

## GPTX Convention 4.9.2016: Minutes

Agenda needs approval so that we can keep a quorum (for the convention right now).  
Agenda is approved. Unanimous.

Aaron: We need to certify the statewide results.  
Aaron: 60 Ballots for Jill Stein

Kat Swift: only 53 were valid, after cross checking. I went through each ballot and put them through a spreadsheet and there were some missing ballots so I couldn't verify everything. I came up with 53 total votes for Jill.

Laura: We need to go county by county and figure out which one has the difference.  
Laura: A couple of counties only sent me tallies, they sent me an email

: Who is responsible for making the official tally

Laura: I tally everything that I got from each county. The counties did not uniformly submit. Some gave me results without all the ballot images. We have up on a shared google folder, each county with their ballot images and paperwork. The counties that chose not to give images and just reported the results, it is inconsistent between counties. That is why the counties are each separately tallied.

: Is that procedure okay with the state? Do we need to have images?

Kat: we are supposed to verify the results of the precinct convention ballots. I went through the folder and did the presidential race. I did every ballot you can see at the top, the county, the precinct number, and the ballot number. I did not do anything that was not visible or readable. There's a missing county for Dallas County. Tarrant county there is one ballot where we cannot see who the votes are for.

Kevin: on dallas county, we got some ballots, they were all numbered, a couple were not actually used.

Kat: The precinct 4090 ballot has a missing ballot, the count is 2 but I only see 1 ballot. Collin county, everything matched. So their votes were accurate. Denton matches, one ballot did not have a precinct number. Hidalgo, did not send a ballot on the tally, one of the people who was there was not eligible to vote.

Laura: actually both votes were not qualified.

Kat: hidalgo will be deleted. Webb county, I only have a ballot that has 3 by Jill's name so we don't know who the ballots are or who voted at all. We have no data for orange or Lubbock. Bexar county, there was 3 with no precinct numbers, no participant list to verify how many ballots there should be, the vote for curry shows one on the ballot the

tally says 2. Harris county had two voided that were not counted. [ballot 384 #9 is not valid, it has scratches and corrections which you cannot do.] [going over the rest of counties, some had votes, some did not, they were valid] The dallas county votes have been corrected. Webb county does not have precinct numbers or ballots, we don't know who participated. Do we want to count those?

: can we just accept what webb county reported and certify them or do we actually have to see them? And is that our procedure or a state procedure.

Kat: I cant answer you question, but if this were a primary we need to follow state procedure.

Laura: if we had a person from webb county here I would feel comfortable having them certify, but we do not have a delegate, and they did not provide enough information, I think we are on shaky ground.

:I say we don't accept webb county, we don't have a delegate here, and we don't have enough information.

: I think we can use our phones and call someone there because they took the time to complete the precinct convention so I suggest we call and verify.

**Motion to call Webb county for ballot verification: Seconded**

**32 For.**

**2 Opposed.**

**Aaron: we are going to call and verify webb county.**

Luis Decker: Webb County on phone: We have 3 voters, all 3 voted for Jill Stein.

Aaron: Any questions?

: Are the original documents available.

Luis Decker: Yes, we can send them to you.

Documents will be sent through email to either Laura or Aaron.

**Aaron: is there a motion to accept these results.**

**Seconded.**

**33 accept.**

**1 opposed.**

Kat: Bexar county, do you know how many prticipants you had? How many people were eliglble to vote?

: I want to say around 17.

Kat: we have 10 ballots, you say you have 2 more, so that's 12. 17 voters and 12 ballots. The tally they submitted show 2 votes for curry and the tallies I have show 1. 3 ballots had no precinct number. Do y'all want to accept those ballots so that I can add them to the count.

**Aaron: All those in favor of accepting ballots without the precinct number?**

**36 favor**

**0 oppose**

Kat: The other discrepancy is the 2 votes for curry, but I have 1 ballot for curry.

Aaron: Do we want to accept the original tally or do we want to accept the one vote on the ballot?

George moves we accept the tallies, as reported.

Kat: I have 13 ballots, we just doubled checked/verified with Bexar. There are 12 for Stein.

[discussing certification of votes and the state]

Kat: Bexar county are trying to figure out their total for Curry. We will get back with them.

Vote tallies in Harris county do not match the ballots. The tally shows a vote for Kremel but the ballot shows a vote for Curry. Ballot 0798#16 is voided because it was modified.

**: I vote we accept ballot as counted because Laura saw him modify it and the person is here to verify.**

**Motion.**

**30 favor**

**1 oppose**

**1 abstaining**

[Bexar verified with ballots, 1 vote for curry]

Aaron: So for harris county, 275, the ballot shows 1 vote for curry 1 vote for stein, but the tally says kremel and curry. Do we want to go based off the tallies or the ballots?

**Motion to go with ballots**

**33 favor**

**0 opposed**

**1 abstain**

**[Kat is abstaining from everything. It will not be marked on these minutes.]**

Aaron: The numbers are now accurate, so lets take a look at these numbers and decide if we want to accept them or not.

Laura: Does anyone object to certifying the vote tallies as recorded right now.

Aaron: Stein 57, Mesplay 8, Cherney 6, Kreml 5, Curry 13

**Motion to certify**

**35 for**

**0 opposed**

**[Kat did not abstain this one]**

**Vote counts are now verified.**

Aaron: Okay, we **verified presidential candidates**, now we need to certify statewide candidates.

[explanation of what is going on before we move forward]

**Statewide totals: The file that contains the recorded votes is in a public folder labeled GPTX.**

**Motion to certify**

**36 favor**

**0 oppose**

**Statewide results are certified, we will be forwarding to the secretary of state.**

Now we move on to selecting the PNC delegates.

: Are we doing half votes or full votes?

Kat: I don't know if the national still has that or not. Can somebody check?

Martina: How many delegates do we have in total?

Kat: 23

Art: We have one full vote each. [full votes not half votes for earlier question]

Kat: The presidential electors are for the Electoral College. So that means if we win the presidential vote in Texas, 38 people will go to Austin and cast their votes.

Martina: I want a current count of who is signed up, a total for each list.

Aaron: People are still signing up

Joel: In the past for PNC, texas allowed proxy votes.

Kat: You can only carry one proxy vote.

Joel: I want to make it clear that if you are signing up on the list then you should go to the convention.

Kat: If you sign up and are not planning on going, please make note on the list.

Laura: Tom prentice, shirley wright, and AJ, were unable to make it today but they electronically notified that they wanted to be a delegate.

Aaron: 24for PNC delegates in Houston. 17 for Presidential Electors in Washington.

[we need 38 for Washington, list is being passed around for people to sign up]

Laura: George is typing up the list of names for potential presidential nominating delegates.

[Laura took over, George was not familiar with computer]

Treasurer [David]: I have accounted for 607 dollars in cash, however, we need to account for ever penny that is donated. Money cannot be accepted unless we know the donator.

Aaron: I need everyone's attention. So, we need to have a discussion about how we are going to proceed with this vote. But first, Is there anyone on the Houston list that will not be able to go? Please tell us now because that will solve all of this.

[Eva S., Debbie B., Sheri W., are not 100% they can attend Houston convention]

Laura: We need 23 delegates, right now we have 32. We need to rank and whittle this down.

Aaron: Hey everyone...  
is there anyone who wants to remove their name?

Kat: Or you can take your name off or be an alternate.

Herb G., alternate

Eva S., alternate

Debbie B., alternate

Kat: I found the rules, how PNC delegates are selected.

Motion: We put the whole list up for approval voting for the delegates and the alternates. Those ranked at the bottom will be the alternates, those at the top will be the ones that actually go to Houston. If one of the delegates cannot make it to Houston then there will be enough time to notify the alternates.

**Motion: Extend time for nominating convention to 3:30**

**33 favor**

**2 oppose**

## **1 abstain**

George [point of clarification for PNC delegate voting]: the vote is not proportion, its approval. The persons who have the most votes will be ranked order by how many votes you have. The first 23 of those people will be delegates, the other will be alternates. The alternates will be placed in the order they were ranked.

Aaron: Lets take a vote for the motion. We still have the proposal. Let me restate. We **take this whole list here [pnc] we vote on it, you decide who you want to be delegates.**

**If you want to vote for that, raise your paddle now.**

**31 favor**

**1 oppose**

**4 abstain**

**[Kat voted]**

Aaron: vote for those who you think will go to Houston, do not vote for this that you think will not go or want to go to Houston.

Kat: you are not limited on votes, you vote for whoever you like. You can vote for everyone or you can vote for only 1.

Aaron: there are 36 people on the list. So, the proposal is, to have someone speak on the behalf of the people who are on this list but not present.

: It seems really strange to me to speak for someone that is not here.

: proposal amendment: we will have 10 seconds of speech for each of the 38 on the list.

: friendly amendment: folks have 20 seconds, 10 seconds is not enough time.

: not accepted as friendly amendment

**Aaron: Again the proposal, 10 seconds to speak for everyone on the list. People can speak for those not present.**

**Seconded.**

**14 favor**

**20 oppose**

**2 abstaining**

**The nays have it**

Proposal: everyone that is here and has expressed desire to be a delegate, can they be placed on the top of the list. Automatic approval.

Kat: The bylaws call for approval voting, but I can list them as confirmed, alternate, etc.

Proposal: We rank in order for people who are here all the way to the bottom and people who are not here.

Seconded.

Martina: Friendly amendment. How about people who are here and plan on going, stand

up and raise your paddle.

Seconded.

Aaron: raise your hand if you are here and you want to be a delegate.

[we still have to vote anyway. We are not standing, ballots are being printed]

**Proposal: While ballots are printed, we move to approve those going to Washington.**

**Seconded.**

**Motion enacted.**

**35 favor**

**0 oppose**

**1 abstaining**

**Aaron: Now we go and vote, do we approve this list. This full exact list. This contains the exact number of people we need to go. Do we approve of this list?**

**36 favor**

**0 oppose**

[presidential electoral list approved]

**Joel: I'd like to move to extend to 3:45**

**Motion.**

**Seconded.**

**Friendly amendment: can we take a break until the ballots are printed.**

**Informal vote. No objection.**

[break over]

Aaron: I am going to repeat what laura said.

Joel: I move to extend to 4:30

seconded.

**Motion: Extend voting and discussion until 4:30.**

**23 favor**

**5 abstain**

Aaron: while these ballots are being passed out, we are going to take a look at these resolutions created at the harris county green party county convention. Any questions about these resolution?

George: What is range voting?

Alfred: I apologize; the proposal is incorrect and I respectfully withdraw it. I used the wrong terminology.

Kat: Since it was voted by the county, the county has to vote to withdraw, and a single person cannot remove it.

Aaron: Range voting is, essentially, a range is 0-100 and you can score each person on the ballot and at the end they average out the range and that average is how they determine the victor.

Kat: there are different ranges, it can be 0-9 or 0-99, so there are differences. Basically the person with the highest number wins.

Aaron: any questions about range voting?

:give with the already extensive knowledge, I believe that we should not ask anybody to vote against this.

Aaron: George originally proposed that we just vote it down to dispose of it.

**Motion: Vote on resolution that states the state executive committee review range voting.  
seconded.  
16 favor  
9 oppose  
9 abstain  
Fails the 2/3 vote.**

Aaron: Now we are moving to the second resolution.  
Proposal to vote on the resolution.

[clarification on voting, and eligibility. We are discussing voters and delegates so that voters have a voice.]

**Don: Move to vote**

**Motion: all those in favor to pass resolution 2. [review bylaws]  
25 favor  
5 oppose  
8 abstain  
[Kat Voted]  
Motion Passes**

**Proposal: Add Ashley's name on the bottom [for Houston delegate]**

**Friend amendment: put her name on the top**

**Motion: All those in favour of writing her name in on the ballot**

**27 favor**  
**3 abstain**

Voting for Resolution 3. [Request TX legislature the crafting of laws to implement emergency provisions]

[discussion of resolution.] [change in topic about 3<sup>rd</sup> parties not having early voting]

:this resolution cannot be passed easily, we would need to do a lot of lobbying for it.

**Proposal to extend to 4:45pm**

**Friend amendment to extend to 5 but cancel nominee presentation.**

**Motion: Call a question and call a vote. [end discussion and vote on resolution]**

**Seconded.**

**35 favor**

**1 oppose**

**Resolution #3:**

**35 favor**

**1 oppose**

**1 abstain**

**Motion: Extend to 5**

**Seconded.**

**33 favor**

**2 oppose**

**2 abstain**

#### **4.10.2016 Sunday Minutes**

Voted to postpone the review & approval implementation of platform changes.  
Approved by consensus

David: Financial Reports: I promise to submit report to the chair so that they can post it online. Total revenue we generated last year was 5363 dollars. 500 was a grant from harris county, 537 came from GPUS, our cost last year were 4731, that included convention 1707, 411 of it were assistance for people to go to the national convention and the rest of it was for the state meeting last year. The state meeting was 1300, and we only received about 200 to offset that and it used up a lot of our expenses. The website and web development was 1000+, we had surplus last year of 632. Currently, bank balance is 1633, current year so far we have had contributions of 756, our expenses have been bank charges of 346 and website cost of 78 a month...so its about 232 at this point. We are running a surplus so far this year of about 300. Our current balance as of march 31 is 1974. We have bank account at compass bank and we also have a paypal account and just to update you on this current convention, it wasn't as expensive of last year, 400 for the facilities and 654 or meals. We have a deficit of 400+ for this convention. One of the programs we have at the state is the sustainer program which allows us to withdraw funds from the bank once a month. The current amount we are getting from sustainers is 234. I have a form that we can fill out if anyone wants to become a sustainer. You can also become a sustainer by signing up on the website but you will need to utilize paypal. The last item we have for everyone, we are currently banking with bbb compass bank, that account started back in 2000 in Houston. I went to the bank to get a debit card to make it easier for us to pay expenses. But they can't find our documentation so they cant help with getting a debit card, credit card, etc.

I checked out some banks, I found origin bank in Houston. They are a good bank for local organizations.

They are local and the fees for establishing the account is zero and there are no fees. They seem really willing to work with us. I hope we can make a proposal to move our bank from compass to origin. That is my report.

Alan Alan: Would you clarify which accounts are going to origin bank?

David: We are discussing to move our State bank account over to origin.

Alan Alan: what is our pay pal balance?

David: 713.91 and the compass at this point is 1263.29, that is going to come down because we are paying all of these costs so we will be under 1,000 this month.

**Laura: The question on the floor is, should we move the account over to origin.**  
**28 Favor**  
**0 oppose**  
**1 abstain**

David: one more comment, I am going to post last years reports and the current reports on the Texas website, and I will be working on building monthly reports to post on the nationbuilder site.

Laura: The next item we have on the agenda is GPUS & NC participation review.

[other relevant information, now discussing national delegates]

Kat: Martina is stepping down, and delegates have been voting and active. We are not recommending removing anyone for non participation. We are recommending that since Martina is stepping down, and we are in need of female participation, that we replace her with Rachel since she is already a voting delegate instead of voting and selecting delegates.

We're suggesting as national committee, to hold elections later as planned for the 2 spots opening up, but go ahead and replace Martina with Rachel now since she is already an alternate delegate, and we are wanting to keep the gender balance.

Laura: Perhaps we can do this through acclimation instead of going through a formal ballot process.

**Kat: Is there any objection to moving Rachel up to Martina's seat.**

**[Consensus]**

Rachel will be moving up to the delegate seat for the next year.

[Kat's and Paul's terms are up, there are 2 positions up for election]

[national committee discussion, not a lot of activity, does anyone want to be on any of these]

[Adding people onto committee]

[James Dorsey arrived: Candidate for Sheriff of Bexar country]

[Anti-Capitalist Amendment discussion: limited 10 minutes]

Aaron: So, there was a platform amendment that was proposed by the youth caucus, 10 different state caucus endorsed it. They contacted us and asked if we would be interested in endorsing their anti-capitalist amendment. Basically we are being asked as a party if we want to endorse this.

[5 minutes to read the anti-capitalist amendment]

[11:25 Reconvene]

**[up and down vote for the anti-capitalist amendment]**

**16 for**  
**10 against**  
**2 abstentions**

The Texas party does not endorse.

[George on behalf of Harris county is wanting to amend the motion over ‘committee member who is absent...’]

Laura says we cannot amend this bylaw since it has already been voted and passed.

[Discussing Roy and his removal]

George: the issue is that the state executive committee has no right to do that. They cannot remove him from the committee. They did not elect him “we” did. The state executive committee violated this. I want you all to basically make whole the situation, that, the, that you vote Roy back on as secretary, he had another year to complete. The second part of that is some suggested procedures and I thought we could actually vote on this. IF we had suggested procedures in place then we could have taken care of this but we did not have any in place and the state committee moved forward and removed him

Laura: We cannot vote to change a bylaw right now because it is an election year but we can discuss this and to vote on later.

After we put roy on notice and warned him, we had a 2 week period, and at the request of harris county, we had david cobb come in to mediate the call on which the scc ultimately voted to remove roy. Now one of the things that’s in dispute is that the scc pointed to the withdrawal of endorsement clause, for the mechanisms in the bylaws for things that had been violated, the thing that is making it a question is that that is meant to candidates, but we extended that to roy because we felt it was applicable.

Point of information

: what was the warning? Was it formal, that he would be removed?

Laura: He was warned on 6.28 and removed 7.12.  
[Laura has the text and all other documentation relating to this.]

Kat: There were discussions with secretary of state office and their conclusion was that, we need to make a rule and deal with it, It is our responsibility. Dan as a lawyer suggested we use this, this is what we need to use since it's the only thing there to deal with this situation.

The SOS said these rules don't apply to us, make our own rules.

My concern is that when we form an organization, we form rules to govern each other, that is how we get along, that's what keeps the whole organization in motion. There were two violations of bylaws that were involved in this. One was that the committee voted top down, and we are a grassroots organization, and they have no power to come down. The second is that the rewriting of a bylaw, impromptu, by a committee that is not allowed to do it, is not legal. It cannot be held. You cant just whip out a bylaw when you want to. I am sympathetic to what has occurred, on both sides. However, we need to retain the system or we have nothing.

Maria Ellena:

I am a practicing lawyer as well, and I have put a lot of time into the study of the election code, and it is very explicit about 3r parties resolving things by their own bylaw and rules, the problem with this is that they removed the secretary...he was not removed for disrupting the sec where he couldn't function, he removed because he was carrying his duties. It started because of which notes needed to be used. Apparently there was some show of male chauvinism, reported by one person. I don't care. That is not a basis for removal, of our secretary. We elected him, and this was not in accordance with our ways. [praise because he's young/millennial, lots of energy]  
I consider this nitpicking, but I wasn't in on the exact dialogue, but I definitely think this was a violation of the bylaws.

: I am coming in late on this process, I would like some understand from the sec, would it be possible that an outcome of this would be agreeing with the proposal here that the action of the sec wasn't valid and move forward to the motion to removing the secretary from the office.

Would it be possible to agree with Harris, and initiate a removal process right now, here.

Rachel: I just want to say that I agree with what [person] was saying and that bylaws are to be elected by the people, the delegates, and not the sec.

Martina: we are not in the assumption that we are creating a bylaw, we are reviewing one we used for the removal.

Aaron: SOS said we were empowered to create temporary rules and they urged us to

create rules on the subject, and the state executive committee is empowered to act on violations of the bylaws and platforms/views.

Kat: there is not 30 day wait period to wait to use the rules. The rules are implemented when they are passed by the sec. The ones that have to be timely are the electoral rules and those have to be submitted, but they are active when submitted not 30 days later.

George: we also want to replace a co-chair. We ha a resignation. We thought we would just go ahead and replace her so we contacted SOS and they told us we can't do that. We have to make rule first, before we can do that so we did that. What happened here is the opposite, they removed him and then found a rule to apply to this.

Josh: as much as I like David Cobb, [praise], in this particular situation, I think he screwed up. He agreed to step in as mediator, and we found out that during the course of his investigation, he agreed, he essentially took sides with those that wanted to remove roy and advocated that roy should be removed. David took sides on this. Then during the phone call he presented himself as a third party role, even though prior to this he had agreed to remove him already.

Remy: as an sec member, I would have preferred to stay out of this debate, however, I feel obligated t reply because I think you're taking words out of my mouth. Yes david cobb came in as a mediator and I, it seems to me that someone that comes in with the position of being a mediator, when they come in and they interview them better, and then comes in an says, actually we have a problem. I don't think this should be taking lightly. If that mediator has been given that task and has not stake in the game and then comes back an advises that we have a problem then I will absolutely give way to that opinion and I think it should be taken into account. [david cobb is a professional mediator]

: A part of what happened here is because ever since we had the sec, we elect members to the sec at our conventions and then basically everone steps back and we rely on them to take care of stuff and within the sec, several members tend to step back as well. And all of the weight gets placed on a couple of people to take care of everything so in that environment things are gonna happen, things don't go as planned, etc. It only comes to light whenever shit like this hits the fan, so we as a body as a whole, have some kid if responsibility as well because we allowed just a few people to carry the weight of this work and that needs to be recognized.

Bernadine: We suggested that they bring in a 3<sup>rd</sup> party, we offered the David Cobb to mediate. This did not happen, he facilitated the elimination of someone who is elected. We elected a secretary and expected them to be allowed to do their job, not for someone to come in and say no.

[Offered a letter of advisement.]

We advised them to get direction from national, start an advisory board, or bring in someone to mediate.

[Implying that david cobb was an arbitrator]

As for using the endorsement clause, this has not relevance to our leadership in this party, they went to this clause because they could not accomplish this in any other way so they twisted our bylaws in order to apply this to someone that was democratically elected by the delegates.

[Reiteration]

Debbie: So, I'm on the school board, I was elected, there are processes in every body, within every body, to remove somebody within the ranks in-between those elections, we should have that ability here. I think the issue now is that the bylaws were addressed to this particular situation. The spirits of the bylaws were not broken here.

Everyone In the green party should be held accountable for their actions and their 10 key values. The SOS did not say we violated the bylaws by our action, they said we need a rule.

We need to discuss if bylaws were broken, and to discuss on if we should address this issue and reelect this person or not.

Aaron: [discussing narratives]

1. It was not simply a matter of how to take notes.

He was supposed to work with Kat on how to do it. He did not. He criticized her every step of the way. He harassed her. She literally said she felt harassed; she could not emotionally work with him. I also had 2 Dallas county greens that came to me saying that he had harassed them as well.

[Arguing]

[aaron discussing how this is relevant to bylaws][Discussing multiple instances of roy assaulting women][Discussing how he did not cooperate][Constantly attacked us, violent language, etc][Aaron has documentation of everything Roy has said to individuals]

Point of Clarification.

[I have read 43 email chains, and I have not seen any venomous language]

Aaron: [Just because you do not feel that way does not mean the people the emails were directed to did not feel emotionally disturbed]

[George opposed to putting limit and his reasoning]

[Antonio discussing time, we need to expedite, too much time spent on this issue]

[David discussing how this is a difficult issue, has been with green party for a long time, and he has never experienced an issue like this before, his opinion is that the sec should be able to carry out their decisions. The reason in his eyes for why Roy was removed was because he was completely disruptive to the process. He states that Roy interprets things the way he wants to see them and he pushes them nonstop. When he asked Roy for specifics about how the sec was violating things, he would not provide specifics. He was just continuing a bombardment and not letting us continue the processes. He states that he acted in an authoritarian nature and violated many of the ten key values that did not allow

the green party to act as needed. This was not a power play, this was a situation that the leaders felt that there were no other options because they could not continue their work if they continued to work with Roy.]

Gary: I have no feeling that these people are on a hungry power trip or that they will do something nefarious. The sec were trying to do their job, they are not power hungry, the green party does not have any power right now. The point is that they were elected to do the work that we cannot do because we had other responsibilities, so they were doing our bidding and what I hear is not that they were violating or ignoring the bylaws, but they were confronted with a situation that disrupted. Thank you aaron for providing the details because the details are what mattered and what led them to do what they did. These are violations of conduct of someone who was elected in good faith.

[other information about how the sec is justified]

[Requests to postpone this topic]

Ellen: I'm just puzzled because I'm looking at this young man who I met last year who was running around with a clipboard. He reminds me of his son. This is neat, we have someone young that looks like they're trying to do their job. Anyway, after the meeting, I was concerned about they bylaws. I think I texted with Roy about the bylaws, and then all of a sudden I didn't hear anymore and then I got this huge minutes of the meeting. They were revised, very detailed, very good I think. The minutes were explaining how the bylaws were changed. I thought nothing of this, then I waited for the bylaws. I never got the bylaws.

[Other personal thoughts]

[Concerned about 2 attorneys involved in this]

Laura: We are trying to be brief on time so I will be quick. The circumstances that led to the dismissal are relevant because they allow people to see why the sec made the choice they made.

[Talking about the minutes and dispute that initiated this]

[clarification that that specific dispute was not what caused removal, it was what followed][at least 8 volunteers came to the sec with complaints about Roy][Discussing how Roy launched an attack against Aarons eligibility to be co-chair]

There was email traffic where Roy attempted to delay that submission that interjected confusion. He said he was going to file. And I said that the co-chair did not fail to file, so that confusion was also destructive. Then we had the phone call with David Cobb and the sec voted with majority to dismiss, with one abstention, that was a 2/3 vote to dismiss the secretary. After that he made a statement to the national committee where he alleged all sort of things, but the only one that I am going to say is that he told them that he was the only legally elected member of the Texas state committee.

[Explaining how the clause is relevant in this case]

**Motion: End this discussion at 1PM and end convention at 2PM and that is it.**

**Seconded.**

**George: I have an amendment, the people who are on the stack now will get to speak**

**and we'll try to limit, but if it exceeds time it should be fine, they should get to speak.**

**Motion: Move Roy to the top of the stack and finish the conversation after the stack is done.**

**Another Amendment: [did not hear, was not accepted]**

**Amendment by Antonio, limit speaker time.**

**25 for**

**3 against**

**2 abstentions.**

Maria Elena: Going back to the bylaws, we have a bylaw that deals with the basis of removing an officer that has violated their duties. Keep in mind that this is a 2 way street. [she has been a part of the conversation]  
[She claims she is a criminal investigator and she believes that the language Roy used was not violent]

Kat: [quick interruption, asking if there are any other nominations]

Debbie: This is not a matter of roys character, I am not here to judge it or think about itm, this is irrelevant. What is relevant to me are the bylaws, we need to keep to them but these were infringed. I don't care about Roy and I am not here to judge him. I just know the procedures must be followed. If we don't follow them this organization will fall to the ground.

Bernadine: [reiteration; contorted bylaws to get rid of someone elected][people were very happy with the minutes he provided][All of this took place within a month][claims nothing got done in the party because of obsession over Roy]

George: [Wants to increase time to 3 minutes]

[discussion about ballots]

[discussion tht we need to get back on track]

Paul: I learned a lot about the green party at this meeting.

There are processes to remove elected officials, and when the official is removed by the body that elected him, that's the process. I have heard enough already, and heard from Mr. Stanley.....I think the proper way to restore order is to agree with the opposition and to initiate a process to remove Mr. Stanley.

Don: I want to commend the SEC for trying to do the best. The best they can in a difficult circumstance. I was to applaud the transparency that they provided. I am not sure that there has been entire transparency, I don't think we can assume everyone here has...it should be like a court of law is what im trying to say...we should be able to with all of the evidence that is available. I understand there are some personal thing, privacy involve. I would like to see however the mapping of what I have heard and what rumor

has it. To this specific bylaw, I want to come look to that if I can. That's the legal option, the bylaw, by which the action can be taken. It's the best information that I can understand. I am a little disappointed, I feel there has been inappropriate behavior.

Kevin: I can appreciate the concern about following the rules of the bylaws, and I can appreciate that someone who reads the bylaws very carefully can see a crack. I think its really important with the GPTX that anyone that wants to be on the executive committee needs to be cooperative. I think it is inappropriate for someone to join it with a hidden agenda. The way the green party seems to be set up is very appropriate. [discussing the structure of state, and county set up][the more he hears about this issue, the stronger his support for the sec]

Roy: Feelings, Falsification Statement, Process of Elimination, Personal Feelings, Reasons for Actions, opposing party point of view, final notes.  
[not dismissing anyone's feelings, everything they said is legitimate]  
[the reason why they are saying that they are aggressing them in ways that is untrue is because I brought up a lot of laws that they were breaking]  
[process of my elimination, lets talk about this endorsement which they pulled out of this one law, that's not even true.  
[the sec choosing rules that benefit them, one thing that has been said is that we should trust the sec.]  
[cobb called me already upset when he heard everything, he mentioned to me, that how is it you're the only person to believe your side. He was biased. The phone call between hi and Cobb was recorded, it was clear he was biased and yet he still mediated.]  
[Personal feelings. I love and respect people in this room who cannot work with me anymore. People moved towards the herd. They decided that everything had to say about laws was wrong because of rumours.][my career and personal relationships were personally crippled by the sec][my feelings were not legitimate in this case, they never talked about my feelings, and they illegally went out of their way to silence me.][Reasons for my actions. I did absolutely what they said. When I was disputing process, it had much more to do than the minutes. It was a pile of things. Claims dan never did his job because kat did it. Says there are a lot of unwritten rules and that the sec has so many rules that no one even knows, that only kat knows. He brought up that the rules need to be written, it is unfair for people not to know that they even exist. They didn't even vote. They just did it. They took him off of nationbuilder without reason. They didn't appreciate him sending out emails. Even though they weren't official emails. [Person] used to be close friend, called him crazy and said he was going to remove him as admin from all of the pages. Said that no one knew that listserve existed. He was told that since they don't use listserve, that they should use nationbuilder. But the only people who have access to nationbuilder is Kat. It is whoever they decide. No one votes on this. Points out that no one voted for Laura. Laura is not a chair. The scc made her a chair.] [there is no evidence of laura being elected, its not in the minutes, not in the ballots. Aaron attacked him about not being eligible for being a chair because of his county association. Even though Aaron was registered with Wise County not Denton County. He was only registered through a technicality. This issue was ignored when brought up.][laura and

aaron admittedly broke rules and did wrong but they had reason for doing so. They claimed about being ignorant about it. That they didn't know they had done anything wrong.][the sec does not respect this delegation. We need to question how the sec always shoots down anytime someone speaks up.][their feelings are not a reason to remove me, and slander me.]

**Voting to accept resolution and restore Roy Stanley to secretary.**

**9 for**

**16 oppose**

**5 abstain**

**Did not pass. Roy is not restored.**

[Roy argues validity of vote]

Gary: YOU LOST. SHUT UP.

[chaos]