

Green Party of California State Plenary 3/27/04

RECORD OF DECISIONS FOR SATURDAY:

1. DECIDED Fullerton Plenary minutes need to be brought back to the next plenary for final ratification
2. APPROVED (58-6-2) a proposal to allow only people who have been registered Green Party continuously for the whole recent election cycle to be GPUS delegates
3. ???ENDORSED candidates for office
4. APPROVED by a vote of Yes- 68 No- 4 Abstain- 2 the GPCA State Budget, adding new paid positions, besides fundraiser. Personnel committee will do evaluations and make recommendations- Sharon Peterson, Bill Myers, Michael Borenstein, Gordon Johnson, and Jonathan Lundell are members.
5. ADOPTED BY CONSENSUS the proposal to take wording adopted from New Mexico and Maine, which have withstood court challenges, opposing a tiered system of fund distribution that weakens Third Party participation as a condition of GP involvement in the Clean Money Campaign
6. Platform Plank on Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Gender Expression ADOPTED BY CONSENSUS with 2 stand asides

I. Delegate Briefing- Robin Oetinger

II. Set-up-

Bill Myers, Jessica Finn, Co-facilitators; time, Stuart Beckman, vibes, Kevin McKeown, Barbara Boice, notes, Don Eichelberger

- A. Co-co introduction
- B. Established quorum- 44 delegates in 12 regions- quorum established.- 35 needed in the room for votes.

III. Ratify minutes from last two plenaries in Sac and SD

- A. Sacramento minutes- no concerns or questions expressed- passed by consensus
- B. Fullerton
 - a. Concerns- Magali's name was mis-stated
 - b. should be more finalized- are in draft form at present. Many shared the concerns,
 - c. Friendly amendment proposed to accept the minutes, but have them finalized by the plenary committee for Fullerton. The amendment was opposed.

Decision: The Fullerton plenary notes will be brought back to the next plenary for approval.

IV. Consent Calendar- Mike Wyman

Proposal- 2- parts:

1. to change the fiscal timeline by moving it up a couple of months to give more time for dealing with producing work plans. This has been done ad hoc to now to conform with other reporting.

2. Move to two year work plan and budgeting

A. Clarifying questions

1. Why no specific date to start? What would it take?

Was one, but was somehow removed. To do so would require bringing it back tomorrow for ratification. A specific date will

be set. This will be worked out and brought back tomorrow.

2. Other concerns- how would revisions be made to budgets once submitted.

A. Might come back annually, but that needs to be determined before a formal proposal is brought forth.

A revised proposal will be brought back tomorrow

V. National Plenary payment-Michael Wyman and Jo Chamberlain

At 6/04 Nominating Convention in Milwaukee, CA will send 130 delegates- GPCA paid early at \$50 each. Would like delegates to repay this by May 1. Needed early in case there need to be last minute delegate changes. Later registrants are OK, but fees will be higher, since we paid in advance and got the discount. To make payments, each local needs to identify how many delegates it will have and make out a check for \$50 each and give it to Michael. Also travel support is available, but need to let Mike know in advance. To get help will need to stay at Hyatt because we made a commitment to go there to support a union hotel, People can share rooms. \$170 per night can be shared. If there are questions, ask Michael or Jo.

V. National Delegate registration proposal

- Susan King-

Proposal: In order to be a delegate to the nominating convention people should have been registering Green continuously through the primary election season. Rationale- it is not ethical to participate in two different parties' nomination in the same election.

Clarifying Questions

Q. Peggy L.-People can go as non-delegates?

A. yes

Q. Kevin McKeown- Can people who would be Greens but cannot register due to immigrant or other factors, can they still participate?

A. Yes. Will accept a friendly amendment

Q. Will national GP regs trump our decisions?

A. No overriding body that can make the GPCA do otherwise. We can make our own rules.

Q. Jeff Eisinger, Fresno- Is there a minimum age requirement for under age participants?

A. No age limits have been set, but locals are in charge of nominations, and they should oversee their process to see it is a good one.

Q Nanette Pratini - Riverside- in the future need to set the deadline farther ahead of the cutoff-

A. amendment accepted.

Q- Tian Harter- are dogs allowed?

A. seeing eye dogs, special need dogs only

Affirmations and concerns-

?- Serious concerns about media report quoting Jo Chamberlain advocating "decline to state" during the primary, which counters the intent of this rule.

Response from Jo- Her response was "'cut and pasted'- take that how you will". In the context of trying to prevent people from going over to Kucinich, she included this statement as part of a longer article she wrote. She does not favor people registering anything but Green.

Barbara Schultz- We need to address this problem of people who went outside the party to vote for Kucinich

Dana St. George (SM?)- Felt Jo's response was sort of a last resort- She got many calls from people who were planning to reregister to vote for Kuc. She felt Jo's suggestion was at least a way for people to support the GP, but still able to vote their fears.

Two blocks to consensus- vote taken- Yes- 58 No-6 Abstain- 2
Proposal wins with 86.9 %

VI. National delegate voting procedure

- Jo Chamberlain, Warner Bloomberg, Jim Stauffer-

This will be our first contested convention- An ad hoc group was formed to chart a way through this new experience.

Discussion: Rules for the national meeting are still being set, and we need to keep that in context.

Read proposal from CA to national org committee.

Warner- Proposal- GPCA will vote as a delegation for the first nominating vote in proportion to the voting results in the March primary. Would mandate 100 votes for Peter Camejo, David Cobb- 15 votes, Lorna Salzman, 14, Ken Mespley, 3 votes.

Clarifying questions:

1. Chuck Reuter- Riverside- Copies available to take to locals?
A. yes, available
2. Chuck O'Neil, Sac- Delegates will not be individually assigned to delegates?
A. Correct.
3. Can a delegate pledge ahead of time for a candidate?
A. No
4. Greg Jan, Alameda- Does this proposal include fall back voting ?
A. Other proposals deal with this. This is just for the first round
5. Jerry Grass, Santa Clara- If no delegate is pledged, how do we assure this vote?

Concerns and affirmations

1. Greg Jan- It will be hard to establish how Greens voted, I.e. write-ins should be counted, to be sure we have an accurate representation of how Greens voted. Those vote tallies can be gotten.
2. John Morton- Why are candidates not being asked to sign a pledge, as was in the original proposal?
A. Was in the original, but that is looking at a procedure that works from election to election. We just need a procedure to get us through this cycle, and we will look at other regulations later.
3. ? How will this work for representation? Delegates should be bound to candidates.
4. Other versions are being considered, including NOTA, which should be incorporated as an option for us.
5. Magali Offerman- How viable is it to determine how Greens voted- Likes Greg's idea, if these numbers can be identified.
6. Chuck Reutter- Riverside- Good proposal-
7. Warner response to NOTA Issue- This is admittedly controversial- Determining voter intent is to some degree mind reading- We need to work on this in the future.

Discussion on NOTA

1. Magali- what of the question of write in candidates - finding out the candidates names?
2. Warner says this hasn't been part of the mix so far and needs checking
3. Chuck O'Neil- Sac- If some delegates felt strongly that another candidate needs to be considered, can they do that in a second vote? Sounds like the delegation decides, taking any individual delegate decision.
- A. Each delegate will have individual authority to mark a paper ballot as they see fit. Would hope they would at least try to seek consensus.
4. Q. Magali- Would Plenary before the June convention determine how they would like the delegation to vote?
5. is GPCA mandating a vote on the second round?
6. ??? Magali- yes- how would we
7. Q. Larry Mullin- Fresno- Is NOTA an accepted vote? People may have written NOTA on their ballot. Will that be considered?
A. NOTA is not accepted by the state code.

Concerns:

1. Dana St. George- Ross M. says 10-15% of Green voters did not vote green. There should be a way to poll greens on this.
2. Michael Rubin- Alameda- If delegates not bound, votes subsequent to the first vote will be chaotic
3. ? - Santa Clara- During the primary, people were not aware that Peter C. was not sincere in winning, and that should be considered in allocating his votes.
4. Greg Jan- Friendly amendment "...allow all results..." to reflect other voter's preferences.

5. Response- Aware of no write-in candidate that would have reached any notable percentage. (Kerry write-in= 6%- can consider NOTA). Not considered a friendly amendment.

PROPOSAL VOTE: Delegates will vote in first round in relation to the proportion of votes of the four candidates.

Outstanding concerns? Greg Jan and Chris Finn

Vote taken on Warner's proposal: Yes- 38 No-26 Abstain- 5 Not passed- will be brought back tomorrow morning.

VI. Candidate Endorsements

- Magali-Candidate endorsing process-

Needed to wait until after the primary. There were 6-7 candidates who were not endorsed. 2-3 are here, others did not ask their local. Candidates:

Pat Grey- Running vs. Tom Lantos, who is very bad- He is a war monger, and needs to be unseated- She needs financial support

Terry Baum- Running vs. Pelosi, who does not represent he district, which voted for Matt G for mayor. One of the most progressive districts, a place where a Green has a possibility to win She has voted for war in Iraq. Hard fought write-in, originally won, but was later told by DOE that ballots without the mark next to her write-in would not be counted, which took away 244 votes and her eligibility. She is contesting this decision- calls needed to the election commission and help with attorney costs.

Larry Mullin, Warner Bloomberg, Pat Driscoll vs Matsui, others

??? Were candidates endorsed Most people running ever in GP.

VII. GP Election Code

Warner Bloomberg-

Considering NOTA and other things Greens believe in, so we can go to the square and get them to allow us our rules.

Looking for people to join the committee that is drafting these rules June plenary will be a report and discussion for consensus. Then would look for a friendly legislator to submit it to the legislative pipeline to give GPCA its own election code section.

Primaries- include NOTA, etc.

Party structure - largely by-laws

Discussion:

???Jerry Graf- Santa Clara- January is a good time to submit this.

Interested people should participate in putting this together.

VIII. Platform Plank- Sexual Identity, Gender Identity, and Gender Expression

Shane Que Hee-

Current platform gives longer-term solutions, and he wanted to include more action points for the party to move the plank forward to policy.

Reviewed changes and additions proposed by locals- handout

A. Clarifying Questions

1. Ray Glock_ Santa Cruz Co.- Statement incorporated supporting Gay Marriage?
2. June Brashear- SF- B12- should be 2 sentences (It will be corrected)
3. Sanda- San Mateo- Take out references to Bush, as it makes it time sensitive

B. Concerns and Affirmations-

1. Sanda Everett- B-12- add "...and education..." Also opposing Bush am. Too specific- make more general.
2. June B. A-5 concerns- Protected from verbal abuse, period (all people).
3. same B9- Censorship- "...end selective enforcement..." or something- Ask for equal treatment on explicit or erotic materials.
4. -? Jeff- San Mateo- B12- AIDES screening should be included- accepted
5. Rebecca Marcus- Sac?- Most points are already in the 2002 platform- Rather than re-write the plank, perhaps another way for identify policy directions? Response- Wanted to extend protections to GO,GI. Wrote this to reflect more policy directions in terms of short-medium and long range plans.
6. Fred Hosea- SM- Cautionary concern i.e. definition of sexual definition- don't adopt too liberal Santa Clara?- Concern about multi- Partners raising children- Mild concern- needs clarification of this.
- 6.C-3-d- Establish registry for sex workers... Establishing a registry might put these people at risk, so opposes it.
7. Not sure if we should change the platform to set an agenda of action- should be a forum for our actions

Outstanding concerns not willing to stand aside-

1. Chuck O'Neil- Sac- too much detail for platform- is not an improvement to what is there. Perhaps can add some of the minor details to update it.
2. Santa Clara Greens- Pamela White?|- Concern about medical treatment for transgender when other people are going without treatment altogether
3. Humboldt- Affirms previous concern on medical care.
4. Jim Varno ?- Santa Clara- Platform should be what we are for, this is a document that calls for implementation of the platform.
5. Kamran Alavi - My Concerns, relating ONLY to the last sentence of paragraph 5 of the original submission (sex change surgery); I would step aside, but want to be on record:
Several people blocked. Went to vote- Yes- 35 No- 27, Abstain- 7

DID NOT PASS- will be brought back

Saturday P.M. Session

IX. Established quorum and other set up

- Lucy Colvn, Chris Page- Co-Facilitators-

80% of signed in delegates and ten regions need to be present at the beginning of each session. Quorum established

X. At-Large Election

Jonathan

- Overview- 4 At-Large Reps, 2 elected each year. Use ranked choice of candidates and NOTA. NO need to rank all candidates, although to be seated, the candidate needs more than 1/3 of votes cast. If not, the seat remains empty. Can rank NOTA at any point, after voting for no, 1 or 2 or more candidates

Candidates made presentations

Magali Offerman- San Diego

Jarron Leitine - Sonoma Co.

Jim Fitzgerald, - (where?)-

Chuck Reutter, Riverside-

Megali Offerman and Jerrod Leitine won in the first ballot round

X. Budget discussion

-Michael Wyman and Jo Chamberlain-

Presentation: Adding new paid positions, besides fundraiser. Personnel committee will do evaluations and make recommendations- Sharon Peterson, Bill Myers, Michael Borenstein, Gordon Johnson, and Jonathan Lundell are members.

A. Budget Expenditures- 3 new positions: media secretary, lobbyist and outreach staff. This is a surplus budget, using past surpluses to make up for it. 3 types of budget- deficit (borrows money), balanced and surplus

Tiered funding questions- first tier is minimum. Tier 2 would be funded if there is extra money raised; what the committee really wanted is listed there. Tier 1 is what they were willing to settle for.

B. Revenues side- Fundraising. Direct mail, events, personal appeals and web sites

- Will mail to existing list 3 times
- Sustainers have been providing most of funds. (\$11,000/mo.) Hope to increase this to \$15,000.
- No national dues
- Locals provide about \$8,000- Only \$1000 expected this year due to it being an election year. Most of dues will come in January, after locals have a chance to fundraise and will reflect next year.
- Funds for campaigns have been allocated, subject to raising the funds
- Travel stipends will be available
- Clearinghouse anticipates more activity
- Total expenses=tier 1 \$164,167
- Discretionary 67,975
- Tier 2- Ask Michael for these numbers-

C. Clarifying question-

1. Paul Franklin- Santa Cruz- re fiscal year 2004, what dates are being referred to?
2. Karine Megerdooomian- planning to hire clearinghouse staff? Also shipping for Green Focus
3. Ed Oliva- San Diego- 7-2.3 bylaws-
4. Genevieve Marcus- when will internet fundraising be incorporated
5. Forrest Hill- hiring for staff position- also needs travel, etc. Covered under gen. funds
6. Mike Feinstein- 1. 2. Do we anticipate future def spending, or spending less next year. Why are we spending more this year?
7. Bob Smith, LA- inventory ? How is that derived, should be counted on a balance sheet.

Answers:

1. Calendar year Jan 1-Dec 31
 7. Inventory- working toward trying to get inventory from clearinghouse. We do have thousands of dollars worth of buttons, etc., no way to automatically update this.
 2. Hiring staff? Would be good to have professional hired at clearinghouse, is being considered. Are subsidizing clearinghouse to a great extent- see clearinghouse budget. GP of Sac is given these funds and it is discretionary if they want to hire staff or do it vol.
 5. Travel and phone- may have been dropped, but can come back to CC for reallocation when a nominee is referred. No request was made for the IT committee for web design. IT needs to bring a proposal to CC for an additional allocation for web site development
 3. Bylaws question- Jo- Bylaws intention is that we not end up with negative money at the end of the year. Q. the gen assembly needs to be aware are the bylaws ambiguous? Nothing on accumulated surplus, and that needs clarification. Bylaws committee should bring back clarification.
- Response: Michael- It was never anticipated the party would have a surplus. CC has approved this budget, as well as many of the co-coordinators. The reason we have a reserve is that many of the group did not spend all the money they requested. We need to determine how we can carry over these non-expenditures, so wgs don't lose money that was allocated but not spent in the fiscal year.
2. Green Focus dist- taken care of by clearinghouse. Clearinghouse said they would not be doing the distro for GF. This needs clarification and resolution.
 6. Where to go from def bgt? don't anticipate surplus- will need to identify when election cycles happen and there is an ebb and flow reflective of the election cycles. Next year special attention will be paid to building up our surpluses and preparing for the presidential election.
- A budgeting cycle change is being proposed to more efficiently coordinate with election cycles.

B. Concerns and affirmations:

1. Paul Franklin- 6 concerns- 1. apples to oranges; 2. no percentages given, should incl.; 3. No comparison to last years bgt; 4. Seems unneeded complexity; 5. 6. Not hiring staff but stipending them can lead to personnel issues
2. Ray Glock- Santa Cruz- Concern with new positions- contract as opposed to hires. We should do employment arrangement when feasible. Lot of sticky issues, but not labeling them employees leaves us vulnerable.
3. Karine M. GF has issues with clearinghouse, papers did not go out, etc. needs stronger clearinghouse- 2 friendly ams.: Sac Greens is running the clearinghouse, perhaps can bid out the clearinghouse to locals. Also set up discretionary fund for GF distro
4. Concern we are keeping funds in budget rather than keeping excess funds in a separate account; also, fundraising costs are high; outsourcing vs. insourcing; and eliminate lobbyist
5. Peggy Lewis, Sac- affirmation- pending the extra money does not put us in the red it is spending money on things we need in an election year
6. Werner B- Keeping excess funds in a separate fund resolves some issues
7. Coby Sykes- Need to suspend funds allocated to hires- concerns that living wage and contracting hires involve a lot of possible problems. Need to take care not to burn out our vol base- need more time spent energizing them.
7. Rob Solner- San Diego- friendly am from delegation- Should have mid-year reports on how fundraising is going so it can be evaluated by the plenary.
8. Kevin McK- LA- Wants to affirm hiring of staff- it will be a living wage. We need someone working media to let people know about the great things we are going.
9. Mike B.- Affirmation- Not long ago we were in deficit. Locals, through local rep, can affect the budget all year.
10. Shane Que Hee- Should be sure there is a public accountant to go over it to make sure all is done right. Anything allocated for legal council?

C. Committee Responses:

1. Apples vs. oranges- Committee will take all friendly amendments and make sure apples and oranges are being compared appropriately.
2. Contract vs. hires, contract is more cost effective. We are taking care that contract employees are not confused with hires All labor issues are considered at all times.
3. GF distro- Jo recommends that the CC take up the issue at the next CC meeting, and come back with an amended budget.
4. Separate trust fund has been set up with requested money. They are attempting to get feedback from locals as to how this can be addressed.
5. 30-35% of money is spent on fundraising and this I considered good by most fundraisers, due to frugality and stress on vols.
6. Concern was raised that we would go over our budget, That evaluation is constantly being made, so that money is never allocated without pre approval
7. Moving from Reserves in budget to surpluses in budget (Warner) will be accepted as a friendly amendment. That makes us cash positive in budget.
8. All hires and contracts need to follow the rules of the personnel committee. Finance fundraising committee is willing to issue a report, but will not ask by contract employee to prepare it.
9. Public accountants who are members of the GP are looking at the budget

D. Decision- 4 outstanding concerns-Michael F,

1. Walter Lehmann- San Diego- Spending is too large compared to an uncertain and smaller rev stream -
2. Coby Sykes- will email
3. Mike Feinstein-
4. Shane Que Hee- Legal fees need more clarification as to what is involved, i.e.. allocations for consultations, filings, etc. needed to break these costs down. Also a concern about the media hire- needed more specifics on what that would entail.

Went to vote: Yes- 68 No- 4 Abstain- 2

PASSES

XI. Public Financing of Elections

- Discovered the clean money campaign would have set GP at a disadvantage to the two main parties. The WG looked for alternatives, and adopted wording from New Mexico and Maine, which have withstood court challenges. Pat, Jo, Greg testified against a two tiered funding system. LWV and other groups who would support us are facing problems because their funding could be jeopardized by Democrats.

Discussion- Pat Grey- Clean Money campaign would leave Greens out. Need to even the field to allow people who can get signatures in their districts to get public funding.

Friendly amendments have been accepted: (Get from Jo, as machine crashed)

A. Clarifying questions-

1. Stephanie Cros- Sant Clara ?- Limit gatherers to Vols?

2. Mike F- SM- What is our direction? Are we telling people how we want people to participate in 06?

3. While don't like two tier draft, we should allow a lower threshold candidacy.

Riverside- No timeline for funding.

Sunset after 2006 was requested by Riv.

Santa Barbara- 2 q's- could spending for campaigns be controlled by having candidates participate in a traveling tour? 2. Additional funds alloc to candidates due to extra money spent by non-participating candidates create a burden?

B. Responses-

1. Coalition for 06- Should have lower qualifying? No we want the same money and counts.

2. Timeframe- trying to run it through the legislature and we are trying to amend it there, rather than take it to init.

3. No paid collectors?- Free speech case, so it was shot down in court. We would like to be paid, and will keep the language- we should ask for everything we want and be prepared to negotiate.

4. Traveling tours- we have as requirement that candidates in public funding shall participate in debates. In AZ, where this is in effect, costs have gone own each year.

5. 2-tier, threshold change- If concern is about frivolous candidates, we would (ask Jo)

6. Concern about having to revisit this in 06 again. Sugg. We add language to permanent platform as support for public funding.

7. GPCA needs to be ready to act when the legislation is ready to go forward.

C. Decision- 2 outstanding concerns-

1. Mike F- Not opposed to party plank, but how can we incorporate those in to our coalition work and how we can participate. This discussion should not be considered negotiating points, but needs to come back later.

2. Pamela ?--Concern about low penalties for over collecting private donations.

3. Stephanie- Santa Clara- 5-c- Concern to limiting vols. To local greens only.

Responses:

1. Aware that these guidelines will not be used for negotiating purposes, and will be brought back, so accepted as friendly to come back before language is finalized.

2. P. 16-C- Will be privately funded candidates who did not get public funding- In keeping with ruling in US Supreme Court-protected money as free speech, but can take money and put in to funding mechanism, which is needed.

3. Steph- gatherers need to be reg in their district- Needs to make local district reflect real support for a candidate, rather than bringing in outside gatherers, as is done now.

NO OUTSTANDING CONCERNS- ADOPTED BY CONSENSUS the proposal to take wording adopted from New Mexico and Maine, which have withstood court challenges, opposing a tiered system of fund distribution that weakens Third Party participation as a condition of GP involvement in the Clean Money Campaign

Big lobbying effort with Lonnie Hancock bill- Greg Jan wants people to sign up to help.

XII. Platform Plank- Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Gender Expression- revised from this morning

- Paul Quick, Shane Que Hee- A much more revised proposal was created and distributed for discussion and hopefully consensus

Overview- Paul Q.- gave corrections to paper handed out- we need to come out of this session with a document that reflects Green values

A. Clarifying questions:

1. Kamran - #5- Supporting gender change should also include other medical practices?

A Gender id is necessary, and needs to be addressed- an overriding concern. With or without single payer HC, we need to point out our support for this. We always fund operations for intersex children surgery, without their consent. Adults in this wish they had had the right to be in on the decision, GP needs to address this

2. Tracy- ?- County consented to not change the original plank- no strong arguments made for approving changes.

A. Old plank has nothing about transgender and sexual ID-

3. These are more social than legislative changes.

A. Importance of this is more than social- transgender people are regularly discriminated against

4. Jon Stevens, SBO- The word "intersex" is unclear- is this describing hermaphrodite?

A. this is one type of intersex manifestation. Intersex is used by intersex people themselves- Will try to make appropriate definitions available

B. Concerns and affirmations-

1. Gabrielle- Long Beach- Local supports this- action speak louder than words, and this will help that

2. Ray Glock- Santa Cruz- This will help make the issue a topic of legitimate expression. Also, what happens with prioritization of HC when only a small minority suffers?

3. Marc Salomon- SF- If this plank is not approved, GP work in SF will be a lot harder. People need to believe when people come to them and say their civil rights are on the line.

4. Kalmran- this is civil rights- don't disagree with anything, except many people have problems with discrimination

5. Jim Wright- How can we go about implementing the action items to the public and get it accepted?

6. Theresa Herbeck, Stanislaus Co.- Feels the Gender Equity plank is not a political issue.

7. Chris Finn, SF- strong affirmation- Not just a lifestyle decision or cultural choice. We need to understand that people are born in many different ways, so any decision made on behalf of someone without their consent is not good.

8. We cannot be less than Newsome, who had affirmed the right of gays to marry

2 people with concerns were willing to stand aside with their concerns noted:

1. Kamran Alavi-

From a civil liberties (progressive) point of view, a life style is a matter of INDIVIDUAL choice. To make lifestyles a matter of medical/genetic/biochemical imperative is injurious to civil liberties. The backward forces, as demonstrated in the past are also creative in, legislatively, pushing their agenda. Would we want a person to have to obtain a "medical justification" for their lifestyle? Worse, would we want an individual to obtain medical permission to have a certain lifestyle? Worst, would we want an individual to have to periodically renew the "medical justification" as we have to smog-certify our cars? My answer is an emphatic NO to each of the above.

EVERY individual in our present day civilization needs care. The position that discomforts of the psyche are less real, less urgent and therefore less deserving in care... and to shed proper light on a "valid" need for attention, medical/genetic/biochemical, justification is needed, is reactionary, albeit "compassionate" reactionary.

It is fine to have a Medical Doctor participate in a General Assembly as A Green. It is not legitimate for that person to speak as an expert witness with final say in the matter. The scientific data are far from conclusive in "genetic/biochemical imperative" nature of what ails ALL humans, in a modern society.

2. Theresa Herbeck, Stanislaus Co.- Feels the Gender Equity plank is not a political issue.

Platform Plank on Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Gender Expression ADOPTED BY CONSENSUS with 2 stand asides

Green Party of California State Plenary- 3/28/04

Sunday Session

Record of Decisions for Sunday:

1. CONSENSUS reached on Finance WG proposal to go to a 2-year budget cycle and to change the timeline for WG Budget submissions to bring it in line with other reporting requirements
2. VOTED 90%+ (60-6) for the By-Laws WG proposal, as found in the packet, changing the 2/3 to 80%; that rules will not have an interim implementation; that rules and procedures language would be extended for all proposals that are brought to the floor (J. Lundell)
3. VOTED 90%+ (61-6) on the National Delegates Proposal: The GPCA delegates to the GPUS presidential nominating convention shall vote as a delegation in accordance with the March 2nd Primary Election results on the first ballot or first choice of ranking (i.e., proportionally with the voting results), with write-in votes included and counted as "None Of The Above" votes.
4. REMOVED the proposed Health Care Plank for reconsideration at the next plenary
5. AFFIRMED Magali Offerman and Jarred Laiti- as New At-large (?)Reps
6. AFFIRMED Shane Que Hee as Co-facilitator of the Platform Working Group
7. AFFIRMED Magali Offerman and Sabrina Aller as alternate GPUS reps
8. DECIDED: Next Plenary will be in Sacramento- June 5-6.

I. Announcements

II. Set-up

Paul Franklin – Notes (scribe?)
Craig Krauss; Robyn Oetinger - Vibes
Stuart Bechman / Don Eichelberger - Notes
Matt Leslie, Sharon Peterson - Facilitators

III. Consent Calendar - M. Wyman

Two-Year Budget Cycle, May 1 to April 30 Fiscal Year
No unresolved concerns. Consensus on Item.

IV. Rules & Procedures for Bylaws

- J. Lundell; M. Borenstein; J. Eisinger; D. Brady

Proposal to form a process for separating out Procedural items from Policies. This would lower thresholds for changes to procedures.

Clarifying Questions:

1. Jo Chamberlain, San Mateo: Are we formalizing something that we're already doing informally; and is the Bylaws group to be the administrative body once this proposal is formalized?
2. Warner Bloomberg, Santa Clara: I understood that we were going to break out the Rules & Procedures from the Bylaws

by section, yet this hasn't been done, why not? Also, Rules for Selecting Delegates; Instructions for How Delegates Will Vote; and NOTA, which side do these issues fall?

3. Robyn Oetinger, Alameda: Can you clarify, give more examples of what would be an "Internal Matter" that would be treated as a Rule & Procedure?
4. Kevin McKeown, Los Angeles: I need a definition of what is a bylaw vs. what is a rule.
5. Paul Encimer, Humboldt: Will we use the 2/3 threshold for deciding this change to the bylaws?

Responses-

J. Lundell: These are really new procedures, we're not really doing this right now. Would a subcommittee need to go through this process? We haven't addressed it. Would Bylaws become the administrative body? Based on the rules we're proposing, the vetting of a proposal is intended to be in the hands of the CC and/or the County Council, as long as they don't violate other rules/procedures already adopted. We actually started separating out the R&P from the bylaws, but it became evident that it will be a long-term process, and we felt that getting the procedure in place would assist in that matter. We don't have a clear answer on how to determine a bylaw vs. a R&P; each case will have to be handled individually. We see Bylaws as providing a structure for the Green Party, from which Rules & Procedures are hung. But the GA can always move the line of distinction of what's a Bylaw vs. what's a R&P.

J. Stauffer: Bylaws v. Policies v. Procedures. We've really struggled with coming up with a definitive definition of the three, but it's been quite complicated and incomplete, ascending into abstract philosophical and theoretical constructs that are way too complicated to be useful. Still, we continue to grapple with the issue.

J. Eisinger: Paul Encimer offered at yesterday's Bylaws business meeting: A procedural thing is "housekeeping"-type items; and a policy thing is something that affects the balance of power. I like that distinction, but struggle to figure how to put that down on paper. One other point: When we finally find that elusive distinction, it will require consensus or 80% approval level by the GA, we're not going to make that final decision within our committee.

J. Lundell: We accepted a change to our proposal yesterday, 11-8.4: After a procedure has gone through all the committee work and is presented to the GA, we're changing the "full discussion" threshold from 1/3 to 20% -- basically, the same threshold that can block a decision.

J. Stauffer: We also discussed a concern that the committees would be making a decision on whether something is a procedure vs. a bylaw; and by changing the threshold from 1/3 to 20%, this will allow the GA to engage that same question.

Concerns/Affirmations

1. Chuck Reutter, Riverside: We're not going to stand aside on this issue.
2. Barbara Schultz, Humboldt: When we look at the decision-makers in this process, we have a lot of housekeeping to do, and I see a lot of problems on the micro and macro level; on the local level, I'm just seeing a process problem here in how to communicate from the county to the bylaws committee.
3. Paul Encimer, Humboldt: It was shocking to see the changes you've made here. It would mean that the rules would be presented as a consent calendar; then if there was an objection, then we'd have a full discussion. I'm confused how the GA would exercise their authority. Also, bylaws are constitutional-like, so we want to make these bylaws quite tight.
4. Nanette Pratini, Riverside: Our concerns were that these definitions are not clarified. Also, Clarifying Question: Did you say that we would bring back this proposal sometime after today?
5. Jeff Eisinger: We will be bringing back the proposal after we get permission to do this, to establish this procedure.
6. Mike Borenstein: Then, later, we will be bringing back the proposed separations for the GA to consider.
7. Nanette P: OK, that sets aside my concern, thank you.
8. Warner Bloomberg, Santa Clara: I want to affirm all of the time and energy that this committee has put into this contentious and vital issue. I did submit written concerns via e-mail, and have not heard them addressed: 1) I don't see how this proposal will save any time, esp. when the GA wants a proposal fully discussed; rather, it would seem to double the time. 2) There's no procedure for dealing with a situation where the decisions are made by the committee, then the GA rejects the proposal, what will be the "interim" bridge? And 3) I'm concerned about the review & comment cycle having no timeline.
9. Donna Gikavolich, Solano: Most I agree with. I have an issue with any action being taken / implemented until the GA has voted to approve a policy or bylaw. You're putting the decision into the hands of a small group of people and the GA can only react and undo something that's been brought into effect. I think that these bylaw issues are very important and we need to spend the time to address them. Perhaps we should have a "Bylaws-only" plenary?
10. Kevin McKeown, Los Angeles: I have a concern about the concern, about the affirmation issue itself. I'm concerned that the voting threshold has become a much bigger issue than it deserves to be. We need to keep in mind that we are always striving for consensus; I'm disturbed when people focus on thresholds to determine what it would take to block a procedure. Let's move on.
11. Robyn Oetinger, Alameda: I have an affirmation that this is a positive movement, despite the confusion of what's a

procedure v. a bylaws; but I like to hear that those definitions will be brought back to us to approve, so I'm comfortable with giving Bylaws permission to start this process.

12. Bill Meyers, Mendocino: I'd like to affirm that we pass this proposal. I think this will lead to clarification to the problems in our bylaws.
13. Jo Chamberlain, San Mateo: I affirm this proposal. It's time to trust in each other, move forward. However, I'd like somebody to administer this. We don't have a pamphlet that has all of the policies in it; we don't have a pamphlet with all of the procedures in it. This needs to happen, I'm not sure that's for Bylaws to do.
14. Magali Offerman, San Diego: I want to affirm this proposal. SD would like to see happen that in 11-2.2 where "all the groups that review this process," we'd like to see a polling of the counties and that a certain threshold of votes moves the proposal out of the committee and to the GA. Second, a proposal that helps people understand the difference between procedures and policy in the next plenary or so would be much appreciated. I offer these as two friendly amendments.
15. Rob Salmer, San Diego: I also want to affirm the proposal. Clarifying Q/Concern to the change in the language made yesterday: the 20% threshold via polling to move a proposal to the GA, then there's a 2/3 threshold to make it a business item, these thresholds seem inconsistent and contradictory.
16. Ann Tompkins, Sonoma: China. Cultural Revolution. Rome is Burning. We overthrew all of our leaders of the working unit. I've been in many organizations in this country. My fear is that the GP is going to end up in jail via the Patriot Act while they continue to argue over bylaws. We need an organization that is not only democratic, but an organization that can move. We solved it yesterday with the LGBTIQ; let's do the same thing today with this proposal. Let's pass this and put it behind us so we can address the really important issues.

J. Lundell: Several of the concerns were concerns we were hoping to delay discussion on. Our current proposal gives us a way to bring proposals to the GA floor. We agree that the definition of rules is problematical, so we'll say that proposed rules will not go into effect until the GA has a chance to review it. On polling counties, we've not been asked to poll counties. What we want is an opportunity to ask for feedback from the counties, we recognize that most counties will probably not bother to give feedback. Giving proposals to the floor: What we're trying to do is open up an alternative way to get proposals through, it won't cut off any current methods for moving proposals forward.

J. Stauffer: Some situations just arise where we need something immediate; if you take away our option for interim implementation, these situations will fall back on the CC, which everyone seems to hate just as much. This comes back to the issue of trust: That we trust our committees to act in good faith. We have a catch-22: Do we insist that the GA review every proposal, or do we trust our committees to make sensible decisions?

Magali Offerman, San Diego: <unresolved concern>

Paul Encimer, Humboldt: We're not being given a test. Are we being asked to affirm?

S. Peterson: Please restate the decision you want the GA to make at this time.

J. Lundell: To approve the proposal, as found in the packet, changing the 2/3 to 80%; that rules will not have an interim implementation; that rules and procedures language would be extended for all proposals that are brought to the floor.

S. Peterson: Any unresolved concerns? Okay, I see one concern, Chuck [Reutter], would you be willing to stand aside?

Chuck Reutter, Riverside: No.

S. Peterson: OK, we've going to have to go to a vote and take time from Voter Reg....

Proposal vote: Yes- 60; No-6; Abstain- 2

Proposal passed with 90%+ vote

V. Voter reg drive Kick-off-

Dee Brady, Humboldt: We're launching our new registration drive for 2004! This isn't just another registration drive, this is the GP Registration and Reclamation Act of 2004.

1. Mike Borenstein, El Dorado: It's Voter Registration and Tabling that distinguishes us from all of the other parties and keep us strong. It's the main place they see us around town, and it's taken us to our current level of 165,000 and climbing.
2. Dee Brady: Tabling is basic grassroots work; we need to keep it up. We need to continue replenishing our numbers, you either grow or you stagnate. This is an election year, so politics is on people's minds; we have 17 partisan candidates running in the state, and they need your help and support. Let's keep the momentum going! Bylaws is hard, platform is hard, but tabling is fun. How many of you are here because you came across a Green Party table? Please come to the GROW meeting today, get more details, pick up our registration drive packets for this season. Remember, there will be prizes!
3. Laura Wells, Alameda: Green Focus will continue. Article submission deadline is May 1. We also need high-quality

photographs and graphics. Our current issue is now available, two bundles for the price of one (\$16). Pick them up for your spring tabling.

Afternoon Session:

I. Plenary Delegate Voting- return from yesterday

- Warner and Ross

Proposal resubmitted from yesterday: The GPCA delegates to the GPUS presidential nominating convention shall vote as a delegation in accordance with the March 2nd Primary Election results on the first ballot or first choice of ranking (i.e., proportionally with the voting results), with write-in votes included and counted as "None Of The Above" votes.

Rationale: This would allow people who voted for other than the four candidates in the primary to have their vote counted a NOTA. Greg Jan volunteered to collect the county-by-county reports of the write-in votes, but needs and requests all assistance from anyone willing to participate by going to their local Registrar of Voters, obtaining that information, and providing it to him.

Q&A-

Lost to computer crash- Many questions about how to incorporate or not incorporate other candidates who received votes.

Concerns and affirmations-

- 1 Jim Stauffer- did not vote for this. Makes a broad assumption that if people did not vote for our candidates, we assume a NOTA option, instead of holding a survey to see how many would have voted NOTA. We are altering election results to favor a candidate
2. Solar Soleminto- SC- NOTA and no candidate option are confusing.
3. Jeff Eisinger-Fresno- Does not feel this proposal is a reliable count of telling voter intent- Statewide polling is a better way
4. June Brashear- SF- Not perfect, but will be best way to get people. Hard to tell why people left it blank, but if they wrote another name, it is clear they believe in NOTA. Our sf local has difficulty finding out how greens voted,.
5. Mike Feinstein- Santa Monica- this is the best option for how to decide. Important in first round to make an accurate statement, including a NOTA sentiment.
6. ? This will only be the first vote. Many subsequent votes will probably be needed. Supports his proposal.
7. Ray Krock- Affirmation and 2 concern. A. friendly amendment- distinguish write in for greens and non greens. If a green is voted, should include that number; b. Should allow the NOTA be cast as NOTA or no candidate.
8. Forrest Hill- Alameda- against NOTA, but this needs to move forward, and nota will not win on first vote. We need to keep it simple. Once vote start, they will go fast, and people will need to make their own decisions. We do not really know what the voters want and this is ad hoc
9. Paul Quick- SF- Should vote election results, and for the first vote, we should present top voters to the delegates, and no others.

Responses:

Warner agrees that the original proposal should have been accepted, but since that was not accepted, trying to reach consensus and build on the collective wisdom.

Ross- First round can be thrown in flux depending on what Peter C. does. We have an obligation to the 20% of greens who came to the vote and did not vote for one of our candidates.

Blocking concerns- (sorry I did not get names)

We should not list candidates outside the GP on our ballot

Don't have the right to change the outcome of the election- will not stand aside.

Went to vote.

Yes- 61, No-6- PASSES

II. Platform Health Care Plank

- Bob Vizzard

Overview- Question came up why it should be replaced. Current plank takes position on treatment of disease, but some of the proposals are not necessarily good and GP should be more proactive. While much of it was good, it was felt it needed to be sharpened up and brought forth in 2004.

Starts with statement that we need to support single payer health care. Tried to keep it simple. Emphasis on preventive care and affirming health care systems respect for choice and respect for all. Green values support the decentralized nature of this proposal. Support for LTC and workers comp incl. in this. Changed “support any measure” to “support measures that..”

SB921 would pay licensed practitioners, and this would support that.

Addresses HMOs and for-profit providers escalating costs. Addresses outrageous profit margins.

Need to see that benefits package included chiropractic, vision, gen practice.

Questions-

Q. CNA- Supports SPHC. Working with CNA? What other groups working with?

A. He is a physician, with HCFA. Agrees with need to include CNA in this.

Q. With costs, how were outcomes considered in controlling costs?

A. Hard to deal with in a generic document. Not as objective as it sounds to move toward outcomes . We need to do that, but it gets very complex and hard to incorporate.

Q. Define Complementary care. Also clarify role

A. How do we improve efficacy of modalities. We are open to funding alternative complementary care (allopathic, homeopathic- catch word) More alternative (acupuncture, diet, etc.) care given that what is considered conventional care. Need to support research to determine efficacy of alternative treatments.

Q. Larry Mitise- Sonoma Co.- Old plank said that until single payer is accepted, we should oversee costs. Why not add such wording?

A. Will add wording on his.

Q. Kevin McKeown-SM- Reilly (?) language looked at?

A. Specific to single payer- while we support it, was not incorporated because these values change.

Q. Language is ambiguous

Q. Para 2, does not mention hearing Can add it?

A. Has been

Concerns and Affirmations-

1. Jan Arnold- Alameda- Vast improvement, but it needs more consideration before final acceptance. Perhaps confer with Paul Quick.
2. He was hoping for more help. Not sure how detailed to get?
3. As reg nurse activist, feels CNA needs to be brought in. Nurses not empowered to recognize the problems in the system. Would like to see more clear nurses incorporated in process.
4. Where it refers to HC workers, can suggest wording.
5. Even with single payer there are a lot of problems that would not addressed.
6. Ray Glock-SC- We are so self-identified as a protest party, we do not recognize positive alts. Needs to support hospice
7. Will include adequate public funding for hospice.
8. Linda Hernandez- Orange Co.- Will be a state admin system that will limit all private ins.?
9. Will focus that more

Presenter chose to pull the plank for further revision, hoping more people will help with wording, and will bring it back to the next plenary.

III. Working Group Reports

1. Green Issues- Don Eichelberger- Still looking for a Co-coordinator. Many projects being worked on. Trying to identify local contacts for issues work in Minimum Wage, Single Payer Health Care, Corporate Personhood and Accountability, Energy, and working on convergences.
2. GROW- Robin- Trying to recruit new cocos- Alfonso of SD is interested, and will be trained. Looking for a woman in N cal to help. Working on convergences with GIWG- Looking at getting new workshops. Paul Franklin will work on literature; new Campus Greens Coord.; lots of people working on voter reg. Also working on Diversity- Kalmran- Green Focus- New ed board member.
3. Nat. GPUS Delegation- Jo (?) Happy that voting rules were affirmed today. Need to identify ways to get delegates to the convention
4. By-Laws- Jonathan Lundell- Looking for new co-cos. Lots of effort goes on online. www.Cagreens/bylaws to get involves.
5. Platform- Peggy Lewis- good, big meeting today. David Sheidlower co-co term has ended. New Co-facilitator, Shane Que Hee of Los Angeles was affirmed
6. IT- Jim Stauffer- New coordinators need to let the IT group know who you are so you can be listed on contacts. Updating info on new county councils. This info is needed as soon as possible- get to him. Will be moving server from GIS to a commercial server- need to recruit new people to get this under way. Other technical issues, i.e. using web page to do voting and gauge people's opinions. Continuing discussion.
7. Elect. Reform WG- Chris Collins- Alameda- Focus is to bring el ref to CA and to draft our own section of the election law- now using P&F. Been working on this since 1999. Big focus of work. Now is a good time to review what they have- need all the help they can get. Also, in SF, will have an IRV vote in Nov. Berkeley passed IRV with 72%, so El Ref is trying to get this out to other communities.
8. C&C- Magali Offerman, San Diego.- Working to find out what local candidate needs are and how to help them. Regional meetings of C&C have been happening. Most of focus has been on increasing number of candidates, esp. women and minorities. Need more people running on the local level, Contact them if interested or know someone running
9. Finance- Craig Peterson, Alameda- Redid Petra Kelley fund that is available to help people with travel to conferences, etc. Raised some money here and happy that the budget has been passed and that the fiscal calendar has been brought more in line with how things run.
10. Media- Craig (?) Peterson- Old process is quickly being outgrown in process of reorganization.
11. Diversity- Fred Hosea- Trying to get many Green materials translated in to major CA languages.

III. Rep affirmations

- Magali Offerman and Jarred Laiti- New Reps Affirmed.

IV. Next Plenary- Next Plenary will be in Sacramento- June 5-6.

Let them know if we have input on how they can be better.

VI. Other announcements-

- Sara Amir has been appointed alternative national delegate through May.
- Magali Offerman and Sabrina Aller were affirmed as alternate GPUS reps

VII. Closing