

June 2004 GPCA Plenary

June 5-6, 2004

Sacramento City College, Sacramento, CA

Saturday Morning - 6/5/04

Delegate Orientation

Ellen Maisen: Review of consensus-seeking process

Reminder of why we seek consensus vs. simply voting:

Voting creates factions, while consensus builds community spirit.

Facilitators: Magali Offerman, Jim Shannon

Notes: Adrienne Prince and Don Eichelberger (alt.)

Vibes: Leslie Dinkin, Don Eichelberger

Time Keeper: Ed Duliba

Confirming of Agenda

Ratification of minutes, discussion of electoral reform, and platform plank have all been moved to Sunday. Time-sensitive agenda items were given priority.

Consent Calendar

Jo Chamberlain, SMC: Media bylaws concerns will also be discussed Sunday a.m.

Clarification on "point of process" for Consent Calendar: when concerns are brought up, the item in question becomes dropped from the calendar and can be brought up for discussion and voting later in the plenary as time allows.

I. GPUS Post-First-Round Ballot Voting Instructions Proposal - Nanette Pratini, Jonathan Lundell, Jim Stauffer

Regarding convention delegate voting procedure: "If a delegate's assigned candidate withdraws from the race or if subsequent votes are required...delegates will vote using their best judgment...as to what the voters who selected their assigned candidate would choose."

Floor rules in process of being approved by national CC. Will be conducted as a series of rounds, announced state by state. For first round, delegates are tied to the candidates as represented in the primary. If someone wins and does not want to accept the vote, subsequent rounds will vote. If a willing candidate gets a majority, they will be nominated, If "no candidate" (an option) wins, there will be an IRV election for an endorsement instead of a nomination. This would allow an opportunity to endorse Ralph Nader, though "no endorsement" will also be a choice.

Summary -- Three possible outcomes exist:

1. A nominee is chosen.
2. A candidate is chosen for endorsement
3. No endorsement at all is chosen for endorsement or nomination.

Clarifying Questions:

KCM Curry, LA: Why not do an IRV vote from the beginning?

A. We found no way to be able to translate that into a series of ballots with 132 delegates. This process is similar to IRV, except one question at a time. Multiple rounds cause options to drop off gradually, acting the same way as IRV.

Q. Will the convention vote on these rules?

A. Matter of dispute. GPUSCC is putting out these rules, and it is felt they are taking the concerns into account. Delegates feel they should be the final decision makers. Unresolved.

Q. Greg Jan, AC: -- If the assembly chooses "no candidate," would GP have to endorse someone?

A. If a candidate is chosen states are required to place that candidate on the state ballot. If it is decided not to nominate, a state may choose whether or not to place a candidate on their state ballot.

Peter Camejo -- the convention must be sovereign, delegates unrestrained by preformulated rules. Wants to make a proposal that could render everyone winners.

Second part of this morning's proposal: Packet p. 23, item 7-3: "Candidates may make recommendations to delegates but may not mandate or coerce...Delegates may caucus...Delegate's best judgment is to be the primary guiding principle."

Review of the discussion process that led to today - 4 candidates and NOTA (none of the above.) 2 clauses are being reintroduced since they weren't voted on.

Jim Stauffer: Bottom line, it was felt best to allow delegates to use their best judgment in their voting. This authorizes that. Would like to allow delegates to conduct straw polls on second choice decisions in IRV voting. Just a suggested tool to allow flexibility.

Clarifying questions:

Q. Jo Chamberlain, SMC: Unclear on 2 places in proposal.

A. Jonathan Lundell, SMC: Sec'y of State will only place a nomination on the ballot. Will not list an endorsement.

Q. Jo Chamberlain, SMC: Can CA nominate their own candidate if national chooses "no candidate?"

A. Yes.

Peter Camejo, Sac: Asks again for 10 minutes to address the assembly. As the candidate who won the Green primary, he wants to explain his position.

Ed Duliba, SD and Nanette, RV suggest a straw poll when current discussion is done.

Concerns and affirmations

Don Eichelberger, SF: Concerned about arm twisting on behalf of beating Bush rather than running the strongest candidate.

<Straw Poll conducted for Camejo to speak - passes.>

Peter Camejo presentation- (Don's notes) Winner-take-all system pits progressives against each other. Nader run is the biggest thing going. We should not allow decisions that weaken that relationship. We are used and manipulated by this system. In debating Cobb vs. Nader, Greens are alienated. Cobb has been a good campaigner and needs to be commended. But Camejo does not agree with his safe states strategy, among other things. Nader is on our side in opposing this system. Polls show that millions of people want him. Let's find a way to be unified and get Nader, and possibly Camejo, into the national presidential debates.

Camejo hears Nader is considering naming him as running mate. Not sure if this is happening - he has not been contacted. But he would like to be in a debate with Cheney and he hopes we will do our part to help make that happen.

There are Greens for Kerry. They should be respected, but Kerry will have no problem getting in to the debates and being heard, and that is part of the problem, We need to be for the Greens and not attacking each other. It's normal that we're going through this, but we are walking into the Nat'l Convention without a consensus. Wants Greens to come out united. Send the message that we oppose the war in Iraq.

I would like to advocate that the GPUS offer a dual endorsement of Cobb and Nader at their national convention.

Nanette Pratini: We need to choose decision items: ballot line designation for GP presidential candidate needs to be submitted to Secretary of State soon.

Jim: We need to discuss the various voting options, preceded by training of our national delegates.

<Twinkle-consensus approves this idea.>

II. National Delegate Training

Facilitated by Jo Chamberlain, Kevin McKeown, Dennis _____

A. Jo and Kevin led a "Role play" or "simulation:" as a preview of the convention voting process:

Delegates were appointed and made signs for the 5 candidate options: Salzman, Cobb, Camejo, Mesplay, No Nominee. These will be the actual teams working in Milwaukee. Reporters were appointed for each team (see list) and voting procedure was practiced in the selection process of a California state reporter. An energetic, colorful and occasionally chaotic process.

B. State Reporter election- A state reporter needed to be identified who will be responsible to report the votes of the state delegates to be recorded in national tallies. Result of vote: Of 5 candidates, Sara Amir won the most delegate votes. She proposed that a team of 3 state reporters be formed. By CONSENSUS, it was decided to add ???? And ???? To constitute a State Reporting Team.

C. Issues regarding registering and paying for convention attendance.

D. Daily updates of convention will be aired on C-Span and the Web.

E. Decision- Electoral College - Jim S. - Secretary of State requires a slate of electors to be created. 55 needed. Whoever wins in Nov., delegates will go to Sac. To cast their vote.

Proposal: to authorize the Coordinating Committee to create list of electors.

Ideas: go for gender balance, ethnic representation. As an honorary title, could be linked to fundraising possibilities. <Approved by consensus.>

F. Ballot Line options: If no candidate is nominated, how will the state decide if and who to place on our state ballot? (This only applies if no nomination is made in Milwaukee.)

Three suggestions:

1. County by county polling
2. Another general assembly prior to 8/26
3. A statewide poll - method to be decided later

Proposal: Should we decide this today?

Straw poll: Will bring it back later today, in afternoon session.

III. Finance and solicitation review-

Michael Wyman, Treasurer: Currently \$75,000 in accounts nationwide. Several thousand \$\$ were spent this week for *Green Focus* publication, fundraising mailer. Some financial assistance will be available for delegates going to Milwaukee.

IV. Jane Packer and GPCA Fundraising Committee: The Funds Pitch

V. Announcements

A new campaign coordinator has been hired. A Press secretary is being hired.

(notes by Adrienne Prince)

SATURDAY AFTERNOON - June 5, 2004

Facilitators - Kevin McKeown, Erika McDonald

Timekeeper - Ed Duliba

Vibeswatchers - Mark Barney; Ellen Maisen

Notekeeper - Stuart Bechman

1) National Delegate Bylaws / Rule Change

Nanette Pratini, RV: We've modified the selection portion of the delegation bylaws and implemented Choice Voting for our delegate and alternate elections.

Ed Duliba, SD: In 18 places here, the delegation is asked to serve 2 masters: Both the GPUS and the GPCA CC. I think that's a conflict of interest.

David Marin, CC: I have a concern about the section I asked about, the special election, where only alternate delegates can run. We need to let everybody run; it's not OK for a committee to pick or limit the people that can run. We need choices. We should strive to have contested elections in the Green Party as well as out.

Leslie Bonett, AC: I'm currently an alternate on the delegation. I agree very much with the proposal as written. I think it's important, I know how valuable it is, I understand the responsibilities of the standing delegate; for someone to just come in without any experience [is tough]. I think that being an alternate is an important first step, a training ground; and I hope that we can have many more people step up as delegates. But we could override that if someone really exceptional stood forward. I don't have a problem with this.

Jonathan Lundell, SM: The concern is that the mechanism for reappointing/reaffirming is confusing and makes it a little difficult -- we don't know whether there will be open alternate or delegate slots at a plenary if people can just be reappointed outside the GA. I'd like to offer a non-specific (non-substantial?) FA that the bylaws comm. take a pass over it to clean up the wording?

Jared Laiti, Sonoma: I'd like to affirm the intent of the proposal, but I'm concerned that this proposal goes only half-way, it needs to go further. These delegates don't stand for general election, and they need to.

Jo Chamberlain, SM: We've always had a really hard time filling our full 26 delegation slots. These bylaws may look like it restricts election; but we have room for more, we'd love to have more people step up to these positions. The delegation is like a large standing committee, and it's making its rules based on what it understands its functions to be. I think the bylaws as presented are an excellent compromise and I ask you to support them as well as step forward to serve on the delegation or a national committee.

Genevieve Marcus, LA: The question of alternates and the need for more and more skilled people as we expand. We elect the delegates, but the alternates should be considered not just alternates but apprentices that go under specific training, so we develop a large pool of national representatives.

Jo Chamberlain, SM: I fully agree with Genevieve. We rotate our alternates at our national meetings, it's been very complicated.

KCM Curry, LA: 3 concerns: 1) I've been a Green for 2 years and I've been very disheartened on the lack of ethnic diversity in our delegation. 2) This concept of "alternate", as an African-American, it bothers me -- I don't need to be "trained." This might be working for Y'all, but it ain't working for US! We're not working hard enough to address this issue. How do we not prohibit people of color from getting more involved? This whole concept is scaring me! Let's work it out

Magali Offerman, SD: I'd like to affirm KCM. I have known people of color who would be great candidates, but they felt that they would be tokenized or isolated. That's why I appreciate having the election of members here and avoid having them appointed from elsewhere. Everyone has a different learning curve, and some people can come into a group and be great without any "training."

Mike Feinstein, LA: On 11.2.2 and 11.2.3, it says OT1H that the GA has the power to elect new delegates / alternates; but then it says that the CC has the power to reappoint those people. This doesn't seem consistent. 11.2.3 is ambiguous in that it says either a delegate or an alternate can serve for a vote; we should have either alternates assigned to delegates or the entire delegation determines who the alternate is going to be. I also think that the co-cos need to have term limits -- these are very powerful positions, it's not a criticism of their work, just a concern of a concentration of power. The process for removing people has only one suggested criteria, and I find that to be problematic. Finally, 11.2.3. we can have one person serve on multiple committees, I think this is a problem.

Jo Chamberlain, SM: We worked carefully on these term limits for a long time. Peggy Lewis is up for election to the Steering Committee as a co-chair in Milwaukee. But she has the same problem that I have: Peggy has already served on the GPUS CA Delegation for 2 years; if we were held to term limits, she would be required to step down after only 1 year as the co-chair. Magali is another potential situation where this could happen down the road. Being a national co-chair requires people who are dedicated to do the work. I'm affirming the bylaws as presented today with term limits; and they will be reviewed when the national party changes its term limit policies. Please accept them as presented with the understanding that when the national bylaws change, we will change our bylaws.

Nanette Pratini, RV: The "serving 2 masters" question. Yes, the CC of California does have a role in reappointing the terms. Outside of just taking it out, I'm not sure what else we might be able to do.

Mike Wyman, AC: This is an ongoing philosophical dispute in the party. When we first set up our delegation, we didn't have any precedent for doing that. The CC ended up being the default body for appointing our delegates. Since then, we've heard that the party wants a more democratic process for choosing delegates, but there is still a need to balance that with efforts to expand diversity and keep our institutional memory in place. When we have candidates, you will have women; you will have people of color. According to the rules here, if you want to be considered, you just let the CC know you want to be considered, and your name will be brought to the floor for GA consideration. This is the compromise we made between those who wanted direct accountability and those who wanted to ensure diversity. I hope this answers the confusion if not the concerns.

Mike Feinstein, Los Angeles: POI. I wrote the proposal in 1999; and that proposal had only the GA choosing the delegation.

Nanette Pratini, RV: The question of the role of the CC in reappointments can be addressed with a friendly amendment. Your other concerns about removing a delegate, that's not a part of today's question; it was already consensed in Fullerton, we're not revisiting it here. The issue of only alternates able to become delegates, that we need to be able to directly add new delegates from the floor, that's a consideration.

Mike Wyman, AC: It's doable, but it means that you could be taking somebody with zero experience and putting them ahead of all of the experienced alternates, that didn't seem fair. The alternates do go through an apprenticeship, it's not simple to just walk in to this all cold. Those were some of the concerns underlying this phrasing, not that we're not open to changing it as was suggested.

Nanette Pratini, RV: The issue of the CC reappointing delegates to serve 2nd or 3rd terms...The concern of how the delegation can become more diverse, I'm not sure how to address this in our bylaws short of imposing quotas, which we have discussed; but I'm not sure how to address this in our bylaws.

Mike Wyman, AC: We've had a lot of success in our affirmative action recruitment in our delegation. We have gender balance; we have 30% people of color, more than in this room, more than any other section of the party. But of course we have further to go. We will continue to push for diversity, but the commitment to gender and ethnic balance is in these bylaws.

Nanette Pratini, RV: The term limits issue is something that was agreed to in Fullerton. If there's a FA, we would have to consider this in caucus.

Magali Offerman, SD: POP. It's mentioned many times that the FA would need to be taken back to the caucus to be considered; but my understanding is that FAs are to be conveying a sense of the GA, not the caucus?

Kevin McKeown, LA: I think the entire delegation is considered the entire set of presenters, and we have always let presenters confer whether to accept FA's or not. SO, are there any further outstanding concerns?

Magali Offerman, SD: I heard that the concerns would be addressed via caucus, but the concerns themselves were not addressed.

Kevin McKeown, LA: Anyone with remaining outstanding concerns, please restate them.

Magali Offerman, SD: This body (the GA) needs to be the body that elects and re-elects our delegation, not the CC. I'd like to suggest that all the delegation selections be made by the GA and the delegation prepares a guideline document which indicates what makes a qualified candidate, to be included in plenary packets with candidate bios.

Mike Feinstein, LA: On 1.4.4, I would suggest 2 terms of 1 year each. 11.3, alternate delegates, you said it was settled at a prior plenary, but the section is in play because of an italicized word appearing in it.

KCM Curry, LA: 11.2, FA, add: "To encourage people of color caucuses in the state, and to provide monies to support those caucuses."

David Marin, CC: My concern was about democracy and having GA elections. I would suggest amending 11.2 to end it after "the GA will elect replacement delegates." period. Have an election every time; take the CC out of it. I want to address the concern of gender and ethnic balance -- so our electorate in general has a problem with electing non-white non-males, but I know the GP does not. What we need to do is to recruit candidates of women and people of color. If we recruit them, they will get elected. Same with experience; the GA will elect those based on experience.

Mike Wyman, AC: I appreciate that David is the only speaker who offered a specific amendment that would solve your concerns.

Bob Marsh, AC: I agree completely with Magali and David Marin that we completely remove all references to the CC. However, I'd propose the creation of a candidate recruitment committee which would be created six months before the election would occur in order to emphasize diversity.

2) Election for New National Delegates (Nanette Pratini, Riverside)

Nanette Pratini, RV: First of all, there's a correction. When we're describing the current delegation, there are 2 that self-identify as LGBTIQ. As mentioned, there are 13 delegate positions (2 are vacant) and 13 alternate positions (7 are vacant). Assuming that there were no concerns over the GA selecting alternates, we'll proceed with an election for 2 candidates for alternates, Forrest Hill and Newell Taylor, both who are here and perhaps could come up and say a few words? The proposal is to hold elections for these 2 candidates, yes or no.

Erika McDonald, SF: Any clarifying questions? ...OK, seeing no clarifying q's any concerns?

TH: I would like to hear a few words from the candidates before we move forward.

Walter Lehmann, SD: Is it possible to elect the candidates to be full delegates rather than alternates?

Nanette Pratini, RV: We may have to wait until we resolve the concerns over the bylaws.

Erika McDonald, SF: OK, are ther other concerns?

June Brashares, SF: We have 2 candidates being submitted, can we submit other candidates from the floor?

Nanette Pratini, RV: The way we proposed this in the bylaws which has not been contested is to follow the procedure for CC elections, which means we would not accept new candidates from the floor.

Erika McDonald, SF: OK, are there other concerns? **Having no other concerns, I judge that we have reached consensus and will hold the election now.**

Nanette Pratini, RV: OK, we'll have the two candidates come up and speak, and then follow that with an election as we elect our delegates.

Forrest Hill, Sacramento: I've been involved in the GPCA for the past 4 years; I've served on the CC and have been involved with the GPCA CCWG. I'm here because I want to get involved in the national level. We really need to build this party across this country, and we need to help bring the rest of the party up to where California is. I'd like to be involved in that process.

Newell Taylor, Nevada: I've been an active Green for the past 3-1/2 years, ran for city council; I'm active as a local tabler and county councilmembers. I think one of the big issues we have to confront is taking democracy back, and we've seen that today in our discussions. We have 2 people that are interested in stepping up, I'd like to see more of that. We need to be responsible for educating more of our constituency so they can back our delegates. Thank you.

Nanette Pratini, RV: OK, we've come up with a procedural problem; we're going to have to have a paper ballot with a "No Candidate" option, so we'll have to bring back the election tomorrow.

KCM Curry, LA: Have you heard of the national Black Caucus Organizing Committee? Second, how would you specifically bring more people of color in? Third, do you think that we need to have term limits, and why/why not?

NT: As far as the BCOC, I haven't been focused on the national level to know about the BCOC. Since my county is 98.6% white, it's a negligible issue for us. Term limits, that might be an issue that might be directed towards the kind of job required. If we placed term limits on these positions, we might be pulling off people who are doing a good job.

FH: As far as bringing in more diversity, I think we 2 candidates are good candidates for that. We need to be raising more money so we can start funding and pushing minority candidates. That's a big deal for me in the CWGG. Term limits for the delegates: I think we need more transparent elections, and people need to know when those elections come up. I bet many of the people here didn't even know that there was going to be a delegate election this weekend.

Nanette Pratini, RV: The CA standing delegation did consense to recommend both of these candidates.

Mike Wyman, AC: Are we voting on the candidates tomorrow?

Erika McDonald, SF: Yes, because we need to have paper ballots. We're going to now go back to the proposal since the presenters have finished caucusing.

Mike Wyman, AC: Title: "Alternates and Delegates: Alternates and Delegates will be elected by the GA following the same procedure used to elect CC members. Elections will be made with attention to gender, ethnic and geographic balance" Sec. 2-1b, new title, "Vacancies:" "As delegate and alternate seats become vacant by removals, resignations or term limits, the GA will elect replacements at the next state plenary." Sec. 11-2.2, "Terms:" "Delegates will be elected for a term of 2 years, except...Delegates may be reelected by the GA for more than one term." "At that time, delegates will be elected for a maximum of 3 full terms. Delegates may be reelected by the GA after a retirement period of at least one year." The Delegation also committed to come back with a specific minority recruitment proposal. We felt that's as far as we can go with what we heard.

Kevin McKeown, LA: Given what you've just heard, are there still any outstanding concerns?

Arlen Comfort, SM: You're only talking about delegates, you need to change every reference to delegates to: "delegates and alternates."

KCM Curry: Can't you just put in: "Work with color caucuses"? It's too open.

Mike Wyman, AC: OK, we're accepting both of these suggested amendments. We'll work with KCM to get the right wording.

Mike Feinstein, LA: So, I made a suggestion that, 1-1.1.4, the co-cos have two-term limits, was that considered?

Mike Wyman, AC: Sorry, we didn't consider that, we forgot about it.

Mike Feinstein, Los Angeles: OK, then my concern remains outstanding on that. The CC has already reinterpreted the term limits based on a name change from ASGP to GPUS, so my concerns remain.

Mike Wyman, AC: We acknowledge that these concerns remain; and the GA may always come back and continue to modify these bylaws, so we'll bring it back.

Magali Offerman, SD: When I came up here, I expressed only one concern because my other concerns were addressed by others; but my concern about co-co term limits remains, I'd like to make a FA that if the GA is willing to adopt the current stance, that we agree to a date where we will revisit this.

Mike Wyman, AC: We will make two commitments: One to come back with a proposal about diversity recruitment, and one to come back with a proposal for co-co term limits.

Kevin McKeown, LA: OK, we've heard two remaining outstanding concerns. Are the speakers willing to stand aside, having expressed their concerns? [no] OK, we're moving to a full vote.

3) Announcements

Barbara Shults, HC: We have a GMO Initiative this Nov; We have our July 1st fundraiser, a string-cheese concert. This is a vital issue for all Greens.

MF: I'm the webmaster for our global website, globalgreens.info. A lot of people don't know about the history of our movement, it's all there. We're also rolling out a US Greens Year in Review: 2003 coming out quite soon; check those out.

Warner Bloomberg, SC: This morning, I distributed a sheet about a redraft of the GPCA election code, which we'll be addressing tomorrow afternoon. the ERWG would prefer to get any comments and questions before hand so we can accommodate them. Second...

Tian Harter, SC: Check out the movie "Day After Tomorrow."

Don Eichelberger, SF: The Sonoma County summer event at Bohemian Grove, the summer gathering of CEOs will occur again. Come join us in an encampment out frong.

Ken Culver, Stanislaus: I am seeking Green housing tonight, otherwise I'll have to drive home tonight.

Greg Jan, AC: Please get your county to officially oppose the Westly Initiative, and inform the state of that position. We want to complete this poll by June 15.

Forrest Hill, AC: I'm pleased to introduce our new campaign coordinator, Danika Kubulivich; she'll be at the CCWG meeting tomorrow.

Kalmran Alavi, San Juaquin: We're starting a letter campaign, and we're starting with IRV. Please let me know so I can keep you informeid.

Jonathan Leathers, Yolo: We're hosting a Campus Greens convention this summer, please find flyers in the back.

Jane Packer, SF: We're having a house party at Tyler Snortum-Phelps next Sunday afternoon.

Mike Borenstein, ED: Let's welcome Tulare County as our newest active Green county!

Kevin McKeown, LA: Results of National Delegation Bylaws vote: 59 Yes, 8 No, 1 SA (87.6%). Proposal Passed.

4) SC/WG Meetings

5) Other National Issues

JS: We'll open the mike to discuss the issue of Presidential candidate nomination vs. endorsement vs. no candidate.

JE, FC: Our county spent a lot of discussion on this, but ended up supporting David Cobb with his "Safe States" campaign. There was no support for Nader in our county.

Sanda Everette, SM: This is a difficult issue. Our county seems pretty split over the issue. It might be easier if Peter Camejo could tell us what his intentions are.

Bernie McDonald, Yolo: I think that Nader's candidacy is a great opportunity.

Magali Offerman, SD: I would like some kind of decision to be made today. I think we should stay away from who the candidates are. On the state level, are we willing to put any endorsed national candidate on the state ballot? And if there is no nationally endorsed candidate, are we willing to put someone on the state ballot anyway? I think those are the questions I'd like us to answer today.

Dave Wass, SBa: The SB CC voted on a proposal that would give choice between two things: A "Safe States" option vs. a "No Candidate / Endorse Kerry" option, so our time & money could be spent to promote local GP candidates.

Leslie Bonett, AC: Many of us have lost sight on what the other Greens in the state want, and that is to defeat Bush. There is an article to negotiate, and Dems have given us great power by labelling us as a spoiler; we should use that power to support Kerry while demanding percs from the Dems. We have to grow.

Tian Harter, SC: I remember 12 years ago when we had our first presidential discussion. The answer was an emphatic, flat-out NO. We've come a long way! But what I want is the party machinery to be respected. David Cobb visited Santa Clara county and asked for voters' votes; that's the behavior I want to see. If Nader doesn't want to treat us like a political party, I'd rather have no candidate than support Nader.

Genevieve Marcus, LA: I felt that way too. But we're still getting a mixed message. Peter is very persuasive; and if a Nader/Camejo ticket happens, that will be our strongest suit. But can we do that, can we put Nader on our ballot if he won't accept our nomination?

Mike Feinstein, LA: Primaries normally are used to have a party develop issues for the general election. I advocate the "Free States" strategy where each state determines what nomination/endorsement they would put on each state ballot.

? SF: It's time to take off the Nader training wheels. Our county is very strong in not endorsing Nader. He missed that chance. It's time to run our own candidate, and David Cobb is that candidate.

Lou Ling, Tulare: Q - If the convention votes "No Candidate," and then CA chooses (or GPUS chooses) to endorse Nader, then what is going to appear on our November ballot?

Jim Stauffer: For candidates to appear on our general ballot, they have to have a nomination from the national party or, if that doesn't happen, from the state party.

Lou Ling, Tulare: So if we can override what happens at the national level, is there a reason to go to Milwaukee?

Barbara Shults, HC: We need to remind ourselves what drives the GP. Discord drives evolution. If we put a candidate up there who is not strong, how will we create change? Nader and Camejo are strong and will give change.

Ken Culler, Stanislaus: I have been sent with instructions on this issue, and that is that we do not support a national candidate. We love Nader, but we need to be pragmatic. We know that neither he nor any Green candidate has a chance to win, and we don't want to give the election to Bush again. If we're going to endorse anybody, endorse Kerry.

Michael Rubin, AC: I rise in support of Nader. Under the choices that are actually presented to us, Nader is the best choice in the hopes of building a multi-party culture in the U.S. There's a lot of Nader-bashing, but we need to know that one reason why he took the actions he did was because he was the focus of a lot of Nader-bashing. My point is that for us to build a truly independent and oppositional party, we need to use Nader.

Jo Strausser, AC: I didn't realize that all of the states could go their own way. I'd like clarification on what's possible and what's not. If we can all go our own way, perhaps we should reconvene again after Milwaukee? But I'm very confused then what the point of Milwaukee is then. We're living in a nightmare, and let's make sure that we don't continue it for another four years.

JS: If the convention nominates a candidate, that is the candidate we're obligated to support in California; if they don't nominate, then we're not obligated.

David Marin, CC: I wrote the article "Negotiate, Don't Capitulate". What did our primary tell us? CA Greens love Peter Camejo! But the most contentious issue is not which candidate is the most committed to progressive values; it's what our strategy will be.

Michael Siminitus, Yolo: I feel that supporting Nader will ultimately weaken the party. We need to support David Cobb, a Green. I don't want us to be seen as the Nader party.

June Brashares, SF: I think it would be a bad decision, if we don't nominate someone from within our party, to endorse someone from outside our party. If we're going to do that, why not endorse Dennis Kucinich? But I don't think we should do that. We should only nominate Greens.

Fred Dupperault, SC: I was moving towards Cobb, but I was moved by Peter's speech plus a letter from a Democrat in Democrats.com/Nader.

Jonathan Lundell, SM: Unlike our 2000 discussion, the fact is that Nader is running and we need to respond to that fact. In respect to the Dems, I have a hard time believing that the Dems will believe that we can "deliver the voters" for their candidate. Last, CA Greens do love Peter Camejo; one of the reasons is the creative thinking that he conveyed this morning. It's Peter looking at the situation, and saying, look, we're being torn apart, and we should consider new options.

Louie LaFortune, SCz: In 2000, we were a safe state; the Dems spent millions attacking Ralph Nader. They want to kill us. We need to run. Other states need to retain their ballot line. The more Greens talking about our values, the better.

[Marybeth Wuerthner, Butte: Our county took a poll: 174 wanted a Nader-Camejo ticket; 188 wanted the national convention to endorse Nader.]

Jim Stauffer, SC: OK, let's do a straw poll about the nomination/endorsement of Nader. If no nomination occurs, how many would support an endorsement of Nader? ...OK, how many would oppose such an endorsement? ...OK, it appears that a little over half support endorsement.

The second question is whether CA might move to put our own candidate on the ballot in the event of no national nomination.

Greg Jan, AC: You remember that there were about 3 possible scenarios if no nomination on Milwaukee. the Q is, do we want to spend time right now about holding our own nominating plenary? Or might we want to pursue one of the other scenarios, such as: No nomination, GPUS endorses Nader; No GPUS endorsement

Magali Offerman, SD: Is it possible for this body to decide, given no nomination and no endorsement in Milwaukee, that we do not place any candidate on the CA ballot? And if there IS a GPUS endorsement, could this body decide to place that person's name on the ballot? So whatever happens in Milwaukee, the decision is already known and done.

JS: The question is whether we want to make some kind of decision now, or do we want to fall back on county polling and do it later?

Mike Feinstein, Los Angeles: I think this should go to the counties after the convention. We also need to follow the process in November of 1995. Finally, I think it should be an IRV vote by the county council delegates.

Leslie Bonett, AC: I'd like to decide it now. My strong feeling is that we should do, we should support whatever the national party decides.

Lou Ling, Tulare: If the GP votes for no candidate, then GPCA put Camejo as our presidential candidate.

Warner Bloomberg, SC: If the GPUS does not nominate someone, then I propose that the GPCA have another plenary the end of July or beginning of August.

Genevieve Marcus, LA: If GPUS votes no candidate, nothing goes on the GPCA ballot; if GPUS endorses, nothing goes on the GPCA ballot.

Genevieve Marcus, LA: So if Nader is endorsed, and Nader chooses Camejo as his VP, what would we do in California?

Jim Stauffer, SC: A non-nomination or endorsement frees California from following the GPUS.

Kalmran Alavi, San Joaquin: It comes down to who wants Nader vs. not.

Michael Rubin, AC: I support a special state convention vs. a county-by-county ballot. I think it's really important that we have a face-to-face meeting.

Jim Stauffer: Let's do a straw poll among the delegates on whether we want to make a decision this weekend on how we handle the CA ballots in lieu of no national nominee.

Erika McDonald: OK, how many want to decide this weekend? ...how many sometime later? ...OK, we won't be making a decision this weekend on this question.

Saturday session ended at 5:30pm.

Notes by Stuart Bechman

Sunday Morning, 6/6/04

I. Set-Up

Facilitators: Beth Moore Haines, Jared Laiti
Note Taker: Don Eichelberger

II. National Delegation Certification Consent Calendar Bring-back- Presenters- Jo Chamberlain, Jim Stauffer

National Delegate- Pulling Item 2, with the understanding that there may be certification problems. Plan to submit a proposal to CC saying this process is unnecessarily restrictive.

Today, plan to oppose this credentialing process and ending a letter to that effect to National
Clarifying Questions;

Re: credentialing requirement, are we including opposition to need to follow floor rules at the convention?

A No

Concerns:

Walter Lehman, San Diego- Part D- people have paid for transp. and hotels, and we're now fooling with credentials. This is ridiculous.

Also, response- we are going in to an unknown situation. It is possible we can come out of Milwaukee with a nominee and Nader/Camejo. As Camejo said, it is important we maintain unity. If we endorse the credential requirement, we would not be able to endorse. Striking the word "will".

Our affiliation agreement says we will support candidates chosen. This requirement tries to dictate what locals will do after the convention, and is a problem.

Pat Grey- Does not like being told what to do. Feels if she wants to make a different decision she will be out of the party. We need to remove this section

Ken Koehler, Stanislaus- Supports change, but what happens if it is defeated Will the delegation remain uncertified, or will the delegation accept and be decertified.

A. We offered it in the belief it will be passed, but

?- Supports proposal- We should be able to offer our own interpretation, and since we are a large contingent, it is possible we can get it changed at national

? As she understands, we will take the language out and advocate the national also removing the language.

A. This is being done on behalf of ?????

Jim Dorn, Santa Clara- ...

Ed Duliba, San Diego- In order to be sure our delegates are credentialed, perhaps they could sign a promise to follow the rule, so they can be credentialed.

Accepted as a friendly amendment- Delegates will have the opportunity to sign this, or make the proposal that this requirement be considered "optional" for delegates. Friendly amendment.

No remaining concerns. **CONSENSUS REACHED**

III. Ratification of minutes- Sacramento, San Francisco and Fullerton minutes under consideration

Questions and Concerns-

Pat Gray, SM- Did not have final draft for Fullerton Minutes and Sacramento.

No concerns voiced on San Francisco minutes- **CONSENSED to ratify San Francisco minutes**

Still a problem that Fullerton minutes still appear in draft form.

Note taker said it is the final version, but because of the format, still appeared to be a draft.

Are there any substantive issues?

Jo Chamberlain-Minutes were not included in the delegate packet or available on line.

Jim Stauffer- they are all on the web site. Click on past archive link. Perhaps a better link needs to be created.

Sacramento Minutes already were accepted in SF, so only the Fullerton minutes are not yet approved.

Proposed that we bring Fullerton back next time.

Next Plenary, we need to make clear where the notes are, what is being expected of them relative to the notes and what they are concerned about.

IV. Affirmation of 2004 GPUS CA Convention Delegation- Stuart Bechman

List of delegates was passed out. We are here to affirm that list.

Changes:

Rebecca Markusson, Sac, being added

David Rasmussen, LA, added.

Pat Gray, San Mateo went from alternate to delegate.

Pam Elizondo, Mendocino added.

Charles O'Neill, Sacramento added .

Questions

Ken Koehler, Stanislaus- 123 delegates have been appointed, plus 8 alternates; but you say that 132 delegates are needed. Are the alternates being moved up to get the 132 delegates?

A. Not achieved yet. Alternates have been asked, but not interested for varying reasons. We are allowed to have proxies, but we would prefer to fill all the seats. After today, we will not be able to add more.

Magali Offerman-San Diego- If alternates want to be delegates, can they do so after today?

A. Yes.

San Francisco- Some name changes and spelling errors.

A: Bring them to the committee.

2004 GPUS CA Convention Delegation List, with amendments, affirmed.

V. Media committee consent item- Jo Chamberlain has a concern that the proposal does not conform to the process for setting up a new committee. Current committee will need to be ad hoc, pending consensus at next plenary to make it a full committee. A proposal will be brought to the next plenary. CONSENSUS

VI. National platform- Informational Item (as opposed to decision item as noted in the packet) Bud Dickinson- Saturday of the Milwaukee meeting will be to OK the platform. In 9/02, a process was emplaced. This is the first revision since the original platform was accepted in Denver. Platform is on the web, if behind schedule.

Process overview given.

Table of Contents:

Preamble- Charlene Spretnak wrote preamble and intros to four parts. Feedback to now has been to make it shorter and more terse, but working group would like the party to be more than cursory and we should include a higher level of our thinking to help educate.

Ten Key Values- Value 6- Community Based Economics, changed from Economic Justice Bud is trying to get back to the original language. Value 7, renamed Feminism and Gender Equity.

Four Sections: Grassroots Dem, Social Just. And Econ. Opportunity, Ecology, Economics

Sections:

1. Democracy- Intro by Carlene is long but well-written.
 - A. Political Reform- mostly non controversial
 - B. Political Participation- NOTA should be considered and there is debate in the party over that. Electronic Voting Machine language is still being debated, 2 versions being considered.
 - C. Community- pretty much from the 2000 platform. May move some of the parts around, i.e. transp. in to Trans Plank. Alternative service was moved here from another part of the platform.
 - D. Foreign policy- Bud less informed about this part- Military and trade are two added section.
 - E. Road to peace in the Middle East- International Committee has come p with carefully worded language on this. Still room for movement on this, ie right of return and On state solution vs. two state solution
 - F. Trade- WTO, NAFTA, World Bank- updated slightly from 20000 platform.
 - G. Domestic Security- 9/11 and Patriot Act- more on this in social justice section. New plank on the demilitarization of space.

2. Social Justice
 - A. Civil and Equal Rights, broken down by issue- 10 sub planks
 - B. New women's' rights plank written by the women's caucus.
 - C. Racial discrimination plank is shorter, and pretty much same as 2000 platform.
 - D. Indigenous Peoples- Part was there, and CA submitted 10 planks to the process, and this was one of tem. Some controversial pieces, i.e. what to call native Hawaiians. Some prefer American Indian over Native Americans. Also a statement about reparations. Section on Sexual Orientation and Gender ID- Controversial part about insurance covering sex change operations. Current language is a compromise and needs to be reviewed.
 - E. Physically and Mentally Challenged
 - F. Secular Caucus is questioning a lot of faith based initiatives. Controversial parts include school vouchers for faith schools, pledge of allegiance (taking out "Under God")
 - G. Youth nights- Some feel it needs to be shorter.
 - H. Veterans' Rights- new plank being pushed by vet groups. Does not seem to be much controversial here.
 - I. Consumer protection- mostly from 2000 platform.
 - J. War on terrorism- deals with civil liberties aspects.
 - K. Environmental Justice- new plank submitted by CA. Speaks to "holistic" (a CA word). Short, discusses not having workers choose between a hazardous job and no job at all.

- L. Soc Justice and Social Safety Net- Mostly from 2000, mostly non controversial. Some feel it is long and needs to be cut down,
 - M. Education is mostly same as 2000 platform, although having Greens include education as part of our meetings. Includes wording for funding for the arts.
 - N. Health Care- Updated- Long intro- cut to 3 paragraphs (from 15). Includes items we would like to see included in a national health plan. Some questions include the health effects of x-rays and vaccination. Involuntary psych procedures section is being debated, i.e. electro shock therapy- some feel it may occasionally be helpful, and do not want it banned.
 - O. Labor- NY offered its whole plank. One controversial plank includes right to a job, 32 hour work week, long vacations (4-6 weeks per year being considered).
 - P. Prison- CA plank speaks to alternatives to incarceration, prison conditions, legislative suggestions, three strikes repeal, end death penalty Extensive and well written,.
 - Q. Population- Carrying Capacity arguments, stronger women's rights, over development and over consumption.
 - R. Free Speech- Material has been added from 2000
 - S. Immigration Plank from CA platform
 - T. Housing and Homelessness- From CA platform. Quite detailed, perhaps needs to cut some.
3. Ecology
- A. Energy- mostly non-controversial
 - B. Long Transportation plank from CA. Pretty good in his opinion
 - C. Waste Management- much detail included.
 - D. Clean Air- same as 2000
 - E. Land Use- CA language combined with other language.
 - F. Water- Submitted by CA- quite extensive- almost nothing in the 2000 platform on this. Another plan out from the Midwest is also good.
 - G. Biodiversity- Mostly from CA
 - H. Ethical Treatment of Animals- CA- Questioning ban on use of animals for entertainment- horse racing, rodeos, circuses, zoos, etc.
 - I. Ocean Protection- CA
4. Economics
- A. True Cost Pricing and fair taxation- CA- Rather detailed and technical, but hopeful it will go through. Renamed a plank on small businesses. Job Creation added- Talks about work and artificially putting work in to the job structure. Want to provide alternatives to jobs, Speaks to a 30 hour work week- consistency question here.
 - B. National Debt- privatization of Soc Sec. Also mentioned elsewhere.

Questions-

John-Marc Chandonia- SF- What is the procedure if we do not like language? How do we provide feedback? Will floor voting be by plank, will revision be accepted from the floor?

A. There will be 5 hours provided for platform discussion. We need to get feedback in advance Also need to show for hearings. Will be one hour discussion at the national meeting- will be up or down vote.

Barbara Schulz, Humboldt- Questions his opinions stated about supportability of planks. PETA and other groups involved with animal rights need to be considered.

Q. Where can we look at platform and give info?

A. will be provided

Q. Can get hard copies printed off the web

Q. Jane Arnold- Economics section- 2 concerns- How to resolve contradictions with calling for gov response and also keep small gov. Also, absence of manufacturing concerns- trains and busses, rather than cars. Seems to need large economic enterprises. Mostly focuses on small business.

A. Will be answered and discussed on line

Q. Zack Carb- Butte Co. Seemed what he read on line differed significantly from what was being presented.

A. Should be essentially the same. A comprehensive draft exists on line.

Concern was raised that this item was changed from a decision item to info item. Suggestion made that we send delegates to Milwaukee with the understanding that a lot of info will be assessed there and direct the delegates use their best judgment in making the decisions using the state platform as a guideline.

This suggestion was **ACCEPTED BY AFFIRMATION** of the General Assembly.

VII. Bring-back from yesterday. Affirmation of Forrest Hill and Newell Taylor as GPUS CA Standing Delegation alternates. Delegation meeting discussed it. Process decided- Jonathan- Ballot should have been received at check-in today. 2 candidates running for 7 open seats. Ranked choice voting being used.

Clarifying Questions:

Is NOTA being replaced by NOC?

A: Yes. Need to rank candidates and NOC 1, 2, 3. If no candidate is desired, rank NOC as choice 1.

VIII. Bring back from this morning Consent Calendar item on reconstitution of GPUS CA Delegation as an Ad-Hoc Committee: In reviewing the by-laws, rather than assigning it as an ad hoc committee, this will need further discussion. Proposal to remove it from the plenary agenda. **ACCEPTED BY AFFIRMATION** of the General Assembly.

Notes by Don Eichelberger

SUNDAY AFTERNOON - June 6, 2004

Facilitators - Matthew Leslie, Sharon Peterson

Timekeeper - Don Eichelberger

Vibeswatchers - Mark Barney; Ellen Maisen

Notekeeper - Stuart Bechman

- 1) SC/WG Meetings
- 2) Media Committee Consent Calendar Revisit

Jonathan Lundell, SM: This morning, the Media Committee presented a Consent Calendar item to accept proposed bylaws. We withdrew the item when an amendment was proposed. We would now like to officially withdraw our decision item altogether for this plenary.

BMH, Nevada: The reason we haven't had any bylaws is because we've been struggling with the agglomeration of Media with Clearinghouse and IT under a single Communications Standing Committee. We would like to withdraw our proposal in order to make a new proposal to the CC to reconfigure Media as a standalone Standing Committee.

ML, Orange: Concerns? Affirmations? ...OK, we have **approved the withdrawal of this proposal. The results of the GPUS Delegation alternate election: Forrest Hill, 53; Newell Taylor, 51; NOTA, 3. So they have been approved.**

- 3) ERWG: GPCA Election Code Discussion

ML, Orange: The next item on the agenda is a discussion item from the ERWG, a proposed GP election code. This is the next step in the ongoing effort to create an official Green Party of California election code section.

Chris Collins, AC: We have included the language of the proposed election code sections in the plenary packet, and we are continuing to solicit opinions on the proposed sections. We would like to hear from the general assembly. We will take your comments and concerns and incorporate them into our proposal that we will then bring back at our next scheduled plenary in preparation of taking them to the state legislature.

Warner Bloomberg, : Please take this document and the Q & Cs back to your counties. We need discussion and suggestions at the county level. What have we missed? What's left unanswered? So we ask that you all take this material back to your counties and try to get back to our working group by the end of July.

MB, ED: When do you plan to put this in front of the legislature?

JMC, SF: In Sec. 78-79, bottom of pg. 12: A section says that County Green Parties may modify the size of their county council, and how to do so; I would think that section belongs before 78-78. Also, in 79-41, pg. 16, it says no person may be in a county council unless they're registered Green in a recognized Green Party local. We would like to have an exception for those who can't otherwise register. In 79-43, we'd like to have language allowing how a person can be removed from office. 79-51, All meetings of the committee, it should probably say meetings of the county council.

WB: OK, we encourage everyone with comments to additionally e-mail or send those comments in writing to us.

Jo Chamberlain, SM: I find the election code very annoying, but thank you for your work. 69-65: National delegates shall be provided for as in the bylaws of the national green party. We have no such bylaws; we probably should change it to say the convention policies. I would also ask that the Bylaws committee review this before it is brought to the GA for final approval. Also, it gives the Secy. of State the authority to place a presidential nominee on the ballot, I would like to see a few more criteria before they can do that. Sec. 69-62, we have the same difficulty with the Sec. of State: "The SoS may add to their selection of candidates." 78=78, an IRV issue, there's no formula or threshold provided; it needs to be stated or referred to elsewhere. Sec. 78=92C, pg. 14, it says that the SoS, no later than July 20, can..." what's special about that date? Sec. 79-43, I concur with JMC's concern: "Any party member that registers with another party..." what about DTS registration? And recalling of a county councilperson, the recall procedures need to be done somewhere other than in our bylaws.

David Marin, CC: This issue of whether we let DTS voters vote in our primaries. I'm quite confused about what this proposed code says. Also, if we decided to change this, would we have to go back to the legislature or do it at a plenary?

Jim Staffer: It's not addressed in this code, it's handled elsewhere.

Ken Culler, Stanislaus: I'm concerned that in our enthusiasm to have the most "Green" elections possible, it's possible that we may run into trouble with the state election code. County councilpeople are elected; we have to stand for election. Having ex-cons, etc., as county council people is a violation of state law; you have to be a voter in good standing, you have to meet the same requirements as any other person running for election. We need to make sure we're not violating a state law.

Kevin McKeown, LA: The minutes of our most recent county council draft form have just come out, but here's what they've mentioned. The term "central committee" is bothersome to us in LA county, and I think that there is an effort to redefine them as county councils. However, this term continues to be used in this document, we'd like to see that removed. Sec. 63-12, the NOTA votes must be processed, tabulated, and counted; I'm not sure that will be enough for our county registrar offices to actually count them. Also, per the county council is defined as requiring 50% men and 50% women, we suggest changing it to be at least 50% women.

Greg Jan, AC: In addition to the Q of what body does this, there's the Q of due process. I don't know if we'll be able to fit all this in this one document, but I think it's imperative that we do.

Mike Feinstein, LA: 69-64. If the SoS receives a comm from the GPCA Liaison to the SoS. As written, this gives the Liaison complete power to send whatever letter he wants to the SoS without any further criteria. 69-65: NOTA could not win in a plurality; our court case had a ruling that said if 55% of voters vote for a candidate, then the majority would want a candidate and thus NOTA would fail. 79-20, removing county councilmembers: I would say nothing about removing CC members until there's a process for that, but JS is talking about electing rather than appointing CCs for newly-formed counties, if we move in that direction, I'd like to see that applied here. Also, recalls, the state of CA provides for recalls only for PAID offices; there is no recall process for non-paid positions such as county councilmembers.

Tian Harter, SC: I would like to see some language stating that if the SoS has some information s/he wants to share with the GP, they should put it in a letter and send it to our Liaison for inclusion in the next GPCA plenary.

Chris Collins, AC: Someone asked me to mention a question about Ranked-Ballot voting, pg. 8, where it says the GP should use Ranked-Ballot voting Using RBV doesn't really apply to IRV situations, how would we apply this language in such situations?

Jim Stauffer: There's some confusion in the comments between Bylaws and Election Code; and there's some things that the SoS are going to look for in our proposed code. So what we'd like to do is simply request all of these, prepare a written response, and send it back to the counties.

Warner Bloomberg: One, we want to observe Green process; so how long this will take is a real unknown. We want to eventually come up with a comprehensive document that will be approved by the state legislature. We had originally hoped to have something to present to the state leg. in Jan. 2005; that may be overly optimistic. The point of this is to make us stronger, not tie our hands. MF's comments about NOTA, he's correct about that court decision, what's not operative in that decision is the implementation of Choice Voting / IRV.

Chris Collins: Is there anyone who made comments today who would like an immediate response rather than wait for a written response on our website or otherwise?...OK, great, it appears that everyone's willing to wait for a written response. Our goal is to return this document with all concerns expressed at the next plenary.

4) SC/WG Reports

Don Eichelberger, GI: Green Issues was a bit disarrayed because of the time issue; but we reported out 2 new planks to the Platform committee, one on GMOs. We've also got an Agriculture plank we're working on. We're also working on a convergence with Sonoma County, scheduled around October that will incorporate a discussion about Corp. Accountability. We have a new CC Liaison, Christina Olague, who will be taking Mike Borenstein's place. We're still looking for a female co-co for the WG.

Jim Stauffer, IT: The ongoing project of looking to move the CAGREENS.org site to a new server is moving ahead. We received a number of new comments about website ideas. We want to get the Petry Kelly fund on-line. We also want to get an "Action Alerts" program implemented. E-mail list invitations: We're talking about using our e-mail lists to encourage committee signups.

Craig Peterson, Fin: Our donations are not coming in at the same level as they have been, so we're looking at new ways to bring that back up. We have one subcommittee, the Fundraising committee, which meets once per week. We're looking at new ways of bringing in income, such as house parties, etc. Finally, we're trying to make things much more profitable.

Erika McDonald, Comm/Media: We're devising a new proposal to have the Media group become a standalone committee. We're also looking to hire a PT press secretary sometime in the next few weeks. We're also taking steps to educate the locals about how to set up local media committees. Please get involved.

Jonathan Lundell, Bylaws: We're putting together a new copy of the Bylaws, we've been putting off that until we had the GPUS CA Delegation bylaws, which have now been approved at this plenary. We have an endorsement procedure, and we will be creating a page on the bylaws website which will collect procedures. In our efforts to collect bylaws from counties, we will also create an on-line repository of those bylaws on our webpage. We will also look at issues for county polling, when it's appropriate, how it should be conducted. We're also moving ahead with the separation of policies vs. procedures. We also have two openings on the committee we'd like to fill; please contact me if you're interested.

Shane Que Hee, Platform: We had a presentation from the FinComm rep; we elected a CC liaison; We considered planks that were discussed at this plenary, including the Health Care plank. We also considered to bring forward a Foreign Policy plank at the next platform; and Peter Camejo also advanced the notion of an immigrant's Drivers' License plank. We went through the platform timeline and process, then broke into plank groups and continued our discussions.

Nanette Pratini, GPUS CA Delegation: Most of our work has been before the GA the past two days. We're also working on recruiting outreach, and hope to have a new announcement out to the counties in the next week or two. We're also continuing to work on improving our internal comm. process and training our alternates.

Louis LaFortune, IP: Our job is to help host foreign GP visitors coming to California, and we could use some more help. We discussed the idea of a "Green Passport" that would be internationally applicable. Inspired by Peter Camejo's idea of a "Green Credit Card," we discussed establishing a Green credit card connected to an outside foundation. To establish people-to-people contacts with people in the Middle East, we discussed a Middle East Green Alliance to talk about the issues going on in the Middle East.

MO, CCWG: We introduced our job hire, Danika Kabulich, that was approved on Friday night by the CC; the CCWG will be managing that staffperson. We discussed ways in which we could recruit and vet more candidates, esp. for non-partisan and open-seat races. We talked about the Westly Initiative and about creating a Liaison position for potential GP presidential candidates who come to visit our state.

Jeanne Rosemeier, ERWG: We need to contact repub assemblypeopoe to vote for..., Liited Choice initiative- will be polling counties. Looking to hire a part-time lobbyist in Sac. Cugg. welcome

Stuart Bechman, GROW: His term is ended, so is acting as intirim co-co until new co-cos are nominated and elected. Focused this weekend's business meeting on caucuses. Campus Greens and People of Color caucuses met. Co-coordinators elected for POCC.

5) Next Plenary

Nanette Pratini, RV: We'd like to take a straw poll of the people in this room, followed by a county-by-county polling on this Q: If the GPUS does not nominate a national presidential candidate, should we have a north and a south state gathering, to meet in late July / early August, to decide whether to put a presidential candidate on our state Nov. ballot? ...It looks like **there's strong interest in having a north/south gathering to make this decision.**

Jonathan Lundell, SC: Would these then be categorized as CA presidential nominating convention?

NP: Yes.

Sharon Peterson, Contra Costa: So now we're faced with the question of our next state plenary, probably after the Nov. election. If your county is willing to host a plenary, please contact us.

6) Affirmation of New State Party Officers

7) Closing

Saturday session ended at 4:22pm.

Notes by Stuart Bechman