

Green Party of California

***DRAFT* Minutes of the General Assembly**

October 10 - 11, 2009
Cotati, Sonoma County

Table of Contents

A. Confirming Facilitators and Agenda	2
B. Approval of Past General Assembly Minutes	2
C. Proposal – Voting Threshold Change.....	2
D. Proposal – Constitutional Convention.....	3
E. GPUS Delegation Report	3
F. Election of GPUS Delegates	4
G. Proposal – Platform Planks	5
H. Proposal – Bylaws, Article 2: Purpose	6
I. Scheduling Next State Meeting.....	7
J. Proposal – CC Restructuring.....	7
K. Report Back on GPUS Delegates Election.....	9
L. New presentation on the Constitutional Convention.....	9
M. Proposal Bring-Back – Bylaws Article 2, Purpose.....	10
N. Working Group and Standing Committee Reports.....	11

Saturday 10/10/09 Morning Session

Accreditation: Barry Hermanson and Joe Feller
Delegate Orientation: Warner Bloomberg

Facilitators: Linda Salas, Will Yeager all day, unless noted
Note takers: Adrienne Prince (am), Kendra Gonzales (pm)
Timekeepers: Shane Que Hee (am/pm)
Vibes: Jane Rands (am), Larry Mullen (pm)

Opening Ceremony:
Tim Morgan honors veterans and war resisters
Tom Bolema plays “The Green Party Blues”

9:15 – New Delegate Orientation (Warner Bloomberg)
9:25 – Clearinghouse Announcement (Michael Borenstein)
9:27 – Platform Comments (Shane Que Hee)
9:28 – Opening Quorum Met; 8 regions present
34 delegates – 28 Decision Quorum

A. Confirming Facilitators and Agenda

Facilitators are confirmed by consensus

Agenda is confirmed by consensus

Peggy Koteen (SLO) expresses a concern about lunch; the menu includes meat. She would like only vegetarian/vegan options to be served at Green Party functions. Some discussion follows: Michael Rubin, Clark Casler, Michael Borenstein, Sanda Everett, Andrea Dorey, Michael Feinstein, Linda Salas. Host committee is represented by Susan Chunco. An alternative option is to offer separate serving areas and utensils for meat and non-meat. It is suggested that CC come up with a policy for future GP events.

B. Approval of Past General Assembly Minutes

Dana Point minutes (May 09): APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

Stand-aside concern: Michael Borenstein - certain places in notes have “holes”

Venice minutes (Aug 08): APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.

Stand-aside concern: Warner Bloomberg - inadequate recording of discussion of restructuring proposal. In this case, summary reports were not enough.

Gloria Purcell: How can we get notes and discussion? Jim Stauffer: Audio recordings are often made, not always possible. Notes are not made by professionals, but members.

C. Proposal – Voting Threshold Change

9: 50 APPROVED BY CONSENSUS. One stand-aside concern:

Greg Jan (Alameda): When a low number of candidates and a low number of seats, the threshold will be relatively high. Extra and tricky math makes the process unfair.

D. Proposal – Constitutional Convention

Michael Feinstein and Warner Bloomberg present

9: 53 APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

MF: Current party rules allows for county polling between plenaries to determine position on qualified ballot measures. Asks to authorize CCWG to poll counties on a ballot measure that is still in the signature gathering phase.

WB: county polling requires official text of proposal, there is a comment period for gathering notes and questions.

Clarifying Questions: Michael Rubin, others [slight disruption due to note taker moving for stack]

Concerns/Affirmations [sketchy – not every speaker, county etc. was able to be noted]

Andrea Dorey: Why is this urgent? Final text is needed or we don't know what is on the books until the end.

Joe Feller: This is urgent because the powers that be behind the constitutional convention are the same people who were behind the deregulation of energy in CA and unseating of Gray Davis. This is a great opportunity for GP to participate in state decision making.

Gloria Purcell: Affirmation: this is a matter of timing.

Will Yeager (Los Angeles) Affirmation: being at the table at the Constitutional Convention is a great opportunity.

Kendra Gonzales (Ventura County): Affirmation: provides a mechanism for county polling.

Breakout Session #1 10:10 until 11:40

Groups meeting: Campaigns and Committees Working Group, Bylaws, Platform, Media

Saturday 10/10/09 Afternoon Session

Facilitators: Will Yeager and Linda Salas

Notes: Kendra Gonzales

Timekeeper: Shane Que Hee

Vibe watcher: Larry Mullen

E. GPUS Delegation Report

12:40 Presenters: Sanda Everett (San Mateo) Barry Hermanson (San Fran), Mike Feinstein

Sanda: National is like a standing general assembly, 24 / 7, 365 days a year. Process is: proposals to Steering Committee who see if properly formatted. Then goes to GPUS for 1 to 4 week discussion, and 1 week voting. Quorum doesn't exist, and votes are simple majority and 2/3rds.

Can view www.gp.org with link to the voting page for proposals to view. www.cagreens.org/delegates

Agendas are usually Bylaws, procedural, and platform, and sometimes issues such as anti-death penalty on national level. Our delegation is around 10 people short.

Barry: attended annual National Meeting in Durham North Carolina at Central North Carolina State Univ. (first state run black college). He was struck in particular by a strategy session of entire group. Need to focus on a few keys areas.

Everyone given 2 post-its to put up on the wall and then gradually consolidated into 3 areas: 1) we are ONLY political party to support single-payer universal healthcare 2) Energy and Water 3) Human Rights / Anti-War. There has been very little movement on the issues due to time consuming fundraising and in-fighting (same as at State level).

Sanda: There is a GPUS meeting every year – with focus every 4 years during a presidential election

Do we want to have 2012 national in California?

Mike: Put 2012 National in California on Agenda for next Plenary. Have organized discussion on what would be involved. National is in dire budget constraints due to 2008 meeting expense. California needs to be able to AFFORD to host 2012. We would probably get the meeting if we want it and push for it. National Bylaws approved every 4 years at convention, BUT there were a lot of people who did not have input and many concerns, so couldn't pass new Bylaws. Common platform for Congressional Candidates needed? There is an IT Advisory Group newly set-up, with a National Web-Master and model we could use for California. National has a lack of clarity on procedural issues. Mike Feinstein wants to help National with lay-out of rules, institutional rigor, and to "clean-house".

Martin Zehr (CA Delegate to National): There is policy development on energy and water in "eco-action committee"

Mike: There are 200 members at National. Need women on outreach – only 2 out of 17. (California CAN have 42 delegates)

(Question from floor) David Quinley (Marin County) State rights vs. Proportional?

Mike: there is a cap at 21% from any State in a National committee, re-appropriation happening soon. 2012 elections are wide open as to whom or how to reach out to potential presidential candidates. GPUS has asked State Parties for names and have sent letters to in the past.

Sanda: GPUS has worked with California on co-fundraising. 60% / 40% split dependent on who does the work. GPUS has asked us to give back \$2200, does this undermine the rights / intentions of California donors?

Mike: We need a functioning database county and state level. National had a very bad experience with a database with Democracy in Action as a host. If we use a good database, all levels could access donations, office holders, etc. Do we want to piggy-back?. GPUS pays \$500 a month for this database which we could consider as an asset that GPUS provides us when weighing sending the \$2200 back to GPUS.

(Question from Floor) Gloria Purcell: Need input from treasurer on how – proposal for next Plenary?

Sanda: GPUS is paying for this database, and for Empower , so they are doing things for us. We could also give less than 40% back.

Mike: Some states don't even have phone #s, but California does, so makes sense to use voter database.

(Question from Floor) Mike Borenstein: Do we get our lists back that we send to GPUS?

Mike: Use of National Voting Page existing software has some bugs – we are working on it, but funding has run out to pay for this research. It would be very easy to use County Polling. Need to ask Susan how much?. Not more than \$1,000.

Barry: single-payer healthcare is such a major issue and we do have consensus on it single payer / universal. Don Beckler is building a database now for a probable future Single-Payer Initiative. Everyone should get onto the list by filling out a postcard and get onto that database.

Martin Zehr: Resolution 380 established a National priority on water management and planning, consensus was reached.

F. Election of GPUS Delegates

[see "Report Back on GPUS Delegates Election" on page 9 for election results]

15 openings and many alternates

8 candidate bios have been posted for review.

Delegate Candidates:

Lisa Green; Derek Iverson; Wendy Kenin; Drew Johnson

Delegate Candidate Alternates:

Genevieve Marcus; Tim Casebolt; Josefina Aranda; Cynthia Santiago,

Mike Feinstein: talked about 3 new Greens who are very active and that he supports.

(Concern from Floor) Will Yeager: troubled that we would put new unknown Greens who do not have a local connection to represent us nationally.

Mike Feinstein: new Greens would not function in a vacuum – there are regular conference calls among delegates.

(Concern from Floor) Jim Stauffer: Concerns about Drew Johnson’s disruptive behavior at all levels.

(Concern from Floor) Mike Borenstein: is concerned that L.A. reps who are willing to boycott a State Plenary should be supported in going to National.

Barry Hermanson: civility is an issue at all levels. We seem to love to argue. Too much time spent on the 2% of things we disagree on.

Sanda Everett: since California has only 13 out of 42 delegates allowed, (15 out of 50 really) every little requirement to be a delegate is sometimes overlooked. There is very little in-fighting within the California Delegation.

Mike Feinstein: Bylaws give pretty broad powers to delegation. We can send a link around counties as to how delegates are voting. We can also review the proposals going before National and weigh-in.

(Concern from Floor) Ginger S. (Sonoma) Too much email time spent on personal debate and heated discussion and particular people behaving this way is a negative and detracts, so we might not want to just go for “warm bodies”.

Warner Bloomberg: Delegation can vote with an 80% threshold after consideration of problems with a particular delegate and so remove them.

Secret ballot taken for 4 GPUS delegates and 4 alternates. Outcome to be relayed later in the afternoon.

G. Proposal – Platform Planks

(2:10) Presenters: Martin Zehr and Shane Que Hee

Water plank – APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

Criminal Justice plank – APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

Electoral Reform plank – WITHDRAWN

[Final approved language is online at www.cagreens.org/platform.]

Martin Zehr presented on Water (too much detail info to take notes here)

Went thru sections 1 through 36 with some changes and friendly amendments, PASSED BY CONSENSUS

Shane Que Hee presented on Criminal Justice.

Went through sections 1 through 27 with some changes and friendly amendments, PASSED BY CONSENSUS

Shane proposed to pull 3rd plank on Electoral Reform due to time constraints and has already had a lot of feedback.

(3:15) Breakout Session #2: CCWG, GROW, Green Issues

4:45 Adjourn

Sunday 10/11/09 Morning Session

Accreditation: Barry Hermanson and Joe Feller

Facilitators: Warner Bloomberg, Jane Rands (am); Warner Bloomberg, Gloria Purcell (pm)

Note takers: Adrienne Prince (am), Kendra Gonzales (am), Steve Devereaux (pm)

Timekeepers: Shane Que Hee

Vibes: Daniel Alavi, Gloria Purcell

Announcements – Housekeeping, Condolences to Barry Hermanson, Green Social Profit, Green Focus

9:20 Confirm Facilitation Team

9:35 Agenda change: Afternoon presentation of Restructuring Proposal could leave us with not enough delegates for quorum. After a delegate count, it is ascertained that this afternoon's proposal will be switched with the morning break-out session.

H. Proposal – Bylaws, Article 2: Purpose

9:45 presented by Michael Borenstein and Tim Morgan

[see "Proposal Bring-Back – Bylaws Article 2, Purpose" on page 10 for final text]

Edits were presented; some of wording, some of grammar. Intention was to create a cleaner version.

Clarifying Questions:

- Greg Jan (Alameda) 1. Were the only changes the grammar and word exchanges? YES.
2. Could the last sentence add the word "justice?" PUT TO CONCERNS.

Concerns/Affirmations:

Linda Salas (Riverside) In the last sentence it reads "We act in coalition with other organizations." That seems overly broad, and it would be helpful to be more definitive to modify the word, "organizations" to mean "like-minded" or something more specific. WILL CONSIDER

Bob Scofield (Yolo): The term "environmentally balanced" is too vague. "Environmental protection" would have more muscle. WILL CONSIDER.

Peggy Koteen (SLO): Good job on revisions. Some concerns about word "balance" and the limitation of the parties listed as "Democratic and Republican." "Into society at large" could be modified to "into society" or "into society as a whole."

Tim Leman (Contra Costa): Change "we commit to engage the electoral process" to "we engage the electoral process." Lists other examples of needed dynamic use of language. WILL CONSIDER

Dorothy Kemeny (Los Angeles): Is "human rights" inclusive of "justice?" Were the last 4 things reaffirming the 4 Pillars? Suggests "We affirm our electoral activities as part of a larger social movement...stewardship...and act in coalition..."

OK to LIKE MINDED; OK TO JUSTICE: SWITCH BALANCE TO PROTECTION

Gloria Purcell (San Mateo): Prefers "We hold in common" to "We are guided by" but it's just as a personal preference! I was on the original bylaws committee in 1992 and even then it was hard to agree on language. (17 Great Years later!)

Jim Stauffer (Santa Clara): Here's an example of editing by committee! Submit comments ahead of time is more efficient than by stack. Please consider this, so the presenters could make these changes ahead

Maxine Daniel (Alameda): Troubling to me that we even mention the Dems and Repugs by name. Keep them as "traditionally entrenched parties and others."

Tim Laidman (Contra Costa): Put "Unifying" in front of "10 Key Values."

OK TO TRADITIONALLY ENTRENCHED PARTIES, OK TO OTHER CHANGES.

Jim Stauffer: (Santa Clara) an unresolved concern that will not stand aside.

Authors will present changes in first 10 minutes after lunch. Further concerns can be given to authors during lunch.

I. Scheduling Next State Meeting

10:03 Michael Borenstein – What local organization would like to host the next plenary? For Spring, 2010 – a large gathering.

Linda Salas – Could consider Palm Springs area but would need to research cost for that time of year and vet with her local county council.

Greg Jan (Alameda) – During an election year, please consider never have plenaries in the month before an election – please have it in early April or even before.

Michael Borenstein – also need to consider Earth Day events

Will Yeager – Suggests Venice in as early as February – alternate Plenaries with gatherings to get workshops and work/writing done.

David (Marin) – A gathering in Marin County could work. This October plenary we are at is interfering with some November elections where he lives. Affirms Greg Jan's assertion

Tim Laidman (Contra Costa) – An impromptu offer from Contra Costa county.

Jim Stauffer – we generally try to alternate north/south when possible.

Michael Borenstein – Shasta County local has made a firm offer for a springtime plenary in 2010 or 2011. Gaia is an amazing local hotel with great green practices and values, meeting rooms. Everything would be on site.

Peggy Koteen – Are we due for a Southern then?

Bill Myers (Mendocino) – Shasta would be OK in May or June. It is rainy on the coast in the early spring. Southern would be better.

Greg Jan – Concerned that a Shasta plenary would be expensive; this plenary's \$45 charge should be the highest charged for a while. Lodging costs are a concern as well.

David Quinley – A new location like Shasta would be nice, even though I probably couldn't afford to go.

Gloria Purcell – Any place we are considering, Palm Springs for instance, also pricy. Going to these places off season is the key to saving money.

Will Yeager – Venice had a youth hostel nearby. LA would be warmer than other options. Riverside would be nice if Linda and Riverside Greens. Venice had good LAX transportation. The cost of renting the hall contributes to a higher per delegate cost.

Sanda Everett (San Mateo) - OK for CC to make decision. Hotel in Shasta sounds good but a little inaccessible for a budget plenary. Venice or Palm Springs would be a better choice. Live Streaming our plenaries could make participation a reality even if folks can't attend.

Greg Jan – I want to see a definite commitment that next plenary won't be in May.

J. Proposal – CC Restructuring

10:30am Presenters: Ad-hoc committee, Barry Hermanson was to present, but due to family emergency is not present. Bill Meyers acting as overview presenter.

At last Plenary, an ad-hoc committee was formed to review 3 different proposals for restructuring of the State Coordinating Committee.

An addendum was handed out Sunday morning with some changes to the proposal that was in the Agenda.

Bill did an overview of the proposal:

The CC shall consist of 26 seats with 2-year terms:

- 12 seats shall be elected from regions—one from each region, except Central Valley gets two due to its size.
- 14 seats shall be elected at-large by proportional representation (STV) online voting. Seats will have staggered terms so that half of the seats are elected each year.

The CC quorum shall be 50% plus one of the seated members, and if more than half of the allocated seats are empty, then this must be reported to the counties/GA.

At-large seats are capped at three per county. With a regional rep, that sets a limit of four CC members from a single county.

ANSWERS TO CLARIFYING QUESTIONS

In the 2 year trial period, there will be reporting back to GA by the CC as to the progress of this trial Restructuring. The Plenary will be where major structural changes are debated and approved or not, the minor details will be worked out by the Ad-Hoc Committee.

Current terms will not be affected.

Regional seats: keep same regions and reps, except each regional has only 1 member (except Central which will have 2 due to large size). Regions may use their existing local procedures for the regional seat election, but, where needed, they must be modified for a single-seat election.

[Review comments added by presenters]

The committee discussed an issue about whether or not existing regional reps should be replaced commensurate with the new at-large election. The committee did not reach a decision on this issue so the existing terms are not affected by this proposal. However, the committee did agree that the existing automatic extension for regional seat terms will not be continued.

At Large reps: all candidates will submit bios and be questioned at next Plenary. 2 weeks after, there will be on-line voting. Basic voting page using same software as GPUS delegate voting. This is modeled after county polling. Anyone can run for an at-large, keeping the cap in mind of 3 total allowed to be elected from any county.

The IT group will work with the ERWG and CC and others on electoral on-line voting processes.

On-line works well at National level. On-line is more democratic due to possibility of less reps being able to attend Plenaries.

Term limits: Are not in this proposal so there are no term limits as of yet.

CONCERNS AND AFFIRMATIONS (EACH ITEM)

1. "The CC shall consist of 26 seats. Twelve Seats shall be elected from regions, and 14 seats shall be elected at-large by proportional representation (STV) online voting"

(Concern from Floor) David Quinley: what about alternates?

For this trial it would remain the same for regional reps. No alternates for At Large. Hopefully there will be more than enough members of the CC to function.

(Concern from Floor) Scott Hann from Contra Costa: how would at large candidates campaign?

They may already be well known from their on-line presence or at from plenaries. Its up to the candidates. Bios will be in agenda packets and Q & A on-line, and at plenaries.

2. "Quorum needs a lower limit for attendance, below which the CC cannot make decisions".

Sanda Everett (San Mateo): However CC does things, National follows. So, this will change National, who have not been able to achieve quorum at the national meetings, since changed to 42 delegates. GPUS continues the vote on-line until quorum is reached.

The CC has a unique quorum process. By dropping quorum to 50% it red flags participation issues to the GA.

3. "County Caps – we propose that 3 at-large CC members from any individual county be the maximum allowed a County".

No concerns from the floor on #3

Unresolved Concerns on the three items:

Andria Dorey (Santa Clara): worried about balance between urban and rural and whether this proposal addresses this. Rural areas are not as "on-line", seniors not as computer savvy re on-line voting. Training? WILL STAND ASIDE.

TEST FOR CONSENSUS ALL 3 ITEMS: PASSED

Jim Stauffer: need to go over small detail administrative items and test for concerns:

(Note: The item letters below refer to lettered items in the proposal on page 24 of Proposal Agenda Packet.)

CC Composition Items B & D: NO UNRESOLVED CONCERNS

Regional Elections item G:

Mike Feinstein: states that in first years of GPCA, regional seats were elected by the General Assembly and believes they should be again, as the best approach to inconsistent process and vote verification with regional election and resultant disputes over representation.

Jim S: there will be standardized processes put in place.

Item G PASSED.

Items I, K, L, and N passed with NO OUTSTANDING CONCERNS

CONCERNS, AND AFFIRMATIONS IN GENERAL

(concern from Floor) Dorothy Kemeny (L.A.): What about no internet access voters? Can we offer voting by mail?

Jim Stauffer: One person in the county will submit the votes, voting can be offered in many different ways and the Committee will assure everyone has access to voting

(Concern from Floor) Clark (Orange County): wants to make sure that voting will be accessible to everyone.

Jim Stauffer: the internal voting process is up to each county, the actual vote on an item by the council member can be done on-line.

(Affirmation from Floor) Michael Borenstein: GROW and Green Issues are addressing computer access issue.

Jim Stauffer: Bylaws were written before internet. Problem sometimes is that regions that are also an entire county, have very large locals. So, online easier accessibility might enable a very large voting bloc.

Jim will be bringing a proposal to address this at the next Plenary (possibly).

(Affirmation from Floor) Larry Mullen: This is a great compromise. Not all seats are filled. Some balance needed to be struck and seems to have been. We need as many as 24 so that members are not wearing so many different hats. Main function is to put on Plenaries and we need people to do that, so we need people to actually run and fill the CC seats.

(Affirmation from Floor) Greg Jan: Hope this beginning of climb back to activity. Have to compromise when are diverse people with diverse interests.

Michael Borenstein: reminder that there are open seats for Standing Committees

WITH NO OUTSTANDING CONCERNS THE CC ELECTION METHOD PROPOSAL PASSED BY CONSENSUS.

K. Report Back on GPUS Delegates Election

[from Election of GPUS Delegates on page 2]

Delegates: 3 out of 4 elected – Lisa Green, Derek Iverson and Wendy Kenin

All 4 alternates elected – Genevieve Marcus, Tim Casebolt, Josefina Aranda and Cynthia Santiago

Have now filled 32 out of 42 delegates allowed

L. New presentation on the Constitutional Convention

Mike Feinstein (see “Proposal – Constitutional Convention” on pg. 2)

There is a 6 or 7 month process around state for 2 ballot measures:

1. Measure would amend the state Constitution to allow the PEOPLE of the state the ballot to call for a Constitutional Convention, and the 2nd Measure specifically calls for a Constitutional Convention. (amends constitution)

Some questions now are: Who gets to be a delegate?, What is the scope of the Convention?

2. Models are currently being considered:

A “Citizens Assembly” model would be drawn at large from the diverse background across the state (500) instead of the political class.

10 months process – 1st couple of months spent on public education about the general concepts

Then consideration of all the proposals and how to pass them

2 months in the field public hearings

Last months hammering out what proposals will be voted on

The other model is a “political appointee: wherein county supervisors appoint 5 people who then appoint the delegates.

These 2 models have created tensions within the group – can we submit both models to Atty General now? Seems like political appointee model is getting pushed harder.

Mike Feinstein and Steven Hill have been pushing for both models.

The delegates of the convention shall consider specific questions including proportional representation.

GP should probably back citizens model and not the other – but at least submit both

If the SF Bay Council submits the appointee model, then GP could file other model which would be then at least be on public record and usable.

The Convention is NOT a push by corporate America to de-regulate.

Go to www.repairCalifornia.org to weigh-in FOR “Citizens Assembly” model

M. Proposal Bring-Back – Bylaws Article 2, Purpose

[see “Proposal – Bylaws, Article 2: Purpose” on pg. 6]

Tim Morgan and Michael Borenstein made the changes suggested by the floor:

The Green Party of California is guided by its Platform and the “Ten Key Values” of the Green Movement: Ecological Wisdom, Grassroots Democracy, Social Justice, Nonviolence, Decentralization, Community Based Economics, Feminism, Respect for Diversity, Personal and Global Responsibility, and Sustainability.

As the political expression of California’s Green movement, we provide an electoral alternative competing directly with traditionally entrenched parties and others for elected office.

We engage in the electoral process in order to incorporate our values into the policies, laws and activities of local, state and national government, and into society as a whole. We affirm these electoral activities and act on this in coalition with other likeminded organizations as part of a larger social movement for world-wide peace, democracy, justice and environmental wisdom.

NO UNRESOLVED CONCERNS – PASSED BY CONSENSUS.

Sunday 10/11/09 Afternoon Session

N. Working Group and Standing Committee Reports

Electoral Reform Working Group - Jane Rands, Orange Co.

Need volunteers for the Coordinating Committee.

Electoral Reform Group will meet 10/18/09 at 7:30 PM.

Goals:

- Focus on June ballot items: California Clean Money Campaign, Open Primary Initiative.
- Focusing on education: Single Transfer Voting. Want to be able to clearly explain how it works.

Campaign and Candidates Working Group - Warner Bloomberg, Santa Clara Co.

(substituting for Kendra Gonzales, Ventura Co.)

Looking for a second coordinator for the working group.

Goals:

- Determine what Green candidates are running for offices, and recruit candidates for statewide 2010 elections.
- Discuss how to poll counties on state initiatives. Create a web page that tallies and displays votes as they are collected.
- Come up with recommendations for funding candidates. Pass on recommendations to the Campaign Funding Support Committee.

Bylaws, GROW, Clearinghouse - Michael Borenstein, El Dorado Co.

Too many vacant seats on the Bylaws Committee. Need to recruit more members.

Developing a new Strategy for GROW

- Focus on creating a better web presence.
- Create liaisons with County Councils. Mail a letter to each County Council requesting a liaison. Plan to provide help for people running for County Councils.
- Deploy a group to gather signatures for candidates so they can avoid registration fees.

Have monthly phone conference meetings. Will have a committee meeting in February/March.

Finance Committee - Gloria Purcell, San Mateo County

(Note: all standing members of the Finance Committee had to leave early, so non-members met and Gloria spoke for them).

Discussed terms of committee members and fundraising issues. Two people would like to join the committee: Bill Meyers (Mendocino County) and Will Yeager (Venice County). Michael Borenstein will present these candidates at the November Finance Committee meeting.

Green Issues Working Group - Will Yeager, Venice Co.; Hally DeCarion, Sonoma Co.; Clark Casler, Orange Co.

Focus on:

- Website development - Bert Heuer,
- Water issues - Wes Rolley, Santa Clara Co.
- Organic gardening and biking - Will Yeager
- Generating interest among Spanish-speaking people. Provide written content in Spanish, and attend events in Spanish-speaking communities.

New Co-co's affirmed at the General Assembly by consensus:

Bert Heuer - Co-Coordinator; Halley DeCarion (Sonoma), Clark Castle (Orange), and Dorothy Kemeny (Los Angeles) - Alternate Coordinators

Statement by Attendee (No WG represented) - Peter Alexander

Green Party needs to work with the California migrant community and farmers. Create agriculture cooperatives to put people to work.

IT/Clearinghouse - Michael Borenstein, El Dorado Co.

The working group did not meet at the General Assembly, but they plan to meet soon. For more information and/or materials, contact Michael Borenstein.

Closing Ceremony

Friendship Circle - Tim Morgan, Sonoma Co.

Attendees formed a large circle in the meeting room, and Tim shared message from Barry Hermanson, Green Party candidate for Congress from San Mateo Co. Barry really felt good about what was accomplished at the meeting, and he said it is a good sign that the GPCA is on the rise again. Tim thanked all who attended.

NOTE: Photos taken by Tim Morgan at the Saturday night bonfire can be viewed at

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/blackcloudbrew/sets/72157622574856044/>