

GPCA Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday Sept 9, 2019 7:30 to 9:30pm

(01) Roll Call: (5 min)

There are currently 20 committee members. This means quorum is a simple majority of 11.

Coordinating Committee Members:

Victoria Ashley, Doug Barnett, Marla Bernstein, Carol Bouldin, June Brashares, Eric Brooks, Mica Daniel (Alternate Female Co-Co), Melissa Guevara, Sadie Fulton, Colt Gonzales, Josh Jones, Tarik Kanaana, James Lauderdale, Ann Menasche, Mimi Newton (Female Co-Coordinator), Nassim Nouri, Christine Pepin, Shannel Pittman, Audra Walton, Laura Wells

Present (12): Carol A. Bouldin, June Brashares, Eric Brooks, Mica Daniel, Colt Gonzalez, Jim Lauderdale, Mimi Newton, Nassim Nouri, Christine Pepin, Shannel Pittman, Audra Walton, and Laura Wells. Quorum reached when Colt Gonzalez joined the call at 8:02 p.m. Audra joined shortly thereafter.

Absent (8): Victoria Ashley, Doug Barnett, Marla Bernstein, Sadie Fulton, Melissa Guevara, Josh Jones, Tarik Kanaana, and Ann Menasche.

(02) Roles – Mimi facilitator; Carol notetaker; Jim vibes watcher; Christine timekeeper.

(03) Decision: *Proposal*: Approve the Agenda Draft #2 sent by Mimi Newton at 7:20 pm on 9/9/19. (5 minutes)

Agenda approved by consensus.

Late Agenda items approved by consensus, with time sensitive issues placed ahead of other items, as reflected in the minutes below.

(04) Decision: Approval of prior months Minutes - August 5, 2019 (4 minutes)

August 5, 2019 minutes posted by Eric Brooks, San Francisco County, on August 26 , 2019 at 2:23pm approved by consensus.

(05) Decision: Consent Items:

***Proposal*: Accept the following committee reports for inclusion into the meeting minute.**

Background and Purpose: The consent calendar is intended to pass non-controversial items or items consented prior to the actual meeting. Any item may be objected to and that item will be placed at the end of the evening's agenda.

Finance Committee - Appendix A

Joint Clearinghouse/GROW Report - Appendix C

- one concern (?) was raised regarding Appendix A, the Finance Committee Report and that the CC is not receiving financial reports in a timely manner.

IT and CCWG have not yet submitted reports. Audra stated she would submit the IT report tomorrow and Shannel said she would submit the CCWG report by Wednesday.

Note: The it report from august 2019 is included below at appendix d, [version sent by Audra to the CC on 9/10/19 at 8:18 pm], and the CCWG report from august 2019 is included below at appendix e [version sent by Shannel to the CC on 10/07/19 at 7:41 pm].

Consent items approved by Consensus.

(06) Agenda Item for 9/9/19 CC meeting (Decision: GA location)

Title: Date and location of the next GPCA General Assembly: Fresno County (time requested 10 min)

Sponsor: Tarik Kanaana.

Background: At the May GA in San Francisco, LA county was chosen as the location for the next GA. December 7&8 being the first choice of dates and November 23&24 being the 2nd choice. Since that time the LA county council has decided against hosting the GA and Fresno county has agreed to host instead. This location was previously rejected by the CC with the hope of finding a better location but this did not happen.

Proposal: The next GPCA General Assembly will be held in Fresno county with December 7&8 being the first choice of dates and November 23&24 being the 2nd choice.

Implementation and Timeline: After the proposal is approved the GA Planning committee will prepare and send out an announcement to this effect and requesting agenda items and giving any additional available information.

- Fresno County - June reported that Tarik told her that Orange County has not followed through on taking the necessary steps to host the next GA and that Fresno is the only county which has offered to host, though they do not yet have a venue. Discussion regarding location –
- Nassim and Shannel both raised concerns. Nassim's concern was Fresno will again be a central CA location which makes it difficult for many SoCal and LA Greens to participate, and that GPCA GAs are currently not following our convention of switching between northern and southern CA.
- Shannel's concern was having the GA in Fresno would require taking valuable time off from political campaigns to travel from L.A. to Fresno when they are running up against filing deadlines, etc.
- Nassim - willing to stand aside with her concerns;
- Shannel also willing to stand aside.

Proposal to proceed with Fresno as the location of the GA passed by consensus.

(07) WITHDRAWN BY TARIK - See email dated 9/9/19 at 6:33 pm

(07) LATE ITEMS:

Late item (07A) - Decision: Reaffirming the vote on the Proposal for managing the reduction in GPUS delegation numbers vote started on August 16th, 2019.

Co-sponsors: June Brashares and Tarik Kanaana

Background: On August 16th a 7 day vote was started for a proposal to manage the reduction in GPUS delegation numbers. The proposal passed with 17 Yes and 0 No.

The Coordinating Committee Internal Processes do not provide for a 7 day vote with no discussion period and so we propose that we reconfirm the vote on this call.

Proposal: The CC reaffirms the vote that started on the CC email list on 8/16 and ended on 8/23. The proposal that was voted on follows.

Title: Bylaws Interpretation regarding reducing California's number of delegates and alternates to the GPUS National Committee (NC).

Sponsor: Sadie Fulton

Background: Section 13-3 Bylaws Interpretation: “...Between General Assembly meetings, the Coordinating Committee shall decide these questions...Such Coordinating Committee determinations are subject to a 2/3 confirmation by the General Assembly...”

Proposal: That the Coordinating Committee approve the following bylaws interpretation:

As a result of the reapportionment of state delegates to the NC that was approved on 07/21/2019

(<http://green.gpus.org/cgi-bin/vote/propdetail?pid=963>) the number of delegates and the number of alternate delegates from GPCA has been reduced from 25 to 17 each effective [Monday 9/23/2019](#). Our bylaws do not address this situation.

Therefore, the CC directs the delegation to follow the process described below to achieve this reduction.

1. The 2018-2020 term is reduced to 8 delegates and 9 alternates and the 2019-2021 term is reduced to 9 delegates and 8 alternates.
2. Assuming all seats on the delegation to be full, the four candidates having scored lowest in the Ranked Choice Vote elections for delegate seats in each of 2018 and 2019 will be removed as delegates, and added as alternate delegates, for the duration of their terms. If some delegates have resigned (as is the case for the 2018-2020 term), the delegate reduction will only be as needed to reduce the number of delegates to the maximum for that term.
3. The number of alternate delegates for each of the terms will be reduced in a similar manner, taking into consideration those who were added in the previous step.
4. Any members of the delegation (delegates and alternates) who have lost their seats due to this process will remain full members of the delegation. While these “observers” will not be able to participate in the National Committee, they will be able to participate in internal delegation matters (e.g. appointments to GPUS committees or serve as Co-coordinators.)

To summarize:

	Current allocation	Current filled seats	Added	New allocation	Removed
2018-2020 delegation	12	10 (2 seats vacant)	0	8	2
2019-2021 delegation	13	13	0	9	4
2018-2020 alternates	13	11	2	9	4
2019-2021 alternates	12	8 (5 seats vacant)	4	8	4
2018-2020 observers	0	0	4		
2019-2021 observers	0	0	4		

No concerns voiced. Item approved by consensus.

Late item (07B) Decision Item: GPCA registration deadline for 2020 County Council elections

Sponsor: June Brashares

Background and Purpose: Whereas, SOS Liaison Jared Laiti has forwarded requests to the CC from County Registrar of Voters asking the length of time our party requires a candidate must be Green to be eligible to run for a county council seat and the length of time a candidate must not be affiliated with a different political party; and

Whereas, CA Election Code (Section 8001c) gives the GPCA the ability to set the date by which one must be registered Green in order to run for County Council; and

Whereas, the GPCA Bylaws (in Article 6-2 which governs County Council elections) state:

“6-2.1 ... Only those legally registered to vote in California as members of the Green Party are eligible to be elected.

6-2.4 ... the name of each candidate for member of County Councils shall appear on the ballot only if she or he is registered in the Green Party”

and the GPCA Bylaws don't have additional requirements of a length of time that the candidate must have been registered Green or a length of time to not have been registered in another political party; and

Whereas, in November 2015, the GPCA Standing General Assembly (SGA) approved a proposal <http://sga.cagreens.org/vote/irvdetail?pid=71> to add the following sentence to GPCA bylaws for the GPCA 2016 County Council elections

"6-2.1(a) To be eligible to be elected, one must be registered Green no later than three months before filing their declaration of candidacy for County Council.”

Now, therefore, the Coordinating Committee interprets the Bylaws that for the 2020 County Council elections:

the name of each candidate for member of a county council shall appear on the ballot only if the candidate was registered Green no later than three months before filing their declaration of candidacy for County Council, and was not registered in another political party within three months before filing their declaration of candidacy for County Council, unless a candidate is in County where the County Council establishes a different length of time that a candidate for membership on their County Council must be registered Green or must not have been registered as affiliated with a qualified political party other than the Green Party.

And furthermore, the CC authorizes SOS Liaison Jared Laiti to utilize the above CC determination to respond to relevant inquiries from any County Registrar of Voters and/or the SOS and/or Green Party County Councils, and/or others.

Proposal: The CC approve the above.

Implementation/Timeline/Resources:

A member of the CC needs to inform SOS Liaison Jared Laiti of the CC decision.

Upon CC approval, if necessary this item would be forwarded immediately to the SGA for confirmation (for it to be included in the SGA starting on Sept 9th).

References:

[Elections Code 8001\(c\)](#):

(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), a county central committee, subject to the bylaws of the state central committee, may establish the length of time that a candidate for membership on that committee must be shown by his or her affidavit of registration to be affiliated with the political party of that committee, and may establish the length of time that a candidate for membership on that committee must not have been registered as affiliated with a qualified political party other than the political party of that committee.

GPCA Bylaws (see Article 6) <http://www.cagreens.org/bylaws/06-24-2019>

GPCA SGA proposal #71 from November 2015: <http://sga.cagreens.org/vote/irvdetail?pid=71>

GPCA registration deadline for 2020 county council elections –

June provided the CC with information about prior decisions about how long one has to be registered Green in order to run for a county council seat. The CC can set the rules on what county councils would have to follow. She provided info about how the SGA has voted on this 4 years ago such that a candidate had to be a Green for 3 months and couldn't have been in another party for 3 months.

Approved by consensus.

Late item (07C) - [Was Late Item (13)] - Subject: Decision Item: (5 mins.) Confirm size and length of registration requirements for County Council of Orange County to the Orange County Registrar of Voters

Sponsor: Mimi Newton, Marin County

Background and Purpose:

The Orange County Registrar of Voters posed the following questions to the Orange County Greens, which Jane Rands, GPOC, Treasurer and County Council-member forwarded to GPCA SOS Liaison Jared Laiti in mid-August:

- 1) How many County Council Candidates will be in the ballot?
- 2) What are the qualifications for County Council Candidates? The ROV is requesting the party registration criteria - how long must a candidate have been registered Green to qualify.

Tarik Kanaana has been gracious enough to research the question and provided the following information:

Orange county has 4,823 registered greens which is 5.4% of statewide greens which rounds of to 5 so by 6-1.5 and 6-1.5(a) the number is 7 .

The length of Green registration requirement is based on California Elections Code section 8001 (http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=ELEC&division=8.&title=&part=1.&chapter=1.&article=1.), which says Three months Green twelve months no other party, and it also gives the county council (they use central committee) has the option of changing that requirement in their bylaws. The Orange county bylaws that we have on file <http://www.cagreens.org/sites/cagreens.huang.radicaldesigns.org/files/uploads/documents/orange%20bylaws.pdf>

Proposal: That the GPCA Co-coordinator Confirm in an e-mail to Jared Laiti, with a request that he confirm the same to Jane Rands with Orange County ASAP, the following answers to the Registrar of Voters' Questions:

- 1) How many County Council Candidates will be in the ballot? Answer: 7
- 2) What are the qualifications for County Council Candidates? The ROV is requesting the party registration criteria - how long must a candidate have been registered Green to qualify.

Answer: Candidates must have at been registered as a Green for at least the last three months and for at least the last 3 months registered with no other party.

Implementation/Timeline/Resources: As soon as possible.

References:

- Email message dated Aug 15, 2019 at 7:04 AM from Tarik Kanaana;
- California Elections Code sections:

7905. A person shall not be appointed to membership on a county council who is registered as preferring another party or registered as "No Party Preference." Appointment of other persons who cannot register to vote shall be allowed under certain circumstances as described in state Green Party bylaws and any applicable county Green Party bylaws.

7907. A member of a county council who changes her or his voter registration to no longer prefer the Green Party shall automatically be removed from office upon such registration.

7914. In each county, the name of each candidate for member of a county council shall appear on the ballot only if she or he is registered as preferring the Green Party and has filed a nomination paper pursuant to Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 6850) of Part 1 of Division 6, signed on the candidate's behalf by Green Party voters of the county council election district in which she or he is a candidate.

7915. In counties where members of county councils are to be elected by district, a person seeking election as a member of a county council may seek election only in the district in which she or he resides.

8001.

(a) No declaration of candidacy for a partisan office or for membership on a county central committee shall be filed by a candidate unless (1) at the time of presentation of the declaration and continuously for not less than three months immediately prior to that time, or for as long as he or she has been eligible to register to vote in the state, the candidate is shown by his or her affidavit of registration to be affiliated with the political party the nomination of which he or she seeks, and (2) the candidate has not been registered as affiliated with a qualified political party other than that political party the nomination of which he or she seeks within 12 months, or, in the case of an election governed by Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 10700) of Part 6 of Division 10, within three months immediately prior to the filing of the declaration.

(b) The elections official shall attach a certificate to the declaration of candidacy showing the date on which the candidate registered as intending to affiliate with the political party the nomination of which he or she seeks, and indicating that the candidate has not been affiliated with any other qualified political party for the period specified in subdivision (a) immediately preceding the filing of the declaration. This section does not apply to a declaration of candidacy filed by a candidate of a political party participating in its first direct primary election subsequent to its qualification as a political party pursuant to Section 5100 or by a candidate of a political party participating in its first presidential general election subsequent to its qualification as a political party pursuant to Section 5151.

(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), a county central committee, subject to the bylaws of the state central committee, may establish the length of time that a candidate for membership on that committee must be shown by his or her affidavit of registration to be affiliated with the political party of that committee, and may establish the length of time that a candidate for membership on that committee must not have been registered as affiliated with a qualified political party other than the political party of that committee;

- The Orange county bylaws that we have on file at <http://www.cagreens.org/sites/cagreens.huang.radicaldesigns.org/files/uploads/documents/orange%20bylaws.pdf>
- numbers from SOS <https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/report-registration/ror-odd-year-2019/>
- GPCA Bylaws Article 6 - County Councils (last amended 3/2017) at: <http://www.cagreens.org/bylaws/06-24-2019>

During discussion of 7C, June offered an amendment that the proposal be changed to:

"The CC authorizes CC Co-Co Mimi Newton (and if Mimi is not available the CC authorizes CC Alternate Co-Co Mica Daniels), to provide direction to SOS Liaison Jared Laiti to respond to inquiries from the Secretary of State's Office, County Registrar of Voters offices, Green Party County Councils and others. The CC Co-Co may provide information regarding GPCA procedures, requirements, qualifications, etc... and derive answers from utilizing the GPCA Bylaws and the framework established by the past decisions of the CC to provide guidance (such as agenda item #7B, Bylaws interpretation approved by the CC on 9/9/19), and while supervising and composing correspondence is empowered to use her judgement to update references to election code section numbers, make logical corrections or fix

typographical errors, to be able to provide timely and appropriate responses for the SOS Liaison to convey."

Mimi accepted the amendment, and offered if the amended proposal was approved Mimi would combine/withdraw her following sponsored items 7D & 7E, considering them covered in the 7C amended proposal.

Approved by consensus.

(07 D) [was Late Agenda Item (15)]

Note: as part of the CC's decision with respect to item 7C, above, Mimi agreed to withdraw items 7D & 7E, considering them covered in the 7C amended proposal and decision, see item 7C, above.

Subject: Decision Item: (5 mins.) Request Jared Laiti to provide responses to questions raised by Mono County Registrar of Voters Sponsor: Mimi Newton, Marin County

Background and Purpose:

The Assistant Registrar of Voters posed the following questions to GPCA SOS Liaison Jared Laiti in mid-August:

1. Whether the State has an approved Green Central Committee in Mono County.
2. Who the chair of the Mono County Greens is, and how many seats GPCA bylaws allow or require for the County Council;
3. Could we send a copy of the bylaws.
4. If there is not a sanctioned central committee for the party, are there bylaws that state how members shall be selected, whether by appointment or election?
5. Does the GPCA allow crossover voting in the primary?

Proposal: That the GPCA Co-coordinator transmit an e-mail to Jared Laiti, with a request that he provide the following answers to the Mono County Assistant Registrar of Voters' Questions:

1. Whether the State has an approved Green Central Committee in Mono County.

Answer: There is no approved County Council/Central Committee in Mono County.

2. Who the chair of the Mono County Greens is, and how many seats GPCA bylaws allow or require for the County Council.

Answer: See #1, above.

3. Could we send a copy of the bylaws.

Answer: The GPCA State Party by-laws are at <http://www.cagreens.org/bylaws/06-24-2019>.

4. If there is not a sanctioned central committee for the party, are there bylaws that state how members shall be selected, whether by appointment or election?

Answer: Please see Articles 4, 5 and 6 of the GPCA Bylaws regarding the structure of the Party, the County Organizations, and County Council/Central Committees, respectively.

5. Does the GPCA allow crossover voting in the primary?

Answer: The GPCA does not allow for cross over voting in the primary.

Withdrawn

(07 E) [was Late Agenda Item: (16)]

Note: as part of the CC's decision with respect to item 7C, above, Mimi agreed to withdraw items 7D & 7E, considering them covered in the 7C amended proposal and decision, see item 7C, above.

Subject: Decision Item: (5 minutes) Direct the CC Co-Co/Bylaws Co-Co, Mimi Newton, to provide direction to Jared Laiti to respond to inquiries from the Secretary of State's Office and the following County Registrar of Voters offices with information regarding GPCA

procedures, requirements, qualifications, etc.: Los Angeles, Yolo County, Santa Barbara County,

Sponsors: Mimi Newton, Marin County

Background and Purpose: See email messages from Jared to the CC dated: August 28, 2019 (Los Angeles County, Yolo County), September 4, 2019, (Santa Barbara County), and September 7, (California Secretary of State's Office).

Proposal: The CC is requested to authorize the CC Co-Co/Bylaws Co-Co, Mimi Newton, to provide direction to Jared Laiti to respond to inquiries from the Secretary of State's Office and the following County Registrar of Voters offices with information regarding GPCA procedures, requirements, qualifications, etc.: Los Angeles, Yolo County, and Santa Barbara County. Such authority would also extend to similar questions that may or have arisen between now and the next CC call on October 7, 2019, that may be time sensitive and require a response prior to the next CC meeting.

Implementation/Timeline/Resources: The GPCA CC Co-Co will communicate with the GPCA SOS Liaison as quickly as possible.

References:

See email messages referenced above.

Withdrawn

(o8) SUBJECT/TITLE: Proposal item: Endorse as many Green-values projects as possible (10 minutes, 15-20 if available)

Co-sponsor(s): Laura Wells, Alameda County, Co-coordinator of Grassroots Organizing Working Group and GPCA Media Spokesperson

Purpose: For the CC/Coordinating Committee to implement this element of a workable strategy: to make endorsements where it counts as often as possible, and in the process increase Green Party visibility.

Background:

* The GPCA has capacity in some areas of politics.

* The GPCA lacks capacity in other areas, even though many Greens and the general public think we should have those capacities.

* Capacities we lack (in general), simply because we lack the resources of time, money, people power, and a functioning democracy, include:

- - getting elected to office even when majorities agree with our candidates' positions
- - being primary/lead organizers on movements, issue campaigns, petition drives,

rallies/marches/protests, events

- - calling out masses of Greens and others to participate in all of the above

* Capacities we do have (in general),

- - Running as candidates, particularly when we take advantage of good opportunities

- - Through our candidate campaigns, effectively serving as the progressive think tank, leading the way on Green New Deal, Public Banking, etc.

- - Endorsing worthwhile California efforts - and occasionally national efforts

* Endorsing is one of the strongest capacities we actually have, and it gives us the "biggest bang for the buck" and can make us the "mouse that roared." (Pardon the cliches, but they summarize the point.)

People — even those who like to blame Greens — like to know whether or not the Green Party supports something. And it gets "Green Party" on lists and in the public eye.

Proposal:

(1) That the CC endorses as many projects as possible that advance Green values.

(2) That those who submit endorsement proposals, whether as CC agenda items or 48-hour or 7-day votes, take care to provide the steps for making the endorsement if the CC approves it, to make it as easy as possible for CC Coordinators.

(3) That counties are encouraged to also make endorsements when feasible.

Implementation/timeline/resources:

Agenda time requested is 10 minutes, 15-20 if possible

REFERENCES:

Example of an endorsement that worked:

<https://californiapublicbankingalliance.org/ab-857-california-public-banking-bill-text-digest-and-fact-sheet/>

Note that the text reads, "AB 857 is endorsed by over 100 organizations representing 3.3 million members in California including:" and it goes on to list 17 of the 100+, with the GPCA among the 17. In the longer list, 5 more Green Party organizations are listed.

Proposal is to move this item to next month's agenda.

Audra expressed concern regarding an imminent local water issue—

June will confer with Audra regarding getting a proposal ready for some possible action by the CC.

Approved by consensus to hold this item over to next month's meeting.

9) Agenda item for 9/9/19 CC meeting (Discussion: Report on GPCA Presidential Primary Ballot Process) Sponsor: Tarik Kanaana (10 minutes)

Discussion: Report on GPCA Presidential Primary Ballot Process (time requested: 10 min)

Report from Tarik:

Email Message dated 9/9/19 at 4:46 pm

Dear CC,

I apologize for not being able to attend tonight's (9/9) meeting.

Before last month's Delegation meeting Greg Jan brought this up and proposed creating a subcommittee and suggested a timeline for the process described below. The subcommittee was formed and includes Greg Jan, Sanda Everette, Mike Feinstein, and Tarik Kanaana and remains open to any other delegation members. We met by phone on 8/29 and finalized the process and will meet again [on 9/13](#).

Currently, candidate requests to be placed on the ballot are being received by Jared Laiti and he is assessing them for completion. Below is more information on the process.

The California State Elections Code provides for the Secretary of State to determine who appears on the presidential primary ballot for each ballot qualified political party, including the Green Party of California in its section of the Elections Code (Section 6851). The Election Code also provides for the opportunity for each ballot qualified party to communicate to the Secretary of State whom it desires be put on that ballot (6851.5.) The entire process in the Elections Code governing the Green Party primary is found here: <https://www.cagreens.org/elections-code/presidential-primary-ballot> Since the GPCA first began recommending candidates in 1996, the Secretary of State's office has placed every candidate on the primary ballot that the GPCA has requested.

For a candidate to be recommended by the GPCA, under GPCA Rules and Procedures (http://www.cagreens.org/rules#Article_I_Presidential_Primary_Election_Ballot), a candidate must first submit a written request to the GPCA requesting placement upon the GPCA presidential primary ballot. What is required to be included in that request is explained in the References Section below.

Based upon the contents of that request, either/both of the GPCA's Campaigns and Candidates Working Group (CCWG) and/or the GPCA's GPUS Delegation may vote upon whether to forward the candidate's request for consideration by the GPCA's Standing General Assembly (SGA). For the March, 2020 election,

the SGA discussion period will run through [through Sunday, October 20, 2019](#). Voting will be [Monday, October 21 through Sunday, October 27](#).

Once the SGA makes its decision, it will forward it to the Secretary of State with enough advance notice, so that the Secretary of State can consider the GPCA's formal recommendation before he makes his public announcement in early November, of whom will appear on each party's presidential primary ballot (announcement made no later than E-120, according to CA Elections Code Section 6852).

References

ATTACHMENT #1: Rules and Procedures of the Green Party of California - ARTICLE I Presidential Primary Election Ballot

(http://www.cagreens.org/rules#Article_I_Presidential_Primary_Election_Ballot)

ATTACHMENT #2: California State Elections Code as it applies to the Green Party of California

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB477

6851. The Secretary of State shall place the name of a candidate upon the Green Party presidential preference ballot when the Secretary of State has determined that the candidate is generally advocated for or recognized throughout the United States or California as actively seeking the presidential nomination of the Green Party or the national political party with which the Green Party is affiliated.

6851.5. On or before the 150th day preceding a presidential primary election, the Secretary of State shall send a letter by first-class mail to the Green Party Liaison to the Secretary of State informing her or him that, while a response is not required, any information she or he wishes to submit will be considered by the Secretary of State in the determination of candidates to be placed on the Green Party presidential preference primary ballot pursuant to Section 6851.

Item discussed. No action taken.

(10) Decision item - Adopting a Bylaws Amendment and SGA election process, to ensure affirmative action in GPCA elections for Coordinating Committee members, which will result in the greatest possible parity of representation for People of Color (POC), while also enabling the Coordinating Committee to maintain a representation of at least 20 members, and a parity of female members.

Sponsor: Eric Brooks, San Francisco County

Background: In 2018, through initiating action by the Coordinating Committee, the GPCA Standing General Assembly (SGA) voted to establish procedures for Coordinating Committee elections which better ensure trans and non-binary gender inclusion on the Coordinating Committee, while also maintaining parity for female representation, and even establishing affirmative action encouraging higher representation of women on the Committee. During, and previous to Coordinating Committee and SGA discussions about this decision, it has been noted by many active Green Party members that the GPCA lacks similar procedures to ensure parity in POC representation, and affirmative action to ensure African American membership on the Committee.

It has long been recognized that the Green Party worldwide, nationally, and at state and county levels, far too often lacks sufficient POC and African American representation. This ongoing serious inadequacy of representation is deeply at odds with nearly all of the Green Party 10 Key Values and needs to be corrected as soon as possible. The following proposed changes are intended to serve as a model to remedy this problem in California and in other Green Party global, national, state, and county representation.

Proposal:

That the GPCA Coordinating Committee initiate action through election procedures, and a Bylaws Amendment, to ensure affirmative action in the next, and all future GPCA elections of Coordinating Committee members, which will result in the greatest possible parity of elected representation of People of Color (POC), while also enabling the Coordinating Committee to maintain a representation of at least 20 members, and a parity of female members. The method of implementation will be to first set the minimum requirement of Coordinating Committee POC representation at 50%, including a minimum requirement of 3 African American representatives. Once these minimums are set, if the results of a Coordinating Committee election do not fulfill these requirements:

- 1) up to two (but no more than two) winning, but lowest *first* round vote-getting, straight, white, cisgendered *male* candidates will be disqualified, and subsequently, if there is only one, or there are no, straight cisgender white male candidates who can be disqualified,
- 2) up to two winning, but lowest *first* round vote-getting, straight, white, cisgendered *female* candidates will be disqualified (unless this would lower female Coordinating Committee representation to less than 50% - see below).

Once any such disqualifications are completed:

- 1) If there are two or fewer currently seated African American Coordinating Committee members, the next one or two African American Coordinating Committee candidates (if any) ranked by highest number of votes received in **all** ranked choice rounds of voting (with a preference toward females) will be seated - until, and if, the requirement of 3 seated African American members is reached, and subsequently,
- 2) the next one or two POC Coordinating Committee candidates (if any) ranked by highest number of votes received in **all** ranked choice rounds of voting (with a preference toward females), will be seated.

These mechanisms will be implemented unless and until disqualifying and replacing any candidate will reduce the total number of Coordinating Committee members to less than 20 and/or will reduce overall Coordinating Committee female membership to less than 50%.

Definitions - White Latinx People of Color: For the purposes of this Bylaws Amendment, persons of Spanish or Portuguese white European descent whose ancestors were residents of Latin America or the Caribbean prior to the 1848 U.S. annexation of Mexican territory and/or prior to the 1836 Texan declaration of independence from Mexico, are considered to be People of Color.

Cisgender: Cisgender refers to a person whose sense of personal gender identity corresponds with the sex the person was identified as having at birth.

Example of Results:

In the last SGA Coordinating Committee election (see results at <https://www.opavote.com/results/6308457936322560>) Josh Jones and Eric Brooks would have been eliminated from election eligibility and Erik Rydberg (indigenous) and Terrance Tovar (latino) would have been seated. This would have resulted in our current Coordinating Committee having 9, rather than 7, POC members (including our currently seated 3 African American women). While still being one member short of the required 50% POC representation, this would have been improved POC representation, getting us near to parity almost immediately.

Implementation:

1) The CC Co-Coordinators will communicate to the SGA Vote Administrators that a CC decision item has been passed to require the next election of CC members to be carried out as detailed in the proposed Bylaws Amendment text below, as long as the Bylaws Amendment is also passed by the SGA in or before that same election.

2) The following Bylaws Amendment will be added by the CC to the next SGA election (following the current SGA election), and the text will be communicated by the CC Co-Coordinators to both the Bylaws Committee for review, and the SGA Vote Administrators for implementation.

BYLAWS AMENDMENT

The following section: Section 8-4.6 Unfilled vacant Coordinating Committee seats previously held by females are to be filled only by female candidates, other vacancies can be filled by candidates of any gender.

is amended and extended to read:

8-4.6 Affirmative Action in the Election of Coordinating Committee Members

8-4.6(a) Unfilled vacant Coordinating Committee seats previously held by females are to be filled only by female candidates, other vacancies can be filled by candidates of any gender.

8-4.6(b) Elections for Coordinating Committee members shall be conducted in a manner that will, to the greatest extent achievable, ensure that People of Color maintain at least 50% of all coordinating committee seats, and that three of those seats are held by people of African American descent. For the purposes of this section, persons of Spanish or Portuguese white European descent whose ancestors were residents of Latin America or the Caribbean prior to the 1848 U.S. annexation of Mexican territory and/or prior to the 1836 Texan declaration of independence from Mexico, are considered to be People of Color.

8-4.6(c) When calculating the results of any election to fill Coordinating Committee seats, if the results of the election will not ensure that the number of African Americans seated on the Coordinating Committee is at least 3, and/or the number of People of Color on the Coordinating Committee is at least 50%, then GPCA Standing General Assembly Vote Administrators will disqualify the two winning, but lowest *first* round vote-getting, white, heterosexual, cisgendered *male* candidates, as long as these disqualifications will not result in the Coordinating Committee having less than 20 members after the Vote Administrators carry out the duties described in sections 8-4.6(d) and 8-4.6(e) below. If there are not two white, heterosexual, cisgendered male candidates who can be disqualified, the Vote Administrators will disqualify up to two winning, but lowest *first* round vote-getting, white, heterosexual, cisgendered *female* candidates, so that two seat winners in total have been disqualified, as long as these disqualifications will not result in the Coordinating Committee having; 1) less than 20 members, and 2) less than 50% female members, after the Vote Administrators carry out the duties described in Sections 8-4.6(d) and 8-4.6(e) below.

8-4.6(d) If, as directed under Section 8-4.6(c), one or two winning candidates have been disqualified, they shall be replaced by the highest vote-getting one or two female African American candidates (if any) in *any* of the ranked choice voting rounds in that election. If there are not enough female African American candidates to fill all seats made available by disqualifications, then those seats shall be filled by the highest vote-getting African Americans of any other gender identification (if any) in *any* of the ranked choice voting rounds in that election, as long as this will not result in the Coordinating Committee having less than 50% female members.

8-4.6(e) If, as directed under Section 8-4.6(c), one or two winning candidates have been disqualified, and they cannot be replaced by African American candidates, they will be replaced the highest vote-getting one or two female People of Color candidates (if any) in *any* of the ranked choice voting rounds in that election. If there are not enough female People of Color candidates to fill all seats made available by disqualifications, then those seats shall be filled by the highest vote-getting People of Color of any other

gender identification (if any) in *any* of the ranked choice voting rounds in that election, as long as this will not result in the Coordinating Committee having less than 50% female members.

Implementation timeline: Once the proposal is approved, the CC Co-Coordinator will send appropriate communications of the decision to the SGA Vote Administrators and the Bylaws Committee within one week. The Bylaws Amendment will be placed on the next SGA election ballot.

Discussion: After receiving feedback to the effect that the proposal is too complicated, pits groups against one another or favors one group over another, uses language some find objectionable, etc., Eric withdrew his proposal and asked that people who would like to pursue an alternate proposal contact him to work on a different version.

Withdrawn

(11) Agenda item: For Sep 9 CC Agenda - Decision Item: Censure Of Erik Rydberg To Prevent Further Harm To The GPCA Reputation, & Relationships With Progressive Allies

Sponsor: Eric Brooks, San Francisco County (15 minutes)

Decision item: That the Coordination Committee:

- 1) Removes Erik Rydberg from the GPCA's GPUS delegation, due to a) his refusal to stop disrespectfully and abusively verbally attacking ally individuals and groups, as well as fellow Greens, and b) due to his involvement in the leadership of the 'Socialist Party of Humboldt County' through which he has promoted policies strongly at odds with Green Party values such as those against war and violence – in order to prevent the Green Party from being seriously misrepresented by Erik Rydberg's words or actions.
- 2) Directs the GPCA Media, IT, and Finance Committees to remove Erik Rydberg from all GPCA social media sites, email lists, and all access to any GPCA assets, either physical or electronic, including the GPCA GPUS delegation email list and any other such GPCA national committee lists.
- 3) Will place a proposal on the next SGA ballot which removes Erik Rydberg from participation in any all leadership or other official representation or duties of the Green Party and which legally orders him to no longer publicly or privately claim any affiliation with the GPCA, for the period of at least 5 years from the date of passage of that item.
- 4) Will notify within one month of adoption of this proposal, all active California Green Party counties regarding this decision and the detailed reasons for it, requesting that Erik Rydberg be removed from all official positions of county leadership and authority, all access to any and all county social media and email lists, and all access to physical and electronic county party assets.
- 5) Will notify the GPUS Steering Committee within one week of adoption of this proposal, regarding this decision and the detailed reasons for it, requesting that Erik Rydberg be removed from all official positions of GPUS leadership and authority, all access to any and all GPUS social media and email lists, and all access to physical and electronic GPUS party assets.

Sponsor: Eric Brooks, San Francisco County

Background

Throughout over two years of Erik Rydberg's tenure in GPCA and local county leadership, Erik has repeatedly, proactively, and continuously engaged in abusive and bullying, public and private attacks, on other Green Party members and on allies and potential allies of the Green Party (primarily on email and social media sites).

I have personally witnessed Erik engaging in such abusive behavior with a Southern California progressive organizer with whom I work very closely on environmental and social justice campaigns, and have witnessed how his behavior has directly alienated this organizer from respecting the Green Party. I

will soon back up this personal observation with a record of other such behavior by Erik which was emailed to this list by others in a previous year.

These continuous unacceptable attacks are alienating Greens and others from respecting and engaging with the Green Party.

Erik has already been removed as a GPCA spokesperson by the Coordinating Committee and the Media Committee because of this behavior. Other Greens and colleagues of Erik, have repeatedly asked him to stop such attacks on others and he has absolutely and flagrantly refused to do so, for nearly two full years. Erik has also recently joined as a *leader* of another political party known as the 'Socialist Party of Humboldt County' which has alarming Stalinist fundamentalist views and positions, and which as noted above, is openly and shockingly promoting 'the Left' broadly arming itself against white supremacists. On Erik's personal FaceBook profile page at the following link (where he now calls himself Mtn Lion Waters) you can see Erik's involvement with the Socialist Party of Humboldt County prominently displayed in his Cover Photo and in profile posts. And if you click on Erik's FaceBook profile image you'll find that it is a link to a video of Erik firing a military style assault rifle with a very large multiple-round ammunition clip (appearing to hold about 40 rounds) at a firing range.

FaceBook Profile page:

<https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100012148270914>

IMPLEMENTATION

Upon passage of this decision:

- The GPCA CC Co-Coordination will notify within one week, the GPCA GPUS delegation co-coordinators, and the GPCA Media, IT, and Finance committees of the decisions in points 1 and 2, to ensure that all removals take place as quickly as possible.
- The GPCA will work with concerned Coordinating Committee members, to within one month, draft a measure as detailed in decision point 3, and communicate that text to both the Bylaws Committee for review and to the SGA Vote Administrators for placement on the next SGA ballot (after the current ballot) in order to bar Erik Rydberg from all leadership and representation of the GPCA for five years following the passage of the ballot item.
- The CC Co-Coordination, with assistance from concerned Coordinating Committee members and the IT Committee, send out communications as indicated to the GPCA county representatives, and GPUS representatives as indicated in decision points 4 and 5.

FURTHER REFERENCES

I will forward within 5 minutes of sending this updated proposal, a previous email thread between CC members at the end of December 2018 discussing the decision to remove Erik Rydberg as a GPCA spokesperson. That email thread has numerous examples of Erik Rydberg's continuous bullying and abuse toward others while representing the Green Party. [See Appendix B].

Discussion:

Several cc members expressed concern that there is nothing organizationally or legally that the GPCA could do to stop Erik's behavior/political affiliation. Eric clarified that the proposal has to do more with distancing the party from his verbally abusive behavior and apparent sanctioning of violence through arming oneself, rather than his affiliation with other parties or organizations.

Proposal tabled till next month as there was no agreement regarding possible interventions or even if interventions are possible.

Tabled

(12) Late Item: - Decision Sign On GPCA To Oppose PG&E Wildfire Bailout Bill, AB 235 (5 mins)

Sponsor Eric Brooks

I'd also like us to take just 5 minutes this Monday to sign the GPCA onto the campaign below. This is very important, is from a coalition that I helped organize, and falls within work I was authorized by the GPCA

to do in Sacramento around bills that threaten Community Choice and other renewable energy programs. The end of the legislative session is [September 13](#), so we will have to sign on this Monday. ~ Eric B

URGENT Alert! NEW PG&E Wildfire Bailout Bill! *SIGN-ON* To Oppose Letter & Campaign ASAP
Please forward widely to other environmental and consumer organizers!

New Gut-and-Amend PG&E Wildfire Bailout Bill AB 235 *DOUBLES* the AB 1054 Bailout!

Sign On To Coalition Letter ASAP To Oppose AB 235!

See the sign-on letter attached (and below my signature) and the sign-on contact info under *SIGN ON* below.

DETAILS PG&E is now pushing a new, and even more outrageous bailout bill (AB 235) in the last two weeks of the California legislative session. AB 235 was amended on August 20 to add the *current* costs of the 2017 and 2018 wildfires, on *top* of the \$21 billion in costs already approved in AB 1054 to cover *future* fires.

According to TURN (The Utility Reform Network) AB 235 could put ratepayers on the hook not only for the 2017 and 2018 fires, but for *all* future wildfire costs, which under AB 1054 were at least intended to be evenly (although unfairly) *split* between ratepayers and PG&E. See TURN's oppose letter at: http://ourcitysf.org/AB-235_TURN_Oppose_Letter.pdf

AB 235 is a yet another 'gut-and-amend' bill (now in the CA Senate Energy Committee) to allow PG&E to draw on \$20 to \$40 billion *more* in bonds to pay for its wildfire costs - bonds that are intended to be *tax free* meaning that tax payers could also pay, and California tax dollars would therefore be drained from other programs to pay for the monopoly utilities' 2017 and 2018 wildfires.

See the new text of AB 235 at: http://ourcitysf.org/AB-235_Amendments_8-20-19.pdf

To put it simply, AB 235 is like the AB 1054 PG&E bailout bill, on steroids.

NEW COALITION

Californians for Energy Choice connected last week with PG&E bondholders (not stockholders) who also oppose AB 235. The bondholders oppose the bill because if PG&E gets this added bailout, they believe the company will continue to make poor decisions and collapse in value, thereby harming the value of PG&E bonds.

These bondholders are now working to connect with environmental and consumer groups, and with large industrial electricity customers (beginning with agricultural consumers) to form one united "Stop The PG&E Bailout" campaign to oppose AB 235.

If we join with these interests into a unified force, it will be very difficult for state legislators to vote in favor of AB 235, and for PG&E to get away with another AB 1054 style snow job. See the Stop The PG&E Bailout campaign web page at <https://stopthepgebailout.com> (See the full coalition list at the very end of this email.)

SIGN ON Californians for Energy Choice worked with the Stop The PG&E Bailout campaign to help them come up with the attached joint coalition sign-on letter.

PLEASE REACH OUT TO YOUR OWN ORGANIZATIONS TO SIGN ON TO THIS JOINT LETTER & CAMPAIGN If your group(s) can sign on, send a confirmation email, a short group bio, and a group logo, to the following campaign contact, and *also* copy me at brookse32@sonic.net so that I can keep track of who has signed on.

Contacts: Ian Anderson, Coordinator

Stop The PG&E Bailout

Eric Brooks, Californians for Energy Choice

Thanks all!

If we swing into rapid action we can stop this bad bill!

in solidarity,

Eric Brooks, Californians for Energy Choice

TEXT VERSION OF SIGN-ON LETTER

August XX, 2019

From: (List organizations here)

RE: Opposition to PG&E's Customer and Taxpayer Funded Bailout

Dear Members of the California State Legislature,

After being forced to declare bankruptcy due to misconduct, PG&E is asking the California legislature for a multibillion-dollar bailout funded by customers and California taxpayers. PG&E's plan calls for the issuance of tax-exempt bonds to bailout the company - that means billions of dollars of lost revenue for California. We are writing today to ask you to take the time to understand the facts, and learn the hidden truth behind this precedent-setting request from PG&E – our state government has never funded a bailout for a private company, and we should not start now.

PG&E's requested bailout – which requires legislation – would load the company up with another \$20 to \$40 billion of ratepayer-backed debt. PG&E is trying to hoodwink policymakers into believing that its shareholders will take a 20% cut in profits to cover the costs of this new debt. But, at the same time, PG&E and its hedge fund shareholders are demanding that their regulator increase their profits by at least 20% to cover these cuts. PG&E is saying one thing but doing another. If PG&E won't pay for the bailout, who will? The truth is this debt would be paid for on the backs of ratepayers and taxpayers.

The PG&E bailout plan would have far-reaching consequences for all Californians:

- For Ratepayers: A PG&E bailout would mean higher rates. Period.
- For California Taxpayers: Granting tax-exempt status for PG&E's bailout bonds would mean billions in lost funding for California's schools, hospitals, public safety and other critical services. PG&E is a convicted felon. Why should taxpayers foot the bill for the Company's misdeeds?
- For PG&E Employees: This bailout would mean an uncertain future. By relying on increased debt instead of investments to get out of bankruptcy, PG&E will need to take additional cost-cutting measures, meaning fewer jobs and benefits for employees.
- For Homeowners: This bailout means added wildfire risk. Bailout bonds might provide a temporary reprieve for PG&E, but saddling the company with more debt reduces the Company's ability to make essential improvements to become more resilient against the threat of wildfires.
- The Legislature and Governor already passed legislation to enable PG&E to exit bankruptcy, providing a financial backstop for PG&E and other utilities in the state by establishing a massive wildfire fund. In doing so, the Governor and California legislature stated that they did not intend to provide a bailout for PG&E.

The bailout bonds PG&E wants are not necessary to raise the capital the company needs to pay wildfire victims. The only purpose for new legislation is to protect current PG&E shareholders – hedge funds who bought PG&E stock on the cheap and are focused exclusively on their near-term profits. For PG&E's shareholders, this bailout is a dream come true. They get to keep their massive profits and maintain control of PG&E at the expense of the future health of California's utilities, financial stability and safety. Please oppose PG&E's attempt to bailout the company on the backs of its customers and California taxpayers. California must protect ratepayers, safeguard critical services and reject this handout to PG&E and the hedge funds that control the company.

Sincerely,

Current Coalition Sign-Ons

Industry & Trade Groups

- The Agricultural Energy Consumers Association

- The California Poultry Federation

- The Ad Hoc Committee of Senior Unsecured Noteholders of Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Environmental & Social Justice Organizations

- Food & Water Watch
- California Progressive Alliance
- Sunrise Bay Area
- Californians for Energy Choice
- Sunflower Alliance
- Women's International League for Peace & Freedom (Santa Cruz Branch)
- 350 Butte County
- Sustainable Marin
- Sustainable Novato
- Santa Cruz Climate Action Network
- No Coal in Oakland (NCIO)
- Our City San Francisco

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm.

APPENDICES

Appendix A, Finance Committee, Thursday August 29th, 2019, 8 – 9:00 pm

Present: Victoria Ashley – Liaison, Co-co, Ruscal Cayangyang – Treasurer, Maxine (Mica) Daniel – Co-co
Frank Lambert

Absent: Quinton Crawford, Bob Marsh

1. Review of the Agenda, Approved by consensus.
2. Review of Last Month's Minutes, Approved by consensus.
3. Updates / Treasurer Report

Record Keeping and Filing

FPPC Filing Deadline: Need to have someone regularly check and remind about these dates and requirements:

<http://www.fppc.ca.gov/content/dam/fppc/NS->

[Documents/TAD/Filing%20Schedules/2019/2019_Special_Elections_PP.pdf](http://www.fppc.ca.gov/content/dam/fppc/NS-Documents/TAD/Filing%20Schedules/2019/2019_Special_Elections_PP.pdf)

<http://www.fppc.ca.gov/learn/campaign-rules/where-and-when-to-file-campaign-statements/when-to-file-campaign-statements-state-local-filing-schedules.html>

Implement New Record Keeping: Started Google folder to store invoices and other records in monthly folders going forward. Currently 3 people have access.

Balances:

Travis Credit Union state acct: \$8,287.21

Travis Credit Union federal acct: \$1,600.00

PayPal: \$57.49

Barnett PayPal: \$32.77

August Expenses:

\$150 Treasurer August expense

\$430 Refund to Erik "Yamaho" Rydberg

\$90 Liquid Web Wired Tree

\$11 Call Centric

Recurring Income: If these (and any one-time donations) amount to more than \$1000 in the last 30 or 45 days, then a report must be filed.

Total = \$116/mo

Activity from Current PayPal: Total = \$81/mo

Aug 27, 2019, Recurring payment - \$5.00 USD

Aug 24, 2019, Recurring payment, \$10.00 USD
Aug 22, 2019, Recurring payment, \$1.00 USD
Aug 22, 2019, Recurring payment, \$5.00 USD
Aug 22, 2019, Recurring payment, \$10.00 USD
Aug 20, 2019, Recurring payment, \$10.00 USD
Aug 18, 2019, Recurring payment, \$10.00 USD
Aug 3, 2019, Recurring payment, \$10.00 USD
Aug 2, 2019, Recurring payment, \$20.00 USD
Activity From Doug Old PayPal: Total = \$35/mo
Aug 21, 2019, Recurring payment, \$5.00 USD
Aug 21, 2019, Recurring payment, \$20.00 USD
Aug 14, 2019, Recurring payment, \$5.00 USD
Aug 10, 2019, Recurring payment, \$5.00 USD

Fines status

- No change – we currently owe about \$5000+/-
- Current Treasurer assume liability for the fines
- Agreement to pay \$1000 annually

Upcoming expenses

- Nationbuilder

How much is Nationbuilder costing now? About \$133/mo.

Liquid Web is costing us \$90/mo – is it necessary to have this? Victoria will email Nassim about this. Yes, report:

- The current set-up is not functioning much, due to lack of storage capacity. LW server houses both the website and the listserves and no one seemed to have thought of an archiving or ongoing pairing down plan when they first set it up.
- It was set up by the last IT team as a private dedicated server which is very expensive and an overkill on security. The cost also covers full support which we can't get due to all the security patches the last IT team never installed, LW support says they can no longer support or secure it.
- It appears that IT has not (and likely cannot) go through the loads of stuff on there to migrate or trash.

4. Next General Assembly

We don't yet have a location (Southern CA). Maybe Fresno, date in Nov or Dec. The next CC meeting is [on September 10th](#).

5. Paypal Status

We now have control over the former Doug Barnett Paypal account – what's next? Ruscal in discussion with Nicole about this.

6. Next Meeting: [Thursday, September 26th, 2019](#)

Appendix B

See Email from Eric Brooks to the CC re: Item 11, dated 9/9/19 at 6:46 pm.

Appendix C

Clearinghouse Committee & GROW Joint Meeting, Tuesday, Aug 13th, 2019, 7:30 - 9 pm

- Roll Call CH members/Cocos: Mica Daniel, Nassim Nouri. Present: Mica Daniel, Nassim Nouri.

Quorum [at 7:33](#) min.

GROW members Present: Christine Pepin (SCC), Laura Wells (AC), Mica Daniel (SJC), Nassim Nouri (SCC), Richard Gomez (FC)

- Report back on discussion - Getting County Council elections on March 2020 ballots (Laura, 10 min)

Action: Laura received and has incorporated some clarifications for this notice for future use. Nassim to work with Mimi to collect citation corrections for later reference.

- Proposal on managing incoming campaign emails Decision (CH, 10 min) CH Proposal sent by Nassim to CH Aug 13, 2019, at 9:13 PM

Proposal: Define what candidate campaign email or information to forward to our general inform or contact list

Background: as candidates prepare for the 2020 elections, some presidential and other state's candidates send their regular newsletters and blasts to all publicly available Green emails such as our website's contact email: gpcac@agreens.org. CH has had discussion about how to manage or share this information. Here is what we propose:

Implementation:

- Blasts from the campaigns of national candidates for presidential or other non-Californian races will not be shared with our general contact list.
- Blasts from Californian candidates for all offices will be forwarded to the CCWG as well as to their own county council to make them aware of their local candidates.
- In the CH newsletter, collective lists of ALL Green candidates such as California and Presidential candidates will be shared as an informational resource for readers with some indication that GPCA has not endorsed these candidates.
- Once any California candidate has been endorsed by GPCA and has passed the primary, CH will share campaign news and information provided by the candidate's campaign.

No question or concerns, some suggestions on clarifying process

Proposal amended as above and approved by consensus

- Volunteer management & general outreach discussion (CH, 10 min)

Nassim reported our DB has 800+ volunteers signed up on website or forwarded by GPUS. CH forwards volunteers to their counties. Would other committees want to engage volunteers and use this resource? Discussion led to suggesting Nassim ask IT to (when feasible), parse the list by activity and offer to committees.

- Confirm next second Tuesday call, [Sept 10th](#).

APPENDIX D

GPCA-IT Committee Monthly Meeting Minutes, Monday 8/19/19 , 7:30- 9 pm

1. Roll call GPCA-IT members: David Bond Co-Co (LAC), Nicole Raglin Co-Co (NC), Colt Gonzales (SJ), Audra Walton, CC Liaison' (MC), Nassim Nouri (SC)

Members present: David Bond Co-Co (LAC), Nicole Raglin Co-Co (NC), C Audra Walton, CC Liaison' (MC), Nassim Nouri (SC). Quorum at: -7:40

Members absent: -Gonzales (SJ). Guests: None

Discussions and Issues:

- Reviewed IT-2019 Work Plan. Nation Builder new website design and content, create GPCA archival content from Drupal, Drupal updates and Listserves & email cleanup, access and permissions. Review, Determine, Implement and Train on another communication tool (ie Slack, Discord, Teams, Riseup? other).

- Website Update & Website launch schedule. We may not meet next month's planned launch. Archiving records from the current site is taking longer than expected with the need to create pdfs for previously hyperlinked data and information. Sadie has completed Platform pages, Nassim has led organizing and creating many of the pages, Nicole is working on SGA right now. We may be able to launch the site by the end of the year.

- IT is currently working on finding alternatives to the current List Serve. We suffer from constant spam attacks and are flagged as not being secure. David will look into Slack, Discord, riseup and discourse for price comparison and criteria check.

- Current IT Tickets & Issues - Nicole will nudge Mimi's GA notes, David is going to resolve IT email issues, stop them from bouncing.
 - SOS Database. Ruscal on calls with David. Alternate extraction came back with the same issues. Data: 23K records and it should be 83K. We need a second extraction.
- Action: Nicole will reach out to Jared to get the whole database.
-

APPENDIX E - CCWG REPORT, JULY THRU OCTOBER 2019

July, Quorum not met but plan to break up and contact Greens in other north counties to touch base and see about activating counties slash beginning Green activities.

August, Quorum not met, meeting not held largely because sickness of co-chairs.

October meeting not held due to co-chair bereavement.