

Green Party of California

May 2003 Sacramento Plenary Minutes

(Supplemented by Stuart Bechman via audio transcript)

Saturday Morning, May 3, 2002

Facilitator: Magali Offerman and Michael Borenstein

Notes: Linda Howard

1. Introductions: CC and Working Groups and Committees

M Borenstein: Before we start this setup, we have a few announcements: Whoever has the men's restroom key, the CC would really like that back! Please give it to Jim Barton.

BMH: Found it!

M Offerman: The newcomer's workshop will be happening later today at 3pm.

R Oetinger: The newcomer's workshop is an opportunity for new people to learn more about what we do at a plenary, how it happens, how you can get involved. The workshop has been moved to after lunch, we'll give an announcement later on the room assignment.

MB: As we stack votes, we'll have a microphone on this side of the stage...So as we ask people to come up and talk, you can use one of these microphones...and have you all gotten your platform form from the registration desk, so you can put down what the vote is for your county for the platform, so we can expedite the platform discussion?

D Sheidlower: I happen to have a lot of forms right here!! Turn them in to me!! We're hoping for one per county. We're sorry it didn't get in the packet. If someone has one to turn in, I'll be happy to take it.

MB: While David's handing those out, we have a unique speaker at lunch time, Mr. Gil Cedilla of the state assembly of California will be speaking; we're passing out his bio for those who don't know him. It's the first time that a Democrat has been asked to speak at a general assembly, so it's an historical moment.

MO: OK, Are there other announcements? ...OK, then I'd like to move on for getting ready for the beginning of our meeting, are there any volunteers...

?: These votes on the platform, do we have to turn these in today? Or should we take them back to our county and mail them in?

MB: No. All of those forms are to give us a general sense of which planks have the least amount of contention with them, so that our wonderful Platform group will know which one they will put in which slots for presentation this weekend. Here, let me let our platform cochair speak on this, because he's smarter about this than I am.

DS: The votes will happen on these planks at this plenary; they're already on the agenda. The issue for us is, we have three time slots, and we try very hard to put the planks in places where they have enough time to be talked about. This is a preliminary test for consenses, this is not a vote. All we're asking is, how is your county likely to vote, this is not the vote. This doesn't shut down any questioning, it doesn't shut down any amendments, it doesn't shut down any concerns; it's just to help us have a sense of where the contention is likely to be. So there will be votes on the planks that are on the agenda, and they will be held on the times posted on your agenda. If you can get these cards back to me by 11AM today, we'll tally them up and decide when we should present each plank. Does that answer the question?

?: We have a minor amendment on a plank. It's a minor change, how should we mark it?

DS: If you look on the back, there's a place for concerns. Write the concern on the back and write "See concerns" on the front. If we get a lot of concerns about something, we're not going to present the plank at 11, we might present it at 2 so we don't waste people's times.

?: So you want this now.

DS: Yes, as soon as possible so we can get a sense of things. Sorry it wasn't in the packet, I think that was my fault.

?: Where do we get a packet?

?: Are we getting approvals on updates?

DS: Yes, these are all updates to existing planks. We're not introducing new planks; these planks are already in the platform.

?: Where do we see these planks?

DS: They're in the packet.

MO: If you don't have a packet, please see the registration desk in the lobby.

MB: Very good. We need to ask for those who need to have a side conversation, to keep it really low to not disturb the group. We'd like to have a volunteer for, first of all, a note-taker, do we have note-takers for the plenary? [Yes] ...thank you.

MO: OK, we also would like to have a time-keeper, so that we can stay within our time limits while we're making decisions, someone with a watch?

MB: Yes, timekeeper will have to have a watch; and someone who will keep track of the time and willing to give us warnings, a 10-minute warning, a halfway warning, and a two-minute warning?

R Oetinger: I'll do it.

MB: Thank you. And we'd like to use a male and a female vibes-watcher? ...Dee Brady, female vibes-watcher? Male? ...Vibes folks, when the discussion gets a little too heavy, the vibes-watcher's going to say "Vibes!" loudly and we all just stop, take a deep breath, and then we'll start again. And right now I'd like to take just a moment to introduce any coordinating committee member or working group or standing committee officer that's in the room, if you would come to the front of the room and we'll introduce you along with the county that you're from...any officers? Any standing committee, working group, co-coordinator, or coordinating committee officer?

ROr: Well, I'll start so we can move forward. I'm Robyn Oetinger from Alameda County, and I work on GROW and the International Protocols Committee and I'm on the International Protocols Committee for the GPUS.

?: [unintelligible] ...temporary until this plenary working group.

CP: I'm Craig Peterson, I'm an alternate co-co for CCWG.

SP: Sharon Peterson, regional rep, alternate co-coordinator for the state coordinating committee, liaison for GROW.

JE: My name's Jeff Eisinger, I'm a rep on the state coordinating committee for the southern portion of the Central Valley region, I'm from Fresno, also a member of the state bylaws committee.

KM: Now, back on the left where I belong, I'm Kevin McKeown, mayor pro tem of the city of Santa Monica, regional rep from Los Angeles, member of the national coordinating committee.

BMH: I'm Beth Haines, co-co for the Media Committee, and also a delegate to the national GPUS.

SR: I'm Starlene Rankin, I'm a co-co for the Green Issues WG.

JC: I'm Jo Chamberlain, I'm an elected county councilwoman for San Mateo County, I'm an elected at-large CC member for the GPCA, I'm an elected delegate to the national Green Party, and I'm also an elected co-chair to the GPUS.

DS: David Sheidlower, co-chair, Platform Committee.

ML: Matt Leslie, alternate regional rep for the CC, I'm currently acting rep for Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino counties and I'm on the Orange County Council.

JS: I'm Jim Stauffer, defacto coordinator of the Information Technology group.

FH: I'm Forrest Hill, on the CC and at-large rep (at least for today), and I'm also an interim quad-co for the CCWG, very interested in Campus Greens and...that's it. Also from Yolo County.

MW:: I'm Mike Wyman, Treasurer for the GPCA, on the national delegation to the GPUS, and by virtue of being Treasurer, I'm a member of the CC, the Budget Committee, the Fundraising Committee, and the Finance Committee of the state party.

DSG: Hi, I'm Dana St. George from Santa Clara County, I'm the alternate regional rep under Gerry Gras (who can't be here); and I'm also on the SC County Council, and an alternate national delegate to the GPUS.

MO: My name's Magali Offerman, I'm an at-large member of the CC, I'm also one of the interim quad-coordinators for CCWG, from San Diego.

2. Agenda Approval

MB: I'm Michael Borenstein, a regional rep from the Central region of the CC, from El Dorado County, and other committees. Most of we CC members should be available during the day to answer any questions. Now we will go to ratify past plenary minutes, the minutes from the last Spring's Fresno plenary were posted...

MO: I just remembered, Ventura had something to say in regards to the Agenda...

MB: The only adjustments to the Agenda...excuse me, before we ratify the minutes we will, uh, sandwich this in...the only adjustments to the agenda that you have before you -- we're running a little late -- is the newcomers' workshop has been moved to the slot this afternoon. Are there any concerns for the agenda we have today that we need to have adjusted? What we're doing now is trying to confirm that this agenda will be okay for the weekend.

K Mohny: I'm Kristen Mohny from Ventura County. We had a concern with an item on the agenda, about the recall issue; we feel that this item should not be on the agenda because recall campaigns are negative, not positive, processes; and the Green Party is visionary. But we will stand aside if others want to include this in the agenda.

MO: Thank you. So, my understanding is that you want your concern noted in the minutes, but that you will stand aside for us to affirm the current agenda.

MB: So noted. Thank you, Ventura. So, the agenda you have before you stands, it's affirmed, there are no other concerns? ...no concerns? ...OK.

Agenda Approved by Consensus

3. Ratify Fresno Minutes

MB: The Fresno minutes have been posted as noted in your packet and as posted to the County Contacts list; we want to find out if there are any objections, corrections, etc., to those minutes. Can you come down to the microphones, please, that will make it a lot easier... can someone from the Host Committee adjust the lights on the facilitator's eyes, that would really help.

GC: Ginny Case, LA County. I went through the minutes and I have a number of small corrections to submit. I'm not sure you want me to go through all of them up here? The majority of them are just corrections to names: Paul Encimer is from Humboldt County, not Sequoia County; and also...Los Angeles County....(laughter) (inaudible)

MB: Those are our only objections to the Fresno minutes. Would you submit those to us please, we'll be sure to include those in the final posted minutes.

GC: His name is _____, and he's from LA County.

MB: Are there any other corrections or concerns with the Fresno minutes?The Fresno minutes are now ratified, thank you.

Fresno Minutes Approved by Consensus

4. Palo Alto Minutes

MO: Now we're going on to the minutes for Palo Alto. Come up, if you have any issues.

GC: Again, I have small corrections to submit. Suggested that in the future we put in the packet information on where we can send corrections to the minutes, so we can get the changes made before they come to the whole plenary for approval.

MO: Any other concerns? ...for the Palo Alto minutes? ...We have consensus.

Palo Alto Minutes Approved by Consensus

5. Consent Calendar

MO: We're now moving on to the Consent Calendar.

MB: And timekeeper, we'd like to note that we have 15 minutes for this; and if you can indicate to us when we've broached the halfway point, and perhaps a five-minute warning. The first item on the Consent Calendar is sponsored through the CC; Jim Stauffer is the presenter. Jim?

JS: Consent Calendar doesn't have presenters.

MB: Is there any objections to the first item on the Consent Calendar, which is the Alliance with the American Muslim Association? ...Excuse me, but the lights make it...go ahead...

JC: Jo Chamberlain, Santa Clara County: POP for the facilitators. The entire Consent Calendar is one vote. And people can come down and pull an item if they want to, for later discussion; I don't encourage that; but it's possible. So please call the question on all the items on the Calendar. Thank you.

MB: Thank you, Jo. We have three items on the Consent Calendar: We have the American Muslim Alliance, we have a resolution on supporting Fair Trade Coffee, we have a resolution supporting Medical Marijuana. Are there any objections to any of the three? ...

DB: Dee Brady, Humboldt County. We have a small concern / clarification about the Fair Trade Coffee / Tea, we were wondering why we talk about Fair Trade Coffee & Tea if "organic" is not included?

MB: Okay, this is a Consent Calendar. A Consent Calendar is, folks, if you have an objection it automatically fails. So if you want to pull this item, we'll pull it and bring it back for consideration for tomorrow morning.

DB: OK.

MB: Are there any other objections to the remaining two items on the Calendar? OK, the American Muslim Alliance and the resolution to support Medical Marijuana have passed, and we'll bring the Fair Trade Coffee resolution back tomorrow morning.

Consent Calendar Passage:

a. Medical Marijuana Initiative Approved by Consensus

b. American Muslim Alliance Approved by consensus

6. Budget

MO: Okay, we'll move on now to the Budget. That is included in your packet. It was also posted on the website with breakdowns for each committee, hopefully you all had time to review it before today. We have one hour for discussion.

MW: Hi, I'm Mike Wyman, I'm the Treasurer, as I mentioned earlier. Every county should have at least one copy of the Budget. Are there any counties [here] who didn't receive a copy? Sacramento, Alameda, Monterey, Mendocino, Butte, Los Angeles, Humboldt, Santa Clara, Chico, San Mateo - excuse me, not Butte, they're not here -- Fresno, Sonoma, Ventura, Yolo, Nevada, Santa Cruz, San Joaquin, Contra Costa, Solano, Orange, and Placer. Is there any county I didn't name? El Dorado? San Diego?

?: What are you asking?

MW: I'll repeat what I'm saying. Every county gets at least one copy of the revised version of the budget. The counties I've read off are ones that have received their county.

?: No, you read off Placer, and we don't have ours.

MW: Well, Kristina took it for Placer County. OK. So we have one for El Dorado. And will the people from San Diego and Marin come and get theirs? ...The person who got LA was Pete _____. San Francisco? San Diego? Marin? Fantastic, Okay. And in case there's any late-arriving counties, I'll save the last copy for them. So that means our county count is 25. (I actually may need that last copy for the budget.) Sorry, I didn't really mean to discuss this. Before we tear into the budget, there's a couple of things about, first of all, how well we've done this year in terms of fund-raising and budgeting, and what have you, we've finished the year up \$20,000 higher in our cash reserves than we were at the beginning of the year, that's largely due to some incredible fund-raising efforts by a lot of people in the party. I wanted to review, first of all, our dues situation, as a lot of people here know, there's a voluntary dues structure in place, it's part of, not our bylaws but a proposal that was passed many years ago; I wanted to announce that we have a record 14 counties that are up-to-date with their dues; that's the highest number we've had. I want to acknowledge all of them:

Santa Clara; Humboldt; El Dorado; SLO; Contra Costa, San Mateo, Fresno, Orange, King, Nevada; Santa Cruz; Santa Barbara; Ventura; and Riverside Counties. If you have any questions about whether your county is up-to-date on their dues, see me and, when I get home, back on my computer, I'll double-check on my computer and make sure that I'm accurate about your county. And, there's no penalties that attach to paying your dues, but there are certain sharing of resources that are predicated on paying your dues, such as lists. Did we have a question about dues?

?: How much are they?

MW: They are ten percent net revenues, which means net of fund-raising costs. So if you have a fund-raiser in your county and you spend \$1,000 to make \$1,000, then the net revenue is \$1,000 and the dues are \$100. If you lose money, you don't owe dues, except that there is a \$5 minimum per month (or \$60/year) for each county. So if you make less than \$600 in a year, it's \$60. But some counties voluntarily send us just \$5 per month. As far as lists, I need to apologize to those who have asked for a list of donors. The state party maintains list of donors, we now have something between 5,000 and 6,000 people from the state of CA who have donated to the GPCA or the GPUS or to the Camejo or the slate campaigns. Those people are now subdivided by county, so we can provide them by county. Those counties who are up-to-date with their dues are eligible to receive those lists. The only other thing you need to receive it is an official Treasurer, and a bank account, in order that we comply with FEC laws. Those lists are now available. Several counties participated in joint mailers over the past year; those were LA county (I believe they got theirs). The other counties, I believe, were Fresno, Kern, Yolo, Sacramento, El Dorado, and Contra Costa counties. I will be sending out the donor lists to those counties in the near future, so you can mail to them for your own fund-raising. One of the things that's happened over the past several months, we've had a data input group going through these lists, so now we have not only the names and addresses, but phone numbers, the amount of the donation, and a lot of other data, so when you get these lists now, you'll have this. As far as joint mailers, we've backed off on doing joint mailers at the state level, but that's because the national party has stepped in and is now doing the same joint mailer program, and they're looking for counties that want to do that. The joint-mailer program is, your county wants to participate, you go down to the registrar's office and get a list of registered Green voters, you subdivide it into frequent vs. non-frequent voters, you send the list of frequent voters to the national party, they mail to it in your county, whoever donates to the national party, they compile a list, they send it to the state, the state sends it to your county, and then you have a list to mail to yourself. So if you want to do crosscut mailings to Greens in your county, even if you've done that yourself but want to do it again, contact me or Jo about your interest and we'll direct you to the national party people who can coordinate that with you. And I strongly recommend that you do it, maybe there's some people here who can talk about the fund-raising they've done in their county after receiving those lists, and the kinds of success that they've had with them, they're very good ways to develop local sustainer programs, and local regular mailings, I know in Marin county we've done that, and that's been the main source of their revenues at this point, I think. And that brings us, I think, to the budget; unless there are any other questions about the fund-raising or other activities that we've had this year. Go ahead?

C Collins: Having an up-to-date, accurate list of donors is very important; and I think one would like to access what you sent.

MW: Um, the terms of availability, it's not available to just anybody for the asking, we don't sell the list..

CC: I'm sorry; the steps, for a county council to take to subscribe, to work with the national coordinating committee, there's about six steps, would you outline those...

MW: OK, the easiest thing to do is to just contact me. My name is Michael Wyman, it's mswyman@attbi.com. OK, how about...

MO: Mike, we need to facilitate the meeting, not you.

MB: And I'd like to remind people so that all females and males can hear in this room: If you have a question and you have something to say in this room today, this audience participation, there's one of these mikes over there, there's one over here, please line up in male / female fashion, and you'll be able to address it so that everyone can hear.

MW: In the midst of my confusion, I started to facilitate, which wasn't my role. We're about to move into the budget, so if anyone has any questions, please follow the directions of the facilitators. Those of you who downloaded the budget will find a few changes on the new sheet that went out to you, so you're aware of them. We've got one or two additional items, the major one is on the back page. There was some confusion about the campaign support fund, why is it in Tier 2 and not Tier 1, etc. the CSF (also known as the Peace Chest) is a fund that was started last year that is specifically designed to provide subsidies for Congressional candidates. Last year, we put out about \$8,000 in support for slate candidates and local Green Party candidates. This is a fund that only spends money as it comes in. We found it a little bit easier to understand if we could a budget in here of what our wildest, visionary dreams would be, and present it to you, so you can see the huge fund-raising job we have ahead to get there, and to also see what some of the councilmembers (who worked very hard in putting this budget together) had in mind. This is a sort of separate budget; the money is commingled with our General Operations account, presently but for our purposes is that it's a separate fund. That makes for reading of the Operations budget a little bit easier. There was also an addition to the Green Issues Working Group, the Minimum-Wage initiative, \$100 on Tier 1, \$1,800 on Tier 2. The only other major change between that and the downloaded version, the downloaded version also had a few typographical errors, some Tier 1 things in Tier 2, so as a result if you went through and added everything up, it wouldn't. The figures at the end are actually accurate, and everything is now in its place; I think the big mistake was the \$15,000 allotment that should have been in Tier 1. This current sheet is accurate, up-to-date, and totals up. We'll now move into a discussion of the budget...

JC: Jo Chamberlain: This probably looks a little unusual because it's a 3-tiered budget, and we've historically had only a 1-tier budget. What's really great news here is that there's actually money here! Two years ago, we had a \$20,000 debt; today, we have \$65,000 in the bank. We are really growing, we are going to be successful this year and for years to come. The difficulty with this is how do we equitably share these resources? And that's what we're here to decide today, through this budget. What's the best way to use these monies to the best of our advantage? Is it campaigns, is it issues, is communications, is it all of the committees that we have listed here? Now, every co-co of every committee spent hours on their budget, and they have many, many members that have made huge compensations in pulling back on their original requests. So I want us to go into this with a spirit of understanding that everyone feels a bit "punched around," shall we say, before we start? There's not enough money to do absolutely everything that we want to do. So let's move forward with that understanding that we promise to fund Tier 1 this year, and we will make every good-faith effort (along with the help of the individual committees) to fund Tier 2. Last year, there were how many fund-raisers in the GPCA? Two! And they're sitting right here. And we raised that much money. Think how much money we can raise with your help, if you just help a little bit, we can have an incredibly successful year and an incredibly successful party. Please help us move forward on this and be successful.

MW: I want to thank everybody for the workplans. Again, we had a banner record year; we've had more workplans than ever before. And sometimes it seems defeatist to refer to the past, but this year you put a lot of work in to them, they really worked, and at some point we're probably going to have a committee to come up with a general plan, review the workplans, distill them, and put it together. We're not there yet, but because people have been getting their usual committee workplans in, we're on the brink of being able to do that. With any organization worth its salt, that's the standard operating procedure, so I want to thank you very much for that.

MO: Can we go to questions about the budget? Please come forward to the microphone.

G Case, LA: About the workplans, if we affirm this budget, does that also mean that we're also affirming the individual workplans?

Phil Meyers, Sacto: Without references to how much we spent in past years, I have no reference to know how much things have gone up. So I'd like to ask how much did we spend on the fund-raisers for last year, along with the Media committee and also the treasurer's stipend.

Susan King, CCWG: Wanted to know about the indeterminate amount in the recall in the CCWG budget; and if that is not used, will it roll to Item B?

Kalman Alavi, San Joaquin: My question is in regards to [the fund-raiser stipend?], why is there such a _____?

Tim Smith, Sonoma: Is this the point where we can raise a friendly amendment?

MO: Clarifying questions only at this time.

B Haines, Nevada: I'm wondering about the media budget, it was \$1,000 last year. There were a few numbers in the plenary packet that were corrected, but it still seems that the new document doesn't quite add up, can I give you an update?

MW: Yes.

Adrienne Harris, Contra Costa: In the revised budget Tier 2, \$15,000 for anticipated lobbying services. I would like for clarification of what "Lobbying Services" means?

Matt Spencer, SF: For Mike, could you detail the number of hours per week that you spend as Treasurer, so we can get a sense of how much work that is, and what kinds of things you're doing; and in regards to the CSF, in the amounts that are given for the different types of races, is there any kind of flexibility or will these amounts be locked in as the races move forward?

Jane Jarlsberg, Mendocino: Clearinghouse budget.....

<End of tape #1; Start of Tape #2>

B Meyers, ??: On the Treasurer's and Fundraiser's stipend, in addition to the previous question as to what they were last year, I'd also like to know how by what process these levels were determined, and is that a policy or a budget decision, and how would the money be dispensed?

JC: OK, I'm going to go through the questions in the order they were asked. The workplans, are we affirming them at the same time with the budget? My understanding is that we are doing that; but we are doing that in the spirit of a political party; and what that means is, we can't tell the future. So the first plan we have today, for example, doesn't tell us that we're not going to war, and that a war wouldn't change the workplan of that group. So I believe that you should affirm the workplans and the budget in the spirit and in the time in which they are presented. Now this came up later in regards to the allocation of funds to candidates. If, for example, we have funds allocated to state assembly races, and it turns out that there's an assembly race that we can win, with the \$10,000 put there instead of \$2,000 to five candidates, I believe that we should allow committees the flexibility of making that kind of specific decision. That is my understanding and intention with asking for workplans and approval of budgets, is that it's not to the letter, it is the spirit of the mission and the plans of the working groups today. Now, the amounts spent last year on fund-raisers, we specifically spent money on a Nader fund-raising event, I don't know the exact amount, do you Michael?

MW: We had \$7,500 allocated for a fund-raiser; we never spent it because we never had an actual contract-to-hire. There were people who were paid to help with that fund-raiser, but they were paid out of the fund-raiser proceeds and that was discounted against the amount of money that was split up at the end.

JC: Then, in regards to the amount of money spent for a media stipend last year, I don't believe that any money...

BMH: It wasn't for a stipend. The entire Media budget was \$1,000 to get organized. The committee was formed the same day we got the budgets, it was brand-new.

JC: OK, on the Treasurer's stipend, last year our Treasurer was a full-time volunteer. Then the recall budget, if it's not used on the recall, will it be used for IRV?

MW: There was one other stipend.

?: Was there a fund-raiser stipend last year?

JC: Yes. The fund-raiser stipend was not paid last year. And there's another question that I'm going to address shortly. The next question, I'm going through these questions, in chronological order. The next question is will the recall budget be used for IRV if it's not used for the recall? That would be the decision of that committee, at the direction of the General Assembly. If the General Assembly decides to not participate in the recall but the budget passes, again, in the good-faith intentions, let's go for IRV, right? I mean, let's win some of this stuff! Take some of this money, let's just do it! And the next question had to do with the media budget, again, it was covered, and the next question was for the \$15,000 lobbying services and what would that be used for. This lobbying money would be available to every committee in the state party; and the lobbyist would track specific issues that we're concerned about, for example, IRV; for example, Clean money; for example, ancient forests; and again, that lobbyist would be available, and be managed by the Coordinating Committee. So committees could come to the CC and say, well, could the lobbyist track this bill for us; and \$15,000 seems like a lot of money, but it would cover everything that's going on in Sacramento, it will be very powerful, I personally recommend that one. The next question is, how many hours does the Treasurer spend working each week? Too many!

MW: I've tried putting together a work schedule, a work plan; I tried for two weeks but then I got too busy to fill it in. I think the lowest number of hours I've spent in a week this year is perhaps 20; and that was because I had to leave town for family reasons. Between 30 and 40 hours is more of an average, sometimes it goes beyond that, depending on the particular crisis at the time.

JC: I think we need more Mike Wymans! If anyone would like to give 60 hours per week to the party, please raise your hands?

MW: I should maybe also add in there that that's not just Treasurer's work, my work has also expanded into fund-raising work and what have you. If we hire a fund-raiser, for instance, I'll be turning a lot of that work over to them and the hours I spend will be significantly reduced. So keep that in mind this year, and hopefully _____.

JC: The next question has to do with video tapes and paraphernalia, again, in the spirit of the budget, if we can get video tapes to be self-funding, that's ideal; and it would be nice to sell them if we could, it would be nice if we could lend them out through a lending library if we could get them back. <laugh> So, what happens to the unused money? Well, in a Tier 2 budget, the extra money is allocated to people who come in and ask for it, and that's how it works. And that includes the question on how we prioritize money in Tier 2. And that's where your CC comes in, and your fund-raising committee, because just as we talked about before, a political party is a fast-action group, and that means that let's say one day, suddenly, you have \$20,000 and you have an opportunity to push and get IRV on the ballot, or we could fund something else; your CC that you elected to take action between plenary meetings, they will decide how that money will be used. So when you elect your regional rep, you need to make sure that those are people that represent what your county, your local want to see happen to these monies and other things between the plenaries.

RO: We're one minute over for this item.

JC: OK, there's one more question to answer. and that is, the Treasurer's and Fund-raiser stipends, and last year how the project monies were used and distributed. As I said earlier, we did not fund either of those positions last year, but because we are being so successful, it's very important that people who are working PT or FT, engaged in consistent, everyday ways, be somehow acknowledged in monetary ways; because it means that they're not bringing money in for their household, because they're spending that time with us. And if we want to keep people doing that, if we want them to do a good job, we need to compensate them accordingly.

MW: In terms of the actual amounts last year, the stipend for the Clearinghouse staffers was \$1,200; this year, it's \$3,600, an increase from \$100 per month to \$300 per month; and last year it went from \$0 to \$12,000, this year _____.

MO: We're done with clarifying questions, we'll now move on to concerns. Please line up at the microphones if you'd like to speak. We have ten minutes.

RO: Are we closing the stacks?

MO: Not right now, but if you are planning to speak, please move down to the microphones at this time.

Ginny Case from Los Angeles County: I have a few concerns about this budget. First of, the fact that when I downloaded the plenary packet, that wasn't the final budget, I'm hoping that next year we can raise more volunteers to help pull this together so that we don't have to have so many revisions; second, there's not a workplan, a campaign support plan, I was told that it was somewhat integrated with the CCWG workplan, but my concern is that the campaign support group is an ad-hoc group, and I'd like to see that relationship either with the CCWG or with the CC further clarified and defined and the proposal brought to the General Assembly rather than buried within a committee. Finally -- I don't want to get up here and just moan and groan, because this certainly deserves affirmation, I want to say that it's great to see such a large budget and to see so many workplans; but my concern is for the CC workplan, I see that there's a lot of energy put towards addressing issues that are taking place here and now, and monies for traveling and phone, that's not the problem, the problem is with a lack of "Future Focus" and visions within the workplan of the CC. I just want to make it clear that the highest body of the GPCA is the people in this room, and not the CC, and so people in this room need to pay close attention to the CC's workplan, because we do want it to have vision and we do want it to be used to coordinate our efforts.

Don Eichelberger, San Francisco / Green Issues WG co-co: There was a revised budget sent before for a feasibility study for a minimum-wage increase in the Issues working group, I'd like to find out how that's being treated and, also (I guess I should have asked that during the clarifying questions) some of those items are not fundable, or not found except for this process, how much leeway does the working group have to reallocate some of our funding, to be able to use the fundings for this project?

Tim Smith: Just one thing I wanted to add, if this is the time, for a friendly amendment, to allocate at least under the revised budget, a lot of people have asked for a revised, itemized budget for the feasibility study, I put some seed money in here for a fund-raiser, which I think would solve a lot of problems for the 2nd Tier, even the 1st Tier funding; if we could get the seed money for the fund-raiser, then we wouldn't need a lot of the other monies -- so do you want me to make a formal motion, or...?

David Sheidlower?: I wanted to express a concern that we're spending too much money on business focus internally, not outreach, that Media is Tier 2 and half the amount of the Treasurer's stipend. Both are inadequate amounts of money for the job that's being done, I recognize that; but to have the Treasurer's stipend be Tier 1 and over ten percent of the total budget (which is still very small) and have the media person be half of that and on Tier 2, basically says that we're internally focused, we're not focused on outreach, not focused on getting into the communities, getting into the media, we'll eventually implode, we'll spend all the money on keeping our infrastructure going and no money on reaching out, and we will collapse. So that's my concern.

Bill Noren, Sacto County: At our last county council meeting we had a guest, Sandy Sawyer, who came from the Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS). He's been on ECOS for many years, ECOS is a coalition of environmental organizations in Sacramento. The reason that I'm bringing this up is because, unsolicited, he came out and said that he's seen many organizations over the years (he's also on the Steering Committee of the Sierra Club), and he said that organizations who hire staff to do fund-raising ultimately fail. You have to do fund-raising with volunteers and hire staff to do your internal coordinations so that your organization has the coordination, but you don't have people just focused on earning their own salary. So I have a major concern over a stipend for a fund-raiser. The second is that as the Outreach Coordinator, I see that the GROW working group to me is seriously underfunded. I think that when we bring in new members, they give us money, especially when we tell them that we're a grassroots organization that depends on you. So I think that we should spend our money in the GROW working group to get more members, and use those members to do our fund-raising.

MO: I'm going to close the stack at this point so we can continue, and I need to remind the speakers to use the microphones

RO: We're at five minutes left for this section.

Kevin McKeown, LA: On the whole, this will be an affirmation, I think we should pass this budget as it is. I do have some critical comments, let's talk about what a budget is, really a budget isn't fixed, it's a quantification of what our policy priorities are, and if you look at this, you'll see that yes, there's flexibility, we don't know what's going to happen, where the monies will go exactly. The question before us as a body is, does this adequately quantify our policies and priorities. Now that said, I have to say that I do have a problem with this budget is currently, and that is, I don't think we're recognizing the internal exchanges that happen between one part of our party with the others, and I'll use this specific example: Our Campaigns and Candidates Working Group relies heavily on our internet presence and our web abilities, and our electoral results; and media things that get posted; and yet there's nothing in the CCWG budget that supports that, that pays for that. That's being asked to come out of an IT committee, which really has very little budget and very little reason to ask for a budget. We need to start thinking about what the "true costs" of the efforts that we make are. We talk about "true cost" pricing as being a good economic model, we need to start thinking about "true cost" resource allocations in the party. If we want to do something with a certain working group or standing committee that takes internet resources, we need to allocate the monies for those resources in the future. We need to do this in the future, but I hope that that happens.

Susan King, SF: I have two questions, one, I've looked at the math and it doesn't add up, for the CCWG budget, I notice we have \$15,000 for staff stipends...

MW: You'll notice that that has been taken care of....

SK: OK, I'll move on to my 2nd point, then. I don't know where the IRV support and recall got added to our budget? I worked on our budget, and we never put that in there; so we're kind curious how it got in there?

Bill Meyers, Mendocino: I'd be much more comfortable passing this budget if I could put forward a friendly amendment that the Treasurer's stipend be reduced to somewhere between \$3,000 and \$6,000 rather than \$12,000. The global reason for that, we are making this transition, and I'm not sure it's been well thought-out. We do need to do more things, and we are raising more money, and there's much more work this year for the Treasurer than two years ago, and that will continue to increase, but I would like to see the increase done incrementally. Either we create a position where it's real clear where we have an employee and they're being paid for certain things. It's just a little strange to have a Treasurer already serving and suddenly see a \$12,000 stipend on the budget.

Matt Ahearn, SF: I'd like to offer my affirmation and, seeing a campaign support fund in the budget for the first time, I think that's great, it's been needed for a long time. My concern is that in Tier 1 funding, there's about \$6,000 budgeted for local races; and about four and a half times as much going to state races and Congress; and I would rather see that we reverse them because local races are where we've had success, and the others we haven't.

..., San Mateo: I would like to support the stipends that we have in this budget, they certainly are well-earned. There's a grave danger in volunteer organizations that the power flows to those who have the free time. We want to make sure that the people can earn a living and encourage the party to compensate them for the time they're giving up away from their jobs and their families in order to support the party.

BMH, Nevada: First of all, I'd like to make an affirmation. Mike Wyman works so hard, it's such a thankless job. I think recently there's been a lot of money issues, and it's been incumbent on Mike to traverse those challenges and keep the party solvent, we're always at risk from some ne'er-do-well from one of the other parties to contact somebody and say, "Let's just audit those Greens!" and Mike does a lot of work to keep our T's crossed and our I's dotted. And furthermore, we are a growing party, and it's important that we have a strong foundation. On the other hand, I do have some concerns about the Media budget, media likewise provide services to all committees in the party. Committees don't call the Media Committee up and offer to pay us to put out a press release, we just do it for free. We really need a press person; I teach full-time, I don't sit around writing press releases, and I think it's time that we had a paid media person at least on a part-time basis to cover that. I don't see this budgeted in any other committee's budget, either, setting aside money for that. I feel seriously that we need to have this, and I would hope that you look at having our Tier 2 budget increased. We were really frugal, we didn't pad our budget, we had a total of \$9740, including Tier 2, I think we were very careful, and I'd like to ensure that we get every penny of that. Thank you.

Ken Adams, Sacramento / Clearinghouse Coordinator: Originally, we had put in \$8,000 for a Clearinghouse staff person. It's kind of funny because Bill had mentioned ECOS; two years ago, ECOS hired a part-time staffperson at \$10/20; but within 6 months, they realized that they were getting a whole lot of work done; and they bumped it up to full-time, and they've been able to do an awful lot of work, because their people aren't tied up with doing these day-to-day chores. The Clearinghouse is being asked to do more and more chores as the party grows; I would like some stability here, I'd like to be able to pay a person to actually do that job on a consistent basis, I don't want to go into the election season next year where the position has been moving around from person to person as we try to find volunteers. I'd like to get some stability in Clearinghouse. Some other groups mentioned that they need stability, I want to reemphasize that. Thank you.

MB: Jo, would you like to address the concerns that we've heard this morning?

JC: First of all, I really appreciate the amount of time that people have clearly spent going over the budget and thinking about it. I personally am very gratified at the amount of work that has been put in and how key it is for the operation of the party for the whole year. I will accept, as friendly amendments, the following: 1) The CC of the GPCA will ask the ad-hoc Campaign Support Fund for a workplan; I will accept that, I think it's very reasonable. In regards to the Minimum Wage Initiative, that has to go through the committee; that is not something we can take up on this floor, this is a committee-driven budget, this is not something where a specific item can come in; so the Min. Wage needs to go back to the committee that's supporting it, and if there's a change in what you want, put forward a revised budget request from the committee, and we will handle it accordingly. The next one I will accept as friendly is changing the stipend for the Treasurer to \$6,000 for the remainder of 2003, I think that's reasonable and equitable amendment. The other things that I thought were particularly important that we should think about is that focusing internally first versus externally: The presenters and the people who put the budget together do not control that, so that was focused at all of us, not at the presenters. All of us who put our committee budgets together and do daily work.

MW: I'd like to address one or two of these items. In terms of some of the concerns raised by the Media Committee, I want people to be clear that the budgets that are submitted by the individual groups are not just automatically transferred to the general budget. We look over the items, we assess the history of the expenditures of that committee, and we try to figure out what makes sense in Tier 1 and Tier 2, which rightfully falls under the CC for Tier 2, and what should logically go under Tier 1; so if everything you wanted didn't end up in Tier 1, it was one of those reasons. Something about the historical trajectory was off, or something like that. With the Minimum Wage Initiative, people shouldn't be discouraged on that one; the original \$1,800 request is in there, under Tier 2; all that means is that when the MWI people are ready for more money, all they have to do is come back to the CC through their representative and make a request for an additional allotment. It simply puts the decision in the hands of the CC rather than the budget committee, that's all. In terms of the Treasurer's stipend, I want to thank people for their comments, the reason I haven't commented on it is because I've recused myself from the beginning on this; because I think there's an inherent conflict of interest there. I was not the source of this proposal, I recused myself from all votes on it, and I've refrained from participating in any of the discussions. I wanted people to know that.

JC: The agenda this weekend is a little out of whack. We're going to discuss a Personnel policy later; that Personnel policy will apply retroactively to everything that has to do with any kind of employment, whether it's contract, etc. So any position that we are going to pay or are proposing to pay or any position that is in this budget will be 100% affected by this Personnel policy once it's passed.

MO: We want to know test for consensus...since we had questions raised and concerns...is there a test for consensus?

MB: Are there any unresolved concerns in the room on the budget as presented and amended?

MW: We forgot to respond to the IRV question, is that what you're...oh, the recall, OK...The IRV expense, Mike Wyman put it in; and the reason I put it in, last year, we didn't have it in, and the CC wanted to allocated \$1,000 to support the IRV initiative in SF, and there is a lot of work going on in gearing up to work on other IRV initiatives; and we -- the budget committee, myself and Jo, just felt that there was likely going to be a need for this again; and this was the logical place to put it. The Campaign Support Fund in the past has also provided money to support initiatives as well as candidates, so it was logical to add it here. It was an add-on to the request made for Campaigns and Candidates.

KA: But that was not the question. The question was, why is it so little?

MW: That was your question. Her question was why it was there; your question was why it was so little.. The reason it's so little is because there wasn't a request for a larger amount, this is corresponding to the previous amount was, and the question as to whether or not money can be allocated for us as a party can do this falls under the budget of the Electoral Reform Working Group, they're the ones that need to be talking about that and the whole affair. Right now, the ERWG could use some help, so people who are interested in IRV should gravitate toward that group, I think they just lost their co-coordinator.

JC: I think that this is a very important question, I very much appreciate it because it speaks to a very important point, and that is the work hasn't been done to establish what the Campaign Support Fund is and who is it; and that's why we're sending it back to the CC for a workplan that will clarify these funds if you approve them today, and how that whole fund is going to be managed. And that's why it's in there, because...right, your question is, why is it in there? And Michael is saying that it's in there because he was getting requests for it from people; and so the most logical place for it to go was in the Campaign Support Fund, because that's the group that will allocate the funds. Now the difficulty is that we haven't done the work to establish what this ad-hoc group is and what their mandate is; and that's why there's a confusion.

MW: I should also add one thing -- this was not an attempt to preempt the decision on the recall. This was an attempt to provide a budget-line item in case there was any desire to actually spend money on the recall at a later point. If the decision of this body is, we don't want to participate in the recall at all, then we don't allocate the money.

SK: I still have some unresolved concerns. As far as the workplan, the CCWG did include the CSF funds within our working group particularly later on we're going to be asking for these races...so I have no problem, I consider that we actually do have a workplan. The concern is that there's money for a recall; I think the money for IRV is great. But the money for the recall, and for that reason, my concerns remain unresolved until we get that \$5,000 out of there; it was never discussed in CCWG and we drafted a workplan around the CSF monies, and I don't think it belongs there.

MO: Thank you. Would you be willing to stand aside on that concern?

SK: No.

Jim Barton: I have a concern. Concerning the specifics of the budget process of the state, there are a number of working groups that also, let's take an for instance, \$50,000. There was a budget meeting at which these monies were divvied into Tier One, Tier Two, Tier Three. So could you discuss who was on that committee at that meeting, and that process; it seems like the most powerful two hour meetings in a year, it seems like 40% of the power in the party happens in one session. A number of people submitted budgets; and then when they saw them, they said, hey, there's less here than what we budgeted for, what happened?

MO: Uh...yeah...I guess this is where we discuss the process...

JB: I have a concern that we're moving forward in this process without addressing that. So people know how it works for next year, that's all that I'm saying.

MO: Yeah. We're going to close the stack at this point. I think that this discussion could continue so that it's addressed; so it's something that you want as a blocking concern or a stand-aside as of right now?

JB: I feel comfortable blocking it if we don't get a one-minute explanation of the process.

MW: Sounds like we have two unresolved concerns, so I'd like to address the first one...

JB: But I have another one...

MO: I guess I just...this week, we had a couple of lines here of people addressing concerns, I thought we were done...

JB: You asked if people had blocking concerns...unresolved concerns...

MO: Yes. OK. So we're going to move to a straw poll and, so we don't have to hear the concerns again, necessarily, just a straw poll on the issues, on the budget. So who has unresolved concerns, raise your hands?...Are you willing to stand aside, (hands down)?

BMH: POP. I think what's we're looking into what you asked for is are there any people who still have unresolved concerns. At that time, the presenter can decide whether to address each unresolved concern or move to a vote; if he decided to address each one, he invites the speakers to speak and to address each one; if he says, OK, I see that there are a few, I'd like to hold a vote. So, you invited them, and then he has to deal with that.

MO: We're going to take a moment here to discuss how to proceed...

MB: Let me remind you that, if you have a concern...Point of process?

GC: LA Greens would like to request some time to caucus with our delegation, we have some concerns that we'd like to discuss among ourselves...

JC: Beth Moore Haines, where are you when we need you? We have a request for caucus, my understanding is that we always honor requests for counties to caucus, is that correct?

BMH: Well, no, not typically in the middle of a discussion like this when we're over time; unless the body wants to contract for more time, because regardless of the questions and affirmations if it's clear that some people aren't going to stand aside, you can decide if there's going to go for resolution and consensus, you can maybe decide to go on to the next item on the agenda and come back to this in a little bit; but otherwise it's up to the presenters now as to whether to allow discussion on this one....

MB: Folks, keep in mind that if you have a concern that you're willing to stand aside, they will be entered in the minutes. So as presenters present any one of our items throughout the agenda of this plenary, we can go back to those notes and read those concerns. Presenters do not wish to delay for time with all due respect to the request for LA, so we'd like to continue to call the question...

BMH: So at this time I say once again you want to ask for unresolved concerns; and if so, you ask whether they are willing to stand aside; and if they're not willing to stand aside, we move to a vote...

MB: So...who has, at this time, an unresolved concern; please raise your hand. ...If you're willing to stand aside - only delegates may raise their hands, please -- if you're willing to stand aside, you can have your concern noted in the notes, you can do it by writing by giving your concerns to the presenter; it will be noted by them so they can both take care of them in these budgets and finance deliberations as they go on through the year; and will also be noted in the minutes to this meeting. Now, those of you who had unresolved concerns who were willing to stand aside on, thank you; those were the instructions. Now, who has an unresolved concern that they're not willing to stand aside on? Delegates only, please...

MO: Will you hold your delegate cards up? Can we have the stage lights turned down a bit, please, it's hard to see from here?...

MB: This way, the presenter has the option of removing the proposal and going back to committee...

JS: Was quorum established for this meeting?

MB: Yes, excuse me, thank you very much Mr. Stauffer; quorum for this meeting was established, and the facilitator forgot to announce that...Is there a point of process? (no) ...the, uh, presenters are willing to buy some time on this to address the remaining concerns; but that's going to take more than 1/2 hour. We're looking for a place to buy more time from, in our agenda; and the facilitators would like to suggest that we buy 15 minutes to start with, from WG session #1; and you realize that will shorten: Green Issues, Communications, and Platform WGs...um, that won't work...um, how long do we have this building for?

?: 6 o'clock.

JC: Thank you for your patience. Money is always great fun. We used to always complain that we didn't have any money and how hard it was; we now have money, and we complain about how hard it is...I'd like to thank you all, because everyone has really been in a spirit of compromise, and helping the party resolve these issues; and we are, too, we want you to have the budget you want and that you support, because if you don't support the budget, you're not going to give us \$1,000, right? So what we're going to do right now, is with respect and requests, as to, pull back right now; be available, meet with anyone about the budget, until about 4:45; at the end of the item called "Gray Davis recall;" and then we'd like to ask for 30 minutes between that and the regional meetings to revisit the budget and see if we can't come as close as possible to a consensus so that everyone feels that we've done the very best that we can to do what you want.

MB: The facilitators call the question. I see a lot of twinkling in the room for this; the only adjustment to that is...

<End of Tape #2>

<Scribe note: The budget was pulled at this point, to be returned to the floor at 4:45 pm>

7. Elections:

Nominations:

Liaison to Secretary of State: Jim Stauffer

Treasurer: Mike Wyman

Assistant Treasurer: Bob Marsh

Ballots were passed out, filled out, and returned for count

8. Platform:

Intelligence Agencies / Government Secrets

<Start of tape #3>

David Sheidlower: ...We try and keep the platform planks up-to-date, and keep them as generally applicable as possible; and for all situations; and we also take into consideration the GPUS platform when we can. So, to keep this going...So the process we like to have is very straightforward; Stuart has been given all of the concerns that were listed on here [the platform survey passed out at the start of the plenary], he's going to address them, present the "Intelligence Agencies" plank, and then he'll take clarifying questions, concerns, etc. This is the only plank that we're going to be talking about now, along with Government Secrets only if we have time in this half hour

One other thing that I want to bring up, there were comments in here about typographical errors: The platform committee, at the last plenary, or two plenaries ago, I guess, the Platform Committee got the authority to do "minor changes" without specific GA approval, and that includes the fixing of typographical errors. So for those people who submitted typographical corrections, thank you, we'll update them in right away. If you see typos on the website, get those to us, we'll get those fixed, too. So with that, I'll turn this over to Stuart, who was the leader of the group that put together Intelligence Agencies and Government Agencies (and who I can assure you is NOT affiliated with the CIA).

S Bechman: I realize that I am not one of the facilitators here, so I'm going to make sure that I don't overstep my bounds; but at the moment, what I want to do is I want to address the written concerns that were turned in, and address them the best I can; and then I think, if I understand correctly, we're going to ask for other comments and concerns?...OK. This is a plank that did cause more concerns than the other planks, so we may not get through this in a half hour. There were two concerns with Bullet Point No. 4: "All information gathered by these agencies are to be made publicly available; if it's good for the government to know, it's good for the people to know." Two concerns were addressed, one from Santa Clara and one from Los Angeles, saying this is a little wide open; and in some cases, secrecy should be maintained to protect the lives of our agents. I'd like to ask those groups to reconsider their concerns on this; the thinking on this when we put it together is that it's a shift of approach and strategy on how to address intelligence issues. We've seen a really slippery slope of reasons given to make more and more things secret; and if we give them any leeway, this is the committee's thinking, anyway, if we give them any leeway to give any justifications to make anything secret, even agent's names, we're just going to be repeating the same slippery slope as before; so we're making a call to the agencies to find a way to operate so everything is open, up-front, and above-board; so I'm going to wait to hear further concerns from the counties on that. Now let me address the other issues here...the last bullet, one county asked for "Non-governmental organizations" be added, and I'm comfortable with that, so I think we'll go ahead and add that as a friendly amendment...to the 7th bullet, the last bullet, the line will now end with: "international agencies and non-governmental organizations."...Someone asked that the term in the 2nd bullet, where it says, "the US spy network and their budget should be made more visible", they suggested that it say "more transparent"; and I accept that as a friendly amendment...This plank revision was made before the Bush Administration announced its plan for Homeland Security, so several people noted that we didn't mention it...I have no problem adding the Department of Homeland Security to the list of other intelligence agencies in the 2nd paragraph, here. I'm not sure if that will address all of the concerns, so I'll wait to hear, but I'll accept that...Los Angeles [delegation] wanted us, according to the notes here, wanted to change the term "Patriot Act II" to "Homeland Security Amendments"; and we didn't mention Patriot Act I or II, so I'm not sure what that comment was about, could I get Los Angeles to clarify?

GC: I'm looking at my notes, sorry.

MB: Los Angeles will need to join the stack when we go to clarifying questions...

SB: OK, we'll just move on then...Sonoma had a concern about the 2nd to last bulleted item, where we're asking for "A standard of accountability higher than most other governmental positions." They are concerned that that's a bit vague and want to know how to clarify that further. I'm open to ideas, I don't have any suggestions on that...San Francisco was concerned about downsizing intelligence agencies at a time of terrorist threat to the US. I don't know if this is a standing concern or not, and I'm not sure that I understand the issue here; so I'm going to wait to hear more concerns on that. OK, and uh, Santa Cruz had an issue with Bullet No. 4 again about setting time limits as to when information is available to the public, so that might be a compromise that we can deal with on that one. Those are the concerns, and my addressing of those concerns. So I'll turn it back over to the facilitator.

MB: Clarifying questions. Will the timekeeper be strict with us, please; if you have clarifying questions on the plank that we're working on, would you please come down to the microphones now?

RO: How much time do you want for clarifying questions? We have 40...sorry, 20 minutes left on this item...

MB: We'd like to spend 6 minutes on clarifying questions for this item.

_____, Nevada County: I have some questions, or rather, suggestions....

++++ STOPPED TRANSCRIBING HERE +++++

Four Planks were presented to the plenary:

AIDS/HIV
Water
Intelligence Agency
Government Secrets

9. CC At-Large Election:

Nominations:
Alex Brideau III
James Roberts
Jo Chamberlain
<Candidate #4>
<Candidate #5>

10. Next Plenary

San Diego is interested. In two weeks will know for sure. Will we have a Plenary or a Gathering? Our bylaws require at least 2 plenaries a year. Maybe we need to have a plenary to tell the SOS who we are going to put on the ballot.

Straw Poll: Want a 2 day or 3 day plenary?

Split pretty evenly

Straw Poll: Want a Hybrid meeting..part plenary, part gathering?

Yes!

Saturday Afternoon, May 3, 2002

Facilitators:

Notetaker: Valerie Snook

11. John Klops, Water Platform presenter

Stated concerns

1 Taxation of stored water #11

2 County origin source of water #2

3 Counties don't provide good boundaries for watersheds

4 Salting roads (80) in Placer County

5 County of origin - pits mountain counties against desert counties

6 Choice by voters important for cause - fluoride as a choice should go to voters

Dropping #2-straw vote in favor

Consensus reached on Water Plank

12. Election results

Formal votes:

Jim Stauffer 98.4%-State Liaison

Mike Wyman 94.4%-Treasurer

Alex 37.1%, Jo Chamberlain 45.2% & elected CC at large rep

13. Decision Item Proposal

Interim Policy/Procedural Proposal approved By formal vote count. of present general delegate cards

Y 55 -N 13 Stand Aside- 0 80.8% approval

14. Decision Item: Recall Gov Davis Campaign

Proposed motion: "The GPCA, recognizing the important division of opinion on the present gubernatorial recall campaign, leaves it to individual Greens to decide how they wish to relate to the recall campaign. If the recall petition succeeds, The Green Party of California reserves fully the right to endorse a candidate."

Motion approved by consensus

15. Decision on Budget

****Mike W. to fill in here****

16. Awards for adding to GPCA financial resources (Mike Wyman)

#1 Alameda Co -Raised \$34,000

#2 LA county - Raised \$15,116

#3 San Fran Co - Raised \$13,563

Candle Snuffer of the Year : US Naturalization and Immigration Service

Sunday Morning, May 4, 2002
Facilitators: Forrest Hill and Sharon Peterson
Notetaker: Starlene Rankin

17. Consent Calendar Revisited:

All concerns have been resolved and the resolution supporting Fair Trade Coffee and Tea Passes by consensus

18. Platform:

a. AIDS/HIV plank

Unresolved concern: Harter and Cezana, Santa Clara. Want to allow for some mandatory testing. For doctors, NFL linemen, dentists, etc. Willing to stand aside.

Passes by Consensus

b. Government Secrets plank

Unresolved concern: Cezana, Santa Clara. Delete this line: "Pass legislation removing all secrecy classifications from any governmental document that is ten years old or older" because there are other documents that should never be released, i.e. nuclear weapons formulas. Willing to stand aside.

Passes by Consensus

c. Intelligence Agency plank

All unresolved concerns were met and the Intelligence Agency plank passes by Consensus

Sunday Afternoon, May 4, 2002
Facilitators:
Notetaker: Starlene Rankin

19. Confirm new GPUS Delegates and WG/SC Coordinators:

a. GPUS Alternate Delegates Affirmed:

Ross Mirkarimi
Peter Camejo
Dana St. George
Deborah Richardson

b. Reaffirmed as full delegates:

Jo Chamberlain
John Strawn

c. International Protocol: New Co-co's are Joey Weaver, Leticia Anderson

Election procedural errors were noted from the floor. The new co-cos were not affirmed;
The committee is to run a new election according to proper procedures.

d. Electoral Reform: New Interim Co-co is Chris Collins.

e. New CC At Large Reps are Jo Chamberlain and Alex Brideau III

20. Standing Committees and Working Group Reports

Media: Got Burrelle's list, Updating the website, Developing list of county party media contacts, Developing with relationships with reporters.

Informational Technology: Counties can get help from the IT groups by emailing: IT-help@cagreens.org

Platform: Thanks for passing all the planks this weekend! Coming up are: Corporate Personhood, Land use/Sprawl, Child Care, LGBT Liberation

Bylaws: The bylaws committee has begun its review of the the bylaws, starting with Article 5, with the goal of shifting nonbylaws items into the to-be-created procedural handbook.

Finance: Had a good meeting. Working on: hiring a fundraiser and doing a FR job description, the affinity credit card (need to come back with a proposal), joint mailers with national party. 7 counties did joint mailers with the state. The national party can mail to Camejo's list. Hoping to do some candidates and campaign treasurer seminars.

Electoral Reform: Will be mobilizing Greens to testify at the series of state gatherings coming up on reforming election technologies/HAVA. Working on election code.

Campaigns and Candidates: Endorsing candidates policy, Media Plan, Electoral Strategy Forums, Update website. Candidate's already declared: Pat Driscoll against Matsui (Sacramento-District 5), Pat Gray against Lantos (San Mateo-District 12).

GROW: "New Greens" workshop had large turnout, went well; new volunteers were found at the GROW business meeting to re-energize the Diversity subcommittee, they will be holding a teleconference later this month to formalize their ideas. New volunteers also were found for the Video Production subcommittee.

Green Issues:

Ecology and Earth Stewardship Action Group

Energy Action Group- Solar energy, possibility of sponsoring statewide or regional gatherings to discuss energy issues.

- a. Health Care for All Action Group- Urging support of SB 931 by Sen. Sheila Khul of Santa Monica.
- b. Minimum Wage Initiative Action Group- Feasibility study and fundraising for MWI will be put on the next Co-co teleconference agenda.

Peace and Non-violence Action Group: They are building alliances with other working groups and committees. They voted to support the CA Peace Initiative, sponsored by CA Peace Action and Peace Fresno.

Democracy and Corporations Action Group:

A newly formed Corporate Responsibility action group is working on a Corporate Responsibility Plank for the Statewide Platform. Besides proposing wording for a new platform plank, they are also attempting to incorporate in their wording action steps the party and other entities can take to move forward the goal of diffusing the massive role corporations and money play in society and politics.

Community-Based Economics Action Group: Brian Everett is working with local toxics and urban garden groups to promote the value of soil building nutrient tea centers.