

LNC Meeting

Washington, DC

December 9-10, 2000

DRAFT

Present: Jim Lark, Chair
Dan Fylstra, Vice-Chair (joined the meeting during Check of Paperwork)
Mark Tuniewicz, Treasurer
Steve Givot, Secretary

Ken Bison (IN), At Large Representative
Lorenzo Gaztanaga (MD), At Large Representative (joined meeting during Setting of Agenda)
Elias Israel (MA), At Large Representative
Lois Kinesic (PA), At Large Representative
Jim Turney, At Large Representative

Ed Hoc (AK), Region 1 Representative
Mike Dixon (IL), Region 1 Representative
Joe Dean (CA), Region 2 Representative
Scott Lieberman (CA), Region 2 Representative
Sara Chambers (IN), Region 3 Representative
Michael "MG" Gibson de Lemon (FL), Region 4 Representative
Richard Schwarz (PA), Region 5 Representative
Dan Karlan (NJ), Region 6 Alternate
Daryl Martin (TN) - Region 7 Representative

Also present: Jim Dexter (UT), Region 1 Alternate
Mark Nelson (IA), Region 1 Alternate
Carl Milsted, Jr. (VA) - Region 5 Alternate

Absent: Dan Wisnosky (NV), Region 2 Alternate
Tim Hagan (NV), Region 2 Alternate
Barbara Goushaw (MI), Region 3 Alternate
Ben Scherrey (GA), Region 4 Alternate
Ken Lindell (ME) - Region 6 Representative
Mary Ruwart (TX) - Region 7 Alternate

Vacant: None

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

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

Kaneshiki said that the minutes reflect that LNC Policy had been violated because materials were not distributed sufficiently prior to the meeting.

Item: Credentials

Givot reported that there have been no changes to the constituency of the Committee. He said that all LNC members are present except Fylstra, Gaztanaga, and Lindell. He said that Karlan - Lindell's alternate - is present.

Item: Setting of Agenda

Kaneshiki moved to add 10 minutes for Don Gorman to make a presentation to the Committee on Sunday. She said that she was not aware of the subject of his presentation.

Israel suggested that due to the amount of business before the Committee, that Gorman could address the group when it is not in formal session.

The Committee agreed to modify the proposed agenda to add 10 minutes for Gorman's presentation as the first item on Sunday morning and to begin the meeting at 8:50 AM instead of 9:00 AM.

The agenda was approved as modified.

Item: Check of Paperwork

Dasbach advised the Committee that he has updated financial information to replace a portion of that which was previously distributed.

Item: Chair's Report

Lark thanked the members of the Committee, members of the Executive Committee, and the staff for their hard work during the period since the convention.

Item: Treasurer's Report

Tuniewicz referred the Committee to his written report. He said that he would like to highlight two particular issues.

Tuniewicz said that the first issue is revenue shortfall. He said that over the past three years, the shortfall of actual revenue as compared with budgeted revenue has been growing during each years - both in terms of dollar shortfall and percentage shortfall.

Tuniewicz said that he has three recommendations regarding this:

- That the LNC should take a more active role in monitoring actual revenues vs. budgeted revenues.

- That the LNC should explore the underlying assumptions regarding revenue which are part of the proposed 2001 budget.
- That at its April 2001 meeting, the LNC should adopted a formal major donor program.

Tuniewicz said that the second area of concern is maintaining adequate liquidity.

Tuniewicz cited the fact that in recent years the LNC has adopted a formal reserve policy in an attempt to address this concern. Tuniewicz said that the Reserve Fund started the year at about \$50,000 and has gradually been built up during the course of 2000.

Tuniewicz said that the LP is within striking difference of achieving the core goal of ending 2000 with cash \$150,000 in excess of accounts payable. He said that the existence of the reserve policy and Reserve Fund has helped achieve this goal.

Tuniewicz said that he has a proposed reserve policy for 2001 and beyond. He said that this policy calls for placing \$150,000 in certificates of deposit which would mature on a rotating basis and adopting a policy which requires maintenance of at least 1:1 current ratio.

Tuniewicz said that a new item under consideration is the possible purchase of a headquarters facility in 2005. He said that - while this is not a proposal which requires any action at this time - he wants the Committee to be aware that this possibility is being discussed.

Tuniewicz said that the current LNC Policy calls for an internal auditor. He said that he considered recommending elimination of that position and function, relying instead on the external auditor. He said that before eliminating the position, it would be best to make a serious effort to find a volunteer to serve as internal auditor. He said that such a person can add value, particularly in the review of special projects.

Tuniewicz said that he has also reviewed the LNC Policy Manual with an eye toward suggesting possible changes relating to the role of the Treasurer. He said that he has prepared recommendations regarding these changes. He indicated that MG has suggested that this be incorporated into our upcoming strategic planning efforts.

Tuniewicz moved adoption of new language to replace Article 5 Section 5 of the LNC Policy Manual as follows:

Liquidity Requirements: The National Director shall be responsible to insure that the LNC maintains sufficient cash balances to provide prudent coverage of accounts payable. For purposes of this section, a positive working capital position (current access less current liabilities) measured on a monthly basis is deemed a minimum prudent level.

MG seconded.

Israel said that he believes the past policy has been too strict to permit the National Director to do his job effectively. He asked Tuniewicz whether he believes this is a stricter or looser policy.

Tuniewicz said that he believes that his proposal provides greater flexibility.

Dasbach said that he supports both recommendations. He said that this proposal is stricter in one sense - because it imposes a strict current ratio requirement - but more flexible in terms of permitting the staff to

determine compliance on a month-to-month basis.

Givot spoke about the origin and history of the reserve policy in effect for the past two years. He said that the LNC is responsible for any lack of flexibility that existed under that policy. He said that he specifically proposed a methodology to permit accessing portions of the Reserve Fund, but that the LNC didn't care to consider those suggestions at the time. He said that he would prefer a reserve policy which addresses not only the accumulation of a Reserve Fund, but that also does not permit staff to spend money that it does not have. He said that the proposal under consideration would permit the staff to spend money which it does not have other than in the Reserve Fund.

MG said that in at the July, 2000 LNC meeting, the Committee was charged with improving our process through open discussion. He said that he supports Tuniewicz's recommendations. He said that one thing that the LNC must stop doing is acting as though it is a government - applying our beliefs about how government should operate to the management of this private, voluntary organization. He said that we must demonstrate greater self-responsibility.

Martin asked Tuniewicz whether his proposal would call for an increase in liquidity at the end of 2001.

Tuniewicz said that it would not.

Martin noted the possible purchase of a building. He said that the proposed \$150,000 figure for the Reserve Fund would not be sufficient to cover two months during which there is a 50% shortfall in projected revenues. He said he had hoped that the \$150,000 figure was being recommended as an addition to the Reserve Fund rather than the target level.

Dehn expressed agreement that the dollar amount of the Reserve Fund should not appear in the LNC Policy Manual. He said that he believes that the Policy Manual should be modified to provide for the Reserve Fund, how it is operated, how it can be utilized, but not quantifying the amount of the Reserve Fund. Dehn suggested that such language could be incorporated as Article 5 Section 5 (B) in the LNC Policy Manual.

Tuniewicz agreed with Dehn's suggestion that Article 5 Section 5 (B) in the LNC Policy Manual could be as Dehn suggested.

MG asked for clarification of the purpose of holding the Reserve Fund in certificates of deposit.

Tuniewicz said that the purpose is to segregate these funds from operating funds and to earn an incremental rate of return on those funds.

Fylstra spoke in support of Tuniewicz's proposal. He said that we need to determine what measurement we wish to use and also determine how aggressive the LNC wishes to be regarding financial issues. He said that the new proposal is a better approach because it measures the right thing. He said that measuring net working capital is the right thing to do. He said that including the certificates of deposit in the Reserve Fund as part of working capital is not overly burdensome on staff. He said that there is a limited ability for the LNC to effectively manage or anticipate unexpected shortfalls in revenues or unanticipated expense.

Tuniewicz clarified that the motion before the LNC was to replace Article 5 Section 5 of the Policy Manual with his proposed language.

The motion passed on a voice vote. Dehn, Gaztanaga, and Hoch abstained.

Tuniewicz moved adoption of amendments to the LNC Policy Manual describing the position description of the Treasurer and National Director as follows:

Amending Article III Section 3 (A) to read:

Section 3. POSITION DESCRIPTION OF NATIONAL TREASURER:

A. RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY: The Treasurer is the Chief Financial Officer of the LNC and shall have responsibility and authority to perform all functions in conjunction with that role. In part this includes:

1. To prepare and file Federal Election Commission reports and income tax returns as required by law, directly or through written delegation to staff.
2. To supervise and review the preparation of all accounts and disbursements of the Party.
3. To render appropriate management reports to the Chair as requested.
4. To develop and maintain appropriate banking and contributor relationships.

Deleting Article III Section 3 (C) in its entirety.

Amending Article VI Section 2 (B) to read:

B. The Director is directly responsible to the Chair, and reports to the LNC, and in that capacity:

1. maintains adequate and necessary communications with the Chair, and ensures that the Chair is kept fully informed of all pertinent LPHQ and Party activities;
2. submits all contracts of over \$1000 to the Chair for approval prior to any commitment of the Party to the contracts;
3. submits periodic written reports to the Executive Committee and LNC, including monthly financial statements, annual audited financial statements, monthly FEC summary reports, and monthly accounts payable agings.

Dixon seconded.

Tuniewicz said that it is important to state that the Treasurer is the CFO to assure the ability of the Treasurer to contact the outside auditors or FEC consultants.

Dasbach expressed concern that if there is direct contact between the Treasurer and the Auditor the staff may not be aware of the request.

Israel said that this might best be considered as part of our upcoming strategic planning efforts.

Givot said that this level of detail is probably far below the level of detail that will be developed in a strategic plan.

Dixon said that he believes that this is too detailed for inclusion in strategic planning.

A motion to table failed.

Dehn said that he supports most of the proposed changes. He said that he does not like the deletion of (3)(a)(8) which calls for the Treasurer to prepare an annual financial report.

Dehn proposed that (3)(a)(8) be retained and that it be modified to call for the Treasurer to report to both the LNC and the membership and removing the specification of a date by which to report.

MG said that because the Treasurer is elected by the convention, the Chair cannot restrict the Treasurer in this regard.

The motion passed without objection.

Lark said that after the convention Bill Redpath offered to serve in as internal auditor. He said that Redpath has recently reiterated his willingness to do so.

Tuniewicz said that Redpath had previously expressed some limitation of his ability to do that job aggressively due to other time commitments.

Item: Region 1W Report

Hoch said that, despite the fact that it appears that our candidates did not do particularly well in the recent election, he believes that in some areas we did quite well.

Hoch provided the Committee with the details about the subjects covered in his written report.

Hoch said that he is experiencing problems getting information from some of the states in his region. He cited Hawaii as an example of this.

Item: Region 1E Report

Dixon said that he prepared his report for the affiliates in his region. He said that the LNC also receives a copy of this report.

Dixon said that LPIL is doing something of considerable value. He said that LPIL is holding a candidate recognition event in January which will serve as a kickoff to line up candidates for 2002. He said that LPIL has earned ballot status in two congressional districts which include Chicago.

Dixon said that Mark Nelson is doing a great job and that LPIA has elected some candidates.

Dixon said that LPSD is doing a mailing to registered Libertarians to try to increase membership.

Dixon said that LPKS has expressed concerns about the degree of cooperation they received from the Browne campaign.

Dixon said that LPMN is demoralized. He said that they have had a bad year.

Dixon said the LPND is not reporting.

Dixon advised the Committee that he has relocated to Tucson. He said that he will be reporting the results of this meeting and offering his resignation to the states which he represents. He said that he will continue to serve as the Region 1E representative only if the chairs in his region wish him to continue to do so in light of his relocation.

Item: Region 4 Report

MG said that he has spent some time discussing the content of his report with his state chairs and key activists. He presented a tabulation of registrations, membership, elected Libertarians, and other statistics for each state in his region.

MG noted the comparison with LPNH. He said that LPNH apparently runs a very high percentage of its members as candidates. He said that from the LPNH figures, he concludes that running a lot of candidates appears to draw more people into activist activities.

MG reviewed some of the strategic planning efforts of LPFL.

MG said that LPGA is focusing on activism.

MG described the strategic planning efforts of LPNC.

MG said that LPAL and LPSC are focusing on developing their people.

Item: Strategic Planning

Givot said that there are two mission statements that need to be discussed this weekend: the Mission Statement of the LNC-Strategic Planning Team and the Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party.

Givot proposed that time today be used to discuss the methodology for strategic planning. He proposed that the first of two sessions on the following day would be used to determine the methodology for strategic planning. He proposed that the second session on the following day would be devoted to reviewing the Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party.

Kaneshiki agreed that it is important that we discuss the methodology of strategic planning. She said that the Libertarian Party is unique. She said that the breadth of the current Mission Statement necessitates that the discussion of the Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party needs to be discussed first, because the

methodology for strategic planning may be different if the Mission Statement is changed.

Dasbach read the Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party.

Gaztanaga agreed that it is important to determine the Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party prior to determining the methodology for strategic planning.

Tuniewicz asked what the downside is to discussion the Mission of the Libertarian Party before discussion the methodology for strategic planning.

Givot said that there is no inherent problem with doing things in the order that Kaneshiki suggests. He said that he proposed waiting until the next day to discuss the Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party was to allow people some time to interact and think about the Mission Statement prior to focusing on that issue.

Dixon that if the Committee were to be doing strategic planning today, he would agree with Kaneshiki. He said that since we are only talking about how we will be doing strategic planning, the discussion of the Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party need not be done now.

Karlan agreed with Dixon.

Kaneshiki said that the basis of her concern is that if the established Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party is too broad, then the process may need to be changed to allow more time for deliberation of discussion.

Bisson said that he assumes that the Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party is not likely to change very much, and therefore he feels comfortable proceeding to discuss planning methodology.

Israel said that he also thinks that the Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party is not likely to change as much and supports proceeding to discuss planning methodology.

Strong consensus was reached that there would likely be little if any change to the Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party.

The Committee then reached consensus to proceed to sequence its discussion of topics as proposed by Givot.

Givot said that he believes that there is no disagreement that if a separate group is established to do strategic planning, that it will be the LNC - not the separate group - that ultimately determines what, if any, strategic plan will be adopted by the Party.

The Committee agreed with this without exception.

Givot said that the Executive Committee has had some discussion about how a separate group might operate. He said that one idea that has been discussed is to hold two to three meetings between now and the April 2001 LNC meeting and two to three meetings between the April 2001 and August 2001 LNC meetings.

Givot said that there has also been discussion of a concept advanced by Kaneshiki, that much of the work be done by email instead of meeting in person.

Givot said that he and Lark have discussed the possibility of working in parallel with in-person meetings and email interchanges until April 2001 and deferring until April 2001 any decision not to meeting further in

person.

Gaztanaga said that he always understood that email would be used as an adjunct to in-person meetings.

Givot said that there was a consensus building at the Executive Committee that since missing one of a small number of meetings would leave the absent person seriously behind, attendance at all strategic planning meetings should be a prerequisite for participating on the LNC-Strategic Planning Team.

Givot said that Lark and he have discussed this, and that Lark has volunteered to take upon the responsibility of bringing any absent participant up to date for material covered at a missed meeting. He said that Lark has also agreed to step in if a participant is behind and becomes disruptive to the process and remove the participant from the process at the LNC-SPT level.

Israel said that the best place to make sure that things are done well is at an in-person meeting.

Dixon says that he sees similarities between this process and the LP Platform Committee. He said that both will probably involve a considerable amount of email interchanges which lead to productive results in in-person meetings.

Kaneshiki said that certain processes lend themselves to email - such as brainstorming - but that others do not. She said that her concerns relate to the specific stages and steps to be taken in developing a strategic plan.

Givot described the "consensus-building methodology." He said that this is the methodology he would propose using. He said that the approach is to see if decisions can be made in a manner such that polarization of views is minimized.

Kaneshiki said that a strategic planning must begin with an assessment of where the Party is.

Givot said that the approach that he envisions will begin with exactly that as well as an assessment of the environment in which the Party operates.

Givot provided a brief synopsis of the steps he would envision in developing a strategic plan.

Givot introduced a list of items that the LNC should consider in drafting the LNC-SPT Mission Statement. He asked the Committee to consider these items and be prepared to discuss them the following day.

Dasbach asked Givot to comment on the proposed interface with affiliate parties.

Givot said that a meeting of state chairs is being scheduled for February. He said that he believes it would be of great value to hold the first LNC-SPT meeting at the same time and location and to have the state chairs spend about 5 hours meeting jointly with LNC-SPT so that all of their ideas are integrated into the strategic planning process from the beginning.

Givot said that this would just be the first step of involving the state chairs in the strategic planning process.

Givot asked if any Committee member took exception to these beliefs.

Tuniewicz said that he felt that the prior state chairs meeting was not particularly beneficial.

No one else took exception.

Kaneshiki said that there are many differences among our affiliates. She said that input broader than what might be gotten from only state chairs would be better.

Karlan said that we must avoid the perception that the LNC is attempted to develop a strategic plan in a vacuum. He said that such a perception would cause problems.

Hoch said that it is important to publicize what we are doing to the state chairs. He said that it is important that they are aware of the state chair meeting well in advance.

Israel said that it may be better to break up into smaller groups for brainstorming.

Givot said that he has run larger groups in brainstorming sessions. He said that by structuring the meeting appropriately, fair participation by everyone is easily achievable. He said that the override advantage of doing brainstorming in one large group is the "cross pollination" that occurs.

MG said that tremendous synergy results from having a single large group.

Fylstra said that it will be impossible to get participation by all state chairs. He said that a lot of work will need to be done to make the state chairs meeting productive.

Dasbach reported that in 1997 more than 40 states were represented.

MG said that a similar approach has been implemented by LPFL with over 150 people participating.

Item: National Director's Report

Dasbach reported to the Committee on the LNC's financial status through November 2000 and presented historical financial data which was used to prepare the 2001 budget.

Dasbach presented the Committee a preview copy of the Annual Report letter.

Dasbach presented his written report measuring performance in achieving the goals set by the LNC one year ago.

Dasbach briefly discussed delays in implement the new web site. He told the Committee that the delays did not result in increases charges to the LNC from the vendor.

Dasbach presented the Committee an analysis of actual first-year revenues per starting member. He said that this supports the proposed 2001 budget estimate of \$97.94 in revenues for each member at the start of the year.

Kaneshiki asked whether this figure is gross revenue or net revenue.

Dasbach said that it is gross revenue. He said that net revenue would have to be defined before it can be calculated.

Kaneshiki said that gross revenues per member is a meaningless number. She said that unless the costs of achieving that revenue are taken into account, one cannot determine how well we are doing.

Dasbach said that the only purpose for using this data is to check on the feasibility of the overall budget revenue projections.

Givot said that this gives the LNC a reality check as to whether it is reasonable to expect our members to - on average - fund the Party at a certain level. He said that his can be compared with the proposed budget to determine if revenues are set at a reasonable level. He said that it is a completely different issue as to whether or not it is a good strategy to raise this much money in this manner.

Dasbach said that this methodology has been the best means to determine whether projected revenues is feasible.

Dasbach presented a report showing the detailed costs and revenues of various fundraising letters.

Dasbach presented the requested four-month budget for 2001.

Dasbach explained a revised presentation of the 2000 budget which facilitates certain comparisons with the proposed budget.

Item: Political Director's Report

Crickenberger reported on results for 2000.

Crickenberger said that the 50-state ballot access goal's result is somewhat subject to interpretation of what was meant, because candidates for the LP were on the ballot in AZ for president and vice-president.

Crickenberger said that the goal of running 218 candidates for the US House was achieved. He suggested that in the future, the minimum number that we should strive for was the level achieved this year - 256 candidates for the US House.

Crickenberger said that we failed to meet the goal of 2000 candidates for all levels of office. He said that over 1,800 candidate announced their intention to run, although only about 1,400 candidates ran. He said that this about doubled the party's prior record. He said that the Libertarian Party ran about twice as many candidates as all other third parties.

Crickenberger reported that the party has retained ballot status in 26 states. He listed states where ballot status was probably gained (AL, OH) and states where ballot status was lost (MI, WV, IA, NH).

Crickenberger said that the real strength of the party's efforts this year came in the number of candidates running for office.

Crickenberger said that 35 Libertarians were elected to public office as compared with 5 elected in 1996. He said that the largest gains in elected Libertarians have typically come in odd-year elections.

Crickenberger said that 327 Libertarians hold public office and that they hold a total of 360 offices.

Crickenberger reported on the some details of the 2000 ballot drives. He said that - starting with OK - drives in other states were delaying creating a series of problems.

Crickenberger commented on ballot drives in the coming year.

Givot asked Crickenberger what, if any, ballot drives are schedules for the first eight months of 2001 which could be delayed until after a strategic plan is approved.

Crickenberger said that both the NE and NC drives must be done immediately to avoid loss of Libertarian registrations. He said that OH must be done before year end, but that it would be very ill advised to delay starting that drive until September 1, 2000. He said that the OH drive will provide for running candidates in 2002.

Dasbach said that drives like the OH drive will only be considered for 2001 only if the affiliate party shows a clear willingness to do much of the work required.

The Committee recessed for lunch at 1:30 PM EST.

The Committee reconvened at 1:52 PM EST.

Tuniewicz complimented Crickenberger and Dasbach for the various graphical presentations in Crickenberger's report.

Item: Communications Director's Report

Winter said that Getz and he had a very different experience in 2000 than in 1996, largely because the presidential campaign was not located at the LP HQ office in 2000 at it was in 1996. He said that this made it more difficult for the LP to attract media attention because that was being directed to the presidential campaign which was located elsewhere.

Winter reported that the census campaign, the national convention, and the presidential campaign led to an increase of 42% in media contacts over 1996. He said that the goal was to have 130 media contacts per month and the actual result this year was 135 media contacts per month.

Winter said that the goal was to have 55 media interviews per month in 2000 and the actual number is 50 media interviews per month. He said that the ratio of media interviews to media contacts has been about 50% in the past. This year the ratio dropped to 40%.

Winter said the goal of published op ed pieces was goal 18 and that 12 were actually written. He said that Harry Browne wrote two as well. He said that the number actually printed exceeded expectations.

Winter said that the goal was 24 television appearances and the actual result so far has been 27. He said that an additional appearance on Fox News is scheduled for December which would bring the total to 28 appearances.

Winter said that the LP is now in touch with higher level people in television that it has been before. He said this includes people at CNN's Crossfire as well as John Stossel's unit at ABC News.

Winter reported that the average issue of LP News in 2000 was just over 32 pages. He said that a subscription to LP News is the party's major membership benefit. He said that subscribers are now getting twice as much content as three years ago.

MG said that he is interested in pursuing going to a semi-monthly publication schedule for LP News.

Winter said doing so this would double postage costs.

Winter said that in the coming year he expects to see issues ranging from 24 to 36 pages per issue.

Winter said that he hopes to hire an LP News writer in the coming months.

Givot asked Winter whether it would be fair to characterize the proposed budget for 2001 to be continuing what had been done in the past.

Winter said that it would be a fair characterization regarding those items in his area of responsibility. He said that there is nothing new anticipated in the 2001 budget.

Tuniewicz asked what, if any, policy is in place for non-presidential campaigns to use the party's media fax list.

Winter said that the current list is not broken down geographically or by media type or content. He said that the LP HQ purchases the Bacon's media directory which, by contract, cannot be distributed to affiliated organizations.

Kaneshiki asked for clarification about the amount charged to advertisers for a full page ad in LP News.

Dasbach said that the average cost to the party to produce LP News is about \$150 per page.

Dasbach said that the amount charged for a full page ad (without quantity discount) is about \$1,000 per full page ad.

Givot asked Dasbach to confirm that this means that - even at the highest discount rate for multiple appearances (40%) - adding four additional pages to an LP News issue will always generate a profit if there is at least a full page of paid advertising being added as well.

Dasbach confirmed that this is correct.

George Getz reported details of a variety of media contacts during the year.

Item: Region 2 Report

Dehn referred the Committee to his written report.

Dehn highlighted the concern of LPCA regarding the amount of funds directed to affiliate parties from UMP. He said that LPCA feels particularly handicapped in this regard. He said that there are people within LPCA are disappointed by the amount of membership growth under UMP. He said that some feel that there are few financial incentives for LPCA to expend money to grow membership under UMP. He referred to a proposal

developed by Aaron Starr in response to this.

Dehn said that there is also a written report relating to activities in NV.

Tuniewicz asked Dehn if LPCA will be reconsidering its decision to go from monthly to semi-monthly publication of its newsletter.

Dehn said that during the height of optimism of Project Archimedes, decisions were made that assumed that substantial membership growth would occur. He said that when the member did not grow as projected, it was necessary to reduce certain costs. He said that frequency of publication of the newsletter was one such cost.

Dasbach said that it may be possible to revise the UMP contract to be somewhat responsive to proposals received from LPCA.

Winter addressed some of the issues that the LP would face if trying to accommodate some of these requests.

Lieberman said that Operation Breakthrough cost about \$30,000 and led to election of 13 candidates. He said that this was very cost-effective. He acknowledged that this occurred because these candidates ran without opposition.

Dasbach said that LNC provided additional funding to LPCA for Operation Breakthrough when it was needed.

Item: Region 3 Report

Chambers said that three states in her region ran 100 or more candidates. She said that three other states met or exceeded their prior record for number of candidates.

Chambers said that the feedback that she is getting is that the states in her region are more desirous of intellectual help and tools from the LNC than for money.

Item: Convention Planning

Dasbach distributed materials relating to holding the 2002 convention in Indianapolis. He said that - thus far - he has been unable to locate space in Atlanta for the 2002 convention.

Dasbach said that the Browne campaign has recommended that the LNC consider holding the 2004 presidential nominating convention before July 4, 2004 to provide more time for the presidential campaign to get underway.

Givot reported that his recent visit to Indianapolis convinced him that it would be an excellent choice for the 2002 convention. He said that the city has undergone a major facelift and new construction in the past 12 years. He said that air transportation costs to Indianapolis are comparable to those to Chicago and are very reasonable as compared with Minneapolis, Dallas, St. Louis, or Denver.

Gaztanaga said that, although he has always liked the historical significance of having the convention on July 4, he believes that it is somewhat unusual to be dealing with weighty matters on a holiday that is more

typically a celebration.

Givot moved that the LNC authorizes the National Director to proceed to negotiate the details of holding the 2002 convention in Indianapolis within two weeks before or after July 4, 2002 and authorizes the Executive Committee to review and approve contracts to do so.

Tuniewicz seconded.

Kaneshiki asked why the Executive Committee should make the decision instead of bringing the matter before the LNC.

Givot said that doing a mail ballot would be cumbersome. He said that allowing time for discussion would require a full month from the time the proposal is ready for consideration until it is approved.

Fylstra said that he supports the motion and believes that the level of detail that the Executive Committee will be dealing with does not rise to the level that would warrant LNC discussion.

Dehn said that he agrees with Fylstra. He said that LNC members who do not want the convention to be held in Indianapolis or within two weeks of July 4, 2002 should speak up now. He said that these sorts of decisions - choice of city and dates - should be made by the LNC, leaving the details to staff or the Executive Committee.

Martin expressed concern about the extent to which this process has gone forward without LNC members having more information about the status of convention planning.

Givot said that prior discussions have been publicized in Executive Committee minutes which have been emailed to LNC members in a timely manner.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

Dasbach asked the Committee for input on the perceived value of moving the convention to some time prior to July 4, 2004.

Givot said that he believes that any time between March 1, 2004 and July 4, 2004 would seem reasonable to him.

Lark advised the Committee that some affiliates have restrictions as to when their state conventions can take place. He said that this should factor into the decision about the convention date.

Turney expressed a strong preference for April, but does not object to Givot's March-July 4 sentiment.

Karlan said that he strongly supports holding the convention in April or fairly early in the spring. He said that the more serious they are or the more they are running for local office, the more important that it is that the candidate be available locally by July.

Karlan said that the LP ByLaws require that affiliate ByLaws be on file. He said that we would be able to review them to see which affiliates have a potential problem with an earlier date. He said that if a state fails to provide the national office with current bylaw and if the LNC schedules a convention early based on the byLaws currently on file, that would be the problem and responsibility of the affiliate not the LNC.

Dehn said that he prefers hold the 2004 convention on July 4. He said that some of these requirements are tailored to state requirements and schedules.

MG agreed with Lark that holding the convention during the springtime may cause some problems.

Dexter said that the period from April 15 - April 19 also provides an historical time frame for holding the convention.

Gaztanaga said that, although we should look carefully at potential problems, that the springtime may provide a better choice.

Kaneshiki said that candidates may need to be campaigning by July 4 and on that date, so that holding the convention earlier might be of value. She suggested possibly polling the membership in LP News.

Israel said that NH has signature-gathering deadlines which conflict with July 4.

Item: 2000 Convention Report

Dasbach said that the goal of breaking even (excluding banquet fundraising) was not met. He said that the shortfall was about \$63,000. He said that the overrun was largely due to audio-video costs. He said that billing for items such as camera operators were subject to disagreement between the LP and the contractor. He said that in the future, more care must be taken to assure that these contracts do not lead to similar results.

Item: Presidential Campaign Report

Willis presented a summary report from the Browne campaign.

Willis said that the things that the campaign did well are fairly obvious. He said that his report - and the followup detailed report - will focus on mistakes which the campaign made. He said that reviewing these mistakes provides a basis to learn and improve.

Willis said that the primary problem that the campaign had was maintaining momentum.

Willis said that the concept of establishing an exploratory committee was to build up a war chest so that the campaign could be kicked off with an advertising campaign and start out with great momentum. He said that the exploratory committee should have determined who the major donors were so that the campaign could have focused more on one-on-one fundraising from major donors, avoiding relatively more costly direct mail fundraising.

Willis said that the campaign had a good vehicle to proceed to do this, but that it was not undertaken when it should have been - the FEC lawsuit which, he said, should have been filed in 1997.

Willis said that the 30-minute video is another example of a good idea that was not done at the right time. He said that production of the video interfered with the planned fundraising cycle and was a far larger undertaking than had initially been envisioned.

Willis said that the campaign recovered well from these problems. He said that he believes that the campaign

picked the right projects, but erred in how they were sequenced.

Kaneshiki asked whether Willis regrets not campaigning actively in the California primary.

Willis said that he does not regret that decision. He said that campaigning actively in the California primary would have further drained the campaign financially. He said that it is not likely that active participation in that primary would have resulted in significantly more coverage than was received at other times during the campaign.

Schwarz said that Browne had recently attempted to raise about \$100,000 to pay off campaign obligations. He said that this debt is not reflected in the latest FEC filings. He asked Willis to explain this.

Willis said that the FEC reports need to be amended to reflect outstanding vendor debt.

Karlan said that after the 1996 campaign Browne said that he would not run for president again unless the party members reached certain milestones. He said that Browne ran although those milestones were not met. He asked whether the decision to run was a mistake.

Willis said that he has not gone back to determine how strong that intention was stated.

Fylstra said that the 1996 and 2000 campaigns were very different in that the 1996 campaign was co-located within LP HQ, while the 2000 campaign was very separate. He asked Willis to comment on the effects of this.

Willis said that the decision to be separate in 2000 was in response to criticism that was taken very hard by Browne and himself. He said that he believes that the party benefitted from the way that things were handled in 1996 and suffered from having separate operations at separate locations in 2000.

Dasbach asked about the details of several operational issues.

Willis said that information exchanges were delayed, in part, by the fact that the parties were not on the same premises. He said that Browne authoring an additional book was a drain on the campaign. He said that authoring the book was a financial necessity for Browne and made him unavailable for large amounts of time when he might otherwise have made personal fundraising calls. He said that four months is insufficient time to incorporate a convention-selected vice-presidential candidate into the campaign and get the campaign underway.

MG asked Willis whether he feels that holding the presidential nominating convention in the spring of the election year would be helpful.

Willis said that it would be helpful

MG said that as we enter into strategic planning, it would be helpful to have Willis' input. He asked if Willis would assist in this process.

Willis said that he would be delighted to help.

Chambers related some negative feedback about the campaign that she had received from people she knows is related to the decision to locate the presidential campaign at a site other than LPHQ.

Willis said that 2000 was no better or worse than 1996 in this regard. He said that many campaign activities are executed on an ad hoc basis and that this sort of criticism results. He said that the Nader campaign had 100 staffers and that the media provided similar feedback about how the Nader campaign appeared to operate.

Chambers said that he had heard that Browne's visit to Indianapolis was done at a net loss.

Willis confirmed that several last-minute visits failed to produce a net positive financial result.

Dehn said that, at times, it seemed to him that the campaign was citing what needed to be done while doing other things that were unrelated to the campaign. He said that it appeared to him that the campaign was ending long before the election day.

Willis said that some decisions were made - at personal expense to him - to try to keep the campaign moving forward until the end.

Dasbach informed the LNC that the date of the convention ends the time frame during which a presidential candidate can accept pre-nomination funds. He said that holding the convention too early will reduce the number of donors who will likely contribute the maximum \$1,000 pre-nominations and the maximum post-nomination \$1,000.

Gilson moved that the LNC express its gratitude to the Browne campaign for its efforts.

The motion was adopted with objection.

Item: Information on Possible FEC Lawsuit

Herb Titus made a presentation regarding a proposed lawsuit against the Federal Election Commission.

Titus discussed the issue of standing. He said that it would be desirable to have a presidential candidate as a plaintiff because of the issue of standing.

Titus outlined current and potential plaintiffs to participate in the lawsuit.

Titus reviewed the detailed allegations within the complaint.

Tuniewicz complimented Titus on his presentation. He asked if a litigation plan has been developed yet.

Titus said that he has not yet developed a full litigation plan aside from the complaint. He said that he will need to work on experts, testimony, subpoenas and depose all present and former FEC members, some congressmen, and others.

Tuniewicz said that he is sensitive to conflict of interest issues. He asked Titus whether his law firm also represents other national political committees.

Titus said that his law firm also represents the two national political committees who are plaintiffs in this case. He said that his law firm is mindful of potential conflicts of interest that may arise.

Tuniewicz asked for clarification of the "title of nobility" issue.

Titus said that the prohibition in the Constitution has never been the subject of litigation. He said that a government which gives entitlements is a government that can no longer govern equally. He said that with a title come political and economic privilege. He said that this claim calls for removing political entitlements.

Givot asked whether the litigation intends to attack the legal prohibition against corporations making political contributions.

Titus said that he intends to attack these prohibitions as well.

Kaneshiki asked Titus about his fees, past collaboration with the Libertarian Party, and past history of litigation against the government.

Titus said that Larry Straw has a history of litigating against the EPA. He said that Straw has probably litigated more cases against the EPA than any other lawyer in southern CA.

Titus said that Bill Olson and John Miles concentrate in postal law and election law. He said that Olson has represented a number of organizations including political parties.

Titus said that he has taught in five ABA-accredited law schools, focusing on constitutional law.

Titus said that he is unaware of Straw's fees are, but that they are in the range of \$200 to \$250 per hour. He said that all attorneys are independent of the establishment. He said that these attorneys do not have establishment clients, thus they are not likely to have a conflict of interest or a conflict with other clients.

Willis said that all four attorneys have done a lot of work on this project so far but that none has been paid yet.

Gaztanaga said that there is a lot of educational information available in what has been presented to the LNC. He asked what might be done to get this information out to the public.

Titus said that he has done a lot of marketing in this area. He said that he is a former ACLU attorney - a former radical liberal. He said that he was taught to litigate, to legislate, and to take issues to the court of public opinion. He said that these attorneys work with members of Congress. He said that with a case like this, it is necessary to take the case to the court of public opinion as well.

Karlan asked if there has there been thought to extending the sought after result to state disclosure laws.

Titus said that attention also needs to be paid to state constitutions and draconian state laws.

Dasbach asked about the U S Justice Foundation, how it is working, and the payment of fees.

Willis said that David James, who works for Ron Paul, suggested a coalition to pursue this lawsuit and the use of a foundation or a 501(c)(3) organization as the basis to pursue this litigation. He said that the US Justice Foundation is willing to act as a conduct to fund this.

Dasbach asked whether that would make contributions in support of the litigation tax deductible.

Titus said that it would. He said that it is important to establish a steering committee of plaintiffs to assure that the lawyers do not own the case.

Givot asked Titus whether it is his understanding that the LNC and the Libertarian Party are under no financial obligation regarding the cost of this litigation.

Titus said that he understands that to be the case. He recommended that the LNC should have a contract stating this to protect its rights.

Bisson asked what advantage is there to the plaintiffs to have the Libertarian Party participate in this litigation if the LNC is under no obligation to pay any of the costs.

Titus said that Libertarian Party participation gives standing and legitimacy by virtue of the expectation that the party will be fielding future presidential candidates, that the party had established longevity, and that the party had already established a breadth of support and a history of fielding candidates.

Willis said that it is the intention of the Browne organization to do the "heavy lifting" to raise the money required to help fund this effort. He said that it would be very helpful to do email appeals to the party email list or for the party to provide its direct mail list to aid in raising the money.

Fylstra said that early on it appeared that several other organizations were going to provide a significant amount of the funding for this project. Subsequently it appears that this may not be the case. He asked Willis for an update regarding this.

Willis said that the Constitution Party made a commitment to do a good-faith effort to raise money after the election. He said that Gun Owners of America were concerned about the impact of the election on their organization's funding. He said that he hopes to persuade GOA to provide access to their donor list to help fund the project. He said that he is hoping to find major donors as well.

Item: Region 5 Report

Schwarz reported on leadership changes in LPPA in the past few months.

Schwarz said that the leading candidate in PA, John Featherman, received 45,918 votes. He said that LPPA may have lost minor party status which brings with it certain privileges including placing people on the ballot for special elections.

Milsted reported on several projects that have been executed in VA. He said that he believes that some of these may be of value to national for use in other states.

Steve Boone - LPMD - reported on developments in MD.

Carol Moore - LPDC - reported on developments in DC.

Item: Region 6 Reports

Karlan reported on developments in NJ.

Israel reported on developments in MA.

Don Gorman - LPNH - reported on developments in NH.

Bisson asked Israel whether money spent on the Howell campaign helped down-ticket candidates.

Israel said that the degree of notice that Howell received certainly brought greater attention to other Libertarian candidates.

Kaneshiki said that she had heard that Browne did better in the western part of MA than in the eastern part.

Israel said that he does not have such details with him, but that the western part of MA tends to be less "infected" with the liberal affliction that then eastern part of MA.

Item: Region 7 Report

Martin said that he has been gathering information for his report since October.

Martin said that the general theme he finds in Region 7 is disappointment at the performance of the national ticket. He said that the results in TX were strong. He said that Geoff Neale reports that more than \$40,000 was spent by LPTX to advertise the party. He said that the national party has a definite advantage in developing ads.

Martin said that - as he would expect - the national party dropped the ball in communicating during the height of the election. He said that some of this is to be expected.

Martin said that national should take a leadership position in developing support materials for local issues. He said that national should help draw the line on local issues and provide support and training for local candidates.

Martin said that running a large number of candidates has very positive benefits.

Martin said that, although the states in his region support UMP, there is some diversity of opinion - and some ignorance - on the details of the program.

Martin said that he believes that state chairs are in need of training and that this is an area where the national party can help.

Item: Discussion of General Counsel

Lark introduced the topic. He said that the responses he has received from three possible candidates all require some payment for their services.

Lark expressed some queasiness that the party may - for the first time - be compensating the LP General Counsel for services rendered.

Lark said that he knows all of the individuals. He said that he would be very comfortable appointing Hall if

the Committee was supportive of that idea.

Dasbach said that the outside auditors had asked the LNC to determine what the fair market value of legal services provided by Hall had been. He said that Hall estimated that to be \$50,000 based on his records.

Lark said that he is somewhat queasy that - at the time possible candidates were sought - because he did not indicate to potential candidates that this might be a paid position. He said that he is not sure that he "cast the net wide enough" in letting people know that the LNC was proceeding in this direction.

Bisson moved the proposal from Bill Hall be accepted for a term of one year.

Hoch seconded.

Bisson said that he has no doubt that he will be satisfied with Hall's continued efforts. He said that if LNC members are concerned with perceptions of Hall as an insider, he could also support offering the same arrangement to Mark Rutherford.

Givot suggested that we have a fiduciary responsibility to publicize that we will be paying for legal services of our General Counsel in the future, soliciting proposals, and reviewing them with the understanding that the pricing of legal services is not the only factor to be considered.

Givot suggested that he would be more comfortable to have Hall continue as General Counsel on some interim basis while the party solicits proposals and makes a long-term selection.

Dasbach said that Hall has agreed to complete several projects underway.

Gilson asked what the role of the General Counsel is.

Lark said that the role of the General Counsel is to provide general legal advice and work - primarily relating to transactions, not litigation - as well as selection of other legal specialists to assist in specific matters.

Kaneshiki asked whether Hall would also provide advice or input on such matters as the proposed FEC lawsuit.

Dasbach said that Hall has already read the prior draft of the FEC lawsuit and pointed out strengths and weaknesses.

Kaneshiki asked whether Hall had offered an opinion on the likelihood of prevailing in the recent litigation in AZ.

Lark said that he does not recall Hall offering such an opinion.

Dehn said that it appears to him that Buttrick is not asking for compensation for his time, rather reimbursement for out-of-pocket costs, including travel.

Bisson said that, although he likes John Buttrick, Buttrick carries certain "baggage" because of his past involvement in the dispute in AZ. He said that it may well take a year to select a long-term general counsel, in which case Givot's suggestion is not necessarily in conflict with Bisson's proposal.

Givot asked Bisson if anticipates exploring other alternatives if Hall's proposal is accepted for on a one-year basis.

Bisson said that it was his intention that this would be the case.

Bisson clarified that has moved that the LNC accepts Bill Hall's proposal for a term of one year as an interim measure while beginning a broader search process for a long-term appointment of General Counsel.

There was no objection to Bisson's clarification.

Kaneshiki asked why we would not want to appoint Mark Rutherford as General Counsel for the coming year.

Givot said that Hall provides a degree of continuity that Rutherford cannot provide. He said that Hall has built up considerable expertise in areas such as ballot access law and FEC regulations which would take a substantial time for Rutherford to match.

The motion passed on a voice vote. Schwarz voted no. Gilson abstained.

Item: Approval of Minutes

The Committee approved adoption of the minutes of its June 29, 2000 meeting on a voice vote.

The Committee approved adoption of the minutes of its July 2, 2000 meeting on a voice vote.

The Committee approved adoption of the minutes of its July 3, 2000 meeting on a voice vote.

The Committee approved adoption of the minutes of its August 24, 2000 meeting on a voice vote.

Item: Appointment of Committees

Lark entertained nominations for the Advertising and Publications Review Committee

Fylstra nominated Dehn.

Bisson seconded.

Hoch nominated Dexter.

Bisson seconded.

MG nominated himself.

Bisson seconded.

The Committee approved appointment of all three nominees by acclamation.

Lark said that the Convention Planning Committee has been vacant for the past two years.

Tuniewicz said that it has been populated but inactive.

Tuniewicz moved to amend the LNC Policy Manual to abolish the Convention Planning Committee.

Bisson seconded.

Tuniewicz said that eliminating the committee does not end oversight of the convention process by the LNC and Executive Committee or individual LNC members.

Gaztanaga said that he sees no reason to abolish the committee if what Tuniewicz says is true.

Dasbach said that the former Convention Oversight Committee was involved in dealing with outside contractors who ran our conventions. He said that when convention management was internalized, the Convention Planning Committee was formed to work with staff on convention details.

Dehn said that we should not be eliminating the Convention Oversight Committee simply because we don't have to oversee an outside contractor.

Dixon said that staff now has its own expertise and no longer needs as much input from a committee.

MG said that he agrees with Dehn.

Dasbach said that staff has continued to consult with LNC members at various stages of the process as needed.

Kaneshiki said that she is concerned that our conventions lose money year-after-year. She said that the last time that the convention was profitable was when it was not run by staff. She said that the LNC should not bear the liability for a convention loss.

Dasbach said that in 1993 the vendor lost money and the hotel sought to collect from the LNC.

Tuniewicz said that staff will continue to bring the LNC budgets and that the LNC will continue to exercise oversight over the national convention.

Martin said that the staff is able to continue to employ outside contractors to the extent it deems appropriate.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

Lark opened nominations for appointments to the Program Committee.

Givot said that he drafted the ByLaws which established the Program Committee. He said that the party has not been successful in making the LP Program all that it can be. He said that the LNC is probably responsible for providing a lack of direction as to what was expected by the LNC. He said that the result was a proposal that was not embraced by the LNC. He said that he recommends that the Program Committee should do very little until the strategic plan is developed - providing better direction to the Program Committee.

Gaztanaga nominated himself.

Dehn said he wants to comment as the outgoing chair of the Program Committee. He said that the problem in early 2000 was more than what Givot said. He said there was a lack of consensus as to what direction of change would lead to the LNC embracing a proposed new program. He said that the lack of consensus didn't provide the Program Committee with good input as to how to proceed.

Dehn said that the current program is "moldy" and that something should be done to update the current program to avoid the embarrassment of having it out there in the near term.

Dasbach said that currently available text might be substituted on an interim basis.

Chambers said that lots of members don't know what the LP Program is or how it should be used.

Givot said that the former LNC was resistant to the idea of approving new text unless it was willing to put its reputation behind it. He suggested that as an alternative, the current, embarrassing program could simply be withdrawn in its entirety.

Hoch nominated MG.

Gaztanaga nominated Chambers.

MG seconded.

The Committee appointed all nominees by acclamation.

Lark introduced the topic of appointing an internal auditor.

Dehn moved that the LNC authorizes the appointment of Bill Redpath as Internal Auditor.

Kaneshiki said that it would be advisable to have something in writing about the individual being nominated prior to voting. The appointment was approved without objection.

Item: Comments from Don Gorman

Gorman expressed support for the LNC's activities as seen today. However, he said, there is too much talk about procedures and planning and not enough about politics.

Gorman shared several email messages he has received from various LP members indicating a need to focus more on politics. He said that these communications demonstrate a lack of support for political activity by the national party.

Gorman said that "we got our butts kicked" in the presidential race by Nader and he has only been running for four years. He said that the Green Party now has ballot access in as many states as the LP.

Gorman said that he heard no mention about the "split in Michigan" which should concern the LNC.

Gorman said that Perry Willis has just masterminded the biggest disaster the LP has ever had. He says that he hears complaints that the LP News is no longer the LP News but the Harry Browne newspaper. He said that the LP needs a divorce from Harry Browne. He said that - having had two bites of the apple - we need to

move on.

Gorman said that he does not believe that there is anyone in the LP that has more political experience than he has. He reviewed his record of political achievements. He said that he has never been asked for his ideas on how to move forward in the political arena.

Gorman said that he has put together a program - a seminar - on doing politics. He said that he has one day and three day versions of it. He said that he plans to put that seminar on in as many states as possible.

Gorman said that he is asking for neither help nor money from the LNC. He said that he would like to participate in planning the LNC's strategy in the future, but that he will proceed with his seminars regardless of what the LNC does.

Lark asked Gorman what he would need in the way of help or money.

Gorman said that he will be charging for it in excess of expenses. He said that he plans to manage this by himself.

Givot asked Gorman if he believes that he could train other people to deliver his message.

Gorman said that he believes that would be effective and that he would be interested in doing so. He said that he believes that someone who does not have his level of experience in retail politics could effectively deliver his message.

Bisson expressed concern that if the LNC were to be supportive of his efforts, that the LNC might subsequently be criticized for supporting a potential future Gorman campaign as the LNC has been criticized for its past support of Harry Browne's efforts in support of the LP prior to seeking the 2000 nomination.

Tuniewicz suggested that Dasbach give strong consideration to employing Gorman's expertise in developing the content for the upcoming meeting of state chairs.

Kaneshiki said that Gorman has not come to the LNC looking for help. She said that she believes that little is gained by throwing money at local affiliates.

MG said that he believes that the LNC is aware that it is time to bring in experienced, elected LP members as mentors - people who can help spread our message not only to the outside world, but also to others within the LP.

Lark thanked Gorman for his many accomplishments on behalf of liberty and for coming to address the Committee.

Committee recessed at 7:16 PM EST.

Committee reconvened at 8:07 AM EST.

Item: 2001 Budget and Goals

Dasbach presented a lengthy review of the the major components of the proposed 2001 budget. He described

the budgetary categories and explained them in detail.

Committee members inquired about specific line items and specific LNC operations.

Dasbach provided answers to these questions.

Dasbach proposed several goals for 2001. He said that the first goal is to complete ballot drives in NC, NE, MI, and OH.

Kaneshiki asked whether there is specific information available as to why the national party should participate in each of these ballot drives.

Dasbach said that Crickenberger had covered that in his report the prior day. He said that this will move the party closer to achieving 50 state ballot access in 2004. He said that this will also be supportive of maximizing the number of US House candidates. He said that in each of these states will be making a significant contribution toward achieving ballot access.

Kaneshiki said that she believes that there should be something in writing from the state chairs indicating why national assistance is required. She said that he prefers to get affiliate parties "on their own feet" so that they can do this themselves. She said that this is just "another welfare program." She said that there should be a long term plan to get all affiliate parties on the ballot. She said that the details are missing regarding such a plan.

Dasbach said that, as a benchmark, affiliate parties are expected to provide 25 signatures per member - either by volunteer petitioners or by the affiliate funding purchase of that number of signatures.

Karlan said that considerable discrepancies among state ballot access laws makes it critical that the national party assist some affiliate parties achieve ballot access.

Kaneshiki said that every state should be able to arrange for the successful completion of its own ballot drive. She said that the LNC will not develop past its current level if this cannot be achieved by affiliate parties. She said that, like welfare programs, if it is felt that the national party will always step in to bail out failed ballot drives, that affiliate parties will not have adequate incentives to undertake ballot drives on their own.

Lark said that this discussion would more properly have been entered during the Political Director's report.

Givot said that he feels that this is a very appropriate time to discuss this topic, because it is directly applicable to the question of whether or not this goal should be adopted.

Givot said that the national party already makes efforts to encourage affiliate parties to be self-sufficient in terms of ballot access. He said that the national party does nothing to discourage its affiliates from becoming self-sufficient. He said that the large number of affiliates that neither seek nor require assistance demonstrates that the party is not encouraging dependency.

Dehn asked whether the purpose of this discussion is to approve a list of goals for the coming year or whether it is to simply enumerate the goals which were the basis of the proposed budget.

Lark said that he understands that the purpose of this agenda topic is present the proposed budget and to build the goals from the ground up.

MG said that the LNC has begun a process which will address the issues being raised. He said that the party is running on past momentum and perhaps the best thing to do today is to let that momentum.

Givot moved that the LNC approves the proposed four-month budget proposed by the National Director and directs the National Director to present a fully enumerated set of written goals and a budget to achieve them at the April 2001 LNC meeting.

Israel seconded.

Givot said that the legwork has not been done by the LNC to establish goals for 2001, yet there is a full year budget before it. He said that the organization is running on momentum. He said that it is inconceivable to him that serious consideration can be given to these goals, possibly changing them, and emerge with a budget which is geared to achieving those goals. Israel said that he supports the motion. He said that he agrees with Kaneshiki's assessment that we need to formulate better plans to make our affiliates more autonomous. He said that the next four months can be used to do that.

Bisson moved to substitute that the LNC approves the proposed full-year budget with an addition of \$20,000 to legal, accounting, banking under the category of governance, reducing the net surplus to \$46,000.

Tuniewicz seconded.

Bisson said that this can be done repetitively in small increments. He said that much time will be spent on strategic planning in the coming months, but that by April we will not know our long term strategy any more than today.

Dasbach said that either the LNC or Executive Committee - not the staff - should develop goals for the year.

Gaztanaga said that he is torn between the two proposals. He said that the lateness of the budget presentation is a problem.

Dehn disagreed that the Committee will not do much more in April. He said that he can see the discussions that take place during the strategic planning efforts might be a good foundation for establishing goals for 2001. He said that adopting a full-year budget on an interim basis provides no incentive for the Committee to reopen the issue of goals adoption.

Tuniewicz said that he favors passing the full-year budget. He said that the budget can be amended at the April 2000 meeting.

Israel said that he can support either proposal, but that he favors adoption of the four-month budget because it imposes a timetable to address the issue of goal establishment.

MG said that the strategic planning process will likely develop consensus in certain areas along the way which may provide input to the April 2001 LNC meeting.

Fylstra said that he needs additional information in order to assess which of the two alternatives he prefers. He said that information on the timing of expenditures such as direct mail prospecting and ballot access is significant.

Dasbach said that the four-month budget reflects the timing of expenditures in the first four months. He said

that ballot access is heavily weighted toward the first third of the year. He said that about one third of the direct mail prospecting will be done in the first third of the year.

Dasbach said that it would be valuable for the Executive Committee to develop 2001 goals prior to starting strategic planning.

Dehn said that he did not intend to suggest that the strategic planning group should be diverted from its main task to develop these goals.

Givot said that strategic plan and the 2001 budget issues should proceed independently. He said that we will have much more info in four months. He said that in four months the Committee will know what goals have support for the current year. He said that it is important to adopt a constraint to ensure that no more than four month's of the year's planned expenditures are made in the first four months. He said that there has been a serious regression in the party's budgetary process over prior years.

Tuniewicz referred to the LNC Policy Man Article 5 Section 2 Paragraph A which states, in part:

The Executive Committee in consultation with the National Director shall develop an annual operating budget presented to the LNC for approval prior to the start of each fiscal year.

MG asked the Chair to rule that Givot's motion was out of order because of the LNC Policy Manual cited by Tuniewicz.

Lark declined to do so.

Givot said that the LNC Policy Manual requires "development" of an annual budget, not approval of an annual budget. He said that the LNC is not obligated to approve a full-year budget at this time if it finds that it does not have an acceptable budget proposal before it.

Bisson's motion was substituted for Givot's motion on a vote of 9 to 7.

The Committee voted to adopt the proposed full-year budget on a vote of 10 to 3 with 1 abstention.

Tuniewicz moved that the Article 5 Section 5 of the LNC Policy Manual be amended by adding new paragraph B

"Reserve Requirement: The LNC shall set an amount to be set aside as a cash reserve, separate from operating funds. Withdrawal of funds from the Reserve shall require prior approval of the LNC or the Executive Committee."

Givot seconded.

Tuniewicz said that this is consistent with the prior day's discussion, formally defines the Reserve Policy, and formally defines how money in the Reserve Fund can be accessed, if needed.

Gaztanaga asked how closely associated this Reserve Fund is associated with possible future purchase of real estate.

Tuniewicz said that, at the present time, he sees no association between the two, although this mechanism

could be used in the future for that purpose.

Martin said that he supports an even stronger proposal, but that he can support Tuniewicz's proposal as a necessary first step in the right direction.

Israel said that he wants to be reasonable and prudent, but that he is concerned with the Dasbach's reaction to how this would affect operations.

Dasbach said that, depending on the amount of the reserve set by the LNC, this is consistent with how he would like to proceed.

Kaneshiki asked Tuniewicz if it makes sense to modify his proposal to require that the Reserve Fund would be net of any outstanding accounts payable or debts.

Tuniewicz said that the current policy does permit accounts payable to encumber the Reserve Fund.

Givot said that he understands Kaneshiki to be asking whether it would be prudent to let accounts payable to exceed that cash which is not part of the Reserve Fund.

MG said that he agrees with Tuniewicz. He said that this is a good first step.

Fylstra said that Kaneshiki's comment relates to what was decided yesterday, not the action before the LNC currently. He said that to implement what Kaneshiki is suggesting would require amending the action taken on the prior day.

Martin said that this may be something that will be addressed as part of strategic planning.

Motion passed without objection.

Tuniewicz moved that the LNC sets the dollar amount of the Reserve Fund at \$150,000 to be funded over the first six months of 2001 consistent with the Treasurer's Report.

Givot seconded.

Tuniewicz said that we must start somewhere. He said that there may be questions about whether this is large enough. He urged the Committee to pass an amount no less than \$150,000. He said this establishes an initial starting point which is sufficient, given past experience, and one which we can afford to establish at this time.

Hoch asked where the \$150,000 figure comes from. He said that he recalls that the LNC has been building up to this amount over the past two years. He asked why the LNC should stop at that level.

Givot suggested increasing the amount of the proposed Reserve Fund. He said that in the past, the Reserve Fund was built up by adding a percentage of revenues each month. He suggest ramping up the Reserve Fund by 1% of Revenues each month.

Kaneshiki said that she supports the idea of ramping up the Reserve Fund.

Dasbach said that the Reserve Policy previously in place did not get the party to where it is. He said that stopping spending caused the surplus to grow. He said that the \$150,000 proposed by Tuniewicz is a

"quantum leap" forward in creating financial stability. Dasbach said that having to monitor - each month - the amount to be added to the Reserve Fund creates administrative problem.

Martin said that he supports the concept of adding to the Reserve Fund.

Fylstra said that the past Reserve Policy was largely a fiction. He said that while it would be nice to have more money. He said that the low point over the past year was a negative net worth of minus \$150,000. He said that establishing a \$150,000 Reserve Fund would have covered the party's worst situation over the course of the past year.

Tuniewicz said that the intent of his motion is that there will be a six month time frame in 2001 to purchase the certificates of deposit which will fund the Reserve Fund.

The motion passed without objection.

Item: Strategic Planning (continued)

Givot distributed a draft Mission Statement for the LNC-Strategic Planning Team (LNC-SPT). He said that the Mission Statement that the LNC develops for LNC-SPT is critical because it defines the boundaries within which LNC-SPT will operate.

Givot sought consensus regarding the role of LNC-SPT in strategic planning. He suggested language which defines the role of LNC-SPT as developing and recommending a strategic plan as opposed to adopting a strategic plan for the party.

Kaneshiki said that she believes the LNC should do strategic planning.

Fylstra said that even if LNC-SPT is defined to include the same people as LNC, when the group is operating as LNC-SPT, it needs a well defined mission statement to keep it on track.

A discussion ensued about whether the LNC-SPT Mission Statement should include a statement of the purpose of the strategic plan.

Strong consensus developed around the following statement:

The mission of the LNC-SPT is to develop and recommend a strategic plan to the LNC to advance the mission of the Libertarian Party.

Givot sought consensus of the Committee regarding target dates as well as how it will keep the LNC up to date.

A brief discussion ensued in which strong consensus developed that the LNC-SPT will make its final recommendations to the August 2001 LNC meeting and that Lark will keep LNC members who are not LNC-SPT participants briefed on the progress of strategic planning.

Givot sought consensus on the deliverables. He introduced the concept of planning cycles. He summarized the sense of the Executive Committee that it is probably too late to include 2001 in the strategic planning process. He said that the sense of the Executive Committee was that LNC-SPT should develop and

recommend a plan which begins in 2002.

Kaneshiki said that in addition to a one-, two-, or four-year plans, LNC-SPT should also take a look much further out.

Givot said that Kaneshiki's concept is what is sometimes called the "vision" of the organization.

Turney said that he is not sure that the LNC should be setting the time frames of the plan.

A discussion ensued as to whether the LNC should set the time frames for strategic planning.

Dehn said that his willingness to comfort level with LNC-SPT determining the time frames for strategic planning is directly related to how many LNC members are on LNC-SPT.

Chambers agreed.

The Committee set this topic aside pending resolution of who will be participating on LNC-SPT.

Givot sought consensus on the level of detail the LNC would like to see in the strategic plan. He suggested a list including: goals, strategies, tactics, and measurables. He said that it may also be appropriate to including contingency plans.

Fylstra said that he would like to see a written discussion of why certain choices were made by LNC-SPT. He said that this could be characterized as a set of underlying assumptions (e.g., what a third party can accomplish in a winner-take-all environment in American politics). He said that these should be stated explicitly.

Givot said that there are two categories that relate to what Fylstra is suggesting: underlying assumptions and underlying factual information or evidence.

Hoch said that if LNC-SPT only presents a recommendation without the basis for making that recommendation, a lot of questions can be answered before they are asked.

There was strong consensus that the report of LNC-SPT should explicitly including any assumptions made in developing the plan as well as any facts upon which underlie the strategic plan.

Israel raised the issue of what is meant by goals, strategies, and tactics.

Givot provided an example in which the goal is fielding competitive candidates, a strategy in support of that goal is membership growth to provide better funding, and a tactic in support of that strategy is direct mail prospecting.

A lengthy discussion ensued as to how to structure and what to call the various levels of the strategic plan.

Bisson suggested that LNC-SPT be allowed to develop its own hierarchy for presenting its recommended strategic plan.

After additional discussion, the Committee reached consensus on the use of the hierarchy provided in the TEC strategic planning brochure: goals, strategies, objectives, and action steps. There was consensus that

"objectives" are also known as "measurables" and "action steps" are also known as "tactics."

Givot sought consensus as to who shall be on LNC-SPT.

The Committee listed potential people to consider for inclusion on LNC-SPT. This list included: LNC members, LNC alternates, state chairs or executive directors, candidates running serious campaigns, elected office holders, appointed office holders, staff, members, outside professionals, outside politicians, registered Libertarians, former members, and Libertarian think tank staff.

Givot said that - in his experience - a large group is fine for brainstorming, but that for discussion the maximum size of the group should be 15 to 20 people. He recommended that the group should try to fill no more than that many places.

Kaneshiki said that if LNC-SPT is not going to conduct all of its business in in-person meetings, then much of the input and work can be done by a larger group prior to any in-person meeting.

Dixon said that he envisions that this process might work like the LP Platform Committee, with much work and input being done by email and culminating with in-person meetings.

Givot suggested that perhaps it would help to determine the extent to which LNC-SPT will be meeting in-person.

Kaneshiki said that requiring physical presence at four to six meetings in additional to LNC meeting is a barrier to participation for many.

Chambers said that she strongly supports meeting in person although it will preclude her participation.

A strong consensus developed that LNC-SPT should conduct its business in in-person meetings.

Givot polled the Committee and found that 12 LNC members felt they were highly likely to attend and LNC-SPT meetings.

Gaztanaga said that selection of LNC-SPT participants need to be chosen in a manner that is inclusionary.

After considerable discussion, the Committee reached consensus that the LNC members who have expressed that they are highly likely to participate in LNC-SPT will include representation by people who also have been candidates running serious campaigns or are current or past state chairs,

Lark expressed his opinion that LNC-SPT should be comprised solely of LNC members. He said that this will protect the integrity of the LNC. He said that this would still permit broad input into the process. He said that he sees staff participation in an adjunct, non-voting role.

Dasbach said that it is important to bring in some others for their expertise.

Fylstra said that he strongly supports including elected Libertarians as LNC-SPT participants. He said that he does not see LNC-SPT as voting on various things, but rather working to achieve consensus. He said that he also thinks that including people who are libertarians but not necessarily active in the party.

Tuniewicz said that he believes that Don Gorman brings particular expertise that is unlike what anyone else

can bring. He said that he believes that Gorman is the only elected Libertarian who should participate.

After additional discussion, the Committee reached consensus that LNC-SPT would have adequate representation if the LNC members who are highly likely to attend are joined by some combination of elected Libertarians, libertarians who are not active in the party, and staff.

A lengthy discussion was held on the issue of the participation of the staff on LNC-SPT. The Committee was unable to reach consensus on this issue. The Committee proceeded to vote on three issues relating to staff participation on LNC-SPT.

The Committee voted that staff should be invited to be present at the table during all LNC-SPT meetings, except if something staff-sensitive is being discussed).

The Committee voted that the staff should be equal participants at all LNC-SPT meetings.

The Committee voted that Steve Dasbach and Ron Crickenberger from staff should be appointed to LNC-SPT.

After considerable discussion, consensus developed to invite all LNC members and alternates to participate on LNC-SPT in addition to Steve Dasbach, Ron Crickenberger, two elected Libertarians (Don Gorman and one to be appointed by Lark), and two libertarians not active in the party to be appointed by Lark. All LNC-SPT participants will participate on an equal basis.

After a lengthy discussion, the Committee developed consensus to hold its meetings as follows:

- February 10-11 in Indianapolis
- March 10-11 in Chicago
- April 22 in Washington
- May 5-6 at the site of the LPNC convention
- June 16-17 at a site to be determined
- July 15-16 at a site to be determined (if needed)
- July 28-29 at a site to be determined (if needed)

As part of this discussion the Committee also agreed that the LNC shall meet on April 21 in Washington, August 25-26 at a site to be determine, and December 8-9 in Washington.

Givot said that the Executive Committee has discussed the issue of expense reimbursement policy for those attending LNC-SPT meetings. He said that there was a consensus, but not unanimity on the subject. He said that he will not present his personal view to the LNC.

Lark said that he feels that participation on LNC-SPT is voluntary. He said that he has some queasiness regarding LNC reimbursing LNC-SPT participants for their travel expenses.

Tuniewicz referred to Article 5 Section 4 of the LNC Policy Manual. He said that the Policy Manual says that travel expense for LNC members traveling to LNC members is excluded from reimbursement. He said that it is his understand that this policy permits reimbursement to LNC members who are traveling to LNC-SPT meetings.

Dasbach said that LNC members are already making a substantial financial commitment to attend LNC

meetings. He said that failing to reimburse LNC-SPT members for their travel expenses would invite non-participation. He said that the variable cost among participants is transportation at the lowest available fare. He said that the next logical step would be to cover lodging costs.

Dixon said that he prefers to cover transportation costs, leaving the participants to cover lodging and other expenses.

Lieberman said agreed with Dixon that the LNC should cover only airfare.

Chambers said that this could be a publicity nightmare for the LNC. She said that in agreeing to serve on the LNC, one undertakes the costs of traveling to meetings. She said that absent a public relations mechanism in place to deal with criticism, issues raised by members relating to this could be very distracting.

Dasbach said that for state chairs' meetings, only transportation is covered. He said that lodging and other expenses are paid by the attendees. He said that there was no criticism of this policy.

Dixon said that there is a difference between offering to reimburse and applying for reimbursement. He said that he often scheduled business travel to coincide with such meetings so that his employer ends up subsidizing his travel expenses to such meetings.

Givot said that the LNC also needs to consider a reimbursement policy for those attending who are neither LNC members nor alternates. He said that he believes it is unreasonable to expect these people to cover all of their own travel costs.

Gilson said that he believes both transportation and lodging should be reimbursable.

Tuniewicz moved that the LNC shall offer to cover the costs of all LNC-SPT participants for transportation (airfare or driving) costs, lodging, and any working meals.

Givot seconded.

Tuniewicz said that LNC members already make sacrifices in terms of time and money in fulfilling their obligations. He said that this is an appropriate business function which reasonably calls for reimbursement. He said that having the party cover these costs will broaden participation. He said that if some members take exception to this policy, he will be willing to respond to such criticism.

The motion passed on a voice vote. Kaneshiki and Lieberman voted no. Martin, Chambers, Schwarz, Fylstra, and Givot abstained.

Tuniewicz said that this is "uncharted ground" for the LNC. He said that it is his expectation that, with regard to choice of lodging, he is looking for hotels costing under \$100 per night, where possible.

Givot sought consensus on the attendance policy for LNC-SPT participants.

Lark said that the language in the draft LNC-SPT Mission Statement adequately provides for this.

Kaneshiki asked whether there will be minutes taken at LNC-SPT meetings.

Givot said that he does not anticipate that minutes will be taken.

Kaneshiki said that she believes that the meetings should be recorded to establish a record.

Lark said that the meetings will be recorded to create a record.

Schwarz asked whether the meetings will be open.

Fylstra asked whether the participants will behave differently if there are public observers or if the meetings are recorded.

Israel said that he is as much a fan of openness as anyone in the room, but that it may be more difficult to say certain things if the meetings are open.

Gaztanaga said that LNC-SPT can reserve the right to determine this for itself depending on what was being discussed at any point in time.

Kaneshiki said that it is very important that all meetings are open.

Martin said that if the meetings are open to the public, it is important that the audience is told the ground rules for strategic planning.

Dasbach said that if the meeting is open, it is almost axiomatic that some people will not feel free to speak their minds openly. He said that this will change the discussion.

Crickenberger said that he tends to favor open meetings. He said that if the meetings are closed, there will be a rumor mill. He said that if the meetings are open, then anything that is discussed will be reported by some as something that has been decided.

Dixon said that he has a problem with the electronic recording of the meetings. He said that if the meetings are recorded, the release of the recording may be determined at some future time by others.

Givot said that if the decision on open meetings is left to LNC-SPT, someone is going to have to establish the rules for the first meeting before the first meeting convenes so that others will know, in advance, if they will be permitted to attend.

Lark said that, while he favors openness, the result will be less than a frank discussion. He said that there may be some sensitive material discussed relating to staff or legal matters. He said that it may be helpful to discuss at least these topics in a closed session. He said that because LNC-SPT is not taking any action which commits the Libertarian Party to anything, there is no legal requirement that the meetings be open.

Karlan said that he doesn't expect to play to the camera. He said that since the nature of LNC-SPT is more of a discussion group than a deliberative body, he sees no reason to record the meetings for posterity. He said that people desiring to view the meetings could be approved by LNC-SPT upon application to do so.

Turney said that LNC should have a recording of the meetings for its own purposes. He said that the first meeting, which will involve the state chairs, should be open to all. He said that LNC-SPT could decide how to proceed after that first meeting.

MG said that he feels that recording all of the meetings will be of benefit to the LNC. He said that portions of the meetings might be helpful to distribute to affiliates for training purposes. He said that he thinks that the

recording can be turned off when some of the non-LNC members speak, if they wish to do so.

Dehn said that he believes that there is value to record the meetings for posterity. He said that if someone misses a meeting, the recordings could help bring that person up-to-date. He said that if the reason not to record the meeting is to preserve confidentiality, then the group should not be so large. He said that he agrees with Crickenberger that secrecy breeds rumors. He said that in exceptional cases, the recording could be turned off if someone feels that comments to be made should not be recorded.

Givot said that the first question is whether there should be an open attendance policy - perhaps with exceptional closed portions of the meeting.

By a narrow margin, the Committee determined that it will set the attendance policy for LNC-SPT meetings.

Consensus was also developed in support of making all LNC-SPT meetings open, with the possible exception of specific, sensitive discussions.

Givot said that the second question is whether the LP should record LNC-SPT meetings for internal purposes.

There was strong consensus that the LNC should determine this policy.

There was also strong consensus that the LNC should record all LNC-SPT meetings.

Givot said that the strong question is whether others should be permitted to record LNC-SPT meetings.

There was strong consensus that the LNC should determine this policy.

Turney said that based on his personal experience in recording similar meetings, video recording should not be permitted, but that audio recording should be done. He said that video recording is very distracting. He said that he can provide audio recording for the LNC-SPT meetings.

Dasbach agreed with Turney. He said that, after the fact, the LNC can decide to make the recording available to others if it wishes to do so.

Kaneshiki said that strategic planning is an extension of the LNC function. She said that LNC meetings can be recorded, so there is no reason to prohibit recording of LNC-SPT meetings by others.

Schwarz said that he does not believe that camera or microphones get in the way of others. He said that, in response to Crickenberger's concerns about rumor mills, that he has sometimes used recordings to disprove rumors.

Israel said that our strategic planning should not be done in a manner that our political opponent have access to our thinking.

Gaztanaga said that he believes that potentially disruptive aspects of allowing others to record LNC-SPT meetings can be addressed by LNC-SPT should problems arise.

Dasbach proposed a compromise whereby other would be prohibited from making such recordings, but that LNC would make recordings of the meetings available to members at cost.

Chambers said that "politics is war." She said that she is concerned because appeasing our members may work against us politically.

Tuniewicz suggested a compromise whereby the LNC records the meetings and, for the time being, withholds judgment as to whether it will make the recordings available.

Dasbach said that he prefers Tuniewicz's proposal.

Dehn said that he wants access to a recording in case someone else is taping the meeting illicitly.

Kaneshiki said that this is "uncharted territory" and that we need to learn from this experience. She said that we should err on the side of openness.

Givot observed that little progress is being made on this issue. He asked a member of the Committee to propose how to proceed.

Martin suggested that the Committee reconsider its decision on the first question: open meetings.

Without objection, the Committee reconsidered that topic.

Kaneshiki asked why some people wanted closed meetings.

Israel said that this is a team-building exercise and that participants shouldn't have to worry about making a mistake or how others - outside LNC-SPT - would react.

Givot cited some of his experiences in strategic planning in which closed sessions enabled people to have discussions that might never have taken place in an open meeting.

Schwarz said that the LNC can review these matters in April. He said that all that needs to be determined at this time is the policy governing the first two LNC-SPT meetings.

Givot said that the fourth question is whether the content of LNC-SPT meetings should be held confidential by LNC-SPT participants.

There was strong consensus that the LNC should determine this policy.

Tuniewicz moved to appoint Givot as the LNC-SPT Facilitator.

Israel seconded.

(Givot absented himself from the room at this time.)

The motion passed.

(Givot returned at this time.)

Givot thanked the Committee and encouraged the members of the Committee to provide him with both positive and negative feedback.

Dixon suggested an alternative plan. He proposed that the LNC establishes that it will establish the openness policies for LNC-SPT. He proposed that the February LNC-SPT meeting shall be open and that the March LNC-SPT meeting shall be closed.

Givot said that the meeting in February will be primarily brainstorming, training, and team building. He said that the March meeting will be primarily used to structure the ideas that have been brought forth and will probably be the first time that various ideas may be passed over. He said that Dixon's proposal fits well with the schedule for the first two meetings.

Martin said that he supports Dixon's proposal.

Dasbach said that this proposal will afford some experience with both approaches which will be good input to the LNC regarding a final decision to be made at its April meeting.

Givot summarized Dixon's proposal as an open meeting in February at which the LNC and anyone else can record the meeting, a closed meeting in March with only the LNC recording the meeting and that recording archived for the time being, and LNC determining the ongoing policy at its April meeting.

Karlan reminded Givot that the issue of who will determine the time frame for strategic planning has yet to be decided.

Consensus was developed to permit LNC-SPT to determine the time frame for strategic planning.

Givot said that he would prepare and distribute a final Mission Statement for LNC-SPT. (Copy attached.)

Dasbach said that, due to the lateness of the day, it would be inappropriate to change the Mission Statement of the Libertarian Party at this time. He said that it would be reasonable to see if there is much sentiment to change the current Mission Statement.

Tuniewicz said that fatigue is setting in among the Committee. He said that his initial belief was that the LNC should review the Mission Statement and provide it to LNC-SPT to use. He said that due to the late hour, he now believes that it would be most appropriate to defer any action on that and permit LNC-SPT an opportunity to discuss the Mission Statement and propose possible changes.

Dasbach said that he would like to know if there is much interest among the Committee to change the Mission Statement.

MG said that the current Mission Statement is very succinct. He said that one of the benefits of conducting a review is that it provides incremental buy-in.

Dehn asked Givot whether the LNC has approved the Mission Statement for LNC-SPT incrementally.

Givot said that is his understanding.

Item: Proposed Resolution Recognizing James Merritt

Tuniewicz moved adoption of the following resolution:

Where as the Libertarian Party is the third largest political party in the United States, and

Whereas the party regularly seeks to recognize those activists who have made a substantial and continuing contrib to the success of the party, and

Where as party member James Merritt of Santa Cruz, California has been a L P members since 1989 and has hosted the Libertarian Party forum on America Online at keyword Libertarian Party since 1993, and

Whereas the LP forum on America Online represents a valuable resource to over 20 million user s of that service and has grown in size activity AND influence over the last 7 years, and

whereas Mr. Merritt has recently concluded his service as the LP forum host on AOL after having served with distinction in that role for 7 years,

Be it resolved therefore that the Libertarian National Committee expressed its thanks to James Merritt for his outstanding service to the LP and bestows an honorary life membership upon him as a small token of appreciation on behalf of party members across the United States.

MG seconded.

Karlan said that he believes an insufficient number of LNC members is present to bestow a Life Membership.

Lark ruled that 2/3 of the LNC members present and voting is required by the LNC Policy Manual and that a quorum is still present.

Tuniewicz spoke on behalf of his resolution. He said that Merritt had developed substantial content on America Online from nothing to a thriving, content-rich area.

Dasbach said that he supports the motion but for the grant of a Life Membership. He said that the Committee should develop a formal policy relating to granting Life Memberships in recognition of outstanding contributions to the party.

Turney said that he is very pleased with the precedent that would be set if this motion were adopted.

Lieberman asked if the LNC had previously granted Life Membership to someone to recognize the individual's contribution.

Dasbach said that it had been done previously.

Crickenberger said that he supports the resolution except for the granting of a Life Membership. He said that there are hundreds of individuals who deserve a Life Membership based on their contributions to the party.

The motion passed by a vote of 8 to 4.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:56 PM EST.

MISSION STATEMENT

LNC STRATEGIC PLANNING TEAM

The mission of the LNC Strategic Planning Team (LNC-SPT) is to develop and recommend a strategic plan to the LNC to advance the mission of the Libertarian Party.

LNC-SPT shall deliver an interim report to the LNC at its April 21, 2001 meeting and a final recommendation at its August 25-26, 2001 meeting. LNC Chair shall update the LNC, in writing, on the progress of LNC-SPT after each LNC-SPT meeting.

LNC-SPT shall develop and recommend a strategic plan which has the following characteristics:

- A short-term strategic plan.
- A long-term strategic plan.
- A proposed strategic planning cycle which defines how strategic planning will be done prospectively.

The strategic plan shall include such components as:

- Strategies to achieve the LNC's mission.
- Goals enroute to implementing each strategy
- Objectives - to evaluate success in achieving goals
- Actions to be taken to achieve each goal
- Assumptions and facts underlying the proposed plan

The LNC-SPT shall be composed:

- All LNC members and LNC alternate regional representatives who agree to participate
- Steve Dasbach and Ron Crickenberger of staff
- Don Gorman and one additional elected Libertarian to be selected by the Chair with the advice and input of LNC members
- Two individuals who are active in the libertarian movement, but not necessarily active in the Libertarian Party, to be selected by the Chair with the advice and input of LNC members

The LNC-SPT shall schedule meetings on:

February 10-11 in Indianapolis
March 10-11 in Chicago
April 22 in Washington
May 5-6 at the site of the LPNC convention
June 16-17 at a place to be determined later
July 14-15 at a place to be determined later
July 28-29 at a place to be determined later

The last two meetings will only be held if needed.

Steve Givot shall serve as facilitator.

The LNC shall offer to cover the costs of travel, hotel, and working meals for all LNC-SPT participants.

The February 10-11 LNC-SPT meeting shall be open to the public. Electronic recordings of that meeting can be made as long as the recording process is not disruptive to the meeting.

The March 10-11 LNC-SPT meeting shall be attended only by LNC-SPT participants and those whom they invite.

At its April 21, 2001 meeting, the LNC shall determine who may attend subsequent LNC-SPT meetings.

The staff shall electronically record all meetings of LNC-SPT. These recordings shall not be released to anyone but participants and LNC members and alternates without LNC permission.

LNC-SPT participants are expected to attend every meeting, without exception. Should any participant miss a meeting, the LNC Chair shall endeavor to bring the absent participant up to date regarding progress made at the missed meeting. The participant shall be expected to undertake the initiative to get this information from the LNC Chair. Should absence of an LNC-SPT member from meetings result in delaying or disrupting the work of LNC-SPT, the LNC Chair may - at his sole direction - remove that participant from LNC-SPT.

