

Green Party of California Fresno General Assembly

May 4-5, 2002

Saturday morning session

[My personal comments are between these (*). Anywhere there is incomplete info, I use "... - al]*

1. Opening Ceremony [9:00-9:10 AM 9:20-9:25 AM]

2. Housekeeping: Facilitators, Vibes-Watcher, Timekeeper; GPCA-CC and WG/SC Co-coordinator introductions (10 min)

Co-Facilitators: ...

Tish Anderson, San Bernadino and ... as Vibes watcher

Aaron Lipke, San Diego as temporary note taker

Timekeeper: ...

Working Group and CC and Standing committee introductions were made

3. Ratification of January Plenary Notes; Affirm Current Agenda (10 min)

Concern- **Kevin McKeown, LA**: Minutes grievously incomplete; we can't accept them in their current form

Concern- **Jo Chamberlain, San Mateo** agrees with **Kevin**

January Plenary Minutes - tabled, not ratified

Agenda reviewed by **Jo**; approved by assembly (* consensus process not followed!! on agenda approval.*)

4. Consent Calendar (10 min) (**Warner Bloomberg**)

Most, but not all, of the Consent Calendar was approved by the assembly. Several items were put off until Sunday for presentation and approval after the CC had a chance to incorporate stated concerns.

5. Reapportionment Implementation Report (10 min)

Michael Borenstein, El Dorado reported on his travels around the state to meet with local county councils and help the new regions elect regional representatives. Most of the regional rep positions have now been filled, except for one? position. He will be travelling to that region after the plenary to help get that last rep position filled.

6. Regional Representative Selection/Election Discussion

Discussion was led by **Michael Borenstein** and **David Shorey, Sacramento** in regards to clarification of the process stated in the GPCA by-laws for selection / election of regional representatives.

7. Communication SC Proposal; 3 Co-Cos Introductions

Proposal of combining IT Working Group, Clearinghouse Standing Committee, and Media Working Group into a single Communications Standing Committee was presented by **Beth Moore Haines, Jo Chamberlain**, and **Kendra Markle**. These 3 women would become the co-coordinators for the new Standing Committee

The proposal was accepted by consensus. The co-co candidates were accepted and affirmed by consensus.

8. Break [10:45-10:55 AM]

9. Platform Proposal Session #1 (45 min) 10:55 AM

MASS MEDIA AND FREE SPEECH PROPOSAL
Presented by **Budd Dickinson**, Platform Committee

Clarifying Questions:

Chuck O'Neil, Sacramento: Will the grammar be corrected?

Budd: Yes.

Affirmations/Concerns:

Kevin McKeown, LA: Section 3, talks about community radio. Santa Monica worked on a local free radio station, bill passed to help, but the bill was gutted. Low Power FM ideas in platform need updating. **Kevin** to produce some written material.

Paul Encimer, Sequoia: spoke

Beth Moore Haines, Nevada: Affirmation - Public Schools

Jonathan Lundell, San Mateo: Comments from county council review. News coverage of political campaigns diminishes, (addressing last paragraph?) **Jonathan** thinks it hasn't been diminishing.

... - ...: Don't conflate Pacifica and local radio issues.

... - ...: Concern with item number ten (10): Would any community group be able to walk into a radio station and demand free time?

Emily Dale, Riverside: Preliminary information concern, Paragraph 2, Sentence 2: "criticism" language should be accompanied by "offer solutions"

Greg Jan, Santa Cruz?: Political matters don't reflect current law? Comment on #7, coverage of candidates, minor party candidates are skipped over during the pre-primary phase because press says it covers only contested primaries, so they get the attention. Particular problem needs to be addressed.

David Sheidlower, Alameda: Affirmation. Don't need to put tactics into the plank. Proportion. Election 2002 columns in papers are giving candidates daily coverage when candidates....

Lisa Rowe, Nevada: Do more research on new and existing technologies. Cable, satellite and broadband communications should be researched.

... (**Guy with green Vertical-striped shirt**) - ...: Advocate public newspapers to provide news for motivations other than profit.

David Silva, Watsonville / Santa Cruz: Item number ten (10): fair free and equal right to...

Mark Stout, San Francisco: Item two (2): Green party supports those who...Green Party supports the concept of...Item ten (10): Everyone has a right...too broad.

Kevin McKeown, LA: Presenting Language:

Get rid of "including thosewhich," change "allow" to "allowing for a new service" . At Stations: "We call for an expansion of low power FM radio, including extension into major market urban areas where LP-FM was blocked by the National Association of Broadcasters and National Public Radio."

New Paragraph at: "We are pleased ...".

..., ...: We need to show support for pirate radio...it's illegal, but we need to support non-licensed news distributors at times

..., **SLO:** ...

(* A change was excepted by a bearded man I don't recognize. *)

Mark? ... - ...: Will, please write something down about newspapers

... - ...: **Mark** had a comment on number two(2), I agree.

... - ...: Pirate stations ...

Presenter's Responses to Expressed Concerns:

Budd: Ten(10) has been stricken. Some discussed responses have not been adopted. I Accept **Kevin's** language. New language submitted for item number ten.

(* Note: Note Taker could not keep up with the changes! *)

Paul Encimer, Sequoia: ...

The Assembly reached consensus of platform changes with amendments adopted by Presenter. People who submitted language changes need to get them in writing to **Budd**.

10. GPCA Budget Proposal (35 min)

Jo Chamberlain, San Mateo will be presenting this instead of **Michael Wyman**, our treasurer, since Mike isn't here this weekend.

Jo: This is an aggressive budget year. (**Jo** announced the counties that had paid their dues.) There was an explanation of the fund-raiser mailings that the GPCA is doing to raise party funds. We've been partnering with various individual counties to reach donors in those counties. We are happy to partner with any counties who wish to participate in any such joint mailing with the state. We had a successful mailing in SF; and we're preparing to do a prospect mailing of all registered Greens in LA later this summer. This will be the first time that this has been attempted in LA county, so we don't know what the results will be.

Jo asked the assembly to accept the budget as proposed in the plenary packet.

Clarifying Questions:

Susan King, SF: Untargeted mailing in LA should be slightly targeted, target new greens, try for half the debt.

Dave Shorey, Sacramento: What is the budget year? Sacramento County gave, can that count as dues? When does the budget become effective?

... (green shirt striped guy), ...: Voter history fits on 2-gigabyte JAZ drive.

David Silva, Watsonville / Santa Cruz: \$300 is a low number for press packet materials.

John Strawn, Santa Barbara: Inconsistency in phone conferencing requests between committee budgets. Our county council supports group budget. \$4,000 for paraphernalia, what is that?

Jean Rosenmeier, Contra Costa: Column on the left is what? right? Retention mailer in January?

Kevin McKeown, LA: Long-time greens give lots. We need to tap into this incredible funding source.

Frank Duperall, Santa Clara: \$1,000 for media subcommittee seems quite small if they're going to be producing videos.

Jonathan Lundell, Santa Clara: Please add in your response a description of the LA mailer?

Larry Shoup, Alameda: \$15,000?

Presenter's response to questions raised:

Budget year is January 1, 2002 to January 1, 2003 (left column). Clearinghouse questions go to the Communications committee. \$4,000 for paraphernalia is printed materials, bumper stickers, t-shirts. Money allocated has already been spent. Green Party of California carries the entire expense of the state/county mailings. Half of the net of the LA mailing will go to Los Angeles. There's a big distinction between prospects and retentions; prospects are basically Greens we've yet to contact or have never given any funds to the party; retentions are Greens who have contributed something to the party. We usually lose money on prospect mailings, but we the retentions list that is culled from that mailing is a gold mine that we can draw from over and over in the future at very little cost.

Affirmations/Concerns:

Matt ..., San Francisco: Do we have a sustainable mailing program? Is the retention list paying for future prospecting? In San Francisco, Project 2000, money was spent in SF and we lost money. Concern: just doing LA isn't good.

Ginny Case, LA: Affirmation. The CC has been working on this for six months. The cost of the mailing is reimbursed before any money is split with the county, so it's really a low-risk effort.

David Sheidlower - Alameda: This is not the way to propose a budget. Otherwise affirmation.

... (woman), ...: Some comments - Affirmation

Jonathan Lundell, Santa Clara: Affirmation

Michael Borenstein, El Dorado: Affirmation. In my opinion, the budget is a conservative one and is closely monitored by responsible people.
Will Yeager, ...: The Green Registration list is cheap! I've purchased my own copy in the past, it cost me only \$232 for this list.
Jean Rosenmeier, Contra Costa: Rolling Fundraising mailing, after LA...
Mark Stout, San Francisco: Affirmation of state's ongoing mailing campaign. Have faith! Concern with per piece cost. \$.75 or \$.50?
Tish Anderson, San Bernardino: Affirmation. We need to spend a little money to make a little money.
Kevin McKeown, LA: Is the budget stating to send to all of LA?

Presenter's response to concerns raised:

Regarding **David's** comment on how this is not the way to present a budget, "We know, please help." The mailing to LA will be done incrementally, giving the Finance committee a chance to monitor it as it proceeds. If it does not appear to be at least breaking even, then the committee will likely choose to stop the mailing before it is completed.

Facilitators called for a test of consensus. No outstanding concerns; **Consensus on the budget was reached by the Assembly.**

Saturday morning session ended at 12:12 pm.

(Minutes taken by **Aaron Lipke**.)

Saturday afternoon session

Session started at 1:12 pm.

1. Setup (5 min)

Co-Facilitators: **Pamela Meidell, Chris Collins**
Notetaker: **Stuart Bechman**
Vibes-Watchers: **Beth Moore Haines; Alex Brideau III**
Timekeeper: **Michael Borenstein; Budd Dickinson**

Reminder: There are new delegates arriving this afternoon; we need to make sure they are registered.

Pam reviewed the consensus process for the delegates.

2. Affirm Delegates to GPUS (30 min) **J Chamberlain; M Borenstein**) 1:00-1:30pm

Michael reviewed the situation of GPUS delegate slots to be filled from the GPCA. He reviewed the criteria that were used to make as many appointments as possible at the March GPCA-CC retreat to allow the GPCA to exercise a maximum of its allotted votes. Since those appointments were made, four additional applications have been received and were appointed as a GPCA delegate by the CC last night.

Michael presented all delegates and appointments appointed by the CC, and asked for affirmation by the CC of these appointments.

Clarifying Questions:

Cameron Spitzer, _____ : Please re-read the list of additional names added to the packet?

Borenstein: Greg Jan; Donna Warren; Bill Piez

_____ : What is the financial commitment and responsibilities for these delegates?

Chamberlain: There is only a time commitment. Delegates must be on-line and deal with dozens of GPUS e-mails each week. So their responsibility is serious. There is a request for delegates to travel once per year to an annual GPUS meeting; this year, it will be held in Philly. We want to have a maximum of people from California at the event to preserve our votes, but will be looking for volunteers from our delegate pool. The Philly event would likely cost \$1,000 for each delegate to attend. At this time, no funds have been budgeted from the GPCA budget to cover these costs.

Affirmations / Concerns:

Emily Dale, Riverside: Concern: We need to clarify the process of delegate selection. Are the delegates nominated by one coordinating committee, then elected at a plenary? Or appointed by the CC, then rubber-stamped by the plenary? If we're electing them at this plenary, it will be difficult because we don't have bios or clear by-laws.

David Shorey, Sacramento: Affirmation: We've come a long way over the past few years. It's extremely inspiring to see that we are at a national level and to have the opportunity to advance these delegates to the national level; it's inspiring, it's amazing. It shows that we at the local level have influence and power at the state level; national level; and even the international level. This is far more than any other party. Thank you delegates; thank you, CC.

Jim Stauffer, Santa Clara: Concern: How much of a drain on our party is the national party? A whole long list of people who will be devoting their time to the GPUS will not be available to spend that time on the GPCA. Also, the funding from the GPCA for the GPUS, etc.; it's a general concern. I'm skeptical about national parties in general, so I'd like to hear responses.

Alex Brideau, LA: Concern: The e-mail address listed for me [as a GPUS delegate to be affirmed] is out-of-date. Feel free to approach me for my new address. [Alex's e-mail addresses: alex@cagreens.org; abiii@greens.org]

Budd Dickinson, Alameda: Affirmation: Some of the language that's been used by a number of people has, I felt, been inappropriate. The word 'Appoint' has been used; I objected to it. However, I would now like to affirm this process, affirm these delegates, and ask that the process be improved and democratized as much as possible.

Ginny Case, LA: Affirmation: I affirm the process; I'm excited about the possibility of being a national delegate. I want to affirm Jim's concern, too: We need to be more actively recruiting people for these national and state positions. There's a lot of energy, a lot of opportunity that we need to be better mining.

Pam Meidell: Stack is now closed.

Ray Glocken, Santa Cruz: Address **Jim & Ginny's** comments about investing in a national party. These are appropriate concerns that Green values are locally based and grassroots. At the same time, our strength is to confronting trans-national corporations; we need to strengthen this confrontation.

Paul Encimer, Sequoia: Affirmation. I affirm the delegates. The process has been problematic. The CC should be very clear about its executive and policy roles and I'd like to affirm the CC's process to select these delegates. These are very important positions we're appointing; the plenary needs to have a say in it as well.

John Strawn, Santa Barbara: Affirmation. I want to affirm the CC to take the action that it took, despite the concerns that many people have had about centralization of power. The CC was really forced to take action because of a ruling that came forward from the GPUS that the 13 delegates were not able to take part in on-line votes. The GPUS deals with many, many proposals on-line. This ruling would have disfranchised GPCA at the national level. We fought for proportional voting so we could have our 13 votes with a temporary weighting of 2 votes per rep until our delegation was filled. The CC acted prudently in filling these positions immediately so our votes could be made at the national level. It would have been irresponsible otherwise. It's not a perfect process, but it was the best approach at this time. We will continue to strive to formalize and clean up this process. There is every plan to do so.

Beth Moore Haines, Nevada: Affirmation. Although we will, as an expanded delegation of 13 delegates and then 13 alternates; and although we will have the largest delegation in the country; California has 150,000 of the 250,000 Greens nationally. So even this largest delegation still cedes some power to the rest of the country. We're continuing to push and refine the process. At a December meeting in Texas, **Jo** got the GPUS to agree to allow our expanded delegation on-line as soon as they're appointed (rather than having to wait until the July GPUS plenary). So the CC responded appropriately. We've continued to actively recruit applicants for these positions. It's been a little rough to respond to the challenge, but there's been a lot of leverage and trust granted to the GPCA. There's always room for feedback and improvement; I appreciate those who are willing to give the process some latitude as we work it out.

Presenter's responses to expressed concerns:

Jo Chamberlain, San Mateo: Can you believe it? We have Green activity in every Congressional district in the state of California. This is what blew the national org away. Growth is really painful; really icky. Like a puppy, the head grows big, then the tail lengthens, and then the legs come along. That's what the national delegation is doing. We're trying to adapt to this process (and succeeding). We've always appointed people to these positions; we've made the best decisions possible for GPCA. Did I mention that I'm on the GPUS fund-raising committee, and we get half of whatever GPUS raises in their national efforts? GPUS is not a drain; it's a benefit. We need to support the national growth. I'm speaking in two weeks in Germany as a US Green. This is going to be spread across the media. We're going to get international recognition; and this is how the money rolls in. This is not smooth; this is not clear. But it's vital for our growth. You need to tell these delegates your concerns; and you need to support these delegates for their responsibilities. The delegates are meeting tonight at a pizza place; please join us and support our selections.

Pam: You should run for office, **Jo!** (She is!). To repeat: There are 250,000 Greens in the US; 150,000 live in California! We need to have full representation!!

Appointments affirmed by General Assembly.

Committee meeting spots:

- International Protocols: Not meeting today.

Chris: I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the Fresno party for hosting this plenary. Room N-29 is out the door, then left, then left again; Platform Committee will be meeting there. The Career Center is out the door, down the stairs, then left. The Faculty Room, downstairs by the Cafeteria, will hold the Campaigns & Candidates session. We're running behind, so we'll only have an hour for this session.

David Shorey, Sacramento: *Point of Process:* If there are people who want to talk about international issues, would **Pam** be amenable to meet with those people?

Pam: Sure. If you would stay in the auditorium, I'll be happy to meet with you.

Susan King, San Francisco: I would strongly encourage all campaign managers and candidates to come to this Campaigns & Candidates meeting. Please come to the Faculty Lounge in 2 minutes.

Pam: Thank you. Please meet back here in the auditorium at 10 minutes to 3.

3. (SC/WG Session #1: ~~1:30-2:50pm~~ 1:50-2:50pm)

4. Platform Session #2 (45 min) (Economics: **David Sheidlower, Budd Dickinson**)

Budd gave the history of the review of the Economics section, starting in July 2001; it was submitted and comments received at the January plenary; and we're at our 2nd attempt to pass the current version. There has been so much work on it, we hope that the GA will pass it here today. Here's a few points: 1) San Diego said it was too long, so we cut 25%; 2) Someone said it insisted too much on revenue neutrality; we've addressed that. 3) It was pointed out that the phrase: "...we should generally decrease sales and income taxes..." is not quite right; we changed 'decrease' to 'reform'. 4) 'Repeal Proposition 13': Too drastic, we toned it down to 'Reform'. 5) Corporate Tax Policy: We reworked that just now, broke it up into several sentences:

"With Corporate Tax Policy..."

"Adopting a short 30-hour work week" we're adding "As a standard".

"Supporting small business by reducing tax fees and regulatory burdens", this brought forth concerns, so we changed it to "...and BUREAUCRATIC burdens". A small business shouldn't have to fill out as many forms as a multi-national conglomerate.

Clarifying Questions:

--None--

Affirmations / Concerns:

Jonathan Lundell, San Mateo: Our county's concerns are now mostly addressed. We have a minor one with companies submitting environmental statements; someone should review this, because we understand that it's the lead governmental agency, not a company. Other than that, all of our issues of substance have been resolved. I will submit the standard complaint that no hint of **Henry George** should appear in this platform.

Ginny Case, LA: Concern. Our county voted to oppose this plank. There wasn't enough communal support in the plank; and we wanted to see a stronger renter's credit statement. Overall, the plank is way too far to the right.

Chuck O'Neil, Sacramento: Affirm. I reviewed it and the few objections I had have been taken care of. It's not too far to the right at all; it's just right.

Jane Jarlsberg, Mendocino: Affirm. However, I would like to see affordable housing highlighted a bit more; it's a major current problem, and I would like to see more "Green Investors" promoted in the plank. I don't know where it might fit in, but please consider it.

Barbara Anides, Stanislaus: Affirm. I'm very impressed with this plank. I was an economics major in college. The comments I heard to day are excellent; I affirm the effort.

Kevin McKeown, LA: Concern: LA heard that it was an 'all or nothing' case of changes, and everybody had some problem with it, including a question why we were supporting an economics platform that's to the right of the Democratic Party. In regards to "Shared Housing," page 43, it's vital that we need to have the word "voluntary" in front of that phrase, else I will be the subject of hit pieces in my campaign claiming that I'm trying to force people to share their housing.

Mark Stout, Sacramento: Am I to understand that this is [a set of] updates to existing planks? It would help if the pages in the plenary followed the strike-out/bold-in formatting so we know what the changes are to the original planks.

Beth Moore Haines, Nevada: I see that the LA contingent has concerns, but I'm not seeing most of the LA delegates are in the room to be asked of these concerns. I'm hoping that we can work out some resolution with the LA contingent so we don't have to go to vote.

Don Eichelberger, SF: Affirm. It's going to be an overwhelming effort to get total consensus on such a complex platform. Income Sales & Consumption Taxes: Gas Taxes are good. Are we overlooking other undertaxed consumables, such as SUV's? Can we expand this?

Ginny Case, LA: LA is mandated to vote against this platform; we can't negotiate this.

Beth Moore Haines, Nevada: If a delegation is sent to the plenary with a hard-line mandatory opposition without any flexibility to try to address their concerns, there's something seriously wrong and non-Green about that. I have a serious problem with that and I just want my concern in the record.

David Sheidlower, Alameda: We have tried to work with the LA contingent to address their issues, but they have been obstinately unavailable to work with us.

Pam: Is LA just here to vote against the planks, or are they asking to have their concerns resolved?

Ginny Case, LA: All I have are the votes from our county council meeting. All of our notes are not on-line, so it's hard to say.

Kevin McKeown, LA: It's unfair to put the heat on Ginny. Ginny's no longer a county council member; she's simply a messenger. We have a new county council. I personally object to the county council's stance on it, but as a delegate we have to vote what the council has mandated us to do.

Pam: I just wanted to have this voiced out by LA. We're now closing the stack. We have 5 more minutes on this issue, please be brief.

Beth Moore Haines, Nevada: *Point of Process:* We have 5 minutes for this issue? Are the presenters going to accommodate a vote in this time?

Chris Collins: We will complete the stack before considering a vote.

_____ , San Diego: As a labor organizer, there is not enough stuff in here about right to organize and other labor issues. I would be happy to work with the committee to include it.

Sola Sarmiento, Santa Cruz: I have a lot of problems with the proposal to allow property taxes to rise. This goes against the working-class people being able to own their own homes. I'd like to have that issue discussed and brought back to the committee and studied more closely.

David Silva, Santa Cruz: I'm still concerned about the process in LA. If they operated under the fallacy that it's a "take-it-or-leave-it" deal, it was based on a fallacy. Therefore, the delegates should be able to stand aside.

Cameron Spitzer: *Point of Process:* ????

Chris: The stack has been closed. All concerns have been voiced; we now need to address them. I've listed approximately 12 that have been raised.

Beth Moore Haines, Nevada: It's up to the presenter to address the concerns, or we can have a straw poll.

David Sheidlower: I do want to address some of the concerns. We have a whole plank for unions that we haven't changed. There's nothing we've changed about public ownership; it remains the same, we didn't take anything out. We would welcome a friendly amendment to strengthen the renter's tax credit. Same with the Environmental Report Process, we need more clarification to understand this, and we passed a proposal this morning to correct errors. The Gas tax / True-Cost Pricing with the Environmental Planks: We feel that essentially motivating people to use less internal combustion engines is always a good idea, although we realize that it's tough on poorer people. Affordable Housing: It's in the Housing Plank, but I will be happy to review to make sure we address Voluntary Shared Housing.

Pam: The stack has been closed.

Sola Sarmiento, Santa Cruz: I asked about the Property Taxes as a concern; I would like to have it addressed.

Budd Dickinson: I think we need to raise property taxes. Most homeowners are higher-income; there are ways to ameliorate it, such as elderly homeowners have laws to relieve them of property taxes. But we really need to raise property taxes, especially in businesses; we would raise them higher than residences. So I'd like to keep it in as is.

David Shorey, Sacramento: Since we know there's a standing concern, let's not bother testing for consensus; we should move directly to a vote.

Pam: So we're moving to a delegate vote. All delegates, please get your delegate cards ready; and we need counters.

Ginny Case, LA: Point of Process: Many delegates / alternates have not yet picked up their delegate cards.

Pam: Any alternates / delegates without a delegate card please move to the front of the room. **Ginny** can give you your delegate cards. While this is going on, we're buying 10 minutes to do this: 5 minutes from the break and 5 minutes from Regional Caucuses for the timekeeper. We're hoping we'll have an extra 5 minutes at the end for **Budd's** proposal on minor & substantive changes.

Jim Stauffer: I'd like to suggest that **Budd** move his presentation to the next Platform proposal; we won't need the 20 minutes allotted for that segment.

Pam: OK. Does everyone have their delegate cards? We also have 5 more minutes; **Budd** has agreed to take his proposal over to tomorrow's platform section. This is the democratic process folks; it's messy, but everything that's fun in life is messy. Just remember that...After break, we'll be presenting our November candidates; and if you have any announcements, keep them in mind, keep them concise, this will be the time for you to make announcements. Please be calm as we wait for the democratic process to unfold...Anybody who'd like to stand up and breathe, this may be our break -- wait; we have an unannounced transition [harmonica music from member]...OK, we're ready to vote. All right, all delegates...OK, we have a quorum. 7 of our regions are represented, so we can move to a vote. We've reached the point where the hubbub subsides, and we vote with our concerns. I'm asking all those willing to accept the proposed changes with concerns to raise their cards...Now all those opposed...it's very close. We want a recount. So those who are in favor of the plank as it stands, please stand up and hold your cards up; and we need help counting the cards, can someone else help?...OK, keep them up...OK, the vote is within one, so we're going to do a roll-call vote by county. It doesn't matter if you're sitting with your county. We're going to call by county and ask how many yays and how many nays. Please focus.

County	YES	NO	ABSTENTION
Alameda	9		
Contra Costa		3	
Fresno	1		
Lake			Not Present
Mendocino	2		
Napa			Not Present
Placer			Not Present
San Bernardino		2	
San Joaquin			Not Present
Santa Barbara	1		
Sonoma			Not Present
Yolo		1	
Butte			Not Present

Del Norte			Not Present
Humboldt	1	1	1
Los Angeles		5	
Merced	1		
Nevada	1		
Riverside	1	1	
San Diego	3	1	
SLO	2		
Santa Clara	4		
Stanislaus	1		
Calaveras		1	
El Dorado	1		
Imperial			Not Present
Marin	1		
Monterrey			Not Present
Orange	2	1	
Sacramento	4		
San Francisco	6		
San Mateo	2		
Santa Cruz		3	1
Ventura	1		
TOTALS	44	19	2
	67.7%	29.2%	3.1%

Pam: It doesn't pass. We have 44 yeses, 16 nos, and 2 stand-asides. We needed 49.6 yeses, for 80% of 62. OK, the Platform Committee is going to renegotiate and make another attempt tomorrow... All right, we have a break. Announcements are after the break; Go outside, breathe some fresh air, then be back in. *Point of Process:* Wait a minute!

Lawrence: We have someone who wants to be in the Platform committee negotiations. Who do we talk to?

Pam: Budd. We're going to be introducing our candidates and giving announcements after the break; be thinking about your 'Haiku' for after the break.

5. (Break: 3:35-3:45pm 3:55-4:10pm)

6. Announcements (15 min)

Pam: Thank you everybody; please come back in; and all candidates for office, please come down - please come up on the stage. Calling all candidates to the stage. **Peter Camejo; Jo Chamberlain;** who else is running? **Laura Wells; David...** all candidates, please come down to the front. Here comes the next governor of California! Yay! **Peter Camejo!**...All candidates, please come up to the front; all candidates, please come to the stage. We're going to be using the microphone up here. I'd like everyone to sit down please, we're going to begin; and all candidates running for office, please come down to the stage. You'll have 30 seconds to appeal to us, give us your vision. We're going to start at the top and work our way...across. Before we start though, we need to correct the vote count: We had 44 yes votes, 19 no votes, a total count of 65 votes. We had only a 67.7% affirmation, we needed 80%; so this will be reflected in the minutes.

Here's our first candidate, **Peter Camejo.** [Thunderous applause]

Peter Camejo: Thank you. Thank you very much; I have 30 seconds, I think it's over. [Laugh] Let me say, that I've recently noticed sudden interest in our campaign. I think we need to be very sensitive to the incredible vacuum between our campaign and what the people know. I read in my local paper every day that **Davis** is out there recruiting [for us] Greens: Every day, he's upsetting people. The Democrats and Republicans are running 14

MEN!! I'm going to start every talk with that point. This is 2002, and we have two parties running 14 European Men, and that on top of the issues! Thank you.

Jeanie Rosenmeier, Contra Costa: I'm running for Treasurer, and, yeah, what he said!

Larry Shoup, Alameda: ...We need a change in US trade policy so we don't have a race to the bottom. Thank you.

Laura Wells, Alameda: I'd love to get my hands on the books to see whose pockets the money is going into!...

David Sheidlower, Alameda: Hi, I'm the guy doing the Economics plank. But I'm also running for Insurance Commissioner; and we need to break the corruption of the office and stick up for the people.

_____ , Assembly District 23, San Jose: Without the Green Party, there would be no election for this office; because I am the only candidate opposing the Democratic incumbent. I will bring the Green Party message to the campaign.

Roy Glocken, Assembly District 17: For those who can't remember my last name, I tell everybody to just vote for all Greens on the ballot; and you'll get me. I refuse to concede to the fascist turnaround in this country since 9/11. My country, Right or Wrong: When it is Right, let me help keep it right; and when it is wrong, let me help to correct it.

Jo Chamberlain, Assembly District 19: I want to know, why aren't you running? If you're not already in office, why aren't you running? We need you; we need all of you! Thank you.

Ken Adams, Assembly 5th District: I've been catching HELL lately from my neighbors why I didn't run this time. So now I'm running as a write-in candidate. We need to do this; it's not that complicated, we need to start working on it. We need more Green Party candidates; people like you. It's crazy to think only a few people can represent us. Get out there as CANDIDATES! Thank you.

Pam: Let's give this incredible group a round of applause. [*"Go, We, Go!!"*] Our candidates set a wonderful example of 30 seconds each; I'd like to keep this precedent for all announcements.

Susan King, San Francisco: May 18, San Francisco: Campaign Training: How to run a campaign, How to be a candidate. BE there!! I've got flyers!

Beth Moore Haines, Nevada: I've been in touch with the **Campus Greens**; they've been growing exponentially. The other parties are the dinosaurs, old, old, old; we are the young party. I have packets to help you get local campus chapters, to talk to them; if you can't afford the \$50, approach your local chapter, because you need this packet.

Louie _____: Ancient Trees Initiative: We need to continue pushing. Here's a stack of signatures [*shows a stack of several inches of paper*]; but I didn't do them, I found a professional petitioner who's using them to get people to sign all of his other petitions!

Jo Chamberlain, San Mateo: For those national delegates/alternatives just affirmed, when we leave here at 5:30, go to **Di Ciccio's Pizza**, at the corner of Clinton & Blackstone, on the NW corner behind the Albertson's. (559) 267-9851. We have a private room in the back, we'll have dinner and discuss the agenda I posted on the website.

David Shorey, Sacramento: Planning & Conservation League in San Francisco offers workshops in several environmental issues for citizens who want to become activists.

John Stevens, San Bernardino: I have a **public access** show in San Bernardino County. I get into 5,000 houses each night; we did an interview with 5 of the candidates, 1/2 hour each, on tape; get ahold of **Teri Regan** if you want to use them for your public access channel. This is real important; you can talk forever, but with 5,000 households, a message on public access TV does a great job getting it out.

Kenny Muscoso: Many of you in this room will be getting e-mails from me asking to host a candidate house party and public meetings for the candidates. Please contact me if you can do this.

Peter Camejo: A special meeting on **June 3rd** just for **Latinos**. There's a flyer in the back, it's a community meeting just for Latinos, and I'll be hosting the event. We're bringing Greens and Democrats together to talk about Latino issues. It's at the Mission Center. Please pick up a flyer.

Joyous Rainbow: I'm on a peace walk to the United Nations for peace around the world. I'm asking people to come with me; I want a whole caravan of people to show that 98% of the people do not support our war. And thanks for being Green.

Tyler Snortum-Phelps, San Mateo: We have **Camejo campaign materials**, a lot of brochures, and newspapers; please talk to our coordinator, **Craig Peterson**. Now, we also have a fully appointed tabling kit; if you can donate \$75 to cover our costs, we have 3 kits. We will also have a campaign meeting tomorrow, we'll announce it then.

_____ : If there is interest in campaign communications, CONTROL over the website, meet in the Lobby afterwards, we'll see if there's a critical mass to work on a proposal.

7. IT/Website Update...and a Surprise! (30 min) (**Kendra Markle**)

I'm here to get everyone excited about our website. It's an AWESOME tool, get familiar with it! Some things: We want to set a policy of giving people e-mail addresses from our party, and we want to get buy-in from the membership. So we're going to show some great webpages; we have an on-line newsletter; and some chills & thrills, a really cool database. Then I want your buy-in, because we can build all of this, but if no one uses it, it's a lot of effort wasted. Then the surprise: Our information policy: Not everything is public, so we need to have some guidelines, some distinguishing characteristics, some levels of security:

Public: It's on our website, anyone can see it. It's on our public e-mail list; we send it out in our press releases, you can forward it to anybody.

Internal: We don't want it in search engines or available to casual surfers. This is the password-protected stuff that we want all Greens to find: The login is *GPCA*, the password is *10greatyears*. Does this sound familiar? But really, this is **Cameron's** baby, he just hates talking. [**Cameron** demos the login screen] This is the login screen. Please, pass the login info to any Green; but do not forward it to the public website or any public e-mail groups; if you do, we won't have two levels, we'll have only one. Please, be vigilant.

Private: Private access means we have specific names of people to whom we want to give access. The contribution list is one; access to our own webpage is another. For this you have to use your login name and password for the private area. You have two logins, and two passwords, for the two levels. Does this make sense? Do you understand why we need it? That's wonderful!! Because there are still people who come to me who are confused. For the plenary, that's your private e-mail and password. There's a 3rd login and password if you're a local webmeister; but don't worry about that.

So here's some future plans with these private passwords. We've had them out for more than a year. Another thing you can do with that is to submit your official county delegate list. Can we go to that site,

Cameron/Vanna?...The GPCA delegate registration page? [**Cameron** goes to that page, logging in as **Kendra**] OK, he's using my login name and password to do this. But in general, don't give your login/password to anyone else!! It will ruin our whole scheme!! OK, so this General Assembly is PRIVATE, because there's no lock appearing. This has saved us SO MUCH time, it's great. People just register by logging in with their private login and password; then BAM! They show up on the Registration List, which is given to the Host Committee! All the committee has to do is print out the delegate list, and THEY'RE DONE!! That's the list! There you go, that's fabulous! But we're going to do more, for instance, we can register for MULTIPLE EVENTS SIMULTANEOUSLY, so if you're having an event around a plenary, we can use the website for that. If you're the Clearinghouse Contact, you'll be able to browse our on-line catalog; and we'll know based on your login whether you're authorized to order stuff! We also have an on-line newsletter, You'll be able to set custom settings on how to get local / state / national news, set up your own sustainer information, and all contact information on you. You can modify all this data YOURSELF!! This is INCREDIBLE, because there's all these old lists floating around; so you can change your e-mail address, your subscriptions; and it will be updated across all of the e-mail listgroups, the access database, etc., AUTOMATICALLY. You can read more about all of this at

<http://www.cagreens.org/webmaster>, and you can even contact me directly from this page, as you'll be able to tell from the butterfly (which indicates that it goes directly to me). Now, here's the painful part: We REALLY NEED to have people submit bios...but, one of the concerns is, not everybody has a computer; so, can this really be inclusive? My answer is YES! YES!! In fact, we HAVE to do it!! I don't have a TV, but that doesn't mean we need to ignore network news! The internet is such an important media tool, I want your COMMITMENT that you'll learn to master two logins and two passwords; can we get that? Otherwise, we'll be tied forever to paper and pencil, and we'll NEVER grow!! My goal is that we GROW the party, to make life easier, to save us time and

effort, to offer tools for free that would otherwise cost a lot of time and effort. So, is everybody OK with this? Because now I'm going to go on to the GROW website. This website has SO MANY great things on it to help local chapters and campaigns, so we can have one central place for all this stuff; Can we go to the Media page? We track this stuff from all over the nation. The other thing I wanted to show was the streaming video that I showed last time, but we can't show it today; we have some great video streams, the founding of the GPUS, the Nader nomination, and other great stuff. How about the 'Election Results' page? Ohhh, it's not available. Does anyone have the bookmarks? They're great!! We have them available, we're sending them out, they're also available from Clearinghouse... Oh, yay, the Election Results page is up!! We track stuff in every state, if you want to know about anybody's campaign, it's here. Now, the newsletter: It's a public newsletter, because we're not only trying to reach Greens, but also their parents, and especially young people; young people will move mountains by word of mouth, so that's one of the main reasons for putting this newsletter out.... Now I want to go to the CC Reps webpage; this is so cool!.... But basically, the upshot is, we have new e-mail addresses; so if you send an e-mail to 'sonoma@cagreens.org', you don't have to know who the Sonoma contacts are, they'll automatically get the e-mail, so we're handling this automatically behind the scenes. But I need one more buy-in: That these Election Results, the County Contacts, that everybody submit their resources to the site! The structure is there, now we need to use it. So I want a buy-in that everyone will contribute to these amazing repositories. Will you do that? You will? That's great... We have big election-season plans for the website; basically, we're in-practice for 2004. We basically want 200,000 people on our e-mail list for 2004, so we're wrapping up. But here's a mockup picture of what the new website's going to look like; this is my surprise, although it's not done because I'm a zombie when I don't get enough sleep... So, I must leave you; Sorry it wasn't so exciting; but support the website! Thank you.

8. Bylaws Retain/Remove Language Discussion (30 min)

Chris: We're moving on. That was simply a presentation, so there's no need for clarification questions / concerns at this point. We'll move on to the bylaws language proposals, which my cohort, **Pamela**, will present.

Pam: I will be assisted on this by **Beth Moore Haines**; the presenters are **Beth** and **Jim Stauffer**; we have until 5:05, but they said they need 20 minutes, so we may go a little over. I turn it over to you.

Jim: Hi, I'm **Jim**. I'm sorry that this topic isn't as interesting as websites. **Jonathan Lundell** has been helping on this and will be helping me present it. Go to the page in the plenary document... this proposal is fairly obscure, when changing a rep in mid-term; we want to make this a presentation now, it will come back later as a proposal. This has a really long history, going back many years; it's been trying to get into the bylaws for the past two years. The bylaws say, when you want to recall someone from office, we need to make a proposal whether this person should be recalled. This is not good; the question should be, should the person be retained? Where 2/3 of the people want to keep the person in office vs. 1/3 not (as opposed to the reverse for the current situation). The phrasing of the question is critical in super-majority situations, which is what the Greens follow. Normally, the question should be whether to change the current situation; but this is a special case, we need to ask whether to maintain the current situation. The critical situation in any proposal is where the proposal fails by one vote. We're talking about a problematic person, a controversial person; and if this vote fails by one [*with the current bylaw wording*], that means that 2/3 of the people who wanted that person removed don't get their wish. That's the difference, and it's all the difference in the world. The Bylaws do say that officeholders do need to maintain the confidence of the representatives; accepting this proposal will honor this principle. The problem is, either way, that you have a minority in control. The minority can impose its veto control over the majority. There are dangers in both situations: In a vote to recall, where 1/3 of the people can keep someone in office, you can have a minority taking over the party like what happened in the Reform party. In a vote to retain, you can have 1/3 of the people wreaking havoc on the officeholders, throwing good people out of office. Our discussion led to a third choice: Using simple majority, 50% plus one, to keep someone in office, thus removing the minority issue. We want to hear opinions on these three options; then in the near future, we'll have a vote for these three options, using IRV. **Jonathan**, do you want to add anything?

Jonathan: We've had a bit of a knockdown drag-out fight on-line, and I'm happy to be able to present a third option. My opinion is that it should be difficult to overturn an election, even if they're problematic, they're controversial. Nonetheless, they could be so bad that we need some wording on this matter. We've had issues like this to deal with in the past. It comes up more in Parliamentary situations; but we need to hear opinions on it. As

you can see, the Bylaws deal with some pretty fun & dynamic issues; it's well known that that's the kind of committee we are, we have some open slots, if you want to join in our fun, come to our session meeting tomorrow!

Pam: We have about 8 minutes for comments.

Kevin McKeown, LA: Persons elected to positions should be able to exercise their leadership. I'm concerned that the third option would disempower an elected official and hold him back from effecting his vision. If it takes only 50% to recall, we'll be having all sorts of elections overturned and major havoc.

Emily Dale, Riverside: I am here with approval of only the removal-from-office approach, the 2nd proposal. I would like to address, though, the 51%, as the gentleman before me mentioned, that would give people an advantage to do misdeeds. If the official's misdeeds are serious enough to remove them from office, the 2/3rds threshold is adequate and appropriate.

Don Eichelberger, San Francisco: I watched these discussions go by regularly on e-mail, and this was one where I chimed in where my 'Fundie' credentials came in. If I didn't feel like I had at least 2/3 support of the people, and we strive for consensus, I don't think I should remain in office. I think we should stick with the Super-Majority.

Ray Glocken, Santa Cruz: Clarification on the 50%+1: We still have to commit ourselves on which way the question is phrased, it doesn't address it. Also, whenever you have a fixed term of office, you have an automatic sunset clause, which addresses the issue.

Cameron Spitzer, _____: I want to congratulate and thank Jim for explaining this issue very well. Thank you.

Lerner Goodie, San Bernardino: If we make it easier to take him out of office than it is to elect them, we're asking for real trouble.

Paul Encimer, Sequoia: I agree with **Lerner**. It's going to create havoc, and is ridiculous. So is the IRV approach. When are we applying that to all other votes? How many surprises can we have on this issue, and why are we doing it? I've got more reasons, but...forget it.

Mike Borenstein, El Dorado: The reason we're doing this is because we've had to deal with these problems in the past. I need to remind the delegates that there are currently bylaws dealing with this; we're just trying to adjust it.

Paul Encimer, Sequoia: I've never seen a recall that wasn't politically motivated. I'd rather increase the threshold to 80%.

Pam: I noticed that the stacks were male-dominated. Are there any women who wish to speak on this issue?...All right, if not, then we're now breaking for dinner. We need to have the delegate cards collected; **Ginny** is out front to collect them, please give them to her before you leave. I'm making one more announcement for the GPUS delegates to meet at Clinton and Blackstone at **Di Ciccio's** behind **Albertson's**, from 5:30 to 7:30, anybody who's interested in GPUS issues, the phone number again is 559-227-9851.

Beth Moore Haines, Nevada: Don't forget, I have the **Campus Green** packets, I'm looking for the official contacts from each county. Thank you.

Chris: Thank you for the opportunity. Have fun tonight; thanks for letting me facilitate this afternoon, I'm happy with my first experience. See you tomorrow.

Sat Afternoon session ended at 05:06 pm.

*(Minutes taken/transcribed by **Stuart Bechman**)*

Sunday morning session

Session started at 9:12 am.

9. Housekeeping (15 min)

Co-Facilitators: **Michael Borenstein, Jo Chamberlain**

Notetaker: **Stuart Bechman**

Vibes-Watchers: **Kevin McKeown; Teri Regan**

Timekeeper: **Bill Meyers**

Mike: We'll try to have a group picture taken after lunch out front. Also, if anyone has not yet paid their plenary fees or other donations that they wish to make, please do so as soon as you can.

Jo: We'll affirm the meeting officers...and now we'll affirm the agenda. There are two corrections. One is that...the 2nd is the 10 to 10:30 slot, where we will be affirming additional delegates. The question is, are we affirming the agenda for the entire day or just the morning? **Cameron**, please roll the agenda up on the screen so we can see the whole day. Closing ceremony is the last thing. So the question is, are there any concerns about the facilitation team or the agenda? ...Thank you.

10. Consent Calendar / Saturday Items (15 min)

Mike: We're going to bring back our Consent Calendar items from yesterday; and, **Warner**?... Consent calendar, for those of you who don't know, are do-or-die items presented on Saturday morning that are generally voted on without discussion. We're bringing back those that failed yesterday.

Warner Bloomberg: This first item is in regards to the GPCA region redistricting, from pages 7-8 in the plenary packet. I've talked with the various individuals who had concerns. For the record: **Mark Stout** requested that the phrasing regarding district of use be changed. His words: "San Francisco's Castro District, between two Senate districts ... diluting the strength of the Lesbian, Gay, and Trans-Sexual Community." 2nd Amendment: **San Mateo County** rep: "Take the redistricting process away from politicians and place it under the control of a commission process." On the following page (8), after talking with **Kevin McKeown**: the word 'competitive' is replaced with 'equitable'; 'between' is replaced with 'among'. These are all the changes that I understand were requested; and they are all accepted as friendly amendments.

Mike: Warner has gone out of his way to address all concerns. Are there any other concerns?...If not, we'll move to test for consensus...are there other concerns?

Ray Glocken, Santa Cruz: Clarifying Question / Concern: I will stand aside, but want to express a concern. Is that appropriate for Consent Items?...No?...Then I withdraw my concern.

Mike: Are there any other concerns?...OK, that's consent. **Don Eichelberger**?

Don: Good morning everybody. So I brought up this request for state approval of statement in support of **State Constitutional Amendment #7**, which is coming up in June, so that's the urgency of putting it on the consent calendar now. We've addressed the issues expressed by **San Mateo county**; are there any other concerns?

Mike: Again, **Don** has gone out of his way to address yesterday's concerns. Are there any other concerns?

Ginny: Point of Process: Yes. It's a process concern, a technical thing. But we didn't follow the process to get it into the plenary packet; we don't know what local originated this, that's LA's concern.

David Shorey, Sacramento: If the item came from a local and the state CC accepted the item, then it can be said that the CC presented the item on behalf of the local.

Mike: That was the case here. Any other concerns?...Then we have consensus, Thank you....We need consensus on the selection of delegates from the county councils. So if there's anyone here who has concerns on this matter, please raise your hands?...[no hands raised] OK, thank you.

David Shorey, Sacramento: The reason we have to have this is because it's in the bylaws to have the General Assembly affirm the election of county council members. Can we affirm?...[twinkling] OK, thank you.

11. Platform Proposal #3: Peace & Non-Violence (30 min) (**Jim Stauffer, Peggy Lewis**)

Jo: We are now moving towards the morning's platform proposal. Presenters, please come on stage and confer with us on how you want us to facilitate this section....

Peggy: I want to remind delegates that this will be the last chance to make positive changes to our platform planks before we go to a new printing.

Budd: Also, we'll be bringing back the Economics plank rejected later today with a change to hopefully address the concerns of most of those who voted no.

Jim Stauffer: Hi, we're going to present changes to the **Peace & Non-Violence** platform. It begins on p.46 of your packet. The **Peace & Non-Violence** section is grouped into various groups; For clarification, we're not adding new planks; we're just clarifying existing planks, I don't think there's much to be controversial. We did propose one new plank, titled "Terrorism"; but based on the feedback I got (none of which was positive), I'm inclined to pull this plank entirely. However, within that Terrorism plank, there were a few sentences which people did like, so I want to try to work those sentences into other planks, which I'll go over a little later. The 2nd change, the Death Penalty clause: On page 48, it's actually in the plank called "Violence & Society". There was the 2nd sentence of that paragraph that had been removed: "We, therefore, oppose the Death Penalty." But everybody really liked that, so that sentence it back in. [Applause] So, I guess I've resolved 3/4 of the concerns

out there! I'd like to ask whether there are questions/concerns outside of the **Terrorism** plank, how many? Quite a few, OK. So we'll start with that.

Jo: The process that the presenter would like to follow would be to take all concerns from the floor, then address all of them at once. The presenter would like to limit this to 10 minutes.

Affirmations/Concerns

Pamela Meidell, Ventura: Thank you, **Jim**. I have questions on the **Disarmament** plank on page 50, and ask that you include unsigned and unratified agreements in addition to the current agreements that the US appears to be withdrawing from, for instance, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Also, the **Global Justice** section, I'd like to reinstate the struck-out part with: "...until all signers, including the United States...establish Nuclear-Free Zones". I think that's important.

Jonathan Lundell, San Mateo: Point of Process: Is this ten minutes for the entire section?

Jo: The answer is Yes, minus the 'Terrorism section. Is the process issue addressed, **Mr. Lundell?**

San Diego delegation: San Diego has the same concern that was mentioned about the treaties. We're sorry we did not bring this forward earlier, but we had the impression that we couldn't make changes prior to the plenary. This is an emergency situation: Our country has just authorized a massive ground war in January; but we are a peace-loving party. We need to stand for our principles. I have the language on disk.

Jo: Thank you. I'm now closing the stack for clarifying questions. I'm stopping at **Kevin McKeown**. Two **Points of Process: Budd?**...Thank you **Budd**. Some of the comments sound like concerns rather than clarifying questions. We'll get to concerns in a moment. ...Or do you want to take both? ...The presenter wants to take both, so we'll be reopening the stack for concerns as well.

Chuck O'Neil, Sacramento: Violence in Schools: I would like to see an addressing of...also, grammatical errors are not to be addressed, I know, but I just wanted to point out one...

Jo: The presenter reminds the delegates that he would like grammatical changes to be presented in writing. OK, I'm closing the stacks again now. Please keep comments to a minute, to **Lundell & Shoup**.

Ray Glocken, Santa Cruz: Selective Service & Conscientious Objectors. We don't have an unequivocal call to rescind the Selective Service Act; we need that.

Jo: I'd like to see **Susanne** come over to the end of the stack. **Jerry** has yielded the stack to **Susanne**, go ahead.

Susanne _____, _____: I've worked a lot withSolidarity...it's notoriously controlled by right-wing unions in many countries, so I think we should seriously consider removing this.

Gerry Gras, Santa Clara: Pg. 49, You're talking that the Soviet Union is no longer a threat; but that needs to be reworded a bit about the '2nd Superpower Threat has died'. Also, page 46, something about threats, fears, intimidation as violence, I disagree with that statement.

Paul Encimer, Sequoia: On the **Militarism** plank, I have a number of questions and friendly amendments. When you took out 2 and 5, I'm presuming that you're trying to keep current; but I find a lot missing, such as a "Registration for the draft" plank, and support for GI's in the military, that there's been a lot of desertions since 9/11, this plank is not timely enough. I would be happy to write something for the new printing.

Jonathan Lundell, San Mateo: With 'Superpower died', I'd suggest...my point is, top of pg. 48, Guns, and eliminate guns: We appear to be attempting to accommodate hunters; I don't want to address that, but if we are, it seems that hunters could be accommodated while eliminating weapons whose sole purpose is to kill. So this raises a concern: Should we be rewording it to people?

Donald Brooks, _____: Page 47, the "Death Penalty" part: I would like to strike the sentence following it. It misses the point.

Kevin McKeown, LA: The LA contingency is very pleased that the "Death Penalty" sentence is being restored, we think that this is very important. Unfortunately, we've been mandated to vote for some of the planks, and against others; so I'm distressed and relieved to report that LA will stand aside on this plank vote.

Larry Shoup, Alameda: "In order to strengthen the Green Party's desire for worldwide democracy and self-determination, the US must change its policy"...The Cold War? This is happening....

Paul Encimer, Sequoia: I was just wondering, **Point of Process:** With the 2 terrorism planks, obviously meaning to be voted on separately, it presumes that the other planks were also to be voted on separately, and I urge that each of the planks be voted on separately.

Jo: The presenter has asked that further comments be submitted in writing to the committee. At this point, I will ask the presenter to respond or decide to end the presentation at this point.

Presenter's responses to expressed concerns

Jim: Boy, this would have been so much more helpful to have had these comments EARLIER...OK, first, **Pam's** Disarmament plank concerns, pg. 49...and, yeah, a couple of minor clarifications, when we talk about all of the unsigned treaties, adding unratified, yeah, that's no problem. The biggest one was the addition of point #6: Nuclear abolition / Enforcing the nuclear non-proliferation treaty regime, until all signers, and especially the US have fulfilled their obligations under article 6 of that treaty; and establish binding...for nuclear-free zones....How do these sound to the group, any concerns?...OK, we'll do that, definitely. OK, San Diego's suggestion for a new plank on Humanitarian concerns. We've discussed that new planks have to be sent out to the counties and placed on the plenary agenda; that wasn't done here.

San Diego delegation: Add the 3 bullets to **Foreign Policy**.

Jim: You're adding big proposals to the platform. How many people want to try to deal with this thing on the floor?...[ruckus on floor]

Jo: OK, the facilitator's stepping in here. The time for public comment here is over, and we have to respect the presenter's time to respond. We have **Point of Process** from **Aaron**, and **Jon**

Aaron Lipke, San Diego: If the Presenter asks for response from the group, is it [not] appropriate for the floor to respond?

Jo: The presenter stepped out of his role. He should have asked the Facilitator to call for responses.

Robert Robinson, _____: I'm concerned about LA having mandated concerns. If we allowed this, we would NEVER get a new platform approved; This would leave us with the old platform forever; leaving us with the old shit!!!

[VIBES]

Jo: OK, everybody, that wasn't a process point; and we're out of time. So we'll confer with the presenter as to how he would like to proceed. Everybody take a breather....

Jim: OK. So, basically, no, I'm turning down **San Diego's** request, it will have to go in the next cycle. So, basically, all the other comments I've heard are pretty minor changes, so I would tend to accept all of the other comments. Of all of the other comments, I would like to know if there are any concerns from the floor on accepting all the other comments.

Jo: Here's the situation. The presenters now want to open up....so, **Jim's** going to ask a question. Does everybody have a delegate card? It's a straw poll. Put up your card when he asks his question and respond to the YES or NO.

Jim: I will accept all suggested amendments except the San Diego additions. Is there anybody out there that has a concern about this?

Jo: Minus the additions from San Diego, he will accept all other amendments. Who would accept that?...Who would oppose that?...OK, it appears only one opposition in the straw poll. We're out of time; we need to formalize the vote. We request ten additional minutes to do this; I recommend that we take 5 minutes from the Working Groups session; and 5 minutes from lunch. Twinkling? *[yes]* Thank you.

Jim: Now, I want to talk about the **Terrorism** section a little bit. I want to go over the good sentences we're salvaging...OK. Starting on pg.46, **Terrorism** version 1: In the 1st paragraph., 3rd line, there's a couple of sentences beginning with: "The Bush Administration...rationalization. Our Foreign Policy is under criticism from the Muslim world...values around the world." I would like to save that; any concerns?

Jo: If everybody could just sit down, we just want a show of hands for concerns, don't come forward. Are there concerns on the issues [that] they raised? One hand per person...*[many hands raised]* Please bear with us. We do have a plan.

Jim: OK, well, given the number of concerns on that point, I won't pursue that.

Ray Glocken, Santa Cruz: Point of Process: Would it be possible to have some indication to the nature of the concerns?

Jo: No. Please bear with us, we do have a plan. Thank you.

Jim: OK, on the same page, 46, 2nd paragraph, "The group causes anti-...cultural despair." That fits very nicely in the **Peace Dividend** section.

Stephanie _____, _____: Point of Process: I don't think that **Jim's** reading the version he means to read?

Jim: Yes, in that section that I've read first, there are some additional examples. I was going to go ahead with those examples if we could go ahead. We only have 3 minutes left; I'm going to skip the **Terrorism** planks entirely. I'd like to approve our recommended changes and the other amendments minus the San Diego additions.

Jo: There's a slight modification. There's going to be one sentence added to the other section for your approval. The **Terrorism** plank is being pulled.

Jim: Yes, but a really good suggestion from **Patty Marshall**: "In keeping with...or individuals". I want to retain this. *[Applause]*

Jo: I need to see your delegate card if there are any other concerns. *[None]*

Aaron Lipke, San Diego: Point of Process: I heard you say something about reworking the **Terrorism** plank when you also said this would be the last opportunity to change it, please clarify?

Jim: We're looking to publishing [the latest version of the platform this summer, so this is the last chance to get changes in this summer's document.

_____, _____: **Point of Process:** Are we going to see the written document, or have we already approved it?

Jo: No. We just did the concerns; there were no concerns, I think we're done.

Aaron Lipke, San Diego: Point of Process: I don't understand testing for consensus prior to addressing **Point of Process** concerns?

Jo: OK, we'll do this one more time. If you have concerns, please raise your cards. I see 2 cards; that's a super-majority [without concerns]...no, that's not consensus, would they be willing to stand aside?...No, so we're moving to a vote...another **Point of Process** from **Aaron**?

Aaron Lipke, San Diego: Point of Process: You're supposed to ask the presenter what he wants.

Jo: He's been very clear that he wants a vote. Please hold up your delegate card if you approve of the proposal...We would now like to call on those who would like to vote NO. Please, only the card; don't hold up notebooks or anything else...That's an 88% approval, Process Point, Kevin?

Kevin McKeown, LA: Point of Process: LA is standing aside; we would like a full count of stand-asides...

Jo: Very good. Please raise your card for stand-asides. Now we're going to ask the Bylaws committee to report the standaside...44 yes votes, 5 no votes, 7 stand-asides. **The proposal has passed.**

12. Candidate Speeches & At-Large CC Representative Election (10 min) (Peggy Lewis)

Jo: Let's review our time, we need to find another 10 minutes, where do we take it?...OK, we'll take another 5 minutes from lunch. On to **Mr. Borenstein**.

Mike: Thank you all. Good voting. 20% standasides would have caused additional problems...the CC has a proposal to make to you about that; **Peggy** will be presenting, where is **Peggy**?

Peggy: Sorry, I missed that we had changed the agenda. Since the last plenary, we had **Justin Muscoso** resign; so we talked at Friday's CC meeting about several options, balancing those out with a time-frame of next April, which, if we wait to the next plenary, it will adversely impact the campaign season. We would like to ask for bios today, then have the authority for the CC on May 20 to appoint someone to that seat, to be affirmed at the next plenary. Will that meet with your approval, are there any questions?

_____, _____: Does that mean that the additional openings will also be filled?

Peggy: Bios until May 17th; the CC will appoint one person on May 20th; the GA will affirm at the next plenary. The 3 other openings are a separate issue.

Mike: Any other Clarifying Questions?...No? OK, are there any concerns?...No concerns. Thank you very much...

Proposal for the CC to appoint a replacement for the CC slot left open by Justin Muscoso's resignation at the next CC teleconference affirmed by the assembly.

OK, **Bill Piez**, are you in the house? We're now going to entertain a brief speech from each of the candidates. Is **San Diego** ready? And, **Ken Adams**? And, will **San Diego** please come forward?

Ken Adams, Sacramento: Believe me, I'm busy; but I'm willing to take on being on the CC, I have my own cable access show, I'm very active, I work in the office, I am busy, and I'm looking forward to staying with the state.

Mike: We hope you all read all the bios prior to the plenary, 'cause that's one of the Ten Key Values! *[laugh]* now, the other candidate comes from **San Diego**, but she's struggling to get back from South America, so **San Diego** will speak on her behalf.

San Diego, for Magali Offerman: This is the 1st plenary that she hasn't made since getting involved 2 years ago and is missing this one only because of a family illness. She's a sparkplug for the **Lagoon Greens**; she handled the **Camejo/Copeland** debate in our area this year, she was active in the **Nader** campaign, she's a joy to work with, a hard worker, very responsible and would do a wonderful job. The SD delegation supports her fully. Thank you!

Mike: Are there any brief questions for either of the candidates, **Magali** being represented by the choir, and **Ken** representing himself, come to the mikes please.

Budd Dickinson, Alameda: I want to know how many plenaries **Magali** has attended?

SD: About 3 or 4.

Mike: Any more questions? OK, the stack is closed. **Bill Piez** will explain the election process.

Bill Piez, LA: We're going to use a ballot. Since there's only 2 candidates, it's not IRV, it's Choice Voting. We will give ballots only to those with delegate cards. We need a vote to accept the ballot: At least 33 of the 41 delegates need to pick up ballots for the election to happen. You'll see on the ballot that both candidates are on the ballot, along with "No Other Candidate." You're not just marking the candidate you want, because there are two seats to fill. Mark 'No Other Candidate' if you want one or both of the seats to remain vacant, not if you want to abstain. To abstain, don't pick up a ballot. Otherwise, rank the candidates you want to support. Since **Jim Stauffer's** not here, **Tish** will start passing out the ballots, and we need to count them as they're passed out. You can keep the ballot until after lunch; they must be turned in, and you must show your delegate card at that time so it's all official. We'll be out by the registration table or by the doors.

Jo: Are there any questions about this process?

Aaron Lipke, San Diego: Is there any difference between not voting at all and abstaining? If you take a ballot but turn it back in blank, that seems different than not picking up a ballot.

Bill Piez, LA: Good question. There's two ways to determine quorum: Either by counting ballots taken, which is what we're doing here; the other is turning in a blank ballot.

Greg Jan, Alameda: What are the effects on the results of you take a ballot but turn in a blank ballot?

Bill Piez, LA: You're free to vote for no one, or just one. If you vote for just one, then that one vote will be recorded in our first round. If you turn in a blank ballot, we just won't record any votes. Is that acceptable?

Jo: Please pick up your ballots. A few announcements. **Mike?**

Mike: If you haven't paid your fees or other donations you can make to the host committee, please do that as soon as possible. Also, we want to get a group picture at lunchtime.

Jo: Please organize out front at 12:30, that's when the photographer would be ready. Lunch goes to 12:50, but the photographer will be taking the picture at 12:30. we're going to break now; at 10:45, go to the following places:

Communications WG, go to the Faculty Room, the small room downstairs next to the Cafeteria. **Bylaws:** Stay in this room. **Issues:** Go to N-29, it's outside & to the side. [She repeats the room assignments] So we're going to break, then to breakout sessions; then we'll meet here after lunch and collect our ballots. Where's the **Womens' Caucus** going? **Women's Caucus** is meeting in the Cafeteria.

Mr. Piez will be here after the photo-op and prior to 12:50 to collect and count ballots. Where does the **Women's Caucus** want to meet?...They'll meet in the Faculty Room during lunch.

David Shorey, Sacramento: Could I have your attention please? The **Lavender Caucus** will meet in the lobby and then find a place to meet at lunchtime.

Sunday morning session ended at 10:32 am.

*(Minutes taken/transcribed by **Stuart Bechman**)*

Sunday afternoon session

Session started at 1:04 pm.

13. Housekeeping / Affirmation of spokesfolk (15 min)

Co-Facilitators: **David Shorey; Ginny Case**

Notetaker: **Stuart Bechman**

Vibes-Watchers:

Timekeeper:

David: We have a few housekeeping issues. Transportation: Due to a private emergency, **Lupita** needs a ride to the train station early this afternoon, we'd appreciate a volunteer to help her. Also, I want to thank Fresno for doing an amazing job; however, they've got a small problem because they're running a little short of cash, so we'll be passing around a hat.

Mike Borenstein, El Dorado: The shortfall is due to 34 people registering for the plenary but failing to show up. So we're about \$700 short of what we expected. We're passing around hats to ask for help.

Ginny: Please turn in your delegate ballots, so we can turn them in. If you're a regional rep selected in your regional caucus, please come up to the front.

Beth Moore Haines, Nevada: I'm **Beth Moore Haines** from **Nevada County**, coming to you as the newly affirmed **Communications facilitators** for the Green Party. Here's the spokespeople we've selected; these are basically people with high integrity and functionality, and can speak authoritatively for the Green Party. Two are here today: **John Strawn**; and **Ross Mirakimi**, who's currently in Spain. He's got a great voice; plus, his history, he knows what he's talking about (but it's mainly his great voice that we want him for); then there's **Sara Amir**, who's been with the party a long time, she's choosing to speak primarily for the southern California region only; and finally, myself, **Beth Moore Haines**. We are the 4 people that we're presenting to you for affirmation.

David: Are there any clarifying questions to **Beth** or any other spokespeople? *[no]* Any concerns? *[no]* Then we have consensus! *[twinkle]*

Ginny: The next is the affirmation of the new regional reps. Please come up front and introduce yourselves, let us know what region you're representing.

Kevin McKeown, LA: I've been officially elected for the LA region.

Gerry Gras, Santa Clara: Santa Clara / San Mateo County region.

Dana St. George, Santa Clara: Alternate Rep for Silicon Valley.

Martha Devine, Humboldt: Emerald Region; new alternate rep, our main rep who's not here is **Paul Encimer**.

Aaron Lipke, San Diego: Imperial / San Diego County, elected by delegate caucus.

Patricia Kovner, Mendocino: Alternate rep, Emerald Region

John Markshadonwia, San Francisco: SF acting rep, elections to be held in another month.

Sharon Peterson, Oakland: East Bay; plus **Leslie Denkin** from **Alameda** was recently appointed

Ginny: The other LA reps include: **Faramarz Nabavi; Franklin Rogers; James Roberts; Gabrielle Weeks;** and **Tom Buloma**. The next thing to do is check on the votes for the at-large.

David: Each region selects their own representatives. So a big hand is in order! *[applause]*

Ginny: The at-large election results, are we ready for those?...**Bill? Jim?**...Can someone go check on them? All right...

David: There's also, **Jo Chamberlain**, there was an item about a vacancy created by resignation, and the CC asked for time to discuss this...oh, we did this this morning; so if you're interested, please send a bio to **Mike Borenstein** or **Peggy Lewis**, the Co-Cos for the CC of California.

Ginny: Here's **Bill! Bill**, come on up, you're next!!

Bill Piez, LA: So, everything's done properly; trust us. *[laugh]* We had 54 votes, 54 ballots came in. So to win, a candidate had to get 18 votes. Both candidates, **Megali**, with 36 votes; and **Ken**, with 19 votes, won on the first round.

Ginny: Thanks, **Bill**. It's now time for our third breakout session. **GROW:** Meet in Faculty Lounge. **Electoral Reform:** Meet in the Auditorium. **Finance:** Meet in N-29. Be back at **2:20** for the next Platform Proposal session.

14. SC/WG Session III [1:05-2:20pm]

15. Platform Proposal #4: Child Care; Economics; Minor/Substantial Misc. Changes (40 min)

David Shorey, Sacramento: We're down to the final stretch...Can we give another hand to Fresno?

Ginny: We're going to start in about a minute. Those of you floating in the back area, please come down and take your seats so we can get started. We're already starting 10 minutes late...Alrighty, here we go.. This is **Platform Session #4**. We've got **Child Care**; we've got...is this **Economics?**...**Minor and Substantial Changes** and **Economics** will be coming up at the end. We've got until 3:00 for this one, it'll probably go over and...is **Beth** in the room?

David Shorey: Presenting this will be, stepping out of her role as facilitator, is **Ginny Case**; and **David Sheidlower** and **Budd Dickinson**. **Beth Moore Haines** will be facilitating with me for this segment whenever she shows up. Presenting now is **David Sheidlower**.

David Sheidlower, Alameda: Pages 32, 33, & 34. The person who wrote this is not here, so we're somewhat winging it, based on information that we've collected the past 2 days. We're now asking for Clarifying Questions:

Clarifying Questions:

Clay Mandolf, San Diego: Whatever Working Group considered this, did they consider funding? How is it funded, or is it handled someplace else?

David Sheidlower, Alameda: As with many planks in this platform, the funding is considered but we don't address it in the platform. The funding for this plank could be handled either through public or private means.

David Shorey, Sacramento: Are there any further Clarifying Questions?

Ginny: Actually, we need a minute to discuss the facilitation approach with the team. Just a minute...

David Shorey, Sacramento: To clarify the process that we're doing, due to the fact that the author is not here, the presenters will take your clarifying questions here on the floor. However, if you have concerns, we ask that you submit them in writing, as they will be taken back to the author and we will not have a vote at this time. We have a **Point of Process:**

Matt _____, San Diego: Shouldn't we be able to voice our opinions so that it would be in the record?

David Shorey: The presenters want to handle it otherwise, since we don't have the author here.

Matt _____, San Diego: But can't we still have the discussion?

Beth Moore Haines, Nevada: The presenters could pull the agenda item, but they're doing what they feel they can to try to solicit comments for a more effective presentation and vote next time.

Matt _____, San Diego: But I came ready to discuss this!!

David Sheidlower: The plank is posted on the CAGREENS.ORG website and is set up so that when you submit the comments, they will go directly to the author of the plank. Also, gpcaptf@cagreens.org will work. Also, this is a matter of conserving time. We can't possibly get through all of the issues at this time, so we're trying to be as efficient and effective as possible.

Sola Sarmiento, Santa Cruz: Who was the author?

David Shorey: Nancy Marmol. So the agenda item is being pulled; please submit any comments to the GPCA website. Now, the next section that will be discussed is a re-vote of the **Economics** plank.

Budd: We have talked to a number of people who voted no yesterday; there is one sentence that we'll be deleting that we think will address most of those people's concerns. Under "Creating the writing" sentence: "Therefore, we should generally...increase capital gains, property taxes." This is being deleted because of the number of concerns over property tax increases. I would like to hear of any other outstanding issues, other than that sentence, and other than the LA contingent.

Clarifying Questions:

David _____, Calaveras: Are you taking out the whole sentence or just the part about property tax?

Budd: The whole sentence.

Sola Sarmiento, Santa Cruz: If you're going to remove the whole sentence, does that mean you go back and rewrite it?

Budd: It won't be gone forever, we'll rewrite it and re-present it down the road.

Ginny: Closing the stack; opening for concerns.

Concerns:

Chuck O'Neil, Sacramento: Sac county has surveyed our Green voters, and our overwhelming #1 issue for our county is sprawl. One of the many things that helps create sprawl is the conspicuous consumption of luxury homes, due to low property taxes. I'm extremely disappointed that the plenary has found the need to strike this clause. The compromise doesn't satisfy me or our county. I do wish that people will start following the process; and that when people ask for comments [between plenaries], they do that rather than wait to the last minute so we can find a workable compromise.

Ginny: I need a timekeeper. Our time is limited, and we've overlooked this...We're going to 3pm. So I'm limiting the stack.

Emily Dale, Riverside: I've heard enough concerns about the property tax issue, and I would like to offer a compromise to that. The state of California has a homestead exemption that exempts the bottom portion of the value of the property [e.g., *the first \$10,000 is exempt from property tax. --ed*]. Supporting the homestead exemption would solve the property tax issue for us.

Cliff _____, San Bernardino: It seems like development goes against the Green Principles.

Jean Rosenmeier, Contra Costa: We were one of the people who [first] expressed our concerns at the plenary. We didn't notice it [beforehand]. But it was inevitable that it would come up, it's just too controversial.

William Thomas, Riverside: I'm concerned that higher property taxes would hurt the poor and not the rich.

_____, _____: I'd like to see a tax on currency transactions included in this.

Ginny: We're going to test for consensus. Are there any unresolved concerns? Seeing that LA has unresolved concerns, can we go to a vote? Is LA County willing to stand aside?

Kevin McKeown, LA: As delegate chief, I have to repeat that we are mandated to vote against this.

Ginny: OK, we'll go ahead and place a vote.

David Shorey: We have quorum as established earlier in the day. Can I ask...is there one other individual who is not a delegate who can assist in counting the votes?...**Beth**, are you a delegate?

Beth Moore Haines, Nevada: Yeah, but I'll help count unless / until you find someone else.

David Shorey: All those in favor, please raise your cards....All those opposed, please raise your cards high...those who are abstaining please raise your cards high....Give us 30 seconds while we...

Ginny: Jo, can I borrow your calculator?...There were 49 yeses; 6 nos; and 1 abstention; **the measure passes** with 89%. We will now move into the next plank, which is...whatever it is....

Budd: This is a miscellaneous piece. Throughout the platform, there are little changes that we want to make. They're called minor, because they're one-liners; but they're substantial, they're more than just grammatical errors. I'd like to get comments on this.

Clarifying Questions

Jonathan Lundell, San Mateo: Would you say a word about "Eco-Cities" and why they are singled out [in the plank]?

Budd: The reason it's there is because it was already in our platform. It's just an organization.

Kevin McKeown, LA: I had the same question. Secondly, **Santa Monica** has had their groundwater poisoned by MTBE, and we're currently suing the oil companies for it.

Pamela Meidell, Ventura: Budd and I talked yesterday about adding a phrase to the Nuclear Contamination section, and I was wondering if it would be added.

Budd: We have agreed to include it in the Nuclear Contamination section, at the end of the 4th sentence, it will say: "...Continue dismantling current stocks until we reach zero nuclear weapons."

Affirmations/Concerns

Ginny: Any outstanding Concerns?

Jonathan Lundell, San Mateo: We call for the ban of MTBE, which is a dandy idea; but in the **Peace & Non-Violence** section, we're saying that it's already been outlawed. This is a contradiction.

Budd: Actually, the state has banned it, but the deadline is not until two years from now. We'll make sure that it's consistent.

Jonathan Lundell, San Mateo: On the matter of Eco-Cities, I'd ask that we generalize this, there are other smart-growth efforts.

Budd: How would you generalize it? Sustainable Communities? Smart Growth?...OK, Sustainable Communities. [applause]

Jonathan Lundell, San Mateo: Finally, supporting the use of RU-486 by doctors, does that mean we oppose its use by carpenters, etc?

Budd: Thank you, we'll clean that up.

Ginny: Are there any other concerns?

Aaron Lipke, San Diego: Why are we not asking for concerns & affirmations?

Ginny: Because my phrasing is off...I'd like to test for consensus now. Are there any outstanding concerns? [no] Thank you.

David Shorey: I'd like to ask **Michael Borenstein** and **Peggy Lewis**, we're going to talk about the next state meeting and the location of it.

_____, _____: I'm not comfortable with 'Sustainable Community'. A community can be sustainable if it runs on nuclear power. I'd like to request that you change 'Sustainable Community' to 'Economically-sound Sustainable Community.'

Budd: Sure, that's fine with me.

Aaron Lipke, San Diego: Point of Process: We need clarification of the change, for the record!

Tian Harter, _____: Please go through the formality of doing it right.

Ginny: All right. Are there any outstanding concerns from the assembly about changing the wording of 'Sustainable Community' to 'Economically-sound Sustainable Community'?...OK; **we have consensus**. Now, back to **Michael** and **Peggy**.

16. Next State Meeting (10 min) (**Michael Borenstein, Peggy Lewis**)

Peggy Lewis, Sacramento: I'm turning it over to Pam and Stuart, who will introduce the suggested site.

Stuart Bechman, Ventura: Well, it's been quite a struggle to get to this point; but I'm happy to report that Ventura County is happy, willing and able to host the GPCA gathering in our county in August. The gathering will be held on the **Peter Strauss Ranch** in the **Santa Monica Mountains**. It's nestled in the middle of an Oak Grove, well-isolated from the world. The gathering will be held the weekend of August 10th and 11th. Come join us in August.

Peggy Lewis, Sacramento: Any questions / concerns?

Affirmations/Concerns

David Shiedlower, Alameda: What happens if it doesn't pass?

Ginny: Then we'll "plenary" you to death!!! *[laughter]*

Kevin McKeown, LA: The 10th & 11th, is that right? I thought it was a later weekend?

Pamela Meidell, Ventura: It was a different date. Changing the date to the 10th & 11th makes it possible for Ventura to host this gathering.

Peggy Lewis, Sacramento: We're planning a gathering, no business. Workshops, get out the vote, learning consensus.

_____ **(Slow speaking gentleman), _____:** This ranch, where is it located?

Pamela Meidell, Ventura: Southeast corner of Ventura County on the border with Los Angeles County.

Lawrence Rockwood, _____: Will there be an opportunity to issue responses to things like ground war?

Pamela Meidell, Ventura: Yes, some business may be possible to conduct. We'll take the rest of the concerns together and then answer them all at once.

Jonathan Lundell, San Mateo: May to December is a long time to wait between business items.

Kevin McKeown, LA: I have a concern with scheduling. Petition deadlines for candidates are August 8th; but they could be extended a week to August 15th, that would conflict with the gathering. (Not that I'm planning on turning my petitions in late! But others might...)

Lupita _____, _____: Transportation concern. I'm concerned about the site being remote from civilization. How will we get there? Will we need a car to get there? Where will we stay, do we have to camp there? Does Ventura have an airport?

Red sweater guy with hat and white beard: Pre-Nader, we had alternated our state meetings with a gathering between every plenary. It would be wonderful to return to that schedule, I think that gatherings are invaluable.

Cameron Spitzer, _____: Is it practical to hold a large green meeting way out in the country? What facilities does the site have? Does it have power, internet / phone access, water?

T _____, Fresno: Is there attendance requirements for Delegates if there might be business?

Michael Borenstein, El Dorado: Finding out where a plenary gathering might be is tough work. Our process needs a lot of lead time. We've been trying to put together a three year schedule for our plenaries and gatherings so we aren't against the wall for the next one each time we meet. Please be thinking about whether your county can host a plenary/gathering so we can complete our schedule..

Response to Concerns

Stuart Bechman, Ventura: When I said that the space was isolated, I did not mean to imply that it was remote. It's less than 3 miles from Highway 101, where there's plenty of suburbia with hotels, restaurants, gas stations, the works. We expect to have plenty of locals able to host out-of-town guests in their home close by. The site does have power and water, and a nice kitchen area in the cabin; but no internet access on the site, and no access after dusk, we'll be holding our evening events elsewhere. There are local airports: LAX, Burbank, and Santa Barbara; and even Oxnard has an airport.

Pamela Meidell, Ventura: The railroad even runs through the area. Oxnard is really close and the train is great! Sorry about the conflict with the scheduling and the signature gathering; but it's the only weekend that will work for us. We'll defer to the CC for the questions as to whether or not there will be business...

Peggy Lewis, Sacramento: This is not a plenary. This is not a plenary/gathering. This is a plenary with a hint of business flavor. This will be fun in the summer.

T _____, Fresno: Some business? What does that mean? If there is any business then do we need delegates? Will there be an agenda beforehand?

Peggy Lewis, Sacramento: Delegates will be expected there. There will be an agenda pack. There will be a minimum amount of business (but no bylaws / platform changes).

Stuart Bechman, Ventura: Even though it's a gathering, the Working Groups and Standing Committees will still be meeting. The good thing is that they'll have a lot more time than they did this weekend, which should please a lot of people.

_____, _____: What is the process of sending in a workshop idea?

Peggy Lewis, Sacramento: Mail it in. To the CC, to the WG co-facilitators, to your regional rep.

David Shorey: We're going to test for consensus now. So, are there any outstanding concerns?....**We are consensed.**

17. SC/WG Reports; Announcement of new Co-Co's / Liaisons

Don Eichelberger, Green Issues: We talked about LGBT planks added to the platform; about computer literacy, improving knowledge and access; Peace issues, weapons divestiture, Israel, etc.; we talked about how to respond more quickly to Green issues, on behalf of the Green party. That's an ongoing discussion. Thank you.

Jean Rosenmeier, Electoral Reform: As you probably know, **Caleb Kleppner** has recently stepped down as co-coordinator; and I'm thrilled to announce that **Bill Piez** has stepped up to be my co-coordinator. We'll talk to **Kendra** about improving our **Electoral Reform website**; talk to the CC about improving our **ER planks**; and working to get our own section in the **California election code**.

Peggy Lewis, Platform: We divided into groups to work on **Economics**, and **Peace & Non-Violence**; and another group worked on what we're going to present next, setting up a rotating schedule. The December plenary will be Water; Land use; Electoral reform & Democracy. We welcome help.

Ginny Case, Finance: We had a good meeting this afternoon, although no major decisions. We will approach the CC about filling standing vacancies for our committee. Talk to the CC if you're interested. We also talked about fund-raising and the mailers, and we'd like to see more coordination between the national and the local groups; andat the August Plenary/gathering.

Pam Meidell, International Protocol: We did have a small meeting to try to determine what our focus should be. We decided that our focus should be on putting up a website to disclose our history, we will take advantage of **Kendra's** offer; we're also going to work on things like translation and links to other international Greens, as we have people in our group with links to them, so we'll have a cadre locally to work on this; and work on a network of hosts so that we can host international Green visitors. It's a work in progress.

Beth Moore Haines, GROW & Communications: For **GROW**, I'm pleased to announce that we have a new co-coordinator, **Stuart Bechman**, the fabulous note-taker; and **Stuart** has been preparing himself for this role for awhile now, participating in-between the plenaries. **GROW** is actively soliciting people for videos, intro packets, the extraordinary website that **Kendra** has put together for us. Please check it out and you can even join our listserv group there, if you have such interest. The **Communications Standing Committee:** This was our first joint sub-committee meeting today. Please let us know of additional **collateral material** you think we should make/have/buy for local tabling & events; please use **Kendra** as a resource to improve your **county / WG webpages**; and we are soliciting people to get involved with the **Media** subgroup. A lot of people didn't have time to speak; we encourage them to take advantage of the website and our listgroup to do so.

18. Wrap-up & Evaluation

David Shorey: Let's affirm the two new co-co's announced! [twinkle] OK, thank you for your efforts. We're moving to the closing ceremony, which I understand is out front. So we're going outside to the closing ceremony, then home; and we are ENDING ON TIME!!!. Comments, **Kevin McKeown**?

Kevin McKeown, LA: Doesn't this plenary have a process to express general concerns about the plenary? Where does that happen?

David Shorey: I apologize, we will have an evaluation period. We will spend 5 minutes total, 30 seconds each person.

Aaron Lipke, San Diego: I want to commend the Fresno group and all others who made this weekend a success. However, many of us have noticed that there has been some 'skimping' going on in the consensus process, I'd like to volunteer to help improve on that.

Kevin McKeown, LA: I want to thank the Fresno group for putting on this weekend. I'm also apologizing for the great number of LA Greens that failed to show, I take personal responsibility for that. I also notice that there are no elected Greens in the assembly; please run for office, we need you.

Beth Moore Haines, Nevada: I still have Campus Green Packets!

Tristan Sulger, _____: The weekend was great; but the platform stuff was tedious, I think it would be better to discuss the platform on the floor one plenary, then vote on it next plenary.

Robert Robinson, _____: I want to apologize for my outburst yesterday; and thank s for a great plenary.

Sola Sarmiento, Santa Cruz: I want to thank everybody for all the hard work that we've done. I do want to give feedback, I think there's some holes in our process; I'm concerned about the tendency to slam-dunk the platform, I'd like to have the plenaries being a place to fully discuss these issues, I think the facilitators are being a little too tightly controlling.

Chuck O'Neil, Sacramento: Thank you for the weekend., especially last night's party. I'm disappointed at the lack of process that seemed to occur; and I disagree with the prior speaker, these should be discussed in working groups, NOT on the assembly floor. Take personal responsibility!

Paul Encimer, Sequoia: Thank you, this is a really a wonderful event. I think there's budget, process, platform and policy wonks; I think we need more time for these policy wonks to spend more time hashing them out, thank you.

Peggy Lewis, Sacramento: Thanks again for the Fresno team for putting this fantastic weekend together! I also encourage people to chat on-line between the plenaries.

Dennis _____: I've been to every plenary, until up to Denver; I was shocked then at the lack of consensus that happened there, and I'm a little shocked about the lack of consensus here. We need to hash these matters out more fully before bringing them to the floor.

_____ (woman on crutches), _____: Thank you for this weekend. As a physically-challenged person, I had some difficulty getting around, and I would like more attention to be paid to this in the future.

Tian Harter, _____: Thank you for it all!

Pamela Meidell, Ventura: Thank you Fresno, especially for all the special touches, e.g., harps, salsa, etc.!

Roy Glocken, Santa Cruz: Thank you for the plenary. I know I'm one of the people who didn't read the packet beforehand, and I apologize for that, please be patient and persistent so that we finally get it.

_____, _____: I've been to several plenaries, even in other states, where we've used consensus. It's a modified version to streamline parliamentary process, and we need to come informed on the issues; but we still need to respect discussion on the floor.

Tristan Sulger, _____: I'd like to have more of a 'ceremony' feeling as we close; and like to have it addressed in future plenaries.

Kendra Markle, _____: Hi, I'm Kendra and I know you know what I'm going to say. Everybody, look, we have the INTERNET!! It's WONDERFUL!! USE it; I think it's important that we have web access with a SCREEN to show the agenda at every plenary, I can't imagine not having it.

David Shorey: I think the host committee is now ready to conduct the closing ceremony. Everybody, we'll close here and everybody move out to the front for the closing ceremony.

Sunday afternoon session ended at 3:49 pm.

19. *Closing Ceremony [3:40-3:50-3:50-4:00PM]*

*(Minutes taken/transcribed by **Stuart Bechman**)*