

GREEN PARTY OF CALIFORNIA

Plenary Meeting
September 22 – 23, 2001

Minutes

*Hosted by: The Green Party of San Mateo County
Location: Burlingame High School, Burlingame*

Saturday, September 22, 2001

New Delegate Orientation and Q&A [8:30AM -- 9:00AM]

Jo Chamberlain opened by giving an overview of the organizational structure of the Green Party.

Mike Borenstein discussed the consensus process and his rules of thumb for consensus decision making. Process Guidelines were passed out describing how proposals are discussed and how we test for consensus.

Saturday Opening Ceremony [9:00 AM -- 9:05 AM]

Jo Chamberlain called Josh, Gloria, Pat, Tom, Carol, and Patch onto the stage, warning the audience that the opening ceremony would be fairly emotional.

Jo spoke briefly about Seattle 2000: 100,000 people, including Greens, closed down the WTO summit.

Josh spoke of David Brower who died on Nov 5th, 2000. Josh read a quote from Brower.

Patch read a quote from Rachel Carson who died in 1964.

Carol read a quote by Cesar Chavez who died in 1993.

Jeff read a quote by Mimi Farina.

Pat read a quote by Ken Saro Wiwa who was killed in 1995.

Gloria read a quote by Steve Biko who was killed in 1977.

Tom read a statement expressing sorrow for those who died in the September 11th terrorist attacks but also made a statement of concern regarding the war-like direction in which our nation is heading.

A moment of silence was observed.

Housekeeping [9:05 AM -- 9:20 AM]

Facilitators: Beth Moore-Haines & Mike Wyman.

Time-keeper was selected: Thomas

Vibes watchers were selected: Michelle and Lerner Goude.

Note-taker: Robin Oetinger

Delegates were informed that they need their green delegate cards; also that they may not remove the cards from the room.

It was announced that the car rally would be held at noon.

Musical instruments would be welcome at the break time.

Following a big mailing to Sacramento and Sierra Counties, there was leftover literature on the floor in front of the stage and someone from those counties should take the material.

There were envelopes up front and people were encouraged to become sustainers; there are now almost 100 sustainers.

There are green postcards to send to Governor Davis saying we want alternative energy, not nuclear.

Green Pages were available for free.

Minutes from the last plenary could not be approved due to _____

It was established that we have a quorum.

Report from Reappointment Ad-hoc Working Group [9:20 AM – 10:00 AM]

Presenters: Jonathan Lundel, Jo Chamberlain, Rick _____

This was not a decision item, just for informational purposes regarding the work that has been done trying to correct some errors in the method of choosing CC seats. There will be a proposal on the agenda at the January Plenary. There was a large poster out in the tabling area on this issue. There is also a link to more information on

the website.

Jo put up a series of overhead sheets that showed maps of California and possible arrangements of Green districts.

A decision was made to stay with 20 reps. With more than that, communication begins to break down. There was also a proposal for 24 reps but not more than that.

Currently there are 10 regions, with 14 regional seats, and 6 at-large reps. With this arrangement there's been a disproportionately large group in the center of the state.

some of the proposed options were:

- 3 regions
- 6 regions with 24 reps
- 11 regions (adjusted for number of registered greens using the 10-region model)

Jonathan: we're proposing that reps be elected within regions, not statewide. The current formula for the CC says that we have 6 at-large seats statewide and 14 seats allocated to the regions. It says that every 10 regions get a rep while the four largest regions get one extra.

To sum: the 11 region proposal that Mike Wyman put together follows the scheme to bring more proportionality. 6 region map from Rick: the principle was to have equally sized regions and end up with 24 seats. Jonathan prefers the 3 region map. Common to the three is that we abandon the at large seats. There would be enough seats in each region to use choice voting. We use choice voting now for the at-large seats. One or two of the options will be brought to the next plenary to try to make a decision in order to use the new format at the following plenary.

Mike told people to feel free to bring this back to the locals and give input to what people want.

Mike described his rationale for regional groupings based on commonalties on issues, political leanings, etc.

Ricardo noted that it's important to look at representation for the CC; what the purpose of the CC is. It's essentially an executive body to be able to act as the primary decision body outside of the plenaries. The general assembly at the plenaries is the decision body but we can't bring everybody together every month to make decisions so we have the CC.

Caleb suggested no regions but give proportional representation statewide and elect through choice voting once a year. But if we want to enforce regional distribution these other options are what we come up with.

Ricardo: The principle of proportional representation based on geography is somewhat at odds with political opinion. If we insist on going based on geography, we won't necessarily be politically represented.

Caleb spoke about choice voting. How you elect people is really separate from the region you elect them. Regardless of the unit from which you're represented. Caleb stated that he is not taking a position on any of the 4 options. Suggested that we need to determine if geographical representation is important on the CC or if it isn't just go ahead with proportional representation. There are two questions: using a winner-take-all system vs proportional representation? OR using a regional vs a statewide system?

Ricardo expressed concern about too much emphasis on regions. There is too much expected of regional reps. and they cannot do all this work for the state. It's important to remember that the CC is not the state party.

Questions from the floor:

Ted Smith wanted to review why the system is like this. An executive body was created to keep things going.

There were 3 main purposes:

1. functionality (to come together more often)
2. make the state grow
3. it was based on the peace and freedom model -- one person one vote created problems.

He stated that this system has worked well year after year.

John Morton: in addition to the principle of one green one vote, members of the CC have other responsibilities: to convey decisions to the locals and regions. It helps CC members disseminate information. He said that currently the system doesn't really work well. People are not finding out about decisions soon enough but added that regional reps are good for coordinating activism in local areas.

Ricardo responded: Regional Reps disseminating info isn't working partly because they're so busy already.

Jonathan added that this was one of the big items in their discussions and they have talked about other mechanisms to achieve dissemination of info.

Delegate from San Diego: inquired as to whether Caleb would go with a combination model of proportional representation and geographical regions and Caleb responded 'yes'.

Delegate from Santa Clara: Stated that the CC is not a decision making body, it's an administrative body. Counties are decision-making bodies and they are not population based, but regionally based. The current problems are geographical problems so we should try to base the solution on that.

Faramarz stated that he concurs with Ric that the current system isn't working as well as possible. There is too much expected of our regional reps. He pointed out that each standing committee and WG, gets regional representation.

****Vibes-watcher intervened when the speaker got upset at being cut off because time had run out. Was allowed to continue.****

Faramarz suggested that we should try to keep regions as small as possible. We'll never be able to create a perfect system. Need to focus on growing the party, not over-managing the system.

Jeff from Fresno: expressed that he hadn't seen a really persuasive position for at-large seats; he would prefer to see a regionally based system

Didn't give name: expressed that it's important to have geographical distribution. Suggested splitting the Sac-Sierra region.

Mike Borenstein: prefers the smaller regional models because it means more regional reps, more people in the process.

As time was running out again, Beth Moore-Haines suggested that since the concerns expressed were already going to be addressed at the next plenary by further proposals, this proposal could go through just to correct the immediate errors.

Confirm Betty Traynor as Secretary of State Liaison [10:00 AM – 10:15 AM]

Mike Borenstein explained that the CC appoints someone to be Secretary of State Liaison because it takes some work and presentation. The CC is proposing to reaffirm Betty.

Betty Traynor came forward and spoke about her qualifications. She said that she was one of the cofounders from SF Greens. Has been on the CC too. She inherited the position from Michael Meyer. She's happy to hold this position as a woman because most other parties' reps in this position are men. If anyone is interested in the position and would like to work with Betty, please let her know. She described some of the duties required in this position. Occasionally when a county is first registering, she sends a letter to the state on their behalf.

Mike added that we're looking for folks to be more familiar with these positions. The CC cannot work without these officers. Also looking for secretaries. Mike urged people to hook up with anyone on the CC and see if the work they do interests you. CC likes to assign folks to work as liaison to the Secretary of State and then affirm an alternate to get you ready for next term.

Point of Process: It was requested that all CC members stand up and come forward.

All CC members came forward except a few people who were outside or at the registration table.

Consent Calendar -- Missile Defense [10:15 AM – 10:20 AM]

No unresolved concerns.

Passed with consent.

Announcements [10:20AM - 10:30AM]

Caucus of the Bay Area: all delegates from bay area region will meet right outside the cafeteria. They needed to choose alternates and one or two new regional reps to the CC. That region represents almost 40% of the state.

Lesly: photo from the LA Times.

National party Oppression Caucuses will be forming. She has contact info.

Ginny from LA: LA delegates will be meeting right before lunch.

Kevin McKeown: brought literature on policies that have been passed in Santa Monica.

Jo: if interested in improving communication, meet with Cameron or Kendra, our web wizards. They'll do training today on using the web.

Charles Douglas: announced that the Center for North Coast Environmental Center burned down in July. Green Party records and archives were in there so any donations would be helpful.

Larry: Sunday night at La peña in Berkeley: Green response to corporate globalization. Will also be showing video from the global Greens conference in Australia.

Delegate from SF: Nader coming to town for public power super rally at Masonic Center in San Francisco. Local Greens are hosting a fundraiser/reception.

Ricardo: setting up a conference call for those who are not comfortable communicating via the internet.

Cameron: operates various websites; current budget is about \$300/month. He has mailboxes and supports about 200 auto-mailing lists, etc. If you want to help, donations are welcome.

Adjourned for break [10:30 AM -- 10:40 AM]

Proposal: ERWG -- Election Code [10:40AM -- 11:40AM]

Presenters: Jean Olsenmeyer, _____

Jean explained that the ERWG has been working on the Green Party's section of the California elections code and has reached consensus to use choice voting and IRV for primary elections. There was previously already consensus on the concept but this proposal was the formality of giving the ERWG the authority to implement this concept. The ERWG has been working on the terms of it for many months; thanks for the input.

This is so important for us because nobody has even heard of this. So we are trying to have our registrar allow us to use choice voting and IRV for our County Council elections. The Secretary of State said 'no' because it's not in the election code. So this is an excellent opportunity to publicize this issue. Currently seeking a legislator to sponsor the bill.

First the assembly achieved consensus on the third resolution (to coordinate with other political parties wishing to establish sections on the state election code) which was on page 17 of the plenary packet, then went back for Resolutions #1 and #2.

Clarifying Question from the floor: Why?

Response: because we're thinking that other parties would want the same thing. (i.e. the concept that parties should control their needs, not the state legislature.) The Libertarian Party would like to create a section of the election code where they control the guidelines of their own elections.

Question: Are any other parties interested?

Response: maybe Natural Law.

There were no concerns on number 3.

Resolution #2: to seek a state legislator to draft and introduce legislation to introduce and negotiate final language of the bill, which is subject to oversight by the coordinating committee. This is because we can't write our own bill. The legislator's council would write up language of actual bill.

Questions from the floor:

Nancy LaFortune: inquired as to whether anyone's contacted Fred Keely?

Response: he's at the top of our list.

Warren Bloomberg: what is the authority for saying we can't draft our own proposed statute? I've never heard any law permitting this.

Response: there's nothing that prevents us from writing the language but we don't have the experience and if the legislator does it, their staff can do it professionally. So it's both to save us some work and to have it done more professionally. We would like to introduce this bill next January so there's no time to bring it back to the next plenary.

Lesly Byne: What legislators are you thinking of?

Response: we'd like suggestions.

Consensus was reached on resolution #2.

Resolution #1: attempt to pass legislation to create a Green Party section of the state elections code with the provisions listed in the proposal.

Caleb: What do we want in the Green Party state election code? There are 8 specific proposals on page 17 of the packet. let's address the first two then move on to the others.

We're doing this because our bylaws say that we use choice voting and IRV to elect members and the court wouldn't let us.

Joshua Blyer: asked for clarification regarding what the difference is between choice voting and IRV.

Caleb: Choice voting is a form of proportional representation that uses a ranking system for the voters' candidate preferences and give the option of None-Of-The-Above (NOTA). Whereas IRV (Instant Run-off voting) is just for electing one office.

Joe Strausser: wondered if a legislator would get bogged down on this one point because people would say it is impractical.

Caleb: If the legislature shoots us down, it's not a complete loss because we shouldn't have to go to the legislature because it's an internal party matter.

Friendly Amendment from the floor: if this portion is impractical, that legislator is allowed to scrap that section.

Response: Yes, point five addresses that.

Mike: This is not just about IRV, it's also about allowing non-citizens and felons to vote, etc. It's about challenging the issue of who gets to be registered Green. It's extremely important.

Peter Camejo: suggested that we should look at the legal language that they've already adopted regarding proportional representation in California used by corporations.

Jo Chamberlain: had the concern that the delegates won't get a chance to see the proposal before it goes to the legislature.

Caleb: explained that it was written the way it was because there wouldn't be time to come back with a full proposal before the January session. But this won't be private and will be published. Unless you want to delay the process, it's not practical to bring the language back to the plenary.

Jo: does it say you will get approval from the CC? It's not written in the provisions on page 17.

Caleb: yes, it is in there.

Floria Purcell: if you have an uncontested election it's not even on the ballot. Gloria thinks that it's essential we're all aware of that. We need to make sure we have enough candidates.

Chuck O'Neil: has anyone done this before or have other Green parties done this before?

Caleb: No, we're breaking new ground, with the exception of the Peace and Freedom Party. We're trying to force the election officials to do things the way we want.

Jeff Isinger: echoed Jo's concern that this should be reviewed by a plenary group or at a minimum this should go to the CC before going to legislature.

Caleb: this will definitely go to the CC before its introduced.

Jo: does this have an ending? a time at which it's no longer in place? we should have something in here that more than just the CC can approve it.

Caleb: would accept a friendly amendment to have a sunset clause.

Tristan Sulger: When language is written by the legislature, things can get added in. We need to watch the process very closely.

Caleb: there is a risk that the legislature could use this as an opportunity to really screw us. they can't wipe us off the ballot and we'll either be better off or at the same place after this. But we do need to constantly monitor them. The CC has the right to say this isn't working for us. We submit the substance of the bill and they draft the actual language but we'll be able to look at that language and say that's not what we wanted.

Nancy LaFortune: What if the legislature doesn't go for it?

Caleb: We sue the state for violating our rights.

Sola Sarmiento: Stated that as a new member to GP these concepts are very foreign and expressed concerned about voting for these concepts without understanding what they mean. Suggested having workshops to help understand better.

Caleb: Point well taken, need to continue to educate ourselves. Thank you.

Beth: If you still have lingering questions can discuss during working group time.

Harry from SF: Stated that he has great faith in the folks who have been working on this for so long.

Craig Peterson offered a friendly suggestion: to add to the documents an FAQ.

There were no other questions or clarifying comments, no unresolved concerns. Consensus was reached on numbers 1 and 2.

Now is the hard part: numbers 3 – 8.

3. do we use a primary or convention to elect our presidential candidate?

4. if you don't have competition, candidates don't appear on ballot

5. if practical problems, going to work in good faith.

6. relic of the Peace and Freedom Party: if you run for office, you're automatically on the County Council.

7. election code section is large and there are totally non-substantive items

8. if there's anything else, we want to hear about it.

Numbers 3 through 8 were addressed all at once.

David Shorey brought up the fact that currently there is a provision to allow state and local parties to use county facilities and we don't want to repeal that and take away our access to state buildings.

There was some discussion on the topic of having a Convention vs a Primary.

Jim Stauffers: Stated that if we're going to use the convention method, it's going to look like this room today.

Caleb: it's the Green Party that tells the state who to put on the ballot. The voters' wishes should be respected via a primary. However there are good arguments on both sides.

Chuck O'Neil: Are we saying we're going to keep, change or put our own provisions?

Caleb: We're going to keep our own provisions.

Josh Blier: Will it be a national or state convention?

Caleb: State.

Jo: If we choose to elect by primary rather than convention will it be an open primary or no? There are very serious implications. Currently the Republicans and Democrats are allowing non-party members to vote in our primaries. Others could blow out our strong candidate.

Caleb: This doesn't have to be answered in state election code. The current default decision is that non-Green Party members could not vote in our primaries.

Jo: What has the ERWG group recommend?

Caleb: They have not come to a decision.

Mike Wyman: If this magnate actually goes into state election code does that repeal the Peace and Freedom statute?

Ricardo: There are several different scenarios: People putting their name into the hat in an election for offices the Green Party doesn't want to run candidates for; people carrying the Green Party banner who don't represent us. Another concern is that outside this body people are not going to recognize the County Councils.

Caleb: This only applies to the presidential nomination.

A straw poll was taken on whether people prefer primary or convention. The majority were for primary.

Nancy LaFortune: What is the fiscal impact of holding a primary vs convention?

Caleb: There's not a big cost concern. A primary changes nothing, and we're already holding a plenary/convention.

Tom Higgins: In the case where there's a candidate for national office who ran for more than one party, would there be a non-registered Green as our national nominee? Nader, for example.

Caleb: State law says that non-registered Greens cannot run as a candidate. Nader won the nomination and we put him on the ballot. But he couldn't have done that for State Assembly. because state law is different.

Lesly Bonnet: requested clarification on #6: somebody who runs for state assembly would automatically be on the county council?

Caleb: yes.

There were no unresolved concerns.

Consensus was reached.

It was announced that delegate ----- from LA passed away last night in his sleep.

Report: Update from Platform Committee [11:40AM -- 11:50AM]

Peggy Lewis reported that at the last plenary, the status of the platform was a little inconclusive. Three issues in particular have been the planks on Education, Energy and Transportation. Since July, they've been working on the Economy section, and will be adding Child Care and Immigration soon. They picked planks in need of the most attention. Peggy thanked everyone for all their work and announced that the Platform Committee would be meeting on Sunday at 12:15 and that they would be able to work on more planks if they had more people.

Jeff Isinger asked Peggy to speak on the need to write at a level to reach people. Peggy responded that in California, 25% are at less than 4th grade reading level, and 50% at less than 8th grade level. So yes, they have been addressing that.

Tammy Tatum requested that there be something in writing so it would be easier to report info back to the counties.

Housekeeping:

Time for group photo in front of the building.

Some changes to schedule: at 4:00 today in the auditorium, there would be a discussion of the recent events in NYC. Friday night the CC had decided this would be an appropriate addition to the agenda. Committees will still go full time but if people get out early, discussion will begin in the auditorium around 4:00 with a formal discussion beginning at 4:30.

National Green Party Report [11:50AM -- 12:00noon]

Jo reported that we currently have 2 delegates to the national party.

John Strawn said that the national conference of the Association of State Green Parties (ASGP), made the decision to file for national election status and to change to be the Green Party of the United States. This represents a lot of work by a lot of people for many years. When it was decided to be affiliated with ASGP, part of the charge was to push for a proportionate system within that organization and have two reps for each state.

Jo explained that there was a transition committee. Originally there were two delegates per state but the State of California has more registered Greens than the rest of the country together and growing! Had the opportunity to vote on two or three options: Mike Wyman, Beth Moore-Haines, and Jo voted for option number 1 which would have given us 20 votes at the national level. But only California and probably Texas voted for that option. The option that won was a little more proportional and California now has 13 delegates, and some delegates may carry 2 votes, while others carry one.

This proposal was for selection of delegates at the national level. Page 19 of the packet describes how delegates are selected. There is one delegate for 4 congressional districts. There will be 106 delegates at the next meeting.

Mike: We have filed for national party status. The preliminary report was favorable. On November 15 we should have a ruling as to whether we'll be granted national party status. Then we can argue that we're national party, yet

we're kept out of the national debates. In Santa Barbara we elected Jo Chamberlain to be on the steering committee of the national party.

Jo said that it was an honor to be on the steering committee and that she accepted based on everyone's support, adding that she wouldn't do it without the support. She offered thanks to Santa Barbara and John Strawn.

There's going to be another national meeting at the beginning of next year we need input. If you're interested in serving on a national committee or participating, contact Mike Wyman, Beth Moore-Haynes, John Strawn or Jo Chamberlain.

John encouraged people to consider being a delegate.

Housekeeping:

Jo announced that the hybrid car rally would begin. Unfortunately, there were no electronic vehicles, only hybrids. After the rally, their computers would be checked and the most economical driving would be rewarded later in the day.

Delegates must turn in their cards which they won't need until tomorrow morning.

Group photo now.

Lunch Break [12:00 noon -- ?????]

International Standing Committee Discussion of Sept 11th Attacks. [4:30 PM -- 6:00 PM]

Sunday, September 23, 2001

Facilitators: Sola Sarmiento, Peggy Lewis, Michael Borenstein
There were some changes to the agenda: the first consent item was pulled.

Announcements: [9:15 AM -- 9:30 AM]

Housekeeping [9:30 AM -- 9:35 AM]

Timekeeper: Ginny
Vibes watchers: Kevin Lequin and Beth Moore-Haines
Notetaker: Robin Oetinger

Jo reminded delegates that everyone needs to have a delegate card.
Jim Stauffer was acknowledged for the excellent packets which he prepared.
Assembly quorum was found to exist.

Proposal: Delegate Allocation [9:35 AM -- 10:20 AM]

Presenters: Jo Chamberlain, Jonathan Lundel, Ricardo Newbury

Jo described the purpose of this proposal. She explained that the number of delegates at the plenaries should be allocated based on the number of registered Greens in each county. (see page 20)

Ricardo clarified that appendix A, the Delegate Count is just an attempt to describe the process and is not what's being approved today. In determining delegate allocation, there are going to be some inequalities so we need to determine the most fair and equitable way. The method this proposal is suggesting is based on the geometric mean as used by the US House of Representatives, while trying to maintain a 100-delegate assembly.

Jonathan explained that the approach taken was for minimal change. They tried to come up with a total of 100 delegates and have fair proportional representation. While there are subtle differences in the methods, none differs more than one delegate for only a handful of counties. The method proposed has been in use for congressional allocation and has been well analyzed.

Clarifying Questions:

Cameron Spitzer asked why it was important to have exactly 100 delegates if that makes the formula more complicated.

Chuck O'Neil requested an explanation of the difference between an arithmetic mean and a geometric mean. Ricardo explained that an arithmetic mean is just an average while a geometric mean takes two numbers, multiplies them together and then takes the square root. When you're dealing with statistics or ratios, you're using the arithmetic mean, but it weighs unfairly to the wrong side. So in this case we figure out the number of greens per county, then figure out the geometric mean. It's pretty easy to show someone how this is done.

Carl Sanders suggested that maybe there didn't need to be 100 whole delegates but instead that certain delegates be counted as 1.3 for example, to equal a total of 100 votes. Jonathan's response was that this would be beyond the scope of bylaws housekeeping.

Tristan Sulger wanted to know what the real difference in allocation would be.

Dennis Time from SLO requested that the presenters explain how this method is definitively proven to be better than the way we do things now.

Jo explained that all we're really doing is fixing a problem with the formula.

*** Time was running out so 5 minutes were taken from the announcements ***

Jim Stauffer expressed concern that the ad-hoc committee that put this proposal together didn't take a look at

whether the philosophy that originally put this system together is correct, but simply corrected mathematical problems. This method is based on population. Currently, urban centers are getting most of the delegates but he would like to see a philosophy of allocating more delegates to some of the smaller counties. He would like to propose something that looks more like congress as a whole. He would like to see a formula where every county gets one delegate and then the rest are allocated based on population. Jim will send out an email on this. He is currently discussing this with members of the CC.

Jo clarified that Jim is not asking to amend the proposal but is asking to form another ad-hoc committee to address this other issue.

Ricardo noted that the numbers in the packet showing the allocation of delegates is pretty close to what it would really be. Alameda and San Diego would each get one more while Sacramento and Sonoma would each get one less so it would basically shift two delegates.

Did not state name: if we are a party of minority voices, alternative voices, etc. seems there should be some representation from non-active counties. It's a philosophy thing.

*** Out of time; bought 5 more minutes ***

Beth suggested that since there is no direct opposition to fixing this immediate problem and Jim has already stated that he will move forward with re-evaluating the philosophy of allocating delegations, we can go ahead and vote and re-address this at the next plenary.

There were no unresolved concerns.
Consensus was reached.

Report from Hank Chapot, GPCA State Archivist [10:20 AM -- 10:35 AM]

Starting in 1990, Hank volunteered to start collecting official documents of the party (minutes, plenary packets, press releases, etc). Now he's expanded the collection to candidate materials, posters, flyers, etc. Today he has a pretty good-sized archive. He has records boxes of paper materials, plus video and audio cassettes. He thanked John Strausser, Mike Finestein, and someone else. These materials are available to anybody who wants to use them. Mike also has quite a lot of materials available. Now Hank is planning on donating the collection soon. He would like to get it in a state archive or a university library. These materials are more for current internal party research. He would like counties to start collecting their materials such as bylaws and founding papers and put them together in a 3-ring binder. Sometimes things fall apart and it's nice to have a kind of memory. Please don't send a bunch of unsorted boxes of papers to him. What's most important is to look for someone within each county to start formalizing the process. The CC has the power to start collecting stuff, determining where it goes, and duplicating it. Hank has founding documents of Alameda and San Francisco counties, but his info is kind of Northern California-centric. Requested that people especially collect handmade posters and correspondence as well as mailing lists, sign-up sheets, etc. Kendra is also starting an electronic archive of website info.

There was a request from the floor that get some 'how to' info.

Hank said to put everything in acid-free folders/boxes, separate out newspapers, keep in cool-dry place. He offered to put a statement on the web page about how to archive info.

Beth and Hank are heading the Archive Committee.

Adjourned for a break [10:37 -- 11:00 AM]

UNWE was pulled from the agenda because there was no one to present it.

Announcements [11:00 AM -- 11:08 AM]

Leslie Bonnet: announced that there are t-shirts for sale. The national lawyers guild wants to put an ad in the SF Chronicle condemning the terrorist attacks and to promote a peaceful response, rather than more violence.

Pamela: Since we're facing loss of civil liberties it would be unfortunate to leave the meeting without a response to this threat. Invited people to join with our European counterparts for a vigil. We need to be calling for truth force not military force. Oct 14th will be a day calling for peace. Look on emails for more info.

Didn't catch name: locals should look at the GP statement and incorporate that to use for local outreach.

Didn't catch name: Tonight La Pena Berkeley Green response to corporate globalization.

Kent Smith announced that next weekend there will be a large mobilization in San Francisco in Dolores Park. Saturday, September 29 at 11AM.

Linda Lamester: there's a display about alternative housing in the hallway up front.

Jean Rosemeyer: clarified that the ERWG is at 12:15

Report on Strategies for 2002 -- Campaigns and Candidates WG [11:08 AM -- 12:10 PM]

Presenters: Susan King and Oroville Osborne

There have been several meetings to ratify campaign strategies and they now have a template of what to do for 2002.

Susan began with the statewide issues. There are several sets of candidates for the statewide constitutional offices. Which brings up the question: as a state party, are we going to endorse either of the two sets of candidates? Yesterday at the working group it was decided that it was not practical or fair to allocate an endorsement or preference for either slate of candidates. In January 2002, will revisit this issue once we know who has filed. At that point we will take a stand for or against endorsements.

Oroville spoke about Regional Offices. Explained that the WG discussed what kind of qualifications we'd like to see in Green candidates. He explained what he calls "The Susan Principal" which is that if you're considering running for office, you should plan for it well ahead of time. If you don't have any experience, fundraising ability, etc maybe you shouldn't run for congress, but should start with city council or even start with a board or commission. Conceded that we can't stop anybody from running for any race but is simply suggesting that the best return on our investment is with smaller, local offices. And of course, we're hoping that if you get elected that you can actually perform the duties of that office. Oroville stated that he's not ready to run for anything other than a small office in a small town and said that if he's going to run, he's going to win! He said that it's worth it to put in the time in smaller positions. Then there are also some races where we do want to try and have Green candidates. The report from the WG was updated last night and was distributed. It will also be on the website.

Susan said that they were pleased with the regional layout. That we have candidates running at various levels, not just local, or high-profile. Susan listed various candidates running for various offices. She added that one area that is weak is the central valley and that we would like to see someone in Gary Condit's seat. Besides regional diversity, it's also important to have racial and gender balance diversity among Green candidates.

Susan went on to report that we currently have 35 elected officials in California. Unfortunately we don't have as many candidates running this year as last year. Made the comparison that this strategy of starting with local offices is how the Christian Right gained power and maybe it's a good model to follow (with our own values, of course). Oroville added that we need to build the base if our party is ever going to be strong.

Kevin McKeown, City Council Member from Santa Monica came up front to speak. He said that being in elected office as a green is the hardest thing he's ever done but also the most worthwhile and he's also the most proud of this contribution. Mentioned that there are flyers on the tables up front describing some of the progressive policies that have been implemented in Santa Monica. For example, City Hall is running entirely off of renewable energy, they implemented an energy efficiency program in the school district, passed a resolution against FTAA and NAFTA, passed a living wage in Santa Monica.

Kevin expressed that if someone wants to run for office, s/he doesn't have to understand everything beforehand, because you will learn it as you go. But you do have to build your coalition. All the Greens in Santa Monica wouldn't have gotten him elected. He was on other boards and organizations before being elected. He worked his way into this position. Kevin encouraged potential candidates to be a Green voice on other governmental bodies.

Susan addressed the issue of whether or not we should try to fill every office on the ballot. There was a lot of back and forth on this issue and ultimately no decision was reached on this matter.

Charles Douglas came up front to represent the Deep Green Slate and speak about their campaign efforts. Rebecca Kaplan followed, representing the other slate.

Charles Douglas said that the Deep Greens are still working on a vision statement so he couldn't state it yet. But he did speak to issues that had previously been agreed upon. Deep Green means within, without, practice what they preach. They're going to be running a strong, clean, positive campaign, no negativity, lots of unity. Please feel free to contact charlesdouglas @charlesdouglas.net. Emphasized that the two slates are not working against each other. Actually it's a good sign that we do have a contested primary because it shows that we have enough candidates and are organized enough. The focus for Lt. Governor is to change the way we run public education with a focus on social and environmental responsibility for every university such as purchasing, procurement, etc. This could change so much of our economy. Charles also talked a little about the other candidates on the slate and added that hopefully they will all be here at the January plenary. Visit www.charlesdouglas.net for bios on the other candidates.

Rebecca Kaplan: is the campaign director for the Larry Shue for Lt Governor campaign. She agreed that this is positive that we have some internal competition and may end up with a slate of people from both slates. In the meantime it's important to spread the message of the Green Party and the campaigns need to be sufficiently organized, well funded, etc. Their slate is reaching out to Latino organizations. Rebecca is taking leave of her job and doing this campaign full time. Some liberal democrats have offered to host house parties because they're not happy with Governor Davis. Both candidates are phenomenal speakers and will be excellent candidates. Davis has destroyed the economy of our state, even people who don't care about social or environmental issues care that the economy doesn't get run into the ground. Volunteer sign-up forms were passed around. There is a need for local volunteer coordinators. They have some creative fundraising ideas. They're going to demand that Comejo gets into the debates!

Questions from the floor:

David: expressed interest in insurance commissioner. why? Insurance companies are very large with lots of money and health care and the auto industry are both controlled by insurance. Having a Green in that office could have many favorable outcomes with regards to the environment, social justice and economic equality.

Kent: expressed that he is in favor of contested elections. Though they have the potential to degenerate and get nasty, in which case we all lose. However, in New Mexico, opposing candidates for the Senate campaign both recognized that they did not want to divide the party. So they appointed a campaign ombudsman to make sure that no campaign materials were divisive and all campaigning followed Green values.

Rebecca: responded that the two slates have already talked about working together like this and no literature will even mention the other candidate. Candidate forums will bring the candidates together in the communities for dialog.

Faramarz: expressed concern that all of the campaigns must operate by Green values. Sometimes when there is heightened urgency to get things done, opportunities can be lost and people can become alienated. We must always remember consensus.

Joan: expressed that we're living in dangerous times and the Green Party is now more powerful than once before. It's important that we not go public with petty internal disagreements.

Bill Tucker: Aside from the importance of running for the State University system and school boards, there is also an intermediate system which is the community college boards. The only people running in his area are the two incumbents.

Magalee: expressed that having 2 slates brings us into the media spotlight more.

Rebecca: Stated that we're also looking for an Attorney General to run.

Susan: whoever we get needs to be a capable candidate.

Michael Borenstein: asked both slates to work on increasing our registration while we're running candidates.

Didn't catch name: mentioned the growth of homeless population. Urged candidates not to lose the social justice component.

Didn't catch name: in Napa, the Green candidate is being blamed for causing the Democrat to lose by 10%. Rebecca addressed that: IRV avoids that. We ought not to say there is no difference between the parties but ought to promote a democratic process.

Brief statements from the candidates:

Greg _____: is running for school board in Humboldt County. They could have the first Green majority on the school board. They would like help for their campaign.

Larry Schue: running for Secretary of State. Said that we advance together, not separately. He intends to be very active contacting County Councils and working with all Green members. Will bring up issues the Republicans and Democrats are not addressing such as public financing of elections and a ban on lobbying which makes us all second class citizens unless we have as much money as they do. Electoral reform: only with proportional representation can we represent the people of our state. Also need corporate charter reform. Need to 'reinfranchise' the people of our state who have been disenfranchised. The Secretary of State should be a watch dog of the state.

Peter Comejo: Stated that even though Sept 11 hurt us, this is a great opportunity to educate. Mentioned the corruption of Democratic and Republican parties. Never has there been a time when the economy and the interest of the people have been so mismanaged. The campaign will be subordinate to the needs of the party.

Bill Meyers: is currently on the school board and is looking at the possibility of running for north coast State Assembly seat. If he does, he will run to win. Will work to improve schools, end corporate rule, not to protect the environment but to restore it. Will fight to protect people of California from predatory corporations, against racism, sexism, classism. Democracy and corporate rule are incompatible.

Thomas from Santa Cruz: has been a Green since 1990 and is running for City of Santa Cruz school board. He hosted house parties for candidates last year and would love to have other candidates come to speak as part of his candidacy. Reminded candidates to take advantage of local TV airwaves.

Initiatives:

Ancient Forest Protection initiative

Support the writing a minimum wage increase initiative.

Election day is March 5th, 2002

Susan: strategy this year has been somewhat reactive, just trying to address things as they come up. Next year we want to be more proactive. We need more females because almost all our candidates are males. The battleground for us is now the central valley. There will be a statewide fundraiser October 12 with Ralph Nader. \$100/plate luncheon.

Copies of the report from the Campaigns and Candidates Working Group were distributed.

Housekeeping: 12:12 PM -- 12:15 PM]

Lunch has been held back, will start at 12:20 PM.

There were some time changes on the schedule

Working groups were pushed back to 12:45 -- 2:30 PM.

Evaluation and closing will at 2:50 PM

Report on National Campus Greens Gathering [12:15 PM -- 12:20 PM]

Justin Moscoso was not there to report.

Faramarz reported that Campus Greens met in Chicago. California is actually lagging behind the nation. He encouraged every local to set up groups at every community college, high schools, faculty, staff, alumni, in the community.

Check the following websites for more info: www.campusgreens.org and www.cagreens.org/youth or email: faramarz@greens.org

Stephanie from the University of LaVerne said that at the meeting they talked a little bit about the environment. They had a rally which brought people together. They're working to expand the Green Party and to bring more Latinos in.

Faramarz asked for everyone to email him contact info for every single campus in your community.

Adjourned for Lunch at 12:20 PM

Working Groups and Standing Committees met [12:45 PM -- 2:50 PM]

Evaluation [2:45 PM -- 2:50 PM]

Closing [2:50 PM – 3:20 PM]

Greens and the National Organization of Women (NOW) are the only two who have not 'sold out' with relation to the current post-September 11th situation. We're only ones speaking out about eroding American civil liberties and killing people.

Jo said that she loved having everyone here, everyone's been wonderful but don't take the delegate cards.

She warned that the closing would also be very emotional so Carol will take it over so that Jo doesn't choke up.

Carol: the ritual performed was something she learned working to shut down the School of the Americas. The name of someone 'fallen' is read, then the drum is beaten and everyone says "presente" which means present in Spanish. Even though those people are not here with us, they are with us in spirit. This is a big tradition with Latin American revolutionary movements starting with Che Guevara.

Each person said a name, the drum was struck, and the crowd called out "presente".

"November 30, 1999 – Seattle"

"David Brower"

"Hernan Hertilio"

"Mimi Farinia"

"Rachel Carson"

"Cesar Chavez"

"Ken Saro Wiwa"

"Judy Barry"

"Steve Biko"

"The victims of the terrorist attacks on September 11th"

And then many other names of progressive leaders were called out.