

LNC Executive Committee Meeting

Teleconference

July 22, 1999

Present: David Bergland, Chair
Hugh Butler, Vice Chair (joined during discussion of Financial Report)
Steve Givot, Secretary
Mark Tuniewicz
Joe Dehn

Staff: Steve Dasbach, National Director Ron Crickenberger, Political Director

Also present: Dan Fylstra (NV), Region 2 Alternate (joined during discussion of the Web Site Proposal)

The meeting was called to order by Bergland at 8:30 EDT.

Item: Minutes of July 6 Executive Committee Meeting

Givot asked for guidance regarding the July 6 Executive Committee Minutes. Dasbach suggested that he would be comfortable to using the draft minutes if there was a reference to the minutes of the meeting of June 22.

Consensus was reached to proceed as Dasbach proposed. Givot will supply slightly revised minutes within a day.

Item: Financial Report

Givot asked Dasbach whether the June 1999 overall negative budget variance of \$23,293 was indicative of a problem or just a random variation.

Dasbach said that some trends are developing. He cited the decision to cancel the April 1999 pledge telemarketing effort led to a \$100,000 drop in one-time revenues with an offsetting cost savings of \$60,000. He said that this also resulted in a monthly reduction in pledge income of about \$10,000 or \$11,000 per month. He said that feedback to the pledge telemarketing -- largely from new members -- was very negative. He said that successive attempts to grow the pledge program by telemarketing have been less and less fruitful.

Dasbach said that an analysis shows that -- thus far -- individuals who contributed in response to Archimedes mailings seem to exhibit comparable renewal rates and other behavior as individuals who came to the LP through other means.

Givot suggested a telemarketing run which is limited to individuals who have been contributors for more than a year to avoid some of the concerns Dasbach expressed.

Dasbach said that he believes this might be a good way to proceed.

Crickenberger said that he believes that we should try to get people into the pledge program before their first renewal date. He said that this would be a means to keep people members by way of their pledges.

Tuniewicz said that he had received a few complaints regarding the last telemarketing run. He asked Dasbach how widespread the complaints are.

Dasbach said that he has no quantification of the number of complaints. He said that some people complained that they were getting notices about a pledge which they never made.

Bergland asked where we stand on the OK ballot drive.

Crickenberger said that three people are currently working in OK. About 2,000 signatures have been collected already. Another person will be starting in OK in August.

Crickenberger said that signatures from the OH drive were currently being validated. He said that another 1,000 to 10,000 signatures will likely be needed, depending on the results of the validation.

Crickenberger said that the AL is about 2/3 done.

Crickenberger said that ND has changed its ballot access law. Under the new law, there will be no presidential primary. There will be a caucus instead. Therefore, petitioning in ND will not start in one month, but will be over in one week. He said that the law that they are basing their interpretation on does not become effective until August 1, and it would end petitioning on August 2.

Dasbach said that this will not preclude our presidential candidate from being on the ballot, but may make it more difficult due to winter weather and other factors.

Crickenberger said that LP is also assisting with a full party petition in NH. Thus far about 3,000 signatures have been gathered.

Dehn asked whether there will be sufficient funds available for the upcoming 500,000 piece Archimedes mailing.

Dasbach said that there is a funding issue. He said that Crickenberger may be supplementing his major donor calls with an email appeal sometime next week.

Item: Discussion of Web Site Proposal

Bergland opened the topic for discussion.

Dasbach said that he is planning to send it out tomorrow to those already expressing interest in submitting a proposal. He said that Dehn will be creating a web page to make it available to others.

Dasbach said that a response date of one month will be set. He said that he will request vendors to respond to let him know if they intend to send a proposal.

Givot asked whether the web site would permit affiliate parties to change the address, telephone number or other personal data of one of their members via the web site.

Dasbach said that he would look into that idea.

Dehn asked what the deadline for expression of intent to bid would be.

Dasbach said that if the request for proposals goes out July 23, the cutoff for bidding would be August 23. The deadline for expressing intent to bid would be one week earlier on August 16.

There was considerable discussion of intellectual property rights and the possible vendor requirement to sign a non-disclosure requirement. There was consensus that Dasbach would have to wait to see what, if any, non-disclosure agreements bidders might request.

Butler suggested that bids not be opened until the deadline date. He suggested that whatever information is provided to one vendor should be provided to all vendors.

After a brief discussion, Dasbach said that it would probably be best to wait until the proposal deadline before opening any proposal.

Item: Discussion of Issues Relating to Inclusion of Presidential Candidate on the LP Web Site

Bergland said that the matter would be resolved by the LNC, however he sought input from the Executive Committee on the issue.

Givot, Bergland, Butler, Tuniewicz, and Dasbach expressed support for including no candidate links on the LP web site.

Dehn said that he prefers the current policy, but would prefer to list no candidates rather than using a list that excludes some candidates.

Bergland said that absent establishing objective criteria of the sort he previously proposed, he would support listing no presidential candidates. He said that this will become a hotter issue in the future.

Dasbach asked Dehn to state the current policy.

Dehn said that the current policy is to include those publicly identified as a candidate either by their own statements, by being reported by other media as a candidate, or by other people working to get the nomination for the candidate.

Item: Discussion of Objective for Friday, August 13 meeting

Bergland asked the committee for its ideas. He said that his intention was to have further discussion of the Carver model at the meeting.

Givot suggested that the time should be used to work on long-term strategic planning skills and tasks.

Dasbach said that this is the wrong time in our four year cycle to be making major strategic changes. He said that the LP operates on a four year cycle, and that the appropriate time to make long term strategic shifts would be after a presidential election

Bergland said that this would be an excellent opportunity to provide a greater opportunity for all LNC members to participate in the planning process.

Dasbach said that a planning review would be appropriate in this time frame, whereas consideration of a new strategic direction would not be appropriate until after the 2000 election.

Givot agreed.

Fylstra said that Terry Savage had done this professionally and for LPNV.

Dasbach said that we might start now to develop a strategic plan for 2001-2004.

Bergland said that we should have a status review and possibly modify the current plan for the near term. He said that we should expect this to be the first step in an ongoing process which will include long-term planning at the appropriate time in the cycle. He said that expectations for this meeting should be adjustments for 1999-2000. He suggested some examples of adjustments that might be made.

Dehn said that there is a difference between developing a strategic plan from scratch and performing a review of an existing plan. He said that it is important that LNC members attending the Friday session understand which process they are being in asked to join.

In response to the examples given, Tuniewicz asked whether this was a piecemeal implementation of the Carver approach.

Givot said that it was not, because the fundamental thrust of Carver is board setting of broad overall goals and statements proscribing certain management behavior, leaving management free to use the resources of the organization to achieve those goals without engaging in proscribed behavior. He said that LNC and the EC have far more hands-on authority than would be consistent with Carver, that no set of proscribed behaviors had been adopted, and that current budget policies in effect make it clear that management does not have broad latitude to use the organizations resources to implement goals as management judges would be best.

Givot said that we can either start with a planning document or we can develop one during the meeting.

Dasbach said that we can also come into the meeting with a skeleton or outline of a plan and develop it further during the meeting.

Givot said that in December it will be appropriate to discuss the linkage between various budget expenditures and the plan document developed.

Butler suggested narrowing the focus to identifying one or two goals by which the LNC would like to be measured in July 2000.

Bergland said that he and Dasbach would develop materials to be distributed to LNC members prior to the Friday meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 PM EDT.