

LNC Executive Committee Meeting

**Teleconference
28 November 2000**

Attendance: Jim Lark
Steve Givot
Mark Tuniewicz
Ken Bisson
Joe Dehn
Michael Gilson de Lemos

Also: Sara Chambers
Lorenzo Gaztanaga
Lois Kaneshiki
Scott Lieberman
Mark Nelson
Dan Wisnosky

Staff: Steve Dasbach
Ron Crickenberger

The meeting was called to order by Lark at 8:39pm EST, with Dehn serving as secretary.

Item: Chair's Report

Lark thanked various people for their work, congratulated Wisnosky and Kaneshiki on their new positions as state chairs, and congratulated Nelson on his election to public office.

Item: Systems Review

Gilson reported that he has collected about 250 suggestions that he has organized into five categories based on the points Lark emphasized in his campaign for Chair. He said he would be distributing copies of this to LNC members along with a systems flow. He said he also has about 100 pages of raw material.

Givot asked about the relationship between this effort and the strategic planning process. Gilson said that it was a necessary part of strategic planning.

Dehn asked whether the systems flow was intended to document current processes or to represent a proposal. Gilson clarified that it was intended to document current processes.

Dasbach noted that although he had provided a lot of information for the systems flow he had not had a chance to review the result, so everybody should understand that it does not necessarily fully reflect how things are currently done.

Gilson said that it should be viewed as a work in progress.

Dasbach suggested that it could be useful to new LNC members when they take a tour of the national office.

Item: Director's Report

Dasbach noted that he had sent a financial update recently. He noted that Nick Dunbar had been out for a week but had arranged for all the bills due this month to be paid and entered into the system before he left. Dasbach estimated that additional revenue and expenses since that time were approximately equal. He said he expected to end the month with a positive balance of around \$110K to \$120K.

Dasbach noted that he had distributed a proposed twelve-month budget for 2001, and said he would also be preparing a four-month version as well as notes regarding cash flow.

Gilson asked about the projections for membership-related revenue.

Dasbach said they were developed based on past experience, that he would be providing notes about how various categories were projected, that he assumed the year would start with about 33K dues-paying members, and that there were not separate projections for the various contributor categories.

Gilson asked what kind of membership increase was envisioned in this budget.

Dasbach said that it probably corresponded to some increase but that he couldn't give an actual number without further calculations. He said that many sources of revenue can be adequately projected based on starting membership. He cited the major donor and telemarketing categories as ones which depend more on how much effort we put into them.

Crickenberger said that although the presidential results were disappointing, in other areas we did about what could be expected in line with growth of the party.

Dasbach noted that our candidate in Washington state accounted for the balance of power in the US Senate race which in turn was important for the balance of the entire Senate. Crickenberger said that this was resulting in a lot of publicity.

Givot asked about the chances that the \$150K year-end goal would be met. Dasbach said the chances were good.

Givot asked how expenses for the annual report fundraising letter were handled in the budget. Dasbach said that postage for the portion mailed to current contributors was assumed to be paid out of the 2000 budget while the postage for the rest and all the printing would be from the 2001 budget.

Dehn asked whether the problem of lack of contributor information from the Browne campaign had been resolved. Dasbach said that Perry Willis believed that the information had been provided but that because Nick Dunbar was out he hadn't yet been able to confirm this.

Dehn asked what was holding up the transfer of the domain names that had been agreed to with Web Commanders. Dasbach said he would check with Jack Dean.

Lark asked Dasbach to report on a lawsuit filed by a candidate for president whose name did not appear on the primary ballot in California.

Dasbach reported that the LPC was having David Bergland handle it and that Bill Hall had suggested that Bergland could handle it for us also.

Givot noted that, depending on the facts of the case, there could be reasons to have the state party and the national party represented by a different attorney.

Item: Strategic Planning

Givot said that there seems to be strong consensus on most questions of methodology, although there was some difference about funding of travel expenses. He noted that Kaneshiki had raised the question of whether basing the process on in-person meetings would leave some people out.

Lark invited Kaneshiki to comment on her concerns. She said that she considers strategic planning to be an integral function of the LNC, not something to be delegated to a smaller body. She suggested that if she can't attend the meetings she be allowed to appoint someone to represent her. She said that any subcommittee should only be making a recommendation, not making the actual decision.

Lark said that his understanding all along was that the subcommittee would be only making a recommendation and that the product would have to then be approved by the full LNC. There was consensus that this was the approach under consideration.

Dasbach noted that the proposed schedule includes opportunity for review at a meeting of the full LNC in the middle of the process as well as at the end. Lark said that he envisions reporting progress to the full LNC at each step to allow for feedback.

Dasbach asked whether a "SWOT" (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis should be included in the timeline. Givot said that he considered that to already be included but that it could be listed as a distinct item.

Dasbach said that the proposed 2001 budget includes money to pay for travel expenses for the strategic planning meetings, and a similar allotment for a conference of state chairs. He said that although he believed LNC members should be expected to pay their own way for the meetings they originally committed to attending, these additional meetings were above and beyond that.

Tuniewicz asked for comment on where in the process the mission statement should be considered.

Givot said that the LNC should spend some time discussing the mission statement at the beginning of the process, because leaving it to the subcommittee would create the risk of basing the plan on a mission different from what the LNC wanted. Dasbach said that the LNC should begin by looking at the current mission statement and deciding whether to confirm it or spend additional time to modify it. Givot said that we should take a fresh look and not assume it would be unchanged. Bisson suggested that if anybody wants to propose a new one they should circulate it before the meeting.

Item: December LNC Meeting

Dasbach described arrangements for LNC members to visit the office on Friday.

There was discussion of meal arrangements.

Lark said that he would be sending out a tentative agenda shortly.

Dasbach reported that a representative from the Browne campaign would be available to give a report.

Gilson suggested there be time allowed for presentation of the systems review. There was discussion of whether a detailed presentation of this would be most appropriately done during the regular meeting, in a less formal setting, or as one of the first items of business for the strategic planning subcommittee.

Dasbach asked if arrangements should be made for the lawyers involved in the proposed lawsuit against the FEC to make a presentation. Dehn said that if we are going to be asked to get involved then we need to have such a presentation. Bisson expressed concerns about spending time on this given how much other business we have to cover and said that we should not act on this unless we are given adequate information in advance of the meeting. Tuniewicz said he would prefer that this be deferred to the April meeting. Dehn said that it was important that any presentation be early in the meeting so the LNC is not put in the position of having to make a final decision without time to reflect on it. Dasbach said that he thought it was likely that we would be asked to join the suit and that he had asked Perry Willis to provide documentation prior to the meeting.

Item: Future Meetings

Lark asked for comments on the Executive Committee meeting schedule.

Gilson moved that the schedule be changed to every four weeks.

Dasbach suggested that if we want an interval around four weeks it would be better to go to a monthly schedule.

Tuniewicz said that he thinks the current schedule of every two weeks has kept the committee better informed, has helped build cohesiveness, has allowed each meeting to be shorter, and is in keeping with the responsibilities of the Executive Committee.

Dehn said that having a schedule of frequent meetings helps avoid delays in addressing important matters and reduces the need to schedule emergency meetings.

Gilson withdrew his motion.

Givot suggested that everybody bring their calendars to the LNC meeting to help in the scheduling of future meetings.

Item: General Counsel

Lark reported that several people had expressed interest in serving as General Counsel but that they all wanted some kind of compensation. He suggested that if this is going

to have to become a paid position it might be appropriate to solicit proposals from more people.

Dasbach said that funds for paying the General Counsel were included in the proposed 2001 budget.

Givot agreed that we need to consider a wider search if this position is going to involve payment for services rather than just expenses, but said that it was not practical to conduct a wider search in two weeks. He suggested a quarterly payment arrangement, instead of committing to anybody for a full year, while a wider search is conducted.

Dasbach said he prefers a full year arrangement so that the search doesn't have to be started right away, because the staff will be very busy during the first half of the year.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:08pm EST.
