

LNC Meeting

Washington, DC

December 8-9, 2001

DRAFT

Present: Jim Lark (VA), Chair
Ken Bisson (IN), Vice-Chair (arrived during ???)
Deryl Martin (TN), Treasurer
Steve Givot (CO), Secretary

Lorenzo Gaztanaga (MD), At Large Representative
Don Gorman (NH), At Large Representative
Elias Israel (MA), At Large Representative
Lois Kaneshiki (PA), At Large Representative
Jim Turney (VA), At Large Representative

Ed Hoch (AK), Region 1 Representative
Mark Nelson (IA), Region 1 Representative
Joe Dehn (CA), Region 2 Representative
Scott Lieberman (CA), Region 2 Representative
Mark Rutherford (IN), Region 3 Representative
Michael "MG" Gilson de Lemos (FL), Region 4 Representative
Richard Schwarz (PA), Region 5 Representative
Dan Karlan (NJ), Region 6 Representative
Mike Dixon (IL), Region 7 Representative

Also present: Tim Hagan (NV), Region 2 Alternate
Della Croft (PA), Region 5 Alternate
Mary Ruwart (TX), Region 7 Alternate

Absent: Jim Dexter (UT), Region 1 Alternate
Tom Knapp (MO), Region 1 Alternate
Greg Holmes (MI), Region 3 Alternate
Ben Scherrey (GA), Region 4 Alternate
Mark Cenci (ME), Region 6 Alternate

Vacant: Region 2 - First Alternate

Staff: Steve Dasbach, National Director
Ron Crickenberger, Political Director
Bill Winter, Communications Director

Lark called the meeting to order at approximately 9:00AM EST.

Item: Credentials

Givot advised the Committee that Region 5 Alternate Carl Milsted has been replaced by Della Croft of Pa.

Dehn advised the Committee that the Region 2 first Alternate position is currently open as a result of the resignation of Dan Wisnosky.

Item: Check of Paperwork

Dasbach reviewed the paperwork in each member's notebook.

Item: Disclosure Statements

Gorman informed the Committee that he continues earn money doing political training seminars around the country.

Karlan said that several LNC members have such several LNC members have similar duties. He said that he does not believe that these constitute conflicts of interest, but rather "confluence of interest."

Item: Setting of Agenda

Nelson moved that approval of the 2002 budget should be removed from the agenda for this meeting and that discussion of the 2002 proposed budget be discussed on Sunday December 9 as a committee of the whole.

Hoch seconded.

Nelson said that the LP has not had a budget for the past several years, given how poorly we have performed. He said that the culture of the party needs to be changed so that the budget is accompanied by the information required to adopt a budget with broad support. He said that a funding resolution can be considered to provide for the operation of the party until a budget can be adopted. He said that the Committee should proceed as a committee of the whole - as SPT did - to discuss this topic instead of formally considering the budget for adoption at this meeting.

MG asked whether it is Nelson's intention to postpone consideration for one day or to postpone consideration until another meeting.

Nelson indicated that it is the intention of his motion to postpone consideration of adoption of a budget for 2002 until another meeting.

Dixon said that there are items on the agenda placed after the budget discussion. He said that some of these have budgetary impact. He said that these should be decided earlier in the agenda that consideration of the budget.

Dasbach said that some of the information present in the budget proposal will aid in discussion the other items which may have budgetary impact.

Israel ask Nelson if he envisions using time as the committee of the whole to set up expectation about process and information so that the budget would be considered at the March 2002 LNC meeting.

Givot said that the budgetary process is the time when the LNC has the greatest amount of input into priorities. He said that the Committee has just spent a year laying out a multi-year strategic plan. He said that in October 2001, the Committee requested a staffing plan which indicates when - in the coming year - staff will be brought on to implement the strategies developed in the strategic plan. He said that no such staffing plan has been presented thus far. He said that adopting a budget without such a staffing plan leaves the Committee in a position where it will have not established specific expectation as to when each strategy will start to be implemented. He said that this, alone, is sufficient to support the motion.

Martin said that he sympathizes and empathizes with the concerns expressed by others. He said that it is unfair not to adopt at least an interim budget.

Nelson said that he believes that there is adequate time to craft and pass an interim budget at this meeting.

Dehn said that either a year or two ago there was a similar issue. He said that the decision at that time was that the Bylaws do not permit this. He said that perhaps a full-year budget can be passed with limitations so that it has the effect of being a three-month budget.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

Dixon moved to add an item to determine the process for making convention committee appointments.

Givot seconded.

The motion was passed without objection.

Karlan noted that the appointment of Credential Committee members should be added to the agenda.

MG asked to add an item regarding comments for the good of the party to the agenda.

The agenda was approved as revised.

Item: Chair's Comments

Lark thanked the members and guests for attending the meeting.

Lark thanked the staff for their hard work, effort, and support during a very difficult year.

Lark thanked Dan Wisnosky for his service on the LNC and SPT.

Lark congratulated Cat Deburg for her election as Chair of LPDC.

Lark noted that transportation problems have delayed the arrival of Ken Bisson for several hours.

Lark said that we live in very dangerous times. He said that - in the past - wartime has lead to the death of political parties championing individual liberty. He said that if there are additional attacks on US soil, these

will pose additional threats to the LP.

He said that - over the next week - we celebrate the 210th anniversary of the signing of the Bill of Rights and the 30th anniversary of the Libertarian Party. He said that the survival of the Libertarian Party for those 30 years is a feat. He said that we have done extremely well in growing and surviving these 30 years.

Lark thanked the efforts of those in the room as freedom fighters.

MG asked the Chair to place the his comments - verbatim - in LP News.

Item: Statement by New Members

Gorman said that new members of the NH Legislature were given an opportunity to address the legislature to introduce themselves and indicate where their interests lie.

Gorman said that the LNC lacks a subcommittee structure. He said that the use of subcommittees is a very effective way for large organizations to do business. He said that he has no specific proposals to offer. He said that he would like to engage in conversations over the weekend about how we might establish such a structure for use in the future.

Croft said that her only agenda for serving on the LNC is to elect Libertarians to office at all levels.

Item: Treasurer's Report

Martin said that his report will deal with financial questions that seem to be on the minds of many LNC members.

Martin said that some have asked what has happened to the financial reserve. He said that we have not had a financial reserve in a true sense. He said that he has worked to develop the current reserve policy that is being phased into place. He said that the party has retrenched - deciding to establish a true reserve. He said the funds that were in certificates of deposit comprising the former reserve have been used to pay down accounts payable. He said that it is no surprise to him that the reduction in certificates of deposit is almost identical to the reduction in accounts payable. He said that the former "Reserve Fund" has been used to pay bills. Martin said that if the proposed budget were to be adopted, the Reserve Fund would have to be about \$86,000. He said that this would be a true reserve.

Martin said that some have asked why membership has fallen. He said that about a year ago the national party stopped prospecting for new members. He said that - over time - statistics such as first-year renewal rates and subsequent-year renewal rates have been quite constant. He said that the fall in membership is almost exactly explained by applying these renewal rates to the membership base that existed. He said that this should not be a surprise. He said that the cause of membership decline is the failure to continue to prospect for new members to grow the party.

Martin said that some have asked whether the financial downturn is temporary or permanent. He said that the mail embargo resulting from the anthrax attack biased the ability to determine this as he had previously suggested. He said that the current resumption of prospecting coupled with an expected return of mail

delivery to normal expectations should provide helpful data to provide forward visibility.

Martin moved that the proposed changes in his report be made to the Policy Manual.

These proposed changes are:

1. Adding the following sentence to Article V, Section 2 A of the Policy Manual:

The National Director shall provide monthly budgets for the next calendar year including when the proposed budget might use reserve funds for any purpose.

2. Adding a new item (5) to Article V, Section 2 B of the Policy Manual:

The Executive Committee shall be notified in advance by the National Director of any intention to undertake any project that is estimated, on gross, to cost more than 2.5% of budgeted revenue. The National Director must immediately report to the Executive Committee when any project's gross cost unintentionally exceeds 2.5% of budgeted revenue.

3. Replacing the second sentence in Article V, Section 5 A with the following:

For purposes of this section, a minimum prudent level is deemed to be that cash assets including CD's but excluding the special events account must exceed accounts payable (not including accounts related to special events) at each month-end. Also, no single account payable shall ever go beyond 60 days past due including revolving accounts where minimum payments are due each month.

4. Replacing Article V, Section 5 B with the following language:

B. Reserve Requirement: The reserve for each month is calculated as the excess of all cash assets not including the special events account (federal checking, non-federal checking, time deposits, and credit card balance) above accounts payable (not including accounts related to special events) measured at month-end, provided that no less than 90% of such excess is held in interest bearing (CD) deposits. The reserve should average 2.5% of budgeted revenue. In additional, the reserve at the end of each December should be no less than 2% of budgeted revenue. CD maturities must be no less than one month but longer term CD's may be purchased at the discretion of the National Director. Early withdrawal is not allowed except by explicit approval of the Treasurer. Not renewing a maturing CD requires consultation with the Treasurer.

Israel seconded.

Nelson moved to amend the proposals by changing all references to the "National Director" to the "Executive Director."

The change was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Nelson moved to amend the second proposal to require that the National Committee be notified instead of the

Executive Committee.

The change was accepted as a friendly amendment.

MG moved to amend the fourth proposal to add the sentence "Early withdrawals and decisions not to renew certificates of deposit are subject to LNC oversight."

Gorman seconded.

Nelson moved to substitute the following language: "The National Committee shall be notified promptly by the Treasurer in the event of an early withdrawal or decision not to renew certificates of deposit."

Dixon seconded.

Martin said that he supports the substitute language. He said that early withdrawal or non-renewal of a certificate of deposit are minor occurrences. He said that he estimates the penalty for the early withdrawal of funds from a certificate of the size current used to be about \$40.

Givot said that he is not concerned about the whether the reserve funds are converted from certificates of deposit to cash. He said that what would concern him is if the funds were being spent instead of held in reserve. He said that he prefers the substitute language, but that neither provide notification when the reserve funds are being spent.

Martin said that the difficulty is in defining what constitutes "dipping into" the reserve. He suggested that Givot might provide a definition of when this is happening.

Givot acknowledge that he was thinking in terms of the prior approach. He said that periodic reports from the Treasurer showing the target reserve and the actual month-end performance would provide him with good notification of when the reserve funds were being used.

The motion to substitute passed on voice vote.

The amendment passed on voice vote.

Dehn said that he favors the motion to update the Policy Manual. He said that he supported these changes at the October 2001 LNC meeting, except for the timing of this going into effect. He said that he agrees that this policy establishes a true reserve. He said that he believes that the prior policy sought a true reserve, but had a loophole.

Martin said that the Treasurer sincerely appreciates the comments made by Dehn.

The main motion passed on a voice vote.

MG asked Lark to rule that Proposal 4 is out of order because the Committee cannot delegate its oversight authority.

Lark ruled that the Committee can delegate this authority.

MG appealed the ruling of the Chair.

After discussion, MG withdrew his appeal of the ruling of the chair.

Main motion passed on a voice vote without objection.

Item: Region 1E Report

Lark asked regional representatives to report on anything not contained in their written reports.

Nelson said that LPIL is facing problems with the Federal Election Commission resulting from late filing of FEC reports.

Nelson said that his region has two interesting gubernatorial races and possibly a third interesting one.

Region 2 Report

Dehn said that LPCA has between 41 and 44 candidates for Congress. He said that two LPCA candidates have been suspended. He said that their judicial committee will be reviewing the suspensions.

Hagan updated the Committee on events in NV.

Region 3 Report

Rutherford said that LPOH lost the second round of their ballot access lawsuit at the appeals court level and is preparing an appeal to the Ohio Supreme Court.

Rutherford updated the Committee on ballot access efforts in KY.

Rutherford told the Committee that

Kaneshiki asked Rutherford about the reasons that Tim O'Brien (MI) and Dena Bruedigam (OH) have resigned.

Rutherford said that there were there were several issues regarding O'Brien's resignation. He said that Bruedigam's resignation was entirely a personal financial matter.

Region 4 Report

MG updated the Committee on activities in FL.

Region 5 Report

Croft said that LPDC did not run any candidates.

Nick Sarwark said that the Green Party sued MD about ballot access requirements. He said that if the Green

Party wins the lawsuit, all petitioning requirements for minor party candidates will be eliminated in MD, leaving only the requirement that the minor party petition.

Kaneshiki reported that there were 48 wins in November in PA. She said that only 41 of the victories will result in Libertarians assuming office because some people were elected to multiple positions or for other reasons. She said that nine Libertarians were reelected. She said that one person was elected as a Republican. She said that 34 are newly elected Libertarians.

Israel updated the Committee on the efforts of LPMA to repeal the state income tax.

Region 7 Report

Dixon said that he has spent most of the last few months traveling to visit with the affiliate party executive committees in his region. He said that the AZ registration drive has been completed and registered with the state. He said that Maricopa County has also received certification, but that the county is continuing to investigate the submitted registrations.

Item: Executive Director's Report

Dasbach reviewed financial results including interim financial results through November.

Dasbach updated the Committee on some aspects of the party's bookkeeping relating to credit card charges made on the party's credit card.

Dasbach said that when mail deliveries were delayed by the anthrax attack, a major push was made to raise funds over the Internet. He said that this is reflected in the current financial results. He said that all revenue sources that rely on mail service to deliver contributions show a drop in October and November. He said that it is not yet clear as to what the long term financial implications of the September attacks will be.

Dasbach said that the significant increase in lapsed memberships may reflect delayed mail which is enroute to the party. He said that the shortfall in the number of new members being generated is explained by reduced prospecting and the fact that this is not a federal election year.

Dasbach reviewed the returns from the recent prospecting and fundraising letters. He said that they are disappointing on an historical basis. He noted that these are dependent on the postal system and that this may be the cause of the drop. He said that fundraising and renewal efforts that do not rely on mail are performing at levels consistent with past performance.

MG said that the format in which financial information is being presented is "very managerially oriented." He said that he finds this very helpful.

Ruwart asked Dasbach if he suspects that he is not getting all of the mail yet.

Dasbach said that has been arriving from all sorts of time periods. He said that he is not sure whether the shortfall in mail is a result of processing delays or, possibly, and change in contribution patterns as a result of the events of September 11.

Item: Political Director's Report

Crickenberger said that the Libertarian Party has had a very good year in terms of winning elections.

Crickenberger said that the party doubled the prior record for the number of candidates elected in a single year as well as electing double the number of candidates on a single day.

Crickenberger said that because we ran about twice as many candidates, he has concluded that the best thing he can do to increase election wins is to continue to work to increase the number of candidates running.

Crickenberger praised the efforts of the Libertarian Victory Caucus and Chris Azzaro for their efforts in support of LP candidates.

Crickenberger reported on results of legal and ballot access efforts in OH.

Crickenberger reported that there is a possibility of problems with the registration drive in AZ.

Crickenberger updated the Committee on ballot access issues in CA. He complimented Dehn on his efforts in this regard.

Dehn thanked Crickenberger for recognizing his efforts. He said that the person who is most responsible for recruiting a large number of candidates in CA is Ted Brown.

Crickenberger said that Aaron Russo is expected to announce his candidacy for governor of NV in the near future.

Crickenberger said that he would like clarification of what he is permitted to do in support of candidates prior to nomination. He said that he currently engages in pre-nomination recruiting, sends out materials that he would provide to any prospective candidate, provides pre-nomination ballot access assistance generally done in consultation with affiliate parties, and provides other assistance with the consent of the affiliate party.

Crickenberger said that he would also like clarification whether approaching people such as Walter Williams to see if he is interested in running for office - for example, the presidency - would violate LNC policy.

Dehn said that all of Crickenberger's efforts in CA have been pre-nomination.

MG said that all candidates in FL are controlled by the state committee.

Item: Communications Director's Report

Winter said that for 2001 media contacts are down about 20% from the prior year but that the number of interviews is up about 5%.

Winter said that television appearances are down from 27 appearances in 2000 to 8 in 2001. He said that more than half of the appearances in 2001 were related to either national convention or the census project. He said that publication of op ed pieces is up 200% over 2000.

Winter said that in recent months media efforts have been focused on the September 11 attacks. He said that this resulted in a peak of 63 interviews during October.

Winter said that the party has been trying very hard to communicate the party's non-interventionism, pro-civil-liberties agenda without antagonizing others. He said that Bush has a 90% approval rating and there is current 85-90% support for the global war on terrorism. He said that if the party is not careful, it can easily "turn off" people and come across as "un-American" or "pro-terrorist." He said that after a recent Browne appearance, the party received more than 40 telephone calls and emails complaining about what Browne said or how he said it. He said that no communications were received supporting what Browne had said. He said that the negative comments all came from people who had voted for Browne for president.

Winter said that Getz has done over 100 interviews on terrorism and the US response.

Getz said that this is a tough issue for the party. He said that there is the possibility of saying the wrong thing and doing a lot of damage. He said that the guiding influence was designed to focus on doing no harm. He said that the focus was on preventing future attacks while acknowledging the need to go after bin Laden and the people who caused the attack.

Getz said that he has been raising the question as to what countries such as Switzerland, Canada, and Australia are doing differently such that they do not attract such attacks. He said that - while some people responded that the US needs to be the policeman of the world - they seemed to understand that the viewpoint we are expressing is respectable, even if it is not what they believe.

Gaztanaga said that he feels that the methods used by the staff show good judgment. He suggested that it might be helpful to obtain a tape of what Browne has said that has alienated so many people.

Winter reviewed the efforts of the party to publicize the upcoming 30th anniversary of the party on December 11th.

Winter said that there is a possibility that a member will volunteer to print LP News below cost. He said that this might enable LP News to print in color on all pages at a cost below today's cost.

Item: Discussion of Use of Mailing List by 1996 Browne Campaign

Gorman said that he understands that preferential treatment was given to the Browne campaign in the 1996 rental of the mailing list. He said that he understands that preference was given both to the rate charged and the extension of credit in payment for those rentals.

Gorman said that he believes that his campaign and others were required to prepay for such rentals and at a significantly higher rate.

Dasbach said that the records indicate that it appears that the National Director at that time - Perry Willis - was renting the list to Browne for half price that were full price rentals taking place to the Browne campaign as well. He said that it appears that each month there were two rentals - one at full price and one at half price. He said that only Willis would have information on why this was done.

Dasbach said that standard practice is to require prepayment for list rentals from political campaigns, but not

for non-campaign renters after their initial rental.

Dasbach said that all list rentals were invoiced on a timely basis. He said that Browne did not make payment on many of the invoices in a timely manner, but that list rentals were continued notwithstanding the outstanding balance.

Lark said that in his review of these records, he noted that the building debt from Browne campaign for these list rentals was correctly reported on the corresponding FEC reports.

Dasbach said that a delay in payment for list rentals from a non-campaign list renter is not unusual.

Dasbach said that this is a clear conflict of interest on the part of Willis because he was both the National Director - and obligated to the party - and doing work for the Browne campaign - and obligated to help out the campaign. The two positions were clearly in conflict on this matter.

The Committee recessed for lunch at 12:11 PM EST.

The Committee reconvened at PM EST.

Item: Methodology for Appointment of Convention Committee Members

Karlan moved

that voting for convention committee appointees shall be by preferential ballot. Each LNC member shall cast votes for each candidate, the total not to exceed the number of available seats, as "Yes" and "No". Each LNC member may also cast a single ("Yes") vote for NOTA. Those candidates for whom the net ("Yes" minus "No") is greater than or equal to one-third (1/3) of the total number of LNC members present, and greater than the total "Yes" votes for NOTA, shall be ranked and all those qualifying shall be seated on the respective committee according to the number of seats to be filled by the LNC, with those qualifying in excess of the available seats being ranked alternates.

Dixon seconded.

Karlan said that this convention's Platform and Bylaws Committees are being charged by the LNC with certain tasks related to the strategic plan. He said that this makes it important that the LNC appoints people whom, the Committee believes, will be supportive of the goals of the strategic plan.

Dehn said that this breaks with past tradition. He reviewed the past procedure. He said that, in the past, a majority vote in favor of each committee member was required. He said that this proposal will hide the Yes and No vote totals for each person.

Givot said that it is his recollection that two years ago the committee appointments were done by secret ballot.

Givot asked Dehn whether publishing the Yes and No total for each candidate would address this concerns.

Dehn said that it would address some of his concerns.

Lark said that the Platform Committee members must be appointed by February 28. He said that the Committee has more leeway as to when to appoint the Bylaws and Convention Rules Committee.

Dehn moved to add the sentence: "There will be a recorded vote showing how each LNC member voted for each person nominated."

Kaneshiki seconded.

Givot moved to divide the question (1) between the method of election and recording of the votes for each candidate and (2) the question of whether or not the votes of individual LNC members should be recorded.

The Committee agreed to divide the question.

Lark said that the first vote will be on whether or not to record how many Yes and No votes each convention committee nominee received.

That portion of the divided question passed on a voice vote.

Lark said that the next vote will be on whether votes of each LNC member for each person nominated will be recorded.

That portion of the divided question failed on a vote of five to eight with three abstaining.

Dehn, Gaztanaga, Gorman, Kaneshiki, and Turney voted in favor. Croft, Dixon, Givot, Karlan, Lieberman, Martin, Nelson, and Rutherford voted against. MG, Israel, and Lark abstained.

See hardcopy for final form of motion.

Motion passed on voice vote.

Givot moved that the appointment of Platform Committee members to immediately before the next break to permit tallying of votes during the break.

Nelson seconded.

The motion passed without objection.

Item: Consideration of Strategic Planning Committee Report

Nelson reported on the survey of those in attendance at the meeting regarding prioritization of the goals proposed by SPT. He said that the top-ranked goals are:

GOAL	POINTS*
1	63
2	61

3	59
5	56
6	48
4	45

*Higher points indicates preferred goals

Nelson said that the rankings of the 10 most popular strategies was:

STRATEGY	POINTS
1	87
10	71
20	67
11	52
13	49
6	47
7	44
3	42
5	41
4	37

*Higher points indicates preferred strategies

Dasbach reported on a survey of members' prioritization of goals:

GOAL	SCORE*
1	3.5
2	4.1
3	3.5
4	3.8
5	2.6
6	3.5

*Lower points indicates preferred goals

Dasbach reported on the percentage of surveyed members supporting various strategies:

STRATEGY	%
15	63

10	55
7	53
16	52
8	50
1	48
2	48
13	45
3	43
18	41
17	40

Givot noted that the strong disparity between the strategies favored by the LNC and those favored by the response to the membership survey.

Dixon reminded the Committee that this was a response to a mail survey by people who are responsive to mail but perhaps not interested in personal involvement in grassroots politics. He suggested that the disparity in the favored goals between the two groups is the cause of the disparity of the strategies supported.

Dasbach said that this indicates that we have to be careful to use those strategies and goals favored by the membership as a vehicle for fundraising and to find other sources to fund the remaining strategies.

MG said that the LNC seems to favor process and internally-oriented strategies while the membership seems to favor strategies that are more externally visible. He said that this is to be expected.

Givot said that what he is hearing underscores the importance of implementing the entire strategic plan. He said that those internal strategies that involve internal process are very important, even if not particularly appealing to the membership. He said that we still have to implement those strategies which the members find most important. He said that this argues the importance of implementing the entire strategic plan.

Givot said that the following strategies are not on either top ten list of strategies:

- Strategy 9
- Strategy 12
- Strategy 14
- Strategy 19

Dixon said that he feels that Strategies 19 and 20 are very closely connected and that if we accomplish Strategy 20, Strategy 19 will have been achieved.

MG said that Strategy 9, Strategy 12, and Strategy 14 are nuts and bolts issues.

Dasbach said that Strategy 9, Strategy 12, and Strategy 19 had a larger than typical number of comments from the membership survey indicating lack of clarity and understanding of what was meant.

Karlan said that he wonders how many of the survey responses would have been changed as a result of the

presentation by SPT members.

Givot said that in the past the SPT and LNC have taken the position that it wants to pursue all of the 20 strategies. He said that although this information provides some guidance as to where we might choose to place stronger emphasis, that it does not convince him that we want to implement anything less than the full proposed strategic plan.

Dixon said that the strongest support is for more people, better candidates, branding, Platform revision, and training. He said that targeting races, grassroots outreach, and cultural reform were strongly supported by one group and supported by the other.

Dehn said that he does not see much value in prioritizing the strategies absent some understanding of where there is a conflicting use of limited resources.

Karlan said that feedback from the SPT presentation to LPVT indicated that there was a difference in understanding of the strategic plan and the terms employed in it. LPVT suggested a web site providing frequently asked questions and answers to them.

MG said that these two surveys highlight where we need to communicate sensitively with our members and where we need to listen carefully.

Lark suggested that the Committee move on to consider Dasbach's recommendations for metrics and monitors for 2002. He said that it is also important to consider values for 2004 and 2008.

Dasbach corrected the percentage of youth metric to make it consistent with what was established in the October 2002 minutes.

Dasbach changed proposed 2004 revenues from \$5.5 million to \$5 million.

The Committee asked staff about the basis for their projections regarding several metrics.

Staff answered these questions.

Gorman said that he believes that the LNC should establish subcommittees to work with some of the champions in support of achieving certain metrics.

Givot said that he prefers to for the LNC not to mandate this, but to leave each champion free to organize as he or she wishes.

Nelson asked about the source of the data for the benchmark 2000 youth market share metric.

Dasbach said that the source is a Zogby poll and the cutoff ages were 19 to 29.

Dehn said that registration data is readily available and highly accurate. He said that it would be helpful if a few states across the country might be

Hoch said that Oregon has such a database currently.

Givot suggested narrowing the age bracket defining youth from 18-29 to something more like 18-25. He said

that this is more closely aligned with where we intend to expend effort to recruit youth - in particular, it is more closely aligned to the ages of college students.

Dasbach said that aside from the costs of surveying for specifics - as opposed to using publicly available survey data - there is a question of how much time will be spent administering such surveys.

Hoch moved to adopt the proposed metrics and monitors for 2002, 2003, and 2004.

Israel seconded.

Kaneshiki said that we do not know what is required in the way of financial resources to achieve this. She said that until there is a budget adopted, we do not know if these are attainable.

Lark said that the goals need to be set before the budget is set. He said that Dasbach's proposed budget is set at a level where he believes that these metrics can be achieved.

Dasbach said that it is most helpful to think of this as an interactive process. He said that changes to the budget may cause the need to review the metrics that have been established.

Dehn asked why there are no metrics proposed for 2002 and 2003 for youth market share.

Dehn moved to amend the figure of 1.7% as the youth market share for 2002 should be used for the metric for youth market share for 2002.

Dasbach said that the polls that would be used to measure youth market share are generally run in even-numbered years. He said that he believes that the startup time for an effort to is sufficiently long that it is not likely to see a meaningful improvement in the coming year.

Without objection, the amendment as proposed by Dehn was approved.

Givot moved to amend the metric relating to developing a marketing plan during 2002 to indicated that in 2002 the plan is due in December 2002 and that in 2003 the metrics for the marketing plan would be developed by April 2003.

Without objection, the amendment as proposed by Givot was approved.

Without objection the Committee added the following metrics to the proposal:

- Developing a contract with affiliates was set to be complete by June 2002
- Getting feedback and advice from state chairs on four issues was set to be complete by June 2002
- Completion of a review of membership definition and certification requirements was set to be complete by June 2002
- Completion of a review of internal governance and election issues was set to be complete by June 2002

Dehn raised questions about the number of campus contacts and organizations. Based on the discussion, without objection, it was determined that there should be three categories measuring campus penetration: campus contacts, campus organizations, and campus individuals eager to establish organizations. The value for campus organizations for 2000 and 2001 were set at 47, the value for campus individuals eager to establish organizations was set as 10 for 2000 and 2001, and this last category was set as a monitor rather

than a metric.

Dehn moved to amend the number of candidates in 2003 from 500 to 600 and the number of candidates in 2004 from 2500 to 3000.

Dixon seconded.

Kaneshiki said that it is important to run candidates for offices where they can be elected. She said that running more people for office will not necessarily result in more wins.

Givot asked Crickenberger how much additional funding would be required to produce the metrics Dehn was suggesting.

Crickenberger said that he estimates that an additional \$10,000 would be required in 2003 and an additional \$50,000 in 2004.

Gorman said that the key is running people for offices where they can win. He said that the key is recruiting people to run for those offices.

The amendment failed on a vote of 8 to 9.

The main motion - to adopt the proposed metrics as amended - passed by a voice vote. Kaneshiki voted against.

As a result, the following metrics and monitors were adopted:

Goal	Type	Responsible	Description	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
1	Metric	Crickenberger	Libertarians in elective office	208	298	340	410	500
1	Metric	Crickenberger	Libertarian candidates (target/actual)	2000 1436	300 347	2002	500	2500
2	Metric	Pilcher	% of data of core and critical activities provided by affiliates to national LP	N/A	1 item 88%	10 items 50%	10 items 60%	10 items 70%
2	Metric	Pilcher	Affiliates with active written plan to improve performance	N/A	N/A	12	24	36
2	Metric	Crickenberger	Ballot access self-sufficiency (presidential)	30	N/A	N/A	N/A	36
2	Metric	Nelson	Develop a contract with affiliates			June		
2	Metric	Nelson	Get feedback/advice from state chairs on 4 issues			June		
3	Metric	Dasbach	Dues-paying national members	33,261	~30,000	35,000	40,000	50,000
3	Metric	Dasbach	National party revenues	\$3.6M	~\$2M	\$3.3M	\$3.6M	\$5.0M
4	Metric	Brandl	College & university campus contacts/organizations	162 47	190 47	250 75	350 105	500 150

4	Metric	Brandl	Market share: % of youth who self-identify as libertarian	1.70%	--	1.70%	--	3.5%
5	Metric	Crickenberger	Total # voting for at least one Libertarian / total votes for all Libertarians	3.3M 10M	--	increase over 4 years ago	increase over 4 years ago	increase over 4 years ago
5	Metric	Winter	Develop marketing plan and establish metrics			Plan: Dec	Metrics: April	
6	Metric	Lark	Review of membership definition and certification requirements			June		
6	Metric	Givot	Review of internal governance and election issues			June		
6	Metric	Gilson	Develop and implement membership improvement / feedback process					

Givot moved adoption the SPT Final Report modified to incorporate the changes just made.

Karlan seconded.

Dasbach said that - under Goal 2 - monitoring the number of individuals actively involved in political processes at all levels outside of campaigns and elections as well as the nature and extent of their efforts is not something that he feels he can deliver. He said that there is a similar monitor under Goal 3. He said that the latter monitor is much easier to implement and must better defined.

Givot moved to amend the proposed strategic plan by deleting that the monitor under Goal 2 measuring the number of individuals actively involved in political processes at all levels be removed.

Karlan seconded.

Dixon said that this monitors progress in the implementation of Strategy 17. He said that he is sympathetic to Dasbach's concerns, but feels that it would be better to retain the monitor and better define it and how to measure it.

Nelson said that perhaps the monitor should be more clearly presented, but that it should not be deleted.

The amendment failed on a voice vote.

The main motion - to adopt the SPT Final Report as modified passed by a vote of 11 to 3 with 2 abstentions.

Dixon, MG, Givot, Hoch, Israel, Karlan, Lieberman, Martin, Nelson, Rutherford, and Turney voted in favor. Dehn, Kaneshiki, and Schwarz voted against. Gaztanaga and Lark abstained.

Item: Review of Action Plans Submitted by LNC Members Acting as Champions

Gaztanaga reported verbally on how is proposed to champion

Strategy 3: Redevelop the Libertarian Party Platform, presenting both direction and destination, with an eye toward electoral success without compromising core beliefs

Gaztanaga also distributed a document indicating progress to date.

Nelson reported on his proposal to develop a contract with affiliates and to get feedback and advise from state chairs.

Givot reported on his proposal to conduct a review of internal governance and election issues. He said that two items have been added to the list of items to be reviewed: consideration of procedures for expulsion of a member and review of procedures for the LNC to conduct business other than in a physical meeting.

Ruwart reported on her proposal to measure the internal education effort. She indicated that she is seeking input and feedback relating to what she proposes to do.

Lark said that his proposal relates to changing the culture of the LP. He said that he welcomes comments and feedback on how to proceed.

Item: Appointment of People to Platform Committee

Lark opened nominations for LNC appointments to the Platform Committee.

Turney suggested nomination of all individuals who submitted their names for consideration. These are:

- Carol Moore (DC)
- Aaron Biterman (WI)
- Alice Lillie (NV)
- Robert Murphy (OK)
- George Squyres (AZ)
- Henry Haller (PA)
- Peter Krembs (GA)
- Sean Haugh (NC)
- Erin Hollinden (IN)
- Kenn Gividen (IN)
- Paul Hager (IN)
- Mark Schreiber (IN)
- Joe Hauptmann (IN)
- Sam Goldstein (IN)
- Dean Ahmad (MD)
- Lorenzo Gaztanaga (MD)

Karlan nominated Mike Dixon (AZ).

?? nominated Ed Hoch (AK).

Martin nominated Michael Gilson (FL).

Nominations were closed.

Members of the Committee were afforded to speak for or against any of the nominees.

Candidate	YES Votes	NO Votes
Ahmad	10	5
Biterman	1	2
Dixon	15	0
Gaztanaga	14	0
Gilson	8	0
Givinden	3	0
Goldstein	5	1
Hager	2	1
Haller	9	1
Haugh	12	0
Hauptmann	7	2
Hoch	12	0
Hollinden	14	0
Krembs	1	1
Lillie	3	2
Moore	6	9
Murphy	8	0
Schreiber	6	1
Squyres	11	1

Givot announced that the following nine people were appointed on the first ballot:

Dixon
 Gaztanaga
 Gilson
 Haller
 Haugh
 Hoch
 Hollinden
 Murphy
 Squyres

Givot said that this leaves one person to be appointed.

The Committee determined to proceed by voting using the same methodology among the next tier of people based on the first ballot: Ahmad, Hauptmann, and Schreiber. The Committee determine that those not

appointed will be ranked alternates.

Candidate	YES Votes	NO Votes
Ahmad	8	2
Hauptmann	3	0
Schreiber	3	0

Givot announced that Ahmad was appointed to the tenth position on the Platform Committee and that Hauptmann and Schreiber were tied for ranking as alternates.

Candidate	YES Votes	NO Votes
Hauptmann	8	0
Schreiber	3	0

Givot announced that Hauptmann is the first ranked alternate and Schreiber is the second ranked alternate.

Item: Approval of Proposed LNC Policy Manual Changes: LP News

Givot asked for approval of the language he drafted for LNC Policy Manual Article VII, Section B 6 in response to action taken at the October 2001 LNC meeting. He moved that Article VII, Section B 6 to read:

6. A directory of state and Party contacts shall be included at least once each year. Information on where to find a directory of contacts online shall be published monthly at the Editor's discretion.

MG seconded.

Kaneshiki moved to amend to strike the words "at the Editor's discretion."

Gaztanaga seconded.

Kaneshiki said that the amount of space required to print the location of the online information is small and should appear monthly.

The amendment passed on a voice vote unanimously.

The main motion passed on a voice vote unanimously.

Item: Approval of Proposed LNC Policy Manual Changes: Prohibition on LNC

Members Being Members of Other Political Parties

Karlan moved to delete Article I, Section 3 D in its entirety.

Hoch seconded.

Karlan said that this language has been in the Policy Manual for a long time. He said that while the restriction may be an appropriate one for a member of the LNC, however it is inappropriate for the LNC to impose a limitation on whom the delegates elect to the LNC. He said that - if this restriction should exist - the place where this restriction should be imposed is in the Bylaws, not the LNC Policy Manual.

Dehn asked how the LNC can set any policy which proscribes the behavior of an LNC member.

Givot said that problems are created if LNC policy cannot be equally enforced among all LNC members. He said that state law varies between states. He said that this membership in another political party may be easy to determine in some states, difficult to determine in others, and impossible (from that of a one of the major parties) to change in other states. He also noted that the LNC is not empowered to remove a regional representative even if the regional representative is a member of another political party. He said that these differences make uniform enforcement to be impossible.

Kaneshiki said that this policy also discriminates against people in different states where state laws call for widely different abilities to demonstrate for various political parties or as independents.

Nelson disclosed that he is technically in violation of this policy because he voted in a Republican primary in Iowa three years earlier when no Libertarian was on the ballot. He said that he intends to remedy this as soon as possible.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

Israel, Turney, Rutherford, Dehn, Martin, MG voted against.

Item: Appointment of Members to the Bylaws and Rules Committee

The Committee agreed to nominate of all individuals who submitted their names for consideration. These are:

Ruth Bennett (WA)
Rich Moroney (IA)
Ken Bisson (IN)
Geoff Neale (TX)
Sam Goldstein (IN)
Paul Hager (IN)
Don Gorman (NH)
Tim Hagan (NV)

Karlan nominated Mark Nelson (IA).

Karlan nominated himself (NJ).

Lark nominated Dana Johansen (VA).

Lark nominated Marianne Volpe (VA).

Nominations were closed.

Members of the Committee were afforded to speak for or against any of the nominees.

Candidates	YES Votes	NO Votes
Bennett	5	6
Bisson	15	3
Goldstein	10	2
Gorman	13	3
Hagan	11	0
Hager	7	1
Johansen	9	2
Karlan	14	2
Moroney	14	1
Neale	15	3
Nelson	13	0
Volpe	7	1

Givot announced that Bisson, Goldstein, Gorman, Hagan, Johansen, Karlan, Moroney, Neale, and Nelson are appointed to the Bylaws and Rules Committee. He said that there is a tie for the tenth position between Hager and Volpe.

A second ballot was conducted.

Candidates	YES Votes	NO Votes
Hager	9	2
Volpe	5	0
None of the Above	1	0

Givot announced that Hager was appointed to the tenth position on the Bylaws and Rules Committee and Volpe was appointed as an alternate to the Committee.

Item: Appointment of Credential Committee

Committee agreed to defer appoint of the individual to the Credentials Committee until the March 2002 LNC meeting.

Item: Appointment of Interim Chair of Platform Committee

Karlan nominated Gaztanaga.

Gaztanaga nominated Dixon.

Gaztanaga withdrew.

The Committee appointed Dixon as interim chair of the Platform Committee by voice vote.

Appointment of Interim Chair of Bylaws and Rules Committee

Israel nominated Bisson

Dixon nominated Nelson.

Gorman nominated Neale.

Nominations were closed.

The first ballot the results were:

CANDIDATE	VOTE
Bisson	7
Neale	5
Nelson	5

The second ballot results were:

CANDIDATE	VOTE
Bisson	7
Neale	3
Nelson	6
NOTA	1

The third ballot results were:

CANDIDATE	VOTE
Bisson	7
Nelson	9

Nelson was appointed as interim Chair of the Bylaws and Rules Committee

Item: Reappointment of General Counsel

Lark said that he believes that appointment of Hall as general counsel was an excellent decision which provided great value to the party.

Givot moved that Hall be reappointed as general counsel.

Israel seconded.

Gorman asked if individual Committee members permitted to contact the General Counsel directly regarding party business.

Lark said that he believes that individual Committee members may do so. He asked the members of the Committee to exercise discretion in so doing.

Schwarz said that he was not pleased with the process by which Hall was appointed general counsel a year ago. He asked Lark if Lark had sought alternative candidates for this position.

Lark said that he had not done so.

Schwarz asked about the terms of retaining Hall.

Dasbach said that Hall is paid a quarterly retainer of \$5,000 per quarter. He said that Hall is reimbursed for out of pocket expenses as well. He said that if the total of Hall's billable hours is kept. He said that if Hall's billable hours exceed \$20,000 for the year, Hall is not paid any additional amount. He said that if Hall's billable hours do not exceed \$20,000, the difference is to be returned to the party. He said that last year the value of Hall's services was in excess of \$50,000.

Kaneshiki asked why there is no formal contract relating to retaining Hall's service.

Givot said that it is customary to continue agreements for legal representation from year to year unless there is some dissatisfaction on the part of the client with the attorney. He said that he believes that Hall's advice and services have been of great value during the year. He cited Hall's efforts which led to recognition of ALP Inc. by the State of Arizona as well as Hall's efforts in overturning the early deadline for the filing of petitions for independent candidates in AZ.

MG said that he has a negative impression of Hall's performance on behalf of the party during the past year. He said that he did not find Hall responsive to requests for information and opinions during the year. He said that "bad quality is bad quality no matter how cheap it is."

Gorman said that it is his intention to ask the counsel what the legal procedures would be to return to the Cisewski issue and rescind the sanctions imposed on Cisewski. He said that - aside from Cisewski being a friend of his - he thinks it would be a healing act that would bring some people back into the party. He said that he believes that it would be a good think for the party.

MG said that he believes that the party can, in fact, act as Gorman suggests.

The motion passed on a voice vote. Schwarz and Kaneshiki and MG voted against.

The Committee recessed at 6:00 PM EST.

The Committee reconvened at 8:32 AM EST on December 9.

Item: Approval of Minutes of August and October 2001 LNC Meeting

Givot indicated that he had received many changes to the minutes immediately prior to the meeting. He said that most were not substantive.

Givot said that regarding the August 2001 minutes there was no explicit mention that the Committee added reconsideration of the FEC lawsuit during the course of the meeting.

Givot said that the discussion of the resolution regarding US involvement in Afghanistan needs to be modified to note that the language shown was the amended language and not the original draft language.

MG asked that his comments on page 9 of the October 2001 minutes be included verbatim.

Karlan moved approval of both sets of minutes.

Israel seconded.

The motion passed without objection.

Item: Review of Proposed Changes to LNC Policy Manual Regarding the

Political Director

MG asked Crickenberger to comment on the proposals he has made. Crickenberger said that there are three things that he is trying to accomplish with the changes he proposes. He said that all of these are intended to bring the LNC Policy Manual in line with what he is doing or proposes to do.

Crickenberger described his objectives in bringing forth these proposals.

Crickenberger said that his two proposals are to amend the LNC Policy Manual to insert a new paragraph as Article VIII, Section 2 to read:

Duties of the Political Director

Duties of the Political Director shall include recruitment of candidates for all levels of public office and public advocacy of support for all stages of their candidacy.

The political director shall not provide preferential treatment to any announced Libertarian Party candidate for public office over another announced Candidate for the same office unless done so with the express written permission of the state party.

and to amend the current Section 2 of the LNC Policy Manual (renumbered as Section 3) so that it reads:

Limitations on Party support: Party resources shall not be used to provide information or services

to: (a) any candidates for public office prior to the nomination, or Party office, or (b) any candidate for Party office unless such information or service(s) are available on an equal basis to all Libertarians who have declared they are seeking that nomination, or are generally available to all party members, or in the case of candidate for public office have been approved by the state party.

MG moved adoption of the proposal made by Crickenberger.

Karlan seconded.

Lieberman suggested that the language be changed to recognize approval of either the state or local party.

Crickenberger said that there might be instances where the state and local parties are in disagreement which might complicate matters.

Israel moved to amend the proposal to add to a new clause to the new Section 3 reading:

, or (c) any candidate not running as a Libertarian or not registered as a Libertarian if state law permits the candidate to register Libertarian.

Hoch seconded.

Gaztanaga said that he believes that this language is not necessary because of other language referring to approval by the state party.

Dehn said that the language is quite garbled and requires clarification.

Givot moved to postpone consideration of this matter until immediately after the midday break to permit time to rewrite the language to meet these concerns.

Dehn seconded.

The motion to postpone passed on a voice vote.

Item: Consideration of Changes to the Uniform Membership Program

Nelson reviewed the proposal to revise the UMP payment structure as initially presented in April 2001 by Dixon.

Dixon said that one of the reasons for creating UMP was to provide funding for affiliate parties to fund development of needed infrastructure. He said that he believes that adoption of this proposal will make it easier to achieve this objective. He said that he believes that this proposal complements the strategic plan.

Nelson said that the current UMP payment structure gives the national party additional revenues because the easiest sources of revenue are "creamed" off by the national party. He said that he has been unable to profitably work the other potential sources of revenue.

Nelson moved that

The LNC directs the National office to institute:

- a dues increase to \$29/year for a basic membership,
- a change in the UMP program to decrease the payments for a 1st year member to \$0.50/month, and increase the payments in the 2nd and subsequent years to \$1.50/month,
- and a change in the UMP program that would allow State Parties to retain \$12 from new members joining through the State Parties.

As part of this action, it directs the National Office to prepare a study on the financial impact on the National and State Parties, and suggest a timetable for implementing the above changes. This study and timetable are to be available prior to the March '02 LNC meeting.

Additionally, the National Office is to prepare a separate report on the impact and logistics of creating new membership classifications -- including an electronic membership, a student membership and a household membership. The study is to include

- suggestions for feasible prices for each membership,
- a description of the services associated with each membership,
- the UMP payment to be made to the State Parties for each membership,
- a projected number of new members for each membership classification,
- a projected number of existing members that would change classifications,
- the financial impact of these new and changed members on the National and State Parties.

The study is to report on the advisability and logistics of, and suggest a timetable for, implementing the above changes. Said report is to be presented at the March '02 LNC meeting.

A separate study is to be prepared on the financial impact on the National operations and the State Parties of eliminating the UMP payments in excess of basic dues. A summary description of the format and content of training programs to improve State Party fund raising, and suggested allocation of staff time, including the associated costs of both training and staff time are to be provided. Additionally, a summary description of possible state level electoral efforts that could be funded by reallocation of these funds is to be provided.

Again, the study is to report on the advisability and logistics of, and suggest a timetable for, implementing the possible changes. This study is also to be complete for the March '02 LNC meeting.

Dixon seconded.

Gaztanaga said that there is more in the motion that he likes than he dislikes. He said that he does not feel that UMP is the correct vehicle to help affiliate parties do what they need to do.

Lark said that he understands the intent of the motion to direct the staff to implement the program and to study its impact. He asked whether it would be advisable to study the impact rather before implementing the change than study the impact after implementing the program.

Dasbach any proposed changes to UMP payment rates be made at one time to simply matters.

Dasbach suggested that states participating in the UMP program should be given the option of staying on the current UMP program or moving to the new UMP program.

Nelson said that he believes both of those suggestions are appropriate.

Kaneshiki said that there should be some adjustment for non-UMP states.

Dasbach said that there is no reason why the Committee could not leave the program for non-UMP states exactly as it is. He said that if this proposal passes, this will call provide an additional \$4 in dues revenue which non-UMP states would retain when they provide renewal payments to the national party.

Israel said that he is concerned about the timing of raising the cost of a membership. He said that there is an economic recession underway. He said that he is concerned about elimination of the increased payments made by the national party to affiliate parties when donors give larger amounts to the national party.

Gaztanaga said that he agrees that raising prices during a recession is unwise. He said that he is pleased that UMP is voluntary, but is concerned that at some future time it will no longer be voluntary.

MG asked whether UMP and non-UMP states receive a different level of services from the national party.

Dasbach said that the level of services offered to all affiliate parties is identical unrelated to participation in UMP.

MG said that he is hesitant to support this proposal without consulting with his region.

Dehn said that this year's arrangement to finance efforts such as mailings worked well. He said that he is concerned that if this motion passes, some might understand it to imply that such arrangements should end.

Givot suggested implementing this proposal as another option under UMP for a limited time period to measure results and determine whether this proposal actually delivers the benefits that its supporters claim it will deliver.

Dasbach said that there was a deliberate determination not to promote the UMP program to affiliates, but rather to let them join it if they wish. He said that his concerns are that UMP continues to be optional, that any change such as the one proposed be an additional choice to the current UMP program, and that no changes should become effective until staff can effectively support it.

Kaneshiki said that she is more concerned with recruiting activists than dues-paying members who read a newsletter but are not politically active.

Givot asked for clarification of the timetable for implementation.

Nelson said that the motion calls for a study and timetable to be presented to the March 2002 LNC meeting.

Dehn moved to amend the word "institute" to "study."

Karlan seconded.

Dehn said that he believes that this makes it clear that the LNC is interested in pursuing this sort of proposal, but that the LNC is not authorizing this to occur without further study and review.

The amendment passed on a voice vote.

Gaztanaga abstained.

The main motion passed on a voice vote.

Gaztanaga voted against.

MG said that he believes that it is extremely important that - at a future point - the Committee also studies returning all UMP monies to the states without prejudice to national membership so that national becomes self-funding.

Item: Review of Lapsed Programs and Renewal Programs

Nelson asked Dasbach to update the Sustained Giving Report which was provided to SPT. He also asked that similar reports be provided for other ongoing revenue sources.

Nelson said that states which go back to lapsed members who have not renewed - after a series of letters from the national party failed to get them to renew - have been quite successful. He said that perhaps the national party should look into what can be done to improve its renewal program.

Nelson moved that the staff update and present the Archimedes Sustained Giving Report adding UMP data and create similar reports for other sources of new members prior the March 2002 LNC meeting.

Dixon seconded.

Dasbach said that the first part of this is not difficult. He said that if a couple of additional large categories are desired by March, this may not be too difficult. He said if more details are desired, until certain database changes are made, it might become a problem.

The motion passed unanimously.

Item: Discussion of Customer Service Examination and Evaluation

Nelson said that Givot, Martin, and he conducted the examination.

Nelson said that the evaluation team submitted a request for certain information prior to the meeting. He said that Dasbach provided the requested information.

Nelson said that he believes that customer service would benefit from spending some money to enhance database and other capabilities.

Martin said that one item that came up in the examination is that the web site development contract work has not yet been completed. He said that the contract payment schedule was - appropriately - rear end loaded.

Martin said that he would like to see at least \$6,000 included in the budget to complete some of the needed work.

Dasbach said that delays by the web vendor is not holding back development of this capability.

Crickenberger said that some of what he saw struck him as limiting his flexibility.

Dehn said he hopes that these improvements will be implemented so that affiliate parties can make these functions available to regions within states.

Nelson said that he expects to report again in March 2002.

Item: Reorganization of the Executive Committee

Gorman said that actions that have been taken by the Executive Committee have been proper, legal, and consistent with the authority that this Committee has granted to it. He said that he does not believe that there has been any impropriety in how the Executive Committee has operated.

Gorman said that he is nonetheless concerned about the adequacy of notification sent to LNC members of Executive Committee meetings. He said that he sees no reason that there should not be 48 hour notification of LNC members prior to any Executive Committee meeting.

Gorman said that he believes that LNC members who attend Executive Committee meetings should be permitted to vote.

Gorman said that he believes that LNC members who attend Executive Committee meetings should have a right to be recognized and address the Executive Committee. He said that this has always been extended as a courtesy, but that he believes that this should be a right.

Gorman said that in today's world of communications, he sees no reason why a quorum of LNC members cannot be convened within 2 hours.

Gorman said that he would like these concerns addressed today.

Karlan thanked Gorman for bringing this issue up. He said that one SPT metric is including a full review of LNC governance issues prior to the 2002 national convention. He said that he believes that Gorman's concerns should be addressed as part of this review.

Gaztanaga said that he believes that these limitations were likely put in place to avoid having unwieldy meetings and to keep things more focused at the Executive Committee. He said that the SPT process puts us in a place where we can probably move to a more open governance structure.

MG said that the party has undergone several changes in the style of how decisions are made. He said that LPFL has implemented procedures whereby non-members of their Executive Committee are permitted to vote if they have attended a two or three prior committee meetings.

Martin said that he understands Gorman's concerns. He said it would be great if changes in financial situations could be anticipated sufficiently in advance to implement his suggestions. He said that in his role as

Treasurer, he believes that it is impossible to address all of Gorman's concerns.

Gorman moved that all duly elected LNC members become a part of the Executive Committee.

Schwarz seconded.

Givot moved to refer the matter to the governance team.

Karlan seconded.

Givot invited Gorman to join the governance team.

Gorman withdrew his motion and accepted Givot's invitation.

The motion to refer the matter to the governance team passed unanimously.

Schwarz said that twice this year an Executive Committee meeting was convened with less than 24 hours notice to LNC members.

Martin said that financial problems can arise in a matter of seconds.

Gaztanaga said that he is really very happy with everyone else in the room.

Item: Consideration of Resolution Regarding Non-Interventionism

Dehn moved adoption of the following resolution:

Resolution on Non-Intervention

Whereas, the Libertarian Party Platform calls for a policy of non-intervention by the United States government in the affairs of other countries, and

Whereas, experience has shown that failure to follow such a policy leads to an erosion of our traditional liberties, has a very high cost to taxpayers, and is endangering the very lives of Americans, and

Whereas, many politicians both Democratic and Republican appear ready to support further interventions which have the potential to create a situation even worse in these respects than anything we have seen thus far,

Therefore, the Libertarian National Committee calls upon the President, the Congress, and the people of the United States to reconsider this course and to enact the following measures:

- an end to military and economic support by the US government for any foreign country, government, political faction, or military organization,
- the withdrawal as expeditiously as possible of all US military forces stationed or operating in foreign countries,

- the termination of all US government embargoes, blockages, and any other interferences with free trade that have been imposed in support of or in opposition to foreign governments or their policies.

The best way for America to serve the cause of peace and freedom in the world is by demonstrating a way to live in peace with other nations and by remaining a beacon of liberty at home.

The best way to live free from the threat of terrorists is by not getting into a bloody, unwinnable war with terrorists in the first place.

Gaztanaga seconded.

Givot said that he is concerned by one aspect of the proposed resolution. He said that there is some disagreement about whether or not the United States is currently in a state of war, albeit undeclared. He said that he believes that the United States is, in fact, in a state of war. He said that he is concerned about the language in the resolution calling for "the withdrawal as expeditiously as possible of all US military forces stationed or operating in foreign countries" would call for the United States to quickly remove its forces from Afghanistan. He said that he cannot support that action at the present time.

Lieberman proposed amending by adding the following language to the language cited by Givot: "unless said forces are actively pursuing terrorists who have killed American citizens on US soil."

Gaztanaga seconded.

Lieberman said that this added language would make this more acceptable to non-Libertarians and to many Libertarians.

Martin said that he has the same reservations as Givot although he has not discussed it with Givot. He said that Lieberman's amendment goes a long way toward addressing those concerns.

Gaztanaga said that US foreign policy has been one of painting itself into a corner. He said that he would prefer to begin the resolution by stating as much rather than quoting the party's Platform.

Rutherford said that he will vote against every such resolution and any similar resolution because he feels that this is a very difficult situation which the national headquarters has handled very well. He said that of the 700 Libertarians in Indiana, he has heard about 100 different ways to respond to this situation. He said that adopting any resolution on this topic permits our political opponents to paint this party into a corner. He said that there is no reason to issue a resolution on this topic. He said that our Platform speaks for itself.

Gorman said that he agrees with Rutherford and intends to vote against this resolution for the same reason. He complimented the staff on how they have handled this situation. He said that the Committee should let the staff continue to do what they have done so well.

Ruwart said that she would agree with Rutherford and Gorman had the LNC not issued its prior resolution on this topic in October 2001.

Israel agreed strongly with Rutherford and Gorman. He urged the Committee to continue to trust the staff to handle this matter.

MG said that he believes that there is a fundamental problem in the way that such resolutions are crafted. He said that he believes that we spend too much time writing about what the Democrats and Republicans are doing wrong and not enough writing about what we do right. He said that he believes that we should be focusing on what Libertarians are doing right. He said that this is where we should focus our communications.

The amendment failed on a voice vote.

Gaztanaga, MG, Kaneshiki, and Schwarz abstained.

The resolution failed 3 to 10 with five abstentions.

Dehn, Dixon, and Nelson voted for the resolution. Bisson, Givot, Gorman, Hoch, Israel, Karlan, Lieberman, Martin, Lieberman, Rutherford, and Turney voted against the resolution. Gaztanaga, MG, Kaneshiki, Lark, and Schwarz abstained.

The Committee recessed at 1045 AM EST.

Committee reconvened at 11:10 AM EST.

Item: Review of Proposed Changes to LNC Policy Manual Regarding the

Political Director (continued)

With the consent of the Committee, MG moved that the following changes be made to the LNC Policy Manual:

to amend the LNC Policy Manual to insert a new paragraph as Article VIII, Section 2 to read:

DUTIES OF THE POLITICAL DIRECTOR: Duties of the Political Director shall include recruitment of candidates for all levels of public office and public advocacy of support for all stages of their candidacy.

The Political Director shall not provide preferential treatment to any announced Libertarian Party candidate for public office over another announced Candidate for the same office unless done so with the express written permission of the state party.

and to replace the current Section 2 of the LNC Policy Manual (renumbered as Section 3) with the following two sections:

LIMITATIONS ON PARTY SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC OFFICE: Party resources shall not be used to provide information or services to any candidate for public office prior to the nomination unless: (a) such information or services are available on an equal basis to all Libertarians who have declared they are seeking that nomination, (b) such information or services are generally available to all party members, or (c) the service or candidate have been approved by the state party.

LIMITATIONS ON PARTY SUPPORT FOR PARTY OFFICE: Party resources shall not be used to provide information or services for any candidate for party office unless: (a) such information or services are available on an equal basis to all Libertarians who have declared they are seeking that office, or (b) such information or service(s) are generally available all party members.

Kaneshiki said that the first proposed change might result in the national party providing information or services which might violate a state party's bylaws either specifically or in spirit. She said that it is unclear whether the reference to the state party actually means the state party's governing committee.

Crickenberger said that this would not happen because he would provide such assistance with the permission of the state party.

Kaneshiki said that the state party might be providing approval in violation of its own bylaws.

Kaneshiki said that she objects to providing services to presidential candidates pre-nomination. She said that the lack of information about what might be provided pre-nomination has made this inequitable in the past.

Kaneshiki said that he has a problem with the entire proposal because she believes that if there is any legitimate function for a local party it is the recruiting of candidates. She said that this conflict with that function.

Karlan said that all this amendment proposes to do is to divide the current Policy Manual change into two sections. He said that this amendment does not change what can or cannot be done by staff. He said that the existing policy is subject to the same objections that Kaneshiki has voiced.

Martin moved to amend the words "state party" to "state chair" in the first and second paragraphs.

Nelson seconded.

Martin said that it is the state chair who is responsible for his actions if he does something that he should not do.

MG said that the reason that this language is in the Policy Manual is to reflect what is required by some state laws. He said that the Political Director really needs to make sure that he is dealing with the correct person or committee to assure that they have the authority to permit him to support a candidate.

Gorman said that relying on the state chair is fraught with danger. He cited past issues in AZ as an example of this.

Givot said the national headquarters must be able to rely on state chairs to correctly represent the position of their state party. He said that Crickenberger must be able to rely on a statement from a state chair that support of a candidate is authorized by the state party.

Crickenberger said that regardless of whether the amendment passes, he must rely on what the state chair tells him to accurately represent the position of the state party.

Gorman said that subcommittee that drafted this revised language worked diligently on this language. He said that the subcommittee agreed on the term "state party." He asked the Committee to respect this effort and the recommendation made.

Karlan agreed. He said that "state party" is the appropriate term. He said that there are differences between the degree of authority which various state parties give to their state chairs.

Martin said that the definition of what "state party" means is ambiguous and is determined by each state party. He said that the term "state chair" is unambiguous.

The amendment passed 10 to 7, Lark abstained.

Dehn said that he is concerned about candidates knowing what services or information are available. He said that he is also concerned that this language would permit the Political Director to recruit presidential candidates without clarifying what that means. He said that this language does not clarify where recruiting activity ends and support activities begin. He said that he would like to clarify that recruiting ends when interest in running has been created.

Gorman said that Crickenberger is a "fish out of water" when it comes to anything political. He said that Crickenberger has to call those in the state and ask who is available. He said that this is just one person. He said that the Political Director must rely on local people to do this. He said that the Political Director should be given an opportunity to fail rather than precluding him from doing this.

Kaneshiki asked the Committee to focus on SPT discussions about the poor quality of candidates we have and how they embarrass the party.

Dehn moved to amend "available" to "available and announced" in all places that it appears.

Karlan seconded.

Schwarz said that this was tried six years ago. He said that it failed. He said that some candidates are not going to ask for such services even if they are known to be available.

The amendment passed on a voice vote.

At this point, the amended motion moved

to amend the LNC Policy Manual to insert a new paragraph as Article VIII, Section 2 to read:

DUTIES OF THE POLITICAL DIRECTOR: Duties of the Political Director shall include recruitment of candidates for all levels of public office and public advocacy of support for all stages of their candidacy.

The Political Director shall not provide preferential treatment to any announced Libertarian Party candidate for public office over another announced Candidate for the same office unless done so with the express written permission of the state chair.

and to replace the current Section 2 of the LNC Policy Manual (renumbered as Section 3) with the following two sections:

LIMITATIONS ON PARTY SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC OFFICE: Party resources shall not be used to provide information or services to any candidate for public office prior to the nomination unless: (a) such information or services are available and announced on an equal basis to all

Libertarians who have declared they are seeking that nomination, (b) such information or services are generally available and announced to all party members, or (c) the service or candidate have been approved by the state chair.

LIMITATIONS ON PARTY SUPPORT FOR PARTY OFFICE: Party resources shall not be used to provide information or services for any candidate for party office unless: (a) such information or services are available and announced on an equal basis to all Libertarians who have declared they are seeking that office, or (b) such information or service(s) are generally available and announced all party members.

The main motion passed on a voice vote.

Kaneshiki, Schwarz, and Turney voted against the motion. Dehn and Dixon abstained.

Item: Proposed change to LNC Policy Manual: Posting Notice of Assistance

Provided to Candidates

Kaneshiki moved that the Policy Manual be amended to include the following language:

Whereas the local party membership has a right to know when pre-nomination candidates are receiving assistance from the national office,

Be it resolved that at which time the Political Director promises and/or provides assistance to any pre-nomination candidate for office, the Political Director will immediately post such information to any public email lists provided on the state party's web site.

In any case that the Political Director provides assistance to a candidate for the LNC, the Political Director will post its information to the LPUS email-list.

Gaztanaga seconded.

Kaneshiki said that she is concerned that candidate support provided by the national party may result in problems at the state level. She said that if support available to candidates for party office were more widely publicized, it might encourage more people to run for such office.

Gaztanaga said that this might help.

Dasbach said that assistance can only be provided to candidates with the approval of the state chair. He said that the state chair can assume responsibility to publicize such assistance.

Dasbach said that with regard to candidates for internal party office, the only things that are offered are identical to what is offered to any party member. He said that the current language does not prevent staff from interacting with candidates for party office differently than any other member.

Dehn said that adoption of this proposal might serve to provide additional publicity to those running for party

office or considering running for party office as to what services might be available from the national party.

MG said that people have become sensitized to these concerns.

MG moved that this matter be referred to the governance team.

Karlan seconded.

MG said that he supports this so that he could "get out of here before Tuesday."

The motion passed on a voice vote.

Kaneshiki against the motion. Gaztanaga abstained.

Item: Consideration of the Proposed 2002 Budget

Lark proposed that consideration of the proposed budget being by the Committee going into a discussion mode in which no motions would be made. He proposed that the Committee go into this mode for a time period not to exceed a set amount of time, then deal with any formal motions.

Givot moved that the Committee enter into this discussion mode for a period not to exceed two hours and that the discussion be structured after going into that mode.

MG seconded.

Lark said that it is his preference that a budget be approved today. He said that some spending authority is required for the staff to have authority to act.

Gorman moved to substitute that the LNC consider whether there should be a continuing resolution to fund the party for first three months of 2002.

Gaztanaga seconded.

Gorman said that a continuing resolution would maintain the same level of spending as was authorized for three months in the 2001.

Martin said that he has a proposal to make if the Committee is not able to reach agreement on a full year budget.

Dehn said that it is not well defined how a continuing resolution would be defined given that the party expends things differently from year to year.

The substitute motion failed on a voice vote.

The main motion passed on a voice vote.

After approximately two hours of discussion the Committee returned to its tradition mode operating under Robert's Rules of Order.

Kaneshiki suggested that self-funded projects such as the war on drugs project could be taken off-budget because they are self-funding.

Givot asked whether reducing the \$75,000 ballot access expense item would assist in providing the surplus needed to achieve the reserve fund required by LNC policy. He asked if none of this were spent in 2002, would this prejudice the ability of the party to get its presidential candidate on the ballot in 2004.

Dasbach said that it would not, but it would affect the number of congressional candidates in 2002.

Givot suggested that elimination of this expenditure would be a good place to start to balance the budget.

Crickenberger said that these funds might be used to run candidates in DC to attempt to get ballot status there. He said that these funds would also be used to get 19 congressional candidates on the ballot in OH. He said that it might affect retention of ballot status in NH for 2004 which would eliminate the Libertarian presidential primary in NH in 2004.

Lark asked how much of the \$75,000 was already committed to affiliate parties.

Crickenberger said that there is some commitment to OH which he believes is still in effect.

Dixon reminded the Committee of the information from the membership survey presented earlier.

Givot related that most of the funding in the budget seems to be well aligned with the preferences of the membership expressed in that survey. He said that of the project expenditures in the budget every item is related to the top five priorities of the membership except ballot access funding which is tangentially related to having more candidates and contingency. He said that we cannot adopt a budget without some contingency funds. He said that this leaves ballot access as just about the only item to cut to balance the budget and create the mandated reserve by year end.

Dehn said that the Committee has yet to "get a handle" on the resources required to implement some of the strategies in the strategic plan. He said that branding is an example of this.

Dehn expressed concern that the amount budgeted for branding and campus growth would be sufficient to make serious inroads in those areas. He said that it might make more sense to spend these funds on efforts in areas where we know that we can achieve measurable results within our budget.

Dasbach said that the budget figure for branding has been pulled out of the air. He said that this is an estimate related to developing a branding strategy, not in implementing such a strategy.

Dasbach said that not every decision is all or none. He said that some of these things can be done to a greater or lesser extent.

Martin said that there are no guarantees about results in matters such as these. He said that we must take risk to grow.

MG said that the issue of the national party providing ballot access is a sacred cow. He said that LPFL has found this battle in the courts and won. He said that this type of solution is the best long term solution. MG said that cutting ballot access funding should be accompanied by development of long term plans in each state to resolve ballot access on a long term basis.

Kaneshiki said that she believes that it is irresponsible to approve funding for brand development.

Dehn said that - while he understands that nothing in the budget can be guaranteed -- the two items that he identified seemed particularly speculative and where there has not been an attempt made to estimate how these dollar expenditures will yield the projected results.

Givot said that the expected return on an investment should be proportional to the risk taken to earn that return. He said that the question of whether or not to invest in branding - or anything else - boils down to a judgment as to whether the perceived risk on that investment is justified by the perceived return. He stressed that these perceptions are entirely subjective.

Givot said that his personal assessment is that the party is in a fourth down position, five yards to go, forty seconds left in the game, and we are more than 3 points behind. He said that trying for a 3 point field goal is not a winning strategy. He said that the membership and he are frustrated that there has not been a breakthrough. He said that if we need to take greater risk if we want to have a breakthrough.

Givot said that he supports direct mail prospecting because he believes that it will gradually build the party. He said that the only way to have a high reward breakthrough is to take some risk to try to achieve it. He said that \$75,000 to develop the branding strategy is, to him, a small investment with a great potential to make a considerable breakthrough.

Kaneshiki said that this is all the more reason to take it off the budget and make it self funding.

Nelson moved that the budget as presented by Dasbach for the months of January through March be accepted without change.

Karlan seconded.

Nelson said reviewed what would be covered by that amount of spending. He said that he is sufficiently confident that this will afford the Committee enough time to have additional discussions and determine how to proceed for the rest of the year.

Dasbach said that the items to be included in the project budgets are the first direct mailing, the state chair's mailing, portion of the Drug war project is self funded, internet advertising self-funded, and the first expenditures of time with a consultant to refine the time line and budget for branding.

Nelson agreed that this is his intent.

Israel moved to substitute to approve the budget as proposed.

Bisson seconded.

Gaztanaga spoke in favor of the main motion. He said that this will provide for funding the party for the next three month while assuring time to debate the full proposed budget during that period and in March.

Martin asked Dasbach how many people asked for the monthly budget.

Dasbach said that five Committee members had asked for the monthly budget.

Martin said that he is sensitive to Israel's concern that failure to adopt a full-year budget may create a problem with marketing and fundraising.

Dasbach said that as long as any given item is not complete eliminated, it should not pose a major problem.

Lark said that he understand the reasons for approving only a three month budget. He said that the Committee is empowered to and should be reviewing the budget at all times. He said that he believes that it is much cleaner to adopt a full year budget.

Gorman said that he looks at this as an opportunity assure that a budget review will occur which may not occur if we pass a full year budget.

Bisson chaired the meeting at this point.

Lark said that he believes that the Committee will review the budget in March 2002 regardless of which motion passes. Regardless of which motion may pass, he urged Committee members to begin discussion of the budget soon rather than wait until March.

Gorman said that he sees an opportunity with the main motion to adopt a three-month budget and review what to do beyond them in March. He said that he believes that the Committee will not perform a thorough budget review in March if the substitute motion passes.

Lark said that he sees no problem with the Committee having the discipline to review the budget in March. He said that the time for further discussion about the budget is when this meeting ends. He said that the Committee members should not wait until March to start that discussion.

Israel said that adoption of a full year budget is preferable. He said that he will personally be reviewing the budget materials with an eye toward revisiting the budget in March.

The substitute motion passed on a voice vote. Gorman voted against.

Lark resumed chairing the meeting at this point.

Kaneshiki moved that:

Whereas the LP membership has a right to know when pre-nomination candidates are receiving assistance from the national office,

Be it resolved that at which time the Political Director promises and/or provides assistance to any pre-nomination candidate for office, the Political Director will immediately post such information to any public email lists provided on the stat party's web site. In any case that the Political Director provides assistance to a candidate for LNC, the Political Director will post this information to the LPUS email list.

MG seconded.

Givot asked the Chair to rule the motion out of order.

Lark ruled that the motion is out of order. He asked the Committee if there was objection to adding the five

minutes to the agenda for the purpose of permitting consideration Kaneshiki's proposal.

There was no objection.

Nelson moved to amend the proposed budget by reducing revenues for major donor from \$400,000 to \$325,000 and increasing revenues for branding to \$75,000.

Givot seconded.

The amendment passed by a voice vote.

Givot moved to amend the proposed budget to make the following items "accordion items" for which increased revenues would permit staff to increase authorized spending by an equal dollar amount: direct mail prospecting, internet advertising/prospecting, branding, and the drug war focus.

MG seconded.

Dehn asked Givot if it is his intention that there would be no upper bound as long as offsetting revenue exists related to the same budget line item.

Givot said that it is his intention that there be no upper bound under such circumstances.

Dasbach suggested adding inquiry generation and response and material sales to the motion.

Dasbach's suggestion was accepted by the Committee without objection.

The motion passed on a voice vote without opposition.

Dasbach suggested that the Committee consider reducing the following expense items by one-third: Affiliate Membership & Support, Campus & Youth Outreach, Campaign Training & Support, Ballot Access, and Contingency

Martin moved to amend the proposed budget to reduce the following expense items by one-third: Affiliate Membership & Support, Campus & Youth Outreach, Campaign Training & Support, Ballot Access, and Contingency.

MG seconded.

Givot said that he opposes the motion because it there has not been adequate discussion of the tradeoffs among various expense items. He said that he favors leaving the budget in a place where the Committee must work on it further in March. He said that approving Martin's amendment would remove any sense of urgency for the Committee members to discuss this in the coming months.

Bisson said that he has had discussions about this with Israel. He said that he believes this to be an appropriate way to proceed..

The amendment passed on a voice vote.

The motion to approve the budget as amended passed on a voice vote.

Kaneshiki voted against the motion. Schwarz abstained.

Item: Consideration of change to LNC Policy Manual: Publication of

Kaneshiki moved that:

The national office shall include in every fundraising appeal an offer to provide a copy of the national budget at no charge.

MG seconded.

Bisson asked whether a budget document suitable for distribution to the membership already exists.

Dasbach said that Nelson has proposed a format for the budget that would be suitable, but that this may be relatively expensive to provide.

Bisson asked whether the budget is published in LP News.

Dasbach said that the annual report published in LP News provides this information at the end of the year.

Kaneshiki suggested publishing the budget on the web site.

Givot asked Kaneshiki if she is aware of another not-for-profit organization which makes such an offer in its fundraising letters.

Kaneshiki was not able to name one.

The motion failed on a vote of 6 to 8 with three abstentions.

Dehn, Gaztanaga, MG, Gorman, Kaneshiki, and Schwarz vote in favor. Bisson, Dixon, Givot, Hoch, Israel, Martin, Nelson, and Rutherford voted against. Karlan, Lark, and Turney abstained.

Confirmation of March 2002 Meeting Date

Givot said that the next LNC meeting will be on the weekend of March 16-17 in the Denver area.

Givot said that Dasbach has suggested that the meeting be held at his home. He said that he is uncomfortable in holding the meeting at his home without first asking the LNC if that would be acceptable. He said that the meeting would, of course, be open to the public.

Kaneshiki asked if it is more difficult for the public to get to his home than a hotel meeting site.

Givot said that there is no public transportation of significance to either his home or the area in general.

MG commented that the first ever LNC meeting was held in the home of David Nolan.

On a voice vote, the Committee approved holding the March 2002 meeting in that location.

Item: Comments fo the Good of the Party

MG said that he expects to provide information about Libertarians in Afghanistan in the future.

MG said that he is in touch with someone who has stepped down from the Democratic National Committee who has mentioned that one thing the party should look into is getting Libertarians appointed to the federal appeals court.

Hoch said that Judge Kleinfeld is a Libertarian.

The Committee adjourned at 3:25 PM EST.

