

# Green Party of California

## General Assembly

**Venue, Los Angeles**

**May 15-16, 2009**

---

### **Proposal Agenda Packet**

#### *Table Of Contents*

Meeting Schedule .....	2
Proposal – Ratify Meeting Minutes .....	3
Report – 2009-2010 GPCA Two-Year Strategic Plan .....	4
Election – GPUS Delegation .....	6
Proposal – GPCA Budget .....	7
Proposal – Special Election Ballot Measures .....	12
Proposal – Los Angeles County Bylaws .....	13
Platform – Preliminary Test for Consensus .....	17
Platform (new) – California Elections/Legislature Reforms .....	19
Platform (revised) – Public Education .....	22
Platform (revised) – Violence in Society .....	25
Platform (revised) – Water .....	27
Recommendation – Restructuring Proposals .....	30
Proposal - Bylaws Restructuring #1 .....	31
Proposal - Bylaws Restructuring #2 .....	38
Proposal - Bylaws Restructuring #3 .....	40
Announcement – Password Change .....	43
GA Delegate Allocation .....	44

## Meeting Schedule

---

### SATURDAY 5/16

Min.	Schedule Time	Item	Sponsoring Standing Committee or Working Group
60	8:00	Breakfast/Registration	
20	9:00	Delegate Orientation / Opening Ceremony	
10	9:20	ACTION: Facilitators / Confirm Quorum	
15	9:30	PROPOSAL: Confirm Agenda	
10	9:45	PROPOSAL: Approve Minutes from Dana Point GA	
20	9:55	REPORT: Two-year Strategy Plan	Coordinating Committee
75	10:15	Breakout Session #1 - Committees and Working Groups Finance; IT & Clearinghouse; Platform; Campaigns & Cand. #1	
30	11:30	ELECTION: GPUS Delegates	GPUS Delegation
60	12:00	LUNCH	
100	1:00	PROPOSAL: GPCA Annual Budget	Finance SC / Budget sub-committee
30	2:40	PROPOSAL: Ballot Measures - 2009 Special Election	Campaigns & Candidates
75	3:10	Breakout Session #2 - Committees and Working Groups GROW; Electoral Reform; International Protocol	
10	4:25	GPUS Election Results	
30	4:35	PROPOSAL: LA County Bylaws Acceptance	Bylaws & CC
	5:05	ADJOURN	

### SUNDAY 5/17

Min.	Schedule Time	Item	Sponsoring Standing Committee or Working Group
60	8:00	Registration / Delegate Sign-in / Breakfast	
20	9:00	ACTION: Introduce Facilitators / Confirm Quorum	
90	9:20	PROPOSAL: One new and three revised Platform planks	Platform SC
75	10:50	Breakout Session #3 - Committees and Working Groups Campaign & Cand. #2; Bylaws; Green Issues	
60	12:05	LUNCH	
120	1:05	PROPOSAL: Three restructuring proposals: 1 - Replace Regions with At-Large Elections for CC + Online Decisions 2 - Use Region / At-Large Mixed System for CC 3 - Restructure LA Region into Autonomous Local Districts	Bylaws
	3:05	ADJOURN	Bylaws

Closing Ceremony: Spiral Dance/Sunflower sharing; gather in circle in church parking lot

## Proposal – Ratify Meeting Minutes

---

The meeting minutes from the August 2008 General Assembly are available for review from the archive page:

<http://cagreens.org/plenary/archives/>

Meeting minutes should be reviewed particularly by the presenters and sponsors of the proposals.

## Report – 2009-2010 GPCA Two-Year Strategic Plan

---

The Mission of the California Green party shall be to operate the party in accordance with its bylaws, to increase party membership, run candidates for nonpartisan local and partisan state offices, to raise and publicize Green activist issues, and raise funds to accomplish the goals of the Party.

### **2009**

The Party will:

- Modify the bylaws to improve internal party structure and operation.
- Increase Green registration by 10%.
- Increase donations to the Green Party by 5%.
- Develop 5 green issues for candidate development and party activism.
- Conduct two prospective mailings with 3 participating counties each mailing.
- Hold 1 gathering, 2 plenaries and 2 CC/Coco joint retreats.

### **2010**

The Party will:

- Fill all standing committees and working group vacancies.
- Increase Green registration by 12%.
- Increase donations to the Green Party by 7%.
- Run candidates in 29 assembly districts and local nonpartisan races.
- Make additions and modifications to the Green Party platform.
- Hold 2 plenaries, and 2 CC/Coco joint retreats.

### Related links:

The Coordinating Committee membership and contact information is at [www.cagreens.org/cc](http://www.cagreens.org/cc).

The Green Party budget may be found at [www.cagreens.org/finance/internal](http://www.cagreens.org/finance/internal).

The generic monthly meeting calendar of committees and working groups is at [www.cagreens.org/structure/calendar.shtml](http://www.cagreens.org/structure/calendar.shtml).

The Clearinghouse website is [www.cagreens.org/clearinghouse/](http://www.cagreens.org/clearinghouse/).

The Green Party working calendar is at \_\_\_\_\_.

Working Groups' websites and contact information may be found at:

The Green Issues Working Group [GIWG] [www.cagreens.org/giwig](http://www.cagreens.org/giwig).

The Electoral Reform Working Group [ERWG] [www.cagreens.org/erwig](http://www.cagreens.org/erwig).

The Green Organizing Working Group [GROW] [www.cagreens.org/grow](http://www.cagreens.org/grow).

The Campaigns and Candidates Working Group [C&CWG] [www.cagreens.org/ccwig](http://www.cagreens.org/ccwig).

Standing Committees' websites and contact information may be found at:

The Media Committee [www.cagreens.org/media](http://www.cagreens.org/media).

The Finance Committee [www.cagreens.org/finance](http://www.cagreens.org/finance).

The Bylaws Committee [www.cagreens.org/bylaws](http://www.cagreens.org/bylaws).

The Platform Committee [www.cagreens.org/platformsc](http://www.cagreens.org/platformsc).

The CA GPUS Delegation [www.cagreens.org/delegate](http://www.cagreens.org/delegate)

The Information and Technology Committee [IT] [www.cagreens.org/it](http://www.cagreens.org/it).

**Notes:**

All meeting dates, times, and places and teleconference information were the best information at the time they were published. It is recommended that the Coco be contacted to confirm meeting information and to join the list serve.

The leadership, work plans and budgets of the individual committees and groups will be found at their websites.

## Election – GPUS Delegation

---

### ***Delegation to the Green Party of the United States***

There are 31 candidates running for seats on the delegation. Their applications are posted at

<http://www.cagreens.org/delegates/election/>.

Paraphrasing from the GPCA bylaws, the GPCA selects delegates who are voting members of the National Committee (NC) of the GPUS. These delegates are authorized to cast the full number of votes allocated to the GPCA to represent GPCA positions on matters before the GPUS. (On July 4, 2007 the number of votes allocated increased from 13 to 42, capped at 21% of the national body.)

GPCA delegates to the GPUS take part in the on-line discussion of proposals before the GPUS NC and vote on those proposals. They participate in monthly teleconferences and are encouraged to attend delegation meetings at State General Assemblies. They also are encouraged to attend the GPUS National Committee Annual National Meeting and to participate in GPUS committees. They are responsible to the GPCA General Assembly (GA) and the GPCA Coordinating Committee (GPCA CC). Alternate delegates are encouraged to participate in all meetings, teleconferences, and votes, and to serve on GPUS committees.

Elections will be held on Saturday at May 15-16 General Assembly using Ranked Choice Voting. Though there are 31 people running for all open seats, it is IMPORTANT to rank everyone whom you find acceptable, so that all candidates can reach and pass the election threshold. If you don't rank everyone, we risk not filling all of our delegate seats and not increasing our number of alternate delegates, and disappointing people who have volunteered to represent you to the GPUS. SO, PLEASE RANK ALL CANDIDATES (unless you know something we don't know, that someone who has applied is not suitable for this role.) Thanks very much!

### **ELECTION PROCESS (from bylaws)**

7-1.8 Choice Voting: Each delegate shall be provided a written secret ballot containing the names of the candidates in random order. The ballot shall also include a "No Other Candidate" (NOC) option. The delegates shall vote by ranking the candidates along with the NOC option in order of preference. The ballots shall be tabulated utilizing a Choice Voting system with fractional transfers and a Droop threshold,  $1/(n+1)$  (1/3 threshold with two open seats). No candidate shall be seated who does not cross the threshold before NOC. Choice Voting is the Single Transferable Vote (STV) form of proportional representation described in the International IDEA Handbook of Electoral System Design. (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA). First published 1997. Second edition. Stockholm, Sweden).

7-1.10 Single Candidate Election: Approval Voting When only one candidate seeks office, an Approval Voting election shall be held. Each delegate shall be provided a written secret ballot containing the name of the candidate seeking office. The ballot shall allow the opportunity to indicate a "yes" or "no" preference on the seating of the candidate. The candidate must receive "yes" votes on at least two-thirds (2/3) of ballots cast to be seated.

## Proposal – GPCA Budget

INCOME	Proposed 09-10	Budget 07-08	Actual to date 03-09
Clearinghouse Sales	750	2000	734
Donation			0
Mail Sustainers	480	1800	425
Miscellaneous		2500	210
Resolicitation Mailings	17500	30000	11300
Sustainer	8400	18500	7700
Dues		0	1739
Events		0	34
GPUS Revenue Sharing	6000	9000	0
Green Focus Sales	750	1000	350
Interest Income		120	55
[new fundraising income]		0	0
Receipts from Return of Loans	4500	4500	3400
[spend down cash on hand]		0	0
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>38380</b>	<b>69420</b>	<b>25947</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>			
<b>Bylaws</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>0</b>
CC			
Insurance	1350	1350	1239
Legal	0	1000	0
Loans for Plenary	4500	4500	0
Meetings			
Plenary Dinners	0	600	100
Retreat	0	1200	200
Phone	0	360	354
Plenary Administration	400	800	238
Plenary Travel Support	0	2000	0
Recordings of CC meetings	0	200	0
<b>(Subtotal CC)</b>	<b>6250</b>	<b>12010</b>	<b>2131</b>
CCWG			
Administrative Assistant	0	0	0
Admin. Assistant -- Expense Reimbursement	0	0	0
Nonpartisan Campaign Support	3000	6000	2650
Strategy Meetings	0	1000	0

Candidate Training Sessions	750	1500	0
Copying for meetings	200	200	0
Teleconference Reimbursements	0	200	0
Co-Cos Retreat Travel/Lodging	0	200	0
<b>(Subtotal CCWG)</b>	<b>3950</b>	<b>9100</b>	<b>2650</b>
Clearinghouse			
Office Rent	0	5500	0
Fax-Phone-Printing Machine	0	0	0
Phone	500	500	483
Office Supplies	0	200	0
Postage/shipping	200	0	0
GPC merchandise (old "paraphenalia")	1000	3000	218
New materials and merchandise	0	2000	0
<b>(Subtotal Clearinghouse)</b>	<b>1700</b>	<b>11200</b>	<b>701</b>
ERWG		400	0
Elections Code: Travel	0	250	0
Elections Code: Phone	0	25	0
Elections Code: Copies	0	125	0
Public Finance: Travel	0	400	0
Public Finance: Phone	0	25	0
Public Finance: Copies	0	25	0
Ranked Voting: Travel	0	500	0
Ranked Voting: Phone	0	125	0
Ranked Voting: Copies	0	25	0
Ranked Voting: Training Packet	0	750	0
Ranked Voting: Campaign Contributions	0	1000	0
Internal Voting Process: Phone	0	13	0
Internal Voting Process: Copies	0	25	0
Election Administration: Phone	0	25	0
Election Administration: Copies	0	125	0
Voting Technology: Travel	0	500	0
Voting Technology: Hosting Meetings	0	1000	0
Voting Technology: Phone	0	125	0
Voting Technology: Copies	0	250	0
Redistricting: Travel	0	500	0
Redistricting: Phone	0	125	0
Redistricting: Copies	0	150	0
Media (cds, etc)( Old "Co-co retreat participation")	0	125	0

Postage(Old " Education Workshop")	0	150	0
<b>(Subtotal ERWG)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6763</b>	<b>0</b>
Finance Committee			
Resolicitation Mailings	8000	8000	3656
Bulk mail permit	150		132
Prospect Mailings	0	0	0
Copying and Reproduction	0	400	0
Thank you notes	0	300	0
<b>(Subtotal Finance Committee)</b>	<b>8150</b>	<b>8700</b>	<b>3788</b>
GPUS Delegation			
National Meeting Travel Support (13 delegates)	1000	8450	3835
Presidential National Nomination Convention Registration	0	10000	0
Plenary Travel	0	0	0
ANM subsidy for 2010 (Old "Polling Software")		0	0
QPNC Subsidy for 2012		9	
Planning Honorarium for Web Page Assistance for all GPCA Committees and Working Groups	0		
<b>(Subtotal GPUS)</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>18459</b>	<b>3835</b>
Green Issues			
Green Actions (replaces Convergences)	0	3000	0
Issue Papers (replaces Printing)	0	0	0
Teleconferences	0	600	0
Research	0	600	0
Formatting and Distributing Proposals	0	300	0
Writing and Distributing Notices and Minutes	0	300	0
Update Organizing Webpages	0	100	0
Retreat (Healthy Community Alliance)	300	0	0
Requested for all efforts (Rural Organizing)	0	0	0
<b>(Subtotal Green Issues)</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>5000</b>	<b>0</b>
GROW			
Green Focus	3000	10000	0
Green Focus: Subscription Maintenance	0	1600	0
Registration support (Old " Voter Registration Drive")	0	2000	0
Volunteer Coordinator	0	1500	0

County Council Support	0	1500	0
County Organization Grant Program	0	5000	0
County State fundraising (Old "Gathering Support Fund")	2000	1500	0
Campus Greens	0	5	0
Diversity Outreach	0	5	0
Rural Outreach	0	5	0
General Grow Funding (Old "Additional Printing")	0	0	0
<b>(Subtotal GROW)</b>	<b>5000</b>	<b>23115</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>International Protocol</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>0</b>
Information Technology			
Server Hosting	1200	948	1421
Server Backup Services	300	240	0
CMS Implementation	0	0	0
Voting/Polling Page	0	2000	0
Staff	0	0	0
(Reserve)	0	0	0
(Server Move)	0	0	0
(Domain Name not expiring)	0	0	0
<b>(Subtotal IT)</b>	<b>1500</b>	<b>3188</b>	<b>1421</b>
Media			
Office Supplies(Old "Business Cards")	0	75	0
Fax and email distribution			150
Press Secretary Compensation and Expenses	6900	6600	5775
Visibility Campaign (Old "Travel")	1000	300	0
Letters to Elected Officials/Candidates	0	100	0
Videotapes	0	200	0
Backdrop for Press Conferences	0	100	0
Teleconference Expenses	0	100	0
Paid media Advertising Campaign	0	0	0
(Workshops)	0	0	0
<b>(Subtotal Media)</b>	<b>7900</b>	<b>7475</b>	<b>5925</b>
Platform			
Printing and Supplies (Old "Full Platform printing")	1000	3000	1000
Platform Summaries	0	2000	0
Camejo Scholarships (Old "Platform Adendum")	0	0	0
2008 Platform Summary Addendum	0	500	0

Travel to Retreats	0	200	0
<b>(Subtotal Platform)</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>5700</b>	<b>1000</b>
Treasurer			
Bank Charges	0	150	0
Data Entry Assistance	0	500	0
Legal	0	500	0
Merchant Fees	1500	1800	1195
Post Office Box	106	300	106
Postage	0	600	0
Printing	0	300	0
Software	0	750	0
<b>(Subtotal Treasurer)</b>	<b>1606</b>	<b>4900</b>	<b>1301</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>38356</b>	<b>115910</b>	<b>22752</b>
<b>Deficit if all requests honored</b>	<b>24</b>		

### **Notes**

Description notes on key line items will be available before the plenary in electronic format at [www.cagreens.org/plenary/](http://www.cagreens.org/plenary/) and at the meeting in paper format.

In the event that the FY 2009-10 budget is not passed on time, the GA agrees to automatically extend the allocations in this budget on a monthly, pro-rated basis until the budget is passed.

## Proposal – Special Election Ballot Measures

---

SPONSOR: Campaign & Candidates Working Group

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

SUBJECT: General Assembly of Delegates Positions of May 19, 2009 Special Election 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. Revised policies and procedures for County Polling were adopted at the April 2008 (Berkeley, Alameda County) plenary. Those procedures provide that, where a plenary occurs during a County Polling period or County Polling preceding the plenary has not resolved one or more pending ballot measures, consideration of those ballot measures shall be placed on the plenary agenda for decision, if possible, by the GPCA General Assembly of Delegates. Where the plenary fails to take a position on any ballot measure, then the County Polling continues to attempt to reach a decision by that method. Where the plenary delegates reach a decision on any measure, that decision controls and becomes the state party position upon adoption at the state meeting. The GPCA can take a position to support, oppose or have no position on any ballot measure. Where an 80% decision threshold is not met, the default is for the GPCA not to have a position.

At the time this description was written (early March 2009), the period for collecting reports on ballot measures had not been completed. It is intended that those reports will be published as an addenda to the agenda packet after they have been completed in the middle of March. The following is a list of measures placed on the ballot for a special election on May 19<sup>th</sup> by the California legislature as part of the recent so-called “Budget deal”.

Propositions that are on the May 19, 2009, Statewide Special Election Ballot

- Proposition 1A – Stabilizes State Budget. Reforms California Budget Process. Limits State Spending. Increases “Rainy Day” Budget Stabilization Fund.
- Proposition 1B – Election Funding. Payment Plan.
- Proposition 1C – Lottery Modernization Act.
- Proposition 1D – Protects Children's Services Funding. Helps Balance State Budget.
- Proposition 1E – Ensures Funding for Children's Mental Health Services. Helps Balance State Budget.
- Proposition 1F – Elected Officials' Salaries. Prevents Pay Increases During Budget Deficit Years.

PROPOSAL: The General Assembly of Delegates will consider May 2009 ballot measures to determine if consensus or an 80% decision threshold exists as to positions to support, oppose or have no position on those measures at the May 2009 state meeting in Venice, Los Angeles County.

COMMITTEE PROCESS: Not applicable.

TIMELINE: Adoption of GPCA positions of ballot measures at the next plenary at Venice, Los Angeles County, CA, May 2009, to the extent that GPCA positions have not been determined by earlier County Polling.

RESOURCES: Time and energies in creating and presenting ballot measure reports. Costs for producing paper copies of reports for General Assembly of Delegates. Media Committee time and energies publicizing any positions.

## Proposal – Los Angeles County Bylaws

---

SPONSOR: Bylaws Committee and Coordinating Committee

PRESENTER/CONTACT: Mike Wyman, Bylaws SC Co-coordinator, mswyman@comcast.net;  
Jim Stauffer, jims@greens.org, 408.432.9148

SUBJECT:

The GP of Los Angeles County has submitted revised bylaws for acceptance by the GPCA. The review by the state Bylaws Committee found several problems. Therefore, the decision to accept this bylaws submission is forwarded to the General Assembly.

(This proposal will be moot if the LA restructuring proposal (May 09) is adopted. That proposal requires the LA Region to be reorganized into autonomous Locals.)

PROPOSAL:

The GPCA Bylaws Standing Committee (BSC) and Coordinating Committee (CC) are submitting the newly revised bylaws of the GP of Los Angeles County (GPLAC) to the General Assembly (GA) for its consideration and review. It is the recommendation of the BSC that the bylaws not be accepted for the reasons enumerated below.

Acceptance of the bylaws as submitted will require a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly. If the General Assembly accepts the bylaws, it will have the effect of overruling the finding of the BSC. The bylaws as submitted would then be posted on the GPCA website.

If this bylaws submission is not accepted by the GA, the GPLAC County Council would have to post bylaws acceptable to the BSC by the next General Assembly in order to receive their allotment of delegates.

The LA bylaws in question can be viewed at <http://www.cagreens.org/lacounty/cc/gplac-bylaws.htm>.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

Under Section 3.2.2 of the GPCA bylaws, to be recognized by the General Assembly, “a county organization must adopt organizational bylaws consistent with the ten key values, the GPCA bylaws, and California law” as well as fulfill specifically enumerated requirements under the section. (Reproduced Below)

HISTORY:

Several years ago the BSC established the duty of reviewing all county bylaws submissions for compliance with section 3-2.2 of the state bylaws. Under this policy numerous counties submitted their bylaws. Most county submissions were found to be in compliance and were accepted. Where they were not, they were returned with comments, revised by the county in question, and resubmitted. Through a process of communication between the counties and the BSC, all submitted bylaws were eventually accepted.

For a number of years, beginning in 2002, the state party has repeatedly informed the GPLAC that their bylaws were not consistent with the requirements of the states bylaws, in particular for their method of electing Regional Representatives to the GPCA Coordinating Committee.

In June of 2008 the GPLAC County Council submitted a revised set of bylaws for the county. The state BSC found these bylaws to be compliant with the requirements of our state bylaws, specifically section 3.2.2, accepted them, and posted them on our website.

On March 9 of this year, the GPLAC County Council submitted additional revisions to their bylaws. This revision essentially nullified the June submission and returned the bylaws to their previous version. The BSC reviewed these bylaws and found them to be inconsistent with the requirements of GPCA bylaws Section 3.2.

At the time of the finding, the following comments were submitted by the BSC volunteers who made the review.

The main problem is that they [the bylaws] structure LA similar to a county, ignoring the size of LA and its unique position as a region-county. There are no autonomous Locals within this region. Any recognized local group is held under tight control of the Council.

A surprising defect in these bylaws is that they do not define any decision-making body. The Council is granted authority over a specific list of responsibilities, but no one has authority over any decision outside of that specific list. Also, for any Green in LA to have input into party decisions means traveling, possibly, a long distance through heavy traffic. This discourages grassroots participation.

The Council elects CC reps, GA delegates, and Council replacements for vacancies. CC reps and Council replacements are elected by serial IRV, which is a simple majority system. GA delegates are elected by PR, if there's ever a contested election. No explanation is provided for this bizarre mix. And, having delegates and CC reps elected by, and reporting to, the Council, plus the absence of autonomous Locals in a region this large, plus the use of simple majority to keep one group in power constitutes a centralization of authority unparalleled within the party. This is certainly inconsistent with Green Party philosophy.

The bylaws need proofreading. There are numerous typos and misstatements. For instance, Section 12.3 (CC reps) digresses into some Council membership requirements, for some reason.

### **Argument:**

LA must remedy the following problems to be in conformity with Section 3.2.2.

In reference to section 3-2.2, generally and specifically:

#### **Generally:**

Both the method of selecting regional representatives to the GPCA Coordinating Committee and the structure of the GPLAC County Council are at odds with the ten key values, in particular the values of decentralization and grass-roots democracy.

#### Structure:

The structure of the GPLAC County Council is highly centralized, granting extraordinary power to two elected Co- Coordinators, who may set the agenda for every party meeting unless overruled as to the order of items by a three fifths majority of the council, or overruled as to content by a two-thirds majority of those voting.

This super-majority requirement means that any concerns about the agenda will be resolved in favor of the Co- Coordinators interpretation unless overruled by a super-majority of Council members. This gives the Co-Co's the power to reject any item for any reason, unless overruled by 2/3 of the Council. As a result, the Co-Coordinators have the power to become *de facto* rulers of the Council, rather than facilitators of a decentralized and consensus-seeking group of Green Party representatives, if they so choose.

This concentration of power in the hands of two people in a county council with a potential for a total of 44 councilors has been a source of recurring strife on the council, depending upon the personalities and the political agenda of the Co-Co's at any one time.

### Election of Regional Representatives:

The Los Angeles County region has three seats on the GPCA Coordinating Committee. The bylaws under consideration call for all seats to be filled by vote of the GPLAC County Council, who are the only eligible electors. (Though the wording in the text of the submitted bylaws doesn't quite make this clear.)

The rank and file does not participate in the vote. Each seat is voted on separately by council members, with a majority rules (IRV) vote on each seat. Two seats are divided, male and female, and one is gender neutral. There is no requirement or provision for alternates.

By arranging Regional Representative elections in this manner, a simple majority of the GPLAC County Council may elect all three of the representatives.

There is no provision that would allow for minority representation, either through division of the representatives, or the election of alternates.

This method of electing Regional Representatives has been a point of contention for many years. It is highly undemocratic, and effectively shuts out minority opinions and voices from election to the state Coordinating Committee. The state party, which has endorsed proportional representation through choice voting, has repeatedly instructed the GPLAC to elect representatives and alternates through some method of choice voting/ proportional representation so that a broad, diverse and unified delegation from the LAC region could be elected to the state Coordinating Committee.

In June of 2008, the GPLAC County Council amended their bylaws to elect regional representatives and alternates by a combination of approval and Single Transferable Vote/Proportional Representation (STV/PR). This bylaw, however, was repealed by the present presiding GPLAC County Council, which reinstated the previous, "majority takes all" method of electing regional representatives.

### **Specifically:**

The submitted bylaws need additional work in the following enumerated Requirements of section 3.2.

#### c) Describe the decision-making process;

LA bylaws: There is no statement as to any body holding general decision authority. Article 5 contains a list of responsibilities of the Council, but the Council is defined as a "coordinating body." There does not appear to be a decision-making body defined outside of the specific duties of the Council.

Article 9 describes the decision process for the Council, with its defined list of issues for which it has decision authority. (And it uses three different thresholds for those decisions.)

#### d) Describe the process for filling county council vacancies;

LA bylaws: Article 8

However, Section 8.6 says, "...Council will vote upon each vacancy separately using Instant Run-Off Voting." If there are multiple vacancies, this will be another instance of simple majority voting.

#### e) Describe the process for selecting General Assembly delegates;

LA bylaws: Article 11

However, Section 11.4 says, "Delegates shall make a good faith effort to fairly represent the discussions and decisions of the County Council..." But, as noted under c) above, no decision body is defined and the Council is not specifically authorized to decide state party proposals.

COMMITTEE DECISION:

Bylaws Committee approved by consensus 3/19/09. Coordinating Committee endorsed on a 7-2-1 vote (yes-no-abstain) on 4/6/09.

TIME LINE:

Compliant bylaws by the time of delegate distribution for the next General Assembly.

RESOURCES:

The Bylaws Committee may be required for consultation.

For reference, these are the requirements in the state bylaws:

3-2.2 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.

## Platform – Preliminary Test for Consensus

---

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

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

~~~~~

There are four individual planks being presented here.

For updated planks, the objective of the Platform Working Group is to get approval of any updates, not to revisit all of the existing content. Therefore for revised planks, discussion will be only concerned with changes.

***Please encourage those in your county that wish to work on content to become active members in the Platform Working Group.***

~~~~~

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

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

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

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

## VOTE HERE

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

Plank Title	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
California Elections/Government (new)			
Public Education (revised)			
Violence in Society (revised)			
Water (revised)			

### Comments

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

County \_\_\_\_\_

Submitted by:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_

email \_\_\_\_\_

### Concerns

This space is for concerns or friendly amendments that relate directly to the approval of the proposed platform planks and any updates. Please provide specific wording for any changes.

### Other Comments

This space is for general comments about any plank that the Working Group can address in the future.

## Platform (new) – California Elections/Legislature Reforms

---

SPONSOR: Platform Standing Group

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

SUBJECT:

California Elections/Government in the Democracy and Electoral Reform 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:

The state of California has had a long-standing deficit, an intractable legislature-governor interaction, a static legislature, and a public trust problem.

The credit rating of California since the internet boom ended in the late 1990s has been very low. The Pew Center on the States has graded California as D+, tied with Rhode Island, in relation to how the 50 states manage their money. Public trust has been drained partially due to the past history of racial discrimination in home sales before 1963 and subsequent court battles on that topic, property taxes during the Jerry Brown administration that begot Prop 13 in 1978 which shrunk local tax revenue and centralized authority in Sacramento, the 1988 corruption convictions for 14 lobbyists, staffers, and legislators that spawned term limits, the 1996 deregulation of electricity under the Wilson administration that led to Gov. Davis's recall after the resultant profiteering of the energy supply companies in the face of Governor and Legislature impotence, and the chronic late state Budgets. It is time the elected representatives and the Governor work for the good of California rather than for themselves, the corporations, and the duopoly.

The California Legislature has drawn its own election districts since 2001 when the duopoly conspired together to minimize change to the 2001 situation. In only 12 U.S. states is the legislature denied ultimate power of its own redistricting. Just 6 states give congressional redistricting to another entity. Such an inflexible system in California restricts grassroots Democracy by discouraging voter participation at elections. African Americans were first elected into the Legislature in the 1950s, with 4 Assembly Districts being represented by 1974. In 1973 when Governor Ronald Reagan and the Democratic Party controlled Legislature could not agree on a political map then considered every 10 years, the state Supreme Court appointed three retired judges to draw the district lines to increase Black and Latino representation. Latino voters now constitute 19% of those registered to vote even though they will soon become the major ethnic group. The Legislature brazenly diluted the Latino vote in its 1981 redistricting, and a Supreme Court appointed panel of 3 judges in 1991 recommended changes that resulted in Latino representation increasing from 4 in 1990 to 17 in 2000. Their representation in the State Senate also grew from 3 to 6 in the same time frame, the number in 2008 being 10. History has shown that the Legislature protects its incumbents, whereas independent judge panels boost minority representation in the Legislature. Prop 11, passed in November 2008, prescribed a team of 14 to draft a redistricting strategy.

Borrowing against future California lottery money is not supported because much of its revenue goes to Education; taxing winners is a better solution. The lottery was conceived in 1984 independent of the Legislature.

Far too much money is spent on the prison system and not enough on giving convicted people another chance. Too many people are sent to jail so making the situation worse. Federal orders on California's prison system all agree that the state's prisons are overcrowded, and that means, in hard economic times, early release and lighter sentencing are important tools.

Government bonds are one of the key linchpins of how the wealthiest individuals and biggest corporations extract money from taxpayers. This perpetuates a hostile tax and economic system against working people and poorer people. Since many bonds are paid over 30-40 years, the young pay a disproportionate amount of the bonds' total

cost even though they have fewer assets and earning capacity than the older generation. The Green Party proposes a “pay-as-we-go” system.

#### PROPOSAL:

The Green Party proposes:

1. A unicameral legislature of 360 apportioned among California’s 8 regions according to their respective populations. Within each region, half the seats would be elected by District as done currently for the House but using ranked ballot voting, and the other half by proportional representation. The voter would elect both a district representative, and a political party to represent their region. The party seats would comprise of prioritized lists of registered district voters balanced by gender, ethnicity, and age. The minimum percentage for a political party to achieve representation should be 1% of the District vote at the election.
2. A decision-making threshold of 55% in budget matters rather than the current 2/3rds majority. The only other states that use 2/3rds majority are Rhode Island (D+ on the Pew Center of the States scale) and Arkansas (B-). Lowering the threshold would end budget delay by the minority party.
3. Formation of a flexible state Reserve Fund as mandated by Prop 58 in 2004, fed by state windfall money, money borrowed from financial markets, or from other government agency windfall funds.
4. The diversion of the pay of legislature members and governor into the Reserve Fund when the Budget is not agreed to in time. When Budget disagreement occurs, the previous year’s Budget should be extended until agreement is reached.
5. Regular examination of spending programs to determine whether they should be revised, reduced, or discontinued. The emergency examination trigger should be within 1.0% of the deficit threshold. There also need to be embedded independent financial experts in each state agency to monitor how taxpayer money is spent.
6. Regular review of tax loopholes to assess if they are needed, and to plug them if not.
7. Formulation of five-year and one-year budgets to expedite planning and budget adjustments before deficits occur.
8. Exploring tax reforms to create a simplified yet equitable system based on taxing corporations and people who earn the most.
9. Prioritization of spending areas on year-to-year and five-year bases.
10. Maintaining term limits at all levels of state and local government for elected officials.
11. The placing of net legal settlement monies in favor of the state in any state Reserve fund.
12. Borrowing against future lottery receipts is not supported. A 10% tax on state lottery winners is favored instead.
13. Stop building more prisons. People convicted of non-violent offences must not be sent to prison. The death penalty (on humanitarian grounds) and death rows (on financial and space grounds) must be abolished.
14. Electioneering for state candidates be paid for by the state of California, and occur not more than 60 days before election day.
15. Governments need to raise the money to pay for needed infrastructure and other programs on a “pay-as-we go” basis to remove the extra costs of state bonds, including interest payments, payments to Wall Street bond brokers, and fees to millionaire lawyers. The savings could then be redirected to much needed government programs and investments, or returned to working and poorer people by reducing regressive taxes such as sales taxes on non-luxury items and payroll taxes. The budget must be balanced within 1% for every financial year relative to direct income (taxes, fees, surcharges, interest, and intra-government transfers) and direct spending (amounts actually spent —not net amounts)

16. The Green Party of California intends to have formal input into efforts of state electoral and budget reform, for example, participation in the Prop 11 redistricting committee, in any Constitutional Convention, in organizations that further the cause of proportional representation and IRV, and in efforts to reform state taxation.

COMMITTEE DECISION: Versions were placed on the Platform Listserve on the following dates: 1, June 27 2008; 2. July 1 2008; 3. July 9 2008; 4. July 28 2008; 5. Aug 4 2008; 6. Sep 9 2008; 7. Sep 16 2008; 8. Feb 22 2009; 9. March 7 2009

TIMELINE: This is the first consideration of the Platform Plank.

RESOURCES: There is no comparable GPCA or GPUS plank. There is some overlap with two other planks in the Community-Based Sustainable Economics Section, Creating the Right Budget for Our Government, and Creating the Right Incentives.

## Platform (revised) – Public Education

---

[underline = new material relative to existing Platform; strike-out = deleted material relative to current platform]

### ONLY THE CHANGES WILL BE DISCUSSED

SPONSOR: Platform Standing Group

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

SUBJECT:

Public Education in the Peace and Non-Violence Section. Grassroots democracy, social justice and equal opportunity, respect for diversity, and personal and global responsibility are the involved 10 Key Values of the GP. This revision incorporates material from the unsuccessful Conservation of Health platform plank of 2006.

BACKGROUND:

An important purpose of education is to prepare young people for leadership and participation in the governance and maintenance of their communities. To do this well, they need experience in participatory democratic practices. Since a good educational system is the most important insurance we have that our country's basic principles of social justice will be preserved, we must allocate sufficient resources to our public school system.

We owe our young people the right to learn to communicate well (read, write and speak), to understand how the world works (science, mathematics and ecology), to learn about the existence and allocation of resources (economics and geography), to study the people who came before us and those who now inhabit the Earth (history, anthropology), and to understand health and human nature (nutrition, psychology and sociology). We must also assure that they learn to value themselves enough. We must encourage them to critique what they hear and see in print and in the media.

Young people also should be exposed to the creative arts (music, dance, drama, fine arts) as well as physical education. Vocational education should be included in the curriculum as well.

School has a tremendous influence on people's lives, because it is the primary social institution that young people encounter outside of the family. Schools reflect society's mores, including all of the prejudices and stereotypes which abound in our society. This too often results in the segregation of students by perceived academic and physical ability, language proficiency, religion, wealth, ethnicity and gender, and in the fostering of unhealthy competition. Young people are often tested and graded on meaningless drivel. All of this contributes to the alienation of young people and to feelings of passivity, powerlessness and hopelessness. We must end these practices and transform our schools into communities that nurture everyone involved with them. Our schools must become places where parents want to send their children and where teachers want to work.

Every child should have equitable access to free and appropriate educational resources and opportunities in a well-maintained public school. Since equal state funding does not produce equitable educational opportunities, funding for schools should be related to need. Schools with students living in poverty require higher funding. In addition, schools and districts with high numbers of English language learners and special education students should be funded at higher levels because those students need and deserve enhanced resources.

Since the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, California budget allocations have slighted education. Because of insufficient funding, teachers are woefully underpaid. An entire generation's music, art and foreign language programs have been dismantled. This is true at the preschool and K-12 grade levels, and in the area of higher education as well. California's community colleges, which educate more students than the University of California and the California State University systems combined, and which particularly serve immigrants, women, people of color, and working class students, receive far less money than they need. We will never have a quality educational system until we provide adequate funding. Special education is a federal program that has received decreasing

funds that has crippled the program since funding can only then come from the school general fund. The Federal Government must fund such programs at the level it promised to do.

Another area of particular concern is the increasing use of mandatory standardized testing. ~~which is educationally indefensible.~~ High-stakes tests impose a climate of fear on students, parents, and teachers. They reduce education to memorizing disconnected facts - the very opposite of the thoughtful engagement in learning our children need. Standardized tests exhibit persistent racial, gender and economic bias. Reliance on test scores inevitably leads to students, teachers and schools being sorted along the lines of race, class, ~~English language proficiency, disability~~ and learning styles. As an alternative to high-stakes tests, we should support the use of tools such as the learning record which rely on the authentic assessment of a student's actual work and have as their primary purpose improving student achievement. Meeting the needs of historically-neglected schools in working class communities and communities of color should be a priority.

The Green Party advocates the following:

1. Substantially increase and make more equitable state and federal funding for public education at all levels, from preschool and K-12 to the community college, the California State University, and the University of California systems.
2. Increase compensation for teachers. Improve teacher support, training, mentoring and sabbaticals. Work to recruit and retain qualified teachers, especially teachers of color. Work toward putting fully-trained teachers in every classroom.
3. Work for free education eventually to be available from preschool through community college, university, graduate and professional schools.
4. Reaffirm the value of public education and reject the use of public funds to pay for students' attendance at private or parochial schools, or to pay any for-profit organization to manage or run a public school.
5. Decrease the student-teacher ratio in classrooms and increase the number of counselors, nurses, librarians and social workers. Provide smaller, more personalized schools and a greater diversity of choices.
6. Oppose state or federal requirements to make significant decisions about schools, teachers or students based primarily on test scores.
7. Advocate the design and use of a variety of developmentally appropriate assessment techniques that allow necessary accommodations, modifications, and exemptions and are bias-free, reliable and valid. While high-stakes testing remains in use, support legislation encouraging parents to opt their children out of all mandated standardized tests without penalty for students, parents, teachers or schools.
8. Promote and fund bilingual and second-language immersion education with trained teachers and appropriate materials and support services.
9. Oppose any advertising or promotion of commercial products on a school site or in any adopted or recommended curricular materials or school-based Internet access.
10. Develop curricula ~~which~~ that make the connection between our rights as individuals and our responsibilities to others and to the earth. New or expanded topics could include bioregional studies, cultural sensitivity, sustainable development, global interdependence, human rights, sex education, public health, environmental justice, and peaceful conflict resolution.
11. Vocational education high schools and vocation education programs in comprehensive high schools should be revived, expanded and fully funded. Training during the high school years should prepare graduating students for a variety of careers which pay a living wage.
12. Add before-school and after-school programs. Nutritious, preferably ~~plant-based~~ organic breakfasts and lunches must be available for all students, subsidized according to need.

13. Educate children and their families as early as possible through role-play in how to recognize, prevent, and react to adult behavior that is violent and addictive.
14. Promote creativity and self-defense ability for children at elementary school
15. Provide training in how students should interact non-violently with peers and adults at the junior high school level
16. Offer small classes generally, and in addition do training in negotiation, mediation, non-violence skills, and in dealing with diverse peers/adults in senior high schools
17. Include civics courses that include histories of how civil rights were achieved, and how current law can be used to achieve personal civil rights
18. Promote and explain the roles of gender, race, sexual orientation, gender identity, and age in the real world, as the maturity of the student allows
19. Educate children how and when to be individualistic and team players.
20. Mandate researched-based drug, tobacco, and alcohol prevention in middle and high schools.
21. Expand special classes to address students' academic needs in light of their disability and language status. The state must enforce existing laws in this area by funding these programs, by increasing the accessibility of needy students, and by funding/training teachers in these special areas.

**COMMITTEE DECISION:** The Conservation of Health plank insertions were first conceived in the Green Issues working group at the 2003 San Francisco plenary and posted on the Women's Discussion Board in April 2004, and on the Platform listserv in May 2004. The June 25 2006 Ventura General Assembly directed that the Conservation of Health plank sections be added to the appropriate Platform planks. Versions of the revised Violence in Society platform plank were placed on the Platform Listserv on the following dates: 1, September 2, 2008; 2. September 9, 2008; 3. September 16, 2009; 4. March 5, 2009; 5. March 7, 2009

**TIMELINE:** This revised platform plank needs to be approved at the first opportunity.

**RESOURCES:** This is a revision of the current GPCA Platform Plank.

## Platform (revised) – Violence in Society

---

[underline = new material relative to existing Platform; strike-out = deleted material relative to current platform]

### ONLY THE CHANGES WILL BE DISCUSSED

SPONSOR: Platform Standing Group

PRESENTERS/CONTACTS: Shane Que Hee, squehee@ucla.edu, (310)208-1624

SUBJECT:

Violence in Society in the Peace and Non-Violence Section. Grassroots democracy, peace and non-violence, social justice and equal opportunity, respect for diversity, and personal and global responsibility are the involved 10 Key Values of the GP. This revision incorporates material from the unsuccessful Conservation of Health platform plank of 2006.

BACKGROUND:

American society has an historical legacy of violence that results in a widespread acceptance of violent methods. This is reflected in high violent crime rates, the highest handgun murder rate in the world, a propensity for military solutions, and a patriarchal desire to dominate through threats and outright force.

Domestic violence is becoming more recognized and is being addressed, but it continues to linger as a major problem in our society. As with most acts of violence, the causes are known and the solutions are attainable.

Despite arguments about the second amendment, it is obvious that the easy availability of guns contributes to violent crime. The more guns there are in society, the more they will be used. Hunters, gun enthusiasts and those needing personal protection can be accommodated with minimal inconvenience while eliminating assault rifles and other such weapons whose primary purpose is to kill people.

Governments have a special responsibility to set good examples through their policies and actions. We, therefore, oppose the death penalty because executions are motivated more by vengeance than by justice. It has also been proven that executions are carried out in disproportionate numbers among minorities and the poor. More evidence is mounting that shows innocent people are being sentenced to death due to inadequate defense, false testimony from other criminals seeking reduction of their sentence, and over-zealous prosecution. Executing criminals has not proven to be an effective deterrent to crime, and it does not address the underlying causes of crime: lack of economic opportunity and education, drug use, child abuse, etc. In California, 125 organizations and religious groups have called for a moratorium on executions, as well as the U.N. High Commission on Human Rights. We recognize the need to protect society from violent criminals, but support a basic right to life and humane treatment. The lengthy appeals process is itself inhumane as well as costly. We also have a responsibility as a society to comply with international treaties regarding treatment of prisoners, both civilian and military. Yet we have a prison system that brutalizes prisoners, which hardens rather than rehabilitates them. And we have a system driven more by private profit than by penitence.

The role of violence in the media needs to be addressed because scientific studies have shown that an environment of unchallenged violence is conducive to the practice of violence. We need to reduce/take away the tools of violence and eliminate the glorification of violence.

Violent individuals need to be encouraged, counseled, and taught how to best cope with their angry feelings in a therapeutic environment. Mental health, medical and health care services need to be provided as needed. Attacks on the vulnerable, such as the elderly, need to be addressed through victim restitution. Addressing gang violence requires community-based programs and public education.

The Green Party proposes these actions to counter patterns of violence:

1. Expand mass media campaigns to educate the public on the presence and long-term damage of domestic violence. Provide early screening and prevention training for those families at high risk, and provide more intervention and treatment for both victims and perpetrators of domestic violence.
2. Register all legal firearms, especially handguns and other concealable weapons. Strengthen the ban on sales of automatic and semi-automatic weapons.
3. Teach nonviolence and peaceful conflict resolution at all school levels. Abolish corporal punishment in schools since to use it is to teach violence. Provide training in nonviolent parenting skills.
4. Provide adequate funding to remedy the conditions that spawn violent crime. Such funding is economically more effective than the cost of trials and prisons. [see [Criminal Justice](#) plank]
5. Develop police training and procedures that stress handling situations through mediation and negotiation, while minimizing the necessity for armed confrontations.
6. Support incarceration rather than executions, with the provision that dangerous criminals will not be released as long as they pose a threat to society or other individuals. We support the growing call for a moratorium on executions.
7. Control the disposition to violent behavior by taxing the sale of items that promote violence such as media that display content with gratuitous violence, the instruments of violence such as weapons, and products generally adjudged to evoke violence such as films that feature frequent beatings. The imposition of a large enough tax (for example 100% of cost) will deter violence. The generated funds should be used to aid the victims of violence. The Green Party, however, does not support any content-based tax on the sale of movie tickets, videos, television broadcasts, or other media for content protected by the First Amendment.
8. Curb the profit motive in businesses that market products that induce violence by making them not-for-profit and/or by taxing their products at a high rate, for example, 100%.
9. Advocate counseling/education programs/anger management/medical care/healthcare as appropriate in a therapeutic environment for victims of violence and for the perpetrators of violent acts according to their separate issues-- to include special communities like children, LGBTs, adolescents, men, women, seniors, ethnic minorities, the disabled, veterans, drug abusers/users, single parents, parents with jobs, the suicidal, and the homeless.
10. Promote less media glorification/sensationalism of violence
11. Address gang violence through community-based programs and public education

COMMITTEE DECISION: The Conservation of Health plank insertions were first conceived in the Green Issues working group at the 2003 San Francisco plenary and posted on the Women's Discussion Board in April 2004, and on the Platform listserv in May 2004. The June 25 2006 Ventura General Assembly directed that the Conservation of Health plank sections be added to the appropriate Platform planks. Versions of the revised Violence in Society platform plank were placed on the Platform Listserv on the following dates: 1, September 2, 2008; 2, September 16, 2008; 3, March 5, 2009; 4, March 6, 2009; 5, March 7, 2009; 6 March 7, 2009

TIMELINE: This revised platform plank needs to be approved at the first opportunity.

RESOURCES: This is a revision of the current GPCA Platform Plank.

## Platform (revised) – Water

---

[underline = new material relative to existing Platform; strike-out = deleted material relative to current platform]

### ONLY THE CHANGES WILL BE DISCUSSED

PRESENTERS/CONTACTS: Martin Zehr, m\_zehr@hotmail.com (PRESENTER); Shane Que Hee, squehee@ucla.edu

SUBJECT: Water in the Ecology & Earth Stewardship Section. Ecological Wisdom, Decentralization, Personal & Global Responsibility, and Sustainability are the involved 10 Key Values of the GP.

### BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Water is essential to all forms of life. ~~The many roles water performs in the natural world deserve our respect and attention.~~ Water is a basic human need and a requirement for all life. A clean, safe supply of drinking water is of paramount concern to every California resident. It is the responsibility of government to assure a clean, safe supply of drinking water to every California resident. Our existing surface and groundwater must be protected from pollution by agricultural and industrial wastes as well as runoff from our homes and roadways.

Cycles of intense drought and flooding ~~have demonstrated~~ the need to reorient our priorities in order to achieve a truly sustainable water policy. Over-development and poor planning have resulted in increasing rain-impermeable areas, which then compound the severity and frequency of flooding and pollution in regions downstream. We must ~~begin to~~ understand and apply a holistic “watershed approach” to managing our state's water resources. The principle of bioregionalism - living within the means of a region's natural resources - should give direction to future water policies. Current expenditures do not address regional depletions of groundwater, and they minimize the real costs of research and development to assure adequate supply. Regional water budgets for user water allocations and public welfare statements that define regional water use priorities need to be accountable to the public.

Conservation (reduce, reuse, recycle) must be an essential part of any water policy. Water conservation also reduces energy consumption and pollution. Attention to climate change requires conservation/recycling/management strategies. Pricing mechanisms that encourage conservation and re-use must be developed to establish consistency and fairness to all users. Bloc pricing can provide a means of increasing costs to larger users. This, in turn, creates new funds for research and development to decrease demand or increase supply of adequate water.

~~MTBE (methyl tertiary butyl ether) is a gasoline additive used to lower auto tailpipe emissions. It has leaked from underground tanks and has polluted drinking water supplies. As of 2001, about 1200 tank sites leaking MTBE lie within 1000 feet of California supply wells or on vulnerable drinking water aquifers serving millions of people.~~

### PROPOSAL:

~~To conserve water,~~ ~~†~~The Green Party proposes ~~to~~:

#### For Water Conservation/Pollution---To:

1. Mandate water efficient appliances and fixtures be used in all new construction, ~~and~~ as well as to promote retrofitting of older buildings.
2. Promote native landscaping and other drought resistant/climate-appropriate plants, ~~in order to~~ reduce the need for irrigation. ~~Where irrigation is necessary, promote drip irrigation systems.~~
3. Promote drip irrigation systems, laser leveling, infiltration in recharge zones, and other steps to improve water use efficiency and recharge of aquifers.

4. Eliminate storm water pollution of our water resources through education of our citizens, enforcement of our laws, and holistic watershed management. Promote storm water technologies that detain, treat, filtrate, and use storm waters near ~~where it is collected~~ collection points.
5. Promote the appropriate reuse of the “gray” and “black” waters we produce. Use separation techniques, such as dual piping systems where pure water is used for drinking and washing, and reclaimed water is used for lawn watering and similar purposes.
6. Mandate pre-treatment of industrial wastes to eliminate the presence of metals, solvents, and other toxins in sewer water. This ~~will would~~ reduce the cost of municipal treatment and encourage wastewater reuse.
7. Promote passive and natural systems (such as wetlands) for water and wastewater treatment where appropriate.
8. Eliminate water subsidies for corporate agribusiness. Higher water prices give agribusiness incentives to conserve.
9. Assist community organizations to monitor the use of local resources, ~~and~~ as well as to oversee the enforcement of water quality regulations.
10. Preserve and restore ~~the nation's~~ natural water features (~~California's~~ streams, rivers, lakes, bays, wetlands, the ocean, and groundwater aquifers) that ~~which~~ are vital to achieving sustainable use of water resources.

~~Immediately ban the use of MTBE. Use ethanol which is produced from corn.~~

11. Support eliminating pollution of groundwater from leaking underground and above-ground storage tanks and regulating water pollution from septic tanks.
12. Prevent future ~~such~~ sources of pollution of water and the other compartments of the environment (See the Transportation plank to reduce gasoline use)
13. Support the use of desalination technology to recycle wastewater.
14. Support protection of California's Marine Protected Areas and endangered species.
15. Support mandatory conservation requirements in urban and rural areas to assure aquifer stability and to end aquifer depletions that are faster than their recharge.
16. Encourage the maintenance of existing wetlands
17. Prevent the introduction of radionuclides, pharmaceuticals, toxic metals, toxic organics, endocrine disrupters, and perchlorate into surface and ground water via source and government control and monitoring.
- 18 Increase the utilization of best available technology to treat polluted water
19. Enforce regulations against dumping of pollutants and develop local wetlands for water purification through regional Water Quality Control Boards.

#### **Water Management/Policy--To:**

20. Develop regional water plans that assure public input into the state water plan that in turn must be based on sound science and on priorities that are in the public interest.
21. Oppose private water banking because profit making subverts consistent planning for the public interest
22. Support upgrade of the water infrastructure including levees, implementation of water quality standards for pharmaceuticals, and improving/increasing water quality. Currently, California spends just 2.5 percent of the gross state product on water infrastructure, compared with 20 percent in 1960.
23. Support policies to implement the Marine Life Protection Act, as well as to end dumping of sewage and pollutants into the ocean.

24. Require governments and councils to document water supplies to last 50-100 years before any development is considered.

25. Implement strong laws to promote conservation, reclaim polluted water systems, develop water-supply restrictions, ban toxic and pesticide dumping, control or ban corporate farming, and bring the rule of law to trans-state and trans-national operations that pollute water systems. 26. Encourage local municipal support to transition local economies away from high-tech industry, confined animal feeding operations, military bases, and national laboratories that withdraw disproportionate amounts of water and pollute public waterways.

27. Support state legislation that establishes/enforces standards beyond the Clean Water Act regarding the impacts of mining, quarrying and tunneling industry operations.

28. Use an ecosystems/watershed approach to ensure sustainable water use. All stakeholders need to participate in the planning. Environmental justice, ecological impact, and depletion of groundwater supplies need to be integrated with the ongoing process for approval of new withdrawals.

29. Achieve a truly sustainable water policy in the light of climate change considering, for example, snow packs, aquifer recharge, and available water supplies.

30. Address the special needs of senior and child/infant water users, including price reductions and providing high quality water.

31. Oppose the disproportional political influences of the mining, timber, real estate and development industries, while working to support family farms, open space, the protection of water quality in our rivers, conservation of watersheds, and the sustainable use and preservation of healthy forests.

32. Integrate land use with water use for urban planning decisions. Political bodies, such as municipal water authorities, need to be more inclusive in the representation of users, hydrologists, environmental health professionals, and environmental advocates in the region and address the issues affecting the regional supply and demand of the resource, as well as water quality. Presently, the interests and concerns of real estate and development interests have a disproportionate voice in new allocations.

33. Reduce water allocations to energy producers by establishing viable systems for renewable energy production. Public policy for conservation should include whether or not to make conservation measures mandatory or voluntary and whether to implement pricing that is pro-rated based on amount of use.

34. Uphold the water and land rights established under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and the sovereign claims of Native American bands, tribes, rancherias, reservations, Mission Indians, and non-federally recognized bands and tribes.

COMMITTEE DECISION: Versions were placed on the Platform list serve or discussed as appropriate on the following dates: 1. April 11, 2008; 2. May 11, 2008; 3. June 13, 2008; 4. August 31, 2008; 5. December 28, 2008; 6. February 21, 2009; 7. February 22, 2009; 8. March 5, 2009; 9. March 7, 2009

TIMELINE: This is the second General Assembly consideration of the platform plank.

RESOURCES: This is a revision of the current Water GPCA platform plank and a revision of the proposal submitted at the Dana Point Plenary.

## **Recommendation – Restructuring Proposals**

---

The following pages contain three proposals advocating different ideas for restructuring parts of the GPCA to resolve certain problems.

Barry Hermanson, San Francisco rep on the Coordinating Committee, proposed to the CC that a recommendation be made to the General Assembly on an approach to deliberating these proposals. The concern was that county delegates to the GA may not have sufficient familiarity with these complex topics to be able to render a fair decision without extensive presentations and historical context.

The discussion resulted in a recommendation that the CC should appoint a committee within 60 days of the GA that includes all interested parties. This committee will develop a recommendation on a course of action for the next General Assembly.

## Proposal - Bylaws Restructuring #1

---

SPONSOR: Bylaws Standing Committee

ENDORSEES: Green Party of Alameda County, Green Party of Los Angeles County

PRESENTERS/CONTACTS: Greg Jan, Oakland, gregjan4@yahoo.com 510-444-7336; Mike Feinstein, Santa Monica, mfeinstein@feinstein.org, 310-392-8450; Ross Frankel, Lawndale rdfrankel@earthlink.net 310-387-6613

SUBJECT: On-line Voting in between General Assemblies and at-large on-line, elections for Coordinating Committee and other GPCA officers

### BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

A key problem plaguing our state Green Party for years has been the internal disputes over elections to, and membership on our state Coordinating Committee (GPCA-CC). This has led to greatly reduced effectiveness of the GPCA-CC and wasted enormous time of key party activists fighting over the disputes.

Separately, there has been a growing recognition of the need to make decisions in between General Assemblies, including because of the limited time available at General Assemblies and the limited delegate attendance owing to scheduling, geography and cost.

This proposal addresses both issues, by amending GPCA Bylaws to allow for on-line voting in between General Assemblies and eliminating the problematic and artificial CC "regions" by shifting to at-large, proportional, on-line elections for the GPCA-CC and other party officers. To read an introduction to the specifics of the proposal, please see the "Explanation of Basic Changes and 'Ten Reasons to Approve These Bylaws Changes'" section starting on the next page (pages 2-11 of this section), or at this link:

[http://www.cagreens.org/lacounty/2009-03/gpca\\_bylaw\\_change\\_explain.doc](http://www.cagreens.org/lacounty/2009-03/gpca_bylaw_change_explain.doc)

This draft is meant as a point of departure for discussion by your county Green organization. Suggested further amendments are welcomed by the co-sponsors. A web site has been set up for counties to follow suggested changes in the text between now and the May General Assembly:

[http://lac-wiki.greens.org/index.php/Main\\_Page](http://lac-wiki.greens.org/index.php/Main_Page)

Also, there will need to be a transition plan on how these changes will be implemented, once this bylaw amendment is approved. That plan is currently under development and will also be available before the May plenary for your inspection.

We strongly believe that now is the time for us to come together and make the major internal reforms we need, in order to turn our party around, at this very critical time. Therefore, we want to hear from you very soon, so we can discuss how to move forward with this proposal -- well before the May 16 plenary meeting in Venice!

### PROPOSAL:

That the GPCA Bylaws are amended to appear as it does on this link and on pages 12-45 of this section:

[http://www.cagreens.org/lacounty/2009-03/gpca\\_bylaw\\_change.doc](http://www.cagreens.org/lacounty/2009-03/gpca_bylaw_change.doc)

See also this version with strikeout text showing changes

[http://www.cagreens.org/lacounty/2009-02/gpca\\_bylaw\\_changes.pdf](http://www.cagreens.org/lacounty/2009-02/gpca_bylaw_changes.pdf)

## TIME LINE:

Development of on-line voting software during the spring, summer of 2009. First Coordinating Committee elections held in September 2009. Sub-Committee appointed by Coordinating Committee to evaluate process, bring back recommendations in two years on functioning of process.

## RESOURCES:

GPCA IT is already developing on-line voting software and would implement that side of this project. The Coordinating Committee's existing role in handling agenda items would be expanded to also coordinate agenda items for on-line voting.

## PROPOSAL:

On-line Voting in between General Assemblies and at-large on-line, elections for Coordinating Committee and other GPCA officers

### Primary Changes

1) Establishes on-line decision-making in between General Assemblies, utilizing a web-based, password protected voting page like that used for the same purpose by the GPUS.

Process is designed so that voting occurs on a clear schedule where any/all proposals under consideration are on the same discussion/voting timeline, to minimize confusion. Proposals have five-week discussion periods and one week for voting. There will be a limit of four proposals to be dealt with at any one time, and proposals shall be dealt with no more frequently than once every two months. Process also includes three different models by which counties can choose to cast their votes, so that there is no dispute over whether a county uses an acceptable model.

2) Elections for GPCA officers and representatives are elected on-line.

To increase participation and to provide a clear and undisputed process for all seats, elections for Coordinating Committee, GPUS Delegation, Treasurer and Liaison to the Secretary of State are all conducted on-line and they are elected by votes from the elected County Council members in each county.

To make this process transparent, as part of the Strategic Plan already mandated in the bylaws, the Coordinating Committee shall prepare and distribute to the active county organizations a schedule of all scheduled elections for Coordinating Committee, GPUS Delegation, Treasurer and Liaison to the Secretary of State in the ensuing year.

3) Entire Coordinating Committee is elected at-large with mandatory gender and geographical balance. Twelve seats are elected from the northern half of the state, twelve seats from the southern half; twelve seats are men, and twelve seats are women.

4) GPCA Decision-Making threshold is given a two-year test period at 2/3 instead of 4/5, with a vote to revisit this at the end of test period. This is done for two reasons. One is that this is the first time the GPCA will try to make on-line decisions and imposing 80% upon an on-line process might be extremely onerous. Second, if it makes sense to at least try 2/3 in the on-line process, we don't want different decision-making thresholds depending upon whether a decision is made in-person or on-line. Hence a trial period to see how 2/3 works for the GPCA. As part of this proposal, there will also be a committee assigned to track and analyze the performance of the on-line voting and make recommendations to the General Assembly on how to improve it.

### Secondary Changes

4) A new Removal for Cause Petition process was created to correspond to the fact that the Coordinating Committee would be elected in a new manner and this replaces the existing removal/recall section of the bylaws, which some Greens found to be a source for disputes.

5) Lowers the attendance quorum of the Coordinating Committee to a majority, while increasing the size of the body to 24

Having a 2/3-attendance quorum for the Coordinating Committee has made it difficult to reach quorum on many occasions, delaying or preventing business from getting done if/until quorum is reached. By lowering the quorum to a majority, this problem is reduced, but by doing it simultaneously with increasing the size of the Coordinating Committee and other changes, it increases the likelihood that there will be enough members in attendance to provide a wide-enough basis for decision making and enough members to take on work tasks as needed.

6) A standardized process across the state was created for Removal for Cause for County Councilmembers. The existing bylaws have a single sentence. That says any member of the county council may be removed if they “Violate the bylaws of the state plenary or county”. However, there is no process described here on how to do this. This potential arbitrariness is especially egregious since County Council elections are the primary connection between registered Green voters and how the GPCA is run and to remove from office people they’ve elected is a serious matter. The process parallels that established for Removal for Cause of Coordinating Committee members (see new 4-3.1(d) ).

7) Some small changes were made as a part of this process. The beginning of County Council terms was defined to be as starting when the results of the County Council election is legally certified. Currently there is no definition for the beginning of the County Council term and since the on-line voting depends upon this, a clear definition was needed, to eliminate the basis for disputes over who gets to vote..

For delegate selection to existing General Assemblies, the existing bylaws say that if a Region doesn’t select its own process for picking delegates, the County Council picks the delegates – but the bylaws are silent on how. A definition of how they would do this was added, that is based upon traditional GPCA use of IRV and Choice Voting.

Finally, the existing bylaw about counties submitting bylaws changes was clarified that the Bylaws Committee would play a consultative and advisory role to the sponsoring county and the General Assembly, but would not be a gatekeeper for whether a proposed bylaws revision would be forwarded to the Coordinating Committee for the agenda-setting process.

### Housekeeping Changes

1) In order to insert these rules changes, there was no easy way to just place them into the existing bylaws. That necessitated some reordering to start with.

Then in addition, the effectiveness of these changes rests upon the integrity of how clearly the voting membership and the manner in which proposals are processed is defined. As a result, sections relating to GPCA membership and county councils were amended and reordered for clarity.

In addition, some of the Coordinating Committee’s duties that are already in the bylaws, but not in the Coordinating Committee’s bylaw section, were added to it for completeness.

Finally, consistency in use of terms was added as part of these edits, as the present bylaws varies widely in how the same thing is described.

### Ten Reasons to Approve These Bylaws Changes

1) Allows GPCA to make decisions in between In Person General Assembly Meetings

California is a large state and the GPCA has a lot of business to do to become an effective political party in the state. The limited accessibility provided by in-person business meetings and limited amount of agenda time available at two to three General Assemblies a year has in practice meant that either a few agenda items can be addressed well, or many can be addressed poorly. Both scenarios have occurred and limited the GPCA’s development.

An on-line statewide voting process that expands upon what the GPCA has already been using for years for County Polling on statewide propositions can help to address this situation in the following ways. First, it can provide an extended on-line period for discussion and amendment of proposals over several weeks, providing more time than is currently available today. Second, it can remove items from the in-person meetings that can easily be done on-line, like elections, and free up that time for items that are best handled at in-person meetings.

The GPUS has been doing business on-line in this manner for years through the use of an on-line voting page software program. An updated version of that program is being installed currently by GPCA IT on the cagreens.org server and can be used by the GPCA for this purpose. This program includes software that runs Choice Voting and Instant Run-Off Voting elections, as mandated by GPCA bylaws.

## 2) Provides for Much Greater Proportional Representation on the Coordinating Committee

The GPCA's current system for the Coordinating Committee has 16 out of 20 seats elected regionally, all in single-seat IRV elections, and four elected at-large, in two separate Choice Voting elections.

When the Coordinating Committee was first created in August 1990, this ratio was 14 regionally-elected and six at-large, but this was changed in 2000. This means the current system has extremely minimal proportionality. The two, two-seat Choice Voting elections are themselves only minimally proportional and they are the only multi-seat elections out of the entire 20 seats elected in total.

For the other 16 seats, they are all picked in single-seat, winner-take-all elections - and other than those picked from the San Francisco and Los Angeles regions, all the others are picked from artificially-created, multi-county regions in which it's cumbersome even to find a way to meet and make a decision in the first place (and in which often the largest county within the region can dominate anyway, making them less 'elections' and more 'anointments'.

An on-line, statewide at-large election process would vastly improve this by making all the Coordinating Committee elected proportionally by Choice Voting.

Part of the way that this would be enabled would be by increasing the number of Coordinating Committee members from 20 to 24. This would promote more proportionality while also simultaneously addressing other party goals of gender balance and geographic diversity.

The proposed process would accomplish these goals through holding two simultaneous elections each year, with six men elected in one election and six women elected in another. In one year the men would be elected from the North Region and the women from the South Region and the other year, the women would be elected from the North Region and the men from the South Region.

## 3) Eliminates disputes over Coordinating Committee elections, enabling the Coordinating Committee to do its job and removing basis for internal conflicts

There have been numerous disputes over Coordinating Committee membership in the last several years. These have cost the GPCA dearly in terms of time and energy of some of its most committed activists. The party as a whole has been the loser, because its chief administrative committee has been rendered far less effective than it could have been and activist energy that could have been spent on growing the party has been spent on internal squabbles instead.

The shift to on-line, at-large Coordinating Committee elections would solve this problem by providing a clear and undisputed process for electing Coordinating Committee members.

There are three main structural problems with the current system. One is that there can be disagreement over the validity over a region's Coordinating Committee election process itself. A second another is over who can rightfully vote within that process and hence the validity of the reported results. And a third is that there is disagreement over whom in the party can adjudicate disagreements on points #1 and #2.

Going to an on-line, statewide at-large election process would eliminate all three of these problems.

First, there would be a single clear process for the entire state that would be written into GPCA bylaws. That process would be an on-line vote by the counties that would be conducted openly on a GPCA on-line voting page, utilizing the same on-line voting software, as does the GPUS.

Second, that process would provide a clear basis of who gets to vote. That would be those Greens who have won County Council elections. Since those elections are run by the state of California through the County Registrars and the results are certified by law that eliminates disagreement over who gets to vote.

#### 4) Ensures Gender Balance

Although gender balance has always been a key guiding principle of the Green Party in California and all over the world, the record of gender balance on the Coordinating Committee under the current system is extremely poor. Only three of the 16 regionally-elected seats are held by women and even when there have been more in previous years, it has only been a few more.

GPCA Bylaw state that “Regions with two or more seats are encouraged to strive for gender balance”, but only one of the three multi-seat regions (Los Angeles) even has a bylaw mandating gender balance and the Central Region which has three seats has sent three men now for several years. Of the eight seats elected in single-seat regions, a woman currently holds only one of them.

Also, the internal fighting over Coordinating Committee membership has been cited often by leading women in the party as a reason why they don’t want to serve on the Coordinating Committee.

The on-line at-large election process solves these problems because there is a gender-balance mandate for the seats. Of the 24 seats on the Coordinating Committee, 12 would be reserved for women and 12 for men. Not only would this address the formal balance between men and women, but by removing the basis for disputing Coordinating Committee elections and hence a major locus of internal conflict, this approach also would make the Coordinating Committee a more desirable place to serve for women in the party.

#### 5) Ensures Geographic Diversity

As mentioned earlier, when the Coordinating Committee was created, 14 seats were to come from geographic regions and 6 at-large. The geographic seats were created – not as some think today, to be ‘regional reps’ for a region the way a GA delegate might be ‘representative of a county’, but rather to ensure that the Coordinating Committee had people on it that were literally familiar with different parts of the state. (This was especially because many in the Green movement in California (and the United States) at that time also had roots in the bio-regional movement.)

However unlike today, those geographic-based seats (from the regions) were originally elected by the General Assembly. However in practice, it was found that most Greens from around the state didn’t know many of the people running for the Coordinating Committee from within various regions, especially because the party was in its first year or so and many people hadn’t met each other yet. That made the GA decision-making process relatively uninformed, and ended up promoting “he said, she said” dynamics about people many others didn’t know.

It was for that reason, that the practice was changed from electing regionally-based seats by the General Assembly to electing them by regions. In other words, at-large members were always from regions, but were not always elected by regions.

The shift to on-line, at-large Coordinating Committee elections promotes geographical diversity in two ways. One, it has half the seats elected from a North Region and half from a South Region. Two, it increase the number of seats and uses proportional representation within each region, ensuring a distribution within the region. Enlarging the size of the Coordinating Committee to 24 seats increases this distribution.

#### 6) Provides clear beginning and ending times for Coordinating Committee terms, removing basis for internal conflicts

Although GPCA bylaws aim for two-year terms for Coordinating Committee members, they handle at-large and regionally-elected members differently, resulting in terms of greatly different lengths, which not only contradicts

the goal of two-year term lengths, but also incentivizes the kind of internal conflict over Coordinating Committee membership.

GPCA bylaws governing the four at-large Coordinating Committee members elected by the General Assembly specify that their terms end with the first General Assembly of the calendar year. This results in terms that roughly approximate 24 months, sometimes varying by a month or two, but rarely more than that.

By contrast, GPCA bylaws governing the 16 regionally-elected Coordinating Committee members allow sitting members to remain in office for an unlimited time period, if a new election hasn't been held to replace them.

This has resulted in numerous members staying not simply numerous months past the end of their terms, but even in one case a member stayed three years after his term was over. Having clear beginning and ending terms for democratically elected representatives is one of the most basic tenets of democracy. Yet the GPCA bylaws allowance for open-ended terms contradicts this.

There are two reasons for this. One is that the cumbersome, artificially-created regional structure makes it challenging in some parts of the state simply to hold a new election in the first place.

But even more problematic is that the ability to stay beyond the end of a term also inherently provides an incentive to not hold new elections, or to attempt to disqualify the results of new elections, in order to leave people on the Coordinating Committee that some individuals favor. Internalizing such an unproductive incentive in party rules is not desirable.

Going to an on-line, statewide at-large election process would eliminate all of these problems by providing clear beginning and ending times for Coordinating Committee members and easy-to-use on-line election process to conduct new elections.

7) Ensures staggered terms for Coordinating Committee members that correspond to internal party timelines

Staggered terms for Coordinating Committee members has always been a GPCA goal, since the Coordinating Committee was first created in August 1990. The idea behind staggered terms is to combine institutional memory, which would be lost if all seats were up for election at the same time, with incorporating new membership, at the same time.

Between 1990 and 2000, Coordinating Committee terms were set at 18 months. But when the first set of Coordinating Committee members were elected, some were elected for 18 months, some for 16, some for 14 and some for 12 months, so that the terms would become staggered after that point.

This new plan also provides for staggered terms and connects them to specific internal party timelines. The first timeline corresponds to the election of new County Councils at the Direct Primary election. Since it will be elected County Councilmembers who vote for the party's internal officers and representatives (including the Coordinating Committee), the first set of Coordinating Committee elections (held in even-numbered years) is set to occur four months after the new County Councils are elected. This would give time for the new County Councilmembers to meet and settle in, but also follow soon on the heels of the Direct Primary in order to reflect the will of those elections.

The second set of elections, held in odd-numbered years, would correspond to the beginning of the new GPCA fiscal year, with elections scheduled to conclude in time for newly-elected Coordinating Committee members to assume office along with the beginning of the new GPCA fiscal year.

8) Establishes a clear process for Removal for Cause of Coordinating Committee members, removing basis for internal conflicts

The current GPCA bylaw that provides for recall and removal for cause (Section 6-3) has been yet another source of internal conflict, with significant dispute over how it should be interpreted and implemented, leading to yet another level of internal struggle over Coordinating Committee membership.

Section 6-3's primary author, Beth Moore (Nevada County), has stated that 6-3 was written in reaction to a couple of specific incidents to deal with narrow circumstances and believed that the authors failed to anticipate the manner in which it could be used and believes it is unworkable as written and asked that it be revisited.

The on-line, statewide at-large election process bylaw change successfully addresses this by providing a clear, simple Removal for Cause Petition process that would be similar to the process that the GPUS has to recall its Steering Committee members.

A Removal for Cause Petition would require support from a number of counties representing a proportion of General Assembly to call for removal, based upon reasons stated in writing. If there were sufficient support, it would be forwarded for to the General Assembly for a discussion and vote. The 2/3 threshold to remove from office would be retained.

9) Ensures a consistent electoral system for all elections

The current system has 12 different ways of electing 20 people – 11 different regional processes and then the at-large process at the General Assembly. "The only reason for maintaining all of these different procedures is because the GPCA delegated the voting process from the General Assembly to the artificially-created geographic regions. By changing to an on-line, at-large voting process, the need for these different processes is eliminated and all seats can now be elected subject to the same rules, the same electorate and the same approval threshold.

10) Ensures that Party Officers and Representatives are elected by all active counties, rather than only by those who are able to attend a particular meeting, promoting internal democracy and equity

The current system of holding elections for party officers and representatives at General Assemblies results in a widely different electorate, both in the number of voters and where they come from, depending upon when and where state meetings are held. Factors of cost and timing affect who can attend and vote, meaning that major elements of party's basis for choosing its own internal officers and representatives are uncertain and arbitrary

Going to an on-line, statewide at-large election process would eliminate this problem by allowing all eligible voters to participate in elections for the GPCA's internal party officers and representatives (i.e. the Coordinating Committee, GPUS Delegation, Treasurer and Liaison to the Secretary of State.)

**PROPOSAL:** On-line Voting in between General Assemblies and at-large on-line, elections for Coordinating Committee and other GPCA officers

## Proposal - Bylaws Restructuring #2

---

SPONSOR: Bylaws Committee

PRESENTER/CONTACT: Larry Mullen, (559) 227-0293, larry\_mullen@sbcglobal.net

SUBJECT: Coordinating Committee Restructuring Proposal

### BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

This proposal offers a more representative sample of Green Party members to participate in the administration of the Green Party. Its purpose is to increase the efficiency of the CC and be more representative of the grassroots membership. The objective is to retain "regional/geographic" representation and increase at-large and apply ranked choice voting. The other purpose is to provide enough people-power to accomplish the work of the CC.

This proposal respects the intent of STV and IRV voting and grassroots porportional representation as intended in Green Values.

### PROPOSAL:

The Members of the Green Party will be represented by a twenty-three (23) member Coordinating Committee. The CC will be comprised of eleven (11) regional reps and twelve (12) at-large reps. Reps will be selected in two ways.

#### ***Regional Reps***

To ensure that regional and geographic representation occurs, each of the eleven regions will select one (1) representative, which should have an alternate. Regional reps will be selected following the primary in which new county councils are elected [unless an alternative plan is filed with the CC] and may be replaced whenever needed. Instant Runoff Voting will be used with NOC on the ballot.

#### Recall And Implied Resignation

Regional reps will be subject to the same recall and implied resignation rules as currently exist. When the rep and the alt rep will both miss a meeting they will notify the region and the CC list prior to the meeting of the reason for the absence or be noted in the minutes of the CC meeting as breaking quorum. Breaking quorum twice during a two-year term will be considered resignation from the CC.

#### Quorum

Because regional reps may have alts there will be no reduction in the number needed for quorum due to the absence of a regional rep or the regional rep alt.

#### ***At-Large Reps***

There will be twelve (12) at-large reps., which will be selected by STV.

They will serve two-year terms. Initially half will be elected to staggered terms after the plenary when the budget is passed. Each nominee must post a biography on line. Nominees will be given plenary time to give brief campaign statements. They may have table space at the plenary for literature. Voting will be by plenary delegates in an on line vote the week following the plenary. Delegates may vote for nominees without being at the plenary.

### Recall And Implied Resignation

At-large reps may be recalled by the GA at a plenary or by an online vote. Charges of recall must be brought through the CC as a CC sponsored proposal. At the meeting following the proposal of charges delegates will vote on line as per the election process. A vote taken on line will follow the CC rules for online posting, commenting, and voting. The seat will be vacated until the next plenary for electing at-large reps and the number needed for quorum will be reduced by one (1) for each recalled seat.

At-large reps are subject to the current rules for implied resignation as currently exists in the bylaws.

### Quorum

At-large reps must notify the CC list and the regional list that they will be missing a meeting and state the reason for the absence. After properly notifying the region and the CC of the impending absence, the membership number quorum for that meeting will be reduced by one (1).

The CC must have a 2/3rds of membership for opening quorum and may not fall below half of the membership for continuing quorum.

### TIME LINE:

Discussion at bylaws-assign bylaw numbers, comments, etc.

CC discussion/decision at appropriate monthly meeting.

Discussion at CC/Coco retreat in January/February.

Placed on agenda of April plenary for discussion.

Placed on August plenary for decision.

At-large reps take office one month after selected. Regional reps will be replaced by caucuses at the plenary or regional elections prior to the August plenary.

### RESOURCES:

Bylaws Committee will number and prepare the proposal consistent with bylaw format and language.

CC meeting time to accept the proposal.

Retreat time of CC/Coco and other interested Greens.

Agenda team to prepare agenda.

IT to figure out an on-line voting system akin to GPUS or other that works.

Hours of work – many.

Costs – personal to members for travel and meals.

## Proposal - Bylaws Restructuring #3

---

SPONSOR: Bylaws Standing Committee

PRESENTER/CONTACT: Jim Stauffer, jims@greens.org, 408-432-9148

SUBJECT: This proposal seeks to restructure the LA Region into autonomous Locals to comply with GPCA bylaw requirements for county organizations.

### BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

If a single, core problem can be identified as the cause of all the Los Angeles issues that have beleaguered the GPCA, it is LA's centralized structure that results in unitary control of the entire region and on-going power struggles over who controls the region's sole decision body. The centralized control of this region by one group has been the source of major conflicts that have spilled over to the Coordinating Committee (CC) and into General Assemblies (GA) for years.

LA is the largest region within the GPCA structure with about 20% of registered Greens in the state. Accordingly, LA has 20% of the GA delegates and 15% of CC seats. LA exists as a single-county region. But LA must be considered as a region not as a county in regards to CC reps and GA delegates. LA is too large and diverse in geography and population to function as a single county. This is why it was designated as a region.

However, LA's internal structure resembles that of a small, rural county rather than the largest metropolitan region in the state. All decision authority in the LA region resides with the County Council. This is the equivalent of taking any other region, disbanding all of the county councils and creating one regional council that makes decisions for all counties.

CC Rep elections in LA have generated complaints from LA Greens for years. CC reps are elected by the LA council with no grassroots participation. The council uses a distorted application of IRV for the election. The process can be described as serial IRV elections with quotas. The ultimate affect is a simple-majority, winner-take-all election that represents the will of one group while denying representation to any other group. LA was warned about this being incongruent with GPCA philosophy and bylaws as early as 2002 (Bill Peitz, ERWG coco), and repeatedly since then.

The LA council also selects all of the GA delegates and mandates their votes, again with no grassroots participation.

The result of all this centralized control is that one group has always dominated LA to the exclusion of all others. As with any centralized, winner-take-all organization, LA has been wrought with power struggles over who gets to control the one decision body in the region. This is the living example of why Green philosophy espouses decentralization.

A similar proposal to this was scheduled for the May 2005 GA but agenda problems prevented it from coming to a decision. That proposal and background info can still be viewed at [www.cagreens.org/bylaws/la/](http://www.cagreens.org/bylaws/la/). (The GPCA common password is required.)

### PROPOSAL:

Restructure the LA region into autonomous Local Districts with similar authorities and responsibilities of a recognized GPCA County Organization. Each Local has a district council, makes its own decisions, selects GA delegates, and participates with the other LA Locals in CC rep elections. The LA County Council becomes a coordinating body with little or no decision authority.

The rationale for this action is as follows:

- Section 3-2.2 of GPCA bylaws require county organizations to have bylaws "consistent with the ten key values, [and] GPCA bylaws...";
- Section 7-1.7 of GPCA bylaws require STV (proportional representation) elections for at-large CC members;
- The Ten Key Values include Grassroots Democracy and Decentralization;
- The GPCA platform promotes the use of proportional representation;
- LA does not comply with any of these requirements, which has caused significant disruption and degradation of the GPCA, and has repressed the development of Locals within LA;

Therefore, LA does not qualify to be recognized as a county organization of the GPCA until it is reorganized into a decentralized, Green structure.

A framework for reorganizing LA follows below. However, this is offered only as a model, not as a definitive action plan. See the Resources section below.

COMMITTEE DECISION:

TIME LINE:

A target timeline would be six months.

RESOURCES:

LA Greens will have to participate in significant numbers.

GPCA Bylaws SC will have to help with bylaws development.

The Liaison to the Secretary of State should monitor the process.

The CC and any other interested Greens should assist in this project.

***Reorganization Framework Example***

**1 Formation of Districts**

- 1.1 Regional districts shall be formed within LA county defined by an existing political boundary (e.g. Assembly districts, Supervisor districts, etc). The finest granularity for defining boundaries would be the precinct level. The restriction is that we must be able to ascertain the number of registered Greens within the boundary using data from county or state elections offices.
- 1.2 Districts do not have to be the same size in terms of Green registration. However, limiting the size differences to no greater than 50% will prevent a large district from dominating region-wide decisions.
- 1.3 Districts should be formed based on existing active locals or Green groups, and with anticipation for future growth.

## **2 Autonomy and Authority of Districts**

- 2.1 Each district shall be individually recognized by the GPCA as a county chapter of the GPCA, equivalent to how counties are recognized.
- 2.2 Each district shall create bylaws IAW GPCA bylaws 3-2.2.
- 2.3 Each district shall have its own District Council, recognized as equivalent to a County Council.
  - 2.3.1 The size of council shall be IAW GPCA bylaws 4-1.3.
  - 2.3.2 The council members shall consist of the district representatives to the LA County Council plus additional members elected IAW the district bylaws.
- 2.4 Each district shall be allocated delegates to the GA in the proportion defined in GPCA bylaws 4-2.2.

## **3 Authority of LA County Council**

- 3.1 The purpose of the LA County Council will be to facilitate communication between districts, coordinate county-wide decisions and actions, conduct CC Regional Rep elections, and maintain the county district structure (reapportions, new districts, etc.).
- 3.2 An appropriate size for the County Council has to be determined IAW GPCA bylaws 4-1.3.
  - 3.2.1 The election or appointment of a member to the County Council shall also constitute the appointment of that member to his/her District Council.
  - 3.2.2 At least one District Council member from each district shall attend each County Council meeting.
- 3.3 The three CC Regional Reps can be elected by a district model or at-large.
  - 3.3.1 District model – The regional districts can combine themselves into three groups and elect one CC rep each. In this model, each district is required to approve the CC Rep candidate. There will not be proportional voting.
  - 3.3.2 At-large model – All CC Rep candidates run at-large across the county. Each district is allotted votes in proportion of their Green registration to the county total.
- 3.4 The districts will have to coordinate on any county-wide decisions. Each district shall have a vote in proportion of their Green registration to the county total.

# Announcement – Password Change

---

## THE COMMON PASSWORD FOR [www.cagreens.org](http://www.cagreens.org) IS CHANGING

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

### Why We Need a Password

We implemented password protected pages for several reasons:

- To keep search engines from finding our internal business. There is internal business that should not be publicly accessible, such as our electoral strategies, candid statements in committee meeting minutes, and draft documents (those not yet approved) circulating in the public domain.
- We want the public to find those pages that contain the information that the public is looking for. This is best served by the navigational links on our front page, not sifting through drafts and notes on internal pages.

### Password Change Policy

The current user ID is `gpca` and the password is `16greatyears`. This relates to achieving ballot status in 1992, 16 years from 2008.

The common password will change within a week after the first General Assembly of each year. For 2009, this will be the Venice, LA meeting in May.

---

The new password will be: `17greatyears`

The user ID will remain the same: `gpca`

---

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

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

### Access and Security

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

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

PLEASE follow these basic security guidelines:

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

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

For the IT Group  
Jim Stauffer

PLEASE ENSURE YOUR COUNTY COUNCIL  
HAS A COPY OF THIS ANNOUNCEMENT

## GA Delegate Allocation

County	Greens	%	Delegates		Change from GA August 08	% Change in Voter Registration	Registration GA August 08	Delegates	% CA Registered Greens
Alameda	10117	9.41%	9			-8.06%	11004	9	9.68%
Butte	1629	1.51%	2			-5.67%	1727	2	1.52%
Calaveras	284	0.26%	1			-3.07%	293	1	0.26%
Contra Costa	3429	3.19%	3			-4.96%	3608	3	3.17%
El Dorado	895	0.83%	1			-4.48%	937	1	0.82%
Fresno	1555	1.45%	1			-0.13%	1557	1	1.37%
Humboldt	3069	2.85%	3			-4.60%	3217	3	2.83%
Kern	702	0.65%	1			1.89%	689	1	0.61%
Los Angeles	22129	20.57%	19		lost 1	-4.98%	23290	20	20.48%
Marin	2226	2.07%	2			-9.33%	2455	2	2.16%
Mendocino	1978	1.84%	2			-2.03%	2019	2	1.78%
Monterey	1094	1.02%	1			-0.64%	1101	1	0.97%
Napa	785	0.73%	1			-5.99%	835	1	0.73%
Nevada	1188	1.10%	1			0.42%	1183	1	1.04%
Orange	7366	6.85%	7			-5.93%	7830	7	6.89%
Placer	1229	1.14%	1			-2.77%	1264	1	1.11%
Riverside	2642	2.46%	2			3.69%	2548	2	2.24%
Sacramento	4581	4.26%	4			-3.94%	4769	4	4.19%
San Benito	115	0.11%	1			-11.54%	130	1	0.11%
San Diego	7399	6.88%	7		added 1	-4.34%	7735	6	6.80%
San Francisco	9182	8.54%	8			-7.85%	9964	8	8.76%
San Luis Obispo	1520	1.41%	1			-5.77%	1613	1	1.42%
San Mateo	2785	2.59%	3			-14.12%	3243	3	2.85%
Santa Barbara	1703	1.58%	2			-11.02%	1914	2	1.68%
Santa Clara	4652	4.33%	4			0.89%	4611	4	4.06%
Santa Cruz	3232	3.00%	3			-10.35%	3605	3	3.17%
Shasta	491	0.46%	1			1.24%	485	1	0.43%
Solano	774	0.72%	1			-0.26%	776	1	0.68%
Sonoma	4824	4.48%	4			-3.75%	5012	4	4.41%
Tulare	464	0.43%	1			-3.53%	481	1	0.42%
Ventura	2365	2.20%	2			-6.60%	2532	2	2.23%
Yolo	1156	1.07%	1			-9.69%	1280	1	1.13%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>107560</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100</b>			<b>-10.05%</b>	<b>119579</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

CA SoS Report of Registration March 20 , 2009

CA SoS Report of Registration May 19, 2008

<end>