

**Green Party of California General Assembly  
Orange County  
August 23 - 24, 2008  
Meeting Minutes**

**Saturday August 23  
Morning Session**

**Finance Report and Funding Appeal**

Meeting called to order. Matthew Leslie announced that he will stand in for Press Person at Cynthia McKinney lunch press conference and asks that GA participants avoid interrupting the event.

Finance Report by Jeannie Rosenmeyer. JR passed out copies of financial report. Fiscal Year starts May 1 and ends April 30. This report covers first quarter and slightly beyond. Revenue for FY about \$5,000 below what was budgeted; spending about \$10,000 below what was budgeted therefore Party doing well. Thus far, expenses have gone to appeal mailings, travel for national convention and press secretary. Expenses to come will include campaign contributions and Green Focus, among other things. At end of FY 2007, \$52,00 in bank; now there is less than \$45,000. GP is gradually spending down reserves. People in this room have kept us going with monthly contributions.

Ms. Rosenmeyer asked GA participants to make donations to GP. Donation envelopes were passed out. Please help distribute in your county. It was asked if monthly sustainers could be taken off solicitation list; a show of hands was taken and about half supported this proposal, and half were against. Those who'd like to be taken off solicitation list were asked to make a note on the donation envelope. Contact information will not be shared with anyone. If you give more than \$100 or more in any year, donation must be reported to state (name, occupation and city only).

Finance Committee is down to three people. Anyone interested in working on fundraising, please come forward. House parties, setting up local sustainer program, and any other fundraising ideas are welcome.

GP contemplating doing joint fundraising with locals and counties in the future. Would be followed up event or phone campaign; State would pay for mailing. See Jeannie or Bob if interested.

GP US has asked if GP CA would share mailing lists with them and in return they would update contact addresses. Can be taken up at CC. State party gets about \$8,000 from national and their total budget is about \$60,000. In response to inquiry it was stated that GP CA has three pots: candidate, state, and federal pots. GP CA has shared donor lists with counties.

Larry Mullen announced the new policy on quorum. Per Alameda plenary, if participants are going to leave, they were asked to check out by turning in delegate card.

LUNCH BREAK

**Saturday, August 23, 2008**  
**Afternoon Session**

**Proposal: Green Science Plank**

Shane Que Hee presented two changes. On page 9, number 5: after “United States” add “and that are known to have adverse environmental, ecological and human effects.” The second change is regarding number 15: strike the last sentence.

Affirmations, concerns and clarifying questions: Jean Rosenmeyer asked about number 13. Should it say that the State of California “should” be required to provide ongoing annual and five yearly reports on the state of Green Science in California? The change to include “should” is accepted.

Joey S. from Contra Costa County: He expressed concern about doing this process now. This process is very important. Lots of people don’t understand the technical niceties.

Woody Hastings, San Francisco City and County: He expressed concern about use of the term “exploited” in the first paragraph under “Proposal.” He feels it implies that we’re okay with exploitation. Suggests using another term. Change: Delete “exploited and” from first sentence of first paragraph.

Peggy from San Luis County: She would like to affirm the plan.

Bob M. from Alameda County: He is concerned about statements which don’t say what they mean. Such as number 11 which says, “Adverse effects to all living things must be prevented.” Does this mean you can’t kill ants in your kitchen? Where do we stop?

Jean Rosenmeyer: She likes the concept of this platform plank but finds it difficult to read. She’d like to see it flow better and sound more professional.

Jim M. from Los Angeles County: He would like to echo what Jean said. He would like to see plank address nuclear energy and nuclear power and make clear that that is not what is meant by “clean energy technologies.”

Daniel from Orange County: On number 18, phrase seems overly simplified regarding genome research.

Ron R. from Orange County: most people aren’t trained in scientific linguistics. Perhaps there should be two plank versions, one aimed at lay people, one at scientific community.

Sasha K. from Los Angeles County: He echoed concern about number 11 regarding “adverse effects” language. Perhaps it could be changed to “unintended adverse effects must be carefully considered or studied.”

Shane Que Hee response: Regarding nuclear power, Green Party is against it and its already in another platform. Does it need to be reiterated in this proposal? That’s fine. Where should it go? Number 6?

Jim M. from Los Angeles County: Yes.

**Action:**

Shane Que Hee addressed delegates. He will add that the Green Party opposes nuclear power in all its uses and will reference the energy plank. regarding number 13, the word “should” will be added to first sentence after “The State of California.” Regarding number 18, Shane said that “target traits” language was formulated so that one could pick and choose what one wants. “In humans” will be added after “target traits.” Regarding number 11, the first sentence will be deleted; it will now read “Susceptible populations such as the young, the old, females bearing offspring and living creatures most exposed to chemical, physical, and biological agents may be sentinel populations of a problem.” Back to number 18, change to “The human genome must not be manipulated using science to achieve target traits, for example, to make an embryo heterosexual.”

**Action:** Facilitator tested for consensus. There were two unresolved concerns; parties were willing to stand aside. Concerns will be submitted in writing to transcriptionist. Consensus was achieved on platform plank. An e-mail address will be provided for submitting concerns to the minutes. Also, Shane Que Hee said to send suggestions for better wording to him too.

**Proposal: California Tax Plank Platform**

Shane Que Hee: Referred to handout. Changes are in capital letters and deleted sections have been double stricken.

Point of process discussed.

Shane Que Hee: Major alterations are in item one (pages 2 - 3). Platform committee had further changes. Instead of “gradated,” it should read “graduated.” Page 3, number 2, last sentence should read, “. . . one other alternative.” Paragraph 3, sentence 3 should say, “It *would also be* a simple tax system . . . ”

Section 1 has been changed from an either/or item. There can be mixed systems too. There need to be principles. Greens can only make general recommendations.

There are no changes in sections 3, 4, or 5. In section 2, delete “Instead, the Green Party supports” from last sentence.

Facilitator asked for affirmations, concerns and qualifying questions. A point of process was discussed.

Jan raised objections to proposal including definitions (e.g., land rent, labor wages, and capital interest). There are items in our economy that are taxed that don’t fit these categories. Feels the platform needs more work.

Marvin (?) supports what Jan said. Emphasis on rental tax doesn’t have a lot of traction.

Linda from Riverside applauds efforts. Would like to see a definition of what constitutes small vs. big business.

Mike, LA County. Feels this lacks good definitions. He suggests a friendly amendment showing that we understand taxation. Would like to direct state party IT to come up with a blog-formatted space where everyone in state party can review document and comment on it.

Liz Appelberg from San Luis County. Appreciates what Janet said. What about taxation on inherited wealth? It’s not in there.

Andrea Dori, Santa Clara County. Appreciates what Janet said too. Do pensions include social security? It’s very much an issue for seniors.

Jim Stauffer, Santa Clara County. It’s normal process that a tax plank would need more work. Thanks to David Wolberg (?) for putting in the time to get it this far. Question for Shane: there is a tax plank under “Creating Right Incentives.” Does this replace that?

Sandra from San Mateo County. Also agrees that there’s a lot of hodge-podge-ness in this plank. Doesn’t know what “adjusted gross rents” means. It still needs more work and preferably by more than one person.

Ron from Orange County. Applauds efforts. Disagrees with few first words on GP tax principles. Wording and philosophical intent should be carefully reconsidered. “Working person” can be anybody.

David from Orange County. Plank is way too complex to be part of our platform. Has stuff in it that doesn’t belong.

Warner from Santa Clara County. Needs summary of existing state budget to understand and support the plank.

Jean R. from San Francisco. Desperately need a tax platform. Agrees with basic principles in it. What you earn with your work should be taxed the least. We should be making a philosophical statement that certain things should be taxed lower or higher. Re: gross receipt tax, it should be called a “value-added tax.” Don’t believe we should say we want a simple tax system. Taxes are inherently complex. It’s also unclear what is a state tax, what is a federal tax in this plank. This needs to be specific to California.

Anonymous: Disagrees with Jean. Tax system can be simple. Tax professionals should not have jobs. It doesn’t happen in Europe. We shouldn’t have exact numbers in plank. We should have a statement of principle of what we believe in.

Greg, Alameda County. Wants something that candidates can use, something made clearer. We need comparisons between current state budget and what this would look like.

Michael Borstein: Plank has bit off more than people we’re trying to reach can chew on. Suggestion: make a general statement and entertain a tax section in our platform. There’s too much in this document that conflicts with local and state GPs.

Ron from Orange County. Need idea of what we tax, how we tax, why we tax.

Jack, 20th Assembly District. Plank should be philosophically based.

Recap of comments and concerns by Shane: Rent on apartment buildings not specifically addressed though somewhat in number 3. Other categories to address are income pensions, social security and inheritances. There are many overlapping categories. Definition needed for small and big businesses (threshold rather than gross). IT blog will be looked into. Plank needs definitions. Plank is meant to address California specifically. Will try to simplify. Will try to add comparison to current state budget in plank. Will see if they can change from gross tax to VAT. Candidates have to take out what they can use. Tax section a good idea. Example of Europe will be looked into. Thank you for comments.

## **Proposal: Water Plank**

Shane: Please discuss and make comments.

Andrea Dora, San Clara County. Concerned about giving support to fuel resources that come from food supply. If we're using plant sources we need to specify that we use wild grasses that can't be used for food. Referring to page 12.

Jim, Los Angeles County. Good document. Source protection needs to be addressed. Conservation section well done. Use of term "stakeholder" bothers him. Can be dangerous. Use of "authorities" also dangerous, often a derivative of bureaucracy.

Greg Jan, Alameda County. Beginning of document needs to address domestic and state issues first or on equal basis with global issues. Half of plank could be taken out -- parts of it are repetitive.

Mike, LA County. First sentence of plank doesn't make sense. Poor writing in several places.

Jack from LA. None of importance of Orange County issues in document.

Peggy, San Luis County. Has many problems with the plank. Global warming not addressed. It's also too long and repetitive. We shouldn't be giving subsidies to dairy farmers.

Facilitator: We're ending on time. Now going to break-out sessions. Returning at 4:15 p.m. Address for sending in concerns is [agenda-team@cagreens.org](mailto:agenda-team@cagreens.org). Please include for "Dana Point Minutes" in subject line. And include your contact information.

## **Proposa: CC Safe Quorum**

Larry Mullen: Consensus achieved on nomination of Cynthia McKinney and Rosa Clemente for President and Vice President. Confirmed by acclamation.

Michael B: An internal procedure was adopted due to problems maintaining quorum. Proposal allows less than by-law mandated two-thirds of CC membership to be maintained during meeting. Affirmation needed. Friendly amendments were accepted. Still maintain the need to have two-thirds of membership show up at a meeting in order to convene legally quorumed meeting. People allowed to leave as long as we don't go below 50% of total membership -- rounded up.

Clarifying questions, affirmations, and concerns about proposal:

Anonymous: CC decided internally to change this. On what basis can CC change state by-laws?

Anonymous: Don't agree with solution because of by-laws. Would prefer by-laws amendment to lower quorum to 50 - 60%. As long as meetings start with quorum, quorum should be considered met even if people leave. 2/3 is high for quorum.

Warner Bloomberg, Santa Clara County. What is being asked of GA?

Bob Marsh, Alameda County: Is there any elected body in US that follows what is being proposed? In past, CC has been like national congress where it is hoped there is gridlock; high quorum threshold is generally a good idea.

Greg Jan, Alameda County: Seems like a bizarre formulation. If CC meetings are having trouble with quorum, that could be an indication of structural problems. If people leave intentionally to disrupt quorum, then address that more specifically.

Anonymous: Attendance problem is due to people not being able to attend set monthly meetings; those people don't belong on CC. Real issue is that it's a drag to be on CC. Process problems aren't working due to internal

rules. This allows agenda to be manipulated during course of evening so that smaller number of people can change agenda.

Ross, LA County Council: Has serious concerns and is not comfortable voting in favor of this proposal.

Jim Stauffer, Santa Clara County. This is not an ideal solution but will affirm because there have been too many instances of broken quorums. Something needs to be done. This is a quick easy step that can be taken.

Anonymous: Speaks in affirmation of proposal. Feels it's "bizarre" for people to leave a meeting to disrupt it. It's not a "drag" to be on CC. As far as manipulation goes, it's manipulative for people to leave meeting to stop business.

Anonymous: Surprised that quorum is two-thirds instead of half, which it is for most bodies. Have we ever considered continuing voting online until quorum is achieved?

Facilitator: Shall we add more time? Five more minutes added.

Michael B: There was a rule on CC where once a quorum, always a quorum. Two-thirds quorum rules is in by-laws. There have been problems with quorum breaking. We're trying to get a rule to conduct business. Committees allowed to decide internal processes.

Facilitator: Test for consensus. Any unresolved concerns? Quite a few. None willing to stand aside. This is a procedural decision.

Roll call. Doesn't pass. 17 yes, 17 no, 6 abstain.

## **Election: CC At-Large**

Larry Mullen: Orange Plenary At-Large election. Two candidates. Turn in ballots Dorothy Kameny and Jim Facilitator.

Announcement from Ron Rodarte: There's a party tonight from 6 - 10 p.m. It's a fundraiser plus there are speakers.

Larry Mullen asks that CC At-Large candidates come forward.

Linda Solace from Riverside County. Would like to bring a voice to RC. Has been involved for four years.

Matt Leslie from Orange County. Involved at local and state capacity for about eight years. Would like to endorse Linda Solace.

Questions?

What are your top agenda items?

Linda would like to engage more people in political activism.

Matt: Top priority is to see that the business of party gets done. Has been on CC before. Would like to see that working groups and standing committees are coordinated by CC and see that plenaries happen on time.

Facilitator: Would like to discuss roll of at-large representatives. Positions created to represent under-represented constituencies in GP. Argument made from time to time that because CC is an administrative body it doesn't need to be representative. She completely disagrees. CC should be representative. Question to two candidates: How would you go about representing people of color?

Linda: I can't because I'm not a woman of color. But I can speak on behalf of people I'm representing in Riverside. Not sure how to answer the question.

Matt: Currently there aren't any seated at-large reps. So I would go out and find person of color to fill open seats. Would actively outreach to people of color and individual counties.

Anonymous: For Linda, based on what CC is supposed to do, how do you see yourself fulfilling those tasks? When confronted with direct rule violation, what would you do when state rules thrown out?

Linda: I'd have to learn state rules very clearly and then CC them on violations. If I found they were not just rules, I would do everything possible to amend them. I have a professional administrative background and could therefore take on any task requested of me. She would hope to use CC to assist in reaching out and getting GP to be heard more.

Mike: I would try to maintain fidelity to by-laws to best of my ability and would respect by-law committee. I've been on state working groups and that is helpful to completing duties of CC at-large rep. We have a moribund working group. What group should be doing is liaising with progressive causes and issues in state, taking green platform to those groups and establishing something between us.

Facilitator: Who will be collecting ballots? Everyone needs to bring delegate card and ballot to Dorothy.

Michael B.: Question in reference to last subject. Apparently there are some people who don't mind laggard attendance. How do you feel about staying until end of meetings, your attendance in general, and the act of leaving meeting to break quorum because you're not getting your way?

Linda: Assuming that people who are leaving on perpetual basis are doing it for that reason, in that case, something about that would have to be addressed within CC. Decision to change the by-laws or regulations within committee should have been done within the committee.

Mike: It's despicable to leave meeting with intention of breaking quorum. If that happens, that's the region's problem. Regions have to keep track of what reps are doing, and if you find that your rep is consistently leaving meetings early, you might want to ask your rep why that is the case. As far as extending meetings, it's fine to extend them within 35 - 40 minutes. There is a problem that the CC is legitimately trying to resolve. Would rather have more calls than longer calls if that's what the question was.

Announcement from Linda Pierre Avila regarding the GP US delegation. Meeting for dinner at Harbor House for 5:15 p.m.

Facilitator: Election announced tomorrow.

Meeting at adjourned.

# **GPCA PLENARY NOTES**

## **SUN., AUG. 24, 2008**

### **I. MEETING CONVENED AT 9:23 A.M.**

No objections to agenda. Quorum confirmed: 28 delegates in attendance, 23 needed. Facilitators: Jeanne Rosenmeier and Bob Vizzard

### **II. CONFIRMATION OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS**

presented by Jane Rands, State Liaison to the Secretary of State.

A. She began by apologizing for a few mistakes on the printed list (Pool of Electors 2008) she sent around the room

B. Delegates' clarifying questions and points of process:

1. Greg Jan, Alameda: wanted to know whether we were electing 55 names today.
2. Point of process, Cat Woods, Marin: suggested giving everyone a certain number of votes (perhaps 10 or 20)
3. Jim Stauffer, Santa Clara: pointed out these were electors to electorate college, and the list would only go in the Sec. of States' file unless our presidential candidate is elected.
4. Jeanne Rosenmeier, San Francisco: This process helps raise funds, she stated, by encouraging those on the Pool of Electors list to be donors
5. Jack Lindblad, LA County: suggested we purge names of those no longer registered Green from the list
6. Patty Marsh, Alameda, had clarifying question: Were these people asked if they want to be on this list? ("Yes," answered Jeanne Rosenmeier)
7. Jane Rands asked us to mark our top 55 people from the list, and cross out names of anyone we didn't want, with an explanation
8. Greg Jan, Alameda, friendly amendment: Many of us are more familiar with delegates than donors. We need to get our donors more involved, and mark a small number of delegates.
9. Jim Stauffer, Santa Clara: The question of whether we ask people whether they want to be on the list or not: In the past, we didn't want to contact 55 people. But can the finance committee do so of the donors? Jeanne said "Yes, we'll use the magic of mail merge."

C. Jane Rands said we'll pick sustainers and donors, provided they can be balanced by gender; and would take recommendations from delegates after that.

### **III. PROPOSAL: BALLOT INITIATIVES**

presented by CCWG.

A. Warner Bloomberg, Santa Clara County, Coordinator, explained process and background: We are in the middle of a County Polling period; if the plenary takes positions, those will be the positions of GPCA; otherwise, county polling will continue. He also explained plenary voting procedure.

B. Greg Jan, Alameda, presented list of initiatives and facilitated consensus process. Began with "no brainer" propositions. Based on unanimous consensus, GPCA positions on propositions 2, 4, 6 and 8 are as follows:

- ❖ Prop. 2, Treatment of Farm Animals: Yes
- ❖ Prop. 4, Parental Notification for Under-18 abortions: No
- ❖ Prop. 6, Anti-Gang Penalties (Runner initiative): No
- ❖ Prop. 8, Same Sex Marriage Ban: No

"Those were the quick ones," Jan said, adding we'd test for concerns on the following:

Prop 1, High Speed Rail Bond.

a. Concerns:

1. Bob Marsh, Alameda County: concerned rail advocates really want high-speed rail, but this isn't what the initiative is about. It's a land grab. Schwartenegger's buddies want land along the route. \$10 billion is only one-quarter of what is needed; the rest will come from private investors, so taxpayers become seed money for project. "I don't think it's the business of the GP" to support "land scams," he said.
2. Jeanne Rosenmeier, San Francisco: "I'm chairing a task force for city of SF on coping with oil prices. If this passes, there will be money to" enlarge a railway tunnel leading into SF; but she'll step aside based on Bob Marsh's points.
3. Sandi Stiassni, Orange: Thinks we should take a second look and say yes, for environmental reasons.
4. Andrea Dorey, Santa Clara: concerned about use of inflammatory words like "scam."

b. Bob Vizzard took straw poll: 6 for, 20 against, 3 abstained, 1 no position. 80% threshold not reached, so counties will settle this

Prop. 3, Children's Hospital Bond: "No" position reached by consensus.

Prop. 5, Nonviolent Offenders Sentencing and Rehabilitation: "Yes" position passed by consensus

Prop. 7, Renewable Energy Requirements For Utilities:

a. Concerns:

1. Todd Van Etten, Orange County: Favors a yes vote because it actually makes laws and policies already in place more effective
2. Andrea Dorey, Santa Clara: She shares Todd's concerns, and believes many environmental groups would support this.
3. Jan Arnold, Alameda: There is big money on both sides of this. "I support no, with regrets," she said. "I think we should look at who our opponents would be" if we opposed. Many environmentally and labor-minded groups are opposed, she pointed out.
4. Tian Harter, Santa Clara: Kids in clean T-shirts came to his door to support this proposition, and he supports them.
5. Bob Marsh, Alameda: Propositions in general are extremely difficult to undo. If we "gullible environmentalists" make a mistake on this 80-page, fine-print law, it will be too hard to undo.
6. Daniel Alavi, Orange: does not support this overcomplicated legislation which does not support decentralized energy
7. Jack Lindblad, LA: Decentralization is one of our 10 Key Values, so we should not support it.

b. Straw poll: 4 yes, 21 no, 2 abstain, 2 no position

c. Official vote: 3 yes, 23 no, 3 abstain, 2 no position. So "no" passes

Prop. 9, Victims' Rights, Reduction of Parole Hearings: "no" position passes by consensus

Prop. 10, Alternative Fuel Vehicles and Renewable Energy Bond: "No" position passes by consensus



Prop. 11, Redistricting:

a. Concerns and clarifying questions:

1. Jack Lindblad, LA: asked a clarifying question about how redistricting is handled currently; Warner Bloomberg clarified current law
2. Cat Woods' concern: We want multiple-seat districts so we can have proportional representation. We don't want to support something that makes it "more fair for Republicans" who want to get elected.
3. Mike Borenstein, El Dorado: had a concern he'd step aside from
4. Bob Marsh, Alameda: Said if it passes, we should try to get a seat on the commission in order to oppose redistricting.
5. Jack Lindblad, LA: It will be very difficult for that one Green on the commission to speak to the press. This is an important issue to empower Greens to get elected. But will stand aside on his concerns.
6. Ron Rodarte, Orange: We should go No Position with an explanation.
7. Drew Johnson, Santa Clara: In favor of proposition and not willing to step aside.
8. Vote: 2 yes, 24 no, 1 abstain, 4 no position. No passes.
9. Prop. 12: Veterans' Bond.
10. Concerns:
11. Béa Tiritilli, Orange: She is generally against bonds because they ask tomorrow's taxpayers to pay for projects which should be funded by today's revenues.
12. Cat Woods: Marin: concerned with bonds, even if for a good cause
13. Peggy Koteen, San Luis Obispo: affirmed Cat's concerns
14. Jeanne Rosenmeier, San Francisco: A good case needs to be made to borrow money to pay operating expenses. This is for VA mortgages, however, that will be paid off by Vets
15. Drew Johnson, Santa Clara: As a veteran, he knows benefits are inadequate. People asked to do something for their country should get something back.
16. Bob Marsh, Alameda: This merely extends a bond that was given to vets previously. Unfair not to extend it today. Also, how else do we pay for mortgages if not by loan?
17. Bob Smith, LA: Was given a house after his service, not asked to pay for one.

b. Vote: 27 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain, 2 no position. "Yes" position passes.

c. Warner stated: Please take Proposition 1 back to counties for poll.

d. Cat Woods said to call her when we know county results: 415-897-6989

IV. 10:45 a.m. (approximately): **BREAKOUT SESSION #3:**

Committees and working groups; campaigns and candidates; bylaws; Green issues.

A. General Assembly reconvened after lunch at 1:10.

B. Jim Stauffer, afternoon facilitator, asked for a female facilitator to help. No one came forward.

Quorum count: 27, exact number needed to meet quorum.

**V. ELECTION: GPUS DELEGATION**

A. Intro.: Sanda Everette, San Mateo

1. After her intro. to the process, quorum count was retaken, and this time was counted at 28, which exceeds quorum.

2. Nominated delegates: Gary Ruskin, Jack Lindblad, Marnie Glickman

Alternate nominated: Bernie MacDonald

3. Concerns were registered after most ballots were cast:

- a. Jim Stauffer, Santa Clara: GPUS is staying strong, but California is weakening. We need more volunteers to donate their time to California, and "we're losing it to the state party"
- b. Cat Woods, Marin: We need to disaffiliate from GPUS
- c. Jan Arnold: If some committees are showing signs of life, its because they have a clear function and mandate, and/or are not run well.
- d. Sanda Everette: We need a larger pool of activists, period, both locally, statewide and nationally; different people have different interests
- e. Craig Thorsen, LA: Wanted to be appointed to LA County Council two years ago; wasn't. Got involved in GPUS politics in other states
- f. Linda Pierre-Avila: Number of delegates was increased to 42, so a big push for more national delegate recruitment ensued. Gratifying to be on committee.
- g. Jeanne Rosenmeier, San Francisco: Agrees with Jim. It is unsustainable to send so many people to go to a national meeting, and to pay so many to attend.
- h. Mike Feinstein, LA: Generally embraces what Jim said, but state coordinating committee "got to be such a drag" it wasn't "a valid mechanism for" helping Green politics.
- i. Peggy Koteen, San Luis Obispo: I think we can do both. "I totally disagree with Cat" Wood's stance on disaffiliation with GPUS.
- j. Greg Jan: The situation is very complex and should improve. Many GPUS delegates are otherwise inactive Greens. We need better recruitment into Green positions.

**VI. STANDING COMMITTEE/WORKING GROUP REPORTS; AND CO-CO INTRO.**

A. Warner Bloomberg, Santa Clara Co.: CCWG still needs a co-co (one resigned), and as of Jan. 2009, will need a second when Warner's term expires

Looking for local contacts to work on McKinney campaign.

B. Peggy Koteen, Platform Committee: Platform planks still being worked on. Grateful to pass Science plank. Making progress on Tax plank. Hoping to work more on Water plank.

C. Mike Borenstien, El Dorado, reported for GROW: "We bit off four things," including local building. Discussed doing joint county-state fundraising.

D. Daniel Alavi, Orange, Green Issues Working group; Jamie Snyder, Orange, will be another co-co, and Sandi Stassni, Orange, will be an alternate. Want to work with locals to learn their needs and help publicize. Want to get discussion group together, presentation for workshop. Discussed such issues as alternative transportation, animal rights, etc.

E. Jim Stauffer, Santa Clara, I.T. Committee: Need people with I.T. skills

F. Jane Rands, Orange, Co-coordinator for Electoral Reform Working Group. Working on getting someone to sponsor Green elections code. Need to fill in gaps in bylaws. Needs people to join teleconference list.

G. Mike Borenstein, El Dorado, Clearinghouse: Fairly small administrative group. Takes care of things like state snail mail.

H. Mike Borenstein, Bylaws: small group. Delineated a few projects they'd like to see over the next year or two, s, including Article 2, Purpose.

## VII. NEXT GA LOCATION/DATE-REQUEST DECISION (CC)

A. Jim Stauffer said hosts are needed. For 2009, we're looking at January (gathering—non-decision-making event); April and September for plenaries. Another possibility is three full plenaries.

1. Larry Mullen, Fresno: At our retreat, we spent a lot of time discussing this very thing. Time is important for figuring in hotel and other costs, which can impact attendance. Off election years are a good time to schedule an extra plenary. Need to avoid Thanksgiving and Christmas. April plenary would handle budget. Plenary in fall is needed to cover subsequent business. A third plenary can cover more business.

2. Jim Stauffer: Always good to have a plenary or gathering around the time a new president is inaugurated

B. No volunteer hosts, but will be advertised on County Contacts list

## VIII. VOTE RESULTS

announced from yesterday:

Matt Leslie and Linda Salas were elected to Coordinating Committee at-large positions.

## IX. STRATEGY PLAN DISCUSSION (CC)

A. Larry Mullen, Fresno, introduced topic and took notes on large paper from people at stack.

B. Topics brought up:

1. Sanda Everette, San Mateo: We need an improved structure for growing activist layer of party. We need more I.T. experts. We need to have a way to reach out to other people who share our values and can help grow this party.
2. Mike Feinstein, LA: Before we get into election and party-building strategy, we need to prioritize plenary agendas, giving greater importance where its logically due, such as elections. We have fewer people running in elections outside party elections. Need to run more, especially in state-assembly races. We are in danger of going off ballot if we don't build numbers, and we can above will help.
3. Craig Thorsen, Los Angeles: List-serve moderation and expectations. Themes: better communication and moderation. Will research how they moderate their lists. The number of times I've heard back-and-forth name-calling on list serves is not constructive. Passionate discussion with constructive criticism is better. Some people will leave our party due to list serve conflicts.
4. Michael Borenstein, El Dorado: Dysfunction and name calling: Internal mediation committee can mitigate this so we can present ourselves more professionally. We need to standing General Assemblies to incorporate more locals; registration; affinity groups in inactive counties. Green Focus needs to get up moving. We need an issue we can work on together (as opposed to our pet issues) that can put this party on the map (such as IRV).
5. Béa Tiritilli, Orange: Need to sell ads in Green Focus. Pay people a commission for selling them. Pay an editor to edit. Have a group oversee which ads are acceptable.
6. Mike Borenstein: Ads can be a real money generator. Can generate \$6,000 per issue easily.
7. Mike Feinstein: Green Focus articles need to be in both .pdf and single link format in order to be more accessible.
8. Mike Borenstein, El D.: Reminded folks these are deas only. All should stay on table.
9. Craig Thorsen, LA: Is a member of Obama's church. Noted they have meetings planned out eight years in advance. Three meetings next year and we don't have dates? We need better planning.
10. Mike Feinstein, LA: In order to plan future plenary meetings we need a better financial accounting at state meetings.
11. Larry Mullen: Addressed one of the above ideas. Pointed out that comments on list serves can stay out in cyberspace a long time, and can affect our image negatively for some time.

**GPUS DELEGATION ELECTION RESULTS:**

All candidates passed threshold and were elected.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.