

Minutes of ExCom Meeting
Tuesday, July 4, 2000
As approved

Minutes

Date: July 4, 2000
Time: Tuesday, 9 a.m. - 5 p.m.
Place: Anaheim Doubletree Hotel

In attendance:

Officers:	Mark Hinkle	Chair
	Rodney Austin	Northern Vice Chair
	Ted Brown	Southern Vice Chair
	Sandi Webb	Secretary
	Eric Lund	Treasurer

At-Large Reps: Aaron Starr
José Castañeda
Joe Dehn
Bruce Dovner

Alternate At-Large Reps:	Elizabeth Brierly	ExCom Alternate #1
	John Scott Ballard	ExCom Alternate #2

Regional Reps:	Frank Manske	Region 1
	Brian Lee Cross	Region 30
	Steve Cicero	Region 37
	Jascha Lee	Region 43 (alternate representing region)

Alternates:	Bill Hajdu	Region 30
-------------	------------	-----------

Staff:	Juan Ros	Executive Director, LPC
	Alexandra Goldburt	Executive Assistant, LPC

Visitors: Philip Zoebisch, Melinda Pillsbury Foster, Starchild, Doug Scribner, Paul Frankell, Chikako Suzuk, Kate O'Brien, Jonathan Zwickel

Absent: Bernard Zimring, Region 61; Lori Adasiewicz, At-Large Rep.

1. Call Meeting to Order: The meeting was called to order at 9:07 am by Mark Hinkle.

2. Approval of Agenda:

Change item 9b from Quackenbush Recall Resolution to School Voucher 2000 Initiative Resolution (Prop 38);

Motion: Add 15 min (2a) for presenters for item 9e to speak.

Add item 9e "Setting guidelines for attendance at CA LP events;"

Add item 9d Operation Breakthrough;

Add item 9f discussion of open primary;

Add item 5c(i) Membership discounts for Students;

Add Executive Session 9g to discuss potential lawsuit by Edison McDaniels. **Passed**

a) Special Presentation by Philip Zoebisch and Melinda Pillsbury Foster.

Melinda Pillsbury- Foster explained about a problem that she had had at the February of 1998 LP State Convention. Melinda was refunded her package.

Philip stated that he and Melinda were talking about having a committee set up standards for disciplining LPC members. He listed several things that he would like the committee to look at.

1. Did the chair have the authority to exclude Melinda from the convention?

2. What should future policy be?
3. Should there be censorship of materials at conventions?
4. Who can make the decision to censor material?
5. What standards should be used?

Mark Hinkle described what happened that led up to Melinda being censored

3. Approval of Minutes: March 18-19, 2000

There was discussion on how extensive the minutes should be.

Motion: Eric Lund moved to delete the third paragraph and all but the first and third sentence of the final paragraph from his report. Speaking to his motion Eric stated that he did not feel that the minutes should include all conversation, only the action items.

Motion to extend debate: Failed

Vote on motion: Failed

Approved as amended.

4. Officers Reports:

a) Chair – Mark Hinkle

Mark Hinkle reported that he has a new job with a startup company and has been working very hard. He noted that Juan Ros has been relieving him of quite a few burdens. He noted that Aaron Starr would be speaking about Operation Breakthrough.

Mark Hinkle reported that we had received an unsolicited donation of \$10,000. He stated that he is very pleased and that it tells him that we are doing the right things. Mark Hinkle introduced Alex Goldburt, Juan Ros' new assistant. Mark stated that Juan really appreciates having an assistant. He noted that opening the office was another activity that occurred since the last ExCom meeting. He reported that we had purchased a couple of new PCs and that Alex's should be arriving soon. Mark stated that he wanted to publicly thank Ray Strong for helping to implement that. Mark stated that we would be entertaining a bid to network the PCs together. Bruce Dovner who was working on this with Mark commented on the progress of the software. Mark gave further information on the progress of opening the office.

b) Northern Vice Chair – Rodney Austin

Rodney reported on the progress of new regions. He stated that there had been three meetings in Merced. He reported that the attendance at those meetings was low but that there were three people who are really dedicated and are persevering to try to get an organization going. He stated that Tulare had a meeting last month with nine people in attendance. He stated that Tulare is looking pretty good and should be organized by election time. Rodney reported that Juan has agreed to help with the other unorganized counties. He reported that Juan had recruited contacts in Modoc, Sierra, Glenn and Del Norte counties. He reported that Juan had started writing a Membership letter that would go out to all of the registered Libertarians in those counties. He reported that a letter had already gone out to Sierra County to 30 registered Libertarians and Rodney had done the phone calling in that area. He reported that we had gotten two new members because of it. He reported that this was significant in Sierra because we only had three before. He reported that we are moving toward splitting Region 26, Inyo / Mono Counties into two regions.

Rodney reported on the progress of the campaign brochures. He reported that this is a project to supply campaign brochures for candidates who cannot afford to put one together. He reported that the plan is to have campaign brochures in the hands of candidates by Labor Day.

Rodney gave a report on the progress of the upcoming conference in Fresno. He reported that last year the conference of regional chairs was a success and there will be another one this August 26-27. He reported that he would have the location of the hotel in the next couple of weeks. He reported that he had four provisional speakers lined up on topics such as creating newsletters, fund-raising etc.

There was some discussion about the policy of dues payments to regions especially when those regions do not cash the checks or there is no one to mail the checks to.

c) Southern Vice Chair – Ted Brown

Ted Brown reported on campaign activities. He noted that Region 66 is putting out a campaign brochure with several candidates on it. He reported that San Bernardino Chapter sent a letter to 3,300 registered Libertarians asking that they join and become monthly pledgers. Ted reported on prospective demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention at the Staples Center. Brian Lee Cross noted that Orange County was also putting together a brochure with several candidates on it. He said that they intended to hand out brochures at a county fair in July.

d) Secretary – Sandi Webb

Sandi Webb reported that there had been 6 e-mail votes of the Executive Committee. She reported that she records the OpCom votes separately and did not get it into the packets. She reported that she has put up a Secretary's Corner web site at <http://www.sandiwebb.com/lp>. The official LP state web site was discussed.

e) Treasurer – Eric Lund

Eric Lund handed out copies of the balance sheet and income statement. He reported that two fundraisers had done really well. The net proceeds from the first one was \$6,100. Strategies of fund-raising were discussed. Eric noted that our spending was a bit above budget, but that revenue was also above budget. Funding of the newsletter was discussed.

Motion: Ted Brown moved that the October issues of the newsletter be published normally.

Joe Dehn explained the schedule for the newsletter. He stated that the August issue would be online only, the September issue would be printed, the October issue would be on-line and the November issue would be printed. He stated that we could switch them around but only print two more issues unless we increase the budget.

Motion to amend: moved to add a September issue and increase the budget by \$4,000.

Motion to table: Aaron Starr moved to table the question of which issues to print until after the treasurer's report. **Passed with no objections.**

The expense for the office was discussed. It was noted that most of these are one-time expenditures. Alex's duties were discussed especially as to how soon she could take over Thea McLean's duties.

Revenue was discussed. Aaron Starr noted that the \$28,500 in the major donor category is misleading because \$13,500 received in June are restricted funds. He noted that we have \$15,000 unrestricted major donor funds. Mark noted that now he will be able to spend more time on fund-raising..

Lunch

The discussion on the newsletter was brought off the table. It was whether we actually will have enough money to add another issue. Mark Hinkle suggested doing a targeted fund-raising specifically to do one printed issue of the newsletter. It was discussed whether this would add money for this item or merely divert it from something else. It was discussed that we had raised \$15,000 in unrestricted funds and that we still needed to raise another \$30,000 in unrestricted funds. It was discussed that this would make that figure \$34,000. The difference between restricted funds and unrestricted funds was discussed. It was suggested to move up the November issue by a couple of weeks and if we raise the additional \$4,000 an extra newsletter can be printed. It was suggested that, as we were out of time, this be dealt with as an e-mail vote.

Vote on the amendment on the floor: Print the September issue and increase the budget by \$4,000. **Failed.**

Vote on the main motion: Ted Brown moved that October and December issues of the newsletter be printed issues instead of September and November. **Passed. 10 yes, 3 no.**

f) Executive Director – Juan Ros

Juan Ros reported on media contacts. He reported that there had been no reason for him to go to Sacramento since the last ExCom meeting but that we did formally oppose two bills. Juan gave an update on the blanket primary bill. Juan reported on the campaigns and elections goal of 200 candidates. He stated that we were up to 126, which leaves us 74 candidates short of the goal. Juan gave a report on

Operation Breakthrough, explaining what it was. Juan reported on the progress of regional development. He reported on the progress of fund-raising. He stated that the first fund-raising letter brought in \$11,155. He stated that this was the second fund-raising which was targeted to only 1,811 was only targeted to 1811 prior donors, brought in \$4,660. He reported that he did a mailing to the Golden State Torch Club but no revenue has come in from that mailing yet. He reported on the progress of the new office.

Motion to extend for 10 minutes: Failed.

Motion to extend for five minutes: Passed.

The split of Region 26, Mono/ Inyo Counties was discussed further.

5. Standing Committees:

a) Audit Committee Report

Mark Hinkle reported that he had spoken to Steve Marsland about the audit report and that it was supposed to be ready by this meeting. As Steve Marsland was not at the meeting there would be no audit report. Mark stated that if he got something before the next ExCom he would put it out to an e-mail ballot.

b) Budget Committee

Mark noted that it was not time yet for the budget committee to meet and report.

c) Membership Committee

Bruce Dovner gave the Membership Committee Report. He handed out tables that showed a breakdown of membership by Region of lapsed verses current members. He noted that there were 9,263 lapsed members in the database. Of those, 2,406 memberships had expired within the last 14 months. These were the lapsed members that the committee wanted to target. This number excludes those members who had lapsed within the previous two months, as they were expected to renew on their own. He reported the cost of contacting these people. Aaron Starr asked what was currently being done by either the national party or the state party to contact these people. Joe Dehn gave an explanation of the procedure from National. He stated that we could assume that a generic renewal mailing or a generic renewal phone call is either not going to work or is already been done. It was discussed to have a report generated monthly for regional chairs giving them the names of expired members in their regions. Bruce noted that he was going to ask that the vice chairs help with calling the regional chairs and with setting up this program.

Motion to extend debate for 10 minutes. Passed.

Bruce Dovner explained that there was no action item at this time. He explained that he would be setting up the program over the next few months and getting it started through volunteers. Ted Brown stated that he would bring it up the next time he calls the regional chairs. Rodney Austin noted that there are 40 regions in the northern California area and that it would be too difficult for him to call the chairs in all 40 regions on a monthly basis. He noted that he would be happy to contact each of the regions once and explain the program. He noted that the conference of regions coming up in August would be a good time to have someone from the Membership Committee talk to the regional chairs about this program. Rodney asked that the Membership Committee looked at having some form of membership discounts for students. He also asked that they looked at finding some way of tracking the source of new memberships. Aaron Starr made a proposal for a "retention of membership" contest among the regions. The details are to be worked out by him and Joe Dehn.

6. Other Committee Reports: None

7. Evaluation of Standing Resolutions:

Sandi Webb reported that she had reformed the Standing Resolutions several months ago as part of the previous ExCom meeting. The Standing Resolutions pertaining to the election code was discussed. It was discussed whether to have someone in the legislature change the existing election code to reflect the Libertarian Party bylaws.

Motion: Remove the first three paragraphs under Dues/Inactive Counties.

~~The county portion of dues from members in counties with less than 10 members shall be placed in a separate fund and used by the Vice Chairs for expenses used in organizing those inactive counties. (1-89-02.1)~~

~~An inactive region is entitled, upon becoming an active region, to any dues collected for that region within the prior one year period.~~

~~Inactive region funds not claimed after one year shall be placed in the appropriate Vice Chair fund. (2-94-11.2)~~

Passed.

Motion: Remove the Dues/ Membership Form category.
Unnecessary because of unified membership with National.

Motion to amend: Replace the three items under Dues/ Membership Form with “Minimum dues for out of state membership shall be \$25.”

The membership form shall offer choice of dues amount to members. (5-89-05.5)

LPC central committee minimum annual dues to shall be \$25;

There shall be a category of “sustaining membership” of \$50; effective January 1, 1991; (3-90-11.3)

Passed.

Main motion: Passed.

Motion: Delete the second paragraph under Contracts: Approval/ evaluation/ termination.

The Executive Committee delegates to the Operations Committee the authority to approve contractual obligations provided that they do not exceed 60 days, \$10,000, or the budgeted amount for that category of activity. (98-04)

Passed.

Unnecessary because of bylaw changes at the previous state convention.

Motion: Delete the entire Approval/ evaluation/ termination section.

—All contracts for services will be negotiated with the approval of the Chair and the Officer(s) who is (are) responsible for the specific services proved and shall contain, in addition to other relevant provisions, criteria for evaluation and provisions for termination. (2-84-72-2)

—The Executive Committee delegates to the Operations Committee the authority to approve contractual obligations provided that they do not exceed 60 days, \$10,000, or the budgeted amount for that category of activity. (98-04)

Passed.

Motion: Change the name “LPMASTER” to LPC database under Contracts/ Database (page 6). **Passed.**
Other items to be added by the LPC Secretary from the last convention.

8. Old Business:

- a) Gail Lightfoot, use of LP mailing list (Gail Lightfoot was not present)

9. New Business:

- a) Approval of Initiatives (Ted Brown gave a brief report on each Ballot Proposition. He read the Attorney General’s Title and Summary for each proposition.)
 - i) ACA 12 (Prop. 33 Legislature. Participation in Public Employees’ Retirement System. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. An act to amend Section 4.5 of Article IV, relating to the Legislature.)

Motion to take a position to oppose ACA 12. Passed without dissent.

- ii) AB 2305 (Prop. 32 Veterans’ Bond Act of 2000)

Motion to take a position to oppose Ab2305. Passed without dissent.

- iii) Prop. 39 School Facilities. 55% Local Vote. Bonds, Taxes. Accountability Requirements. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. (Son of Prop 26)

Motion to take a position to oppose. Passed without dissent.

- iv) Prop. 37 Fees. Vote Requirements. Taxes. Initiative Constitutional Amendment. (Redefines as taxes any compulsory fees enacted by state or local government after July 1, 1999 to monitor, study or mitigate societal or economic effects of activity where such fees impose no regulatory obligation on the payer. Requires two-thirds vote of Legislature to approve such state fees; majority or two-thirds vote of local electorate for local fees.)

Motion to take a position to endorse. Passed without dissent.

- v) Prop. 35 Public Works Projects. Use of Private Contractors for Engineering and Architectural Services. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. (Overrides constitutional restrictions to allow state, local contracting with private entities for engineering and architectural services in all phases of public works projects; exempts such services from constitutional requirement to use civil service workforce. Requires competitive selection process for awarding contracts.)

Motion to take a position to endorse. Passed without dissent.

- vi) Prop. 36 Drugs. Probation and Treatment Program. Initiative Statute. (Requires drug treatment program and probation for certain non-violent drug possession offenses and similar parole violations not including sale, production or manufacture. Permits court to impose additional conditions of probation but not incarceration. Specifies procedures for determining probation or parole violation and consequences. Authorizes dismissal of charges upon successful completion of treatment but requires

disclosure of arrest and conviction to law enforcement and as necessary for candidates, peace officers, licensure, contracting with State Lottery, jury service. Requires studies of this measure's effectiveness. Appropriates state funds for drug treatment program through 2005-2006. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: This measure is likely to result in net savings to the state that probably range between \$100 million and \$150 million annually for lower costs for prison operations with a one-time avoidance of capital outlay costs of between \$475 million and \$575 million for prison construction. Counties would probably experience net savings of \$50 million annually due primarily to a lower jail population.

Discussion:

It was noted that it was a hard decision whether to support or to take no position. It was noted that this was like a choice between shooting someone in the head or just breaking their legs. It was noted that this took us in the right direction. Starchild urged the ExCom to support it. Mark Hinkle asked if there were any opposing viewpoints. The LP had taken a position against forced treatment. Aaron Starr noted that this was a strategy to get around the conflicting power issue between the State and Federal governments. As the state can determine the sentencing guidelines for crimes, this allows the state to set the sentence with a slap on the wrist. It gets people out of jail and is tantamount to a \$1 fine. Rodney Austin noted that we do not need to take a position on every initiative that comes along. John Scott Ballard noted that this gave our candidates something positive to run on. Aaron Starr noted that as people are let out of prison and the crime rate continues to drop, this would put more pressure on legalization of drugs. Rodney noted that he was in favor of the measure but that he thought we should take no official position.

Motion to take a position to endorse. Voice vote, 1 no; 1 abstention. Passed.

- vii) Prop. 38 School Vouchers. State-Funded Private and Religious Education. Public School Funding. Initiative Constitutional Amendment. (Authorizes annual state payments of at least \$4000 per pupil for qualifying private and religious schools as grants for new enrollees. Expands eligibility in phases; by fourth year, all children enrolled in qualifying schools are eligible. Permits Legislature to replace current constitutional funding priority and Proposition 98 guarantees for public schools with new minimum per-pupil public school funding at no less than national average. Restricts regulation of private schools. Exempts private schools from designated Uniform Building Code requirements. Requires academic testing in grant-redeeming schools. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: This measure would result in a major rearrangement of the State's system of school finance, with growing annual savings in public school expenditures and growing annual costs of a new system of grants for children transferring to, or already attending, private schools. Initial fiscal impact ranging from annual costs of over \$150 million to over \$600 million. Long-run fiscal impact ranging from net annual costs of over \$500 million to net annual savings of around \$2.5 billion. Other fiscal effects include: (1) potentially significant annual savings to the State from reduced teacher retirement contribution; (2) unknown, potentially significant, savings to the State and local school districts from reduced capital outlay needs; and (3) unknown potential loss of federal education funds to the State.)

Discussion:

Aaron Starr asked if we had taken a position on the voucher initiative in 1993. Ted said that we had. Aaron Starr asked if there was anything in the initiative that protects private schools from further legislation by the state. Ted answered that the summary says the measure restricts regulation of private schools and an exemption of private schools from the designated UBC requirements. The provision for testing was discussed, as well as the term in the initiative "qualifying school." It was noted that testing is a moving target. Starchild asked whether the ExCom had dealt with PAVE 2000. Mark Hinkle answered that the ExCom had specifically avoided dealing with that, because the convention had voted specifically not to deal with it. Starchild noted that he would rather we support something coming from one of our own members above an outside initiative. Aaron Starr agreed that this would be good but noted that it was this initiative that had made it to the ballot.

Motion to take a position of "no position": Seconded.

Rodney Austin spoke to his motion saying that there are many Libertarians who are wary of vouchers for many reasons and that a position of "no position" was more appropriate than a position of either yes or no. It was noted that regulation of private schools was also a moving target.

Motion to substitute: Aaron Starr moved to take a position to endorse. Seconded.

Speaking to his motion, Aaron Starr stated that he thinks this is a move in the right direction. He said that he had read the initiative a while ago and that it includes restrictions on new regulations of private schools. He pointed out that the Legislature can always pass new regulations today and this provides them with more protection. He said

that moving into a voucher system would save money. He mentioned the provisions that were in the initiative on funding.

Motion to extend debate for 5 minutes. Passed.

Mark noted that after he had been approached by the supporters of this measure for an endorsement, he had gotten an opposing view from Marshall Fritz. He said that he had wanted to bring it to this meeting instead of an e-mail vote. Ted Brown said that he was torn on this issue. He noted that the main argument against this was that the government could control the private schools. He noted that there are provisions in the measure to help protect against this. He noted that the legislature could put a measure on the ballot to overturn this portion. He noted that the LP Platform supports tuition tax credits instead of vouchers. He said that those who are supporting this measure are against the current system and it would be better for us to be on the side of supporting this than not supporting it. Overall he thought it was better to support it. Frank Manske spoke against the substitute motion. He said that he would eventually oppose this because we want to get rid of the government school system and replace it with private. Aaron Starr said that there are a lot of people involved on this initiative that are with us on other issues and that he would like to see us work with them on this. It was noted that private schools don't have to enter the program. Bruce Dovner noted that this could create a constituency for private education as well as government education. He noted that virtually all of the teachers are under the public school monopoly. He noted that there would be an offset to regulation as more people have an economic interest that they not be regulated.

Vote of the substitute motion: Aaron Starr moved to take a position to endorse. **Passed**

Vote of the main motion to support the School Voucher 2000 Initiative: Passed by voice vote. 2 no votes.

b) Approval of School Voucher 2000 Initiative Resolution (Prop 38)

Motion to endorse the following resolution as amended:

Whereas, the government-run public school system is a disaster which deprives our children of a decent education while simultaneously imposing tremendous costs on taxpayers, and

Whereas, an effective means of exposing the failures of the government-run public school system and demonstrating the benefits of alternatives is by introducing an effective element of educational choice, and

Whereas, many parents need the financial resources now being taken from them through taxation and funneled to the failed government-run public school system, so as to allow them access to educational alternatives, and

Whereas, the Libertarian Party of California supports the ultimate complete separation of school and state, and

Whereas, properly designed tax credits or vouchers can serve as a step in the proper direction of creating an effective avenue of educational choice for parents and their children, and

Whereas, the educational bureaucracy, led by teachers union officials and statist politicians, is desperately opposing efforts to break their stranglehold on our children and our wallets, and

Whereas, the School Vouchers 2000 initiative which will appear on the November California ballot offers parents \$4,000 vouchers to educate their children at the school of their choice, and

Whereas, the School Vouchers 2000 initiative will result in a reduction in the tax burden caused by Government run school s because per-pupil government expenditures are greater than the voucher amount, and

Whereas, the School Vouchers 2000 initiative will add explicit legal protections for private and home schools, to prevent the California government from imposing onerous new regulations upon them, therefore be it

Resolved, that the Libertarian Party of California supports the goals of improved education and expanded choices as expressed in the School Vouchers 2000 initiative, and

Resolved, that the Libertarian Party of California endorses the School Vouchers 2000 initiative as a significant advance over the failed status quo, and urges its passage.

Vote on motion to support the School Voucher 2000 Initiative Resolution as amended: Passed by voice vote. 1 no.

c) Choose Electors for the Presidential Election

Mark Hinkle noted that we needed to choose 54 people for this position. Requirements for this position were discussed. Several suggestions for selecting the electors were discussed.

Motion to delegate this item to the Operations Committee. Seconded.

Motion to amend: Rodney Austin moved to add the following guidelines: 1. Either an LPC member, 2. An LPC financial contributor; or 3. An elected registered Libertarian. Accepted as friendly. **Passed.**

d) Operation Breakthrough

Aaron Starr gave a brief overview of Operation Breakthrough. He stated that he had come up with a way to get more Libertarians elected cheaply. He said that there are 2,200 special districts in the state of California that are elected. He said that in many of these districts the elections are canceled because no one files for the seat or the incumbent runs uncontested. He said that if we could run candidates in these offices we could elect some of them. He said that he is gathering information on the 595 districts that are coming up for election this November. Aaron said that it was hard to tell what district anyone lived in. He said that he had had a slate mailing firm gather the data for him. He said that, after searching the data for certain criteria, he found just under 10,000 registered Libertarians living in these districts worth contacting. The proposal is to do a mailing to the 10,000 Libertarians asking them to run for the offices. One week after the mailing there would be a phone follow-up. He stated that it was his hope that of these 10,000 people we could get 100 Libertarians to run. He said that the help of the regions would be needed to help these people file. He stated that it was estimated that it would cost approximately \$20,000 to run this program. He explained about slate mailers. Aaron explained that during the convention he, Mark Hinkle and Juan Ros had raised \$15,570 toward this campaign. Aaron asked that he be granted the authority to spend the money that had been raised with the LPC making up any difference.

Motion to extend debate for 5 min: Passed

Rodney Austin said that the concern he had was that these were local races and that this is the area for the regions. He agreed that some things can be better organized statewide, but he didn't want to get the state party too involved in the local area. He thought this would create too much state control over the local regions. Aaron Starr said that this was not subsidization, just economies of scale. The larger regions could do this themselves. He argued that we already have Ted Brown doing statewide recruiting of candidates. The funding was discussed. Aaron stated that what he was asking for was a line item in the budget for \$21,000 for Operation Breakthrough, and to instruct the treasurer to break out a separate line of revenue for the contributions. The logistics of who would do follow-up phoning was discussed. John Scott Ballard said that this was important for his region. He thought that this may bring in more activists.

Motion: Create a line item in the budget for \$21,000 for Operation Breakthrough and instruct the treasurer to break out a separate line of revenue for the contributions. **Passed by 2/3 with 1 abstention.**

e) Setting guidelines for membership standards.

Aaron Starr suggested that a committee be established and that Ted Brown be appointed as chair. The distribution of material at state conventions was discussed. It was pointed out that this had only happened twice, and it was asked how much time should be put into it. The question of who the decision making body should be was discussed. Mark Hinkle stated that the current policy is that the LPC Chair can make the decision as well as the ExCom. Aaron Starr suggested that we continue with the current policy with the provision that the chair explain to the party that they can appeal to the ExCom.

Motion: Ted Brown moved that the decision be made by the LPC Chair and either two other LPC officers or two other members of the Operations Committee. **Seconded.**

Motion to substitute: Form a committee to study this and come back to the ExCom with a recommendation. **Seconded.**

Vote to close debate: Passed.

Vote on substitute motion: Passed.

Vote on main motion: Form a committee to study this and come back to the ExCom with a recommendation. **Passed.**

Committee members to be Ted Brown, Aaron Starr, Frank Manske, Steve Cicero

f) Discussion of open primary.

Juan Ros gave a brief update on a bill that has been introduced to the State Senate, SB 28 which would allow individual political parties to decide whether to permit "decline-to-state" voters to vote in their primary elections. Ted Brown said that we could support the bill but it would have to go to a convention for us to adopt it as policy. It was discussed that we could support a bill to allow other parties to be able to make this decision. This item was deferred to an e-mail vote when more information was available.

g) Executive Session (discuss potential lawsuit by Edison McDaniels.)
Mark Hinkle gave a brief report on this item.

Motion to go into Executive Session: Passed. Joe Dehn, no.

10. Next Meeting: September 16, 2000 at the San Jose Doubletree Hotel.

11. Adjourn: Mark Hinkle adjourned the meeting at 5:36 p.m.