provisions of this Section 4. shall apply only if the Plenary is held not less than four weeks before the election in which any applicable measure appears on the ballot.

5. Ballot Measures Polling, Only.

The procedures described above apply only regarding determining GPCA positions as to statewide ballot measures. Similar procedures may be adopted concerning candidate endorsements or other GPCA decision-making, but use of any County Polling process for those, or any other purposes, is not part of this proposal. If this proposal is adopted, it shall apply only to procedures regarding determining GPCA positions on statewide ballot measures.

6. Regional Representatives.

CC members and their alternates have the responsibility to actively encourage County GP's in their geographic area(s) of responsibility to respond to County Polling and return timely reports of votes on each ballot measure. Following County Polling, CC members shall submit a written report to the CC concerning the status of any County GP that has not filed a timely County Polling report.

7. Documentation.

Upon adoption, this Proposal shall be appended as part of a Procedures and Policies supplement to the GPCA Bylaws with the date of adoption noted and included, as amended from time-to-time, when those Bylaws are republished.

COMMITTEE PROCESS:

This proposal was published on the CCWG email list in February 2007. At the February 2007 CCWG monthly teleconference, it was agreed that this proposal should be placed on the Consent Calendar for the May 2007 San Francisco County Plenary and that, if it was not accepted by that method, the proposal would be presented as an agenda item during the next Plenary. The proposal was republished on the CCWG email list in March and discussed during the March 2007 CCWG teleconference, at which time, following further amendments, it was approved by consensus. On May 26, 2007, the proposal was acceptable by all but one delegate who refused to stand aside on his concern(s). Accordingly, this proposal is submitted for consideration at the September 2007 plenary in Riverside County. In an attempt to address the concern previously raised, the CPC has been made a committee of the GA administered by the CCWG instead of simply being designated a committee of the CCWG.

#### TIMELINE:

Adoption at the next plenary in Riverside County, CA, September 2007, for immediate implementation. This proposal would require the CCWG to promptly appoint the initial CPC Co-Coordination for a term of office ending in 2009. CPC Co-Coordination would have to promptly initiate the collection of reports for February 5, 2008 statewide Presidential Primary elections that also would include ballot measures. County GPs need to plan to consider and respond to County Polling in late 2007, Spring 2008, and late Summer 2008.

#### RESOURCES:

Recurring time and energies in creating and presenting ballot measure reports via County Polling or to a General Assembly of Delegates for each election cycle. Time and energies for local GPs to consider and report on ballot measure positions. Possible IT Committee time and energies in posting County Polling results as reported. Recruitment and appointment of CPC Co-Coordination by the CCWG. Additional possible involvement of other SC/WGs in recruiting report contributors and Media Committee after GPCA positions have been determined for each set of ballot measures. Regional Representatives would be required to monitor whether County GP's in their region participate in each County Polling and report failures to participate to the CC.

## Proposal – Resolve the LA situation

---

SPONSOR: Bylaws Standing Committee

PRESENTERS: David Blatte, [greenpartymail@sbcglobal.net](mailto:greenpartymail@sbcglobal.net)

SUBJECT: IRV Proposal to Resolve the LA situation

### BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

During the May plenary, significant time was devoted to discussing the problems in LA County and working towards a solution. Although no resolution was passed and no solution reached, the number of viable alternatives was narrowed to four. (There may have actually been three, but because of confusion over wording, I'm including four.) They are:

1. Reboot the CC.
2. Decertify LA County.
3. Arbitration.
4. Let LA decide.

Although the exact wording of the alternative that is finally implemented may change, it seems that the ultimate solution will be a variation of one of these proposals.

The purpose of this proposal is to allow each of the four alternatives to be presented at the September plenary. If no proposal passes, it then provides for a resolution through an IRV process. (If any proposal passes, then there would be no need for the IRV process.) If adopted, the IRV proposal would ensure that a solution is chosen and implemented.

Although as a general rule matters like these are not decided by IRV, there seems to be little choice here. Each alternative will be given a shot on its own, but if none passes, there must be a process for resolution. (You can read each proposal by following the link.)

### PROPOSAL:

At the September plenary, one session will be devoted to resolving the LA situation. During that session, four separate proposals will be presented (in random order), each by a different group of presenters. They are:

1. Reboot the CC.  
<http://lists.cagreens.org/pipermail/bylaws/2007-July/003994.html>
2. Decertify LA County.  
<http://lists.cagreens.org/pipermail/bylaws/2007-July/003989.html>
3. Arbitration.  
<http://lists.cagreens.org/pipermail/bylaws/2007-July/003993.html>
4. Let LA decide.  
<http://lists.cagreens.org/pipermail/bylaws/2007-July/003990.html>

If any one proposal passes, it will be adopted. If two or more proposals pass, the proposal with the highest percentage of yeas shall be adopted.

IF NONE OF THE PROPOSALS PASSES, THE MATTER WILL BE DECIDED BY IRV. The IRV ballot will contain each proposal in its final form after amendments. The results of the IRV process shall be final and binding.

TIMELINE: This will be determined by the timeline in the proposal that is accepted.

RESOURCES: This will be determined by the resources required in the proposal that is accepted.

# Proposal – LA Resolution #1

---

RESOLVING THE IMPASSE: RECONSTITUTING THE GPCA COORDINATING COMMITTEE

PRESENTERS: Jim Dorenkott (jimdorenkott2 at yahoo.com), Cat Woods (cat801 at mindspring.com, 415-897-6989)

SPONSORING COMMITTEE: Bylaws Committee on behalf of the Green Party of Marin

BACKGROUND:

The GPCA Coordinating Committee (CC) has been deadlocked since October 2006. This is a result of an ongoing conflict that goes back to 2001. Many hours of meetings over the past 6 years have been rendered useless due to infighting around the LA situation, meaning which group from LA gets to vote on the CC. Proposals of mediation and compromise have only resulted in more infighting. The number of regions with contested seats has instead increased to 4. The result is that the CC is no longer able to perform its main function of planning plenaries.

This proposal reconstitutes the CC with people who are not and have not been involved in the party infighting, much as a professional committee in the business world will be reconstituted when unable to do its work. It is reconstituted with representation more proportionate to membership, as California has promoted in the national party.

Part of the CC deadlock has been caused by the chaos around the facilitation procedures for the CC. Using supermajority voting thresholds for facilitation decisions has resulted in the following situations:

- meetings being unable to be held at all, and no items even discussed in the interest of consensus-building, due to lack of 2/3 approval of an agenda
- facilitators taking 45-minute stacks on whether to add 5 minutes to an item
- long stretches of valuable meeting time wasted on discussions of whether to add an item to the agenda, alter the agenda or choose a new facilitator
- two different voting thresholds applying based solely on whether the vote itself is taken online or during a teleconference, allowing proposals to be subject to manipulations based on voting thresholds.

This proposal also clarifies basic facilitation procedures for GPCA coordinating committee (CC) meetings in order to avoid such situations. These facilitation procedures are based on two main premises:

1. The decision-making body has authority over its agenda.
2. Basic facilitation decisions, such as agenda approval, agenda amendment, and addition or subtraction of discussion time, are not intended to involve whole separate consensus processes and stacks of clarifying questions, concerns and affirmations on the facilitation decision. (Note that the facilitation rules passed out at plenaries do not suggest this, either.)

This proposal combines a variety of ideas for solving the CC's problems that have been brought forward over recent months. The presenters hope that adoption of this proposal (which received 77% approval from the GA in May) will finally end the CC's infighting based on historical animosities and give the new CC a real opportunity to do its bylaws-mandated job.

PROPOSAL:

I. The General Assembly hereby reconstitutes the GPCA Coordinating Committee (CC)

- a. All seats on the CC, except those filled since May 25, 2007 by people who did not serve on the CC during the 5 years prior to that, are vacant as of 6 weeks from the passage of this proposal.
- b. Until the vacancies take effect, the 3 LA votes shall be split between the two competing sets of representatives, with each representative team holding  $\frac{3}{4}$  vote.
- c. Per Paragraph 7-1.2 of the GPCA bylaws, the GA shall allocate the 16 regional representative seats proportionally to the Green Party membership in each region. This calculation shall be performed by the Liaison to the Secretary of State according to the Method of Equal Proportions described in the appendix to the GPCA bylaws.
- d. All regions shall announce new elections to fill the regional representative seats as soon as possible. Regions must hold open, transparent elections with at least 4 weeks notice distributed as widely as possible in the region. Notice of upcoming regional representative vacancies shall be posted to the county contacts list as soon as possible after passage of this proposal. Regions without alternate processes may adopt temporary alternate processes for the purpose of filling the seats in a timely manner.
- e. No one who has served on the CC, or who has claimed to serve on the CC, as representative or alternate, over the course of the past 5 years, is eligible to run for or fill any representative or alternate seat on the CC for the next 2 years.
- f. Transitional term lengths shall be varied in order to stagger the ending dates. This depends on the new apportionment by the Liaison, but end dates of the transitional terms would be expected to fall as follows:

Even-Numbered Years

- 1 Emerald January 2008
- 2 At-largespring GA 2008
- 1 San Francisco May 2008
- 1 Silicon June 2008
- 1 East Bay July 2008
- 3 Los Angeles November 2008
- 1 San Diego/Imperial August 2008
- 1 ORSB November 2008

Odd-Numbered Years

- 2 At-largespring GA 2009
- 2 Central May 2009
- 1 North Bay May 2009
- 1 East Bay July 2009
- 1 Monterey Bay August 2009
- 1 Central Coast August 2009
- 1 ORSB November 2009

II. CC Facilitation Guidelines

GPCA CC meeting facilitation shall proceed according to the following guidelines:

- a. Proposals for CC meetings must be posted to the CC listserv at least one week in advance of a scheduled meeting.
- b. CC meeting agendas shall be approved by the CC prior to or at the beginning of a meeting, with a simple majority threshold for approval.
- c. Changes in announced facilitation require a simple majority threshold for approval.

- d. Adding time to an agenda item or altering the approved agenda requires a simple majority approval of the CC.
- e. Adding a last minute item that was not submitted to the CC list one week prior to the meeting requires a 2/3 threshold.
- f. The CC prefers to discuss decision items on teleconferences and at in-person meetings. If an item is discussed at a meeting and scheduled for an online vote, the threshold for that vote is the same as if the vote had occurred during the meeting (2/3 for regular meetings, 80% for a special meeting not scheduled at a prior meeting at least a week in advance). If an item goes to an online vote without being discussed at a meeting, it has an 80% threshold.
- g. Decisions may not be made after the regularly scheduled adjournment time of the meeting unless a majority (over half) decides to extend the call for a specific amount of time. Decisions must then be made within the time of the approved extension.
- h. Simple majority approval votes on basic facilitation decisions can be done by asking quickly for ayes and nays, and only going to a roll call if approval is unclear.
- i. The new CC is requested to hire a Secretary to take thorough minutes of meetings, post them to the CC list, amend them according to posted corrections, and post the final version to both the CC listserv and the archive of minutes. The new CC shall draft a job description and hiring criteria for this position.
- j. The new CC shall form a schedule of its basic tasks that follow from the GPCA bylaws and integrate this schedule with the 2-year GPCA work plan, when it is adopted.

This proposal temporarily suspends GPCA bylaws provisions regarding the length CC terms and CC membership, because the CC has become unable to comply with the bylaws and do its job.

**TIMELINE:**

Vacancies effective 6 weeks passage. Elections may take place starting 4 weeks after passage of this proposal, provided 4 weeks notice has been given to the regional membership. Newly elected CC members may attend teleconference, but do not have a vote until the vacancies take effect. The new CC may meet on teleconferences immediately but may not make any decisions until quorum and attendance of at least 10 voting representatives are achieved.

**RESOURCES:** Hiring a Secretary would require the CC budgeting funds for this.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** 80% Approval through online vote

## Proposal – LA Resolution #2

---

SPONSORING COMMITTEE: Bylaws Standing Committee

PRESENTERS: Jared Laiti, jared.laiti at gmail.com

SUBJECT: Decertification of GPLAC County Organization

### BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

This proposal is presented individually and as part of a broader proposal that uses an IRV process to resolve the turmoil in LA County. The IRV proposal includes the presentation of four individual proposals and provides for an IRV process should none of the proposals be adopted.

This proposal is to decertify the GPLAC county organization.

In order to decertify a county organization, the General Assembly must first amend the bylaws to define the grounds and procedure for decertification, the consequences for the county organization, and the procedure for recertification. This proposal amends the GPCA bylaws to do this, and it then decertifies the GPLAC county organization pursuant to the amended bylaws.

### PROPOSAL:

#### I. Amendments of Bylaws

Article 3 of the GPCA bylaws is hereby amended by the addition of the following, Section 2.3:

##### 3-2.3. Decertification of County Organizations

The General Assembly may, by a standard 2/3 business decision, decertify a county organization for behavior that is inconsistent with:

- a) the ten key values
- b) the GPCA bylaws, or
- c) California law.

Upon decertification, all delegate seats to the General Assembly allocated to that county organization are vacated.

If decertification results in a region with no recognized county organizations, then all Coordinating Committee seats allocated to that region are vacated.

Any county organization which has been decertified may, at any time, seek to be recertified by the General Assembly in conformity with Article 3, Section 2.2 of these bylaws.

II. The General Assembly, pursuant to Bylaws Article 3, Section 2.3, hereby decertifies the GPLAC county organization on the grounds of behavior inconsistent with the key values of Personal Responsibility and Grassroots Democracy. The GPLAC county organization has failed to resolve their conflicts internally at the grassroots level and has instead allowed the conflict to dominate the state party, at great cost to the party.

TIMELINE: This proposal will be effective immediately

RESOURCES: None

### REFERENCES:

GPCA Bylaws Article 3, section 2.1 Definition and Delegation of Authority

Green Party county organizations recognized by the General Assembly are the official organizations of the GPCA at the county level.

GPCA Bylaws Article 3, section 2.2 County Organization and Recognition

To be recognized by the General Assembly and to seat General Assembly delegates, a county organization must adopt organizational bylaws consistent with the ten key values, the GPCA bylaws, and California law, and must file a current copy of these bylaws with the GPCA Bylaws Committee (see also Paragraph 4-1.22 for recognition of a new county organization). These bylaws must:

- a) Describe the organizational structure including the relationship between any local Green organizations and the County Council;
- b) Define the membership of the organization;
- c) Describe the decision-making process;
- d) Describe the process for filling county council vacancies;
- e) Describe the process for selecting General Assembly delegates;
- f) Establish the office of treasurer.

## Proposal – LA Resolution #3

---

SPONSOR: Bylaws Standing Committee

PRESENTERS: David Blatte, [greenpartymail@sbcglobal.net](mailto:greenpartymail@sbcglobal.net)

SUBJECT: Arbitration proposal to resolve the LA situation

### BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

This proposal is presented as part of a broader proposal that uses an IRV process to resolve the situation in LA County. The IRV proposal includes the presentation of four individual proposals and provides for an IRV process should none of the proposals be adopted.

This proposal is to submit the dispute to arbitration.

GPCA Bylaws 7-3.2 specifies that when there is a bylaw ambiguity or a procedural disagreement, the General Assembly shall decide the meaning of its bylaws or the appropriate procedure to follow.

There are currently process disputes over the CC status of all individuals who claim to be either CC members or alternates from the Los Angeles County region.

This proposal would fulfill the General Assembly's obligation under Bylaws 7-3.2 by effectively making the decision of an arbiter the decision of the General Assembly. The decision of the arbiter would constitute the General Assembly's decision regarding the current dispute.

The arbitration will be conducted by Jeremy Friedman, Esq., a practicing attorney in Oakland, California. Mr. Friedman is a graduate, cum laude, of the University of Chicago Law School, and has been a member of the California Bar since 1989. His practice includes, among other areas, civil trial and appellate practice, civil rights, employment and discrimination. He was the lead attorney in *Ketchum v. Moses*, a seminal case in California regarding attorneys' fees litigation, and has also handled federal False Claims Act and California anti-SLAPP cases. Mr. Friedman is a registered Green.

The total cost of the arbitration will be \$1,000, which would cover all transportation costs and all legal costs, including Mr. Friedman's time to review documents, conduct a hearing, and render a decision.

### PROPOSAL:

That the General Assembly hire Jeremy Friedman to conduct arbitration proceedings and render a decision that would serve as the General Assembly's decision, under GPCA Bylaws 7-3.2, regarding the CC status of all individuals who claim to be either CC members or alternates from the Los Angeles County region, dating from June 2006 through September 2007.

The arbitration process will be as follows:

All interested parties will submit all relevant documentation to Mr. Friedman by October 1, 2007.

Mr. Friedman will review the documents and, if necessary, ask for any clarifications or additional documentation.

Mr. Friedman will provide a copy of all documentation to all parties by October 4, 2007.

Mr. Friedman will conduct a hearing in Los Angeles on October 8, 2007, at 2 pm. At the hearing, each side will have a minimum of one hour to present its case. Mr. Friedman may ask any questions he deems appropriate and may, at his discretion, allow for additional testimony.

Any side will have the opportunity to be represented by its own counsel, paid for wholly by that side only, to prepare or present its case during the day of arbitration. There will be no discovery and the only materials for review will be those previously presented to Mr. Friedman. However, at his discretion, Mr. Friedman may allow the presentation of additional documents during the proceeding.

Mr. Friedman will issue his ruling not later than October 15, 2007.

Mr. Friedman's ruling will be binding upon the GPCA in the same manner as if it were made by the General Assembly under Bylaws 7-3.2.

Mr. Friedman will be paid \$1,000 to cover all transportation and legal costs. These costs will come out of the CC's budgeted fund for legal expenses.

**TIMELINE:** The arbitration process will be completed by October 15, 2007

**RESOURCES:** The entire process will cost the GPCA \$1,000

**REFERENCES:**

**GPCA Bylaw 7-3.2 Bylaws Interpretation**

In cases of bylaw ambiguity or procedural disagreement, the General Assembly shall decide for itself the meaning of its bylaws or the appropriate procedure to be followed. Between General Assembly meetings, the Coordinating Committee shall decide these questions subject to review at the next General Assembly meeting. The Bylaws Committee and its coordinators are charged with assisting with the interpretation of the Bylaws and the resolution of procedural questions.

## Proposal – LA Resolution #4

---

SPONSOR: Bylaws Standing Committee

PRESENTERS: Jared Laiti, jared.laiti@gmail.com

SUBJECT: Let GPLAC decide how to resolve their internal conflict

### BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

This proposal is presented individually and as part of a broader proposal that uses an IRV process to resolve the situation in Los Angeles County. The IRV proposal includes the presentation of four individual proposals and provides for an IRV process should none of the proposals be adopted.

This proposal is to let GPLAC determine its Coordinating Committee representatives for itself.

The proposal is based on GPCA Bylaws 7-3.2, which specifies that when there is a bylaw ambiguity or a procedural disagreement, the General Assembly shall decide the meaning of its bylaws or the appropriate procedure to follow.

There are currently process disputes over the status of CC members from the Los Angeles region.

Although there are several possible ways to let GPLAC decide for itself, the presenters ultimately decided between two alternatives. The first was to default to the most recent selection process and declare that the representatives chosen in that selection process are the CC representatives from LA County. The second was to vacate the seats of all regional representatives from LA County and to require GPLAC to complete a new selection process to determine its CC representatives.

While both options are viable, the presenters chose the second option as the one to put forth. Accordingly, this proposal would vacate the seats of all six purported CC representatives from LA County and require a new selection procedure to be held in accordance with GPLAC procedures.

### PROPOSAL:

The General Assembly hereby affirms that there is a procedural disagreement with respect to Coordinating Committee regional representatives from the Los Angeles region. Pursuant to its obligation under GPCA Bylaws 7-3.2 to decide the appropriate procedure to follow, the General Assembly hereby establishes the following as a one-time procedure for resolving this procedural disagreement:

1. The seats of all regional representatives to the Coordinating Committee from the Los Angeles region are vacated:
2. Not later than November 30, 2007, GPLAC shall complete a new selection process for the three vacant seats allocated to the LA region. The selection process shall be held in accordance with the selection process on file with the Coordinating Committee and Bylaws Committee.
3. The three regional members determined by the selection process will be seated on the Coordinating Committee immediately upon completion of the selection process.
4. The three regional representatives shall serve until the results of the next primary in which county council seats are elected are certified.

TIMELINE: To be resolved no later than November 30, 2007.

RESOURCES: The resources required to conduct a new selection process.

## REFERENCES:

### GPCA Bylaw 7-3.2 Bylaws Interpretation

In cases of bylaw ambiguity or procedural disagreement, the General Assembly shall decide for itself the meaning of its bylaws or the appropriate procedure to be followed. Between General Assembly meetings, the Coordinating Committee shall decide these questions subject to review at the next General Assembly meeting. The Bylaws Committee and its coordinators are charged with assisting with the interpretation of the Bylaws and the resolution of procedural questions.

## Appendix 1 – GPUS Candidate Statements

---

Bernard C Macdonald  
City - Albion, 95410-0069  
County - Mendocino  
Contact information - (717) 937-4352  
omni@mcn.org

1) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills within of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

~15 years registered Green, 7 years active in local, much as secretary and newsletter producer (participated in chapter reconstitution in 2000); 3 years as regional alt with much full time activity and CC interaction; voting delegate to 2004 National convention. Active in regional and community levels in facilitating sustainable local communities.

2) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills outside of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

10 years as US Jaycee with all offices except president held. during 10 years in Burlington, MA town meeting politic culminating in election to the first local government commission in New England. 15 years in North CA coast environmental efforts including successes in Enchanted Meadow effort, Water Barging issue, and Sustainable Forestry; emphasis on community participation. Member AfD Active Quaker for 10 years,

3) Please describe your vision for serving as GPUS Delegate including addressing the job description for GPUS Delegate.

I am motivated to assist in the discovery of new methods to empower grassroots participation via internet methodologies and to expand and redefine the leadership role of the Green party by purposeful coalitions with other third parties. Intrinsic in this direction is a dramatic re-empowerment of community level organization

My history with GPCA has been notably active in attending meetings and engaging in the development of communication modalities and experimental movements intended to further the practice of Green Party values in the discovery of true consensus process. It is my belief that consensus process is necessary for a new ecological era to emerge and prosper the human spirit.

---

Craig Thorsen  
City - Torrance  
County - Los Angeles  
Contact information - (310) 347-6655  
craigthorsen@yahoo.com

1) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills within of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

I have been a member of the Green Party since 1999 when I arrived in California. I have attended one National Meeting (Tucson, AZ: July 06), and two Plenaries (Moorpark: Jun 06 and South Lake Tahoe: Sep 06). I have been the California member on the GPUS BRPP (Bylaws, Rules Policies and Procedures) committee for the past year.

2) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills outside of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

I have been active in the election process for 18 years as an election judge in Minnesota and an Inspector while in California. This ensures that procedures at polling places are followed and that an election truly represents the will of the people.

3) Please describe your vision for serving as GPUS Delegate including addressing the job description for GPUS Delegate.

Delegates have grave responsibilities to the citizens of California, to serve to the best of their abilities. It is incumbent upon delegates to participate fully in research and discussions, in debate and in reaching agreements that will bring a vibrant Green Party into power at the National level to represent every citizen of the United States. I will actively take part in the discussions and negotiations representing the Green Party of California. I will speak to the issues, listen to delegates from other states and seek common understandings and goals.

---

John Morton  
City - Oakland  
County - Alameda  
Contact information - 510-610-1773 / email- JLM108@yahoo.com

1) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills within of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

- Joined Green Party during Nader campaign, 2000
- Tabled for Oakland Greens with Laura Wells, 2001-02
- Worked on many GP campaigns, including Camejo in 2002 and 2003, Aimee Allison in 2004 and 2005, local ballot measures, etc
- Drafted "Corporations vs. Democracy" plank for GPCA platform, 2003
- Elected to Alameda GP County Council, 2004-06
- Appointed an East Bay Regional Rep to GPCA-CC, 2004-06
- Logistics coordinator for GPCA Gathering in Oakland, 2005
- Attended many GPCA Plenary meetings, 2003-2007
- Currently an East Bay Regional Alt to GPCA-CC

2) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills outside of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

- BA from Wabash College, Indiana, 1964
- Certificate in French Language and Lit, Sorbonne, 1965
- Vietnam war draftee, 1966-1967
- Dropped acid in Katmandu, 1968
- Worked, taught, and built small businesses in Europe and Asia
- MBA from San Francisco State University, 1987
- Worked with Burmese political refugees on Thai border, 1994-2000
- Wrote chapter on World Bank-financed Thai dams for "Dam Nation: Dispatches from the Water Underground", Soft Skull Press, 2007
- Member, Board of Directors, California non-profit Burmese-American Democratic Alliance

3) Please describe your vision for serving as GPUS Delegate including addressing the job description for GPUS Delegate.

Emphasize Decentralization and Grassroots Democracy when building a national organization. The Green Party is a political movement first and a political party second. Our actions must always be subordinate to our principles and our focus should be on implementing the 10 KV.

I will faithfully attend to GPUS delegate duties as required. Since I am not a member of an underrepresented minority, I would also be happy to serve as an alternate.

---

Teresa L. Boardman  
City - Richmond  
County - Contra Costa  
Contact information - teresalouise@earthlink.net 510-725-5147

1) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills within of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

I first became involved with the Green Party in the early 90's up in Portland, Oregon. At that time, it was very difficult to get a third party on the Oregon ballot. This was due to a political move on behalf of government to keep third parties out of the political process. We formed a group called the Pacifica Party, in alliance with the Green Party and began the process of getting third parties into the system. At the time, I was a radio announcer at KMHD radio and I was selected as the Public Spokes person on the committee to get a third party on the ballot. I have since moved to California and have been a registered Green Party member most of my voting life. I am currently a participating member of the Richmond Green Party. Please see resume below.

2) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills outside of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

I have been a politically active citizen since 1978. I have a Bachelor of Social Work/Political Science from Western Michigan University where I began working as a caseworker in immigration and the military for Congressman Wolpe. I later was selected as an Honors College participant in a Washington, D.C. study trip. In Washington, D.C. I worked as a legislative intern and was exposed to several committees, agencies and organizations in the Washington, D.C. area. I have a Master of Public Administration and a teaching credential in journalism. I later became a News Radio Reporter and I am currently a Journalism teacher at Richmond High School.

3) Please describe your vision for serving as GPUS Delegate including addressing the job description for GPUS Delegate.

My vision is to bring more organizations and committees together in achieving the goals of the green party. Instead of setting up an organization with an "us and them" approach, develop more common ground and begin to work on serious issues from a working perspective. For example, many corporations know they must address environmental issues in order to have a healthy planet. In addition, several organizational standards are now requiring companies to include environmental impact in their business practices. I see the Green party working more closely with organizations to address these issues.

Complete submission (1,800 words) on-line here:

[http://www.cagreens.org/cc/cocos/applications\\_2007\\_02/gpus\\_delegation/theresa\\_boardman.htm](http://www.cagreens.org/cc/cocos/applications_2007_02/gpus_delegation/theresa_boardman.htm)

---

Michael McCue  
City - Studio City

County - Los Angeles

Contact information - 818-762-4595 / email- myklmcq@aol.com

I have voted for Al Gore for president in the Democrat primaries of 1988 and 1992 and voted for him as Vice President in 1992 and 1996 in the national elections and also for president in 2000. I wish Al Gore would join our party, or that we could nominate him for president in 2008.

I switched from Democrat to Green Party in 2004 after the stolen national election put Bush in office for a second term. I became determined to become more active in politics and did so by running for office on my local Neighborhood Council here in own community of Studio City. I ran for three years in a row and was finally elected in March 2007 as the top vote-getter (!) with the highest percentage of votes cast for a neighborhood council candidate ever recorded citywide throughout the entire Los Angeles area! This was a surprise for all concerned considering I promoted my Green Party membership very heavily in every campaign appearance and many people counted me out as a contender before the election.

During last year's national election I worked very strenuously on Byron DeLear's congressional campaign to represent the 28th district in which I live. Byron is one of strongest Green candidates ever and I plan to work for him again should he decide to run in 2008.

I have hosted "See the Truth" parties at my home in conjunction with MoveOn.Org to educate my friends and neighbors about global warming. I have been an environmental activist all of my life due to the influence of my father who was one of the original employees of the Environmental Protection Agency and the influence of my mother who was a congressional secretary to John D. Dingell-16th District MI, (who is still serving).

I believe that my service as a delegate representing the California Greens would be significant in that I have experience in campaigning, experience in getting elected, and also in serving as an elected City official who is Green. I am currently serving on the Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council, in a two-year term, occupying the chair that represents the renters in our community. The SCNC Board unanimously elected me to serve as the Recording Secretary for this first year of service.

I have been speaking out against corruption ever since the Watergate scandal (when I was in Junior high) and am calling upon everyone I know to fight to protect our constitution with all of their might, due to the attacks and the "death by a thousand cuts" that Cheney/Bush and the neo cons have planned for our Constitution and our democracy. I am for the immediate impeachment of the President and Vice-President.

I have also been active in the campaign to establish "Clean Money" elections both in the State of California (Prop. 89) and the City of Los Angeles.

I am a dedicated worker who understands service and I believe that to move forward it will be necessary for us all to truly embrace the Ten Key Values which guide my political philosophy.

My 20th century role-model/heroes are Mohatmas K. Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. My 21st century role-model/heroes are Al Gore and Peter Camejo.

I will be honored if selected to be a delegate for the California Green party and look forward to being of service.

- Genevieve Marcus  
City - Los Angeles  
County - Los Angeles  
Contact information - 323-938-4585 drmarcus@pacbell.net
- Participated in Green Party forming CoC meetings locally and statewide starting around 1985.
- Worked to achieve GPCA ballot status and joined the party.
- Participated in writing and editing the first GPCA Platform.
- Served on the first state Coordinating Committee and the first Los Angeles County Council as well as several since.
- Was coordinator of the Internal Communications committee, which at the time consisted of pleading with Greens to get online and instructing them in how to do so.
- Managed the first statewide forums on PeaceNet.
- Served on the Outreach Committee and the Women's Caucus.
- Was a delegate to the first Global Green conference in Brazil in 1992.
- Have been a member of the state and national Women's Caucus since their inception.
- Was a delegate to the national conventions in Los Angeles, Colorado and Milwaukee (was a member of Peter Camejo's delegation.).
- Had an active role on the state plenary planning committee in Los Angeles, 1996.
- Campaigned for numerous Green candidates at all levels.
- Participate in IRV and CF Reform efforts.

Prior experience:

1) Was an author and editor of several newsletters, two books, and numerous articles on

- \*Contemporary Music
- \*Telecommunications in Education
- \* Social and Environmental Problem Solving
- \* Equality and Power in Relationships
- \* Creating a Virtual L.A.

2) Ran for Co-Governor of California on a proto-Green platform and promoting the idea that all elected offices should be gender-balanced.

3) Serve as Co-President and research director for Experimental Cities, Inc., a nonprofit organization created in 1971 to seek positive alternatives to social and environmental problems in cities. Many of the concepts formulated there can be found in the Green Party. ECI is currently organizing demonstration projects to test a means of expanding the use of wind energy to low wind areas.

\*\*\*\*\*

My hope for the GP is that it will provide a viable alternative to the existing structure; one that will make sense to enough people to save the planet and ourselves.

---

Glenn Hopkins  
City - West Los Angeles  
County - Los Angeles  
Contact information - Mootney123@aol.com

- Our impeachment picnic on the 4th had 500 people DESPITE the Beverly Hills Police.
- Convener, GreenCabinet.org,
- Co-founder, Lavender Green Caucus
- L.A. Green County Council District 28
- Chapter Co-Chair, United Teachers, L.A.
- Treasurer, Westside Greens
- Member. International Protocols Committee, Ca. Greens

---

Byron DeLear  
City - Sherman Oaks  
County - Los Angeles  
Contact information - (818) 974-8964, byron@globalpeacesolution.org

I have been a delegate from Los Angeles County (GPLAC) to the GPCA for two years now, and have attended two national GPUS meetings, Tulsa and Tucson. I was also a frontline Congressional candidate for the GP in 2006, delivering the lead off state of the union rebuttal for the GPUS, and successfully promoting the GP, including increasing GP registration in my Congressional district by nearly 10%. There is a possibility I will be able to attend the meeting in Reading. With my experience in running for office, I would like to contribute to making the GP a more effective competitor electorally.

Please find my current CV copied below which summarizes the many accomplishments our very Green Congressional campaign entertained. Complete submission (3,800 words) on-line here:

[http://www.cagreens.org/cc/cocos/applications\\_2007\\_02/gpus\\_delegation/byron\\_delear.htm](http://www.cagreens.org/cc/cocos/applications_2007_02/gpus_delegation/byron_delear.htm)

---

Tim Casebolt  
City - San Diego  
County - San Diego  
Contact information - 619-236-8045 timc@sdgreens.org

I have been a registered Green or voted Green since the founding of the Green Party in California.

My active involvement with Green Party began when I joined the National Lavender Green Caucus in 2002. I was elected Caucus secretary in 2004 and again elected to a second term in 2006. I've maintained the membership database and email lists and conducted elections, endorsements and resolution processes. I am currently managing endorsement proposals for 2 Green Party candidates and will initiate Caucus officer elections immediately after. I also designed and maintain the Lavender Caucus website.

It is through my joining the Lavender Caucus that my Green Party involvement has evolved.

I served on the national Peace Action Committee from December, 2004 to December, 2006. I was a California delegate to the 2004 Nominating Convention in Milwaukee. I helped found the national Secular Greens and helped in drafting the Secular Equality plank of the national Platform that was adopted in Milwaukee and definitively outlines the Green Party's position on the separation of church and state.

I got involved with my local, the Green Party of San Diego County, in 2003. As one of its most active members, I have organized most tabling events, been a delegate to several state Plenaries and was elected to the County Council in February, 2004. I have served another term on our Council since June, 2006 and was elected Co-chair at that time. I helped organize 2 Green Party candidate forums in San Diego prior to the 2006 elections and am currently the campaign manager for a Green that is running for San Diego City Council. At the present time, I am organizing Greens for an IRV ballot initiative in 2008.

My involvement with the Green Party is fulfilling, not to mention time consuming, and I would therefore be interested in an Alternate Delegate position only. Your consideration of me filling this position is much appreciated. Thank you.

Tim Casebolt

---

Nicole Haldeman  
City - Los Angeles  
County - Los Angeles  
Contact information - (323) 533-0034 nicolehaldeman@gmail.com

I am interested in running for the position of Delegate to the National Green Party Convention, from the Green Party of California. I have recently immersed myself in the Green Party and have already exhibited my knowledge and passion of 10 Key Values of the GPCA.

I have demonstrated my involvement through participating in tabling for the Los Angeles Greens, attending City Hall council meetings that pertain to Green issues, sending letters to my Senators and Congressmen, and seeking out creative ways to increase awareness about the Green Party.

I am a 24 year old female, raised in the Houston, Texas area. I became interested in Green politics while studying abroad in Denmark during the 2004 US Presidential Election (my first time legal to vote), where I discovered that I was dissatisfied with the two-party system and found that the Green Party's values aligned with my own.

My professional experience is in the music industry where I am exposed daily to the struggle between artistic expression, corporate politics, social responsibility, and globalization. Additionally, my career has heightened and honed my ability to network, manage projects, and interact with different departments and levels of seniority.

As a delegate, I bring passion, vitality, objectivity, creative idea generation, and ability and firmness of intent to see goals manifested. I am particularly interested in education, voting reform, women's rights, bringing U.S. troops home from Iraq, and corporate social responsibility.

I envision a future for the Green Party that involves broad awareness of the party and what it stands for, and successful grassroots efforts to energize communities about local issues.

Most importantly, I envision a Green Party that shepards the nation in true patriotism, the love and devotion to the founding philosophy of liberty, rule of law, civic virtue, and that all men are created equal

---

Pamela Spevack  
City - Oakland  
County - Alameda  
Contact information - 510-593-0063/email prspevack@Yahoo.com

For the past fifteen years I have been registered with the Green Party. During this time I was a part of the team that got our Candidate, A. Bock, elected to the California Legislature. For several years I was on the Alameda County Council and recently participated as a Delegate to the State Conference, and am an Alternate to the Coordinating Committee. Also I am active with the Oakland Green Party, gathering information on sites for the next National Convention and attending meetings concerning housing issues. Also, working as a Social Worker I am most

interested in Health Care issues and policy, and as a lesbian I am working on justice issues especially for seniors. Please consider me as an Alternate to the Green National Committee.

---

John Paul 'Jack' Lindblad  
City - North Hollywood  
County - Los Angeles  
Contact information - 818-785-2724 /email jplindblad@gmail.com

1) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills within of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

2006-2007 Delegate to GPCA plenaries. Attended May 2007 San Francisco GPCA plenary.

Jack Lindblad is the Los Angeles County local host committee liaison to CCWG (Warner Bloomberg, Coordinator, Campaigns and Candidates Working Group) for the August 2007 scheduled event: 'Candidates Training and Strategy Workshop, GPUS Presidential Candidate Forum,' sponsored by CCWG, California Media Committee and Los Angeles County Greens.

Member, Green Party County Council; County of Los Angeles; Senate District 20 2006-2008 (Northeast San Fernando Valley)

#### Top Priorities

- o "Mitigate climate change" - Deployment of strategies and tactics to reduce and cope with global warming economic, political, social and environmental effects
- o "Clean Money" - Banning of all corporatist lobbying and campaign spending
- o "100% Amnesty" - Human Dignity and full Immigration rights for all
- o "Green Party growth" - Seeing an increase in the number of elected offices held by Greens

2) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills outside of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

#### Biographical Highlights

- o Occupation: Architect - Private Practitioner. Principal in the firm of J. Paul Lindblad Architect in the San Fernando Valley of Los Angeles, California.
- o Master of Architecture, Texas A&M University with an Outpatient Healthcare Facility thesis.
- o Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Design, University of Washington.
- o Pioneered a mix of services which defined Diagnostic and Treatment Outpatient Surgical Medical Centers with Magnetic Resonating Imaging Facilities as a new building type employing innovative daylighting techniques.
- o Served as an initiator of the Panorama City Neighborhood Council formation and is active in the Livable Communities Council of the Economic Alliance of the San Fernando Valley. Jack's work has included religious campus planning and revitalization of existing commercial centers to foster pedestrian friendly sustainable urban environments.
- o Member of the American Institute of Architects, SFV Chapter, Committee on Urban Design. Workshop participant/presenter of Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework for the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks District. o Projects include: Rejuvenation of the Colfax-Magnolia Commercial Corner, Aspen Ambulatory Care Diagnostic and Treatment Center, Simi Valley and the Nancy Reagan Breast Center. Featured in magazines such as California Centers Magazine and was a workshop participant of Paolo Soleri's energy-efficient, sustainable city prototype in Arizona.

o Co-presenter on "Artist-Owned Live/Work Space as Catalyst for Central Business District Recovery" drawing public awareness to reseed the historic district in downtown Los Angeles. Testified as expert witness in forensic consultations. Taught at Woodbury University in Los Angeles, contributes to professional journal articles and has been listed in the Who's Who Registry.

o Experience:

6/1982 - Present Office of J Paul Lindblad Architect North Hollywood, CA Principal Architect

Architect Jack Lindblad has been involved in the design of over 200 million US dollars of building construction. His experience spans diversified building types for urban design, corporate, commercial office, religious, medical, industrial, multi-family and single family housing clients. He leads senior design, construction documentation, project supervision and management.

Lindblad facilitates projects of all scales from design, free-hand presentations through completion. His ability in marketing skills and efforts is impassioned by the spiritual qualities of architecture, creativity, and a sense of humor. Always working in an active team environment, punctual completion of projects is a hallmark of the firm. All projects have been profitable. His work is recognized for design achievement. He researches and implements the firm's computer applications in marketing, accounting, project management, preliminary design, presentation, contract documentation, and master specification system. Mr. Lindblad is responsible for professional staff evaluation, hiring, and review.

11/1981 - 6/1982 Hutner and Appel Architects Los Angeles, CA

Project Manager

Developed building programs and master plans. Responsible for project conceptual design and schematics, design development and supervision of contract documentation for medical building projects.

2/1981 - 10/1981 Woodford and Bernard Architects Los Angeles, CA

Project Manager

Responsible for project conceptual design and schematics, coordination of design development and supervision of contract documentation for commercial building projects.

10/1978 - 5/1979 James D. Fessenden Architect Portola Valley, CA

Job Captain, Designer

Obtained Planned Unit Development (PUD) site approval. Responsible for project site design, conceptual design and schematics, design development and supervision of contract documentation for residential hillside projects. 7/

1977 - 9/1978 Blunk Associates Architects Burlingame, CA

Job Captain, Designer

Generated building programs, feasibility studies and master plans. Responsible for project conceptual design and schematics, design development, engineering liaison and contract documentation for commercial, hi-tech, residential building projects.

o Candidate of the Peace and Freedom Party for the 24th US Congressional Seat in 1992.

o Participant, "Conflict Resolution Training-Mending Human Relations" sponsored by L.A. City Human Relations Commission, National Conference for Community and Justice.

o Co-author and presenter, award-winning Panorama City Urban Design Assistance Team Study for developing of a sustainable historic commercial area in cooperation with the Los Angeles City Council and Planning Department.

o Coro Southern California Neighborhood Leadership Development Program Graduate, 2003.

3) Please describe your vision for serving as GPUS Delegate including addressing the job description for GPUS Delegate.

Because there are an expanded number of delegate and alternate positions allotted the California delegation and it is in the interest of all Greens in California to be fully represented, I am interested in serving in the process that the GPUS is engaged in, especially in the nomination of the Green Party US presidential candidate.

---

Peter Thottam, Esq. (JD MBA)

City - Venice

County - Los Angeles

Contact information - (310) 497-7255 peterthottam at gmail.com

1) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills within of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

I currently am the Executive Director of the Los Angeles National Impeachment Center (LANIC). The Center's website is at [www.BCIMPEACH.com](http://www.BCIMPEACH.com). I am also a recent Green Party state assembly candidate for the 53rd District (Nov. 2006). The district I ran for office in covers the Beach Cities of: Venice, Mar Vista, Playa Vista, Redondo Beach, Del Rey, Playa Del Rey, Hermosa Beach, Westchester, Lomita, and the city of Torrance. I ran against Democratic incumbent Ted Lieu and garnered approximately 3,1000 votes. I am also a long time Green Party peace and community activist. I registered with the Green Party of California in 1998 and was active with the Ralph Nader campaign while practicing as an attorney in the Bay Area (Palo Alto/San Francisco). I have been especially active in party politics attending three state general assemblies and plenaries since 2002. I am a globally oriented Green and have made outreach efforts on behalf of the Green Party throughout the state's various progressive groups and in countries as diverse as Mexico, Germany, Mali and Ethiopia.

- \*On the local level\*, I have been active since November 2002, when I officially the Los Angeles Greens local. I have been a member and, currently, a cocordinator of another local called the Westside Greens. I have been with that group since Spring 2006. I have tabled and been involved in numerous voter registration and Green outreach efforts. I've also participated in numerous activist groups and have helped build the Green Name in these groups (ANSWERLA, Green Party, 911TruthLA, and with Interfaith Communities United for Justice and Peace (ICUJP), and the Los Angeles National Impeachment Center (LANIC).

2) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills outside of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

I received my undergraduate degree with honors from Yale University where he majored in both (1) Economics and (2) Ethics, Government & Philosophy. I have a law degree from UC Berkeley's Boalt School of Law and an MBA from the UCLA Anderson School of Business. A longtime activist, a former Democrat and an active member of the Green Party since 1998, I was so appalled at the deteriorating media coverage in the USA and so convinced that a tragic and mistaken war with Iraq was pending that I resigned from my job as a West LA Corporate Attorney in 2002 in order to focus exclusively on my antiwar work with various antiwar and progressive groups. I spent a full year completely dedicated to organizing marches, teach-ins and political lobbying efforts in Los Angeles, San Francisco and New York and working actively with ANSWERLA, with the Green Party, Progressive Democrats and with Interfaith Communities United for Justice and Peace

3) Please describe your vision for serving as GPUS Delegate including addressing the job description for GPUS Delegate.

Like several others in the Green Party, my goal is to grow the te Party's voter registration and to ensure that it is accurately represented at the national level and that our national party is able to become an effective force in American politics and internationally. I hope to create greater state and national transparency in decision making and greater effectiveness in creating party goals and vying for partisan elected office positions. I hope to help the party do so by building bridges and alliances with activist and interest groups all across the country.

**\*Biographical Highlights\***

- Party: Green
- Occupation: Attorney
- Yale University - B.A.
- U.C. Berkeley - JD from Boalt Hall
- U.C. Los Angeles - MBA from UCLA Anderson
- Activist - Progressive Democrats, Sierra Club, ICUJP
- Activist - Antiwar movement
- Ocean Park Community Center Volunteer

**\*Recent Antiwar Position Paper Link Below (Nov. 2006)\***

Peter Thottam (JD MBA) is the Antiwar Candidate - fighting to bring US Troops Home. <[http://www.smartvoter.org/2006/11/07/ca/state/vote/thottam\\_p/paper1.html](http://www.smartvoter.org/2006/11/07/ca/state/vote/thottam_p/paper1.html)>

As of June 2006, over \$350 billion has been allocated by the US Congress entirely for the Iraqi war. The amount has been calculated at upwards of \$3500 per taxpayer. The war in Afghanistan has cost an additional \$100 billion since 2001. It is time to reverse course and to take back control of a political and economic system that has become beholden to the very military industrial complex that former President Eisenhower warned us against in 1961.

---

Derek Iverson  
City - Los Angeles  
County - Los Angeles  
Contact information - (323) 660-9342; malkavai@mac.com

1) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills within of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

I've been LA Greens Secretary for two years; LA Greens Co-Facilitator for three years; campaign manager for Derek Milosavljevic, a Green Party candidate for Los Angeles City Council in 2003; I've worked on several Green Party campaigns; I've worked in ad hoc committees and formed ad-hoc committees at the local and county level; and I've attended local, county, and state meetings, including state plenaries as a delegate.

2) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills outside of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

I'm a professional writer; I've produced programs for KPFK, the Pacifica affiliate in Los Angeles; I can write simultaneously informing and amusing press releases; and I've edited speeches by President Bush to make them much funnier than they were before.

3) Please describe your vision for serving as GPUS Delegate including addressing the job description for GPUS Delegate.

I hope to effectively represent the best interests of Green Party members in the state of California to the national convention, should I be called upon to do so. I intend to do this through a combination of polling my fellow California Greens, reading about their concerns via the Internet and Green publications, and applying the Ten Key Values to problems unique to our state. I will also strive to effectively and responsibly represent the will of California Greens as it pertains to the selection of our candidate for President in 2008.

---

Sheila Laracy  
City - Sacramento  
County - Sacramento  
Contact information - meatfree@cwnet.com

Green Party experience: Current member of the Sacramento County Council, elected 2006. Became active in the Green Party during the 2000 Presidential election, working on community outreach and media events. Also volunteered on several Green Party congressional campaigns in 2004, 2005 and 2006. Other experience: Environmental, anti-war activist for many years. Recently participated in an anti-war 52-day sit-in at the office of Rep. Doris Matsui, D, in Sacramento. Was one of 7 people (3 Greens) arrested for refusing to leave the office while reading the names of those killed in Iraq War. I have also participated in other social justice efforts, including federal grand jury resister work.

---

Rebecca Gonzalez-Tobias  
City - Sherman Oaks  
County - Los Angeles  
Contact information - 310-916-8888 Rebecca@DeLearforCongress.org

I have been an active Green Party member for many years both here in the United States and in England and Geneva. Most recently I have acquired Canadian residency and will be interfacing with Greens in Vancouver BC as well as Los Angeles as I travel between these two locations over the balance of the coming years. Currently I am working with the core founders of the the LA National Impeachment Center here in Los Angeles, but the balance of my experience here in Southern California has been as the full-time campaign coordinator for Byron DeLear ( [www.DeLearforCongress.org](http://www.DeLearforCongress.org)) who ran for US House of Representatives in the San Fernando Valley's 28th district against prowar Democrat Howard Berman in the last election cycle 2006. I am proud to say that I assisted Byron in the crafting of the language of the rebuttal to President Bush's State of the Union address in Jan. 2006 which called for the impeachment of both Bush and Cheney, as well as an and immediate withdrawl from the unjust and illegal wars taking place in Iraq and Afghanistan.

My experience in the social justice movement is varied and long-standing. While in elementary school I passed out literature in the McGovern for President campaign, and as recently as 2005, I worked in the Office of High Commisioner for Human Rights assisting the Secretariat for the Working Group for Indigenous Populations in Geneva, preparing UN reports that were presented at the Human Rightts sub-committee meetings. At present I am the program director of the Raoul Wallenberg Institue of Ethics located in Malibu, CA. Our primary focus is the planning and presentation of symposiums and teach-ins that facilitate intercultural communication and interfaith understanding. One of the projects of the Institute that I have had a hand in developing has been an on-going Muslim- Jewish Internet dialogue that seeks to shatter the myths and stereotypes of "the other", the program has met with great success and is one of the first of its kind in the nation.

I am seeking the position of delegate to the GPUS in order to do all I can to foster a culture of peace. Thank you very much for your consideration. I have attached a CV for further reference.

Complete submission (1,100 words) on-line here:

[http://www.cagreens.org/cc/cocos/ applications\\_2007\\_02/gpus\\_delegation/rebecca\\_gonzalez\\_tobias.htm](http://www.cagreens.org/cc/cocos/ applications_2007_02/gpus_delegation/rebecca_gonzalez_tobias.htm)

---

Christine Pinto  
City - Los Angeles  
County - Los Angeles  
Contact information - (818) 359-1413 cell, email- greenpintobean@yahoo.com

1) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills within of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

I've been a volunteer with the LA Greens for two years. I spent most of that time as the Events Coordinator, and I organized several events for local candidates including fundraisers and get out the vote phone banks. I've designed Green Party advertisements that have appeared in the LA Weekly and Change Links. I've been published in Green Focus. I've been an observer at LA County Council meetings.

2) Please list any prior or current positions, related experience, and/or personal and professional skills outside of the Green Party that you have, that apply to this position.

I'm a good organizer, I know how to motivate people, I'm a skilled graphic artist and I play well with others.

3) Please describe your vision for serving as GPUS Delegate including addressing the job description for GPUS Delegate.

If I am called upon to serve as a delegate, I look forward to advancing public awareness of the Green Party through smart choices at the national level. I'll encourage the Green Party of the United States to take a loud public stand on issues of importance to Californians, in accordance with the Ten Key Values.

---

Edith Mendez  
City - Santa Monica  
County - Los Angeles  
Contact information - email-emendez2005@hotmail.com

Community organizer with LAANE (Los Angeles Alliance for New Economy), non- profit organization in support of living wages for workers in L.A. county. Extensive volunteer work with other organizations such as Codepink, American Cancer Society, and SMMUSD (Santa Monica Malibu Unified School District). I have attended various Green Party meetings, however I would like to be better informed about Green Party future visions in order to give my own personal opinion. Although my time is limited, I feel it worth the effort.

---

Josefina Aranda  
City - Santa Monica  
County - Los Angeles  
Contact information - 415 756-5587 / email- jvsla@yahoo.com

Community Activities:

2002-2007 Santa Monica, CA

Santa Monica Pier Restoration Board of Directors: Appointed twice by the Santa Monica City Council

2002 to present Santa Monica, CA

Member, Santa Monica Greens

2002 Santa Monica, CA

City Council candidate: Ran as a Green for Santa Monica City Council

1997-1999 Santa Monica, CA

Westside Coalition for Peace and Social Justice Coordinator: Advocacy organization working towards increasing educational opportunity, developing leadership, and lobbying for affordable housing. Served as liaison between

community based organizations and state representatives; structured and implemented programs for "at risk youth" with a focus on education and employment.

1996-1999 Los Angeles, CA  
Chicana/o Studies Coalition

Co-founder: Proactive student oriented organization advocating for Chicana/o Studies, higher education, adult education, and development of cultural institutions. Planned and organized community forums, fundraising projects, and action research.

Education:

Teachers College, Columbia University - New York, New York  
Master of Arts Degree in Curricula and Teaching (2002)  
University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) - Los Angeles, California  
Bachelors of Art Degree in Sociology (1998)  
Bachelors of Arts Degree in Chicana and Chicano Studies (1998)

Work Experience:

12/00-01/02 Los Angeles, CA

Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing - Housing LA Campaign Coordinator: Planned and implemented public education and outreach strategies for a \$100 million housing trust fund campaign; designed campaign literature, organized citywide forums, and lobbied elected officials; responsible for communication and collaboration with labor unions, non-profit agencies, developers and faith-based institutions in the greater Los Angeles area.

12/99-01/00 New York, NY

Teachers College Columbia University

Educator and Curriculum Developer: Managed educational process through evaluation of community indicators; developed culturally competent curriculum to meet state standards and community goals; identified and selected appropriate resources and instructional materials for students in predominantly underserved population; designed strategies to improve reading, writing, oral language and overall critical thinking skills.

1996-1999 Santa Monica, CA

City of Santa Monica/Terry Thelma Community Center Employment Counselor:

Coordinated employment services for over 400 residents; marketed and promoted program services to local businesses and governmental agencies; maintained relationships with community based organizations, community leaders and local representatives in order to enhance program, evaluated community needs via focus groups and surveys; established year-round program planning goals; provided direct services such as: pre-employment assessments, case management, job training, and development for residents in search of career opportunities.

Complete submission (600 words) on-line here:

[http://www.cagreens.org/cc/cocos/applications\\_2007\\_02/gpus\\_delegation/josefina\\_aranda.htm](http://www.cagreens.org/cc/cocos/applications_2007_02/gpus_delegation/josefina_aranda.htm)

---

Jim Dorenkott

City - San Francisco

County - San Francisco

Contact information - 415 756-5587 / email- jimdorenkott2@yahoo.com

I am a member of the SF county council and alternate to state CC. Prior to that I worked with Matt Gonzalez when he was president of the board of supervisors at city hall as a legislative aide.

I believe that we can make a difference in the national debate in the direction of the foreign and economic policy of this country. I would like to be part of that effort. I would like to be a delegate.

## Appendix 2 – Delegate Allocation

---

<b>County</b>	<b>Registered Greens</b>	<b>% of Ttl</b>	<b>Delegates</b>
Alameda	12,482	9.5%	9
Butte	2,187	1.7%	2
Calaveras	314	0.2%	1
Contra Costa	3,918	3.0%	3
El Dorado	1,079	0.8%	1
Fresno	1,661	1.3%	1
Humboldt	4,004	3.1%	3
Kern	728	0.6%	1
Los Angeles	25,482	19.5%	18
Marin	3,190	2.4%	2
Mendocino	2,247	1.7%	2
Monterey	1,340	1.0%	1
Napa	892	0.7%	1
Nevada	1,460	1.1%	1
Orange	8,101	6.2%	6
Placer	1,258	1.0%	1
Riverside	2,697	2.1%	2
Sacramento	5,488	4.2%	4
San Benito	151	0.1%	1
San Diego	9,072	6.9%	6
San Francisco	12,257	9.4%	9
San Luis Obispo	2,123	1.6%	2
San Mateo	3,704	2.8%	3
Santa Barbara	2,364	1.8%	2
Santa Clara	5,214	4.0%	4
Santa Cruz	4,685	3.6%	3
Shasta	510	0.4%	1
Solano	900	0.7%	1
Sonoma	6,321	4.8%	5
Tulare	556	0.4%	1
Ventura	2,999	2.3%	2
Yolo	1,614	1.2%	1
<b>TOTAL ACTIVE</b>	<b>130,998</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100</b>

Data from Feb. 2007