

Green Party of California
Minutes of the General Assembly
San Jose, March 6-7, 2010

Contents

Saturday Morning Session.....	2
A. Opening Ceremony / Host Announcements	2
B. Confirm Facilitators / Delegate Orientation / Quorum	2
C. Proposal: Approve Agenda.....	2
D. Proposal: Approve previous minutes.....	2
E. Proposal: Consent Calendar / CCWG Single Payer Bill / GPUS Delegation Bylaws.....	2
F. Announcement:.....	3
G. Report: GPUS Delegates.....	3
H. Election: GPUS Delegates.....	3
I. Proposal: GPCA Annual Budget.....	3
J. Proposal: June Ballot Measures	7
Saturday Afternoon Session	7
K. Results from GPUS Delegation Election:	7
L. Proposal: June Ballot Measures (continued from morning session).....	7
M. Election: CC At-Large Candidates and Election Procedure.....	9
Sunday Morning Session.....	11
N. Confirmation of Facilitators	11
O. Proposal: Platform Planks	11
P. Proposal: Registration Drive.....	13
Sunday Afternoon Session	14
Q. Consent Calendar Bring-back.....	14
R. Registration Drive Proposal.....	14
S. Pending Ballot Measures.....	15
T. Next General Assembly	16
U. Reports from Working Groups and Committees:.....	16

Saturday Morning Session

A. Opening Ceremony / Host Announcements

(9:15)

Dana St. George read a poem titled “Turtle” by the first lesbian Nobel Laureate and a short essay by Howard Zinn was read by Fred Duperrault from our host committee.

Certificate of Appreciation presented to Larry Mullen (not present) by Coordinating Committee Co-Cos Adrienne Prince and Barry Hermanson. Larry is stepping down from State Party involvements – will remain involved at local level.

Housekeeping: Candidates Forum moved to nearby coffeehouse due to need to leave general assembly location by 5pm. Leave by 3:30, doors locked, we are reserved at coffee house until 6pm; reviewed restroom locations, breakout locations.

B. Confirm Facilitators / Delegate Orientation / Quorum

Facilitators: Matt Leslie (Orange County) and Sanda Everette (Santa Clara)

Notetaker: Kendra Gonzales (Ventura County)

Timekeeper: Randy Hicks (Sacramento)

Vibe watchers: Shane Que Hee (L.A.) and Pamela Spevack

Delegate orientation: Warner Bloomberg

Quorum: Opening quorum established with eight regions represented. 35 delegates present.

C. Proposal: Approve Agenda

Agenda changes: GIWG Proposal on Sunday 11:20 to review support of Peruvian Presidential has been replaced with discussion of a Registration Drive Project and since the Ballot Measure County Polling did not reach quorum, the GA will need to take a vote on each for the State Position.

Agenda approved by Consensus

Matt reminded floor that we need to seriously consider where next general assembly will be held

D. Proposal: Approve previous minutes

Clarifying Questions:

Michael Borenstein (El Dorado) : where are the Minutes?:

Matt Leslie: available on-line, is responsibility of delegates of review before the general assembly.

Concerns:

Gloria Purcell (San Mateo): Stand Asides were not stated on Minutes from Cotati.

Jim Stauffer (Santa Clara): Does not want to postpone approving the Minutes otherwise they will just keep piling up. The minutes are available on-line as indicated in the Agenda Packet which is every Delegate’s responsibility to review.

Minutes APPROVED by Consensus

E. Proposal: Consent Calendar / CCWG Single Payer Bill / GPUS Delegation Bylaws

Concerns:

1. CCWG Single Payer Bill support – is PULLED for bring back after lunch.

[name not recorded] has concern over Single Payer.

(Michael Borenstein): good to discuss concerns with presenter Dana Silvernale over lunch)

2. GPUS Bylaws Amendments PASSED by Consensus

F. Announcement:

Common password has been changed, see page 8 of Agenda Pkt and share with local County Councils

G. Report: GPUS Delegates

Presenter: Sanda Everette

We can always access info of what is going on with GPUS – see Sanda for URL.

Need assistance with national committees, don't need to be a Delegate. Many types of committees: Ecology, Peace, Bylaws, etc...committees.

Some states have to re-qualify every 2 years. Only 16 states with continuous ballot access, many states struggle so much, don't even try. There are 38 "Accredited States" in the GP.

California allocation is 42 Delegates, we now have 35 filled with 18 alternates. Our delegate allocation may be lower. Applications available 2 months before general assembly

Annual National Meeting this year is being done along with US Social Forum (20,000 attendees). Last week of June in Detroit, registration for Green meeting includes registration for Social Forum.

Warner Bloomberg: Agenda has a survey form re having National Meeting in California, Warner asking GA to reply end of general assembly or via email is fine too by next week, for general assessment.

Peggy Koteen: also working on US Platform, need help in writing / editing, cleaning up, streamlining.

Sanda: Bylaws were not revised in 2008, now working on changing Bylaws, different states submit platform proposals which are then integrated, presented at national meeting, discussed and voted on and then comments posted on website. Deadline is April 15th to submit the Platform.

H. Election: GPUS Delegates

(9:55) Presenter: Sanda Everette

Sanda: Delegates should have reviewed delegate packet (and there was an email that went out to County Contacts list and have been on-line). Most candidates are running for re-election. This is a ranked choice vote, with NOC (no other candidate) noted at candidate(s) you do not wish to vote for.

Candidates are: Craig Thorsen, Jared Laiti, Susan Chunco (present), Jack Lindblad, Greg Jan (present),

Alternates: Jan Arnold (present), Mike Chamess

Shane Que Hee (LA): Reminded GA that Jack Lindblad has been the center of controversy in L.A. county relative to supporting Republican over Green candidates.

[name not given] Sacramento is very supportive of Jared Laiti, works very hard, fundraises, works on campaigns.

Peggy Koteen (San Luis Obispo County) Clarifying questions on vote procedure, and Jack Lindblad has run for Assembly before as a Green, seems pretty Green.

David Q: Always been impressed with Greg Jan

Secret ballot vote conducted.

Elections committee: June Brasheres and Jim Stauffer

I. Proposal: GPCA Annual Budget

Presenters: Jeanne Rosenmeier.(Treasurer, and ex-officio of Budget Committee) and Barry Hermanson.

Income has gone way down, and have had to make some major cuts from committees and working groups.

Barry has pledged to raise \$6,441 or pay that out of pocket, otherwise that would be our deficit.

\$28,000 total for entire budget for the State. Barry doing a fundraising effort in San Francisco, send out a few letters a year, and are starting to get more responses from fundraising letters which include things that people can actually do, such as postcards like the "U.S. spending priorities to Obama", did a mailing in December from Don Beckler's org "single-payer now" healthcare reform, etc.

Supporting SB 810.

Last state mailing, (1500 or 1600 out) rcvd 90 single-payer postcards back on healthcare and more donations. Barry trying to do same thing at local level to recent voters. We need NEW donors!

Plans to mail to 3,000 or 4,000 new donors. We should not keep mailing to same donors, that list will just get smaller. How can counties reach out to their locals for donations and simple tasks like the postcards?. Barry will provide postcards if requested. Barry is also including voter reg cards with next mailing. We should be asking fellow Greens to ask people they know to re-register as Green.

Initial response from these kinds of efforts are very good.

Question from floor [name not recorded]: can we donate on-line?

Yes: websites provide on-line donations as well as sustainer options. Sustainers are on decline.

Jeanne: We need to let people know that GP is very active in community leadership roles

Barry: If we are successful in fundraising and bringing in more, we will restore funds to committees where cuts have been made. CC can decide between GAs to restore funds.

Sanda: Is one of 7 co-chairs to GPUS. GPCA is very linked to GPUS, in that there is fundraising option for donors from GPUS to choose to give a % of the donation to their state. (40% to GPCA)

After 2008 Convention there was a \$50,000 deficit. GPUS cut from 3 to 1 staff person in Washington office, but doing major fundraising and debt is being cut. Did receive a \$20,000 donation.

GPUS (caucuses and committees) owes GPCA \$2400 for 2008 and \$2100 for 2009. GPUS might be able to pay off internal debt by end of 2010. GPUS Finance Committee is asking for some states to forgive the debt. Sanda did not support this for GPCA.

Main expense of Delegation is Annual National Meeting. Mostly people are able to pay their own way, but there are those who cannot, so GPCA asked for \$3500 for funds to support travel, but was cut to \$1,000 and this really is not enough. (20 people attending?) Sanda proposing an amendment to the budget that IF money comes back from GPUS we could use that to pay for delegates to attend.

Clarifying Questions / Concerns

Shane Q: What about funding for registration?

Sanda: There is a loan to GPCA, don't have to pay 25%, but this is a cash neutral part of budget. She will ask if some registration can be credited, but don't know if that is going to work

Jane Rands (Orange County): Why is there not a cost off-set for Green Focus and Platform Summaries. There is a budget cut for these items. Isn't there income from the purchase of these items? GROW county / state project, isn't there a expected return of \$2,000

Jeanne: Prospect mailings may not show an immediate return – is on-going. Green Focus has never been properly paid for, so is more of a give-away.

Michael Borenstein: GROW is doing best to recoup by asking Greens to pay for these items, and ask for the monies to be returned to that line-item. Volunteers are needed to handle clearinghouse sales and collections.

Mike Rubin, (Alameda): What is the realistic chance of GPUS paying GPCA its donation %?

Barry Hermanson: there is no solid assurance, but will only go into budget if it comes in.

Dana Silvernale (Humboldt) initial fundraising effort usually loses \$, break-even is a good sign, pay-off is over time. Brent McMillan is a stellar fundraiser.

Tian Harter (Santa Clara) contested primary for Governor is a great opportunity to use in a mailer. Hoping we will do a mailing around this.

Cres Velluci (Sacramento): On track to do more mailings. We should do 5 or 6 a year. Optimistic that we can raise plenty of funds this year.

AJ Del Arringa (Sacramento): Need to focus on students, progressive Dems, lots of Measures to use for outreach.

Sanda: National debate was on newspaper payments also. GPUS has moved to on-line newspapers. Can we do Green Focus on line?.

Cres: Would have to change the format to be able to print, but Green Focus is only State “brochure” to use in tabling, etc.....

Michael Borenstein: Wants opinions on new bumper stickers and bookmarks, which is a budgeted item. Can we put \$1,000 back into GROW budget for Voter Reg Project, tier 2?. Voter reg was cut, which now he regrets due to the new voter reg project proposed by Tim Smith. Doing as a Tier 2 means that IF the funds are raised, we can do the project.

Barry: Can come back to it AFTER presentation on Sunday to amend the budget.

Michael Borenstein: submits as a friendly amendment to vote it in now, then remove if voted down.

Barry: Would rather the GA hear the Proposal, then amend the Budget afterwards.

Sanda: Clarifying question if her earlier GPUS funds friendly amendment is accepted?

Barry: Clarifying that when GPUS money is IN HAND, it would be used to send CA Delegates to National Meeting.

Concerns / Affirmations

Jane Rands: Affirms line items under IT contribution to OpenSTV of \$50, and a friendly amendment that Green Focus / Platforms cuts can be fixed by pre-purchasing, paying in advance instead of collecting after so these materials are available, and a concern that we consider more funding allocation for Press Secretary compensation and expenses due to it being an election year.

Barry: Were trying to allocate Press / Fundraising according to the committees.

Jane: Funding should be for press releases for this position

Jeanne: Cres was spending ½ his time fundraising, so are showing that split in the budget

And wants clarification of status of Platforms, want to use up what we have first

Shane: Platform is now using supplements so cuts were ok, but a reprint will be needed at some time.

Barry: as we do bring money in, we will prioritize restoring materials that are needed for outreach

Shane: would like for Platform sales to be an item in Clearinghouse.

Warner Bloomberg: 3rd year in row in repeating his concern about the language of budget adoption “note”. Friendly amendment to delete “monthly-pro-rated basis” and simple state, “In the event that the following year FY 2011-12 budget is not passed on time, the GA agrees to automatically extend the allocations in this budget, **“until a new budget is adopted”**”.

The GPUS Delegation changed from 13 to 42 - 4 years ago. We don’t need to keep referring to “from 13 to 42” any longer.

Also, it is reasonable to expect the funding from GPUS, so we should add the \$2500 to the budget NOW. Its unfair for delegates who are required to go and cannot afford it and need to start making reservations to have to wait to make plans contingent on whether the money comes in or not.

Friendly amendment to show the \$3500 in the budget now, and expect \$2500 to come in from GPUS.

Barry: delegates cannot get good travel prices “later”. If we don’t get funding until July, it won’t be available in June. Inclined to believe we will receive the funds, supports Warner’s amendment.

Gloria Purcell (San Mateo) affirms what Warner proposes. Is a matter of timing, and we need to fund our delegates whether we get the funding form GPUS or not. We should find the money some other way if it doesn’t come in.

Barry: for all who are saying we need more funding, then we need locals to participate in fundraising

Sanda: proposal was due to need to compromise, and budget is a “planning” document. Should put line item of \$2500 back in.

Randy Hicks (Sacramento) is concerned that CCWG not getting any funding during election cycle. We will be going up against people who have a lot of money.

Sanda: out of time on this item, but ahead of general schedule time.

Barry: has a lot of experience on Boards working through budgets. Estimates are made, nothing is guaranteed; you make a reasonable guess as to income. If income does not reach expectations then you make adjustments. In light of \$20,000 donation to GPUS. wants to affirm friendly amendment to add in \$2500. If you don’t agree to the amendment, there will be no funds available for delegates. We don’t know the total # of delegates who will need help in any case.

Warner: POINT of PROCESS: practice in the past is to separate out items that have unresolved concerns in order to pass the rest of the budget, then vote on the remaining item(s).

Barry: can we agree to do this? Can we take a vote on budget as presented, then go to amendment as proposed?

Sanda: clarifying we want to test for consensus on entire budget first, then if consensus we would go to the amendment

Matt: why don’t we test for consensus on entire budget, then take a stack on the amendments

Warner: POINT of PROCESS (couldn’t hear him)

Matt: 3 mins left on this item, but have time to spare while GA considers their concerns

Jeanne: accepting as friendly amendments: adding a line item for platform sales, changing wording re adopting new budget, pre-funding of Green Focus. Unresolved about GPUS funding

June Brasher: not clear whether line item is \$1,000 or \$3500 in budget as presented

Barry: is supportive of separating line item out, is clear there are unresolved concerns

Sanda: concern that should review amendment first

June: clarifying that \$1,000 vote first, but will revisit an amend to change to \$3500

Barry: ok with completely taking out the entire line item, lets pass rest of the budget

June: are we agendaizing time afterwards to deal with GPUS line item?

Barry: this vote is for budget without line item

Matt: test for consensus on budget without line item

Warner: (not on mike) has a concern. Not willing to stand aside.

Matt: we have another outstanding concern

June: we don’t have \$3500, will not stand aside to approve budget without this line item

Gloria: can we just do a straw poll?

Clarifying we are voting on entire budget without GPUS line item

(delegates discussing on the floor, not on mike)

Sanda: GPUS actually owes us \$5,000 so \$2500 is reasonable to expect

Are there outstanding concerns with line item of \$3500

Michael Borenstein: concern that we are not funding tabling and registration, but will stand aside.

PASSED BY CONSENSUS

Budget passed (with friendly amend that GPUS line item shows \$3500)

Facilitators: There is time available to discuss 2 out of 5 ballot measures before lunch

J. Proposal: June Ballot Measures

Presenter: Warner Bloomberg, CCWG

The county polling process has been used for around 6 years, was formalized in the bylaws 2 years ago. Info is collected on the measures through CCWG, sent to County Contacts and other lists, reports are supposed to be made and returned. Last 4 county polling processes, 3 have not met quorum. Started in the middle in January. Would like to hear why counties did not report.

10 counties out of 30 reported. 44 votes total

100% NO votes: Prop 16 & 17

No clarifying questions or outstanding concern

CONSENSUS TO TAKE AN OPPOSED POSITION on Propositions 16 & 17

Announcements made and then break for lunch

Saturday Afternoon Session

Same facilitators, note-taker, timekeeper, and vibe-watchers as in morning session.

K. Results from GPUS Delegation Election:

Delegates elected, ranked highest to lowest:

Greg Jan, Jared Laiti, Susan Chunco, Craig Thorsen

Alternates:

Jan Arnold, Mike Chamness

L. Proposal: June Ballot Measures (continued from morning session)

Present by Warner Bloomberg (CCWG)

2 county polling coordinators from CCWG conduct the polling, acknowledges Richard Gomez as the other coordinator (along with Warner), This helps with the work load and accountability.

(note: counties that reported are: Alameda, El Dorado, Fresno, L.A. Orange, San Mateo, Sacramento, Santa Clara, Ventura, Yolo)

For those counties that did not report, it is troublesome that there is no response and takes up general assembly time to review the Measures and make decisions. Requests that the CC do some outreach to the counties to rectify this lack of response.

Prop 14: "Open Primary"

95% of counties reporting are opposed

CLARIFYING QUESTIONS / CONCERNS:

Sanda: be aware of what local politicians are saying

GPCA POSITION OF OPPOSITION TO PROPOSITION 14 PASSED BY CONSENSUS

Warner: Be aware that Independent voters are in support of Prop 14. "Independent Voters of California" were involved in Redistricting, and in support of Prop 14

Prop 15: “Fair Elections Act”

90% of counties reporting support

If it gets more votes than Prop 14, would create a pilot program for public financing for Secretary of State Office 2014 and 2018, after which it sunsets. Requires Greens to get 15,000 signatures with adjoining \$5 donations. Main parties would only need 7,500 signatures. We could get a million dollar grant. If we only collected ½ signatures required of the 2 large parties, (3500) we would still get around a \$300,000 grant which is more than we’ve ever had. There are a lot of details which were described in polling report.

CLARIFYING QUESTIONS / CONCERNS:

Kendra Gonzales (Ventura): grants would be a million for Primary and million and ½ for the general for the 2 large parties, so 2 grants available to 3rd parties as well; not positive on amounts. Also raises lobbyist fees from \$12 to \$200+ per year. Does seem unfair that requirements for signatures are more for 3rd parties, but in helping us actually get elected to office, and from a seat of power we have more of a chance to change these requirements later on.

Jane Rands: changes election code, overturns 1979 law against public financing which allow legislature to implement instead of another initiative process.

Michael Rubin: also tries to reinstate campaign finance limits? Similar to Hancock Bill?

(Warner answering questions off mike)

CONCERNS AND AFFIRMATIONS

[name not recorded]: Also working on local efforts on this. Very important that this beta test is for Secretary of States office for us due to approval of voting machines, ballot access, etc. There is only 1 line in the Secretary of State’s job description about integrity, nothing forbidding conflict of interest issues that should never be allowed in this Office, such as being a campaign manager for a candidate. Affirms and supports this Proposition.

Kendra: also opens public financing for local offices. Public financing has been implemented in 6 or 7 other states. Arizona in particular has all (?) of its constitutional offices using public finance, and many Assembly members.

Barry: strongly supports, has been recipient as a candidate. Will enable us to have a very strong issue to organize around. 111,000 Greens registered?. We can do outreach to Greens about the \$5 donation requirement NOW and ask for commitments regardless of who runs. Let us use the 15,000 signatures requirement (which is unfair) to our advantage to show the “big boys” how much people power we have. We could reach the 10% requirement in 2014 so we only have to get 7500 signatures in 2014.

David Q: we should form a statewide committee to work on getting the \$5 and signatures

GPCA POSITION OF SUPPORT FOR PROPOSITION 15 PASSED BY CONSENSUS

Prop 13 “Tax break for Seismic Retrofits”

Had lowest support response from counties at 73%. Many responded that its confusing. This is a Constitutional Amendment to original Prop 13, to exempt from property reassessment (commercial or residential) if substantial retrofits are for made for earthquake safety. If it fails, then Prop 13 still taxes retrofits as in improvement. New Prop 13 amends that property value will not increase and not be taxed if retrofit relates to earthquake safety.

CLARIFYING QUESTIONS

John Marc (San Francisco County) The sponsor is an extreme conservative. This measure may contain some benefits for big business.

Warner: of course it does, big businesses are taxed more because they are larger and more valuable.

[name not recorded]: In favor it, though big business should never have benefited from original Prop 13.

Is there any provision to be sure that the improvements made have direct connection to earthquake retrofitting?

Warner: assessments are made by local county assessors, there has to be paperwork and inspections. Depends on local protocols.

[name not recorded]: Big businesses might “slide boxes of champagne” under the doors of local inspectors, but if big buildings don’t fall on people, she is happy however retrofitting gets done.

Matt: add 15 mins to this item?. GA Affirms.

Randy Hicks: Passed Legislature with only 14 no votes on both sides of House, in Governors signing message he stated concerned about business interests, but this would help the state finances, and strengthen buildings and make us safer and would amend and improve Prop 13 and property values.

David Kuelen (Orange) who are the residents that will actually benefit vs businesses?. No one has approached him as a home owner about retrofitting. Has there been an analysis as to how this will impact homeowners vs business owners?

CONCERNS / AFFIRMATIONS

Randy Hicks: Supports this measure. There has been analysis done, and in the Bill there will be a commission set up through the Buildings & Trade Industry to make sure that retrofitting is done and done right.

Cres Velucci (Sacramento) this does benefit homeowners, but commercial interests as well just like Prop 13 did. The Measure sounds nice, but it has to. The easiest way to look at Measures as to whether they are good or bad is to look at who is behind them. This is authored by and supported by conservative business interests. This will be another way to take tax money away from the public when its badly needed.

Mato (San Francisco) have to look at this outside the tax issue and look at the geology. It’s a separate issue and not tied it the tax code, is awkward at best to try and verify intentions and purpose of structural work done. Don’t incorporate this through a “Standards” approach.

Gary Blenner (Sacramento) Lets focus on local government, a lot of local revenue comes from local taxes and this Measure will be diverting more money away from local services like schools, police, and fire. Does not support.

Richard Gomez (Fresno) Fresno does not support this proposition. Earthquake retrofits are important but believes the proverbial “champagne under the door” to inspectors will occur.

Dana Silvernale: (Humboldt) did a garage conversion to earthquake retrofit among other upgrades and taxes increased to \$36 dollars a year. Its affordable for homeowners to do this.

Barry: we should do a split roll but this is a public safety issue. In light of recent earthquakes in Haiti and Chile we see what the public cost can be, so its appropriate to support any incentive to businesses to retrofit. Supports this Proposition..

Matt: test for consensus, still unresolved concerns. Warner (presenter) has requested a vote

Matt: choices are YES to support, or NO to oppose meaning NOT a yes position, or Abstain

Took a vote from the floor, results: YES: 10, NO: 22, ABSTAIN: 5

GPCA DID NOT TAKE A POSITION ON PROPOSITION 13

Clarifying question [name not recorded]: Now that we’ve taken these positions, what next?. Does this mean GPCA is included in Ballot Measure or Legislature literature as endorsing or not?. Wants to see a more public visibility of our positions.

M. Election: CC At-Large Candidates and Election Procedure

Presented by Barry Hermanson

At the last general assembly we all voted to change the structure of our CC (Coordinating Committee)

We put out a request for candidates. As of today, Michael Rubin was only one to respond to run for an at-large seat. There really is no need for a formal vote, but would like for Michael Rubin to say a few words as to why he would like to serve. Please consider this type of additional service to the Party. This means participating in a monthly conference call. We need more women and minorities, but we are getting things done, its mostly amicable and a big change from previous Committees.

We are making a renewed effort over the summer to personally contact Greens to consider participating in the CC, really need a wider range of views.

Michael Rubin: Wants to see us re-orient our State Party. Need changes in way we do our Primary, we don't spend enough time on organizing our counties, working on campaigns, and more collaboration between our candidates. Our general assembly needs to focus more outward, like we did today with the Propositions. Registration drive, more outwardly facing party should be our prime focus. Is running as a "revolutionary" in the way our state conducts its business.

Matt: Bylaws require a secret ballot to vote Yes or NO to affirm Michael Rubin as a CC member with a 2/3rds threshold.

Clarifying Questions:

Jim Stauffer: For any candidate from Alameda County, east-bay regional reps – prior conducts has been less than professional. Wants an affirmation that Michael Rubin will not continue the Alameda agenda. Are you supporting the mixed regional/at-large structure or the all at-large structure?

Michael Rubin: has no stake in any battles from the past on the CC, no axe to grind. Not decided on structure.

Inclination is to allow the restructure as is (mixed regional / at-large) to see if it works before considering another change. not aware of newest idea to restructure the CC to all at-large.

Michael Borenstein: wants to affirm that Michael Rubin has a very even hand. There is a 3 county cap, can you help us further the solicitation of more reps?. We have 10 seats to fill.

Michael Rubin: Lets see how I do first!

Adjourned to Break-out Session #1

2 pm

3:20 re-convene

3:30 general assembly adjourned.

Attendees moved to off-site location for Candidates Forum.

Sunday Morning Session

Registration: 27 delegates present

9:13 a.m. – Morning Session Begins

N. Confirmation of Facilitators

Facilitators: Warner Bloomberg, Jane Rands

Timekeeper: Randy Hicks

Vibes Watcher: Gloria Purcell, David Quinley

Notetaker for Sunday sessions: Adrienne Prince

O. Proposal: Platform Planks

Presenter: Shane Que Hee

Plank #1: Human Rights

Reforms were adopted from Cotati suggestions, per underlined sections in Plenary Packet.

GA decides whether or not to adopt Platform items.

Presenter's Question: Are these items appropriate for inclusion in Human Rights, or rather in the Health Care Plank?

Clarifying Questions/Concerns:

Randy Hicks (Sacramento): Does its removal affect the impact of the Human Rights Plank?

Jim Stauffer (Santa Clara): Is it appropriate in the company of things like discrimination, as a Human Right? Much more appropriate to put in Healthcare Plank.

Gloria Purcell (San Mateo): A lot of our planks have overlap. Perhaps it just needs a cross-reference in the Healthcare Plank.

David Keulen (Orange): More appropriate in Healthcare Plank.

Dana St. George (Santa Clara): Can it be in both, somehow? It is a right, to have control over the products of one's body.

Tom Donohue (Santa Clara): This is essentially a privacy issue. This is trying to assert rights of privacy over one's body and genetic material.

Jan Arnold (Alameda): This is about human rights and dignity. Belongs in HR section.

Presenter: There are two issues: Approval of wording, and where does it go?

Consensus met regarding wording.

Proposal: To adopt, in Human Rights section

AJ Del Arringa (Sacramento): I think this is a health issue, not a rights one. Not willing to stand aside.

Michael Rubin (Alameda): I would like to see these planks in both places and to vote for that.

Dana St. George: "Right to liberty and security of person" is too vague. There are so many things that could be expanded into: rights of women in abortion, etc.

Matt Leslie (Orange): Is it possible to have a friendly amendment – in which much of this is moved to Healthcare plank, while creating a reference within Human Rights Plank to Healthcare.

Presenter: Yes, this has been approved already.

Michael Borenstein (Eldorado): Twinkle the idea of cross-notation. Elaborate wording causes the planks to become overlong.

Presenter: Friendly amendment accepted.

Vote: A Yes vote adopts the plank as part of Human Rights Plank in location presented.

Total: 14 Yes, 9 No, 6 Abstentions. NOT APPROVED. 80% approval needed for Platform items.

Item will be re-presented at next plenary, a blending of this item into both planks.

Plank #2: California Elections/Legislature Reforms

New language as outlined.

Concerns/Affirmations:

Peggy Koteen (San Luis Obispo): Happy with these revisions. There is a grammatical concern.

Jim Stauffer (Santa Clara): I submitted my concerns. Too many major topics are thrown into this plank. Each one of those items deserves a plank of its own. Threshold for Proportional Representation is too low, at 1%. We should only state certain potentially detailed issues in theory only. "New America Foundation" was the source of many of these recommendations.

Presenter: This was meant to affect budgetary claims, not to be detailed.

Jan Arnold: Bullet point #2 yes, this should be a simple majority. #10 I have a blocking concern – term limits. They have been tried, and failed. The principle is that the voters should choose to vote outdated reps out.

Presenter: Accepted amendments: #1 Deleted, #2 changed to "simple majority," Delete #9, new wording for #14.

Jim Stauffer: I still have unresolved issues with proposal as stands.

Amended version goes to a vote.

Yes: 14 No: 8 Abstention: 8 NOT APPROVED. 80% threshold not met. Measure fails.

Facilitator (Warner B.) Asks agenda be moved back 15 min. to accommodate today's late start.

Plank #3: California Tax Reform

Presenter conducts a straw poll for concerns on section 1-5 of Tax Reform Proposal.

Clarifying Questions and Concerns, in Reverse Item Order:

#5 Greg Jan (Alameda): Dislikes the use of "Decrements" in title.

Michael Rubin: Objects to carbon taxes that are not "means tested."

Presenter accepts amendment to language.

Dana Silvernale (Humboldt): Consider changes to water taxes. Can try to figure out different wording.

#4 Barry Hermanson (San Francisco): This applies to many planks – Way too much stuff!

Presenter agrees to delete language in 1st sentence to condense.

Sanda Everett (San Mateo): Exemptions for small landlords who aren't realizing a profit. The whole #4 is really unclear.

Presenter asks for alternative language to be submitted.

#3 Sanda Everett: Needs to specifically penalize large profit-driven property owners.

#2 Randy Hicks: I agree about regressive sales taxes, but needs to address more specifically how the income shortfall would be made up.

Peggy Koteen: Delete word "speedy," it doesn't need to be there.

#1 David Keulen: We need less detail, much more general, for public accessibility.

Peggy Koteen: Very wordy and run-on sentences on an already difficult topic. 3rd paragraph especially.

Barry Hermanson: I promise to do some language condensing. I operated a temporary employment service for many years. A tax system based on gross receipts is inaccurate. No one size will fit all in our society.

PROPOSAL WITHDRAWN. Presenter decides to bring item back at another plenary.

Adjourn to Breakout Session #2

11:38 am - GA re-convenes.

P. Proposal: Registration Drive

Co-Presenters: Tim Smith, Michael Borenstein, June Brashares.

A culture of tabling and registration used to exist in the Green Party. 1900 greens were registered in Sonoma county in the year 2000. There is now a big opportunity for Green registration, as voters become disenchanted with Democrat's lack of change. But we have to get out and meet the people. This proposal sets up some incentives.

The original body of the proposal has an amendment by June Brashares. Her amendment changes the prize structure of the incentive, offering counties support to further their drives instead of just providing competitive prizes. Some things could be transportation, child care, refreshments, etc.

Professional signature gatherers can be approached and given incentive to register themselves Green, and register more Green voters.

Clarifying Questions:

Michael Rubin (Alameda): 1. How do professional signature gatherers figure into this? 2. Has thought been given as to using this to support our candidates?

Presenter: 1. Professional signature gatherers are already out there. 2. Yes, this will dovetail into supporting candidates. More Greens registered, more can vote in the primary.

Shane Que Hee (Los Angeles): How does this piggyback into current initiatives being promoted right now? Can you add express wording into this proposal?

Presenter: Certainly, they can fit together very well.

Randy Hicks: How would we report our results?

Presenter: Make a copy of your registrations and turn it into your regional contact.

David Quinley: What is the reason for the 10% number? How to pay registered Greens?

Presenter: Originally the quota number was a goal of 120,000. But since all counties are different, we thought a goal of 10% would be most descriptive. We are not hiring anyone. The prizes will go to most registrations.

Gerry Gras (Santa Clara): Is there a way to prorate the amount of money donated? Can this affect our ballot status?

Concerns/Affirmations:

Jim Stauffer (Santa Clara): We need a good registration drive, but let's do it right. All counties are not the same, they all have different issues. 10% for each county could vary widely. We need a drive that goes through the election season, not just one month.

Presenter: No prizes for the counties, that's the amendment.

Jane Rands (Orange): I'm concerned about how this is written and want it to be administered well.

John-Marc Chandonia (San Francisco): I like this and suggest a friendly amendment – that we only count registrations and not count donations or meeting attendance.

Kendra Gonzales (Ventura) Let's keep it simple until we get it right. This is a great idea and needed. Is this absolutely legal in the election code? (To use prize money as an incentive for signing up people in a particular party.) Remember, we also can't prevent other party registrants.

Woody Hastings (Sonoma): Voter registration combines beautifully with our issues and candidates. A great opportunity to meet people. Is there a way for the funds to be held in trust until the end?

Richard Gomez (Fresno): Affirmation. I used to be a paid signature gatherer. As a professional your responsibility is to make sure the forms are done correctly.

Greg Jan (Alameda): Affirmation, with suggestions. This is a voluntary project for the counties – encouraged but not mandatory. The professional's part of the funding has already been donated by some counties. 50,000 registered voters used to be Greens but aren't anymore. So 10% is modest and very doable. If ½ % of local Greens went out for a couple of hours one or two times then we can make the goal.

Warner Bloomberg (Santa Clara): I don't see why this wasn't presented as a regular proposal, on time and with normal process. Why isn't this just a project of GROW? There are 10 minutes of bring-back time after lunch for us to finish this discussion.

Matt Leslie (Orange): Concern, wondering how we are working with the paid signature gatherers.

Presenters: T.S. It's not against the law for parties to pay gatherers to register people to vote.

M.B. They get paid for registrations for that particular party but they must take registrations for every party and turn them in within 72 hours. Yes, the funds will be held in trust, and actually we should have included a budget proposal rolling this into next year.

J.B.: 10% was to create more equity, and eliminating the cash incentive for counties. The difference is in choosing venues where one is more likely to meet Greens.

Discussion to continue in afternoon session.

Sunday Afternoon Session

1:15 pm

Facilitators: Warner Bloomberg

Q. Consent Calendar Bring-back

Endorsement of Single Payer Campaign - Dana Silvernale presents

A concern was expressed Saturday morning. Concern has been resolved. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

Proposal now says that GPCA shall apply for membership in OneCare state strategy group in support of SB810 (California Single-Payer). Effort is to highlight and include Green Party in California state efforts.

Pause to express appreciation for host and kitchen committee .

R. Registration Drive Proposal

[Continued from morning session]

Presenters will answer concerns, present an amended version and seek consensus.

Who is involved in this? Registered Greens, including paid petition gatherers.

To simplify, extra credit for donors and active new Greens will be rescinded.

Contact Tim Smith to become a local/regional administrator. rioryon@aol.com.

Certain counties have already pledged donations totaling \$1200+. A special account will be administered by GPCA treasurer. They would like GA's permission to do this fundraising.

They will report back on results

Item PASSES BY CONSENSUS

Request to presenters: Provide supplemental information and training for gatherers.

S. Pending Ballot Measures

1:30 pm

Presenter: Bert Heuer, (Contra Costa) co-chair of Green Issues Working Group

1. Marijuana Legalization – change CA law to treat marijuana like alcohol is treated. Gloria Purcell (San Mateo) elaborates. 1 oz possession as legal. Growing would be legal. Even farming as a taxable product. Decriminalization

Clarifying Questions:

Tim Smith – Makes Hemp production possible

Tom Donohue (Santa Clara) – Does that release current nonviolent marijuana offenders?

Gloria P.: No.

Randy Hicks (Sacramento) - What would keep federal government from overriding that?

Gloria P.: This is a direct challenge to the federal law.

Concerns/Affirmations

John-Marc Chandonia (San Francisco) Affirms and asks for a friendly amendment to entire proposal: a Yes for Prop 8 repeal.

Andrea Dorey (Santa Clara): As a medical writer who's never used illegal drugs – affirms.

Shane Que Hee (Los Angeles): Items like this should have been expressly confirmed in platform.

Sanda Everett (San Mateo): This will be a good draw for voter registration.

Randy Hicks – Affirmation. I hope California is up for the fight against federal government.

Item PASSES BY CONSENSUS

2. Parental Notification for Terminating Pregnancy (4 sub-measures with diff. language)

GPCA opposes all parental notification measures.

PASSES BY CONSENSUS.

3. Repeal of Proposition 8, opposing Same-Sex Marriage.

Strikes out male/female exclusivity line in current state law and adds “marriage ... shall not be restricted on basis of...sexual orientation” to current state law.

PASSES BY CONSENSUS.

Adjourn to Breakout Session #3

2:45 pm: Re-Convenc. Breakout session meetings reports:

Kendra Gonzales recaps the CCWG meeting and the burning issue of whether to do a live training or a virtual (webcast) training. The need to archive past candidate information.

Bert Heuer recaps the Green Issues meeting: Working with other project-oriented groups. The specifics of what it would take of launching a project for GIWG. Who does/doesn't speak for the Party? Perhaps keeping in line with the platform would be a good watchword. Mention of social networking. It's easily done, for a person or a candidate to create support pages or videos.

Michael Borenstein introduces the tri-fold customizable flyer.

If your county wants to do a special fundraising mailing. Phone banking, mailing and a split of funds.

Warner Bloomberg – There were surveys sent in the packets about whether California should host a national gathering. Fill one out or send an email.

Kendra Gonzales – I have candidate statements and Fair Elections paperwork.

Shane Que Hee – Bargain-basement platform summaries available.

T. Next General Assembly

Jim Stauffer and Mike Borenstein – soliciting hosts for the next plenary meeting. Late August to mid-September, avoiding Labor Day weekend. Southern or Central California would be best. Sacramento could be a good media opportunity.

U. Reports from Working Groups and Committees:

Bylaws – Michael Borenstein: Bylaws didn't meet.

GROW – Michael Borenstein:

No new coordinators or alts. Could really use some administration and management help. Registration project is their big push. Green Focus will have a new issue before primary. 4th Monday (March 22) 7:30 pm Teleconference.

Electoral Reform Working Group – Tom Donohue reports. Conference call changed to 2nd Sunday of every month 7:30 p.m.

Clean Voting/Fair Elections. Tom will create a flyer and letter to the editor.

Recommend No on 14, Yes on 15. Comments on Supreme Court ruling.

Warner will draft a letter regarding the need for electoral code reform

IRV education will be focused on year 2011 plenaries.

Goal: put together a kit to implement IRV for local elections. Academy Awards use IRV!

Redistricting – keeping up on that process. Group had been selected to run the process. Will Greens be included? Who is on the commission and what are their leanings?

Electronic voting systems

Campaigns and Candidates Working Group – Kendra Gonzales:

Richard Gomez will be co-coordinator.

County polling will be headed by Richard Gomez and Tian Harter.

Finance subcommittee will be John-Marc and Pamela.

Work plan exists.

Great ideas from today's breakout session – filming the candidates, campaign trainings.

Platform – Shane Que Hee:

Work plan updated – more concise language, use of “white papers.”

Bringing in new members and bringing them up to speed.

IT Group – Jim Stauffer

Need coordinators names on groups' web pages. Send your names to it-help@cagreens.org.

Finance Committee – Barry Hermanson:

Local mailing in San Francisco can be duplicated in other counties, if it works out well.

Striving to make it easy to let our membership know we're doing things.

His postcards about healthcare and budget priorities. Offering canvas bags as a premium.

Creating a short local-cable program to promote the Green Party and ask for donations to air this. Could be done at a very reasonable cost. Or have Green voters choose their favorite program.

Finance committee still needs another co-chair.

Clearinghouse (merchandise) – Michael Borenstein:

Please give your opinion about which bumper stickers you prefer. Bookmark templates to choose from, too.

Meeting adjourned with closing ceremony.