

Green Party of California  
General Assembly in Chula Vista  
September 13-14, 2003 v2003101201

We decided:

- Peter Miguel Camejo endorsed for governor in the recall election
- NO POSITION on the recall question
- Oppose Proposition 54
- 2004 Presidential candidates Cobb, Mastley, Nader, and Salzman, and more to come.
- Created a process for selecting delegates to presidential nominating convention.
- Adopted platform planks: Urban Land Use, Corporations and Democracy,
- Adopted editorial policy for *Green Focus* newspaper
- Created a *Green Focus* editorial board
- Affirmed new working group co-coordinators

Deferred to December

- Child Care platform plank
- Tikkun resolution
- Ratifying May 2003 General Assembly minutes

Saturday (Sept. 13) morning session starts at 9:08 AM

Facilitating: Robyn Oetenger and Michael Borenstein

Timekeeper: Don Eigelberger

Vibes: Ginny Case and Tom Lash

Beth Moore Haines came up with an impromptu **opening ceremony**, delegates come up and state what's going on with their parties.

We've hired a fundraiser, the attention we get is changing, GP of California had a big role in forming the GP-US, Peter Camejo's outreach to Latino voters is succeeding, Peter's in the recall debates, *Green Focus* newspaper is respectable...

Mary Salas, a San Diego County Council person (Dem, but voted for Camejo in 2002) from Chula Vista, addressed the General Assembly (GA). Paraphrasing: Chula Vista is the 6th fastest growing city in the US. The Green Party is growing in influence here, and as a voice in bayfront development, because the public is dissatisfied with a polluting power plant and inappropriate development. Salas was the only Council member opposed to a high-rise beach condo, despite a poll showing opposition in the South Bay community.

Craig Fredericksen, principal of the MACC charter school where we met, welcomed us. Paraphrasing: this is a mostly vocational school serving the needs of mostly at-risk kids, converted from a furniture store and a welfare office, teaching multimedia technology, construction trades, academics. Would the Green Party please take a position opposing Bush's "No Child Left Behind" program; it's destructive.

Peggy Lewis collected the "platform consensus forms" showing the counties' take on the proposed platform planks.

In a brief exercise, the committee chairpeople and working group co-coordinators stood up to be acknowledged.  
[names]

At 9:34 AM we have quorum for the first decision, **ratifying the minutes** from the May GA in Sacramento. Laura Wells couldn't find minutes on the Web. Jim Stauffer and Ginny Case explained the Information Technology (IT) subcommittee never received them to post. Decision tabled for December 6.

Affirming the agenda for this meeting, there is one change, the treasurer will make a 10 minute presentation at 1:35, extending this session.

Considering the **Consent calendar**, which fails if there are any concerns.

Mike Wyman (delegate from Marin County) has an unspecified concern with the Tikkun item, which will come back as an agenda item tomorrow morning.

The next decision item is the Green Party of California's **position on the recall election**.

Presenters: Susan King (San Francisco) and Magali Offerman (San Diego).

The Campaigns and Candidates working group took no position.

This is a peculiar issue, because "NO POSITION" is a position, a fallback in case we can't decide (by consensus or 80% vote) to say one of YES, Recall Davis, or NO, Davis Should Remain.

Delegates report:

Denise Munro Robb (delegate from Los Angeles County) reported her county was conflicted, and decided NO POSITION. The Los Angeles Greens (a local not to be confused with the Los Angeles County Green Party) opposed the undemocratic process of recall, but want Camejo for Governor if it passes, and strongly opposed bowing to Huffington. LA County had limited time to poll its 28,000 Greens.

Kevin McKeown (delegate from Los Angeles County) belongs to a strong minority in his local opposed to the recall. "I refuse to ask my friends to vote for Davis."

Henry Jute (delegate from Orange County) reports his county is split between NO POSITION and in favor of recall, as "being against Davis is a no brainer."

Donna Warren (delegate from Los Angeles County) reminds us to focus on the real question, which is "Should Davis be recalled," and not be confused by the peripheral issue, which is "Should the GOP get the state house?" Points out that Davis supports the cruel Three Strikes law. Personally favors YES on Recall.

Lerner Goode (delegate from San Bernardino County) urged a YES on Recall, acknowledging it originated in the "far right" but hoping it might bring reform to the recall process.

Arlen Comfort (delegate from San Mateo County) expects that if this one passes, it is the beginning of a series of recalls.

With that (9:54am), Susan King called the question with a straw poll on endorsing the recall. 16 endorse, 29 opposed, 20 abstain.

Mike Wyman reported the Coordinating Committee had discussed this procedure and decided consensus is questionable here because it doesn't apply to three-way decisions.

Facilitators: there is no yes-or-no proposal here, we are working on a poll now, and even as a procedural matter the percentage is too low to pass.

Susan King then tested for consensus on NO POSITION. Thirty-four delegates were okay with that, but twenty had concerns, so *that* failed! And an instant-runoff vote (IRV) was inapplicable because 80% is needed to pass a policy question.

Jonathan Lundell (delegate from San Mateo County) suggested that since Yes, No, and NO POSITION are all positions, the real fallback is NO CONSENSUS, which seems to be the sense of the body. Applause.

Greg Jan (San Francisco) stated we have no provision for a roll call vote.

Vibes!

Mike Wyman insisted we want the votes recorded on this item.

Votes taken: 15 Yes on Recall. 32 No, oppose Recall. 22 delegates abstaining.

The motion fails, the result is **NO CONSENSUS**.

Laura Wells points out the more accurate statement is NO POSITION.

Jo Chamberlain (delegate from San Mateo County) observed we are encouraging Mr. Camejo to stay in to the end.

In other ballot issues, GP of Cal is already strongly opposed to Proposition 54. Nevertheless, we test for consensus.

**Consensus to oppose Proposition 54** achieved 10:11 am.

The next proposal is to **endorse Peter Miguel Camejo for Governor** in the recall.

Magali Offerman announced the 36 active counties were polled and 32 (88%) posted a decision.

29 counties clearly endorsed in the poll, and none abstained.

Testing the delegates (a straw poll), 78 vote yes, 10 vote no.

A few counties wanted to tie the recall position to this endorsement but that is not the question in this agenda.

Calling the question, concerns.

Paul Quick (San Francisco) asked if this question is whether Mr. Camejo should stay in to the end. No.

Paul Ensimer (Emerald Region) observed this doesn't mean we're endorsing the recall process.

Susan King asked, do we want to tie our endorsement to "Peter stays in?" No, no, no! Many delegates want to let Mr. Camejo decide for himself.

Paul Ensimer is concerned about the process, will write up (never did).

Consensus on endorsing Mr. Camejo's candidacy, 10:19 am.

New question, should "Peter stay in to the end?" This is a poll, not a decision.

**50 votes YES** (stay in). **4 NO** (consider dropping out). **10 ABSTAIN**.

Next decision item, **presidential candidates** to be placed on the primary ballot next year.

Susan King presenting.

Four candidates will be considered now, and the Coordinating Committee will straw poll the counties on any latecomers between now and October 15.

John Machendoncia (Delegate from San Francisco) asked does this take two thirds of the delegates or two thirds of the counties? None, this is not an endorsement process.

The candidates are:

1. **David Cobb**, counsel to the Green Party of the United States
2. **Kent Mesplay**, a registered Green since 1995, intends to reach out to native Americans and women
3. **Lorna Salzman**, an environmentalist from Long Island
4. **Ralph Nader**, famous US political dissident.

In **clarifying questions**, Linda Piera Ovula (representing LA County) wondered how many candidates are we allowed, Robyn answered as many as we want.

Mike Wyman was concerned Mesplay wasn't born in the US, potential embarrassment to Party to nominate a candidate who can't be sworn in if he wins. Mesplay was born of US citizen parents overseas, therefore believed eligible to be President of the US.

Johnny Lie (representing LA County) wondered what are our criteria. Robyn said they just have to meet the legal requirements, no endorsement is implied.

Sanda didn't see Lorna Salzman's biography beforehand. But it was available in the agenda packet.

Susan King reported Cynthia McKinney "has not responded to us" and therefore won't be listed in our primary.

But counties will be polled for any latecomers they want to name over the next few weeks.

John Mark-something (representing San Francisco) urged we only list registered Greens. If that's not possible, SF Greens request a bylaws change to require it. SF asked the Campaigns and Candidates WG and the CC for this but feels ignored.

Moving along to **concerns**, we had

Chuck Reutter,(representing Riverside County), we are concerned our registrants are switching to Dem for the primary, because we don't have a candidate yet. We suggest qualifying all comers.

Paul Quick (SF) warns us this process is dangerous because so few delegates can remove a candidate so many might have voted for.

Ed Deliva (delegate, county unknown): my county objects to the two-thirds threshold, it should be lower.

Warner Bloomberg (representing Santa Clara County), we are concerned the two-thirds majority requirement should be 80% because candidate selection and endorsement is policy, not administrative stuff.

Chris Collins (delegate, county unknown) observed we have a closed primary: The GPCA Coordinating Committee can stop a hostile candidate who somehow wins the primary.

Learner Goode (delegate from San Bernardino County) objected to there being two classes of candidates, an elite few under consideration here and others who aren't "confirmed." SB County prefers a process that's fair to all candidates. Susan King reported SB County had already taken a proposal about that to the Campaigns and Candidates WG which had considered and rejected it.

Jim Stauffer (Liason to the Secretary of State) replying to SB County's concern: Anybody can get on the ballot by collecting signatures and paying a fee. All this procedure does is offer another way for them to show enough support exists for their candidates that's cheaper and involves more active Greens.

Mike Borenstein (delegate from El Dorado) observed the delegates are supposed to represent their counties, and wouldn't stop any candidate their counties were interested in.

Susan King (presenter) read the proposal aloud. The presenters won't accept the friendly amendment to change the majority to 80%.

More concerns!

Chris Collins had an editorial change, "may" not "must" which was accepted, and affirmed Stauffer's remarks.

Chuck Reutter: Riverside County bound its delegation to oppose. So we can't stand aside.

Johnny Lie (delegate from Los Angeles County), my county didn't get any guidance on whether this proposal meant an endorsement.

John Strawn (delegate from Santa Barbara County) replying, sorry it's coming so late, but this is only procedural, it's not to be considered an endorsement.

Finally, Robyn called the question. Riverside will not stand aside. Voting is by raising delegate cards.

**Sixty voters favor** the proposal.

**Three oppose, three abstain**, the motion passes by vote at 11:02 am.

The proposal was to vote yes, no, or abstain to place each candidate on our primary election ballot next year. All four will appear on our ballot.

<i>Candidate</i>	<i>yes votes</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>abstain</i>
<b>David Cobb</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Kent Mastley</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Ralph Nader</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Lorna Salzman</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>

### Next item, **Proposition 53.**

Get a handout from Robyn, we will poll the counties. Need answers by one week from now.

### Next item, a **platform plank on Urban Land Use.**

Presenter: Peggy Lewis, delegate from Sacramento County and co-coordinator of platform Working Group.

John Cloth is the primary author but couldn't be here.

Sprawl is the #1 issue all over. San Mateo submitted written comments which were accepted. All we got were positive comments on this plank.

#### **Clarifying questions?**

Jonathan Lundell, what are the changes?

Arlen Comfort listed them:

- at line 25, change "dilapidated urban lands" into "brownfields"
- line 33, add the phrase "along urban mass transit stops"
- line 37, add the word "education"
- lines 42-46, add localizing language

Dave Wass (delegate from Los Angeles) offered a friendly amendment. At line 48, seeing that "population growth drives sprawl", we'd like to add population language.

Peggy (representing presenters) no, that's in another plank.

Arlen announced San Mateo will stand aside with all its concerns noted

#### Moving into **concerns and affirmations.**

John Mark-something from San Francisco, what does "ecological footprint" mean? Also, please strike items five through eight, too philosophical.

Kevin McKeown from Santa Monica affirms, my local really wants this plank. Some of the language here is for cities that aren't built out yet. Westside Greens got all our changes and we like it. We want to keep items five through eight.

John Mark-something stands aside with his concern and **we have consensus** at 11:27 am.

### **The next platform plank is Corporations and Democracy.**

David Cobb and Jan Edwards, delegates from Mendocino County: presenting.

There were lots of comments on this plank.

#### **Clarifying questions?**

Arlen Comfort wasn't sure his changes to lines 40-41 were incorporated. Suggests we adopt the Wisconsin statute language "Nor corps doing business in this state... will contribute... to any political party... or candidacy..."

Friendly **amendment accepted**. This brought out more friendly amendments.

Paul Quick, SF has a friendly amendment, please add language to recognize gay marriages in other states.

John Mark-something from SF wants to remove everything before line 26. **Presenters refuse** because too many others have already agreed to it.

Warner Bloomberg, our county would like this plank to be adopted provisionally with the understanding it will be rewritten in simpler language. There is too much economic and political jargon in it, too many big words. We would also like to add the phrase "data formats" to the list of kinds of common property on line 61. **Presenters reject** the friendly amendment.

Bill Myers (delegate from Mendocino): We would like lines 54-55 stricken or modified. The power they describe could be misused to take charters away from non-profits. And we think limited liability should be dealt with more extensively, but elsewhere. Both **changes accepted** as friendly.

Doug Barnett (delegate from LA): add electrical distributions and internet protocols as a commons.

Jon Lundell suggests on line 2, change "unconstitutional" into "extraconstitutional".

The presenters decided not to delete lines 1-25 and SF will not stand aside with its unresolved concern.

We're calling the question now, to approve this plank with amendments.

Fifty-four vote to approve, five vote no, and three abstain. The **plank is approved** by vote at 11:47am.

An item about **results of a recall poll** was pulled from the agenda here.

### Next is the **Green Focus editorial policy item.**

Laura Wells and Karine Megerdoomian presenting.

Applause.

Clarifying questions? None.

#### **Concerns?**

Tarrence Showanter (delegate from Riverside County), referring to page 22, we shouldn't be micromanaging this newspaper. The policy is too detailed.

Kevin McKeown. Westside Greens affirm and honor the amount of work going into making this a newspaper, but want to return to the purpose and it's to support candidates. We all pay to distribute it. I'm concerned this [front page of the current *Green Focus*] should be all about PMC right now, but the best half of this front page is nothing to do with candidates. The *Green Focus* newspaper should be accountable to campaigns and candidates.

Cameron Spitzer (alternate from Santa Clara County), we would like the phrase "recycled paper" either stricken or replaced with clear language or defined elsewhere in the proposal. Should say "best available low environmental

impact” or specify post-consumer content so many percent or something. (Accepted as friendly.)  
Laura replied for the presenters. These should only be considered guidelines, not some exact legal language.  
Magali ( for the presenters) replied to Kevin's concern: The GROW committee started Green Focus for issues coverage and Laura Wells started it for a slate sheet. It was always both (Laura) we didn't want it to be out of date Oct 8. That's why it's not recall specific.  
Showanter stood aside with his concern and the policy **passes by consensus** at 12:02 pm

## **Green Focus Editorial board policy item**

### **Concerns and affirmations.**

Sasha Karlick (Los Angeles) would like to see a special election issue.

Barrington “Barry “ Condoltrick (county unknown) wants to know why do Grassroots Organizing Working Group (GROW) co-coordinators become permanent board members? And why are policy questions passed by consensus or 80%?

Ginny Case (Los Angeles) prefers those “co-cos” not be on projects, they are too busy coordinating.

Kevin McKeown (Westside [Los Angeles]) agrees.

Trina Barton (representing San Diego County) asserted “co-cos” should be nonvoting members of project committees.

Genevieve Marcus asked “what about content disputes, does the CC override the board?”

Stuart Bechman: asked “when do the terms start?”

Laura Wells (presenting) replied the purpose of the board is to "link" the paper to party policy, and the terms would start today

Magali Offerman (presenting) added “final decisions are by consensus of the editorial board, not the 'co-cos'.” and addressing Barrington's concern, business decisions can pass with two-thirds.

Laura asked for further feedback on the policy. “Don't worry about offending or sounding critical.”

Laura pointed out there were no submissions to *Green Focus* by women last time. They had to recruit a writer.

Magali announced the presenters would accept San Diego's friendly amendments.

Final concern, Skydra Smith-Hysters asked why there are term limits on volunteer positions, Magali explained “it's to force rotation.”

Chuck Reutter's concern (?) unresolved, forcing a vote on this item, page 20 in the agenda packet.

**Fifty-seven in favor against one NO and three abstains.** Barely **passed** because we barely meet the minimum for quorum.

### **Announcements**

Bundles of Green Focus for \$16, cheaper to cart away than to ship later.

the Lavender Caucus will meet.

San Francisco needs campaign workers for Matt Gonzales. Come up for Halloween weekend. Donate money. “Queers for Matt” will offer homestays.

Don Egelberger announced the San Francisco Green Party opposes Fleet Week. They're calling on the board of supervisors to oppose it.

Tim Fitzgerald objects to Mono County Green Party not yet being recognized.

Craig Petersen is holding a Camejo Campaign meeting at 5:30.

Chuck Reuter announced the “southwest chapter” will be having a Petra Kelly birthday Nov 29 in Southwest Riverside County.

Susan King introduced Linda Schade and Kevin Zeese, visiting from Maryland to staff the Camejo Campaign.

Tom Lash announced Orange County has a camp pendleton protest and celebration Sept 27.

Brian Ever (San Mateo County) is a compost tea activist, also pesticide reform.

Mike Feinstein of Santa Monica announced Rod Donald, a Green in the New Zealand parliament will be visiting Santa Monica. Meet him Sept 19 at the Westside Greens office 2809 Pico BLVD.

Lerner Goode is monitoring a house under siege due to a terrorist warrant in his neighborhood.

Jan From Mendocino, Mendocino is petitioning for a county wide Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) crop ban.

## Saturday afternoon session

**Facilitating:** Beth Moore Haines and Alex Brideau III.

**Vibes:** Michael Borenstein, Matt Leslie, Ginny Case

Timekeeper ?

**Notetaker:** Cameron Spitzer

The first item is the **Candidate Endorsement Procedure** presented by

Mike Wyman (Marin County), Warner Bloomberg, and Forrest Hill.

Don't use the text in the Agenda Packet, there is a handout called Treasurer's Packet, use the version in there.

Summarizing the many changes:

in section 3-1a and 3-1b, "initiative" means "any kind", that's legislative, petition, or whatever.

No CC member can vote on his own endorsement.

in section 1.2.1 In contested primaries, you need 80% vote of the CC

in section 2-1, insert "congressional, legislative, and Board of Equalization candidates" and keep the rest.

in section 3-1.3 insert "when not unanimous, 2/3 majority of voting counties required to endorse."

Warner noted this is not about presidential or local candidates. It's only about the statewide races. The bylaws committee feels locals must be the first line of screening candidates. We don't want state party endorsements in contested primaries (with rare exceptions). We want the CC to do endorsements promptly on advice of the Campaigns+Candidates WG for timeliness.

Forrest added "in these races the electoral districts cross county boundaries. That's why we can't let locals run it. We want to empower our candidates, not put up roadblocks.

Mike Wyman added, "please see section 9 of the bylaws. We don't have a bylaw about referenda, legislative proposals, etc. Each local has input about endorsing, but nothing about how to oppose. What to do about this lack? Who is the endorsement coordinator, it's not stated. Should we have let bylaws do it, or should we instead add a procedure that honors the existing bylaws? We wouldn't have had to do this morning's votes on [Propositions] 53 and 54 if we'd had this."

### Clarifying Questions

John Mark-something (SF) asked is there one vote per county or is it more proportional?

Genevieve Marcus asked "There's a conflict between [sections] 2-6 and 2-3. Should we start using teleconferences and email polling more? I hope so."

Denise Munro Robb (Los Angeles) asked how the votes would be documented?

Is section 3-a1-2.2 statewide?

In section 2-1, can a small organization filibuster for a candidate? Or does it have to be a county or local Green Party?

What does "substantial" mean?

2-1.2 need specific criteria for exceptions.

Andrea Dorey (Santa Clara County) asked: In section 1-2.2 only joint endorsements, do you mean 80% Or 2/3?

### The presenters reply.

Mike Wyman, thanks for actually reading the proposal.

This is about endorsing before the candidate is a primary winner. "Substantial" was left deliberately vague.

Forrest added, we are avoiding hard thresholds so we can react to circumstances. If you're concerned about the Campaigns and Candidates Working Group getting too powerful, you're invited to serve on it.

Mike Wyman asked, does a candidate for mayor of Inglewood have to go to LA County for an endorsement? How to set a standard? We don't have a procedure for people with local but not county endorsement.

Forrest replied: 2-7 handles that. Counties get to set their own standards.

60 days is only initiatives.

Mike Wyman suggested the [General Assembly] should make the endorsements, but an administrative body is better to come up with a good procedure for doing it than the GA can.

Forrest added: The Working Group is making recommendation, the CC is making endorsements.

### Concerns.

Chuck Reutter said Riverside County is strongly against this. We should endorse after primaries.

Andrea Dorey: concerned about 2/3 vote. It should be 75% or better.

Paul Quick (SF) wanted 2-1.2 deleted. "2-1.1a is creating a free-for-all."

Denise wanted "substantial" made specific. Also please define "a short time," and we need a threshold in 2-1.1.

"Deliberately vague" reflects badly on us." Scattered applause.

Don Egelberger wants a specific threshold in 2-5.1.

Trina suggested we should poll the counties each time, instead of letting the Coordinating Committee endorse candidates.

Paul Quick (SF) wanted endorsements to be by consensus or 80%. "We want it weighted, so we can't be outvoted by small counties."

Jonathan Lundell pointed out "we have no precedent for an unweighted vote of counties" and we should just use the usual delegate count.

Ginny Case suggested this proposal be "pulled" and brought back in December.

The Facilitators suggested adding a sunset provision, and reauthorizing a revised version in December.

Mike Wyman restated, “adopt it provisionally, then adopt a fixup [to address all the concerns] in December.”

**Time to vote, 2:15 pm.**

We used a more careful voting procedure than before. The Facilitators counted off the delegate card numbers, with each delegate or alternate replying with her or his vote. Then there was another pass through the list for all the numbers that didn't answer the first time. It went pretty fast. Traditionally, we try to get everyone in the room to hold still while several people try to count all the cards in the air, and do that three times because the first two times everybody didn't count the same. It seemed to me the new roll call method was no more work than that and everyone was more comfortable with the results. This note taker recommends roll call voting for future General Assembly proposals. **49 YES, 15 NO, 5 ABSTAIN. The proposal failed.** Even with a two month sunset.

### And now a **presentation on the “Engage! Database” project from GROW.**

Fred Hosea (delegate from Alameda County) presenting.

“The 'GROW Engage! database project' is an attempt to formalize how we use information about active Greens.”

There will be one database with a Web front end. A visitor to the Web site can create a volunteer profile to share. We expect to be able to organize teams of volunteers with similar skills by matching them up. The registered visitor can nominate speakers to a speakers bureau. More applications such as donor data management, are planned.

In response to questions about how a new database would play with the one we've got, “we plan to align this database with others.” Presenters agree a “formal policy and procedure to govern use of data” is a good idea but haven't put any features in the application to help enforce any policy.

**What's the current state of the project?**

A proposal was distributed at the Sacramento General Assembly. [In the GROW meeting.]

We're still talking about what tools to use. Microsoft Access<sup>TM</sup> was used for prototyping.

Ross Tobia, an IT professional, built some of this software for the Camejo campaign.

This will energize and empower and bring money and growth.

No decision was requested on this item.

Next, **Peter Camejo introduced Jane Parker**, who has been **hired fundraiser** for the Green Party of California. Then a short speech. We should give credit for our progress to Barbara Blong and Dan Hamburg and all others who have gone before. “We need to raise money for staff and office.” If we had ten dollars per registered Green in California “we could run TV ads.”

Money pledges were collected. Applause.

Next, the General Assembly adjourns for a working groups breakout, to return at 4:30.

### And now the **Bylaws Decision**

to be presented by Jonathan Lundell and Jim Stauffer.

Jonathan explained “We [the Bylaws Committee] are paring down the bylaws, by moving some of the stuff into a procedures book.” New procedures can be adopted without taking GA time, but the counties still get to review everything.

Of course there are **Clarifying Questions.**

Warner Bloomberg asked for the direct presentation language to be read aloud.

#### **Affirmations and Concerns.**

Warner: these procedures have the force of bylaws. we're concerned they are to be treated outside the usual procedure.

Ed Delipa (delegate from San Diego County): There's no definition for rules and procedures, nothing to prevent the CC from taking arbitrary action. This policy is too complex.

Genevieve Marcus: We want regional reps to be required to get feedback about any new rules.

Paul Encimer: This is too convoluted, I can't understand it. We don't need it.

Tim Fitzgerald affirms the proposal. “We're just setting up standing orders.”

Greg Jan didn't like adding a third decision threshold, 75%. “Lets keep that at 80%.”

Mike Borenstein affirmed the proposal “the idea here is to set up a bylaws rewrite and prevent future plenaries of nothing but bylaws.”

#### **Presenters address the concerns.**

Jim addressed the complexity concern. “It looks complex, but we're looking for a more streamlined method.”

Jon added: it “provides a way to get raw input from the counties without burdening the GA every time.

Everyone with concerns was satisfied (standing aside), but suddenly there are more.

Chuck Reutter: [unintelligible, sorry]

So we **go to a vote.**

**41 YES. 21 NO. 8 ABSTAIN. The proposal fails.**

The next item is an **Ad Hoc Process committee** discussion.

Laura Wells and Bill Myers presenting

The Coordinating Committee empowered this committee to get feedback and present a report, and facilitate a discussion about the decision making process.

Bill Meyers: 5 minutes. The rules are the bylaws. The bylaws are the rules. The overview is, we have "Greens", who range from nonregistered Green voters to hard core activists. Our process is how we get from being a group to reaching our goals. All different kinds of people are coming in. recovering Dems, issue activists, decline-to-states.

We have locals, counties, regions, state party, national party. Each makes more than one kind of decision.

Karine: reporting on the questionnaire that went out to all the counties.

There were certain recurring comments.

1. people are untrained to do consensus.
2. need a list of all officers.
3. need an email process, at least for getting the clarifying questions out of the way ahead of time.
4. badly labeled links on web pages. (We can't find stuff on the Web site.)
5. Web updates are not happening fast, due to lack of staff.
6. we like jstauffer's updates list. (<http://lists.cagreens.org/mailman/listinfo/updates>)
7. need regular mailings and fundraising stuff.
8. email broadcasts are redundant.
9. some cc reps not communicating w/ locals
10. opinions not being sought
11. cc should maintain same role but make it more accountable and transparent. publish meeting minutes on the Web. Publish a voting record of cc members.
12. we like polling the counties.
13. make the cc and GA minutes public.
14. empower small groups, no, that's controversial.
15. better leadership training for new leaders.
16. limit the # of committees one person can serve on
17. Agendas should be approved by all.
18. staff should be handling incoming contacts, not the cc.

Magali will now lead a **group discussion**.

Chuck Rutter: We need to restructure the CC and do away with regions!

Denise Robb: Dozens of emails are coming in. Power is concentrating in the CC and we are not consulted. The CC is interfering with regional elections.

Mike Borenstein replied: We are working on perhaps 2/3 of the concerns in the list. County councils should ask their regional reps to come and address the county meetings.

Dana St George (delegate from Santa Clara County): I'm a new member of the CC. It's been an amazing opportunity. We don't have an apprenticeship program. We need a process for bringing newcomers up to speed and offload the oldtimers. I'm concerned about communication styles. We inadvertently offend other Greens. It's hard for the shy folks to be around the assertive folks.

Chris Collins, (from Alameda County): We need a dedicated staff to do referrals.

Robyn: We have growing pains. We need to rotate staff out.

Mike Feinstein: We did a comprehensive restructuring in April 2000. There was supposed to be a two year planning process feeding into a work plan. The CC is supposed to be responsible for it. long term planning alleviates the need for crisis management. We need to return to that plan.

Genevieve Marcus: Greens love to vote and want to be polled. We should be voting on line on everything.

Paul Encimer: "I see a centralizing tendency. It's outgrowing itself. There's intimidation and mistrust."

Sabrina Aller (Orange County): we should communicate with each other better, simplify the language.

Jim Barton (of Sacramento): affirming Encimer. We prefer a long term strategic plan. We've fallen into micromanagement and intimidation of dissenters.

Ginny Case: This stuff is already available, we need to show people where it is.

Tim K. Fitzgerald of Mono county: Affirm Feinstein on need for planning. But differs, there is too much micromanagement by the GA which should be micromanaged by the CC...

Jon Lundell: We have a democratic hierarchy. county councils, delegates to GA, delegates elect the CC. WGs are self-selected, in contrast. We can't do the GA's business in eight days a year. The cc and the councils should be empowered to do it.

Solo Soliento: There are serious CC problems not being addressed, lack of democratic process. I felt abused by the CC

David Cobb: California is bigger than most countries. This is really hard. Find a way to meet on line and have a continuing process. Be open to conflict resolution. The GP-US delegation is self-selected. It's a real problem.

arlen comfort (San Mateo County): Only a fraction of our people have email.

Wrapping up the Ad Hoc Process Discussion... please fill out the evaluation forms.

Magali: this was a brainstorming session. Maybe this should be a permanent committee.



## **Sunday morning session**

Facilitators: Jo Chamberlain, Bill Meyers

Timekeeper: Alex III

Vibes: Sharon, Michael Borenstein

The **consent calendar** item was not brought back.

The Tikkun item will return at the December plenary as a proposal.

And now the **child care plank** item from the platform committee.

Peggy Lewis presenting.

The childcare plank is completely rewritten since the packet went out. This plank will be brought back in december. want discussion today, not consensus.

Donna Worden, Santa Cruz county, 831-338-0818.

[Lots of delegates lined up to speak.]

Nearly two dozen sets of comments came in after the draft was circulated, including a comment set from Ushanda io Elima. We don't know why little comment came from Greens in time for this meeting.

The LGBT comments requested more awareness of those parents' needs.

The platform Working Group will meet by teleconference.

Comments on the **child care plank**.

Pat Gray: the Green Party comments only started coming in in the last few days.

We need more input from men,

Paul Quick (San Francisco): thanks to Donna who has worked for 1.5 years on it. Our job as a feminist and all inclusive party is to write a plank which recognizes all the diverse types of families and parents in CA.

Susan Sayer (Orange County): We're concerned the plank comes from a judgemental place, discriminating against non breastfeeding families.

We'd change "dedicated" to "designated".

Please be careful not to use condemning language.

Tim K. Fitzgerald (of Mono County) thanks Donna for her work over the last 1.5 yers and overnight for the revision.

The second paragraph should mention economic causes of family disintegration.

Beth Moore Haines (Nevada County): It should talk about access to health care.

[unknown] This plank creates "unfunded mandates". They impact small business. Green Party should be sensitive to the needs of small businesses more than large ones.

Genevieve Marcus: Breast milk is now toxic (PCBs, pesticides...), breastfeeding advocacy should be concerned.

Ray Bocrinak (delegate from Santa Cruz county): Affirmation. This plank addresses the roots of American character. We should subsidize small business to mitigate the impact of the mandate.

Sabrina Unknown (of Orange County): It needs something about training and wages of babysitters, counselors, etc.

Line 50 comes out a little hostile to non breastfeeders.

Alex Brudeax III: line 24, please change "one" to "at least one". On line 58 please change "at low cost" to "low or no cost".

Bob Smith (of Los Angeles County): Long ago we talked about child care all the way through school.

Kevin McKeown: It took years to get a dignified place for breastfeeding in our city hall. Affirmation. I support small people more than small business. Discourage petty squabbling and get the plank in the platform.

Peggy passed a **signup sheet for child care plank helpers** around.

Next, working group breakouts.

## Sunday afternoon session

convened at 12:54 pm

First item, a pitch for **Matt Gonzalez campaign for mayor** of San Francisco.

Volunteers and donations needed.

16% of SF voters chose Camejo last year, more than chose Simon.

Democratic machine killed IRV in SF this year.

Quorum achieved at 1:04 pm.

Facilitators: Mike Wyman, Helina Quintano

Next item, **how do we select delegates to the GP of the US presidential nominating convention?**

Warner Bloomberg presenting.

Of course there are

**clarifying questions.**

Jo Chamberlain: In section 3, must we determine how the delegates must vote now, or can we later, or must we mandate them at all?

Chris Collins (of Alameda County): Is this a bylaws addition? if not, where does it go? What force does it have?

Warner replies: The GA consented before our primary will guide our delegates, in numerical proportion to votes cast. Delegates will be chosen at each county that way. That's why the CC has to do the allocation.

**Concerns?**

Jon Lundell: friendly amendment suggestion: San Mateo County affirms the proportionality, but it's not what was in the packet. Please use the proportionality method from the bylaws. Also, if we assume the convention will use IRV, we should send our dels to do that, according to the primary outcome.

Warner: let's do that amendment in December so we can get the language ready.

Jon: will work on language.

Jo: Affirmation, thanks for doing it on time so we can find 150 delegates by next June. Concerned about having language to bind the delegates this early. We should wait till next May.

Warner: The May convention accepted, will strike section 3.

David Cobb: concerned about using the primary because we can't capture nor express the No Candidate option.

Warner: it's not legal under California law.

Cobb: but we can do it internally.

Warner: you can write a proposal for that for May.

Mike Feinstein: instructing an IRV from a primary tally is problematic. Maybe they don't all transfer.

Chris Collins: Affirmation. it's not urgent.

Greg Jan: in section 1.5, it should be clear the deadline is only effective if they had notice. In section 1.6, it should make priority appts for counties that missed the deadline.

Warner: accepted as friendly

Chris Collins: when we discussed election code, we found we get our rules thrown out if they are not legal.

Warner: if we don't adopt it we have no procedure.

**Consensus was achieved** on the proposal as amended at 1:32

Next another working groups session.

**Announcements.**

There is a van to the airport.

Sept 22 is the voter registration deadline for the recall.

**www.greencabinet.org** ad hoc committee

All counties should compare your lists of elected people to your voter reg list. **You may discover Greens in office** you didn't even know about.

There's a **people of color caucus** in formation, please contact [johnny@lai.net](mailto:johnny@lai.net).

Affirmation of new WG co-coordinators

All the newly elected working group leaders appeared briefly, to applause.

Get a list from the facilitators.

Closing ceremony

See you in Orange County.